

**Domesticating Winckelmann:
His critical legacy in Italian art scholarship,
1755-1834**



Lucy Emma Victoria Russell

Candidate Number: 654220

Faculty of Medieval and Modern Languages

St Peter's College

University of Oxford

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Trinity Term, 2017

Domesticating Winckelmann: His critical legacy in Italian art scholarship, 1755-1834

Abstract

This thesis explores the reception of Johann Joachim Winckelmann in Italian art scholarship, 1755-1834. Winckelmann posed a problem: he was a presence in Italy that could not be ignored, yet the views he expounded were Italophobic and contentious to an Italian readership. In light of this dilemma, the research question asked is how did Italian art scholarship respond to Winckelmann in this period and why did it respond in that way.

The core argument advanced is that there were two opposing reactions to Winckelmann, both of which were motivated by nationalism. On the one hand, Italian art scholars presented Winckelmann, his works, and his views as less attractive to an Italian readership than they would otherwise have appeared and, on the other hand, they presented him as more attractive. Through these reactions – termed foreignization and domestication respectively – art scholarship either defended against and ostracized Winckelmann or, when presented as less offensive, welcomed and embraced him amongst Italians. Thus this thesis argues that both reactions demonstrate a nationalistic attempt to portray Winckelmann in the manner most auspicious to the yet-to-be-united peninsula.

In order to explore this response to the German scholar, the thesis centres on three media: translations, art literature, and artistic journalism. Both foreignization and domestication are evident throughout the sources analysed, yet there is a predominance of domestication, achieved through a variety of methods.

This investigation adds to existing literature by examining the previously overlooked dilemma that Winckelmann posed. Moreover, employing the original conceptual framework of foreignization and domestication allows for a re-evaluation of how the art scholarship of the period engaged with the German scholar. Finally, demonstrating the infiltration of nationalistic

sentiment in this period, even extending to Italian art scholarship, this thesis is the first to posit that nationalism played a significant role in Winckelmann's critical legacy.

Domesticating Winckelmann: His critical legacy in Italian art scholarship, 1755-1834

Extended Abstract

This thesis explores the reception of Johann Joachim Winckelmann in Italian art scholarship in the period 1755-1834. The question it poses is: how did Italian art scholars respond to the German figure and why did they respond in that way. The answer it advances is that there were two contrasting reactions to Winckelmann in Italian art scholarship, both of which were motivated by nationalism.

These two reactions, which form the conceptual framework of the thesis, are labelled foreignization and domestication. Foreignization is the presentation of Winckelmann as less attractive to an Italian readership than would otherwise have been the case, whereas domestication entails presenting him as more attractive. In foreignizing Winckelmann, by depicting him and his works as foreign and portraying his views as more offensive, art scholars separated and defended Italy from the German scholar. By contrast, in domesticating him, by presenting Winckelmann and his works as familiar and his views as less offensive to an Italian reader, art scholarship sought to welcome him and embrace his views. Thus both reactions presented the German scholar in the most auspicious manner possible to the Italian reader. As a result, on analysis of these reactions, the turbulent political context, and the individual scholars' agendas, this thesis contends that art scholarship of the period discloses a nationalistic response to Winckelmann.

The research question of this thesis calls for consideration as Winckelmann posed a particular problem to Italian scholarship in this period. On the one hand, he was inescapably present in Italian society. During his lifetime he achieved a high level of eminence through his connections and employment in the upper echelons of the Church, just as after his death his key works quickly became available to Italian readers. On the other hand, the views

Winckelmann espoused in his writing were Graecophile, even Italophobic, and thus contentious to an Italian readership. He even claimed that the belief in a distinctly Roman style in art was a pure 'delusion'. Thus, whilst art scholars could not avoid responding to Winckelmann, in light of his views they faced a dilemma as to how to do so.

This enquiry deserves attention as it allows for a re-evaluation of three main areas of study: Italy's relationship with Winckelmann; the peninsula's art scholarship of the period; and Italian nationalism in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. With Winckelmann considered today an uncomplicated, distinctly positive figure in Italy, this investigation provides the opportunity to assess if this has always been the case. Similarly, whilst Winckelmann is widely considered 'the father of art history', an examination of his impact in light of the aforementioned dilemma will afford a fuller, more nuanced understanding of the influence he had on Italian art literature in this period. Finally, in examining nationalism as a possible motive for the Italian scholars' response to Winckelmann, this question allows for the consideration of nationalism in Italy before Unification in 1861 and its potential infiltration into Italian art scholarship.

This thesis is divided into six chapters. Chapter I introduces the ideas which underpin the investigation. Most significantly, it expounds the conceptual framework central to the core argument. It clarifies the terminology used throughout the thesis, including the three *forms* which each reaction can take: namely, domestication and foreignization of Winckelmann qua scholar, of his works, or of his views. This discussion extends to the theoretical inspiration behind the framework: the key figures of which are Lawrence Venuti (whose terminology is appropriated in this study), Edward Said, William G. Sumner, and Anthony D. Smith. This chapter also delineates the scope of the thesis, justifying the sources used as well as the chosen geographical and temporal parameters. Of particular note are the geographical

boundaries: the focus throughout this thesis is on Northern and Central Italy, including the Papal States.

Chapter II provides background and context to the investigation. First, it outlines the key historical information. This includes an overview of the cultural developments of the period; the rise of nationalism in scholarship; and Italy's political landscape, as an appreciation of Napoleon's campaigns is crucial to understanding the agendas of contemporary scholars. Second, the chapter turns to Winckelmann: briefly outlining his life, aesthetics, and works, including in particular his magnum opus, the *Geschichte der Kunst des Altertums*, on which this thesis focuses. Third, the chapter concludes with a detailed exposition of the aforementioned dilemma: Winckelmann's presence – his eminence in Roman society and the availability of his works – and the Italophobic views permeating his oeuvre.

Chapter III examines three Italian translations of Winckelmann's *Geschichte*. These were produced in 1779 by Carlo Amoretti, in 1783-84 by Carlo Fea, and in 1830-34 as part of the *Opere di G.G. Winckelmann*, also edited by Fea. Having contextualized the translators and their works, attention turns to the reactions to Winckelmann found in these texts, analysis of which centres on a number of relevant sections of the *Geschichte*, as well as the paratextual information included in each publication.

This chapter reaches a number of conclusions. It demonstrates how the response to Winckelmann in these translations was certainly not neutral. Indeed, contrary to the avowed agenda of precision expressed in the paratexts, comparison between the German edition and the translations reveals that the translators made deliberate changes to Winckelmann's work, by both manipulating the text and adding annotation. Employing the conceptual framework of foreignization and domestication, the chapter divides these alterations into those that render Winckelmann and his *Geschichte* as less attractive and those that present Winckelmann, his work, and his views as more attractive to an Italian reader. A plain example of the latter is the

translation of Winckelmann's 'so-called Roman art' simply as 'Roman art', by which the translators completely ignore the slur against Roman art. This investigation demonstrates that there was vastly more domestication than foreignization in these translations. There was also particular focus on the German scholar's views, most likely due to the medium of translation affording limited opportunity to comment on Winckelmann and his works outside of the prefaces. Looking to the motivation behind these responses to Winckelmann, the nationalism section towards the end of the chapter – a section repeated in Chapters IV and V – enumerates the nationalistic elements of the translators' reactions. This includes their defence of the native patria against Winckelmann's criticism as well as their attempts to deny the praise Winckelmann affords Italy's long-standing rival, ancient Greece. This section further continues to corroborate nationalism's role in these translations as it eliminates other possible motives for the translation choices, including personal antagonism against Winckelmann and xenophobia towards Germany.

This analysis not only supplements the limited study of the Italian translations of the *Geschichte*, but further challenges the line of reasoning of leading scholar, Stefano Ferrari. Ferrari argues that Fea's annotatory strategies are simply a means to contest the accuracy of Winckelmann's text. Yet Chapter III demonstrates that concentrating solely on such objectives as precision is starkly incomplete without consideration of the nationalistic purpose so central to the Italian translations of the *Geschichte*.

Chapter IV considers the art literature of the period, the same sphere to which Winckelmann himself contributed. It focuses on the publications of five Italian art writers: Giovanni Battista Piranesi (whose central works were published 1761-69), Giambattista Gherardo D'Arco (1785), Francesco Milizia (1781-97), Luigi Lanzi (1785-1809), and Leopoldo Cicognara (1808-25). After providing justification for the corpus chosen and an introduction to each

scholar's works and objectives, the central aim of this chapter is to explore how these writers responded to Winckelmann.

The investigation provides clear evidence of the foreignization and domestication of Winckelmann in Italian art literature. Notably, it reveals a more balanced response than that seen in the translations: whilst there are still more instances of the writers domesticating than foreignizing the German scholar, the disparity between the two reactions is far less pronounced. The chapter also illustrates how this medium demonstrates greater variety in the forms of reaction. The two reactions were again primarily directed towards Winckelmann's views, yet there are also a number of significant examples of the foreignization of Winckelmann qua scholar and the domestication of his *Geschichte*. A clear example of scholars affording Winckelmann's work greater familiarity is Cicognara's introduction of his own magnum opus as a 'continuazione all'opere di Winkelmann [sic]'. The chapter explains this more diverse response by highlighting how the increased flexibility of the medium of art literature, as opposed to translation, allowed for a more varied engagement with Winckelmann. It also makes plain the important role of the individual agendas of each art writer. Indeed, examination of the five art writers' oeuvres uncovers how each scholar tended to demonstrate a preference either for foreignizing (Piranesi, D'Arco, Milizia) or domesticating the German scholar (Lanzi, Cicognara). The chapter closes by recapitulating the nationalism inherent in the scholars' reactions, including their ostracization of Winckelmann from Italian scholarship and their remodelling of his ideas for the benefit of the peninsula. As in the previous chapter, this section also provides further evidence for the role of nationalism by emphasizing the broader patriotism evident in the writers' works and again disproving other possible motivations.

This chapter contributes extensively to the understanding of eighteenth- to nineteenth-century Italian art literature by uncovering and analysing the works of a number of

understudied art writers. Indeed this study constitutes one of the first considerations of D'Arco's *Della patria primitiva dell'arti del disegno*. Moreover, whilst some academics have examined the patriotism of the art writers considered and there is also some (limited) existing research that identifies Winckelmann's influence in these works, scholarship has thus far failed to synthesize these two elements. This chapter thus fills a lacuna by looking beyond Winckelmann's influence as 'the father of art history' to the overlooked nationalistic and pro-Italian responses he inspired in Italy's art literature.

Chapter V examines artistic journalism, broadening the scope of investigation yet further. As the most extensive medium considered, the corpus is limited to Rome, and more specifically to ten Roman artistic journals, the abridged titles of which are: *Efemeridi letterarie*, *Antologia romana*, *Giornale delle belle arti*, *Memorie per le belle arti*, *Monumenti antichi inediti*, *Memorie enciclopediche romane*, *Memorie enciclopediche sulle antichità e belle arti*, *Giornale arcadico*, *Effemeridi letterarie*, and the *Memorie romane*. In a similar manner to the preceding analyses, the chapter introduces each journal, with specific focus on its agenda and the scholars involved, before continuing to an examination of how the medium reacted to Winckelmann.

This investigation confirms once again how responses to Winckelmann were by no means neutral: the journals display clear efforts to both foreignize and domesticate the German scholar. Moreover, whilst this analysis demonstrates that domestication was again the more common reaction, it reveals a change in the dominant form. Unlike in the previous two media, which primarily engaged with Winckelmann's views, in artistic journals the reactions were chiefly directed towards the German scholar and his works. Likely due to the more discursive nature of periodicals, Winckelmann is discussed qua scholar far more frequently in this medium. Indeed, he is repeatedly included in groups of otherwise exclusively Italian scholars as, for example, when the *Effemeridi letterarie* refers to the 'gloriosi nomi di Gaetano

Marini, Giovanni Winckelmann, Ennio Quirino Visconti'. Of the journals examined, the chapter concludes that the *Efemeridi letterarie*, the *Giornale arcadico*, and the *Effemeridi letterarie* exhibit the most domestication, and considers possible reasons for this. Finally, the nationalism section confirms the nationalistic intent behind the opposing reactions to Winckelmann, from those labelling him as foreign to those terming his *Geschichte* a Roman enterprise. As well as dismissing other potential motivations behind the reactions, it verifies the argument for nationalism through reference to Italy's sense of backwardness in this period and the journals' consequent affirmations that Rome and Italy were by no means inferior to other European countries.

This chapter provides a detailed insight into a body of understudied journalistic sources of the eighteenth to nineteenth-centuries. Indeed, some journals such as the *Memorie romane* have received scarce attention in existing literature. Moreover this analysis emphasizes the crucial role such sources have in our understanding of Winckelmann's reception. Until now scholars have mostly employed journals such as the *Antologia romana* merely as evidence of the German scholar's impact in Italy. However, when examined according to the framework of foreignization and domestication, this thesis demonstrates how they are far more revealing than that. Finally, in identifying the nationalistic responses to Winckelmann in these artistic journals, this study challenges the prevailing view that political journalism marked the rise of Italian nationalism. As this chapter confirms, a nationalistic sentiment permeated artistic journals long before the rise of their political counterparts during the Risorgimento.

Chapter VI concludes the analysis by considering together the three media of translation, art literature, and artistic journalism. From this it identifies a number of patterns, including most significantly: a rising intensity of reaction – as time progressed, reactions to Winckelmann became more pronounced – and, by the end of the period, an increased tilt towards domestication. Indeed, just as the *Opere* demonstrated more domestication than the

earlier two translations, Lanzi and Cicognara domesticated Winckelmann more than their three predecessors, and two of the most domesticating journals – *Giornale arcadico* and *Effemeridi letterarie* – began publication as late as 1819 and 1820, respectively. In considering the intricacies of this pattern, Chapter VI also relates the reception of Winckelmann in Italy to the peninsula's turbulent political landscape. Further supporting the core argument of this thesis, it notes the parallels between the increasing reactions to Winckelmann and the rise of nationalism as Italy approached Unification.

In addition to the individual ways in which each chapter supplements and challenges the present understanding of Winckelmann in Italian art scholarship of the period, this thesis makes three main contributions to existing knowledge. First, the dilemma itself: whilst existing studies have examined Winckelmann's presence in Italy and, albeit to a limited extent, have noted the Italophobic nature of his views, no scholar thus far has synthesized these two elements to unearth the problem Winckelmann posed Italian scholarship. Second, no existing literature has noted the duality of the response to Winckelmann in Italian art scholarship, overlooking the opposing reactions that present him either as less or as more attractive to an Italian readership. Allowing for a more nuanced understanding of his reception, this thesis analyses these reactions using the original framework of foreignization and domestication. Finally, taking into account these antithetical reactions, the agendas of all scholars examined, and the political backdrop of the period, this is the first study to discern and verify the impact that nationalism had on Winckelmann's critical legacy in Italian art scholarship, 1755-1834.

Domesticating Winckelmann:

His critical legacy in Italian art scholarship,

1755-1834

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I feel very fortunate to have been part of the Italian Department at the University of Oxford for the past four years. It has been a truly stimulating environment in which to work and I am thankful to everyone for their guidance and inspiration, from graduate seminars to Transfer and Confirmation vivas. I would like to thank my supervisor, Professor Nicola Gardini, for allowing me the freedom to pursue often uncertain avenues of research and for his constant encouragement along the way. Having supervised me for a term in my first year, I am also most grateful for the advice and continued support of Professor Martin McLaughlin.

For their valuable suggestions and enthusiasm for the project during the final viva, I further extend my sincere thanks to my internal and external examiners, Professor Emanuela Tandello and Professor Giuliana Pieri.

Thank you to the Faculty of Medieval and Modern Languages for the Christina Drake Award, the Isaiah Berlin Scholarship, and the two Graduate Travel Grants. These were all crucial in affording me the opportunity to present at conferences outside of Oxford: experiences which have allowed me to shape and develop my research. Thank you, too, to Dr Stephen Lay.

I am indebted to the Bodleian libraries, and in particular to the Taylorian Institution, where the staff have helped me with numerous interlibrary loans and microfiche films. I would like to express my warmest gratitude to Clare Hills-Nova, who has been so helpful and supportive over the years.

Thank you to everyone at St Peter's College, who has made it such a happy place to be: to the MCR, to Martin Brown, to the librarians, and to the porters, especially Paul. I would also like to thank my College Tutor, Dr Kevin Hilliard, particularly for his inspiration and

encouragement during my MSt year. I am most grateful to St Peter's for the grants covering travel and thesis-binding, as well as for the St Peter's College Foundation Award.

Looking back to where my enthusiasm for Italian and German began, I am greatly indebted to The University of Bristol, and especially to Dr Steffan Davies, who, in the context of examining Weimar Classicism through reference to the Laocoon statue, first introduced me to Winckelmann.

Since 2015 I have been part of a group of scholars organizing a sequence of conferences celebrating Winckelmann's life and work. I am responsible for the Oxford workshop (2018) with Dr Fiona Gatty and am thankful for our mutual interests. Moreover, the principal coordinator of these events is Dr Katherine Harloe, whom I cannot thank enough for involving me in this and various different projects over the past two years, not least including research we are currently pursuing on Winckelmann's love letters. I am truly grateful to be able to share my passion with such a specialist.

I am thankful too, for the correspondence I have enjoyed with academics based at other institutions throughout the world, all of whom have been so enthusiastic in our emails on various aspects of Winckelmann and the eighteenth century. This includes: Professor Maria Pia Donato, Dr Noemi Cinelli, Professor Elizabeth Décultot, Professor Maurizio Ghelardi, Dr Laura Messina, and Judith Harris. I would especially like to thank Professor Stefano Ferrari, for our inspiring and helpful discussions on Winckelmann and Italian art scholarship, and for his kind invitations to publish elements of my research in the future.

I would like to extend my thanks to the Modern Humanities Research Association (MHRA) for my two years as Postgraduate Editor. The experience greatly improved my editing skills and allowed me to meet many academics from different UK institutions, three of whom are now firm friends. Thank you Sophie, Ellie, and Duncan for all your help and support.

Thank you to my Oxford friends, with whom I have experienced so much over the last four years. I am so thankful to have shared the journey with my college friends, especially Helen and Rosie; my fellow Oxford Italianists and the former MML committee; and my housemates and friends, Elizabeth, Sarah, and Izzy: 39 Juxon will always hold very fond memories for me.

I am so lucky to have such wonderfully patient and understanding friends outside of academia, in particular Shireen, Hannah, Jenna, Tom, and Jess. Thank you, too, to Nimmi, and I wish to express my warmest gratitude to Henry, for his endless encouragement and very special friendship.

Finally, thank you to my parents and family, who have been there every step of the way. In particular, thank you to my mother, Gill, and to Michael, who have been my rocks. I will never be able to thank them enough, not only for their practical help in the last stages in particular, but for their unfailing support, understanding, and love. I dedicate this thesis to my grandparents, Bernard (Puff) and Marjory Fenton, who I hope would have been proud.

CONTENTS

<u>GLOSSARY</u>	<u>20</u>
 <u>CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION</u>	 <u>24</u>
I.1. RESEARCH QUESTION AND CORE ARGUMENT	25
I.2. POSITIONING THIS THESIS IN THE WIDER FIELD OF STUDY	27
I.2.1. Wider Studies into Italian Art Scholarship	27
I.2.2. Winckelmann Studies	34
I.3. CONTRIBUTIONS TO KNOWLEDGE	38
I.4. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	40
I.5. THEORY INFORMING THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	44
I.5.1. Nationalism: Anthony D. Smith	45
I.5.2. Foreignization and domestication: Friedrich Schleiermacher and Lawrence Venuti	46
I.5.3. Responding to a problematic presence: Edward Said	49
I.5.4. Nationalism as a stimulus for foreignization and domestication: Venuti and Said	53
I.5.5. Otherness as less attractive, familiarity as more attractive: William G. Sumner	55
I.6. THESIS STRUCTURE	57
I.7. RESEARCH PARAMETERS	58
I.8. PRACTICAL METHODOLOGY	64
I.9. CONTRIBUTION RESTATED	66
 <u>CHAPTER II: BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT</u>	 <u>67</u>
II.1. INTRODUCTION	68
II.2. ITALY, 1755-1834	68
II.3. INTRODUCING WINCKELMANN	74
II.3.1. Winckelmann's life	74
II.3.2. Winckelmann's art history and aesthetics	77
II.3.3. Winckelmann's works	83
II.4. THE DILEMMA WINCKELMANN PRESENTED TO ITALIANS (1755-1834)	85
II.4.1. Winckelmann in Italy today	85
II.4.2. Existing scholarship	87

II.4.3.	Winckelmann's presence	88
II.4.4.	Winckelmann's contentious views	101
II.4.5.	The dilemma restated	106
<u>CHAPTER III: WINCKELMANN IN TRANSLATION</u>		<u>107</u>
III.1.	INTRODUCTION	108
III.2.	EXISTING SCHOLARSHIP	109
III.3.	CONTEXT: TRANSLATORS AND TRANSLATIONS	110
III.3.1.	Carlo Amoretti and Carlo Fea	110
III.3.2.	Amoretti's translation	112
III.3.3.	Fea's translation	113
III.3.4.	Opere di G. G. Winckelmann	115
III.3.5.	Amoretti and Fea: objectives	117
III.3.6.	Opere: objectives	119
III.3.7.	Christian Gottlob Heyne	121
III.4.	REACTIONS TO WINCKELMANN IN THE ITALIAN TRANSLATIONS	122
III.5.	FOREIGNIZATION: THE FOREIGN ORIGINS OF WINCKELMANN AND THE <i>GESCHICHTE</i>	122
III.6.	DOMESTICATION: WINCKELMANN AND THE <i>GESCHICHTE</i> AS ITALIAN	124
III.7.	DOMESTICATION: TRANSFORMING WINCKELMANN'S VIEWS THROUGH TRANSLATION	128
III.7.1.	Etruscan art and society	129
III.7.2.	Ancient Roman art and society	131
III.7.3.	Modern Italian artists	136
III.7.4.	Modern Italian scholars	138
III.7.5.	The peninsula and its people	140
III.7.6.	Ancient Greek art and society	142
III.8.	NATIONALISM	146
III.9.	CONCLUSION	150
<u>CHAPTER IV: WINCKELMANN IN ITALIAN ART LITERATURE</u>		<u>153</u>
IV.1.	INTRODUCTION	154
IV.2.	EXISTING SCHOLARSHIP	156
IV.3.	CONTEXT: ART WRITERS AND THEIR WORKS	159

IV.3.1. Art literature, 1755-1834	159
IV.3.2. Giovanni Battista Piranesi	160
IV.3.3. Giambattista Gherardo D'Arco	163
IV.3.4. Francesco Milizia	164
IV.3.5. Luigi Lanzi	169
IV.3.6. Leopoldo Cicognara	171
IV.4. REACTIONS TO WINCKELMANN IN ITALIAN ART LITERATURE	174
IV.5. FOREIGNIZATION: OSTRACIZING WINCKELMANN FROM ITALIAN SCHOLARSHIP	175
IV.6. FOREIGNIZATION: DISPLAYING WINCKELMANN'S ITALOPHOBIA	182
IV.7. DOMESTICATION: THE <i>GESCHICHTE</i> IN ITALIAN ART LITERATURE	189
IV.8. DOMESTICATION: REMODELLING WINCKELMANN'S IDEAS	197
IV.9. NATIONALISM	206
IV.10. CONCLUSION	210
 <u>CHAPTER V: WINCKELMANN IN ROME'S ARTISTIC JOURNALS</u>	 <u>214</u>
V.1. INTRODUCTION	215
V.2. EXISTING SCHOLARSHIP	217
V.3. CONTEXT: ART JOURNALS AND THEIR EDITORS	218
V.3.1. The rise of artistic periodicals	218
V.3.2. Efemeridi letterarie di Roma	221
V.3.3. Antologia romana	223
V.3.4. Giornale delle belle arti e della incisione, antiquaria, musica, e poesia	225
V.3.5. Memorie per le belle arti	226
V.3.6. Monumenti antichi inediti ovvero Notizie sulle antichità e belle arti di Roma	229
V.3.7. Memorie enciclopediche romane sulle belle arti, antichità ec.	231
V.3.8. Memorie enciclopediche sulle antichità e belle arti di Roma	233
V.3.9. Giornale arcadico di scienze, lettere, ed arti	234
V.3.10. Effemeridi letterarie di Roma	236
V.3.11. Memorie romane di antichità e di belle arti	237
V.4. REACTIONS TO WINCKELMANN IN ROME'S ARTISTIC JOURNALS	238
V.5. FOREIGNIZATION: WINCKELMANN AS AN INFERIOR 'OTHER'	238
V.6. FOREIGNIZATION: ILLUMINATING WINCKELMANN'S CONTENTIOUS VIEWS	242
V.7. DOMESTICATION: WINCKELMANN AS ONE AMONGST THE ITALIANS	244

V.8. DOMESTICATION: WINCKELMANN'S OEUVRE AND ITS ITALIAN EXISTENCE	251
V.9. DOMESTICATION: TAILORING WINCKELMANN'S OPINIONS FOR ITALY	263
V.10. NATIONALISM	266
V.11. CONCLUSION	271
 <u>CHAPTER VI: CONCLUSION</u>	 <u>276</u>
VI.1. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	277
VI.2. IDENTIFYING PATTERNS	281
VI.3. CONTRIBUTION TO KNOWLEDGE	283
VI.4. EXPANDING THE INVESTIGATION	286
VI.5. STIMULUS FOR RESEARCH IN ASSOCIATED FIELDS	289
 <u>BIBLIOGRAPHY</u>	 <u>291</u>
PRIMARY SOURCES	292
SECONDARY SOURCES	295

GLOSSARY

Language of Quotations

When the original language of a source is not English or Italian, the English translation is provided in the body of the thesis and the original text is included in a footnote. In cases where the same quotation is cited more than once, the original text is only provided on the first instance. To ensure clarity, Winckelmann's original German has been modernized as appropriate.

In all quotations, italics appear as in the original unless otherwise stated.

Format of References to Primary Sources

References to the sources listed below are given in the body of the text. They take the form of an abbreviation, followed by the volume number (if applicable) in an upper-case Roman numeral, and the page number, either as an Arabic or lower-case Roman numeral. For example: (GA.I.1), or (AM.I.i), or (DPP.1). In works where the preface is not paginated, 'PR' is used in place of a page number, for instance (EF.I.PR).

For Winckelmann's Core Texts, references to the original sources are immediately followed by a solidus line, volume number (if applicable), and page number of the respective English translation. For example: (GES.I.xx/I.50). When it has been necessary to supply my own translation, this is instead indicated by 'MT', for example (GES.I.xx/MT).

Also provided below are the shortened titles of the primary texts used throughout the thesis.

Winckelmann's Core Texts

GES	<i>Geschichte</i>	<i>Geschichte der Kunst des Altertums</i> , ed. by F.J. Riedel, 2 vols (Vienna: Akademischen Verlag, 1776)
		[English translation: Henry Lodge, <i>The History of Ancient Art</i> , 2 vols (London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle & Rivington, 1881)]
GED	<i>Gedanken</i>	<i>Gedanken über die Nachahmung der Griechischen Werke in der Malerei und Bildhauer-Kunst</i> (Dresden: Walther, 1755)

[English translation: 'Thoughts on the Imitation of Greek Works in Painting and the Art of Sculpture', in *Johann Joachim Winckelmann on Art, Architecture, and Archaeology*, trans. by David Carter (Rochester: Camden House, 2013)]

Translations of the *Geschichte*

- | | |
|--|---|
| AM <i>Amoretti's translation/Storia</i> | Carlo Amoretti, <i>Storia delle arti del disegno presso gli antichi</i> , 2 vols (Milan: Imperial Monastero di S. Ambrogio Maggiore, 1779)* |
| FE <i>Fea's translation/Storia</i> | Carlo Fea, <i>Storia delle arti del disegno presso gli antichi. Tradotta dal Tedesco in questa edizione corretta e aumentata dall'abate Carlo Fea</i> , 3 vols (Rome: Pagliarini, 1783-84)* |
| OP <i>Opere</i> | Carlo Fea, 'Storia dell'arte presso gli antichi', in <i>Opere di G. G. Winckelmann</i> , ed. by Carlo Fea, 12 vols (Prato: Giachetti, 1830-34), I-III (1830-32)* |

* It should be noted that, given the significant attention afforded to the Italian translations in this thesis (in particular, in Chapter III), they are referred to and referenced throughout as the work of Amoretti and Fea.

Giovanni Battista Piranesi

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| DM <i>Della magnificenza</i> | <i>Della magnificenza ed architettura de' Romani</i> (Rome: [n.pub], 1761) |
| DI <i>Della introduzione</i> | <i>Della introduzione e del progresso delle belle arti in Europa ne' tempi antichi</i> (Rome: Salomoni, 1765)*

[Sourced from: Giovanni Battista Piranesi, <i>The Polemical Works: Rome 1757, 1761, 1765, 1769</i> , ed. by John Wilton-Ely (Farnborough: Gregg, 1972), pp. 17-23] |
| PA <i>Parere</i> | <i>Parere su l'architettura</i> (Rome: Salomoni, 1765)*

[Sourced from: <i>The Polemical Works</i> , pp. 9-16] |
| RA <i>Ragionamento</i> | 'Ragionamento apologetico in difesa dell'architettura egizia, e toscana', in <i>Diverse maniere d'adornare i cammini ed ogni altra parte degli edifizi desunte dall'architettura egizia, etrusca e greca</i> (Rome: Salomoni, 1769) |

* Originally published together, these essays are treated separately throughout the thesis.

Giambattista Gherardo D'Arco

DPP *Della patria* *Della patria primitiva dell'arti del disegno* (Cremona: Lorenzo Manini, 1785)

Francesco Milizia

ME *Memorie degli architetti (Memorie*)* *Memorie degli architetti antichi e moderni*, 2 vols (Venice: Remondini, 1785)

DAV *Dell'arte di vedere* *Dell'arte di vedere nelle belle arti del disegno secondo i principii di Sulzer e di Mengs* (Genova: Caffarelli, 1786)

RBA *Roma delle belle arti* *Roma delle belle arti del disegno: parte prima dell'architettura civile* (Bassano: Remondini, 1787)

* Only employed where context ensures clarity.

Luigi Lanzi

NP *Notizie preliminari* 'Notizie preliminari circa la scoltura degli antichi, e i varii suoi stili', in *Saggio di lingua etrusca e di altre antiche d'Italia per servire alla storia de' popoli, delle lingue, e delle belle arti*, 3 vols (Rome: Pagliarini, 1789), III, pp. i-xliv

SP *Storia pittorica* *Storia pittorica della Italia: dal risorgimento delle belle arti fin presso al fine del XVIII secolo*, 6 vols (Bassano: Remondini, 1809)

DVA *De' vasi antichi* *De' vasi antichi dipinti voglamente chiamati etruschi: dissertazioni tre* (Florence: Fantosini, 1806)

Leopoldo Cicognara

SS *Storia della scultura (Storia*)* *Storia della scultura dal suo risorgimento in Italia fino al secolo di Canova: per servire di continuazione all'opere di Winkelmann [sic] e di D'Agincourt*, 7 vols (Prato: Giachetti, 1823-25)

DB *Del bello* *Del Bello: ragionamenti* (Pavia: Pietro Bizzoni, 1825)

* Only employed where context ensures clarity.

Roman artistic journals

EF	<i>Efemeridi / Efemeridi letterarie</i>	<i>Efemeridi letterarie di Roma (1772-98, 1806)</i>
AR	<i>Antologia</i>	<i>Antologia romana (1774-98)</i>
GBA	<i>Giornale delle belle arti (Giornale*)</i>	<i>Giornale delle belle arti e della incisione, antiquaria, musica, e poesia (1784-88)</i>
MBA	<i>Memorie per le belle arti (Memorie*)</i>	<i>Memorie per le belle arti (1785-88)</i>
MAI	<i>Monumenti antichi</i>	<i>Monumenti antichi inediti ovvero Notizie sulle antichità e belle arti di Roma (1784-89, 1805)</i>
MER	<i>Memorie enciclopediche romane (Memorie enciclopediche*)</i>	<i>Memorie enciclopediche romane sulle belle arti, antichità ec. (1806-10)</i>
MES	<i>Memorie enciclopediche sulle antichità (Memorie enciclopediche*)</i>	<i>Memorie enciclopediche sulle antichità e belle arti di Roma (1817, 1819)</i>
GA	<i>Giornale arcadico (Arcadico*)</i>	<i>Giornale arcadico di scienze, lettere, ed arti (1819- 68)</i>
EFF	<i><u>Effemeridi</u> / <u>Effemeridi</u> letterarie**</i>	<i><u>Effemeridi letterarie di Roma (1820-23)</u></i>
MR	<i>Memorie romane</i>	<i>Memorie romane di antichità e di belle arti (1824-27)</i>

* The asterisked shortened titles are only employed where context ensures clarity.

** In order to avoid confusion with the earlier *Efemeridi letterarie*, underlining is used throughout to identify the *Effemeridi letterarie*.

CHAPTER I:
INTRODUCTION

*M'accorgo che non si può scrivere di Antichità senza
essere stata a Roma [...] Questa è la mia fortuna.*

J. J. Winckelmann (OP.IX.148)

I.1. RESEARCH QUESTION AND CORE ARGUMENT

Johann Joachim Winckelmann (1717-68) posed a dilemma for Italian art scholarship in the period 1755-1834: he was a lasting presence that Italian scholars could not ignore, yet fundamental aspects of his oeuvre and seminal history of art were, for them, deeply contentious.

Winckelmann's presence was inescapable in Roman society and Italian art scholarship, giving rise to the first aspect of this dilemma. Having arrived in Rome in 1755 he not only authored his history of ancient art on observation of the city's ancient monuments, but also soon gained prominence amongst the cultural and ecclesiastical elite, even securing two jobs in the Vatican. Further, his influence only increased after his murder, as evinced by the Italian editions of his works: from the first translation in 1779 to the first collated edition of his works, 1830-34. However, with this need to respond to Winckelmann came the need to confront the views permeating his oeuvre that were objectionable to Italy: the second aspect of the dilemma. Winckelmann's Hellenism involved starkly Italophobic sentiments concerning the supposed inferiority of Etruscan, Roman, and more modern Italian art.

The dilemma presented by this need to respond to Winckelmann's contentious views and the uncertainty as to how best to do so forms the analytical starting point to this thesis. Having first contextualized this dilemma, I will turn to my research question: **how** did Italian art scholarship respond to Winckelmann, his works, and his views between 1755 and 1834, and **why** did it respond in such a way?

This research question deserves attention for three reasons. Firstly, it challenges the modern, prevailing view of Italy's relationship with Winckelmann. As I will explore in due

course, he is considered today an uncontroversial, wholly positive figure in Italian history, yet my question invites a fresh perspective as to whether there was a more complicated relationship in the past. Secondly, it allows for a re-evaluation of eighteenth- to nineteenth-century Italian art scholarship, thereby enquiring whether previous study has overlooked the influence of the above dilemma in how scholars responded to Winckelmann. Thirdly, in inviting consideration of nationalism (even before 'Italy' became a unified nation) as a possible motive for the Italian scholars' response to Winckelmann, this question looks beyond the time period and genres within which Italian nationalism is commonly associated.¹ My thesis questions whether consideration of Italian nationalistic sentiment thus far has neglected instances of the peninsula's Winckelmann-inspired, pre-Unification nationalism.

My core argument is that, in the face of the above-clarified dilemma, the response to Winckelmann in Italian art scholarship manifested in two contrasting ways, which I will refer to as **reactions**. The first of these reactions was to present Winckelmann, his works, or his views as less attractive to a specifically Italian readership than they would otherwise have appeared. The second reaction was the inverse: to present him, his works, or his views as more attractive. I will term the first reaction **foreignization** and the second reaction **domestication**, concepts which I develop in my conceptual framework below. My analysis of the two reactions in the media examined by this thesis – translation, art literature, and artistic journalism – will demonstrate that domestication is the more common. Further, I will argue that, despite the contradictory nature of the reactions, both shared the same motivation of an early and, for the most part, pre-Risorgimento nationalism.²

¹ Despite Italy not becoming a unified country until 1861, reference to 'Italy' throughout this thesis refers to the divided collection of states forming the Italy we know today. Moreover, I use the term 'peninsula' throughout to refer to the whole of Italy (and not solely the part of the country surrounded by sea).

² It should be noted that, in the company of scholars such as Riall and Meriggi, the Risorgimento will refer throughout this thesis to the years from 1815 (the Congress of Vienna) to 1860. See Marco Meriggi, 'Italy', in *Nationalism in the Age of the French Revolution*, ed. by Otto Dann and John Dinwiddy (London: Hambledon,

I.2. POSITIONING THIS THESIS IN THE WIDER FIELD OF STUDY

I will now position my thesis in the wider field of study, highlighting the two main areas in which it is situated: research into eighteenth- to nineteenth-century Italian art scholarship; and Winckelmann Studies.

I.2.1. Wider Studies into Italian Art Scholarship

Despite focusing specifically on Winckelmann's reception, in doing so this thesis also draws on and augments existing research on Italian art scholarship of the late eighteenth to early nineteenth centuries. Indeed, whilst different aspects of this sphere's development have received varying levels of attention in scholarship, by examining a number of scholars and media I have been able to cast a broader light on the complexities of the field. To illustrate this, I will now outline how this thesis adds to an understanding of three facets of art scholarship during this period, which form the backdrop to this investigation. Namely: the discourse surrounding Etruria and Rome as competing sources for Italy's artistic past; the parallel between art scholarship and the wider debate on literary aesthetics; and the developing state of art scholarship during this period.

Firstly, this thesis gives new insights into scholars' differing views on whether to promote Italy's Roman or Etruscan artistic heritage, and the possible motivations for this divergence. As confirmed by numerous allusions to 'gran Roma' (EF.I.PR) throughout the three media here examined, the artistic legacy of Rome – both of the Republic and the Empire – was a source of great pride for many art scholars. Francesco Milizia even lauded the Roman sewer system over Renaissance architecture: 'Questa descrizione delle fabbriche Romane è dalla Cloaca Massima alla Sagrestia di S. Pietro: dall'ottimo al pessimo'(RBA.205). Yet, despite this being the most ubiquitously known era of Italian artistic history, this was not the only ancient

1988), pp. 199-212 (p. 211) and Lucy Riall, *The Italian Risorgimento: State, Society and National Unification* (London: Routledge, 1994), p. 1. See also Chapter II.2. for historical context.

art to which scholars of this period referred. Rather, this thesis augments our comprehension of the simultaneous tendency to overlook or even dismiss Rome in favour of the earlier art created in the pre-Roman civilization of Etruria.

Modern scholars, including Mauro Cristofani, William Stiebing Jr., Giulio Firpo, and Antonio De Francesco, amongst others, have already expounded in great detail the origins and development of Italian Etruscology, or 'Etruscheria', as it is often termed.³ Indeed, as their research illustrates, having developed under such key figures as Filippo Buonarroti (1661-1733), Scipione Maffei (1675-1755), and Antonio Gori (1691-1757), the same focus on Etruria can be identified in the work of many eighteenth- to early nineteenth-century historians, including Carlo Denina (1731-1813) and Giuseppe Micali (1768-1844). This thesis, however, further adds to this research by illuminating, through examining the works of neglected figures of art scholarship, the pervasiveness of this phenomenon beyond its principal exponents. A key example of this is Giambattista Gherardo D'Arco, explored in Chapter IV. Indeed, published just sixteen years after the far more widely-researched work of Giovanni Battista Piranesi,⁴ D'Arco's *Della patria primitiva dell'arti del disegno* (1785) – which presents Italy as the 'prima culla' of art due to its Etruscan heritage (DPP.6) – provides critical evidence of Italian art scholars' pride in the early production of Etruria.

Furthermore, current scholarly attention on Etruscheria includes treatment of the possible motivations behind this focus on early Italian art, leading to a discussion of the key concerns facing art scholars in the period, to which this thesis also contributes. One motivation – posited by scholars Emiliana Pasca Noether and Valeria Forte, amongst others – was a search

³ Mauro Cristofani, *La scoperta degli etruschi: archeologia e antiquaria nel '700* (Rome: Consiglio nazionale delle ricerche, 1983); William H. Stiebing Jr., *Uncovering the Past: A History of Archaeology* (Oxford: OUP, 1994), especially pp. 143-58; Giulio Firpo, 'Roma, etruschi e italici nel "secolo senza Roma"', in *Patria Diversis Genibus Una? Unità politica e identità etniche nell'Italia antica*, ed. by G. Urso (Pisa: Ets, 2008), pp. 267-304; and Antonio De Francesco, *The Antiquity of the Italian Nation: The Cultural Origins of a Political Myth in Modern Italy, 1796-1943* (Oxford: OUP, 2013), see especially Chapter II, entitled 'A Plural Italy', pp. 51-84.

⁴ See Chapter IV.3.2. for an introduction to Piranesi's central works.

for legitimacy in an Italy conscious of its political fragmentation.⁵ After all, by focusing on Etruria, Italian scholars had ‘seemingly tangible proof of a national past involving the political unity of their country’, a past that they claimed was older than their rivals, the Greeks.⁶ Both Forte and Noether thus argue that this Etruscheria demonstrates an early Italian nationalism, which, as above, is a sentiment fundamental to my argument. Indeed, particularly in the ‘Nationalism’ sections in Chapters III-V, this thesis provides valuable insights into the nationalism of late eighteenth- to early nineteenth-century Italian art scholarship, demonstrating how it not only infiltrated different media, but even influenced Winckelmann’s reception.

Another suggested explanation behind the focus on Etruria is a negative response to the barbarity of the Roman Empire: an antipathy which was heightened in this period by Napoleon’s ruthless imperialism.⁷ As Frederick Mascioli notes, the ‘subjugation of Europe by the French had disenchanted many as to the glory of Roman victories’; Rome was no longer seen as the custodian of peace, but as a ‘harsh and cruel conqueror’, which had crushed the ‘unity and culture wrought by the ancient Italians before her’.⁸ Whilst such comments as the following from Leopoldo Cicognara demonstrate awareness of the severe rule of the Romans – ‘quando i Greci furono soggetti ai Romani stettero assai peggio reducti in provinciam sotto il governo dispotico di un pretore o di un proconsole’ (SS.I.152) – such an aversion to the Roman period is in fact not particularly prevalent in this examination. Yet I have nevertheless highlighted the need to question instances of praise for Roman art in the early nineteenth

⁵ Emiliana Pasca Noether, *Seeds of Italian Nationalism, 1700-1815* (NY: AMS, 1969), pp. 79-82; and Valeria Forte, ‘Etruscan Origins and Italian Nationalism’, *Studia Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai – Studia Europaea*, 1 (2011), 5-18 (pp. 10-11).

⁶ Noether, p. 81.

⁷ See Chapter II.2.

⁸ Frederick Mascioli, ‘Anti-Roman and Pro-Italic Sentiment in Italian Historiography’, *Romantic Review*, 33.4 (1942), 366-84 (p. 366). See also Antonio De Francesco, ‘Introduction’, in *In Search of Pre-Classical Antiquity: Rediscovering Ancient Peoples in Mediterranean Europe, 19th and 20th c.*, ed. by Antonio De Francesco (Leiden: Brill, 2016), pp. 1-18.

century, in light of Napoleon's own reverence for Roman production. Pro-Roman references in the 1810 volume of the journal *Memorie enciclopediche romane*, for instance, are examined in Chapter V with careful awareness of a potential bias due to the volume's dedication to Napoleon himself.⁹ Thus, demonstrating the complexity of the art scholarly field in this period, this thesis supplements existing understanding both of the prevalence of Etruscheria and of the possible motivations behind choosing to promote either Italy's Etruscan or Roman artistic heritage.¹⁰

Secondly, this thesis brings to the fore the significant yet understudied parallel between art scholarship and the wider literary debate of the period. Indeed, whilst the intricacies of Italian Classicism and Romanticism have been widely examined in great detail, including most notably by modern scholars Fabio Camilletti and Joseph Luzzi,¹¹ such discussions are almost exclusively focused on the field of literary aesthetics. This is perhaps only natural given the role that Madame de Staël's essay, 'Sulla maniera e la utilità delle Traduzioni', played as catalyst to the Classicism-Romanticism debate. After all, in this essay, published in the *Biblioteca italiana* in 1816, de Staël concentrates on poetical translation as the solution to Italy's backwardness in relation to other European countries.¹² She beseeches the Italians to 'tradurre diligentemente assai delle recenti poesie inglesi e tedesche', in order to show 'qualche novità a'loro cittadini, i quali per lo più stanno contenti all'antica mitologia, né

⁹ See Chapter V.3.7., p. 232.

¹⁰ It should be noted that – despite this thesis adding to our understanding of this difference of opinion surrounding Rome and Etruria as competing sources for Italy's artistic past – for the conceptual framework employed in this examination I contend that praise of Italian heritage, whether Etruscan or Roman, would have been attractive to an Italian readership. Conversely, criticism of any period of Italy's past would have been unattractive. See Chapter I.4.

¹¹ Fabio Camilletti, *Classicism and Romanticism in Italian Literature: Leopardi's Discourse on Romantic Poetry*, 2nd edn (Oxford: Routledge, 2016); and Joseph Luzzi, *Romantic Europe and the Ghost of Italy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008).

¹² For an explanation of both this backwardness and the role of nationalism in the Italian response to Mme de Staël, see Chapter II.2., pp. 71-72.

pensano che quelle favole sono da un pezzo anticate, anzi il resto d'Europa le ha già abbandonate e dimentiche'.¹³

Yet, beyond poetry, this examination demonstrates that the same questions raised by the literary debate also had an impact on the sphere of Italian art scholarship. In doing so, it highlights that not only did Italy's artistic past cause a division of views, but there was, moreover, a difference of opinion as to whether art scholarship should be focusing on Italy's history or instead be looking to its future. To begin with the especially neglected medium of artistic periodicals, Chapter V makes plain the role that this debate played in the development of a number of publications. For example, the *Giornale Arcadico*, a particularly contentious periodical, was staunch in its anti-Romantic, even xenophobic views. This is evident, amongst various other examples, in its publication of Carlo Botta's 1828 censure of Romantic scholars, in which he describes them as 'vili schiavi delle idee forestiere' and 'traditori dell'Italia' (GA.37.366-67). This attitude is, however, in contrast with other journals here examined. Indeed, revealing the influence of both sides of the literary debate, the *Memorie per le belle arti*, for instance, instead exhibited a progressive viewpoint. Whilst still demonstrating nationalism in its aims to ensure Italian art work received the 'stima universale' it deserved (MBA.I.4-8), this journal welcomed the 'spirito filosofico' and Enlightenment values infiltrating Italy through the work of French and other European contemporaries (MBA.I.1).

Moreover, another example of the impact that the debate in literary aesthetics had on the development of art scholarship is the role that Pietro Giordani played in encouraging and advising Cicognara in the publication of his *Storia della scultura* (1823-25), as will be discussed in Chapter IV.¹⁴ Giordani's position as a literary figure involved in the Classicism-Romanticism debate is the subject of common study. Not only did he (anonymously) translate Madame de

¹³ Germaine de Staël, 'Sulla maniera e la utilità delle Traduzioni', *Biblioteca italiana*, 1 (1816), 9-18 (p. 16).

¹⁴ See Chapter IV.3.6., p. 172.

Stael's essay into Italian for the *Biblioteca italiana*,¹⁵ but he also penned one of the first Classicist responses, 'Un Italiano risponde alla discorso della Staël',¹⁶ not to mention his close relationship with Giacomo Leopardi. Yet his involvement in and influence on pioneering art scholarship such as Cicognara's is far less known: a collaboration which can be retraced in his letters. Indeed, from these letters, a selection of which I cite in due course, a clear example of a Classical principle that Giordani encouraged in Cicognara's work is unity, or wholeness (the Aristotelian nature of which is discussed in Chapter II).¹⁷ That is, he was strongly supportive of the wholeness that Cicognara achieved by providing historical and political context to his *Storia*, lauding how Cicognara proved that 'tutto è connesso e dipendente'.¹⁸ Thus, through these and other examples, this thesis clearly demonstrates the impact that the wider literary debate had on art scholarship. From artistic journals to histories of art, this is an interplay that, whilst often overlooked, is crucial to our understanding of the art scholarly sphere.

Thirdly, this thesis also adds to our knowledge of the developing state of Italian art scholarship in this important period of advancement post-Winckelmann. In particular, and building on the idea of the interrelation between disciplines, it reveals the wide range of sources that Italian art scholars read and referred to as they composed their scholarly publications. In examining this field, modern scholarship tends instead to focus on the specific innovations of the period. For instance, whilst Art History was not an established discipline until after Unification – arguably under Adolfo Venturi (1856-1941), who is commonly lauded as Italy's first Professor of History of Art¹⁹ – at the turn of the nineteenth century, there was a

¹⁵ Camilletti, 'Toward an Archaeology of Italian Modernity: Rethinking the Classicist/Romantic Quarrel', in *The Formation of a National Audience in Italy, 1750-1890: Readers and Spectators of Italian Culture*, ed. by Gabriella Romani and Jennifer Burns (Maryland: Farleigh Dickinson University Press, 2017), pp. 101-16 (p. 105).

¹⁶ Pietro Giordani, 'Un Italiano risponde al Discorso della Staël', in *Discussioni e Polemiche sul Romanticismo*, ed. by Egidio Bellorini, rev. by Anco Marzio Mutterle, 2 vols (Bari: Laterza, 1975), I, 16-24.

¹⁷ See Chapter II.3.2., p. 81.

¹⁸ Letter to Cicognara dated 21/04/1810, see Stefano Ferrari, 'Cicognara e Winckelmann: continuità e critica della storia dell'arte', *Intersezioni*, 34.1 (2014), 97-114 (p. 107).

¹⁹ Giacomo Agosti, *La nascita della storia dell'arte in Italia* (Venice: Marsilio, 1996), p. 16.

clear move away from regional histories of art to new national, 'Italian' alternatives. Evinced by such works as Cicognara's aforementioned *Storia della scultura*, this trend is the subject of much discussion in scholarship.²⁰ After all, the eighteenth-century focus on cities and towns, each of which was known 'o per l'insieme di opera d'arte che l'arricchisce, o per la scuola artistica che in essa fiori',²¹ had been a constant feature of Italian art writing since the Quattrocento, as Julius von Schlosser confirms.²² Looking beyond such specific advancements, however, I have been able – through close analysis of a large selection of scholars and publications – to augment our comprehension of this field by uncovering the variation of art scholarship's sources of inspiration, as well as possible reasons for this.

Instances of this amalgam of sources are numerous, including, for example, Luigi Lanzi's regular allusions to poetry,²³ and Cicognara's reference to a wide range of subjects that rendered his work of interest to 'il Filosofo, il Politico, il Letterato, il Scienziato, [e] l'Archeologo' (SS.I.19).²⁴ Furthermore, the simple fact that a number of art writers here examined had separate professions whilst composing their art scholarship – as the contextual information provided for each scholar in Chapter IV will demonstrate – reveals the interdisciplinary interests of the authors behind this developing sphere. D'Arco, for instance, was first and foremost a politician, whilst Cicognara, as well as having Giordani as his goad and assistant, was also a poet. In fact, prior to writing his scholarly tracts on art history and aesthetics, Cicognara composed poetry on many of the same themes, a famous example of which is his extended poem, *Le Belle Arti* (1790):²⁵

²⁰ See Julius von Schlosser, *Sull'antica storiografia italiana dell'arte*, ed. by Sergio Bettini, trans. by Maria Ortiz (Vicenza: Neri Pozza, 1969), pp. 95-96.

²¹ Franco Bernabei, 'La letteratura artistica', in *Storia della cultura veneta*, ed. by Girolamo Arnaldi and M. Pastore Stocchi, 6 vols (Vicenza: Neri Pozza, 1979-86), V.1 (1985), 485-508 (p. 486).

²² Schlosser, *La letteratura artistica: manuale delle fonti della storia dell'arte moderna*, ed. by Otto Kurz, trans. by Filippo Rossi (Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1956), p. 527.

²³ See, for example, (SP.I.14), (SP.I.202), and Chapter IV.3.5, p. 170.

²⁴ See Chapter IV.3.6., p. 174.

²⁵ Ferrari, 'Cicognara e Winckelmann', p. 100.

Dalla fervente umana fantasia
Ebber quest' Arti ovunque e vita, e culla
Per avvivar le inanimate cose;
Ma non arrise ovunque in ciel quell'astro,
Che brillò sovra Atene, e sovra Roma.²⁶

Finally, the analysis of artistic journalism in Chapter V allows for a yet greater appreciation of art scholarship's range of inspiration as the journals strikingly lack the disciplinary boundaries that one sees today. Indeed spanning the period examined, this interdisciplinarity can be noted in all journals, from the early *Antologia Romana* (covering such subjects as geography, optics, language, and theatre, as well, of course, as the belle arti) to the later, more understudied *Effemeridi letterarie* (which reviewed books on art, theology, literature, and science).²⁷ As a result, this examination of artistic journals makes plain the range of articles that art scholars of the period not only produced but also consumed, further accounting for the wide-ranging nature of their own publications as the field of Art History progressed towards its eventual establishment as a discipline.

Thus, in undertaking this examination of Winckelmann's critical legacy, this thesis also significantly adds to existing research on Italian art scholarship of the late eighteenth to early nineteenth centuries, affording a broad view of the complexities of this field during the years 1755-1834.

I.2.2. Winckelmann Studies

Turning from the three aspects of art scholarship that form the backdrop to this examination to its central figure, I will now position this thesis in the field of Winckelmann Studies. This a multifaceted field, with a range of past and present academics from numerous disciplines focusing on different aspects of the German scholar's life and works. This academic treatment can be divided into various areas of study, which include but are by no means restricted to: his

²⁶ Leopoldo Cicognara, *Le Belle Arti* (Ferrara: Giuseppe Rinaldi, 1790), p. xx.

²⁷ See Chapter V.3.

biography; his aesthetics; his concept of a history of art; his reading of the classics; his sexuality; and his international, largely European, reception.

The primary focus of this thesis is within the final category and (more specifically) his reception in Italy. However, before identifying the contribution of this thesis to that particular area, I will first outline how this contribution is situated in relation to other areas of study, with which this thesis is connected but does not seek to advance.

I draw (predominantly in Chapter II) on biographical studies in order to contextualize Winckelmann and, more importantly, to outline his presence in Italy: the first aspect of the dilemma delineated above. As I will explore in greater detail in the following chapter, such studies range from Justi's renowned *Winckelmann und seine Zeitgenossen* (1866-72)²⁸ to Wolfgang von Wangenheim's more recent *Der verworfene Stein: Winckelmanns Leben* (2005).²⁹

This thesis also employs existing scholarship on Winckelmann's aesthetics and construction of a history of art when outlining his main works and principles, again in Chapter II. A full understanding of these elements of his work is essential in order to identify the responses to Winckelmann in Italian art scholarship. This is particularly true of Chapter IV, where (as will be seen) art literature frequently responds to Winckelmannian principles without explicit reference to the German scholar. Scholars who have published in this area include, amongst others: Alex Potts, Mosche Barasch, Fausto Testa, A.A. Donohue, and Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann. Moreover, I also identify in the following chapter the limited scholarship that notes Winckelmann's attacks on Roman and Italic art, albeit that this material does not explore in any detail the fundamental Italophobia that permeates Winckelmann's work: sentiments that are central to this thesis as the second aspect to the above-discussed dilemma.

²⁸ Carl Justi, *Winckelmann und seine Zeitgenossen*, 2nd edn, 3 vols (Leipzig: Vogel, 1898).

²⁹ Wolfgang von Wangenheim, *Der verworfene Stein: Winckelmanns Leben* (Berlin: Matthes & Seitz, 2005).

In examining Winckelmann's critical legacy in Italy, this thesis sits alongside research into Winckelmann's reception across other European countries, especially France and Germany.³⁰ It shares a particular perspective with the few studies that recognize Winckelmann's catalysing influence on the rise of nationalism – with one significant difference. I will argue in this thesis that the interplay between Winckelmann and Italian nationalistic sentiment was essentially one of opposition, whereby the German scholar's Italophobia was seen as an attack, against which the Italians were compelled to defend their native patria. By contrast, Winckelmann played a markedly more positive role in French and German nationalism. As regards developments in France, Wangenheim, Édouard Pommier, and Katherine Harloe all point to the hailing, during the French Revolution, of Winckelmann's views on the importance of liberty: an example of embracing Winckelmannian ideas within the country's patriotic discourse.³¹ Similarly, Winckelmann certainly had a role in the later rise of nationalistic sentiment in nineteenth-century Germany. Indeed, as both Athena Leoussi and Hans Kohn discuss, German nationalism 'harnessed ancient Greek ideals' in order 'to shape a specifically German and, eventually, exclusive national identity': a large portion of which were sourced from their native Winckelmann.³²

Turning now to the specific area of study to which this thesis contributes, namely Winckelmann's reception in Italy, the existing scholarship is limited. Academics who have briefly investigated elements of his Italian after-life include: Giulia Cantarutti, Edoardo

³⁰ Principal studies on his German reception and influence include but are not limited to: Harloe, Butler, Marchand, Hatfield, and Disselkamp. Similarly, the following scholars (again amongst others) have written extensively on Winckelmann's reception in France: Décultot, Griener, and Pommier.

³¹ Wangenheim, pp. 230-31; Édouard Pommier, 'Winckelmann et la vision de l'Antiquité classique dans la France des Lumières et de la Révolution', *Revue de l'art*, 83 (1989), 9-20; and Katherine Harloe, *Winckelmann and the Invention of Antiquity: History and Aesthetics in the Age of Altertumswissenschaft* (Oxford: OUP, 2013), p. 11.

³² Athena A. Leoussi, 'Making Nations in the Image of Greece: Classical Greek Conceptions of the Body in the Construction of National Identity in Nineteenth-Century England, France, and Germany', in *Graeco-Roman Antiquity and the Idea of Nationalism in the 19th Century*, ed. by Thorsten Fögen and Richard Warren (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2016), pp. 45-70 (pp. 52-53), and Hans Kohn, *The Idea of Nationalism: A Study in its Origins and Background* (New Brunswick: Transaction, 2005), p. 235.

Tortarolo, and Michele Cometa, all of whose work I refer to in ensuing chapters. However these generally amount to limited explorations on the fringe of larger research interests. Indeed, as will become clear in due course, numerous scholars who refer to Winckelmann when examining Italy's art literature or artistic periodicals are in fact experts on Italian art scholarship, rather than Winckelmann.

The only scholar to have published extensively on Winckelmann's legacy in Italy is Stefano Ferrari, President of the Accademia Roveretana degli Agiati.³³ Ferrari has published numerous books and articles on various aspects of Winckelmann's Italian reception, or 'transfert' as he terms it. This includes, for instance, considerable attention on the Italian and French translations of Winckelmann's work, an example of which is his book, *Il piacere di tradurre: François-Vincent Toussaint e la versione incompiuta dell'Histoire de l'art chez les anciens di Winckelmann*, which examines the never-finished French translation of the *Geschichte*, commissioned by Winckelmann himself.³⁴ Furthermore, Ferrari has also written extensively on the network, which he terms 'Romagna erudita', of Giovanni Bianchi and his two disciples, Giovanni Cristofani Amaduzzi and Gaetano Marini, whose great interest in Winckelmann's intellectual activity was 'fondato sul comune impegno per la cultura e le lingue classiche'.³⁵ This is not to mention his work on Jagemann's role in the intriguing spread – from Italy back to Germany – of Winckelmann's writings;³⁶ the significance of Christian Gottlob Heyne to Winckelmann's Italian reception;³⁷ and moreover Winckelmann's 'transfert italo-

³³ Ferrari and I have communicated electronically to discuss our shared research interests.

³⁴ Ferrari, *Il piacere di tradurre: François-Vincent Toussaint e la versione incompiuta dell'Histoire de l'art chez les anciens di Winckelmann* (Rovereto: Edizioni Osiride, 2011).

³⁵ Ferrari, 'Il transfert di Winckelmann nella "Romagna erudita" (1762-1784)', in *Atti della decima giornata amaduzziana*, ed. by Paola Delbianco (Cesena: Il Ponte Vecchio, 2013), pp. 95-119 (p. 96).

³⁶ Ferrari, 'Jagemann e il doppio transfert di Winckelmann', in *Die Italianistik in der Weimarer Klassik*, ed. by Jörn Albrecht and Peter Kofler (Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 2006), pp. 242-57.

³⁷ Ferrari, 'Christian G. Heyne e la ricezione di Winckelmann nell'Italia del secondo Settecento', *Neoclassico*, 19 (2001), 75-101.

elvetico'.³⁸ He explores this latter subject through analysis of the *Estratto della letteratura europea*, an Italian-language Swiss journal that published announcements and summaries of Winckelmann's works in the late eighteenth century. The breadth of Ferrari's scholarship is thus clear, providing a vital source of contextual information to this examination.

I.3. CONTRIBUTIONS TO KNOWLEDGE

Having now canvassed the wider field of study, as well as introducing the existing scholarship most relevant to this thesis, I will now identify the five specific contributions that I make to the academic understanding of Winckelmann's reception in Italian art scholarship, 1755-1834.

First, I ascribe a new significance to both Winckelmann's presence in Italy and his contentious views: ideas which have hitherto been considered separately, but not combined. Given Winckelmann's career in Rome in the latter part of his life, biographical and other studies have been unable to overlook his eminence. Similarly, as noted above, whilst his Italophobia has largely been overlooked in favour of his Hellenism, a limited number of scholars have highlighted the staunch anti-Roman opinions latent in his work. Elisabeth Décultot, for example, notes that: 'never, before Winckelmann, has the weakness of art in Rome been made the object of such radical demonstration'.³⁹ What has not been considered, however, is the problem this posed to Italians. By synthesizing and expanding existing study, I bring to light an unconsidered but important dilemma that Italian scholars faced in light of their inability to ignore Winckelmann yet the contention surrounding the views he espoused.

Second, this thesis examines for the first time how, in the face of this problem, Italian art scholarship responded to Winckelmann through two opposing reactions (foreignization and

³⁸ Ferrari, *Il rifugiato e l'antiquario: Fortunato Bartolomeo De Felice e il 'trasfert' italo-elvetico di Winckelmann nel secondo Settecento* (Rovereto: Osiride, 2008).

³⁹ Elisabeth Décultot, *Johann Joachim Winckelmann: enquête sur la genèse de l'histoire de l'art* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 2000), p. 140. MT: 'Jamais [...] avant Winckelmann, la faiblesse des arts à Rome n'avait fait l'objet d'une démonstration aussi radicale par son ampleur'.

domestication), and how this alters our understanding of Winckelmann's reception in Italy. As outlined above, Ferrari has studied Winckelmann's reception in Italy extensively. Yet, in overlooking the above-discussed dilemma, he has not considered the nuances in the Italians' response: an oversight that this thesis seeks to rectify.

Third, in explaining why Italian art scholarship responded to Winckelmann through these two reactions, I advance an original argument that both foreignization and domestication were motivated by an early nationalism. Despite Ferrari, as just explored, not examining the two reactions to Winckelmann that I identify, he has nevertheless proposed some reasons why Winckelmann was received in Italy in the manner that he was. One proffered explanation, for example, is the Italian scholars' adherence to the criticisms that Christian Gottlob Heyne raised against Winckelmann. Ferrari does not, however, consider nationalism as a motivation or indeed assess, as this thesis will do, the numerous points of evidence that support such a claim.

Fourth, in making the above three principal contributions, I offer a fresh perspective on Winckelmann's significance as a catalyst for Italian nationalism in antiquarian studies. The prevailing view of leading scholars including Arnaldo Momigliano, Henrik Mouritsen, and Axel Körner is that Theodor Mommsen, writing in the mid-nineteenth century, was the first major stimulus to Italian nationalism in the antiquarian sphere.⁴⁰ This thesis does not deny the profound importance of Mommsen, borne out by plentiful scholarship. However, it does suggest that concentrating on Mommsen overlooks the important role played by Winckelmann, which has not thus far been the subject of research. Whereas Mommsen inspired nationalism through a positive view of Rome as Italy's cultural ancestor, the

⁴⁰ Arnaldo Momigliano, 'Tesi per una discussione sugli studi classici in Italia e i loro problemi metodici', in *Terzo contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico*, 2 vols (Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1966), I, 803-05 (p. 804); Henrik Mouritsen, 'Modern Nations and Ancient Models: Italy and Greece compared', in *The Making of Modern Greece: Nationalism, Romanticism, and the Uses of the Past, 1797-1896*, ed. by David Ricks and Roderick Beaton (London: Ashgate, 2009), pp. 43-49 (p. 46); and Axel Körner, *Politics of Culture in Liberal Italy: From Unification to Fascism* (London: Routledge, 2009), pp. 130-31.

combination of Winckelmann's presence and contentious views had, decades earlier, also precipitated a nationalistic response in Italian antiquarian scholarship.

Fifth, and again in arriving at the primary contributions, I explore the reception of Winckelmann in understudied and overlooked sources across three different media of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Italian art scholarship. In doing so, this thesis deepens academic understanding not only of the reception of Winckelmann in a number of primary sources, but also of the development and complexity of Italian art scholarship during this period. Indeed, for some texts, this constitutes the very first academic consideration. At the start of each chapter, I will thus explain in greater detail the specific respects in which I add to knowledge of both the sources considered and Winckelmann's role therein.

Thus, by filling these lacunae in existing research, this thesis makes a significant and original contribution to the understanding of Winckelmann's reception in Italian art scholarship. As a result, it primarily contributes to Winckelmann Studies. However, due to the interdisciplinary nature of this topic, this thesis also contributes to broader fields of research. To Wider Studies into Italian Art Scholarship it adds to the understanding, as explored above, of three facets of the art scholarly sphere in the lesser-investigated period of Italy's *Sette-* to *Ottocento*. Further, it contributes to Nationalism Studies by demonstrating the far-reaching influence of nationalism in Italian art scholarship of this period and by suggesting that Winckelmann played a notable role in catalysing this nationalistic discourse in antiquarian studies, even before Mommsen.

I.4. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

I will now expound my conceptual framework. As explained in my core argument above, the response to Winckelmann in Italian art scholarship manifested in two contrasting reactions, foreignization and domestication:

Foreignization

Presenting Winckelmann, his works, or his views as *less* attractive to a specifically Italian readership than they would otherwise have appeared.

Domestication

Presenting Winckelmann, his works, or his views as *more* attractive to a specifically Italian readership than they would otherwise have appeared.

Reaction(s)

Foreignization or (and) domestication.

Each of the two reactions can take three distinct forms.

Forms

The three forms of foreignization/domestication are of:

- (1) Winckelmann qua scholar;
- (2) Winckelmann's works; and
- (3) Winckelmann's views.

Reactions to Winckelmann

This refers either to Winckelmann qua scholar or to all three forms collectively, as the context will make clear.

Winckelmannian

This refers to views which are so associated with Winckelmann as to be attributable to him even without express reference. The Winckelmannian views relevant to this thesis are identified in Chapter II.

The first form concerns the treatment of Winckelmann himself: foreignization entails drawing attention to his German nationality, whilst domestication involves a renationalization of Winckelmann as less foreign, or even Italian.

The second form relates to the treatment of Winckelmann's works: foreignization is achieved through an emphasis on the foreign origins of his works, whereas domestication entails the portrayal of his works as less foreign (and even Italian).

The third form pertains to the treatment of Winckelmann's views. Foreignization involves highlighting his views that were offensive to the Italian readership. By contrast, domestication is accomplished by portraying his views as less offensive to the Italian readership.

The connection between all three forms of foreignization is that they present Winckelmann as less attractive than would otherwise have been the case. This is straightforward in relation to the third form, his views: in presenting them as more offensive to Italy, they appear less attractive. In relation to the first two forms, this is achieved by an emphasis on his or his oeuvre's 'otherness' which, this thesis contends, adversely affects their attractiveness.⁴¹ The inverse is true of the three forms of domestication, which present Winckelmann's views as more attractive, and him and his oeuvre as more familiar: with this familiarity positively influencing their attractiveness.

Each form of foreignization or domestication is realized through one or more methods:

Method

That which the Italian scholars do to either foreignize or domesticate Winckelmann in any of the three forms.

When a method is particularly complex, it is subdivided into techniques:

Technique

A means to accomplish a method.

Despite the antithetical nature of how these two reactions present Winckelmann, I will contend that all forms of both foreignization and domestication observed in the three media

⁴¹ I discuss this further in Chapter I.5.5.

here examined were motivated by nationalism: that is, the belief in the supremacy of Italy above any other country. In foreignizing Winckelmann qua scholar, the media highlight Winckelmann's otherness (as a German) to ostracize him and thus to diminish the weight of his criticism of Italy. The same is true when foreignizing his oeuvre: in emphasizing the German authorship of his works, it is rendered less pertinent and its criticism less incisive. Foreignization of his views is nationalistic because, whenever Winckelmann's offensive views are highlighted, the scholars proceed to openly rebut that criticism and accordingly defend Italy. Conversely, in domesticating Winckelmann and his oeuvre, the Italian scholars root him and his works in Italy, appropriating his achievements and thereby claiming the credit for their native peninsula. Further, domestication of Winckelmann's views either dilutes his criticism of Italy to shield the peninsula from the German scholar's attacks or, through more varied methods, modifies his views to present them as more favourable to Italians and their heritage. Thus all these forms of foreignization and domestication display the scholars' engagement with Winckelmann in a manner that demonstrates and secures the native peninsula's supremacy.

To conclude this explanation, I will draw attention to three noteworthy nuances which arise in the application of this conceptual framework.

First, it should be remembered that this thesis is solely concerned with how Italian scholars present *Winckelmann*, *his* works, and *his* views. Accordingly, foreignization or domestication of Winckelmann's views, for example, only involves the presentation of ideas either expressly attributed to Winckelmann or those which are distinctly Winckelmannian. When there is no express reference to Winckelmann, these reactions do not include Italian scholars simply supplying their own perspective on a non-Winckelmannian subject that Winckelmann nonetheless discussed.

Second, it is integral to the definitions of foreignization and domestication above that Winckelmann is presented as less or more attractive, respectively, to a *specifically Italian*

readership.⁴² The touchstone of this thesis is not general praise or criticism of Winckelmann. Instead the question is how an *Italian* audience, distinct from a general audience, would have responded to the presentation of Winckelmann.

Third, one recurring aspect of various methods by which the Italian scholars domesticate Winckelmann is reference to Italy's long-standing rival, ancient Greece. The relationship of rivalry is a complex one: it combines a desire to disparage one's rival with, simultaneously, a respect for their strengths (without which they would not be a *rival* at all). Accordingly, the Italian scholars on some occasions deny ancient Greece the praise which Winckelmann affords it, whilst on other occasions suggest that Italy shares equally in aspects of ancient Greece that Winckelmann extols. Both, however, present Winckelmann's views as more attractive to Italy than would otherwise have been the case.

1.5. THEORY INFORMING THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The conceptual framework delineated above developed organically as I proceeded in examining Winckelmann's reception in the three media of translation, art literature, and artistic periodicals. Yet, both in formulating the specific terminology and in testing the intricacies of the framework, four theorists provided crucial inspiration at different stages in the process. The suitability of both Anthony D. Smith's and Lawrence Venuti's work quickly became apparent on examining the translations. This was then followed by the important addition of Edward Said when broadening the examination from translation to other media, and finally, William G. Sumner, who in the final stages provided theoretical support and clarity to a consistent trend observed throughout all three media.

⁴² It should be noted that whilst every instance of foreignization and domestication must be more or less attractive to a specifically Italian audience, this does not preclude it from being more or less attractive to another country, too. That is to say, examples of these reactions must be *specific* to Italy but they need not be *exclusive* to Italy.

I will thus now explore the role of each theorist. Yet, before doing so, it should be noted that, whilst these theorists were vital in developing my framework, they are not reference points throughout the thesis. Rather, having arrived at my own individual, distinct framework, it is this that I employ to assess Winckelmann's reception.

I.5.1. Nationalism: Anthony D. Smith

On examining Winckelmann's translations, and the manner in which the translators foreignized and domesticated Winckelmann for the benefit of the Italian peninsula, it soon became evident that there was a nationalistic element to their approach. Nationalism, however, is a nebulous term, the definition of which has stimulated much scholarly debate. Thus, in order to clarify how nationalism is understood in this thesis, I reviewed the work of a number of key scholars in the field and adopted a working definition from Anthony D. Smith (1939-2016), who is considered one of the founders of Nationalism Studies.⁴³ Smith's definition is particularly pertinent to this investigation as he acknowledges both actual and potential nations, which – given the time period of investigation when Italy was not yet an actual 'nation' – is an important prerequisite in this thesis.⁴⁴ With this condition in mind, Smith states that nationalism refers to 'an ideology that places the nation at the centre of its concerns and seeks to promote its well-being'.⁴⁵

Smith thereafter continues to clarify this concept of well-being by reference to the promotion of national autonomy, unity, and identity. These goals are certainly a part of the nationalism evident in eighteenth- to nineteenth-century Italian art scholarship: after all, any argument for an Italian artistic past hints at these three qualities. Yet the concept of well-being predominantly manifests in a different manner in the sphere of art scholarship. Italian art

⁴³ Andrew Heywood, *Global Politics*, 2nd edn (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), p. 169.

⁴⁴ Anthony D. Smith, 'Nationalism', in *Encyclopaedia of Nationalism*, ed. by Athena S. Leoussi (London: Transaction, 2001), pp. 222-25 (pp. 224-25). See Chapter II.2. for an overview of this period.

⁴⁵ Smith, *Nationalism: Theory, Ideology, History* (Cambridge: Polity, 2010), p. 9.

scholars of the period instead sought to promote and boast of the peninsula's well-being primarily through an advocacy of Italy's excellence and even superiority.

Some theorists would perhaps identify this addition of an 'advocacy of Italy's excellence and even superiority' as patriotism. Indeed, there is considerable scholarship comparing nationalism and patriotism. However this thesis does not seek either to add to that extensive discourse – to which various writers and theorists have contributed, from George Orwell to Karl Deutsch and Maurizio Viroli – or to differentiate between the two ideologies. As is the case in much scholarly literature as well as in common language, nationalism and patriotism are here used interchangeably.⁴⁶ The reason that this thesis employs the word 'nationalism' and its cognates far more frequently than patriotism is simply my concurrence with Smith's theory and the fact that 'nationalism' speaks to the period here examined. Italy was not yet a nation, but this was nevertheless a period in Italian history when the peninsula was gradually progressing towards the ultimate formation of a unified Italy.

Finally, it is significant to emphasize that my choice of 'nationalism' is in no way suggestive of a negative ideology or of a pejorative opinion towards Italy's response to Winckelmann. Whilst Georgios Varouxakis and other theorists speak of patriotism emerging as nationalism's 'acceptable twin' and nationalism as 'aggressive and a degeneration or exaggeration of patriotic attachments', this is not a distinction made in this thesis.⁴⁷

1.5.2. Foreignization and domestication: Friedrich Schleiermacher and Lawrence Venuti

The inspiration for the terminology of foreignization and domestication used throughout this thesis originally derived from the work of translation theorist Lawrence Venuti (1953-) and his development of Friedrich Schleiermacher's translation theory.

⁴⁶ Maurizio Viroli, *For Love of Country: An Essay on Patriotism and Nationalism* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), pp. 1-4.

⁴⁷ Georgios Varouxakis, 'Patriotism', in *Encyclopaedia of Nationalism*, ed. by Athena S. Leoussi (London: Transaction, 2001), pp. 239-42 (pp. 239-40).

Schleiermacher (1768-1834) expounded his philosophy in his lecture entitled *On the Different Methods of Translating*, 1813.⁴⁸ In this he asserts that in translation there are two methodological options: 'Either the translator leaves the writer in peace as much as possible and moves the reader toward him; or he leaves the reader in peace as much as possible and moves the writer toward him'.⁴⁹ That is to say, the translator can either retain plainly foreign elements in the translation (necessitating effort from the reader) or fluently present a cultural other as something with which the target audience would be accustomed (necessitating changes to the original). These are options that Venuti terms 'foreignization' and 'domestication' respectively.⁵⁰ Indeed in his pioneering book, *The Translator's Invisibility*, which traces the history of English-language translation from the seventeenth century to today, and with which Venuti seeks to inspire a reassessment of current translation practices,⁵¹ he discusses these two possibilities at length. Of the two, Venuti supports the use of foreignization (as I will explore in section I.5.4. below). Yet he explains how domestication has been, and is still, the dominant translation practice. This is due, he posits, to the standards of fluency and transparency, by which translations are judged:⁵²

A translated text [...] is judged acceptable by most publishers, reviewers and readers when it reads fluently, when the absence of any linguistic or stylistic peculiarities make it seem transparent, giving the appearance that it reflects the foreign writer's personality or intention or the essential meaning of the foreign text.⁵³

With this engrained in the culture of translation, Venuti thus recalls Schleiermacher's theory to remind readers that there is not one but two methodological options available.

⁴⁸ Lawrence Venuti, *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*, 2nd edn (Abingdon: Routledge, 2008), p. 15. Schleiermacher's original title: *Über die verschiedenen Methoden des Übersetzens*.

⁴⁹ Friedrich Schleiermacher, 'On the Different Methods of Translating', trans. by Susan Bernofsky, in *The Translations Studies Reader*, ed. by Lawrence Venuti, 3rd edn (Oxford: Routledge, 2012), pp. 43-63 (p. 49).

⁵⁰ *The Translator's Invisibility*, pp. 14-15.

⁵¹ *The Translator's Invisibility*, p. viii.

⁵² *The Translator's Invisibility*, pp. 13-16.

⁵³ *The Translator's Invisibility*, pp. 1-2.

It was on analysis of the translations of Winckelmann's *Geschichte der Kunst des Altertums* that it became apparent that domestication and foreignization would be fitting labels for the different responses to Winckelmann. After all, resembling Venutian domestication, which seeks to render the translated text more accessible to the reader by eliminating cultural differences, domestication in the Italian translations of the *Geschichte* presents Winckelmann's work in a more attractive manner to its readers by disregarding his foreign origins and Italophobic views. Moreover, this same parallel is also evident in foreignization. Indeed, akin to foreignization in Venuti's theory, which highlights the foreign nature of the original text, on occasions where the translators foreignized Winckelmann, his work, or his views, they, too, ensured that both his foreign origins and anti-Italian views were manifest.

In adopting this terminology, however, it was necessary to modify the theory espoused by Venuti in order that it more accurately reflects the reactions to Winckelmann here analysed. Thus, beyond my transferral of Venuti's theory to non-English language translation, I will now delineate three principal differences between the concepts employed in this thesis (as clarified in the framework above) and those espoused in *The Translator's Invisibility*.

First, it should be noted that, unlike Venuti's foreignization and domestication, which have conflicting aims, both reactions in this thesis share the same objective. In Venuti's theory foreignization prioritizes the original text and the characteristics distinctive to the source culture, whilst his domestication gives precedence to the target culture, altering the text to render it as accessible as possible to the reader. In this examination, by contrast, both the foreignization and domestication of Winckelmann – despite being achieved in conflicting ways – equally seek to present the German scholar in the manner most auspicious to Italy and its heritage.

Second, whereas Venuti's theory focuses on *recognition*, the focus in this thesis is *attraction*. Venuti is concerned with something becoming more or less recognizable to the reader. Yet this examination, in order to assess the response to Winckelmann in Italian art scholarship, explores instead how scholars presented him as more or less attractive to Italian readers.

Third, whilst Venuti's definitions present domestication as an active technique and foreignization as a more passive option (with foreign elements simply left as found in the original), in this thesis both domestication and foreignization refer to active, deliberate decisions. Foreignization in this examination involves effort on the part of the Italian scholars to draw attention to the less attractive aspects of Winckelmann, his works, or his views.

Finally, beyond these alterations to the meaning behind foreignization and domestication, there is also a significant difference in how I use Venuti's terminology. Indeed, I employ foreignization and domestication to assess Winckelmann's reception in not only translation, but in the broader media of art literature and artistic periodicals, too. Thus, I expand Venuti's theory beyond Translation Studies to Reception Studies: a process in which the next theorist played an important role.

1.5.3. Responding to a problematic presence: Edward Said

Edward Said (1935-2013) was a fundamental source of inspiration in my broadening of foreignization and domestication beyond translation. His scholarship focuses on the unrelated subject of the relationship between imperialist Western powers and their colonized Eastern territories from the late eighteenth to the twentieth century.⁵⁴ Yet he nevertheless became a fitting third theorist due to his theory of the Orient's resistance against the West. After all, whilst naturally in a different context, the steps that Italian art scholars took to render

⁵⁴ Edward W. Said, *Orientalism*, 5th edn (London: Penguin, 2003), p. 3; and Said, *Culture & Imperialism*, 2nd edn (London: Vintage, 1994), p. xiv.

Winckelmann, his works, and his views more or less attractive to Italian readers were also a means of *resisting* the German scholar, as indeed I will expound in due course.

The point of departure in Said's work is the Western domination of Oriental territories. In fact, in writing about the West, Said chooses to use predominantly Britain, France, and America as his case studies precisely due to the 'privileged status' that the idea of overseas rule has in these three cultures. This idea, Said explains, whilst having 'a lot to do with projections, whether in fiction or geography or art', 'acquires a continuous presence through actual expansion, administration, investment, and commitment'.⁵⁵ As a result, when referring to the Orient, Said focuses on the overseas territories of these Western powers. He concentrates on the Middle East in his first work, *Orientalism* (1978), after which he extends his 'Orient' to include Africa, India, parts of the Far East, Australia, and the Caribbean in his later work, *Culture and Imperialism* (1993).⁵⁶ Thus, throughout Said's work the West is a problematic presence in the East: a point of departure that resembles the analytical starting point in this examination. Indeed, as established in the first lines of this thesis, Winckelmann posed a dilemma to the Italian art scholarship of the period. Not only was he a lasting presence that they could not ignore, but he simultaneously expounded contentious, Italophobic views: both aspects that will be delineated in detail in the following chapter.

I will turn now to Said's discussion of two central consequences of the rise of Western domination. First, he posits in *Orientalism* that, in light of their physical domination over the Eastern territories, the Western nations were able to further exert their power over the Orient by 'Orientalizing' it.⁵⁷ Indeed he affirms that, from the late eighteenth century, 'the Orient was Orientalized not only because it was discovered to be "Oriental" [...], but also because it *could*

⁵⁵ *Culture & Imperialism*, p. xxviii; see also *Orientalism*, p. 4.

⁵⁶ *Culture & Imperialism*, p. xiii.

⁵⁷ *Orientalism*, pp. 3-4.

be'.⁵⁸ Orientalism, a term that, as Said himself acknowledges, has a number of different definitions, is fundamentally the study and portrayal of the Orient according to a Western viewpoint and 'network of interests'. It describes how the Western powers deal with the Orient: 'dealing with it by making statements about it, authorizing views of it, describing it, by teaching it', all of which is 'based upon an ontological and epistemological distinction made between "the Orient" and [...] and "the Occident"',⁵⁹ between 'them' and 'us'. Thus, some of the most common examples of this Orientalism – the first consequence of domination here discussed – are Western references to such phenomena as 'Oriental splendour', 'Oriental cruelty', and 'Oriental sensuality', all of which are alluded to as if they are wholly separate entities from any splendour, cruelty, and sensuality experienced in the West.⁶⁰

Turning to the second consequence of Western domination, Said also explores the efforts of Eastern territories to resist the Western powers. As highlighted above, it is this consequence of Western domination that is of relevance to my thesis and on which I drew when formulating my conceptual framework. Thus, as Said 'left out of *Orientalism* [...] [the] response to Western dominance which culminated in the great movement of decolonization across the Third World',⁶¹ I have focused on his later *Culture and Imperialism*, in which he develops his 'theory of resistance' against imperialist powers. This theory is twofold and comprises primary resistance, which involves 'fighting against [the] outside intrusion' of the Western power, and secondary resistance, which entails the 'rediscovery and repatriation of what had been suppressed in the natives' past by the processes of imperialism'.⁶²

I chose to use Said's theory of resistance as a key source of inspiration when developing my conceptual framework because, having noted the similar analytical starting

⁵⁸ *Orientalism*, pp. 5-6.

⁵⁹ *Orientalism*, pp. 2-3.

⁶⁰ *Culture & Imperialism*, p. xiii; and *Orientalism*, p. 4.

⁶¹ *Culture & Imperialism*, p. xiv.

⁶² *Culture & Imperialism*, p. 268.

points in our work, on reading *Culture and Imperialism*, the parallel between his primary and secondary resistance and the concepts of foreignization and domestication in this thesis also became apparent. After all, in the same way that primary resistance focuses on the separation of that which is harmful from the Oriental territory, so foreignization in this investigation separates Winckelmann from Italy. By foreignizing him, Italian art scholars distance him by drawing attention to his German nationality, the foreign origins of his works, and the offensive nature of his views. Said's secondary resistance, by contrast, centres on the advancement of the Oriental nations through the (re-) introduction of favourable aspects of their former culture: a reaction which bears resemblance to the domestication of Winckelmann in Italian art scholarship. Indeed, through domesticating Winckelmann, Italian art scholars similarly seek to benefit Italian heritage by presenting the German scholar in the most favourable manner to their native Italy.

Moreover, demonstrating the interplay between the theorists I have used to establish my framework, Said's theory of resistance provided both inspiration and theoretical support for the three above-listed concepts employed in this thesis that differ from the respective aspects of Venuti's approach. First, in the same manner that foreignization and domestication in this thesis have the shared aim of presenting Winckelmann in the manner most auspicious to Italy, Said's primary and secondary resistance are two responses to the domination of Western imperialist powers, which both seek to benefit the Orient. Second, just as the concept of *attraction* is central to foreignization and domestication in this thesis, with scholars presenting Winckelmann as either less or more attractive to the Italian peninsula, respectively, Said's theory is premised on a markedly similar dichotomy. Indeed, whilst primary resistance concerns that which is harmful, or one could say unattractive, to the oppressed Oriental nations (outside intrusion), secondary resistance involves that which is favourable, or attractive, to those same nations (cultural rediscovery). Third and finally, both Said's primary

and secondary resistance are active techniques employed to challenge the domination of the West, just as both foreignization and domestication in this thesis require deliberate action from the Italian scholars to render Winckelmann less or more attractive. Thus, whilst in no other sense do I compare Winckelmann with Western imperialism, Said's theory provided the theoretical inspiration for the development of my framework beyond Venuti and, as a result, for the broadening of foreignization and domestication beyond Translation Studies to Reception Studies.

This is not to say, however, that there are not differences between Said's theory of resistance and the framework established in this thesis, two of which I wish to highlight. Whilst Said's concept of secondary resistance involves the Oriental territories *recovering* past elements of their own native culture (as opposed to that of the West), domestication in this thesis refers to Italian art scholarship *introducing* Winckelmann, a foreign figure, into Italy's culture, albeit in a manner that is more attractive to Italian readers than he would otherwise have appeared. Moreover, whilst Said's stages of resistance are introduced as consecutive (primary and secondary) steps, foreignization and domestication in this framework represent alternative but simultaneous reactions to the dilemma that Winckelmann posed.

1.5.4. Nationalism as a stimulus for foreignization and domestication: Venuti and Said

To conclude the above overview of the relationship between Venuti's system of foreignization and domestication, Said's theory of resistance, and the conceptual framework of this thesis, I will now briefly outline how nationalism is a concept common to all three approaches.

To begin, I wish to emphasise how my argument – that Italian art scholarship's responses to Winckelmann (1755-1834) were motivated by nationalism – developed organically through examination, first of the Italian translations of Winckelmann's *Geschichte*, and then of the period's art literature and artistic journals. Be it by drawing attention to and

defending against the unattractive, contentious elements of Winckelmann's work or by rendering such elements more attractive to the Italian reader, it became clear through my analyses that Italian art scholarship certainly did place Italy 'at the centre of its concerns' in order to 'promote its well-being'. This argument is thus not a result of the inspiration provided by Venuti and Said.

Naturally, however, the role of nationalism in both theorists' works adds to their pertinence as sources of theoretical support for the development of my conceptual framework. This is especially true as regards Said's theory of resistance. Indeed, in the same manner that I interpret Winckelmann's foreignization and domestication as evidence of Italian nationalism, both Said's primary and secondary resistance aim at fashioning a national identity for the previously oppressed Oriental nations.

Venuti's theory also has an important nationalistic element, yet there are two significant differences between the nationalism in the theory he promotes and that underpinning the framework of this thesis. Not only does Venuti confer a negative meaning upon nationalism, whilst I define the term in a neutral sense, but he also only associates nationalism with domestication, whereas I argue that nationalism was a catalyst to both Winckelmann's foreignization and domestication. In his *Translator's Invisibility*, Venuti argues against the nationalism that he sees inherent in his concept of domestication. Describing both methods of translation as 'fundamentally *ethical* attitudes towards a foreign text and culture',⁶³ Venuti contends that in domesticating a text the translator is committing 'violence' on the original. Domestication is the 'forcible replacement of the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text' for the benefit of the self-regarding target audience. Throughout his work he thus exhorts translators to practise solely foreignizing techniques,

⁶³ *The Translator's Invisibility*, p. 19.

avoiding nationalistic domestication.⁶⁴ Relating these methods of translation to international relations, Venuti even contends that foreignization can help to combat against cultural narcissism, racism, and imperialism.⁶⁵

Thus, whilst my contention – that nationalism influenced Winckelmann’s reception in Italian art scholarship (1755-1834) – developed irrespective of external influences, both Venuti’s and Said’s theories share this emphasis on nationalism, further adding to their suitability as sources of theoretical support.

I.5.5. Otherness as less attractive, familiarity as more attractive: William G. Sumner

Finally, in light of the here-adopted definition of nationalism as an ideology placing the nation ‘at the centre of its concerns’, a degree of preference for familiarity over otherness is to be expected. Beyond this, however, the final aspect of this framework to necessitate additional theoretical support was the aforementioned notion, evident across all three media, of otherness adversely and familiarity positively influencing Winckelmann’s attractiveness: a trend for which there is theoretical basis in ethnocentrism.

Ethnocentrism was popularized by pioneering sociologist William Graham Sumner (1840-1910) in his foremost work, *Folkways* (1905).⁶⁶ He defined this concept as:

th[e] view of things in which one’s own group is the center of everything, and all others are scaled and rated with reference to it. [...] Each group nourishes its own pride and vanity, boasts itself superior, exalts its own divinities, and looks with contempt on outsiders. Each group thinks its own folkways the only right ones, and if it observes that other groups have other folkways, these excite its scorn.⁶⁷

⁶⁴ *The Translator’s Invisibility*, p. 14.

⁶⁵ *The Translator’s Invisibility*, pp. 16, 19.

⁶⁶ Kathy Stolley, *The Basics of Sociology* (Connecticut: Greenwood, 2005), pp. 55-56.

⁶⁷ William G. Sumner, *Folkways: A Study of the Sociological Importance of Usages, Manners, Customs, Mores, and Morals* (NY: Mentor, 1960), pp. 27-28.

He explains such 'folkways' as 'habits of the individual and customs of the society which arise from efforts to satisfy needs'.⁶⁸ Moreover, clarifying his theory further, Sumner coined social science's now commonly used concept of ingroups and outgroups:⁶⁹

A group of groups may have some relation to each other (kin, neighborhood, alliance, connubium and commercium) which draws them together and differentiates them from others. Thus a differentiation arises between ourselves, the we-group, or in-group, and everybody else, or the others-groups, out-groups.⁷⁰

Sumner's theory has been and continues to be discussed in various spheres of scholarship, from sociology to psychology and political science, and is one which I contend – when applied judiciously – is valuable in assessing the relations between nations. After all, as a recent article on the supposed inevitability of ethnocentrism confirms, 'substantial empirical evidence supports people's tendency to favor in-group members and show hostility towards out-group individuals'.⁷¹ Thus, the nuance present in the foreignization and domestication of Winckelmann qua scholar and of his works – whereby otherness negatively affects the attractiveness of Winckelmann and his works, whilst familiarity augments it – is indeed justified by both Sumner's theory and the modern discussions around ethnocentrism.

Finally, as with all three theories outlined above, I am keen to emphasize an important limitation to the relationship between Sumner's theory and the conceptual framework of this thesis. Much like the disclaimer regarding nationalism, the idea of Italian art scholarship's response to Winckelmann being rooted in ethnocentrism is by no means suggestive of a negative, prejudiced reaction to Winckelmann on the part of the Italians. Whilst the potential

⁶⁸ Sumner, p. v.

⁶⁹ Robert A. Levine and Donald T. Campbell, *Ethnocentrism: Theories of Conflict, Ethnic Attitudes, and Group Behaviour* (London: Wiley, 1972), p. 7.

⁷⁰ Sumner, p. 27.

⁷¹ Soham De and others, 'The Inevitability of Ethnocentrism Revisited: Ethnocentrism Diminishes As Mobility Increases', *Scientific reports*, 5 (2015) <<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4672305/#b4>> [accessed 19 July 2017].

blurring of ethnocentrism and racism is a subject of increasing interest in scholarship, this is in no sense relevant to the present investigation.

I.6. THESIS STRUCTURE

I will now delineate the structure of this thesis' six chapters.

In the remainder of the present chapter, I will explain and justify how I have answered the research question, examining the parameters it has been necessary to define and the different practical methodologies used in investigating Winckelmann's reception in each of the different media.

Chapter II will contextualize this study. I will situate my investigation in its wider historical context, calling attention to political and social developments that must be taken into account, especially in light of my consideration of nationalism. I will also briefly introduce Winckelmann, his aesthetic principles, and his key works: sections that will be referred back to throughout the thesis to avoid repetition. Chapter II will then conclude with an extended exploration of the above-discussed dilemma that Winckelmann presented to Italian scholars. A full understanding of this dilemma – divided into two categories of 'Winckelmann's presence' and 'Winckelmann's contentious views' – is essential in light of its status as the analytical starting point to this thesis.

The following three chapters will each consider one medium in which Italian art scholarship responded to Winckelmann, namely: the translations of Winckelmann's magnum opus, the *Geschichte der Kunst des Altertums*; art literature; and artistic journals. The selected sequence of these reflects an intentional broadening of the analysis of Winckelmann's reception as my investigation progresses.

Chapters III – V will thus follow the same broad structure. At the beginning of each chapter, I will position the respective analyses within existing scholarship and will introduce

the case studies examined in that medium. There is a significant amount of contextual information in each chapter as not only am I drawing on a number of case studies – particularly in Chapter V where I consider Winckelmann’s reception in ten artistic journals – but a number of these case studies are under-explored and thus necessitate concise yet informative introductions. It is, of course, also crucial to form an understanding of the backgrounds and agendas of each translator, art scholar, or journal, in order to judiciously analyse his or its response to Winckelmann. Having contextualized the case studies, I will examine in detail how each medium reacts to Winckelmann in light of the dilemma he presented. I will first explore instances of foreignization followed by domestication. Each of these explorations will further be divided into the different forms these reactions took. According to the occurrence of the forms of reaction in each medium, the order of such investigations will be foreignization of Winckelmann qua scholar, his works, and his views, followed by the equivalent forms of domestication. Finally, on review of how these media responded to Winckelmann, I will posit in the ‘Nationalism’ section that such a response was nationalistically motivated, before presenting various arguments to support my claim. Each chapter will close with a conclusion, drawing together the analysis in relation to that medium.

The final chapter – Chapter VI – concludes the thesis as a whole: reassessing the reactions seen in each medium; shedding light on the differences and patterns evident between the three media; and restating my argument that a nationalistic motivation underpinned Winckelmann’s reception. To close, I will also recapitulate my contribution to knowledge, before considering how this research topic could be expanded in the future.

1.7. RESEARCH PARAMETERS

In order to address the research question in sufficient depth, it has been necessary to define the following parameters to this study.

Firstly, the time period of the thesis spans from 1755 to 1834. 1755 is an appropriate starting point as the year that Winckelmann arrived in Italy, and thus the year in which one would expect his Italian reception to commence. As I will discuss in the following chapter, it is evident that scholarly response began in earnest post-1779, after the first Italian translation, yet I have intentionally chosen an earlier date. After all, Winckelmann's life in Italy, 1755-68, provides crucial contextual information concerning the first aspect of the dilemma that Italian scholars faced. Indeed, whilst his presence continued, through his works, into the nineteenth century and beyond, the need to respond to Winckelmann began in light of his presence in Italian society. Furthermore, in delaying the start date to 1779 one would overlook any potential scholars responding to Winckelmann before the Italian translations of the *Geschichte*, which is itself a noteworthy facet of his reception in Italy.

1834 is the final year of the publication of Carlo Fea's *Opere di G. G. Winckelmann*: the first comprehensive edition of the German scholar's oeuvre. This was chosen as the appropriate end date to this analysis as preliminary research found that Winckelmann inspired the most response in the first sixty-five years after his death, after which the Italian response appears to have decreased. There are a number of possible causes for this decline: perhaps – following my argument – the dilemma associated with Winckelmann had been dissolved through various methods of foreignization and domestication. Alternatively, this lessening of attention on Winckelmann, a 'defender of the classical tradition',⁷² could also be explained by the move away from Classicism towards Romanticism.⁷³ This may even have been compounded by a more concentrated interest in politics in the lead up to Unification, both on the part of the Romantics and the wider scholarly sphere. Whatever the reason, the publication of the *Opere* is a sensible point at which to conclude this examination, as 1755-

⁷² David Irwin, 'Introduction', in *Winckelmann: Writings on Art* (London: Phaidon, 1972), pp. 3-57 (p. 48).

⁷³ Chiara Gauna, *La storia pittorica di Luigi Lanzi: arti, storia e musei nel Settecento* (Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 2003), p. 6. See Chapter I.2.1.

1834 – from Winckelmann’s own arrival to the ‘arrival’ of his complete oeuvre in Italy – provides a manageable time period for analysis.

Secondly, it has been necessary to set geographical parameters to this investigation. As alluded to above, Italy was of course not a united nation in this period and, as I will explain in Chapter II, its political status changed several times between 1755 and 1834. There was, however, a persistent divide throughout this period between the Northern and Central territories on the one hand and the Southern territories on the other. Indeed, with the exception of the Napoleonic period, the political landscape was largely split between Austrian power or influence in Northern and Central Italy and the Spanish House of Bourbon in the South.⁷⁴ I have thus used this partition to concentrate my investigation on the Northern and Central territories, including the Papal States. References to Italy throughout this thesis thus denote these territories, and not the whole of Italy. I do not examine, for example, Winckelmann’s journeys to Naples or the impact he had on art scholarship in the later-labelled Kingdom of the Two Sicilies. Focus on Northern and Central Italy has allowed this thesis to investigate all of the Italian editions of Winckelmann’s *Geschichte der Kunst des Altertums* published in this period (in Milan, Rome, and Prato); a number of the leading art writers, many of whom moved to Rome to pursue their career; and Roman artistic journals, which afforded much attention to the German scholar.

Thirdly, it has been necessary to limit the scope of investigation by exploring Italian art scholarship’s response to a selection of Winckelmann’s main works. The primary focus of this thesis is his magnum opus, the *Geschichte der Kunst des Altertums* (*History of the Art of Antiquity*),⁷⁵ though the four following works are also referred to as appropriate:⁷⁶

⁷⁴ Riall, p. 13.

⁷⁵ Whilst Winckelmann originally published the *Geschichte* in 1764, it was the 1776 edition that was consulted by the Italian translators (see Chapter III.1.). This 1776 edition has thus been used throughout the thesis to ensure consistency.

Gedanken über die Nachahmung der Griechischen Werke in der Malerei und Bildhauer-Kunst⁷⁷

Thoughts on the Imitation of Greek works in Painting and the Art of Sculpture

Monumenti antichi inediti spiegati ed illustrati⁷⁸

Unpublished Ancient Monuments, Explained and Illustrated

Anmerkungen über die Baukunst der alten Tempel zu Girgenti in Sizilien⁷⁹

Remarks on the Architecture of the Old Temples at Agrigento in Sicily

Anmerkungen über die Baukunst der Alten⁸⁰

Remarks on the Architecture of the Ancients

Having made this selection, I do not examine the response to such works as Winckelmann's early writing on gems, *Description des pierres gravées du feu Baron de Stosch* (1760),⁸¹ or his shorter essays on subjects including allegory and the ability to experience beauty in art. Yet, given that Winckelmann's contentious views were predominantly expounded in his central works, especially his *Geschichte*, I consider it logical to assume that any response to the above-discussed dilemma would begin with his key writings. There is also a persuasive historical

⁷⁶ English translations of the titles of Winckelmann's works are sourced from David Carter, 'Introduction', in *Johann Joachim Winckelmann on Art, Architecture, and Archaeology* (Rochester: Camden House, 2013), pp. 1-28 (pp. 6-7; 12-13; 23-25). Although the translation of the *Gedanken* is also sourced from this work by Carter (as explained in the Glossary), references to 'Carter' throughout the thesis refer to his 'Introduction'.

⁷⁷ The first version of the *Gedanken* (1755) is used throughout this thesis, since this was the edition most likely known by Italian scholars. Whilst the *Gedanken* was not translated into Italian until 1831 (in the sixth volume of the *Opere*), Italian scholars would have had access to several prominent French translations of the 1755 edition. This included those published in well-known journals, such as the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque Germanique* and *Journal étranger*. See Christopher Armstrong, *Julien-David Leroy and the Making of Architectural History* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2012), p. 138 and Décultot, 'Généalogie d'un malentendu: la place de Winckelmann dans les panthéons littéraires français et allemand à la fin du XVIIIe siècle', in *L'Art et les normes sociales au XVIIIe siècle*, ed. by Thomas W. Gaehtgens and others (Paris: Editions de la Maison des sciences de l'homme, 2001), pp. 15-28 (p. 26).

⁷⁸ Johann J. Winckelmann, *Monumenti antichi inediti spiegati ed illustrati* (Rome: Pagliarini, 1767). Hereafter: *Monumenti*. It should be noted that this work is never referred to as *Monumenti antichi*, as that is instead the shortened title of a journal investigated in Chapter V.

⁷⁹ Winckelmann, 'Anmerkungen über die Baukunst der Alten Tempel zu Girgenti in Sicilien', in *Johann Winckelmanns Sämtliche Werke*, ed. by Josef Eiselein, 12 vols (Donauöschingen: Verlage deutscher Klassiker, 1825-29), II (1825), 303-29. Hereafter: *Anmerkungen über die Baukunst der alten Tempel*.

⁸⁰ Winckelmann, 'Anmerkungen über die Baukunst der Alten', in *Johann Winckelmanns Sämtliche Werke*, II (1825), pp. 331-471. Hereafter: *Anmerkungen über die Baukunst*.

⁸¹ Winckelmann, *Description des pierres gravées du feu Baron de Stosch* (Florence: Bonducci, 1760).

reason behind such a selection, as it was these central works that were first made available to Italian readers through Italian and/or French translations.⁸²

Fourthly, the selection of media in which to examine the Italian response to Winckelmann required careful consideration. Such a study could naturally be undertaken on analysis of one medium alone but, in light of the scarcity of research in this area, I have selected the three most relevant media (clarified below) to form a cross-section of Italian art scholarship. This research question could, however, also be extended in the future to media less directly related to the German scholar, including, for example, poetry.⁸³

The first medium chosen in this thesis – translations of Winckelmann's *Geschichte* – is not only one of the earliest examples of scholarly response to Winckelmann, but it necessitates attention by virtue of being the vehicle by which other Italian scholars were thereafter able to engage with his contentious views. The translations of the *Geschichte* produced in this period are as follows:

Carlo Amoretti, *Storia delle arti del disegno presso gli antichi*

Carlo Fea, *Storia delle arti del disegno presso gli antichi*

Carlo Fea, 'Storia dell'arte presso gli antichi', in *Opere di G. G. Winckelmann*

Art literature constitutes the second medium here examined. As the field to which Winckelmann himself contributed, with his *Geschichte* and other works, this was chosen due to both the likely prospect of response to Winckelmann therein and its clearly central status in art scholarship as a whole. The five scholars that constitute the case studies in this analysis are:

Giovanni Battista Piranesi

Giambattista Gherardo D'Arco

Francesco Milizia

⁸² See Chapter II.4.3. for information regarding the availability of these works to Italian readers.

⁸³ Whilst written later than the period examined in this thesis, Goisue Carducci's *Saluto Italico* (inspired by Carducci's visit to Trieste in 1878) provides an example of Winckelmann's presence in Italian poetry. See Joseph Cary, *A Ghost in Trieste* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993), pp. 80-82.

Luigi Lanzi

Leopoldo Cicognara

The third and final medium is artistic journals of the period. In line with the intention to investigate progressively broader areas of scholarship, consideration of artistic periodicals allows for an examination of sources that were the result of not one individual author but, rather, groups of editors and contributors. Given the breadth of this field, however, the parameters here were tightened to include only Roman journals. I selected Rome as the most likely arena of response to Winckelmann due both to his lasting legacy in the city in which he lived and Rome's increased engagement with the ancients. After all, this was the time of the Grand Tour, development of museums, and increased trade of antiquities, all of which centred around Rome.⁸⁴ The ten journals analysed are:

Efemeridi letterarie di Roma

Antologia romana

Giornale delle belle arti e della incisione, antiquaria, musica, e poesia

Memorie per le belle arti

Monumenti antichi inediti ovvero Notizie sulle antichità e belle arti di Roma

Memorie enciclopediche romane sulle belle arti, antichità ec.

Memorie enciclopediche sulle antichità e belle arti di Roma

Giornale arcadico di scienze, lettere, ed arti

Effemeridi letterarie di Roma

Memorie romane di antichità e di belle arti

The reasons behind the choice of individual translations, art writers, and journals will be discussed in their respective chapters (Chapters III – V).

⁸⁴ See Chapter II.2.

I.8. PRACTICAL METHODOLOGY

Finally, I will now outline the practical methodologies that I employed in analysing the response to Winckelmann in all three media (Chapters III to V).

Chapter III – translations – first involved identifying multiple extended extracts from throughout the *Geschichte* that would allow for a broad examination of Winckelmann's opinions on the development of art in the different nations and time periods that he considers. These opinions were the focus in this selection given the more limited opportunity to foreignize or domesticate Winckelmann's views on subjects such as pure aesthetics. Having chosen these passages, I undertook close textual comparison of the German of Winckelmann's *Geschichte* and the three posthumous Italian translations, identifying alterations that the Italian scholars made to Winckelmann's text. In addition, I also analysed the translators' paratexts for an understanding of their broader treatment of the German scholar.

Chapter IV – art literature – demanded the identification of an appropriate corpus. Through extensive secondary reading on the broader sphere of art literature of this period, this was selected by reference to a number of criteria that I will explore at the start of this fourth chapter. Having chosen the five most appropriate scholars for this investigation (listed above), research primarily comprised close reading of their texts in order to analyse their responses to Winckelmann. As explained above, in many cases (and in relation to two art writers in particular) this involved identifying reactions to Winckelmannian views despite there being no overt reference to the German scholar or his works.

Chapter V – artistic journals – again involved extensive secondary research. I consulted catalogues, monographs, articles, and a number of sources from the scholarship of the period in order to assemble my corpus of the most suitable Roman artistic journals (listed above). Having selected these ten journals, I compiled a digitized library of their numerous volumes by sourcing online copies; using a Digital Microfiche Reader to make PDF copies of journals only

available in microfiche; and, where necessary, taking photographs of the originals. Using Adobe Acrobat, I then employed OCR (Optical Character Recognition)⁸⁵ to produce encoded (machine-readable) text, which could be searched in order to identify references to Winckelmann. The twenty search terms I used were as follows:

In searching for:	The following search terms were employed:					
<i>Winckelmann (or Abate Winckelmann)</i>	win (winck wink) ⁸⁶	vin ⁸⁷	man (mann)	ann	nan ⁸⁸	bate
<i>His German origins (Stendal/ tedesco/ Germania/ alemanno/alamanno⁸⁹)</i>	stend	ted	defc ⁹⁰	erman	alem	alam
<i>Storia delle arti del disegno presso gli antichi or Geschichte</i>	stor	ftor	chic	--	--	--
<i>Translators Carlo Amoretti and Carlo Fea</i>	rlo	amor	moret	fea	pea ⁹¹	--

This method of searching the text naturally does not guarantee the identification of all Winckelmann-related instances. Yet the large number of search terms ensured it was an effective method that rendered feasible the analysis of such a vast corpus. On finding over 530 relevant references, I then logged these instances in Microsoft Excel, from which I examined the response to Winckelmann.

Given both the large number of sources used in Chapter V and their untrodden nature in scholarship, I have made the digitized library of my corpus available through *Humanities*

⁸⁵ Adobe Acrobat has an OCR, 'Text Recognition', function, which allows the programme to recognize the scans of the journal (which are automatically images) as text that can be read (and searched).

⁸⁶ By searching for 'win', I also ensured that the OCR would detect both 'winck' and 'wink' ('Winckelmann' is a common spelling variant in the journals). The same is true of 'man' and 'mann'.

⁸⁷ By searching 'vin', I was able to identify both instances where Italians referred to him as 'Vinckelmann' and the less frequent occasions when the OCR read 'W' as 'V'.

⁸⁸ I searched for 'nan' to ensure I identified any (rare) instances in which 'man/mann' was read as 'nan/nann'.

⁸⁹ Both spelling variants – 'alemanno' and 'alamanno' – are used in the journals analysed.

⁹⁰ I searched for 'defc' to guard against the (again rare) occurrences when 'S' was read as 'F'. The same reasoning explains the search term 'ftor'.

⁹¹ I searched for 'pea' to ensure I identified the (extremely rare) occurrences when 'F' was read as 'P'.

Commons,⁹² to be reached at the following address: romanartisticjournals.hcommons.org. I hope that this collated, searchable database will facilitate further research into these journals, as well as bringing greater attention to the medium more broadly, as such sources provide a valuable insight into the development of art scholarship during this period.

I.9. CONTRIBUTION RESTATED

I have listed above the five contributions that this thesis makes to the understanding of Winckelmann's reception in Italian art scholarship, 1755-1834. It is these, as well as both the conceptual framework and the practical methodology employed – especially the systematic analysis of a vast amount of overlooked material in Chapter V – that together constitute this thesis' original contribution to knowledge.

⁹² *Humanities Commons* – 'a project of the office of scholarly communication at the Modern Language Association' (MLA) – is a 'trusted, non-profit network where humanities scholars can [...] share their work'. For more information, see 'About *Humanities Commons*', *Humanities Commons* <<https://hcommons.org/about/>> [accessed 10 February 2018].

CHAPTER II:

BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

*Roma non è solo madre a noi che in questo suolo nascemmo, ma è madre
altresì ad ogni artista valente, ad ogni dotto archeologo [...] nostri
furono eziandio e il Bottari e il Venuti [...] e il Winckelmann.*

Luigi Biondi (GA.LX.126)

II.1. INTRODUCTION

This context chapter comprises three parts. First, it provides a historical overview of Italy in the period 1755-1834, with particular focus on the developments which inform this thesis' focus on nationalism. Second, it introduces Winckelmann, outlining his biography, aesthetic principles, and main works. Finally, it explores the analytical starting point of this thesis: the dilemma that Winckelmann posed to Italian art scholarship during the period examined.

II.2. ITALY, 1755-1834

In order to contextualize the nationalistic responses that Winckelmann elicited in Italian art scholarship, it is necessary here to provide an overview of the political developments, the artistic and intellectual advancements, and the rise of nationalism in Italian scholarship more broadly, 1755 to 1834.

I will first briefly outline the political changes that occurred in Northern and Central Italy during this period, since an understanding of the turbulent political backdrop helps to explain why many Italian scholars, even those concentrating on art scholarship rather than political discourse, nevertheless had the Italian nation at the centre of their concerns.

Following the 1748 Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, which was signed at the end of the War of Austrian Succession, Northern and Central Italy were for the most part under Austrian control between 1755 and 1834.¹ It was a period of peace: the 'longest in Italy's modern

¹ Hanns Gross, *Rome in the Age of Enlightenment: The Post-Tridentine Syndrome and the Ancient Regime* (Cambridge: CUP, 1990), p. 326; and Christopher Duggan, *A Concise History of Italy* (Cambridge: CUP, 1994), p. 76.

history' as Christopher Duggan states.² Yet this is with the notable exception of two Napoleonic conquests. The first began in the spring of 1796 when Napoleon led the French over the Alps to Italy and soon took Lombardy, Veneto, Bologna, and the Romagna.³ These victories led to the carving out of two new client states: the Cispadane and the Cisalpine Republics, the former of which was subsumed by the latter in July 1797.⁴ Napoleon thereafter signed the Treaty of Campoformio, conceding Venice to Austria, and left Italy in November 1797. The peninsula, however, continued to experience revolutionary government until spring 1799, when coalition forces finally expelled the French presence.⁵ The first campaign was short-lived but one that triggered change in Italian society, as many Northern cities were inspired to expand their territories at the expense of their neighbours.⁶ Soon after, Napoleon returned: this time for a longer and more permanent conquest. He arrived in 1800, after which the peninsula was divided into three: the Kingdom of Naples; North-West Italy, which was annexed to the French Empire, comprising Piedmont, Liguria, Tuscany, and Latium; and the North-East, where the Cisalpine Republic was restored. This Republic was later renamed the Italian Republic and finally the Kingdom of Italy, of which Napoleon was crowned King.⁷ Both during his first and second campaigns, Napoleon ordered the Popes – Pius VI and Pius VII respectively – to be exiled from the Papal States: decisions that caused great resentment amongst the Italians.⁸ In 1813-14 Napoleonic rule collapsed, after which Napoleon was exiled

² Duggan, p. 76.

³ Duggan, p. 89.

⁴ Raymond Pearson, *The Longman Companion to European Nationalism, 1789-1920* (Oxford: Routledge, 2014), p. 74.

⁵ Duggan, p. 91.

⁶ Duggan, p. 91.

⁷ Desmond Gregory, *Napoleon's Italy* (New Jersey: Fairleigh Dickinson, 2001), p. 67, and Duggan, pp. 92-93.

⁸ David Nicholls, *Napoleon: A Biographical Companion* (California: ABC-CLIO, 1999), p. 194, and H. A. L. Fisher, *A History of Europe* (London: Edward Arnold, 1936), pp. 849-50.

to Elba in 1815, before meeting his final defeat and exile at the hands of the coalition forces later that same year.⁹

Following the Treaty of Vienna, signed in 1815, Italy returned post-Napoleon to the *status quo ante bellum*, with its Northern and Central territories predominantly under Austrian power.¹⁰ Yet the revolutionary era had rendered the situation at home volatile. Marking the beginning of the Risorgimento, there was discontentment and want for change: secret societies emerged throughout the peninsula and revolts began. These included, for example, a series of uprisings in central Italy in 1831 inspired by the July Revolution in Paris, which had established a new constitutional monarch. Despite this unrest, however, the different states and societies throughout the peninsula lacked both practical and shared aims, rendering any progress in this period minimal.¹¹ It is in these early Risorgimento years that this investigation comes to a close, twenty-seven years before Italy achieved Unification in 1861.

As well as political developments, there were a number of artistic, intellectual, and literary advancements in this era, appreciation of which helps to account both for the interest in Winckelmann's scholarship and again for the period's growing nationalism.

Interest in ancient art soared in this period. It was after all the time of the Grand Tour, when tourists (largely young men) flooded into Italy as part of their *rite de passage* of elite manhood: an opportunity to acquire taste and social polish whilst learning about classical antiquity.¹² This was particularly the case in Rome, where the art market boomed as a result. It was not only 'the most important market for trade in antiquities and ancient art', but the demand for commercial production of copies was extremely high: the city became, as Hanns

⁹ Duggan, pp. 96-99.

¹⁰ Michael F. Gretz, 'Italy', in *Encyclopaedia of the Age of Political Revolutions and New Ideologies (1760-1816)*, 2 vols (Westport: Greenwood, 2007), I, 356-59 (p. 359).

¹¹ Duggan, pp. 103-07.

¹² Rosemary Sweet, *Cities and the Grand Tour: The British in Italy c. 1690-1820* (Cambridge: CUP, 2012), p. 25.

Gross describes it, 'one huge craftsmen's studio'.¹³ Nor was the focus solely on trade. Rather there was also a great drive in Italy to restore antiquities: objectives that were largely supported (outside of the Napoleonic conquests) by the Papacy, especially Benedict XIV, who was influential during Winckelmann's lifetime,¹⁴ and Pius VII who ordered a number of restoration projects.¹⁵ Moreover, whilst this investigation concentrates on Northern and Central Italy, the discovery of such ancient sites as Herculaneum and Pompeii, where excavations had begun in 1738 and 1748 respectively, further augmented the interest in Italy's artistic past.¹⁶ It is thus not difficult to explain the attention that Winckelmann received, as a key figure in the period's antiquarianism.

Turning to Italy's intellectual and literary developments in this period, it should be noted that peninsula-wide literacy rates were, and remained, notably low. Even at Unification 75% of the Italian population was illiterate.¹⁷ Nevertheless, Italy devoted itself in the eighteenth century to shaking off the cultural isolationism of the seventeenth century and to reacquiring its position in the intellectual and scholarly life of Europe.¹⁸ Yet, as Duggan asserts, this new engagement was 'by no means unproblematic', as it bred a sense of inferiority compared to other European countries.¹⁹ This feeling of backwardness persisted throughout the period here examined, with a number of Italian scholars, including art scholars, appearing to respond to it.²⁰ Moreover the concern was naturally heightened by the calls for Italy's modernization on the part of such foreign scholars as Madame de Staël.²¹

¹³ Gross, p. 315.

¹⁴ Wolfgang Leppmann, *Winckelmann* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1971), pp. 207-08.

¹⁵ Ronald T. Ridley, *The Eagle and the Spade: The Archaeology of Rome during the Napoleonic Era 1809-1814* (Cambridge: CUP, 1992), pp. 35-46.

¹⁶ Gross, p. 326.

¹⁷ Duggan, p. 152.

¹⁸ Duggan, p. 85, and Noether, p. 8.

¹⁹ Duggan, p. 85.

²⁰ See Chapters IV.9. and V.3.1.

²¹ For Mme de Staël's role as catalyst to the debate between Classicism and Romanticism, see Chapter I.2.1, p. 30.

There was, however, also a defensive element to the Italian responses to de Staël. Even the Romantics, who agreed with the need for change and were supportive of Italy's modernization, simultaneously sought to protect their native patria from such criticism of a foreigner. Indeed, on the views of Romantic scholars, Luzzi affirms:

Whilst it is impossible to reduce these responses to a single formula, they essentially sought to protect native Italian cultural idioms [...] from the imposition of foreign, Northern European norms [...], the struggle to define Italian Romantic poetics often became synonymous with the drive to define *italianità*.²²

Thus, demonstrating yet further the growth of nationalism, discussions surrounding Italy's backwardness also gave rise to a consideration of national identity during this period.

In light of the inescapable presence of a nationalistic sentiment in political and cultural developments of the time, I turn now to a discrete discussion of the rise of nationalism in Italy's scholarship. I will here briefly delineate both the character of scholarly nationalism pre-1755 and the motives behind its rise in the period 1755-1834, thus providing context to the scholarly nationalism explored in this thesis.

Nationalistic sentiments naturally predated 1755. Indeed, to focus on two notable examples, Giorgio Vasari (1511-1574) and Giambattista Vico (1668-1744) have received much attention as key scholars who anticipated many of the principles of later nationalism. As regards Vasari, Rudolf Wittkower confirms that 'the supremacy of Roman art is a conception belonging to the arsenal of national Italian historians ever since Vasari's days',²³ whilst Noether devotes a whole chapter to Vico in her *Seeds of Italian Nationalism: 1700-1815*. Amongst other principles in Vico's thought, Noether especially comments on his contribution – as a contemporary of Buonarroti, Maffei, and Gori – to the aforementioned focus on the pre-

²² Luzzi, 'The Task of Italian Romanticism: Literary Form and Polemical Response', in *The Oxford Handbook of European Romanticism*, ed. by Paul Hamilton (Oxford: OUP, 2016), pp. 377-89 (p. 382).

²³ Rudolf Wittkower, 'Piranesi's "Parere su l'architettura"', *Journal of the Warburg Institute*, 2 (1938), 147-58 (p. 149).

Roman nation of Etruria.²⁴ She even labels Vico's *De antiquissima italorum sapientia* 'one of the sources of nationalist inspiration'.²⁵

Such sentiments increased significantly in the scholarly field between 1755 and 1834. The possible motives behind this are numerous. The French Revolution, at least before the Jacobin ascendancy and the Terror of 1793-94, was certainly a turning point as it opened many Italians' eyes to the idea of a nation.²⁶ The same can be said of the Napoleonic campaigns, as Napoleon provided Italy, especially at the start of the nineteenth century, with an early sense of unity.²⁷ During his first campaign Napoleon also launched an essay competition on the theme of 'which type of free government is best suited to the happiness of Italy', in which entrants were encouraged to view Italy as a nation and to recall 'the ancient glories of Italy'.²⁸ Moreover, as well as being inspired to nationalism, Italy was arguably also driven to it. From Spain to Austria to France, the peninsula had been dominated and fought over for centuries by different European powers: a reality encapsulated in Olson's description of the peninsula as the 'chessboard of Europe'.²⁹ Nor was such treatment restricted to political developments, rather it also extended to their cultural heritage. Not only was Napoleon responsible for the looting of many of Rome's and Venice's cultural and artistic treasures, but the tourists of the Grand Tour stripped Rome and other cities of their past.³⁰ As Gross confirms, 'no pillage was more thorough than that which the city [Rome] suffered at the hands of foreigners [collectors] in the eighteenth century'.³¹

²⁴ See Chapter I.2.1, p. 28.

²⁵ Noether, pp. 59, 78-81. There is, I contend, cause to believe that Winckelmann was aware of and influenced by the work of Vico; John Harry North also suggests as much: see North, *Winckelmann's 'Philosophy of Art': A Prelude to German Classicism* (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars, 2012), p. 66.

²⁶ Duggan, p. 88.

²⁷ J. Christopher Herold, *The Age of Napoleon* (London: Phoenix, 2002), p. 140.

²⁸ Duggan, p. 91.

²⁹ Roberta Olson, 'Art for a new audience in the Risorgimento: a meditation', *Journal of Modern Italian Studies*, 18.2 (2013), 211-24 (p. 211).

³⁰ Thomas Bazley, *Crimes of the Art World* (California: Praeger, 2010), p. 84.

³¹ Gross, p. 314.

Thus from scholarly nationalism pre-1755 and the numerous reasons for its increase to the desire to combat Italy's backwardness; the increasing Etruscheria; and the already-discussed move away from local to 'national' art histories,³² there is a great deal of context to give credence to my argument that between 1755 and 1834 reactions to Winckelmann in Italian art scholarship were motivated by nationalism.

II.3. INTRODUCING WINCKELMANN

Having introduced the historical background to this period, it is now necessary to introduce Winckelmann: his life, art history, and key publications. As explained in the previous chapter, existing scholarship has dedicated much attention to details of Winckelmann's biography and aesthetics, the key aspects of which I will now introduce.³³

II.3.1. Winckelmann's life

Winckelmann was born in 1717 to a Protestant family in Stendal, a town in central Germany now in the state of Saxony-Anhalt.³⁴ He attended school in his hometown, before moving to Berlin for further schooling at seventeen. It was in Berlin that his teacher, Christian Tobias Damm, first introduced him to ancient Greece: its language and its literature.³⁵ He thereafter studied theology at the University of Halle, where he also attended lectures on aesthetics and ancient numismatics, before briefly enrolling in medicine at the University of Jena. Both between his university experiences and after, Winckelmann worked as a tutor to noble

³² See Chapter I.2.1., p. 32.

³³ See Chapter I.2.2.

³⁴ Carter, p. 1, and Ludwig Curtius, 'Johann Joachim Winckelmann, 1717-1768', in *Johann Joachim Winckelmann: 1768/1968* (Bad Godesberg: Inter Nationes, 1968), pp. 5-19 (p. 6).

³⁵ North, pp. 8-9.

families. He then became headmaster of a school in Seehausen, before accepting, in 1748, the post as librarian to Count Heinrich von Büнау in Nöthnitz, near Dresden.³⁶

During this period under Büнау, Winckelmann became familiar with the art on display in Dresden as well as the artistic circles and the Saxon Court,³⁷ the latter of which saw a rise in conversions to Catholicism as the Elector of Saxony, Augustus III, had converted to become ruler of Poland.³⁸ Here Winckelmann met Count Alberigo Archinto, Papal Nuncio to the court, and Gian Ludovico Bianconi, court physician. Both men encouraged Winckelmann not only to move to Rome – Archinto’s contact, Cardinal Passionei, was looking for a librarian – but also to convert to Catholicism, placing great emphasis on the unique ability of the Holy See to further a scholarly career. They further bolstered the proposal by securing a stipend from Elector Augustus.³⁹ After much internal conflict, Winckelmann converted to Catholicism in June 1754. He did not move straight to Rome, but rather to Dresden in October of that year, where his interest in art vastly increased. This was due in part to his friendships with Christian Ludwig von Hagedorn, director of the Dresden Academy of Art, and artist, Adam Friedrich Ludwig Öser. Winckelmann subsequently relocated to Rome in November 1755.

On arriving in Rome Winckelmann’s intention had been immediately to enter the employment of Cardinal Passionei. Yet, supported by his stipend, he instead sought freedom to explore the city. He enjoyed the company of predominantly foreign artists, including German painter, Anton Raphael Mengs, and Danish sculptor, Johannes Wiedewelt.⁴⁰ Given the growing uncertainty around his stipend due to the Seven Years War (1756-63), however, he eventually

³⁶ Carter, pp. 3-4.

³⁷ Curtius, p. 8, and Carol C. Mattusch, ‘Introduction’, in *Letter and Report on the Discoveries at Herculaneum* (LA: Getty Publications, 2011), pp. 1-61 (pp. 4-5).

³⁸ North, p. 12.

³⁹ Leppmann, pp. 88-94, 104.

⁴⁰ Justi, II, 10-17, and Stephanie Gerrit-Bruer, ‘Winckelmanns Leben als Gelehrter in Rom’, in *Winckelmann Museum Stendal: Ausstellung zur Biographie Johann Joachim Winckelmanns* (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1996), pp. 80-94 (p. 82).

turned to Cardinal Archinto, who had just become Cardinal Secretary of State.⁴¹ Winckelmann refused any payment but offered his services as librarian in return for living quarters in the Palazzo Cancellaria.⁴²

In September 1758 Winckelmann accepted the invitation of Heinrich Wilhelm Muzell-Stosch, who – fulfilling the dying wish of his uncle, Baron Philipp von Stosch – invited the German scholar to Florence to assemble a catalogue of the Baron's collection of precious stones.⁴³ On returning to Rome seven months later and after Archinto's death, Winckelmann became librarian to Cardinal Albani, with whom he lived in the Palazzo Albani for the remainder of his time in Rome. With the help of Albani, Winckelmann secured two prestigious posts in the Vatican: that of Commissario delle Antichità della Camera Apostolica (Papal Antiquary) and Scriptor Linguae Teutonicae (Library Scribe Responsible for German Language).⁴⁴

Whilst Winckelmann never travelled as far as Greece, from Rome he undertook four research trips to Naples. There he visited the temples at Paestum, as well as the excavations of Herculaneum and Pompeii.⁴⁵ In 1768 Winckelmann decided to make one more trip, this time to Germany and Austria.⁴⁶ He attended an audience with Empress Maria Theresa but was thereafter filled with longing to return to Rome. He thus made his way to Trieste, from where he would travel back to Rome. He shared the wait for the next boat with a man named Francesco Arcangeli, who murdered Winckelmann on the ninth of June 1768. Arcangeli's

⁴¹ Justi, II, 100-05.

⁴² Gerrit-Bruer, p. 84.

⁴³ Leppmann, p. 191, and Wangenheim, pp. 167-69. The resulting work was the already-mentioned, *Description des pierres gravées*.

⁴⁴ Leppmann, pp. 202-03, 220-23, and Carter p. 8. See also Chapter II, n. 127, for information regarding a third (related) position that Winckelmann may also have accepted.

⁴⁵ Carter, pp. 7, 25.

⁴⁶ It should of course be remembered that – much like Italy – the unified nations of 'Germany' and 'Austria' as we know them today did not yet exist.

motives are uncertain but are likely related to the gold medal given to Winckelmann by Empress Maria Theresa, which the German scholar had shown to his new companion.⁴⁷

II.3.2. Winckelmann's art history and aesthetics

In this section I will outline the central elements of Winckelmann's art history and aesthetics.⁴⁸

These principles are so associated with Winckelmann as to be attributable to him even without express reference. Accordingly, in line with the definition articulated in Chapter I, I refer to them throughout the thesis as Winckelmannian. Before examining these views, however, there are two aspects of Winckelmann's work that I wish to emphasize.

First, whilst Winckelmannian principles are known for their articulation in the German scholar's work, it is of note that they are themselves steeped in Winckelmann's own reading of primarily ancient and Renaissance literature.⁴⁹ Whilst there is not the opportunity to explore in detail the origins of Winckelmann's thought in this investigation, I will note in due course a number of his key sources of inspiration.⁵⁰

Second, I would like to draw attention to Winckelmann's lyrical language, which is not only an integral part of his writing, but likely played a large role in its appeal, too. From the 'gliding' features of the Torso Belvedere that 'rise and fall like waves' (GES.II.744/II.265)⁵¹ to his description of Antinous as demonstrating 'the grace of sweet youth [...], stamped with pleasing

⁴⁷ Carter, pp. 10-12.

⁴⁸ As explained in Chapter I.8., Winckelmann's pure aesthetics are not a key part of this investigation yet the principles here outlined have been central in identifying responses to Winckelmann in Italian art scholarship.

⁴⁹ See Winckelmann, *History of the Art of Antiquity*, trans. by Harry Francis Mallgrave (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2006), pp. 373-414. The bibliography collated here allows for an appreciation of the extensive range of authors – ancient, Renaissance, and beyond – with whom Winckelmann was familiar.

⁵⁰ Winckelmann's sources and the extent to which his work was original have long been topics of debate amongst Winckelmann scholars, an overview of which is provided by Harloe, p. 106.

⁵¹ 'schwebende[n] Züge', 'nach Art der Wellen sich heben und senken'.

innocence and soft attractions' (GES.II.845/II.337),⁵² Winckelmann's eloquence separates his work from that of his predecessors, contemporaries, and even many art historians today.⁵³

Turning to Winckelmann's historical schema, the German scholar drew on a cyclical view of history which, as Irwin notes, had gained prominence in his day over its apocalyptic counterpart. This was the interpretation of history not as an inescapable decline from a golden age, but rather as an ever-renewing cycle of 'evolution from primitivism to sophistication to decline and oblivion'.⁵⁴ Indeed, building on the work of his Italian predecessors, Vasari and Bellori, the concept of rise and decline was fundamental to Winckelmann's understanding of the development of ancient art.⁵⁵ It dictates the entire structure of his magnum opus, the *Geschichte*, and is an essential component of the rest of his oeuvre.

The German scholar begins his exploration of ancient art with that of the Egyptians, followed by the Etruscans. According to Winckelmann, neither nation boasted perfect art, yet he nevertheless traces the improvement of their production. It was not until the Greeks and, more specifically, the Greek artists living in the fifth century that he believed art was raised to perfection. Yet even when this was achieved, Winckelmann explains that such perfection could not prevail forever (GES.I.490/II.143), and thus he identifies art's decline with the Romans' imitation of Greek work. This decline concludes the *Geschichte*, yet Winckelmann did not regard this as the end of art. Instead he praised the High Renaissance as the second 'rising' of art, noting how art was restored to its heights under Michelangelo, and even more significantly under Raphael. Indeed, revealing reservations about the mannerism present in Michelangelo's work, Winckelmann deemed that: 'the best Roman artists, however – Raphael and his school –

⁵² 'ein Bild der Gratie holder Jugend [...] mit gefälliger Unschuld und sanfter Reizung gesellt'.

⁵³ Suzanne L. Marchand, *Down from Olympus: Archaeology and Philhellenism in Germany, 1750-1970* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), p. 54.

⁵⁴ Irwin, p. 53.

⁵⁵ A. A. Donohue, 'Winckelmann's History of Art and Polyklitos', in *Polykleitos, the Doryphoros, and Tradition*, ed. by Warren Moon (Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1995), pp. 327-53 (pp. 333-34).

[...] always came closer [...] to the Greeks'.⁵⁶ Just as before, art subsequently declined: this time in the Baroque period, when artists such as Bernini flourished, whom Winckelmann strongly criticized for corrupting beauty. Finally, concluding the cycle discernible in Winckelmann's lifetime, he believed that his own era was one of a third rise. Subject of particular praise was his friend, Mengs, who he believed 'arose like a phoenix [...] out of the ashes of the first Raphael to teach the world about beauty in art'.⁵⁷ Thus, through this overarching schema Winckelmann provides a systematic examination of the development of art: from his main concern of the ancients up to and including his own day.

With Greek art thus representing the height of artistic achievement, a key question that Winckelmann poses in his work is *why* the Greeks achieved a perfection above all others. His answer: art is a product of the environment and culture in which it originates. Drawing again on the work of ancient and Renaissance scholars – here including Plato, Aristotle, and Vasari – Winckelmann believed it was the external circumstances in Greece that made the perfection of Greek art possible.⁵⁸ These include: the climate, the society and its politics, war (or the lack thereof), the esteem for art and artists, the value placed on beauty, and the lack of disease. This was certainly not an entirely original theory yet, as Kaufmann emphasizes, Winckelmann's powerful reinforcement of the role of climate and other external factors to the meritorious development of Greek art was truly significant to the sphere of art history. Kaufmann asserts that the *Geschichte*, 'a work often [...] regarded as a major turning point in

⁵⁶ Winckelmann, *Geschichte der Kunst des Altertums*, 2 vols (Dresden: Walther, 1764), I, 111. MT: 'Die besten Römischen Künstler hingegen, Raphael und dessen Schule, [...] kommen [...] den Griechen allezeit näher'. See footnote immediately below.

⁵⁷ Winckelmann, *Geschichte* (1764), I, 184. MT: 'Er ist als ein Phoenix [...] aus der Asche des ersten Raphaels erweckt worden, um der Welt in der Kunst die Schönheit zu lehren'. Both this and the preceding quotation were not included in the 1776 edition yet have been employed here as they encapsulate so clearly Winckelmann's schema.

⁵⁸ Peter Burke, *Tradition and Innovation in Renaissance Italy: A Sociological Approach* (London: Fontana, 1974), pp. 15-20, and North, p. 159.

the history of art, may also be seen as having a similar effect in the geography of art, for Winckelmann combines the geography and the history of art inextricably'.⁵⁹

To expound these ideas in greater detail, Winckelmann argues that Greek people, and thus also Greek art, achieved the highest level of beauty due to Greece's moderate climate devoid of extreme temperatures. He suggests that bodies formed in climates that were too hot or cold were characterized by 'excess[ive]' and 'immature' growths, respectively. By contrast, those that developed in temperate climates like that of Greece had a more regular and correct appearance, closer to that of their Creator (GES.I.255-56/I.307).⁶⁰ Consequently, since artists took inspiration from nature, the Greek climate (superior to other climates) enabled its art to achieve perfection. As regards society and politics, Winckelmann declares that, 'the thoughts of the whole people rose higher with freedom, just as a noble branch rises from a sound stock' (GES.I.233/I.292).⁶¹ That is, Greece's (allegedly) free and thus ideal political climate stimulated the way of thinking of the Greek population and was, in turn, conducive to their creative outputs and supremacy in art (GES.I.228/I.289). Moreover, with this value placed on freedom came Winckelmann's great regard for peace. Whilst bemoaning the loss of freedom and thus damage to art in other periods plagued by war, he maintains that peace reigned during the finest periods of ancient Greek art (GES.II.644-45/II.192).⁶² Winckelmann also insists that the Greeks' esteem for art and artists preserved its status. Rather than being the subject of individuals' indulgence, art was reserved for the most respected functions in Greek society, further providing impetus and opportunities for artists to create and display their work, which

⁵⁹ Thomas D. Kaufmann, *Toward a Geography of Art* (London: University of Chicago Press, 2004), p. 37.

⁶⁰ 'dort übertriebene [...] hier aber unreife Gewächse'.

⁶¹ 'Durch die Freiheit erhob sich, wie ein edler Zweig aus einem gesunden Stamme, das Denken des ganzen Volks'.

⁶² Winckelmann allows for just one exception, accepting that art flourished in the war preceding the Peloponnesian War (GES.II.643/II.191).

was itself another reason for the flourishing of art in ancient Greece (GES.I.229-33/I.290-92).⁶³

Finally, Winckelmann emphasizes how beauty was part of everyday Greek life: not only could artists see beautiful youths wrestling in the gymnasia (GES.I.264/I.312), but beauty contests were a common affair (GES.I.225/I.287-88). It was this admiration of beauty that Winckelmann claims transferred onto their art. He even suggests that diseases were not a threat to the Greeks, allowing for an uninterrupted continuation of beautiful subjects (GES.I.47/I.161).

Having examined Winckelmann's historical schema and the considerable attention that he affords external circumstances, I will now outline four further principles fundamental to the German scholar's aesthetics.

First, Winckelmann argues that all beauty is enhanced through unity and simplicity. Demonstrating clear Aristotelian influence, whilst transposing the ancient scholar's principles on rhetoric to art, Winckelmann believed that art should be composed of varied parts (he believed variety, too, was a source of beauty) that are united in one whole.⁶⁴ When discussing the beauty of youthful figures, for example, he asserts in the *Geschichte* that artists found 'the cause of beauty in unity, variety, and harmony' (GES.I.264/I.312).⁶⁵ Moreover, these forms should be simple. Winckelmann emphasizes the redundancy of extravagant ornamentation – immediately clarifying his dislike of the Baroque and Rococo styles – as he maintains that a work does not lose its greatness if it can be conceived in one single glance. On the contrary this conceivability enables one to imagine it 'in its true greatness', expanding and elevating the spirit (GES.I.261/I.310).⁶⁶

Second, for Winckelmann the pinnacle of artistic beauty is the nude male form and, more accurately, this form in the simplicity of its youth. Indeed he extols the contouring of

⁶³ Moshe Barasch, *Modern Theories of Art, 1: From Winckelmann to Baudelaire* (NY: New York University Press, 1990), pp. 119-20.

⁶⁴ Alex Potts, *Flesh and the Ideal: Winckelmann and the Origins of Art History* (London: Yale University Press, 1994), p. 100.

⁶⁵ 'die Ursache der Schönheit in der Einheit, in der Mannigfaltigkeit und in der Übereinstimmung'.

⁶⁶ 'durch diese Begreiflichkeit stellt es uns sich in seiner völligen Größe vor'.

eunuchs and effeminate youths such as the Apollo Belvedere above other more muscular figures (GES.I.273/I.320).⁶⁷ Explaining his preference for sculpture over painting, Winckelmann assigns utmost importance to the ability of sculpture to reveal bodily contour. He lauds the 'flowing' or 'undulating' contours of perfect Greek examples (GES.II.743-44/II.265),⁶⁸ and praises the visibility of the body's contour even beneath drapery. This was a common technique in ancient Greek statuary, in which 'the beautiful build of the body [is revealed] through the marble as though through a Coan garment' (GED.20/40).⁶⁹

Third, Winckelmann's concept of beauty is, as Barasch notes, also inextricably related to the good. Inspired by Plato, Winckelmann often uses the word 'noble' – a term taken from the domain of morals – to describe beautiful art.⁷⁰ Most famously, he describes the Laocoon statue as displaying 'a noble simplicity and a calm greatness' (GED.24/42),⁷¹ and indeed fundamental to Winckelmann's admiration of this piece is his esteem for Laocoon's noble suffering. The German scholar effusively praises how the figure does not react or succumb to the pain he is enduring but stoically controls his reaction. Such a response also explains the 'calm' greatness of Laocoon, emphasizing his virtuous ability to remain calm in adversity, which Winckelmann maintains is typical of figures in ancient Greek art (GED.24-25/42).

Fourth, and finally, imitation is a concept central to Winckelmann's thought. Most plainly inspired by Renaissance theorists such as Vasari and Bellori, Winckelmann discusses two alternative forms of imitation.⁷² On the one hand, he dismisses the precise replication of the original, maintaining that it was due to such imitation of Greek production that art declined under the Romans. On the other hand, Winckelmann actively encourages the imitation of the

⁶⁷ Potts, p. 173.

⁶⁸ 'die [...] Ausfließung einer Form in die andere, und die schwebenden Züge'.

⁶⁹ 'der meisterhafte Contour, [...] der auch durch den Marmor hindurch den schönen Bau seines Körpers wie durch ein Coisches Kleid zeigt'.

⁷⁰ Barasch, p. 118.

⁷¹ 'eine edle Einfalt, und eine stille Grösse'.

⁷² Barasch, pp. 110-12, and Harloe, pp. 59-61.

Greeks, provided that 'the imitator is aware of the distance between himself and his model' and 'he does not entertain the illusion that he can reproduce it with precision'.⁷³ Winckelmann presents this form of imitation as a positive step towards the improvement of art and prioritizes the imitation of the ancients over the more common imitation of nature, portraying the former as a shorter road to perfect beauty.⁷⁴ He famously states: 'the only way for us to become great, and, if indeed it is possible, inimitable, is through the imitation of the ancients [Greeks]' (GED.8/32).⁷⁵

Winckelmann's views on imitation are, however, further complicated by an important contradiction in his work: that concerning absolute and relative beauty. Indeed, whilst he encourages the imitation of Greek art, implying that it has absolute qualities of beauty and can thus be considered a universal 'artistic norm', this undermines his argument advocating the importance of external circumstances. After all, by presenting ancient Greek art as a product of its culture, Winckelmann instead suggests that its beauty is relative: that it was only achieved due to the unique context of fifth-century Greece which can never be identically replicated again.⁷⁶

This concludes my examination of the key Winckelmannian principles that I will hereafter refer to throughout the thesis. I will now briefly introduce the German scholar's main works.

II.3.3. Winckelmann's works

Despite his short career as an author lasting only thirteen years, Winckelmann published a wide range of different works: from the *Geschichte* to many shorter essays on various areas of

⁷³ Barasch, p. 111.

⁷⁴ Henry Caraway Hatfield, *Winckelmann and his German critics, 1755-1781* (New York: King's Crown Press, 1943), p. 7.

⁷⁵ 'Der einzige Weg für uns, groß, ja, wenn es möglich ist, unnachahmlich zu werden, ist die Nachahmung der Alten [Greeks]'.

⁷⁶ Donohue, p. 339.

aesthetics. However, not all of Winckelmann's works are relevant to this investigation. Thus, as explained in the previous chapter, this thesis concentrates on five of his main works, with the *Geschichte* constituting the prime focus.

Geschichte: Winckelmann aimed through his magnum opus of 1764 to provide a systematic study of the history of ancient art (GES.I.ii/I.107).⁷⁷ The work has a bipartite structure. Its first section has a more theoretical focus, exploring not only the aesthetic principles outlined above, but also the varying characteristics of the art of different ancient nations, from Egypt to Rome. The second half is a more detailed *history* of art, focusing specifically on the period from the early Greeks to the fall of the Roman Empire, with an increased emphasis on the external, historical circumstances influencing the art produced (GES.I.ii/I.107).

Gedanken: This essay, published in 1755, was written before Winckelmann left for Rome and contains, as E. M. Butler suggests, the 'embryo' of all his principal ideas.⁷⁸

Monumenti: First available in 1767, this work consists of a *Trattato preliminare dell'arte del disegno degli antichi popoli*, which serves almost as an Italian résumé of the *Geschichte*, followed by Winckelmann's analysis of a number of coins, statues, bas-reliefs, and other monuments that had either never before been published or had previously been misinterpreted.⁷⁹

Anmerkungen über die Baukunst der alten Tempel: Published in 1759 in the German journal, *Bibliothek der schönen Wissenschaften und der freien Künste*, this was Winckelmann's first essay solely on architecture, centred on the Greek site of Agrigento in Sicily.⁸⁰

⁷⁷ As explained in Chapter I, n. 75, the first posthumous edition of the *Geschichte*, published in 1776, is the edition used throughout this thesis.

⁷⁸ E. M. Butler, *The Tyranny of Greece over Germany: A Study of the Influence Exercised by Greek Art and Poetry over the Great German Writers of the Eighteenth, Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (Cambridge: CUP, 1935), p. 45.

⁷⁹ Leppmann, pp. 229-30.

⁸⁰ Carter, p. 25.

Anmerkungen über die Baukunst: Published in 1762 and based on his own observations at the temple at Paestum, Winckelmann discusses here the architectural development of ancient Greek temples.⁸¹

II.4. THE DILEMMA WINCKELMANN PRESENTED TO ITALIANS (1755-1834)

In order to contextualize the Italian responses to Winckelmann between 1755 and 1834, I will now explore the dilemma that Winckelmann posed to the Italians during this period. Introduced in the previous chapter as the analytical starting point to this thesis, this comprised the Italians' need to respond to Winckelmann, given his inescapable presence in Italy, yet their uncertainty as to how to react to his Italophobic views. In the remainder of this chapter I will thus set out in detail Winckelmann's presence – his standing in Roman society during his lifetime and the availability of his works then and thereafter – and, of course, the contentious views he espoused.⁸²

II.4.1. Winckelmann in Italy today

As a point of comparison, and before turning to this dilemma, however, it is interesting to note Winckelmann's contrastingly unproblematic status in Italy today. From the Vatican museums to Radiotelevisione Italiana (RAI), the German figure enjoys enduring fame and a straightforward, essentially positive reception.

⁸¹ Carter, p. 7.

⁸² There is a superficial similarity between the elements of the dilemma that Winckelmann posed to Italian scholarship (the presence of *Winckelmann* and his *works*, and his contentious *views*) and the three forms of reaction that I identified in my conceptual framework (Winckelmann qua scholar, his oeuvre, and his views). This is, however, purely coincidental: this chapter simply provides contextual information explaining the dilemma that Winckelmann posed.

In a recent guidebook to the Vatican Museums, for example, Winckelmann is simply lauded as ‘il maggiore teorico del Neoclassicismo’,⁸³ just as the museum labels in the Palazzo Altemps refer in factual yet praising terms to his identifications of and preferences amongst the pieces displayed. The label attached to the Ludovisi Antinous, for example, reports in an uncomplicated manner the positive influence Winckelmann had to its renown: ‘il Winckelmann disegnò quel pezzo, di proprietà Albani, contribuendo alla diffusione iconografica del tipo’.⁸⁴ Even the tourist board for Friuli-Venezia-Giulia places emphasis on the tragedy of Winckelmann’s death, noting on its website how the decision in 1847 to demolish the Locanda Grande in Trieste (where Winckelmann was murdered) was not unrelated to ‘il desiderio di cancellare la memoria di un tragico evento lì avvenuto nel 1768: l’uccisione dell’archeologo Winckelmann’.⁸⁵

This response continues in the spheres of education and culture. In a recent scholastic textbook on the history of art, for example, Winckelmann is not only introduced under the title ‘Alcune importanti posizioni teoriche’, but also as he who ‘aprì la via alla moderna storiografia artistica’.⁸⁶ Similarly, Salvatore Settis, in a short documentary produced by RAI Educational in 2013, speaks of Winckelmann in an unproblematic and markedly positive manner. Describing Winckelmann as ‘un grandissimo personaggio del Settecento’, Settis unreservedly praises him for surpassing Vasari’s methods: ‘Winckelmann assorbe tutta la tradizione antiquaria ma la supera mediante la narrazione storica [...] e con ciò facendo fonda una nuova storia dell’arte’.⁸⁷

⁸³ Susanna Bertoldi, ‘Il Torso del Belvedere’, in *I Musei Vaticani: conoscere la storia, le opere, le collezioni* (Vatican City: Edizioni Musei Vaticani, 2010), pp. 77-78 (p. 77).

⁸⁴ Museum label, ‘Busto di Antinoo: Ludovisi Collezione’, Palazzo Altemps [photograph taken 10 September 2013].

⁸⁵ ‘Il Grand Hotel Duchi D’Aosta’, Primo Turismo: Friuli-Venezia-Giulia <<https://www.turismofvg.it/it/41878/Grand-Hotel-Duchi-D-Aosta>> [accessed 09 September 2017].

⁸⁶ Andrea Gatti, ‘Il Neoclassicismo: la riscoperta dell’antico’, in *La storia delle arte, 3a: Dal Neoclassicismo alla metà del Novecento*, ed. by Carlo Bertelli (Milan: Pearson Italia, 2012), pp. 7-62 (p. 8).

⁸⁷ ‘Sei lezioni di Salvatore Settis. Terza lezione: Arte classica, libertà, rivoluzioni, la lezione di Winckelmann’, *Arte & Design*, Rai Cultura <<http://www.arte.rai.it/articoli-programma/sei-lezioni-di-salvatore-settis-terza-lezione-arte-classica-libert%C3%A0-rivoluzioni-la-lezione-di-winckelmann/19958/default.aspx>> [accessed 09 September 2017].

So, with this uncomplicated modern response to Winckelmann in mind, I will now turn back to the years between 1755 and 1834, and to the dilemma that inspired a more complex reaction to the German scholar during that period.

II.4.2. Existing scholarship

I will first situate the consideration of this dilemma within existing research. As clarified in the previous chapter, both aspects of the problem – Winckelmann’s presence in Italy and the offensive nature of his views on Italian art – have received at least some attention in scholarship thus far.

As regards the first aspect, Winckelmann’s life in Rome has been widely examined. Indeed, Zampa’s preface to his *Lettere Italiane*;⁸⁸ Sichtermann’s essay, ‘Winckelmann in Italien’;⁸⁹ and Schulz’s chapter of the same title have all been crucial in outlining Winckelmann’s presence and elevated status in the upper echelons of Roman society during his lifetime.⁹⁰ This is not to mention the seminal biographies by Justi, Wangenheim, and Leppmann. In contrast, however, and despite the marked increase in Winckelmann’s prominence after his death, his posthumous influence (as already explained in the previous chapter) has been largely understudied.⁹¹

In relation to the second aspect of the dilemma – Winckelmann’s offensive views – these have also been overlooked, as attention has focused instead on his Graecophilia. Kantor-Kazovsky even rejects the prevalence of anti-Roman sentiments in Winckelmann’s work: a view that I strongly contend to be mistaken. First, she fails to see the stark rise in Winckelmann’s

⁸⁸ Giorgio Zampa, ‘Prefazione’, in *Johann Joachim Winckelmann: Lettere italiane* (Milan: Feltrinelli, 1961), pp. ix-il.

⁸⁹ Hellmut Sichtermann, ‘Winckelmann in Italien’, in *Johann Joachim Winckelmann, 1717-1768*, ed. by Thomas W. Gaehtgens (Hamburg: Meiner, 1986), pp. 121-60.

⁹⁰ Arthur Schulz, ‘Winckelmann in Italien’, in *Winckelmann und seine Welt* (Berlin: Akademie, 1962), pp. 51-89.

⁹¹ See Chapter I.2.2.

Italophobia in the *Geschichte* by mistakenly concentrating on the *Gedanken*. Second, she comments on how ‘the *only* sentence that makes Winckelmann’s *Gedanken* sound anti-Roman [...] was written before he visited Rome’, asserting thereafter that, ‘while living in Rome, Winckelmann fell under the spell of Roman monuments’.⁹² This is immediately disproven when one considers that not only did Winckelmann believe the monuments in Rome to be Greek, but moreover he wrote his even more anti-Italian *Geschichte* when in Rome. Nevertheless, a small number of notable scholars, including Frederic Will,⁹³ Gross,⁹⁴ and, as I quoted in the Introduction, Elizabeth Décultot, have all highlighted – albeit often in passing – the offensive nature of Winckelmann’s views on Italy’s artistic heritage.

Aside from the extent of attention each has received, these two aspects have hitherto only been discussed separately. Thus, as well as augmenting understanding of the posthumous presence of Winckelmann’s works and his Italophobia, in the remainder of this chapter I will synthesize existing research so as to demonstrate the dilemma that these two aspects presented to Italians both during and after Winckelmann’s lifetime. As will become apparent, Winckelmann was a figure who could not be ignored in Italy, but – in light of his contentious views – was one to whom Italians were clearly uncertain how best to respond. I will thus begin this analysis with consideration of Winckelmann’s presence.

II.4.3. Winckelmann’s presence

Winckelmann’s presence, and the consequent necessity to respond to him, can be divided into three facets. First, as an eminent figure who enjoyed the company of the most prominent Cardinals, Winckelmann was almost impossible to avoid. Second, he was not only eminent but

⁹² Lola Kantor-Kazovsky, *Piranesi as Interpreter of Roman Architecture and the Origins of his Intellectual World* (Florence: L. S. Olschki, 2006), p. 33, italics added. The sentence Kantor-Kazovsky refers to here is the first example examined below in Chapter II.4.4.

⁹³ Frederic Will, *Intelligible Beauty in Aesthetic Thought: From Winckelmann to Victor Cousin* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1958), p. 107.

⁹⁴ Gross, p. 328.

also provocative: he was engaged in high-profile disputes with Italian scholars and occupied positions sought after by prominent Italians, augmenting his visibility yet further. Third, not only was Winckelmann himself prominent in Rome but his works also enjoyed a presence of their own through their wide availability to Italian readers.

I will first examine his eminence: Winckelmann lived in Rome from 1755 until his death in 1768, during which time he became an integral part of Roman society. Indeed, as the city was dominated by the Church, he even became an abbot: a title devoid of any ecclesiastical bearing but which nevertheless demonstrates his adoption of Roman customs.⁹⁵ Moreover Winckelmann's access to 'the most powerful social groups' and 'the great art collections', as well as many other opportunities, were occasioned by the Cardinals who supported him,⁹⁶ in particular by a small number with whom he was particularly close: branded his 'Cardinal-council' by Wangenheim.⁹⁷ He certainly did not lack attention from Cardinals. Attracted by his erudition and vast knowledge, Zampa even describes how they competed for him, compelling Winckelmann to act with caution so as not to offend anyone: 'Le manovre con cui i cardinali, all'arrivo a Roma, se lo contendono, come lui è costretto a difendersi, a destreggiarsi, cercando di non urtare nessuno'.⁹⁸

Cardinal Archinto was the first of Winckelmann's 'Cardinal-council'. As explored above, he was influential in encouraging Winckelmann to travel to Rome and, soon after he arrived, provided him with lodgings in the Cancelleria.⁹⁹ As Cardinal Secretary of State,¹⁰⁰ Archinto was well-liked and extremely influential in Rome, enabling him in turn to secure a number of valuable opportunities for the German scholar.¹⁰¹ This included facilitating Winckelmann's

⁹⁵ Wangenheim, p. 128 and Justi, III, 6.

⁹⁶ Jeffrey Morrison, *Winckelmann and the Notion of Aesthetic Education* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), p. 34.

⁹⁷ Wangenheim, p. 187, 'Kardinals-Kollegium'.

⁹⁸ Zampa, pp. xxxvii, xliii.

⁹⁹ Carter, p. 6.

¹⁰⁰ Carter, p. 6.

¹⁰¹ See Justi, II, 102-05 on Archinto's popularity.

participation in scholarly circles, which expanded both his knowledge and contacts in Roman society.¹⁰² Indeed, through Archinto, Winckelmann was able to attend antiquarian discussions held by the custodian of the Capitoline museum, Marchese Giovanni Pietro Locatelli; to accompany Archinto to the Quirinal; and even to dine with him at the Papal palace.¹⁰³ It was further through his association with Archinto that Winckelmann was able to enter a number of libraries and collections free of charge, including for instance that of the famed Collegio Romano.¹⁰⁴

The second of Winckelmann's close Cardinal circle was Domenico Silvio Passionei. Archinto introduced the two men with the aim that Winckelmann would become Passionei's librarian but this never transpired. Passionei owned a copious library in the Palazzo della Consulta on the Quirinal, to which he nevertheless granted Winckelmann free access and even helped him himself with books he could not find.¹⁰⁵ Passionei also later became librarian of the Vatican library.¹⁰⁶ He demonstrated great fondness for Winckelmann and regularly invited him to dinner. In fact, just as Winckelmann took meals with Archinto, he ate regularly with Passionei: a demand on his time of which Winckelmann was evidently proud: 'I go to see him [Archinto] just once a week. I eat at Cardinal Passionei's twice a week. I've thus arranged it so that I never eat at home anymore'.¹⁰⁷ Passionei even invited Winckelmann on holidays to his country residence in Camaldoli.¹⁰⁸ In light of Passionei's controversial anti-Papal and anti-Jesuit views, however, Winckelmann eventually distanced himself from such trips, as he was wary not to mar his relationships with other Cardinals.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰² Justi, II, 112.

¹⁰³ Justi, II, 113, 106-07.

¹⁰⁴ Gerrit-Bruer, p. 84.

¹⁰⁵ Schulz, pp. 58-59, 61.

¹⁰⁶ Justi, II, 94.

¹⁰⁷ Gerrit-Bruer, p. 85: 'Ich gehe also, doch nur einmal die Woche, zu ihm [Archinto]. Bei dem Cardinal Paßionei esse ich zweimal die Woche, und endlich habe ich es so eingerichtet, daß ich niemals mehr zu Hause esse'.

¹⁰⁸ Schulz, p. 61.

¹⁰⁹ Justi, II, 97-100.

The third member of his 'Collegium', nowadays the most famous of Winckelmann's patrons, was Cardinal Alessandro Albani. Albani was Protector of the Holy Roman Empire, nephew of Clement XI, and, with Baron Stosch, was one of the most prolific collectors of Winckelmann's time.¹¹⁰ He was very popular, as Winckelmann himself affirms, 'everywhere he is venerated, almost worshipped; he alone would be in a position to overthrow the Papal States and within an hour make himself *souverain*'.¹¹¹ On the death of Archinto, Albani offered Winckelmann the post of librarian and advisor, as well as the opportunity to live in the Villa Albani. As Wangenheim aptly notes, 'Winckelmann did not think for very long' before accepting.¹¹² Winckelmann was awarded high levels of responsibility. He visually verified Albani's conclusions on pieces of art that Albani, near blind, arrived at through touch and even advised Albani on his collections.¹¹³ The close relationship between Winckelmann and Albani is well documented in the German scholar's letters; he was advisor to the Cardinal but, importantly, was also his companion.¹¹⁴ Winckelmann's association with Albani alone advanced his reputation,¹¹⁵ yet his patron further provided him with increased opportunities to meet the scholars and nobility of Rome. Indeed, not only did Winckelmann find 'an entry to many houses that would [otherwise] have remained closed to him',¹¹⁶ but he was able to accompany Albani to an Academy twice every week.¹¹⁷ With time, Winckelmann was thus awarded membership to a number of renowned Academies, including the Accademia di San Luca and the Accademia di Cortona. This is a clear example of the opportunities that – whilst

¹¹⁰ Irwin, p. 5, and Leppmann, pp. 190, 203-05.

¹¹¹ Wangenheim, pp. 165-66, 189, and Winckelmann, *Briefe*, ed. by Walter Rehm, 4 vols (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1952-57), II (1954), 341: 'allenthalben verehrt ja fast angebetet [...], und er allein wäre im Stande, den ganzen Kirchen-Staat umzuwerfen und sich in einer Stunde *souverain* zu machen'.

¹¹² Wangenheim, p. 168; 'Winckelmann bedachte sich nicht lange'.

¹¹³ Wangenheim, pp. 188-89, and Schulz, pp. 82-83.

¹¹⁴ Wangenheim, p. 191.

¹¹⁵ Schulz, p. 78.

¹¹⁶ Leppmann, p. 211.

¹¹⁷ Schulz, pp. 79-80.

available to Winckelmann in recognition of his scholarship – were certainly rendered achievable by his association with the upper echelons of the Church.¹¹⁸

It was crucially through the patronage and recommendations of Cardinals that Winckelmann was able to secure his two jobs in the Vatican, demonstrating yet further the prominence afforded him through his association with these dignitaries.¹¹⁹ As regards his first, especially significant role of Commissario delle Antichità della Camera Apostolica, Sichtermann notes that it could only have been through the recommendations of Albani and Cardinal Giuseppe Spinelli, another of Winckelmann's acquaintances and friend of Passionei,¹²⁰ that Winckelmann was able to secure this prestigious post.¹²¹ After all, in this role, Winckelmann became 'uno dei personaggi più in vista della vita pubblica romana'.¹²² He enjoyed considerable authority, as all exports of antiquities required his approval and all archaeological finds had to be reported to him.¹²³ The position further necessitated his acting as a tour guide, or 'cicerone', to high-ranking foreign visitors, which made him a famous figure, even object of attention amongst Grand Tour tourists.¹²⁴ Turning to his second appointment as Scriptor Linguae Teutonicae, it was again Albani who arranged this for him as an additional source of income.¹²⁵ This involved such tasks as cataloguing German manuscripts and translating the more important pieces for the use of the Holy See.¹²⁶ Reflecting his interests, Winckelmann was later able to take on this same role for the Vatican's Greek manuscripts, as Scriptor Linguae Graecae.¹²⁷ As scribe, however, Winckelmann was also responsible for processing

¹¹⁸ Irwin, p. 9; Gerrit-Bruer, p. 94; and Leppmann, p. 196.

¹¹⁹ Leppmann, pp. 220-23, and Carter, p. 8.

¹²⁰ Leppmann, p. 223.

¹²¹ Sichtermann, p. 146.

¹²² Zampa, p. xxxix.

¹²³ Carter, pp. 7-8.

¹²⁴ Leppmann, p. 221, and Wangenheim, p. 205.

¹²⁵ Gerrit-Bruer, p. 90.

¹²⁶ Justi, III, 28.

¹²⁷ There is a debate in scholarship as to whether Winckelmann accepted this job or not. Some sources, including Wangenheim, p. 267, and Potts, *Flesh and the Ideal*, p. 194, suggest that he was offered it but did not accept it. Other sources, including Winckelmann's own preface in his *Anmerkungen über die Geschichte*

applications to consult the library resources: work which had to be completed in the library in set working hours,¹²⁸ the rigidity of which eventually led Winckelmann to leave this position to publish the *Monumenti*.¹²⁹

As intimated through the above reference to the influence of Cardinal Spinelli, Winckelmann's circle of dignitaries was not limited to his 'Cardinal-council'. In fact, whilst Archinto, Passionei, and Albani were the central and most influential figures in Winckelmann's Roman life, this triad's support of Winckelmann can be regarded as an example of the encouragement and opportunities that Winckelmann enjoyed through other figures as well. Indeed, as is clear from recommendations made about Winckelmann, which passed from Archinto to Passionei and Stosch to Albani, Winckelmann's contacts quickly multiplied, with the result that he had the backing of many influential figures in Rome. To give one last example, Cardinal Stoppani is described by Justi as the last in Winckelmann's line of patrons. Despite it never transpiring, he was willing to fund an entire research trip to Elis for the German scholar.¹³⁰

Furthermore, Winckelmann's relationships with the higher echelons of the Church were not limited to Cardinals, but even extended to the most powerful figure in Rome: the Pope. Revealing Winckelmann's indisputable prominence in Roman society, he had a number of encounters with the Popes in office during his time in Rome. The first experience was an audience with Pope Benedict XIV arranged by Bianconi,¹³¹ in which Winckelmann asked for permission to examine the Greek manuscripts in the Vatican library. He reports:

I wanted to study some Greek manuscripts in the Vatican and so asked the Papal physician, [via Bianconi], who presented me to the Pope, to whom I disclosed my

der Kunst des Altertums (Dresden: Walther, 1767), p. iv; Carter, p. 8; Gerrit-Bruer, p. 90; and Justi, III, 29, assert that he did undertake the position of Scriptor Linguae Graecae.

¹²⁸ Leppmann, p. 223.

¹²⁹ Wangenheim, p. 271.

¹³⁰ Justi, III, 277-78.

¹³¹ Justi, II, 144.

request. His Holiness promised to serve me in all things, but I do not expect my request to be met; the Pope cannot arrange such a thing himself.¹³²

Winckelmann's claims to have received this Papal pledge of support cannot be confirmed. Yet, as Leppmann suggests, the audience alone afforded Winckelmann a certain authority, as the Cardinals thereafter trod carefully, unsure of what had been said.¹³³ The second, and last, Pope in office when Winckelmann was in Rome was Pope Clement XIII, whose behaviour towards Winckelmann confirms yet further the German scholar's influential standing. Indeed, Clement XIII actively supported Winckelmann and his career, informing him in person of his employment as *Scriptor Linguae Graecae*: a clear indication, in light of his above-discussed request to Benedict XIV, of Winckelmann's increased acceptance in the Vatican.¹³⁴ Pope Clement XIII also encouraged the publication of Winckelmann's *Italian* scholarship. Indeed, he even had Winckelmann recite part of his *Monumenti*, in the company of other dignitaries, at his summer residence in Castel Gandolfo. Revealing the level of intimacy that he had reached with the hierarchy of the Church, Winckelmann reports this episode in a letter to Francke:¹³⁵

I had the exceptional honour of reading a passage from my work to His Holiness in Castel Gandolfo, [...]. I sat between the Pope and the two Cardinals; it was a distinguished gathering at which to be present.¹³⁶

Finally, Clement XIII also demonstrated how much he valued Winckelmann and his presence in Roman society through his attempts to counter any employment offers Winckelmann received

¹³² Schulz, p. 59: 'Ich hatte eine Absicht auf einige Griechische Anekdoten in dem Vatican gemacht, und mich deshalb an den Päpstlichen Leibmedicus Laurenti [via Bianconi] gemacht, der mich dem Papst präsentierte, dem ich mein Verlangen eröffnete. Se. Heiligkeit versprachen mir in allem zu dienen, aber es ist nichts zu erhalten; der Papst kann selbst nicht darüber disponieren'.

¹³³ Leppmann, pp. 147-48.

¹³⁴ Gerrit-Bruer, p. 90.

¹³⁵ Gerrit-Bruer, p. 94. Winckelmann worked under Johann Michael Francke in Bünaus library and maintained correspondence with him throughout his time in Rome, see Harloe, p. 134.

¹³⁶ To Francke, 26/11/1763, sourced from Gerrit-Bruer, p. 94: 'Ich habe die ausnehmende Ehre gehabt, Sr. Heiligkeit ein Stück aus meinem Werke vorzulesen, zu Castel-Gandolfo [...]. Ich sass zwischen dem Papst und zweien Cardinälen, und es war eine ansehnliche Versammlung zugegen'.

from Berlin. Both the Pope and Cardinal Stoppani made Winckelmann 'significant offers' and granted him 'a sizeable annuity', respectively, simply to stay in their city.¹³⁷

Thus, Winckelmann's relationships with the Cardinals, and even the Pope, not only exemplify how he was accepted and fought over by the dignitaries of the Church but, moreover, how these relationships afforded him yet further inclusion in Roman society. There can be no doubt regarding Winckelmann's visibility in Rome; Italian scholarship had no choice but to engage with this eminent German antiquarian.

Turning now to the second facet of Winckelmann's presence in Italy, his high-profile provocation of Italian scholars made responding to him all the more unavoidable. As he divulges to Stosch in a letter dated September 1757, on moving to Rome Winckelmann was not impressed by the scarceness or the quality of the antiquarian scholarship: 'Not one, even of the most intelligent in Rome, could identify the true essence of art'.¹³⁸ He harshly criticized several key scholars, including Ottavo Bajardi, Ridolfino Venuti, Giovanni Bottari, Angelo Maria Bandini, Antonio Ambrogio, and Francesco Maria Pratilli. Much of this censure was naturally limited to private correspondence, yet this is not to say that Winckelmann did not publicly condemn scholars that he disagreed with or scorned.¹³⁹ In fact, in light of Winckelmann's public, or at least well-known disagreements with Italian scholars, Sichtermann expresses disbelief at the career that the German scholar managed to secure: 'The most surprising thing is that Winckelmann [...] despite all his polemics with Italian colleagues and all the negative comments he made about them, was not only tolerated in Rome, but was even able to forge a truly eminent career'.¹⁴⁰ An example of a heated public dispute that Winckelmann instigated is

¹³⁷ Sichtermann, p. 133: 'beträchtliche Anerbietungen' and 'eine ansehnliche Pension'.

¹³⁸ Justi, II, 127; 'Von den allerklügsten in Rom hat dennoch kein einziger in das wahre innere Wesen der Kunst hineingeschaut'.

¹³⁹ Sichtermann, pp. 136-37, 141.

¹⁴⁰ Sichtermann, p. 146: 'Das erstaunliche ist nun, daß Winckelmann [...] bei all seiner Polemik mit den italienischen Kollegen und allen negativen Urteilen über sie doch in Rom nicht nur geduldet wurde, sondern sogar eine recht ansehnliche Karriere hat machen können'.

that with Augusto Domenico Bracci. Both in his letters and more publicly in his *Description des pierres gravées*, Winckelmann disparaged Bracci's knowledge and abilities as a scholar, considering him one of numerous 'antiquarucoli' in Rome.¹⁴¹ With this, a public dispute began. Bracci in turn responded to Winckelmann's public denunciation in his *Dissertazione sopra un clipeo votivo spettante alla famiglia Ardaburia* (1771), continuing also to condemn Winckelmann in his *Memorie degli antichi incisori che scolpirono i loro nomi in gemme cammei* (1786).¹⁴² To list but a few accusations he raised at Winckelmann, Bracci criticized the German scholar's approach to art writing, 'fece pompa d'una vana e fallace erudizione, ammassando notizie fuori di luogo'; his lack of artistic ability, the 'scienza del disegno, senza la quale nessuno può pervenire a decidere giustamente de' monumenti dell'Antichità';¹⁴³ and above all, the 'molti errori' that he made in his *Geschichte*.¹⁴⁴ I will discuss further examples of similar polemics in Chapter IV, yet the Bracci dispute constitutes a paradigmatic example of how Winckelmann's open censure of Italian scholarship did indeed provoke response.

Moreover, whilst not deliberately provocative, it is of note that in occupying the aforementioned roles in the Vatican, Winckelmann robbed Italians of these opportunities: again rendering him inescapably present. Indeed, whilst the German scholar enjoyed great standing and prospects through his employment, these were positions that native Italian scholars would have held if it were not for him. Following Ridolfino Venuti in his role as Commissario delle Antichità,¹⁴⁵ and succeeded by Giovanni Battista Visconti,¹⁴⁶ Winckelmann

¹⁴¹ Ferrari, "'Egli eccellente storico, egli ottimo critico, ...": Carlantonio Pilati interprete dell'opera di Winckelmann', in *Il settecento tedesco in Italia: Gli italiani e l'immagine della cultura tedesca nel XVIII secolo*, ed. by Giulia Cantarutti and others (Bologna: Mulino, 2001), pp. 417-65 (p. 455).

¹⁴² Ferrari, 'Christian G. Heyne', p. 91.

¹⁴³ Domenico Augusto Bracci, *Dissertazione sopra un clipeo votivo spettante alla famiglia Ardaburia* (Lucca: Venturini, 1771), p. 7; sourced via Ferrari, 'Egli eccellente storico', p. 457.

¹⁴⁴ Bracci, *Memorie degli antichi incisori che scolpirono i loro nomi in gemme e cammei con molti monumenti inediti di antichità, statue, bassirilievi, gemme*, 2 vols (Florence: Gaetano Cambiagi, 1784-86), II (1786), ix, italics added; sourced via Ferrari, 'Christian G. Heyne', pp. 91, 100.

¹⁴⁵ Gerrit-Bruer, p. 89.

¹⁴⁶ Stephen Dyson, *In Pursuit of Ancient Pasts: A History of Classical Archaeology in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006), p. 14.

was the only foreigner to ever fill the role: a position to which many of his Italian contemporaries aspired.¹⁴⁷ Thus, through both his censure of Italian scholars and his privileged career in the Vatican, Winckelmann was all the more present in Italian society.

Moving to the third facet of Winckelmann's presence, engendered by his works, the availability of his writings to Italian readers further increased his visibility, in this case both during and after his lifetime. As explained above, the works most pertinent to this thesis are Winckelmann's *Gedanken*, *Geschichte*, *Monumenti*, and his two architectural tracts: *Anmerkungen über die Baukunst der alten Tempel* and *Anmerkungen über die Baukunst*: all of which quickly became available, prompting a response from Italian scholars.

It is often declared in scholarship that Winckelmann's writings were unnoticed or even unknown in Italy when he was alive, with Zampa suggesting, for example, that 'Sino, quasi, alla fine del soggiorno in Italia, le opere di Winckelmann, scritte in tedesco e pubblicate in Germania, furono ignorate dagli italiani'.¹⁴⁸ Both Ferrari and Sichtermann support this, also citing Winckelmann's use of German, which was 'little known [...] in Italy, as it was in the Republic of Letters in general',¹⁴⁹ as a cause: 'Winckelmann and his theories couldn't make an impact on Italian antiquarian studies or the Italian visual arts for linguistic reasons'.¹⁵⁰ However, whilst his reception was certainly far more dynamic after the Italian translations were produced, I contend that it is misleading to argue that Winckelmann's views and works were 'ignore' in Italy before then. There are two primary reasons for this.

First, this does not take into account the *Monumenti*, which, albeit towards the end of Winckelmann's life, was nevertheless written in Italian and published in Italy, providing readers

¹⁴⁷ Heinrich Alexander Stoll, *Winckelmann: seine Verleger und seine Drucker* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1960), p. 30. As I discuss in Chapter IV, this included Giovanni Battista Piranesi.

¹⁴⁸ Zampa, pp. xxxvi-xxxvii.

¹⁴⁹ Ferrari, 'Le transfert italien de Johann J. Winckelmann pendant la seconde moitié du XVIIIe siècle', *Recherches germaniques*, 33 (2003), 1-19 (p. 2). MT: 'peu connue [...] en Italie, comme d'ailleurs dans la République des Lettres en général'. See also Ferrari, 'Jagemann e il doppio transfert', pp. 244-45.

¹⁵⁰ Sichtermann, p. 142: 'Winckelmann [...] konnte mit seinen Theorien schon aus sprachlichen Gründen keinen Einfluß auf das italienische Antikenstudium und die italienische bildende Kunst gewinnen'.

with a synopsis of the *Geschichte*, together with original research on various bas-reliefs, coins, and other monuments in Rome. The popularity of this work in fact proved to be long-lasting, as evinced by a report in Roman journal, *Effemeridi letterarie di Roma*, that a second edition was published in 1821 due to the high demand: ‘perchè gli esemplari della prima edizione divennero di così difficile ritrovamento, da spendere molte ricerche per trovarne un qualcuno in commercio’ (EFF.VIII.253).¹⁵¹

Second, it overlooks the French translations of Winckelmann’s writings, which were not only very swiftly produced, but were also far more comprehensible to the Italian readership than the original German. As M. S. Anderson notes, ‘the eighteenth century [...] saw the pre-eminence of French as the language of European scholarship, culture and polite society’.¹⁵² Both the *Gedanken* and the *Geschichte* were available in French translation during Winckelmann’s lifetime. The *Gedanken* was translated and published immediately: appearing in the July-September 1755 and January-March 1756 issues of *Nouvelle bibliothèque germanique*, and in the January 1756 volume of the *Journal étranger*.¹⁵³ The *Geschichte*, too, was available in French in 1766, just two years after its appearance in German. Winckelmann was in fact so horrified by this version, that it inspired him not only to publish a separate essay outlining the errors he had made in the original,¹⁵⁴ but moreover to arrange himself another French translation (which, however, was never completed).¹⁵⁵ Thus, despite Winckelmann’s disapproval, his two most famous works were very quickly made available through the French language. This is not to suggest that these French translations were widely read or easily

¹⁵¹ Winckelmann, *Monumenti antichi inediti spiegati ed illustrati*, ed. by Pietro Paolo Montagnani-Mirabili, 2nd edn (Rome: Carlo Mordacchini, 1821).

¹⁵² M. S. Anderson, *Europe in the Eighteenth Century: 1713-1789*, 4th edn (Oxon: Routledge, 2014), p. 334.

¹⁵³ Décultot, ‘Généalogie d’un malentendu’, p. 26.

¹⁵⁴ This was his *Anmerkungen über die Geschichte der Kunst des Altertums*, discussed further in Chapter III.3.4.

¹⁵⁵ Stoll, pp. 94-96. On his death Winckelmann had already commissioned a translator, Francois-Vincent Toussaint, Professor of Logic and Rhetoric in Berlin, whom he had planned to visit in Paris on his fated final journey. Due not to Winckelmann’s but to Toussaint’s own death, this translation was never completed. For more detail see also Ferrari, *Il piacere di tradurre*.

acquired in Italy. After all, Ferrari reveals that, contrary to what one might expect, the French language did not ‘viene in soccorso dell’ampia diffusione del capolavoro winckelmanniano’, as ‘la prima criticatissima traduzione francese del 1766 dell’*Histoire de l’art chez les anciens* [...] sembra conoscere solo pochissimi lettori italiani’.¹⁵⁶ Yet this was nevertheless another medium to which some Italian scholars certainly had access. Indeed, as will become clear in Chapter IV, instances of unmistakable Winckelmannian thought appearing in Italian art literature before the publication of any of his works in Italian confirm that the French texts were consulted.¹⁵⁷ Moreover, whilst the reception of Winckelmann in Naples is not covered in this thesis, the uproar following the French translation of a scathing letter that he wrote on the excavations at Herculaneum provides even more evidence that the Italians read French editions of Winckelmann’s work. After all, Neapolitan scholars, Zarillo and Galiani responded to Winckelmann having read the French text.¹⁵⁸

It is further important that statements such as Zampa’s and Sichtermann’s do not give a false impression of the prominence of Winckelmann’s writings in Italy when not considered in context. That is, whilst it is true that Italian translations did not appear until after Winckelmann’s death, it must be remembered that Winckelmann’s career and ‘soggiorno in Italia’ were tragically cut short, not allowing time for translations of his work during his lifetime. Indeed, any doubts concerning the renown of Winckelmann’s works are negated when one considers the number of Italian translations that were published within fifteen years of Winckelmann’s death. Two translations of the *Geschichte*, which will be analysed in Chapter

¹⁵⁶ Ferrari, ‘Christian G. Heyne’, p. 78.

¹⁵⁷ See considerations of Piranesi in Chapter IV, especially IV.3.2. and IV.6.

¹⁵⁸ This was the *Sendschreiben von den Herculanischen Entdeckungen* (*Open Letter on the Herculanean Excavations*). In this letter Winckelmann not only flouted the Herculaneum Academy’s rules forbidding the publication of any discoveries seen during visits to the ancient sites and Royal Museum at Portici, but also harshly criticized the methods of excavation and the personnel involved in the recovery and display of the antiquities. Published in German in 1762, this was translated into French – under the auspices of Count de Caylus – by Michel Huber in 1764. The tracts written by Berardo Galiani and Mattia Zarillo in response were entitled *Considerazioni sopra la Lettera dell’abate Winckelmann riguardante le scoperte di Ercolano* and *Giudizio dell’opera dell’Abbate Winckelmann intorno alle scoperte di Ercolano*, respectively. (Please see Mattusch, pp. 18-25 for more information).

III, appeared in quick succession in 1779 and 1783-84.¹⁵⁹ Furthermore the second of these translations, published by Carlo Fea, included a third volume that not only contained translations of the two architectural tracts here considered (both of which had been translated into French the year before), but also a selection of Winckelmann's letters. After these key publications there was a hiatus in Italian translations, which, however, came to an end in 1830 when the same Carlo Fea published the first Italian complete works of Winckelmann: the *Opere di G. G. Winckelmann*. This large work of twelve volumes included, amongst much more, the first Italian translation of the *Gedanken*.

Finally, it is of note that – beyond translations of his writings – Italian readers both during and after Winckelmann's lifetime were also able to garner some idea of him, his works, and his views through references made to him in Italian art scholarship. As will be explored in greater detail in ensuing chapters, this is especially true of art literature and artistic periodicals.

Thus, although Winckelmann's works did enjoy a lower level of interest in the years before the first Italian translation of the *Geschichte* became available, this should in no way distract from the fact that both in the years pre- and post-1779 Winckelmann's works were present in Italian society. As time progressed, Italian scholars simply became increasingly less able to avoid engaging with the German scholar.

To conclude, the first aspect of the dilemma – Winckelmann's presence – is indisputable. Not only was he eminent and provocative in Rome, but his works also ensured his lasting presence in the peninsula: a triad of reasons that compelled Italian scholars to respond to him.

¹⁵⁹ There is not the scope to investigate the more general impact or commercial success of these translations in this thesis, yet it will become apparent in Chapter V that Fea's translation enjoyed a particularly enthusiastic response.

II.4.4. Winckelmann's contentious views

Turning to the second aspect of the dilemma – the difficulty surrounding Winckelmann's views – a crucial feature of the German scholar's system of art history is his denunciation of Italian, Roman, and Etruscan art and societies. Thus not only were Italians compelled to respond to the German scholar between 1755 and 1834, but in doing so they had to confront these contentious opinions.

To begin this examination with the *Gedanken*, on the first page of this essay Winckelmann extols the art of ancient Greece, emphasizing its unique taste: 'The taste with which this nation imbued its works has remained unique to it. It has rarely spread far from Greece without losing something' (GED.7/31).¹⁶⁰ This famous phrase introduces Winckelmann's Hellenism, yet it is soon followed by a less well-known slur against the art of the Romans. Through Homer and Virgil, Winckelmann compares Greek and Roman production, denouncing the latter by branding it a mere imitation of the former:

A statue by an ancient Roman hand will always stand in the same relationship to a Greek original in the way that Virgil's Dido with her retinue, compared with Diana among the Oreiades, relates to Homer's Nausicaa, which the former attempted to imitate.¹⁶¹ (GED.9/32)

Moreover, in light of Winckelmann's views concerning the significance that external circumstances have on art's production, this critical comparison further extends to Greek and Roman society. In fact, as Holzer contends, some of Winckelmann's most severe assessments of the ancient Romans have at their foundation the contrasting temperaments of the Greek and Roman nations: the 'joviality' of the Greeks and the 'savagery' of the Romans.¹⁶² Indeed, again in the *Gedanken*, Winckelmann compares the civilized performances enjoyed in ancient

¹⁶⁰ 'Der Geschmack, den diese Nation ihren Werken gegeben hat, ist ihr eigen geblieben; er hat sich selten weit von Griechenland entfernt, ohne etwas zu verlieren'.

¹⁶¹ 'Eine Bildsäule von einer alten Römischen Hand wird sich gegen ein Griechisches Urbild allemal verhalten, wie Virgils Dido in ihrem Gefolge mit der Diana unter ihren Oreaden verglichen, sich gegen Homers Nausicaa verhält, welche jener nachzuahmen gesucht hat'.

¹⁶² Angela Cornelia Holzer, *Rehabilitationen Roms: Die römische Antike in der deutschen Kultur zwischen Winckelmann und Niebuhr* (Heidelberg: Winter, 2013), pp. 57-58: 'Heiterkeit'; 'Grausamkeit'.

Greece to the 'bloody' shows popular in Rome, implying that the depraved, immoral spectacles were of Italian rather than Greek heritage:

The Greeks, in their humanity, and because of their flourishing concept of freedom, had not wanted to introduce any bloody spectacles [...] Antiochus Epiphanes, the King of Syria, ordered swordsmen from Rome, and had the Greeks watch spectacles with these unfortunate men, which were abhorrent to them at first.¹⁶³ (GED.14/35)

Such statements thus give the reader a taste of Winckelmann's hostile attitudes to ancient Rome, yet it is not until his *Geschichte* that he expands upon these views. The fundamental claim advocated in the *Gedanken* remains central to his philosophy: the Romans, inferior in art and civilization, imitated the Greeks. Yet Winckelmann further explores in the *Geschichte* how, through such imitation, the Romans were in fact responsible for art's decline. However perfect the Greek models being copied were, imitation, Winckelmann argues, is workmanship and not creation:

As art finally drew near its fall, [...] it is not so extraordinary as it must appear to many, to see not only tolerable, but in a measure beautiful, heads of Macrinus, Septimius Severus, and Caracalla, as the Farnese head is, for the merit of them consists solely in their elaborateness. Lysippus could not probably have made a much better head of Caracalla; but the artist of it could not make a figure like Lysippus; and herein lay the difference.¹⁶⁴ (GES.I.497/II.148)

Indeed it is due to the constant imitation performed by the Romans, not just of Greek but also of Etruscan art, that Winckelmann makes the glaringly anti-Roman claim that the Romans had no style of art of their own. He argues that it was only through the desire of the Romans to find Roman history in art and the contrasting wish of the Graecophiles to distance Greek artists from flawed art that the erroneous concept of a distinctly Roman style arose:

¹⁶³ 'Die Menschlichkeit der Griechen hatte in ihrer blühenden Freiheit keine blutigen Schauspiele einführen wollen [...] Antiochus Epiphanes, König in Syrien, verschrieb Fechter von Rom, und ließ den Griechen Schauspiele dieser unglücklichen Menschen sehen, die ihnen anfänglich ein Abscheu waren'.

¹⁶⁴ 'Da sich endlich die Kunst immer mehr zu ihrem Fall neigte [...] muß es nicht so außerordentlich, wie es vielen vorkommt, scheinen, erträgliche, ja zum Teil schöne Köpfe des Macrinus, des Septimius Severus, und des Caracalla, wie der farnesische ist, zu sehen: denn der Wert derselben besteht allein im Fleiße. Vielleicht hätte Lysippus den Kopf des Caracalla nicht viel besser machen können; aber der Meister desselben konnte keine Figur, wie Lysippus, machen; dieses war der Unterschied'.

The preconceived opinion that the Roman artists had a style of their own, and different from that of the Greeks, has arisen from two causes. One of them is the incorrect explanation of the figures represented; expositors desire to find Roman history [and consequently a Roman artist] in scenes that are drawn from Grecian fable. [...] The second cause lies in an unseasonable reverence towards the works of Greek artists. As many works of only moderate excellence are found to exist, an unwillingness is felt to attribute them to the Greeks, and it seems more just to attribute to the Romans rather than to the Greeks the want of merit in such works. Hence everything which appears bad is comprehended under the name of Roman workmanship, yet without assigning the slightest characteristic of it. [...] I believe myself therefore to be justified in assuming, as a consequence of such groundless opinions, that the idea of a Roman style in art, so far at least as our present knowledge goes, is a mere conceit.¹⁶⁵ (GES.I.603-05/II.162-63)

This bitterly anti-Roman sentiment again extends to society, too, as Winckelmann illuminates how the circumstances in Rome were simply not sufficient to uphold artistic merit. It was, according to the German scholar, outside of the Roman leaders' power to revive art to the perfection it achieved under the Greeks. Thus he argues that the Romans and their society drove art to its fall, a clearly anti-Roman suggestion. Focusing for example on the period under the Antonines, Winckelmann uses medical imagery to compare Roman art to a dying patient, plainly illustrating the critical state that Roman art was in:

The reign of the Antonines is in art like the apparent improvement shortly before death of persons dangerously ill, when life is reduced to a thin thread of breath; it resembles the flame of a lamp which, before it is entirely extinguished, gathers the remaining oil together, flares up into one bright blaze, and then instantly disappears. There were artists still living who had been educated during the time of Hadrian, and [...] [they had] opportunities for the display of their skill; but after this period art sunk at once.¹⁶⁶ (GES.II.847/II.340-41)

¹⁶⁵ 'Das Vorurteil von einem den römischen Künstlern eigenen und von dem griechischen verschiedenen Stil, ist aus zwei Ursachen entstanden. Die eine ist die unrichtige Erklärung der vorgestellten Bilder, da man in den Bildern der Alten von allerlei Art, die alle aus der griechischen Fabel genommen sind, [...] römische Geschichte, und folglich einen römischen Künstler finden wollen. [...] Die zweite Ursache liegt in einer unzeitigen Ehrfurcht gegen die Werke griechischer Künstler: denn da sich viele mittelmäßige Werke finden, entsieht man sich, dieselben jenen beizulegen, und es scheint billiger, den Römern, als den Griechen, einen Tadel anzuhängen. Man begreift daher alles, was schlecht scheint, unter dem Namen römischer Arbeiten, aber ohne das geringste Kennzeichen davon anzugeben. [...] Vermöge solcher ungegründeten Meinungen glaube ich berechtigt zu sein, den Begriff eines römischen Stils in der Kunst, so weit unsere jetzigen Kenntnisse gehen, für eine Einbildung zu halten'.

¹⁶⁶ 'Die Zeit der Antoniner ist in der Kunst, wie die scheinbare Besserung gefährlicher Kranken kurz vor ihrem Ende, in welchen das Leben bis auf einen dünnen Faden des Hauchs gebracht, dem Lichte einer Lampe ähnlich, welches, ehe es gänzlich verlöscht, alle Nahrung sammelt, in eine helle Flamme auffährt, und plötzlich verlöscht. Es lebten noch die Künstler, welche sich unter dem Hadrian gebildet hatten, und [...] [sie hatten] Gelegenheit, sich zu zeigen; aber nach ihrer Zeit fiel die Kunst mit einmal'.

Though Roman art is the more traditional rival to Greek production, Winckelmann's Italophobic views also extended beyond this to include Etruscan art. Again using Greek production as a comparison, Winckelmann not only confirms the inferiority of Etruscan artwork, but further condemns the melancholic, uncivilized society he considers responsible:

But as this point [the perfection achieved by the Greeks] was not reached, and as an excessive degree of hardness continued to characterize the drawing of their artists, [...] the cause of the failure apparently lay in the character and temperament of the Etruscans. [...] The disposition of the Etruscans appears to have been more tinged with melancholy than was the case with the Greek race, as we may infer from their religious services and their customs. Such a temperament [...] gives rise to emotions of too violent a nature, and the senses are not affected with that gentle agitation which renders the soul perfectly susceptible to beauty. This conjecture is grounded, in the first place, on the practice of soothsaying, which was invented, in the West, by this people. [...] Furthermore, we might infer a temperament of this kind from the sanguinary fights at their burials and on their arenas, which were first practised among them, and afterwards introduced also by the Romans. These combats were an abhorrence to the refined Greeks.¹⁶⁷ (GES.I.144-45/I.226-27)

The weaknesses of Etruscan art according to Winckelmann include exaggeration; an emphasis on straight lines and stiff poses (which he identifies especially in its early period); and mannerism, which he maintains was constant throughout its finest period (GES.I.176-84/I.248-54). He condemns the mannered style in particular, claiming that it led to an absence of character in many Etruscan figures:

This second style is, also, to be termed mannered, as we now say — an expression which means nothing else than a constant uniformity of character in all sorts of figures; for Apollo, Mars, Hercules, and Vulcan, on Etruscan works, do not differ in drawing. Now, as a character always one and the same is no character, we might apply to the

¹⁶⁷ 'Da aber dieses [perfection achieved by the Greeks] nicht geschehen ist, und da in der Zeichnung ihrer Künstler eine übertriebene Härte geblieben [...] so scheint die Ursache davon in der Eigenschaft und in der Gemütsart der Hetrurier zu liegen [...]. Die Gemütsart der Hetrurier scheint mehr, als das griechische Geblüt, mit Melancholie vermischt gewesen zu sein, wie wir aus ihrem Gottesdienst, und aus ihren Gebräuchen schließen können. Ein solches Temperament [...] wirkt zu heftige Empfindungen, und die Sinne werden nicht mit derjenigen sanften Regung gerührt, welche den Geist gegen das Schöne vollkommen empfindlich macht. Diese Mutmaßung gründet sich zum ersten auf die Wahrsagerei, welche in den Abendländern unter diesem Volke zuerst erdacht wurde [...]. Auf diese Gemütsart könnte man ferner schließen aus den blutigen Gefechten bei Begräbnissen und auf Schauplätzen, welche bei ihnen zuerst üblich waren, und nachher auch von den Römern eingeführt wurden; diese waren den gesitteten Griechen ein Abscheu'.

Etruscan artists the censure which Aristotle made of Zeuxis, namely, that they had no character.¹⁶⁸ (GES.I.184/I.254)

Nor did Winckelmann believe mannerism was restricted to the Etruscan era. In fact he argued it prevailed for centuries in the art originating from this region, leading to Italophobic remarks on Italy's most-praised Michelangelo:

These characteristics of the ancient Etruscan artists still show forth, in modern days, in the works of their descendants, and to the eyes of impartial connoisseurs manifest themselves in the drawings of Michael Angelo, the greatest among them. Hence someone says, not without reason, that whoever has seen one figure by this artist, has seen them all.¹⁶⁹ (GES.I.184-85/I.254)

Moreover beyond mannerism, Winckelmann also continues to criticize Michelangelo, together with Bernini, for their misguided artistic decisions that limited the beauty of their art:

The former [Michelangelo] busied himself in the contemplation of lofty beauty; this is evident from his poems [...], in them his thoughts relative to it are expressed in elevated language, worthy of the subject. [Thus] in powerful figures he is wonderful; but, [...] his female and youthful figures are, in shape, action, and gesture, creatures of another world. [...] The very course which led Michael Angelo to impassable places and steep cliffs plunged Bernini, on the contrary, into bogs and pools; for he sought to dignify, as it were, by exaggeration, forms of the most ordinary kind. His figures are those of vulgar people who have suddenly met with good fortune, and their expression is oftentimes opposed to the action, as when Hannibal laughed in the extremity of his grief.¹⁷⁰ (GES.I.253/I.305-06)

It is thus clear that, whilst Winckelmann's principal intention is to promote Hellenism – a subject of increasing European attention in this period, especially amongst his French

¹⁶⁸ 'Dieser zweite Stil ist auch, wie man itzo redet, maniert zu nennen, welches nichts anders ist, als ein beständiger Charakter in allerlei Figuren: denn Apollo, Mars, Hercules und Vulkanus sind auf ihren Werken in der Zeichnung nicht verschieden. Da nun einerlei Charakter kein Charakter ist, so könnte man auf hetrurische Künstler das, was Aristoteles am Zeuxis tadelt, deuten, nämlich, daß sie keinen Charakter gehabt haben'.

¹⁶⁹ 'Diese Eigenschaften der alten hetrurischen Künstler blicken noch itzo hervor in den Werken ihrer Nachkommen, und entdecken sich unparteiischen Augen der Kenner in der Zeichnung des Michael Angelo, des größten unter ihnen: daher sagt jemand nicht ohne Grund, daß wer eine Figur dieses Künstlers gesehen habe, habe sie alle gesehen'.

¹⁷⁰ 'Jener hat sich mit Betrachtung der hohen Schönheit beschäftigt, wie man aus seinen [...] Gedichten sieht, wo er in würdigen und erhabenen Ausdrücken über dieselbe denkt, und er ist wunderbar in starken Liebern; aber [...] [hat] aus seinen weiblichen und jugendlichen Figuren Schöpfe einer anderen Welt [...] gemacht. [...] Bernini ergriff eben den Weg, welcher jenen wie in unwegsame Orte und zu steilen Klippen brachte, und diesen hingegen in Sümpfe und Lachen verführte: denn er suchte Formen, aus der niedrigsten Natur genommen, gleichsam durch das Übertriebene zu veredeln, und seine Figuren sind wie der zu plötzlichem Glücke gelangte Pöbel; sein Ausdruck ist oft der Handlung widersprechend, so wie Hannibal im äußersten Kummer lachte'.

contemporaries¹⁷¹ – in so doing he also pronounces extremely damning views on Italy's artistic and cultural heritage. He condemns not only the art and societies of ancient Rome and Etruria, but Renaissance and Baroque production, too.

II.4.5. The dilemma restated

This overview of Winckelmann's presence in Italy on the one hand, and his contentious views on the other hand, clearly demonstrates the dilemma faced by Italian scholars. Even if contemporary Italians had wanted to ignore his Italophobic ideas, his visibility – born of his eminence, his provocative censure of native scholars, and the availability of his works – prevented them from doing so. He was simply too significant in Italian society to overlook.

This thus forms the starting point to my investigation. As clarified in the previous chapter, it is in light of this dilemma that I seek to uncover both how Italian scholarship responded to Winckelmann, his works, and his views between 1755 and 1834, and why it responded in such a way.

In order to answer this, I will now examine Winckelmann's reception in three areas of Italian art scholarship – translation, art literature, and artistic periodicals. Whilst, as previously discussed, this will include one prominent example of Winckelmann's early reception in art literature during his lifetime, the majority of responses identified began in the latter half of the eighteenth century, when his works became available in Italian. For this reason, I will begin my investigation by examining the Italian translations of Winckelmann's famed *Geschichte*.

¹⁷¹ Key examples include Anne-Claude de Caylus and Julien-David Le Roy.

CHAPTER III:
WINCKELMANN IN TRANSLATION

È ben dicevole adunque, che quelle opere le quali gli [Winckelmann] fecero tanto onore fra noi, siano fra noi per quanto si può propagate e conosciute.

Carlo Fea (OP.I.6)

III.1. INTRODUCTION

In light of the dilemma considered in detail in the preceding chapter, I will now explore three Italian translations of Winckelmann's magnum opus, the *Geschichte*, which, spanning 1779-1834, cover the majority of the period examined in this thesis. Supplemented by art literature and artistic periodicals, to be considered in the following chapters, these translations provided the principal means through which Italy's reading public were to gain knowledge of Winckelmann's views.

As already discussed, the *Geschichte* was translated quickly in Italy: first in 1779 by Carlo Amoretti, and second in 1783-84 by Carlo Fea, both with the title *Storia delle arti del disegno presso gli antichi*. A further third edition of the *Storia dell'arte presso gli antichi* then appeared over forty-five years later in the *Opere di G. G. Winckelmann* (1830-34), edited by Fea.¹ Notably, none of these translations were based on Winckelmann's original text, published in 1764, but rather on an extended version published posthumously in 1776 by Friedrich Justus Riedel in Vienna, with the inclusion of new details and observations found amongst Winckelmann's notes and letters.²

It is these three texts which form the principal focus of this chapter and it is the primary sources themselves on which I will concentrate. There are two reasons for this. First, and most importantly, the objective to analyse these Italian translations of the *Geschichte* necessitates, of course, a close reading of the primary texts: both of the three above-noted *Storie* and of Riedel's 1776 German edition. Thus, whilst the works of Harloe, Renzo De Felice, Ronald T. Ridley, and Pascal Griener, amongst others, have been central in building the

¹ Throughout this chapter I refer to the *Storia*, the *Opere* and (collectively) the *Storie*, with context making clear the translation(s) to which I am referring.

² As clarified in Chapter I, n. 75, I cite from the 1776 edition throughout this thesis.

background information to the translators and their texts, close reading is the main method employed in this chapter. Second, whilst the scholars above provide crucial contextual information, the texts themselves are remarkably understudied; thus, through a thorough examination of the translators' work, this chapter fills a lacuna in existing scholarship.

On consideration of these texts, it is evident that the translators do not treat Winckelmann, his work, and his views merely as neutral subjects to introduce to Italian scholarship, but rather that they foreignize and domesticate the German scholar. The main focus of this chapter will thus be on *how* the translators react to Winckelmann, after which I will argue that this multi-faceted response was motivated by nationalism. Indeed, I will suggest that in light of Winckelmann's Italophobic views and Italy's political situation at the time, Italy's growing nationalistic sentiment even influenced the translations of this seminal history of art.

III.2. EXISTING SCHOLARSHIP

Despite the central role of these translations in understanding Winckelmann's reception in Italy, there is, as I have just noted, a remarkable scarcity of scholarship written about them. Indeed, there are only two other scholars who have studied the *Storie* in detail: Daniela Fioravanti and the previously mentioned Stefano Ferrari. Fioravanti has recently completed her doctoral studies at the Università di Roma Tor Vergata, whose thesis explores Amoretti's and Fea's translations.³ Her research is as yet unpublished but her focus is predominantly linguistic, with limited attention to the historical and political significance of Winckelmann's text.⁴ Ferrari, on the other hand, has published widely on the translations. Indeed, with the scholars listed above, his various articles and books examining Amoretti's and Fea's work are an essential source of contextual information on these Italian texts. Amongst numerous other

³ 'Daniela Fioravanti', *Aracne editrice* <<http://www.aracneeditrice.it/aracneweb/index.php/autori.html?auth-id=297024>> [accessed 27 April 2017].

⁴ Fioravanti and I have communicated electronically to discuss our mutual research interests and respective doctoral projects.

subjects, he discusses: Amoretti and Fea as translators; the composition of their publications; the similarities in their aims; the relationship between Winckelmann and Fea's future assistant, Johann Friedrich Reiffenstein; as well as some broader analyses on the European reception of these translations. Yet despite Ferrari's extensive treatment of these texts, his approach is markedly different to that adopted in this thesis. He does not afford emphasis (with or without the terminology) on efforts to foreignize or domesticate Winckelmann and nor does he explore the role of nationalism in these translations: significant omissions which this chapter seeks to redress.

III.3. CONTEXT: TRANSLATORS AND TRANSLATIONS

III.3.1. Carlo Amoretti and Carlo Fea

Before examining the foreignization and domestication of Winckelmann present in the translations, it is important to contextualize the texts, beginning with the translators: their lives and their values.

Born in 1741 in Oneglia, the early life of Carlo Amoretti was devoted to religion. He became Professor of Canon Law in Pavia in 1769, yet turned to secularism later that year and moved to Milan. Here Amoretti developed interests in science, agriculture, and economics, publishing such works as the 27-volumed *Nuova Scelta di opuscoli interessanti sulle Scienze e sulle Arti*, 1778-1807. During this period he also published the first Italian translation of Winckelmann's *Geschichte*. Indeed, whilst predominantly concentrating on scientific subjects, Amoretti also wrote about art and even translated German texts: making him an ideal candidate for translator of Winckelmann's work. Yet, distancing himself from the scholarly sphere soon after this translation, Amoretti dedicated the rest of his life to other

commitments.⁵ When the French occupied Northern Italy, Amoretti lost his position as secretary of the agricultural society, 'Società patriottica', due to his initial reluctance to join the Republican cause. However, he thereafter came to support and even receive recognition from the regime: in 1797 he was appointed librarian of the Ambrosiana,⁶ and in 1803 he became one of the first members, authorized by Napoleon, of the 'Istituto nazionale incaricato di raccogliere le scoperte, e perfezionare le Arti e le Scienze'.⁷ Amoretti died in 1816.

Following this first translation, Pigna-born Carlo Fea (1753-1836), published a second translation of the *Geschichte* in 1783-84. Having first trained as a lawyer and then as a priest, it was this translation and his employment in the library of Ennio Quirino Visconti that roused Fea's interest in antiquity, a passion that was to dictate the rest of his life.⁸ On becoming, in 1801, President of the Museo Capitolino and Commissario delle Antichità (the same role Winckelmann had held), Fea became 'the leading champion of the protection of Rome's classical heritage'.⁹ He was the principal figure behind the Papal edict of 1802, which famously enforced such measures as the ban on illicit exportation of monuments, compulsory documentation of discoveries, and increased investment in museums. As regards his views on the French occupation, towards the end of Napoleon's first campaign Fea published counter-revolutionary tracts, such as *Parenesi agli Italiani*, denouncing atheism and the tyranny of France. He was thereafter exiled and imprisoned on numerous occasions, before, however, later collaborating with French officials on archaeological matters. Despite numerous polemics,

⁵ Ferrari, 'Da Vienna a Milano: genesi e reazioni alla prima traduzione della Storia delle Arti del Disegno di Winckelmann', in *Vie Lombarde e Venete: Circolazione e trasformazione dei saperi letterari nel Sette-Ottocento fra l'Italia settentrionale e l'Europa transalpina*, ed. by Helmut Meter and Furio Brugnolo (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2011), pp. 259-72 (pp. 271-72).

⁶ Renzo De Felice, 'Amoretti, Carlo', in *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani* (Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 1960-2017), III (1961), 9-10 (p. 9).

⁷ Claudia Rotondi, "'Rendere facili le verità utili': Dalla Società patriottica all'Istituto lombardo (1776-1859)", in *Associazionismo economico e diffusione dell'economia politica nell'Italia dell'Ottocento: Dalle società economico-agrarie alle associazioni di economisti*, ed. by Massimo M. Augello and Marco E. L. Guidi, 2 vols (Milan: FrancoAngeli, 2000), I, 39-62 (p. 43).

⁸ Unless otherwise stated, all references to Visconti are to Ennio Quirino Visconti.

⁹ Ridley, *Eagle and the Spade*, p. 32; Ridley, 'Fea, Carlo', in *Dizionario biografico*, XLV (1995), 518-28 (pp. 518-21).

Fea published widely on art and antiquity. His final work, for instance, was a defence of Rome's imperial supremacy: *Considerazioni sull'Impero romano da Romolo ad Augusto, e da questo per l'epoca cristiana fino all'anno 767*, 1835.¹⁰

III.3.2. Amoretti's translation

The translations themselves also have a history. Indeed, whilst Amoretti was the principal figure responsible for the 1779 Milanese translation, it should be noted that it was the Cistercian monks who published the work and authored the preface. Nevertheless, since the preface forms an integral part of the translation and even the monks assert that Amoretti 'non solamente ha tradotta l'Opera dal tedesco; ma ha pur avuta non poca parte ne' fattivi miglioramenti' (AM.I.xii), I will hereafter refer to 'Amoretti' as denoting the entire work (including the preface).

Amoretti was not without aid in producing the translation. To list the key scholars who assisted him, Carlo Giovanni Venini and Angelo Fumagalli aided Amoretti in his annotation and location of illustrative material.¹¹ Karl Firmian, Austrian Governor-General of Lombardy and friend of Winckelmann, procured the German scholar's documents left in the Villa Albani, whilst also placing his own library and collection of antique statues at Amoretti's disposal. Cardinal Albani provided illustrations, and even the Viennese court supplied him with scholarly material.¹² This court's assistance was largely due to their shame at Riedel's version of the *Geschichte*, from which Amoretti was working.¹³ Riedel's edition had been harshly criticized, both in print – in the *Journal zur Kunstgeschichte und zur allgemeinen Litteratur*, 1780, for

¹⁰ Ridley, *Dizionario biografico*, pp. 520-27.

¹¹ Ferrari, 'I traduttori italiani di Winckelmann', in *Traduzioni e traduttori del Neoclassicismo*, ed. by Giulia Cantarutti and others (Milan: FrancoAngeli, 2010), pp. 161-74 (p. 163).

¹² Ferrari, 'Le transfert italien', p. 6; Ferrari, 'Christian G. Heyne', pp. 79-80.

¹³ Ferrari, 'I traduttori italiani', pp. 164-66.

example – and by the majority of leading German scholars.¹⁴ Accused of lacking real improvements to the original, of misinterpretation leading to imprecision and, above all, of unnecessary omission,¹⁵ this edition was, as Griener affirms, ‘longer but by no means clearer’.¹⁶

As regards written sources, Amoretti’s preface reveals his use of both Riedel’s edition and Toussaint’s French translation, which remained unpublished and incomplete on Toussaint’s death in 1772. Yet Amoretti’s familiarity with a broader range of sources is also apparent, including: Winckelmann’s other writings; accounts provided by friends of the German scholar; as well as the anonymously authored *Flüchtige Erinnerungen gegen die neue wienerische Auflage von Winkelmanns*¹⁷ *Geschichte der Kunst im J. 1776*, which listed the errors present in Riedel’s edition.¹⁸

III.3.3. Fea’s translation

In compiling his slightly later edition, published 1783-84 by the Pagliarini brothers in Rome, Fea similarly enjoyed extensive support from the scholarly and artistic community. His preface only accounts for the assistance of patron of the arts, José Nicolás de Azara, and Johann Friedrich Reiffenstein, the latter of whom, as a native German speaker and friend of Winckelmann, was

¹⁴ This included Heyne, Lessing, Herder, and Goethe, amongst others. See Ferrari, ‘Joseph von Sperges e la ricezione austriaca di Winckelmann’, in *L’Accademia degli Agiati nel Settecento europeo: irradiazioni culturali*, ed. by Giulia Cantarutti and Stefano Ferrari (Milan: FrancoAngeli, 2007), pp. 219-40 (p. 237), and Pascal Griener, *L’esthétique de la traduction: Winckelmann, les langues et l’histoire de l’art, 1755-1784* (Geneva: Droz, 1998), pp. 38-39.

¹⁵ C. G. Von Murr, ‘Verzeichniß der Fehler der Wiener Ausgabe von Winckelmanns Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums’, *Journal zur Kunstgeschichte und zur allgemeinen Litteratur*, 8 (1780), 30-56.

¹⁶ Griener, p. 38. MT: ‘La version de Riedel est plus longue, mais elle n’en est pas plus claire’.

¹⁷ There is great variation in the spelling of ‘Winckelmann’ in the primary sources consulted in this thesis, all of which have been accurately replicated throughout. To avoid repetition, I have chosen not to employ [sic] in such occurrences.

¹⁸ Ferrari, ‘Carlo Amoretti e la Storia delle Arti del Disegno (1779) di Winckelmann’, in *Paesaggi europei del Neoclassicismo*, ed. by Giulia Cantarutti and Stefano Ferrari (Bologna: Mulino, 2007), pp. 191-212 (pp. 203-05). MT: *A Brief Reminder of the Limitations of the New Viennese Edition of Winckelmann’s Geschichte der Kunst, Published in the Year 1776*.

particularly significant to the quality and perceived reliability of this edition.¹⁹ In truth, however, the list of people that provided aid was far longer, including: Visconti, Luigi Lanzi, Gaetano Marini, Léon Dufourny, Jean-Baptiste Seroux d'Agincourt, and Anton von Maron.²⁰ Moreover, Fea also had a wide range of written sources at his disposal. Like Amoretti, he consulted Riedel's Viennese edition (FE.I.viii) and others of Winckelmann's writings, yet he further referred to French translations produced by Sellius (1766),²¹ and, more recently, Huber (1781),²² as well of course as Amoretti's own *Storia*.²³

The use of Riedel's text was not, according to Fea, his initial intention: he had instead hoped simply to reproduce the first Italian translation: 'non era mia [Fea's] intenzione se non di ripetere la traduzione, che ne era stata fatta in Milano' (FE.I.v). It was, he claims, only when he noted Amoretti's 'errori innumerabili di lingua' (FE.I.vi) that he considered 'un esatto rincontro sull'originale' essential. This, however, is a dubious claim as, notwithstanding greater precision in some minor details and increased and more thorough annotation, the main body of Fea's text is in fact very similar to that of Amoretti's. Indeed, as De Gregory observed, a French author and acquaintance of Fea, the second translation is simply Amoretti's version revised 'with the greatest care'.²⁴ Nevertheless, by consulting the German text with assistance from Reiffenstein (FE.I.vi-vii), Fea ensured that his predecessor enjoyed no advantage from having worked directly from Riedel's edition.

Furthermore, as alluded to in the previous chapter, Fea added a third volume to this translation (1784), which included translations of Winckelmann's architectural essays; a

¹⁹ Ferrari, 'L'eredità culturale di Winckelmann: Carlo Fea e la seconda edizione della "Storia delle Arti del Disegno presso gli Antichi"', *Roma moderna e contemporanea*, 10.1-2 (2002), 15-48 (p. 22).

²⁰ Ferrari, 'I traduttori italiani', p. 169.

²¹ Winckelmann, *Histoire de l'art chez les anciens*, trans. by Gottfried Sellius, 2 vols (Amsterdam: E. van Harreveld, 1766). This was the first French translation and was available when Amoretti was working on his translation yet, unlike Fea, he does not refer to it as a source in his preface.

²² Winckelmann, *Histoire de l'art de l'antiquité*, trans. by Michael Huber, 3 vols (Leipzig: Breitkopf, 1781).

²³ Ferrari, *Il rifugiato*, p. 58.

²⁴ Ridley, *The Pope's Archaeologist: The Life and Times of Carlo Fea* (Rome: Quasar, 2000), p. 35.

selection of the German scholar's letters on the latest discoveries in Rome, Herculaneum, and Pompeii; and several other additions, including Fea's own *Dissertazione sulle Rovine di Roma*. This volume, along with Fea's general undertaking as translator, was the subject of public censure from scholar, Onofrio Boni. Boni chastised Fea for his lack of German knowledge leading to an excessive reliance on Reiffenstein;²⁵ for his legal background and his consequent incompetence in the sphere of antiquarianism;²⁶ and even, in relation to the third volume, for his alleged plagiarism.²⁷ Nevertheless, regardless of this criticism (which will be explored further in Chapter V), Fea's translation surpassed Amoretti's to become the most widely acknowledged, lauded version of Winckelmann's *Geschichte* in Italy.²⁸

III.3.4. Opere di G. G. Winckelmann

Forty-seven years after Fea's third volume, the twelve-volumed *Opere di G. G. Winckelmann* (1830-34), also edited by Fea, was published in Prato by the Fratelli Giachetti.²⁹ This constituted the first comprehensive Italian edition of Winckelmann's oeuvre. It included the vast majority of Winckelmann's works: from his *Geschichte*, *Gedanken*, and *Monumenti* to his architectural essays and a selection of his letters, all of which were printed in order of importance.³⁰ It moreover included new supplementary material, including the *Risposta del Fea alle osservazioni del Cav. Boni*, as well as that repeated from previous translations, such as Fea's *Dissertazione sulle rovine* and Heyne's *Elogio di Winckelmann*, to be considered in due course.

²⁵ Ridley, *The Pope's Archaeologist*, pp. 43-44.

²⁶ Ridley, *Dizionario biografico*, p. 519.

²⁷ Ridley, *The Pope's Archaeologist*, p. 45. See also Mara Bonfioli, 'Boni, Onofrio', in *Dizionario biografico*, XII (1971), 84-85 (p. 84).

²⁸ The increased visibility of this edition is especially clear on analysis of contemporary artistic journals, explored in Chapter V.

²⁹ Ferrari, 'Cicognara e Winckelmann', p. 113. See also Winckelmann, *Pensieri sull'imitazione*, ed. and trans. by Michele Cometa (Palermo: Aesthetica, 1992), p. 146.

³⁰ 'Avvertimento ai lettori', (OP.I.n.p.).

The work of interest here, given the investigation in this chapter, is of course the third Italian edition of the *Geschichte*: the *Storia* which was published across the first three volumes, 1830-32. With the exception of the preface (which introduces the *Opere* as a whole), it is thus this *Storia* to which I refer when discussing the *Opere* in this chapter. As indicated in the preface – almost certainly authored by Fea due to his position as editor – this edition of the *Storia* was compiled with reference to the two previous translations: ‘la prima a Milano [...] la seconda a Roma [...] noi riproducessimo questa Istoria sulle tracce delle due mentovate edizioni’ (OP.I.4). It also included additional passages from both Winckelmann’s 1764 original and his 1767 addendum to the *Geschichte*, the *Anmerkungen über die Geschichte der Kunst des Altertums* (*Remarks on the History of the Art of Antiquity*). In truth, however, and, as will become further clear throughout the present analysis, the main text is markedly similar to Fea’s 1783-84 (and thus also Amoretti’s) translation.

It is the annotations that demonstrate the most variation from the previous two translations. These, however, will not be considered in this chapter, since it is doubtful that they represent an *Italian* response to Winckelmann. Just as Jansen’s French translation had been ‘avec des notes historiques et critiques de différens [sic] auteurs’,³¹ the annotations in the *Opere* were gathered from the already published French, German, and Italian editions of Winckelmann’s *Geschichte*. The authors are individually named at the end of their respective footnotes, all of whom – with the exception of Demarest, the editors of Jansen’s French edition, the Milanese editors, and Fea himself – were German: Christian G. Heyne, Karl Wilhelm Dassdorf, Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, Karl Ludwig Fernow, Heinrich Meyer, Karl Gottfried Siebelis and Joseph Eiselein. In fact, Meyer, an assiduous student of Winckelmann’s

³¹ Winckelmann, *Histoire de l’art chez les anciens: Traduite de l’allemand, avec des notes historiques et critiques de différens auteurs*, trans. by Henrik Jansen, 2 vols (Paris: Barrois, 1793). MT: ‘with historical and critical notes from different authors’.

writings, composed the majority of these notes,³² demonstrating yet further the illogicality of terming the *Opere's* annotations an Italian endeavour. In one footnote Meyer even criticizes Fea: 'Il Fea [...] dimostra con una sua imbrogliata, e poco critica annotazione la sua totale mancanza di rette storiche cognizioni' (OP.II.201).³³

III.3.5. Amoretti and Fea: objectives

Having introduced the translators and their texts, it is also important to understand the objectives they had in translating the *Geschichte*. Amoretti's and Fea's paratexts each make clear that the overarching aim of their translation was to produce a useful edition that would enable easy understanding of Winckelmann's work. The preface to Amoretti's translation, for example, highlights his utilitarian reordering of paragraphs – 'egli è certo che in molti luoghi erano assai utili, se pur non necessarie, le trasposizioni de' periodi e de' paragrafi interi per serbar l'ordine e per evitare delle ripetizioni' (AM.I.viii) – just as Fea, too, cites this as the reason behind his decision to publish three volumes: 'ad oggetto di rendere questa edizione vieppiù sempre compita, e giovevole, ho stimato bene in seguito di farla distribuita in tre volumi' (FE.I.xv). As the two prefaces reveal, in implementing this overarching aim of utility, the translators shared the same four priorities – accuracy, clarity, annotation, and illustration – which I will now consider in turn.

First, and notwithstanding Fea's subsequent criticism of the inaccuracy of the first Italian translation, Amoretti emphasizes the need for precision. In fact his preface shows bewilderment at Winckelmann's demands that editors were to leave 'le primiere inesattezze' in new editions (AM.I.viii). Whereas the Viennese editors had acceded to some extent with this request, in identifying but not revising Winckelmann's errors, Amoretti was 'meno

³² John Edwin Sandys, *A History of Classical Scholarship: The Eighteenth Century in Germany and the Nineteenth Century in Europe and the United States of America*, 3 vols (Cambridge: CUP, 2010), III, 70.

³³ 'Avvertimento ai lettori', (OP.I.n.p.).

scrupolos[o]' (AM.I.viii): he amends citations, omits excessive praise or blame, and corrects errors. Also in pursuit of accuracy, Fea not only purports to correct Amoretti's text by reverting to Riedel's edition (albeit that in truth the extent of correction was very limited), but further revises the *Geschichte* itself. Indeed he accuses the German scholar of various inaccuracies, from having 'stravolto' the words of other writers for his own means (FE.I.x) to an overstated focus on systematization: 'Volendo egli ridurre a sistema le cose, ha dato delle regole generali, e assolute, che nol sono state mai, e soffrono eccezioni infinite' (FE.I.x).

In pursuit of the second objective, clarity, both translators restructure the *Storia* so as to render it more accessible. Amoretti, for example, provides introductory summaries at the beginning of each chapter, as well as introducing a twelve-book structure to replace Winckelmann's unequally-balanced bipartite original (AM.1, ix). Extending this yet further, Fea adopts these changes and also adds section signs and numbers to identify paragraphs within each chapter (FE.1, xv).

Third, a key alteration in these translations is the increased annotation which, notwithstanding Winckelmann's ban on the addition of any more academic notes to his *Geschichte*, both Amoretti and Fea included.³⁴ Notes in Amoretti's translation include references to Winckelmann's sources; information on recent discoveries; and correction of errors. This was again further developed by Fea, who, as well as adding similar notes in his edition, also verifies and corrects Winckelmann's citations; cites modern versions in place of the old editions of works Winckelmann consulted; and even offers Latin translations where he quotes Greek (FE.I.ix). These notes, which, as Ferrari affirms, almost became 'un testo parallelo e quasi autonomo',³⁵ accounted for an increase of 66% from the number of notes provided by

³⁴Ferrari, "'Un'opera che fa onore al secolo sè dicente illuminato", Carlo Fea e la riedizione della Storia delle Arti del Disegno di Winckelmann (1783-84)', in *Antonio Canova: la cultura figurativa e letteraria dei grandi centri italiani: III settimana di studi canoviani* (Bassano del Grappa: Istituto di ricerca per gli studi su Canova e il Neoclassicismo, 2005), pp. 257-80 (p. 277).

³⁵ Ferrari, 'L'eredità culturale', p. 30.

Amoretti, who had himself already added annotation to that provided in the Viennese edition.³⁶ Moreover, whilst not in the form of notes, Fea adds to the comprehensive nature of his edition through the supplementary information he provides in his above-discussed third volume.

Finally, the Italian translators also add engravings to their editions of Winckelmann's work. Indeed, while there were 24 and 22 illustrations in Winckelmann's original and the Viennese edition respectively, Amoretti and Fea raised the total to 54 and 89. There is not the scope to explore these illustrations in this investigation, yet it is noteworthy that Fea once again emphasizes the ease with which his *Storia* could be consulted by highlighting how his new indices simplified the identification of engravings (FE.I.xv).

Thus, both translators sought to produce useful editions of Winckelmann's *Geschichte* by ensuring their *Storie* were accurate, clear, comprehensive, and illustrated.

III.3.6. Opere: objectives

The preface to the *Opere* identifies similar aims to those in the previous translations, as indeed would be expected given Fea's aforementioned role as editor and author of the preface. As he explains, the decision to publish Winckelmann's whole oeuvre was again inspired by the wish to be useful. The *Opere* was intended to aid understanding of the *Geschichte* (OP.I.5), and to supplement recent scholarship on new discoveries: 'oggi che un lodevole trasporto spinge gli amatori [...] a rintracciarne i monumenti nelle più autentiche sorgenti [...] sembra opportuno che si mettano in luce quelle teorie, le quali meglio possono servire di scorta a tante erudite

³⁶ This percentage was reached by adding together the footnotes in Amoretti's (2151) and in Fea's translation (3583) and calculating the difference.

ricerche, e rendere utili tante fatiche' (OP.I.6-7).³⁷ Further mirroring the previous translations, the priorities of the *Opere* were accuracy, annotation, and illustration.

The accuracy that Fea emphasizes in the *Opere* is not, however, the same as the precision championed in the two former translations. Rather he proposes in the preface to the *Opere* to produce a faithful edition of Winckelmann's original text, with – as noted above – additions from Winckelmann's 1764 edition and his addendum, the *Anmerkungen über die Geschichte*. With this professed desire for faithfulness, he even censures Amoretti's and his own previous editions for ignoring 'con soverchia licenza' Winckelmann's above-discussed decree that his original should not be altered, declaring that 'Noi vogliamo però mantenere costantemente l'ordine assegnato dall'Autore nelle materie, e riportarne colla massima fedeltà i sentimenti confrontando le due traduzioni italiane colle migliori edizioni tedesche' (OP.I.7). This is a surprising statement, given that the text of the *Opere* – as I have already noted – largely replicated Fea's (and thus Amoretti's) previous texts.

Moreover, despite the purportedly strict view on textual alterations, the *Opere* disregards Winckelmann's ban on annotation. Indeed, praising the annotations in Amoretti's and his own *Storia*, 'le quali aggiunsero importanza all'opera' (OP.I.4), Fea further increases the number of such additions in the *Opere*. With emphasis on these as embellishing the content rather than changing it – 'queste anzichè alterare la sostanza dell'opera vi aggiungon pregio ed interesse' – the annotations included in other Italian, French, and German versions of Winckelmann's works were, as discussed above, almost all added to the *Opere*'s text (OP.I.7-8). The *Opere* thus contains even more supplementary material than Fea's earlier translation: including references to further reading; additional historical context to aid understanding;

³⁷ As the *Opere* does not have continuous pagination in its first volume, but rather each preface/essay has its own pagination system, I note that references throughout this '*Opere*: objectives' section are sourced from the 'Prefazione degli editori'.

connoisseurial knowledge regarding recent discoveries; explanations of classical references; and accounts of scholarly debates.

The preface also emphasizes the improved quality of the illustrations added in the *Opere*. These were not only 'emendati e rifatti' where necessary and copied from either originals or high calibre museum copies (OP.I.8-9), but they were also included in a more logical order, once again reflecting the desire to be accessible.

Thus, whilst perhaps dubiously claiming to be considerably more faithful to Winckelmann's original than previous translations, the *Opere* sought to provide a useful, annotated, and illustrated edition of Winckelmann's *Geschichte*.

III.3.7. Christian Gottlob Heyne

Finally, it is also necessary to note the unique prominence in all three *Storie* of several essays that scholar Christian Gottlob Heyne wrote on Winckelmann and his works. Indeed, at the very beginning of Amoretti's and Fea's texts and at the start of the *Opere* the translators include a translation of Heyne's *Lobschrift auf Winckelmann*: his *Elogio di Winckelmann*.³⁸ This was a multifaceted tract that certainly was not simply a eulogy. Heyne in fact included harsh criticism, both of Winckelmann – 'il suo più severo critico' (AM.I.x), as Amoretti describes it – and of Italian scholarship, too. Moreover, all three translations (either in a footnote, or as a separate essay in the *Opere*) also included an extract of Heyne's *Über die Künstlerepochen beim Plinius*, or *Saggio sulle epoche degli artisti presso Plinio*. Heyne again censures Winckelmann in this essay, here for his inaccurate historical information largely sourced from Pliny.³⁹ Nor were these the only two of Heyne's works included. Rather, given the *Opere*'s

³⁸ Heyne's original essay, *Lobschrift auf Winckelmann*, was published in 1778. See Christian Gottlob Heyne, 'Lobschrift auf Winckelmann', in *Die Kasseler Lobschriften auf Winckelmann*, ed. by Arthur Schulz (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1963), pp. 14-29.

³⁹ Heyne, 'Über die Künstlerepochen beim Plinius', in *Sammlung antiquarischer Aufsätze*, 2 vols (Leipzig: Weidmann, 1778-79), I (1778), 165-235.

greater scope to include additional sources of information, it further published another five of Heyne's essays on Winckelmann and his works.

The reasons why Amoretti and Fea (both in his 1783-84 translation and the *Opere*) chose to include these essays, especially the *Elogio* placed prominently at the beginning of all three translations, are unknown. We are limited to conjecture, with Ferrari speculating, for example, that such an inclusion may have provided added promise of editorial success.⁴⁰ Yet what is nevertheless significant is that, by including these works of Heyne, the translators plainly demonstrate their willingness to question not just Winckelmann's accuracy but his central principles, too: an immediate indication of an attitude that continues throughout the translations. Indeed, this provides a fitting introduction to the following explorations of foreignization and domestication, as these reactions further verify that Amoretti and Fea certainly did not follow Winckelmann's ideas unquestioningly.

III.4. REACTIONS TO WINCKELMANN IN THE ITALIAN TRANSLATIONS

Having thus discussed the background and objectives of these translations, attention will now turn to a close analysis of the foreignization and domestication of Winckelmann in all three *Storie*: Amoretti's translation, Fea's translation, and the third edition included in the *Opere*.

III.5. FOREIGNIZATION: THE FOREIGN ORIGINS OF WINCKELMANN AND THE *GESCHICHTE*

Foreignization is limited in these translations, yet there are nevertheless a small number of examples of Fea, in his 1783 preface, drawing attention to the foreign origins of both Winckelmann and his oeuvre. The methods behind these two forms of foreignization are closely related: presenting Italy as a foreign country to Winckelmann and underscoring his works' German origins.

⁴⁰ Ferrari, 'Christian G. Heyne', p. 81.

Fea discusses, for example, Winckelmann's hesitation at publishing his *Monumenti* in Rome. He conveys this both by employing an image Winckelmann himself uses in a letter to Francke – describing Rome as 'il teatro [...] più pericoloso' (FE.I.xiii)⁴¹ – and by likening the German scholar's perception of modern Rome to Martial's depiction of the intimidatingly intelligent ancient city:

L'Autore ne adduceva per ragione, che il teatro, su di cui egli avea voluto figurare con quell'opera [*Monumenti*], era molto più pericoloso. [...] doveva essere persuaso, che in Roma ne' tempi presenti ancora, come negli antichi, si avvera il detto sentenzioso di Marziale al suo libro: *Nescis, heu nescis, dominae fastidia Romae: Crede mihi nimium martia turba sapit.* (FE.I.xiii)

This not only introduces the *Monumenti* as a foreign work, but also foreignizes Winckelmann himself, presenting him as a nervous outsider: as someone separate from Rome.

Moreover, in contrast to the *Monumenti*, Winckelmann published the *Geschichte* both in German and in Germany: providing Fea with a clear opportunity to draw attention to the work's foreign origins: one that he certainly seized. For instance Fea not only reminds the reader that the *Geschichte* was written in German, but also – through repetition of 'sua nazione' – that Winckelmann had written it for a German audience in particular. He affirms that the German scholar sought with his *Geschichte* to 'eccitare, ed estendere in qualche modo nel cuore della *sua nazione* un certo gusto del bello', and that he was successful. His work did indeed: 'adempito il desiderio dell'Autore per la *sua nazione*' (FE.I.xiv, italics added).

Thus, whilst limited, and indeed only apparent in Fea's 1783-84 translation, there are nevertheless clear instances here that draw attention to Winckelmann's and his oeuvre's foreign origins. (There are, however, no instances of the foreignization of Winckelmann's *views* in Fea's translation or in the other two *Storie*).

⁴¹ Fea also includes a quotation from this letter in a footnote: 'Mon grand ouvrage italien m'a instruit de ces défauts; parce que le théâtre où je voulois me montrer étoit plus dangereux'. MT: 'As the theatre where I wanted to exhibit my great Italian piece was more dangerous, the consequent work I did on said piece highlighted to me its [the *Geschichte*'s] mistakes'.

III.6. DOMESTICATION: WINCKELMANN AND THE *GESCHICHTE* AS ITALIAN

Domestication is the far more common reaction in these translations. In direct contrast to the examples just outlined, this includes numerous examples of all three texts presenting Winckelmann and his oeuvre as less foreign and even Italian. The considerable presence of these two forms of domestication is particularly notable given the medium of translation, in which the paratexts provide the only opportunity to talk about the German scholar and his works.

There is one method through which the translators domesticate Winckelmann qua scholar, namely their emphasis on his adoption of Italy as his homeland, by which they present him as less foreign and even Italian. This is clearest in the preface to the *Opere*, which highlights not only that Winckelmann chose to live in Italy, ‘a numerare gli anni di sua vita [...] in questo bel paese’, but that he adopted the country as ‘sua seconda patria’:

Imperocchè fu la vista dei monumenti sparsi in tanta copia sul nostro suolo [...] che lo determinò [...] a numerare gli anni di sua vita dal giorno della sua venuta in questo bel paese, e ad adottare l’Italia in sua seconda patria, la quale ben seppe apprezzarne i talenti ed essergli grata di onorevoli distinzioni. (OP.I.5-6)

The reference here to Italy being ‘grata’, grateful for Winckelmann and appreciating his talents, is especially noteworthy as this is a clear reference back to the preface of the Viennese editors (Riedel’s edition), in which they highlight Germany’s efforts to welcome Winckelmann back to his homeland, ‘providing the most pleasant conditions and [...] forcing him to acknowledge that Germany was not always cold and ungrateful towards its great men’ (GES.I.lxv/MT).⁴² Fea had already challenged this statement in his first translation as he outlined in a footnote to his translation of the Viennese preface how, regardless of Germany’s hospitality towards the end of Winckelmann’s life, the first edition of the *Geschichte* was received with such ‘freddezza’, that it led Winckelmann to ‘chiamarla “patria ingrata”, e a

⁴² ‘[...]daß man an jedem dieser Orte alles zugeschnitten hatte, um ihn zu fesseln, durch die angenehmsten Bedingungen, und ihn zu dem Bekenntnisse zu nötigen, daß Deutschland nicht immer kalt und undankbar gegen seine großen Männer sei’.

pentirsi di avere stampata l'opera in quel linguaggio' (FE.I.lv). Yet, as well as repeating this footnote in the translation of the Viennese preface in the *Opere* (OP.I.xcviii), Fea develops this further in his later work as, beyond simply condemning Germany's treatment of Winckelmann, he reveals the contrary admiration that Italy showed him: 'ben seppe apprezzarne i talenti'. The *Opere* thus not only domesticates Winckelmann through emphasizing his living in and adoption of Italy as his second 'patria', but moreover presents his second homeland as more welcoming and respectful than his native Germany.

Turning to Winckelmann's oeuvre, there are two methods by which the translations (again in the paratexts) present his works as less foreign. The first concerns the presentation of Winckelmann's original *Geschichte* not as German but as a product of Italy; the second involves the introduction of the translations as new, improved Italian editions of Winckelmann's work, to be used to the exclusion of the original.

As to the first method, in translating the preface of the Viennese editors all three translations omit the adjective 'German' in the following phrase describing Winckelmann's 'creation of his own masculine, German style' (GES.I.xxxvii/MT).⁴³ Their translation thus simply reads 'egli formavasi uno stile maschio ed energico' (AM.I.xxvii, FE.I.xli-xlii, OP.I.lxxix), evidently to avoid emphasis on the work's foreign origins where possible. Moreover, beyond diluting the foreign image of the *Geschichte*, the translators further attempt to present the work as Italian. Perhaps most obviously, Amoretti's preface reminds the reader that it was in Rome that the German scholar produced his magnum opus; he 'immaginò, scrisse, e migliorò l'Opera sua in Roma presso s. Ema il sig. Card. Alessandro Albani' (AM.I.xi).⁴⁴ Indeed it was Rome's monuments, Amoretti argues, that provided Winckelmann's inspiration: 'Ivi aveva egli veduti que' monumenti che, suggerendogli nuove idee sulle belle arti, [...] meritavano d'essere

⁴³ '[die] Erschaffung seines eigenen männlichen deutschen Stils'.

⁴⁴ It will be recalled that, despite the preface being authored by Cistercian monks, reference to 'Amoretti' throughout this thesis denotes the entire work (including the preface).

pubblicati' (AM.I.xi). In light of the *Geschichte's* both physical and conceptual Italian origins, Amoretti's preface even expresses frustration that Italians were compelled to read in a foreign language a work inspired by their own country:

Convenevol cosa non era che gl'Italiani fossero costretti a leggere in una lingua straniera quest'Opera dell'immortal Winckelmann, ideata da lui e scritta in Italia, ragionata su i vetusti monumenti che qui per la maggior parte conservansi. (AM.I.vii)

As well as revealing the incentive behind translating the *Geschichte*, this implies that Italians had an entitlement to read this work, that it was in some sense 'theirs': an indisputable example of the domestication of Winckelmann's work in Amoretti's translation. Furthermore, this concept of Winckelmann's work as 'ragionata su i vetusti monumenti' of Rome was not confined to this first translation. Rather, over fifty years later in the preface to the *Opere*, Fea, too, emphasizes the significant role that Roman monuments played in motivating Winckelmann to write the *Geschichte*. In fact, Fea even expands on this idea, suggesting that Rome and its monuments allowed the German scholar to develop the skills – 'suo genio di investigazione intorno alle Antichità' – that enabled him to write such works, implying that without Rome, these works would simply not have been possible:

A questi titoli però che richiamano l'attenzione di ogni culto popolo alle Opere di Winckelmann se ne aggiungono dei particolari per la nostra Italia. Imperocchè fu la vista dei monumenti sparsi in tanta copia sul nostro suolo, che sviluppò quel suo genio di investigazione intorno alle Antichità, che gli suggerì l'idea del suo capo lavoro [sic], [e] che lo determinò ad usar di nostra lingua in alcune sue Opere. (OP.I.5-6)

Like Amoretti above, Fea domesticates the *Geschichte* in his *Opere* by presenting it as Roman from outset to completion.

Through the second method of domesticating Winckelmann's oeuvre, the translators seek instead to replace the original work entirely, with an improved Italian edition. Indeed, whilst I have already noted the translators' objectives to enhance Winckelmann's original through increased accuracy, the preface to the first translation goes beyond this by clarifying that Amoretti had 'i talenti, i comodi, e le cognizioni necessarie a perfezionarla!' (AM.I.x), even

to render it 'preferibile all'originale' (AM.I.xi). Moreover, in stark contrast to Fea's above-noted suggestion that Winckelmann composed the *Geschichte* for 'sua nazione', Amoretti's preface announces the service that he, as its first translator, had done for *Italians*:

Un vero servizio per tanto ci lusinghiamo d'aver loro [gl'Italiani] prestato col solo pubblicarla, recata dalla tedesca in nostra favella. Ma ci siamo proposti eziandio di migliorarla; e ragion vuole che rendiamo conto dell'opera nostra, e insieme delle altrui beneficenze. (AM.I.vii)

It was a work for Italians by Italians. Indeed, notable here is the emphasis on the first-person plural possessive adjective, highlighting yet further its *Italian* nature: 'opera nostra' 'in nostra favella'. Continuing this idea, Fea (1783-84) notes in a similar manner the particularly distinguished Italian origins of his edition. Again in contrast to his examples of foreignization, he presents his *Storia* here not as a German work, but as one far less foreign, one produced by no less than the 'Presidente delle Antichità in questa metropoli madre':

risolvei di correggere questa [...] parendomi, che un'opera fatta dal Presidente delle Antichità in questa metropoli madre, e maestra delle belle arti, e che tanto conferisce alla di lei gloria coll'illustrarne i monumenti, avesse diritto di comparirvi coi di lei torchi nell'aspetto, che fosse, per quanto era possibile, il più degno, e interessante. (FE.I.vii)

The final example of this second method of domesticating Winckelmann's *Geschichte* concerns the titles of Amoretti's and Fea's translations: *Storia delle arti del disegno presso gli antichi*. Whereas the French translators closely followed the German title (*Histoire de l'art chez les anciens*), the addition of the word 'disegno' in the Italian version is a clear reference to Vasari's concept of 'disegno' and to the famous Florentine art academy that he founded in 1563.⁴⁵ Through adding this to the title of their *Storie*, the translators thus plainly sought to present their work as an Italian product: rendering it more familiar to Italian readers through

⁴⁵ The central Vasarian concept of 'disegno' refers to the ability to conceptualize images from nature and transfer them to art. It is thus the cognitive faculty which makes all art possible, 'il disegno, padre delle tre arti nostre': Giorgio Vasari, *Le opere di Giorgio Vasari: pittore e architetto aretino*, ed. by Giovanni Masselli, 2 vols (Florence: D. Passigli e soci, 1832-38), I (1832), 37.

its resemblance to both Vasari's and subsequent Italian works.⁴⁶ For reasons unknown, Fea abandons this addition of 'disegno' in the title of the *Storia* included in his *Opere, Storia dell'arte presso gli antichi*, yet he nevertheless refers to this same concept in subtitles and discussions. The first subtitle in the *Storia*, for instance, reads 'Origine delle Arti del Disegno, e cagione delle differenze presso le varie nazioni'. Thus, despite altering the location of this addition, Fea nevertheless continues in 1830 – as he and Amoretti had done previously – to present the *Opere's Storia* as inherently Italian through reference to the Vasarian tradition.

To conclude, the translators demonstrate clear efforts to domesticate Winckelmann and his oeuvre. They present him as belonging to Italy, and both the *Geschichte* and their *Storie* as Italian pieces of scholarship.

III.7. DOMESTICATION: TRANSFORMING WINCKELMANN'S VIEWS THROUGH TRANSLATION

In contrast to the domestication of Winckelmann and his oeuvre, which was confined to the paratexts and titles of their translations, Amoretti and Fea domesticated Winckelmann's views throughout the three *Storie*. After all, in translating the almost 900-page *Geschichte*, they had abundant opportunity to engage with his views, of which they took full advantage.⁴⁷

It will be recalled that to domesticate Winckelmann's views is to render them more attractive to Italian readers. All three translations disclose two methods of domesticating Winckelmann's views: textual manipulation and annotation. The first method involves changes to the original text of Winckelmann's *Geschichte*, which subtly alter the presentation of his Italophobic and Graecophile views. This is achieved through a variety of techniques: addition; omission; alteration of adjectives and adverbs; variation of nouns; and modification of verb

⁴⁶ Even the title of Winckelmann's *Trattato preliminare dell'arte del disegno degli antichi popoli* in his *Monumenti* refers to the 'arte del disegno'. See Chapter II.3.3.

⁴⁷ Initial research suggests that even Amoretti's and Fea's choice of engravings demonstrates domestication (with an increase in Italic images and a decrease in Greek counterparts). This, however, is beyond the scope of this investigation which focuses on Winckelmann's views as expressed through his writing.

tense and voice. The second method consists of supplementing the *Geschichte* through footnotes, which increase in number over the course of the three editions. Given that these annotations were to be read in conjunction with Winckelmann's text, they have the same effect as textual manipulation in qualifying the Hellenism present in the original. These two methods are the vehicle by which domestication is realized, but in order to draw out the variation in how the translators deal with different subject matter, I will divide this section not by method but instead into six thematic parts.

As already noted, all three translations are markedly similar texts. With this in mind, on occasion where there is no indication of which specific version is being cited or discussed, reference to 'the Italian translations' will refer to all three texts. In addition, since the text of the *Opere's Storia* overwhelmingly replicates Fea's first translation, any reference to Fea's translation will (unless otherwise noted) hereafter also refer to the *Opere*.⁴⁸

III.7.1. Etruscan art and society

The first subject in Winckelmann's *Geschichte* that the translations present in a more attractive light is Etruria. This was a society with clear Italic roots and one in which, in Winckelmann's system, art never achieved the perfection it did in Greece. Whereas Winckelmann thus censures and denies praise to Etruscan art and society, the Italian translators domesticate such views, rendering them more attractive to the Italian reader.

Amoretti and Fea sought, for instance, to reinforce how Etruria, before Greece, was the first to enable art to flourish. Thus, in translating Winckelmann's statement that the art here flourished 'at an earlier date, *as it appears*, than among the Greeks' (GES.I.135/I.220, italics

⁴⁸ Aside from the *Opere's* preface, already discussed, there are two ways in which the reactions in the *Opere's Storia* might have differed from those in Fea's first translation: by the selective addition of material that was either favourable or offensive to Italy, and by the modification of any text that was added. However, preliminary analysis of these additions discloses no pattern of foreignization or domestication beyond that present in Fea's translation.

added),⁴⁹ they – through alteration of the adverbial phrase – instead refer to the arts ‘*le quali certamente in Etruria prima che in Grecia fiorirono*’ (AM.I.111, FE.I.162, OP.II.5, italics added). Moreover, Fea further uses this antecedence to excuse the ‘hardness’ that Winckelmann attributed to Etruscan art (GES.I.4/I.133). Rather than altering Winckelmann’s comments on this hard style, Fea adds annotation to render his views less offensive to Italians. In this footnote he quotes art historian, Mario Guarnacci, who, in reaction to Quintilian’s criticism of Etruscan art, also sought to offer defence for Etruria. In the quotation that Fea includes here, Guarnacci not only notes that the Etruscan works were merely ‘*un po’ duretti*’ in comparison with those of the Greeks, but further suggests that ‘*Quintiliano parli dei bassi tempi*’ (FE.I.206, OP.II.111), implying that earliness excuses hardness, however slight.

Furthermore, even when Winckelmann remarks positively on Etruria, the Italian translators aim to highlight, to a yet greater extent, the merits of Etruscan art and civilization. This includes emphasizing the dynamism of society, which is largely achieved through addition of commendatory adjectives and adverbs not present in the German text. They note, for instance, that Etruria ‘*agevolmente s’impadronì del commercio*’ (AM.I.117, FE.I.169, OP.II.18, italics added) in place of ‘she attracted the entire trade’ (GES.I.143/I.226),⁵⁰ whilst augmenting, too, the simple phrase ‘in this flourishing condition’ (GES.I.144/I.226),⁵¹ with supplementary positive explanation: ‘*essendo per tanto così possenti e ricche (le antiche nazioni etrusche)*’ (AM.I.117, FE.I.169, OP.II.18-19). One could even argue that Amoretti and Fea further strove to suggest the energy and productivity of Etruscan civilization by affording the Etruscans the role of subject in the following phrase: ‘*ed è chiaro averne quindi tratto del profitto e de’ lumi gli Etruschi loro vicini*’ (AM.I.147, FE.I.205, OP.II.110), rather than their position as object in

⁴⁹ ‘zeitiger, wie es scheint, als bei den Griechen’.

⁵⁰ ‘da Hetrurien [...] den ganzen Handel [...] an sich zog’.

⁵¹ ‘In diesem Flore’.

Winckelmann's text, where the Greeks began to 'diffuse light among their neighbours, the Etruscans' (GES.I.185/I.255).⁵²

Finally, the Italian translators also sought to defend the Etruscans' morality by emphasizing the civilized aspects of their culture and, where possible, diluting Winckelmann's suggestions of violence. At the exact same point that Winckelmann criticizes the Etruscans' delight in bloody fights and games, for example, Fea reminds the reader, in another footnote, of 'il grande trasporto, che avevano gli Etruschi per la musica, l'aver quindi inventati tanti strumenti, l'aver avuto ogni città il suo teatro, in cui non solo spettacoli di gladiatori, e tragedie, ma comedie eziandio, con ballerini, e istrioni si rappresentavano' (FE.I.170, OP.II.21). Without altering Winckelmann's idea here, Fea clearly renders it less offensive to Italian readers by adding a positive footnote to be read in parallel with Winckelmann's censure.

Thus, albeit through subtle textual manipulation and annotation, Amoretti and Fea domesticate Winckelmann's views on Etruria, presenting them as both less offensive and more attractive to their Italian readers.

III.7.2. Ancient Roman art and society

Through the two methods of textual manipulation and annotation, the translators also domesticate the anti-Roman views that Winckelmann presents in the *Geschichte*. There was plentiful opportunity for the translators to do so, as Winckelmann afforded more extensive treatment to Rome than Etruria, due to the greater amount of evidence available in relation to Roman art and society.

First and foremost one notes their attempts to defend the *concept* of a Roman style of art. Indeed, on consideration of Winckelmann's view, discussed in the previous chapter, that Roman art was a delusion – 'I believe myself therefore to be justified in assuming [...], that the

⁵² 'erleuchteten auch ihre Nachbarn die Hetrurier'.

idea of Roman style in art [...] is a mere conceit' (GES.I.605/II.162-63)⁵³ – the Italian translators dilute Winckelmann's offensive opinion by adding the following contrasting footnote:

è certo che i Romani, avendo sotto gli occhi tanti bei monumenti dell'arte etrusca e greca, avrebbero potuto formarsi agevolmente uno stile particolare da star del pari a quello degli Etruschi, e de' Greci. (AM.II.120-21, FE.II.149, OP.III.160)

Further ignoring Winckelmann's suggestion, Amoretti and Fea also employ the technique of omission. Where Winckelmann consequently refers to Roman art as 'so-called' Roman art (GES.I.v/MT),⁵⁴ for example, the Italian translators domesticate his view by ignoring this adjective and referring simply to 'lavoro [...] romano' (AM.I.xv, FE.I.xxv, OP.I.lvii). Moreover, Fea continues this defence by arguing against the reasoning Winckelmann uses to formulate this anti-Roman opinion. Indeed, Winckelmann cites the Romans' erroneous interpretation of depictions of Greek mythology as Roman history as proof that a Roman style did not exist and that all such work was in fact Greek. Fea, however, defends Roman art by highlighting in a footnote the contradictions in Winckelmann's argument. After all the German scholar himself discusses art depicting Roman imperial history in the preface of his *Monumenti*:

qui l'Autore pare che non eccettui caso alcuno della storia romana rappresentato su i monumenti dell'arte; ma nella detta Prefazione [*Monumenti*] ne eccettua i tanti monumenti, ove sono rappresentati i fatti degl'imperatori. (FE.II.147, OP.III.156)

Fea thus once again renders Winckelmann's discussion less offensive to the Italian reader as, read in parallel with his text, this footnote plainly weakens the anti-Roman line of reasoning. Shortly after the above footnote, Fea yet further highlights the fallacy of Winckelmann's view by demonstrating that not only was there a concept of Roman art but that it could have reached the level of Greek art. Again through annotation, Fea employs Cicero to affirm this

⁵³ 'glaube ich berechtigt zu sein, den Begriff eines römischen Stils in der Kunst [...] für eine Einbildung zu halten'.

⁵⁴ 'sogenannte römische Arbeit'. It should be noted that, whilst this is sourced from the Viennese editors' preface, a large part of their preamble was a replication of Winckelmann's own preface, as indicated by the editors themselves (GES.I.i). The same is true of Amoretti's and Fea's translations of the Viennese editors' preface, at the start of which they similarly confirm the replication of Winckelmann's own preface (AM.I.xiii, FE.I.xxiii, OP.I.lv). Thus, the words Amoretti and Fea modify here were indeed Winckelmann's.

idea. Indeed, he notes how Cicero even compares the Romans' potential to that of the great Greek masters: '[Cicero] biasima i Romani, che non abbiano data maggior lode a Fabio per l'arte, che professava; che così avrebbero anch'essi avuto i loro Parrasii e Policleti' (FE.II.150, OP.III.161).

Secondly, with the existence of a Roman style of art thus defended, Amoretti and Fea also domesticate Winckelmann's views on the quality of Roman artistic production. In a similar manner to their domestication of Winckelmann's comments on Etruscan art, the translators mitigate Winckelmann's censure of Roman art by emphasizing the earliness of the pieces that he criticizes. Whilst Winckelmann claims that coins stamped in Rome 'in the time of the Republic [...] appear like the performances of beginners in art' (GES.I.604/II.162),⁵⁵ the Italian translators crucially add the adjective 'primo' – 'de' *primi* tempi della repubblica' (AM.II.120, FE.II.148, OP.III.159), seemingly to excuse the coins' poor quality and render Winckelmann's views less critical. Moreover, it is not just criticism that the Italian translators manipulate, but also comments through which Winckelmann himself affords (limited) recognition of the value of Roman art. This includes, for example, Winckelmann's remark that 50 scudi were paid 'occasionally' (GES.II.782/II.290)⁵⁶ for rare Roman medallions, which, through substituting 'occasionally' for 'in generale', the Italian translators alter to suggest a more widespread appreciation of Roman metalwork: 'dirsi può in generale che [...] un raro medaglione romano vien pagato 50. Scudi' (AM.II.262, FE.II.326, OP.III.678). Similarly, Amoretti and Fea also attempt to add more vigour to Winckelmann's accounts of Rome's ability to stimulate artistic production, particularly during the time of the Republic. Indeed, according to the Italian translations, Greek art sought not just 'protection' in Rome during this period (GES.II.763/II.276),⁵⁷ but 'ricovero e vita' (AM.II.247, FE.II.305, OP.III.621), just as the

⁵⁵ 'zur Zeit der Republik [...] wie Arbeiten von Anfängern in der Kunst gemacht erscheinen'.

⁵⁶ 'zuweilen'.

⁵⁷ 'suchten die Künste Schutz in Rom'.

decoration in Roman houses had not simply 'increased so much' (GES.II.769/II.280)⁵⁸ in a few years, but '*a tanta magnificenza crebbero*' (AM.II.253, FE.II.313, OP.III.640).

Thirdly, there are a number of examples of Amoretti and Fea avoiding, as far as possible, the Winckelmannian theory of the decline and fall of Roman art, clearly to present Winckelmann's views as less offensive to their Italian readership. After discussing Antonine art, they simply omit the phrase 'but after this period art sunk at once' (GES.II.847/II.341)⁵⁹ (AM.II.311, FE.II.391, OP.III.860), whilst on further occasions they cast doubt on this notion of decline. Where Winckelmann states that public structures 'show' (GES.II.859/II.349)⁶⁰ how much art had degenerated since Commodus' death, for example, Amoretti and Fea employ the far less certain 'argomentar lo possiamo' (AM.II.319, FE.II.401, OP.III.891). They also domesticate Winckelmann's account of a sculpture of the degenerate period, which he argues 'cannot be regarded as beautiful' (GES.II.860/II.350)⁶¹ but is, nevertheless, of surprising merit for the period. The Italian translators translate this as 'sebben essa non possa dirsi *veramente* bella' (AM.II.320, FE.II.402, OP.III.896, italics added), adding 'veramente', which, although a minor addition, here undercuts and thus refutes Winckelmann's notion of beauty's total absence, giving an added sense of worth to later Roman art and rendering the passage more attractive to Italian readers.

Fourthly, as with Etruria, this domestication of Winckelmann's views is not limited to art but also includes Roman society. Indeed, just as Amoretti and Fea manipulate Winckelmann's views to emphasize the merits of Etruscan society, so, too, do they underline the Romans' dynamism and morality. Indeed, even where Winckelmann compliments the Romans' efforts in the second Punic war, by comparing them to the Athenians at war with the Persians, Amoretti and Fea embellish such praise yet further. They translate 'the Romans

⁵⁸ 'welcher [...] dermaßen gestiegen war'.

⁵⁹ 'aber nach ihrer Zeit fiel die Kunst mit einmal'.

⁶⁰ 'beweisen'.

⁶¹ 'nicht für schön kann gehalten werden'.

strained all their powers' (GES.I.611/II.166)⁶² as 'Durante la seconda guerra parve che la forza e la politica de' Romani operassero de' prodigi' (AM.II.125, FE.II.156, OP.III.173): accentuating, through describing them as working like 'prodigi', the clear strength of both the Roman army and society.

Amoretti and Fea also attempt to defend the Romans' morality, not least by omitting the adjective 'inhuman' in Winckelmann's reference to their 'inhuman, sanguinary games' (GES.I.226/I.288):⁶³ 'i sanguinosi spettacoli' (AM.I.179, FE.I.244, OP.II.193). Whilst Winckelmann endeavours to portray the Roman style of warfare in the most violent and cold-hearted manner possible, the Italian translators adopt a number of techniques to render the text less offensive to Italian readers. They omit the 'not only [...] but also' in the German phrase 'not only to cut down every human being [...] but also to rip open the dogs' bellies' (GES.I.227/I.289),⁶⁴ removing at least some of the emphasis; they choose less violent verbs where possible, such as 'versare l'umano sangue' for 'cut down every human being'; and they even attempt to defend the Roman generals leading such battles. Indeed, instead of copying Winckelmann's German – 'this even Scipio Africanus the elder permitted' (GES.I.227/I.289)⁶⁵ – Amoretti's decision (imitated later by Fea) to rewrite his phrase in the impersonal voice lessens the responsibility of the Roman leader: 'si eseguì sotto Scipione africano il seniore' (AM.I.180, FE.I.245, OP.II.194-95).

Thus, it is clear that through various techniques of textual manipulation, as well as annotation added especially by Fea, the translators domesticate Winckelmann's views on ancient Rome, presenting them as less offensive and more attractive to their Italian readers.

⁶² 'Krieg, in welchem die Römer alle Segel ihrer Kräfte ausspannten'.

⁶³ 'die unmenschlichen blutigen Spiele'.

⁶⁴ 'nicht allein was menschlichen Atem hatte niederzuhauen, sondern auch den Hunden den Bauch aufzuschneiden'.

⁶⁵ 'dieses ließ so gar Scipio Afrikanus der ältere geschehen'.

III.7.3. Modern Italian artists

Domestication is not, however, reserved for the ancients; Amoretti and Fea also present Winckelmann's comments on Italian artists of the Renaissance and Baroque periods as more attractive to an Italian reader. After all, unlike the praise conferred on these artists in Italy, Winckelmann's opinions were often critical, particularly concerning Michelangelo and Bernini, the latter of whom he labelled a fool: 'The moderns are fools compared to the ancients [...] and Bernini is, with the exception of the French, the biggest fool amongst them'.⁶⁶

To begin with Michelangelo, a source of great pride for Italy, Fea defends him against the vicious attack that Winckelmann – by reference to Lodovico Dolce's *Dialogo della pittura* – makes on the Renaissance artist. Winckelmann, after asserting that 'mannerism', or uniformity of character, is the common fault in Tuscan art and the cause of it having no character of its own, supports Dolce's consequent opinion on Michelangelo: 'Hence someone [Dolce] says, not without reason, that whoever has seen one figure by this artist [Michelangelo], has seen them all' (GES.I.184-85/I.254). Fea, however, supplies defence for the Renaissance artist in a footnote. He accepts that this was a 'difetto' caused by 'il fiero di lui animo', yet underscores both that Michelangelo took inspiration from the Belvedere Hercules – association with an ancient model suggesting commendation – and that he meditated on and even exceeded the ancient work. His footnote reads, 'pare abbia sempre avuto innanzi agli occhi il torso dell'Ercole di Belvedere, su cui tanto avea meditato, e meditava; non imitandolo per altro, ma eccedendolo' (FE.I.205, OP.II.108). Fea thus not only preserves the reputation of the Renaissance artist, but transforms Winckelmann's censure into a piece of high praise.

In a similar manner, the Italian translators also defend Bernini by domesticating Winckelmann's views, first by manipulation of the text:

⁶⁶ This was in a letter written to his friend, Berendis, dated 07/07/1756, sourced from Gerald Heres, 'Winckelmann, Bernini, Bellori: Betrachtungen zur "Nachahmung der Alten"', *Forschungen und Berichte: Staatliche Museen zu Berlin*, 19 (1979), 9-16 (p. 9). MT: 'Die Neuern sind Esel gegen die Alten [...] und Bernini ist der größte Esel unter den Neuern, die Franzosen ausgenommen'.

It is not enough to judge – as Bernini did *perhaps not with sufficient consideration* – the statue of Pasquino as the most beautiful of all ancient statues.⁶⁷ (GES.I.vi/MT, italics added)

Non basta usar di *quella franchezza* con cui Bernini giudicò esser Pasquino una delle più belle statue di Roma. (AM.I.xv-xvi, FE.I.xxvi, OP.I.lix, italics added)

Despite the Italian translations' clear similarity to the original here, the translators' avoidance of the negative, 'not with sufficient consideration', reduces the severity of Winckelmann's censure, just as the transformation of the superlative, 'the most beautiful' to '*una delle più belle*', also renders Bernini's suggestion less extreme and thus more easily pardoned. Moreover, Fea also uses annotation here to defend Bernini and render Winckelmann's argument less offensive to the Italian readership. Indeed, even when correcting the Baroque artist's identification – the statue represents Menelaus rather than Pasquino (as was eventually confirmed in the eighteenth century by Visconti) – Fea nevertheless calls Bernini 'uno de' primi valentuomini nelle belle arti' who 'non ha sbagliato altrimenti', as the statue was indeed 'di greco scalpello', as he had suggested (FE.I.xxvi, OP.I.lix).⁶⁸

As well as disparaging them separately, Winckelmann also criticizes Michelangelo and Bernini together, stating: 'in others (including these two), the climate has not allowed the gentle feeling of pure beauty to mature' (GES.I.252/I.305).⁶⁹ Yet once again Amoretti and Fea defend these Italian artists by translating this sentence as: 'Altri sortirono dalla natura un gusto fino e dilicato per la bellezza pura; ma non l'ebbero, a così dire, maturo abbastanza e sicuro' (AM.I.200, FE.I.268, OP.II.246). Indeed, without altering the principal message, the Italian translators nevertheless add the suggestion here that, despite its immaturity, Michelangelo

⁶⁷ 'es [ist] nicht genug, so wie Bernini vielleicht nicht mit hinlänglicher Überlegung getan hat, den Pasquin für die schönste aller alten Statuen zu halten'. Despite the source here being the Viennese editors' preface, this comment originated in Winckelmann's own preface: see Chapter III, n. 54.

⁶⁸ To avoid confusion stemming from the already-mentioned lack of continuous pagination in the *Opere*'s first volume, p. lix here is sourced from the *Prefazione degli Editori Viennesi*.

⁶⁹ 'In andern hat der Himmel das sanfte Gefühl der reinen Schönheit nicht zur Reife kommen lassen'.

and Bernini did still possess this 'gusto' or feeling, ensuring thereby that these Italian masters were not without praise.

III.7.4. Modern Italian scholars

In translating Winckelmann's *Geschichte* for an Italian audience, Amoretti and Fea also endeavour to redress his often-disparaging comments on their native Italian scholars. This once again involves the domestication methods of textual manipulation and annotation, which are especially apparent in their translations of Winckelmann's comments on the following scholars: Giovanni Giustino Ciampini, Giovanni Paolo Lomazzo, Antonio Francesco Gori, and Filippo Buonarroti.

Winckelmann criticizes Ciampini's 'blindness' (GES.II.867-68/II.357)⁷⁰ in his misinterpretation of an edifice that, rather than being a temple of Bacchus as he believed, was in fact a building rebuilt after the original's destruction using a mixture of different styles. On translation of this, however, Amoretti and Fea use the less-aggressive 'l'inavvedutezza' (AM.II.326, FE.II.410, OP.III.923-24), revealing their clear intent to tone down Winckelmann's censure.

A similar objective can be noted, too, in the translation of Winckelmann's criticism of Lomazzo for his erroneous theories about the proportion of different divinities. Indeed, Winckelmann himself states: 'We are, however, by no means authorised to conclude from this, as Lomazzo has done, that the length of his [Hercules'] foot was one seventh of his whole height. The statements of this writer [...] are imaginary and false' (GES.I.340-41/I.376).⁷¹ Yet Amoretti and Fea lessen the severity of this view in their translation. Not only do they omit the negative phrase 'by no means' in 'non deesi pertanto credere al Lomazzi' (AM.I.267, FE.I.351,

⁷⁰ 'die Blindheit des Ciampini'.

⁷¹ 'Hieraus aber ist mit dem Lomazzo auf keine Weise zu schließen, daß der Fuß desselben den siebenten Teil seiner Länge gehalten'; 'was eben dieser Scribent [...] versichert [...] [ist] erdichtet und falsch'.

OP.II.503), but Fea, in a rare example of divergence between the Italian translations, also adds the phrase ‘a ben esaminarlo’ to the final reproach. In asserting that Lomazzo’s claim ‘a ben esaminarlo altro non comparisce che una bella invenzione’ (FE.I.351, OP.II.504), rather than Winckelmann’s simple ‘the statements [...] are imaginary and false’, Fea affords Lomazzo further pardon. By suggesting the need for an examination before his opinion could be disproved, he indicates that Lomazzo’s judgement was less obviously incorrect, and thus less shameful than Winckelmann implies.

Amoretti and Fea also seek to protect the reputation of Gori using two techniques of textual manipulation. First, they omit altogether Winckelmann’s harsh denunciation – ‘I therefore hold the story to be a monkish legend’ (GES.I.173 /I.245)⁷² – of what Gori claimed to be the original inscription of an urn that had since gone missing. Second, by altering the verb choice, they dilute Winckelmann’s criticism of Gori’s suggestion that two graces on a particular sepulchral urn hold a girdle in their hands. Rather than replicating Winckelmann’s presentation of it as a claim that ‘cannot be proved’ (GES.I.405 /II.14),⁷³ the translations frame it as a point of uncertainty: ‘ciò non è ben chiaro’ (AM.I.318, FE.I.414, OP.II.664). In addition, employing the method of annotation, Fea further defends Gori by reversing Winckelmann’s criticism. Whilst Winckelmann criticizes Gori for his interpretation of this urn, Fea in turn undermines Winckelmann, by stating in a footnote that, ‘È una lametta rotonda di metallo, non già un’urna’ (FE.I.414, OP.II.664).

As regards the final scholar, when discussing ancient vases of Tuscany and Arezzo, Winckelmann harshly criticizes Filippo Buonarroti, declaring, ‘I omit here the *unimportant* comments of Buonarroti concerning crowns and vases in the hand of Bacchus’

⁷² ‘ich halte daher dieselbe für eine Mönchslegende’.

⁷³ ‘nicht zu beweisen ist’.

(GES.I.194/I.260, italics added).⁷⁴ This is a contemptuous statement, which – plainly to present the German scholar's views as less offensive to their native readers – Amoretti and Fea in turn omit (AM.I.153, FE.I.214, OP.II.126-27).

Thus, whilst Winckelmann censures the work of many previous Italian scholars, Amoretti and Fea domesticate his views, presenting them as far less offensive.

III.7.5. The peninsula and its people

Despite Winckelmann's Italophobic views, there is very little criticism of the peninsula in his *Geschichte*. It was, after all, his 'seconda patria'. Nevertheless, even when translating Winckelmann's commendation of the peninsula, the Italian translators continue to domesticate his views by rendering his praising comments even more complimentary.

Winckelmann, for instance, effusively praises Rome as 'the lawgiver and the instructress of the whole world', due to its ability to 'send forth [art] to the latest posterity, from the bosom of her riches' (GES.I.618/II.170),⁷⁵ declarations that Amoretti and Fea intensify even further: 'la legislatrice e la maestra dell'*universo*', who 'aprendo successivamente il suo seno, andrà mostrando *di continuo* anche ai più tardi nipoti que' prodigi dell'arte' (AM.II.131, FE.II.162, OP.III.184, italics added). Indeed, by emphasizing the yet wider influence of Rome by substituting 'world' with '*universo*', as well as alluding to the constancy of Rome's international influence through the addition of the adverb '*di continuo*', Amoretti and Fea present Winckelmann's already-praising sentiment as yet more attractive to Italian readers. Furthermore, the translators even present the German scholar's images of the Italian landscape in a more positive manner. Whilst the German scholar praises the fragrance of Italian flowers, for instance, 'whose fragrance increases in proportion to the dryness of the soil

⁷⁴ 'Ich übergehe hier die *unerheblichen* Anmerkungen des Buonarroti von Kränzen und Gefäßen in der Hand des Bacchus'.

⁷⁵ 'Rom ist [...] die Gesetzgeberin und Lehrerin aller Welt geworden, und sie wird auch den spätesten Nachkommen aus dem Schoß ihrer Reichtümer Werke [...] hervorbringen können'.

and the warmth of the climate' (GES.I.45/I.160),⁷⁶ Amoretti and Fea add beauty here, too, 'tanto più belli sono e odorosi' (AM.I.37, FE.I.50, OP.I.105). Their desire to make all elements of Winckelmann's work more attractive to their Italian readers is unmistakable.

Amoretti and Fea also continue to amplify Winckelmann's already-extant praise on the topic of the Italian people. This is achieved through various techniques of textual manipulation, not least including the addition of adjectives and comparatives not found in the German. When talking about the form of face found amongst Italian people, for example, Winckelmann states that 'the parts of it [are] in harmony with each other' (GES.I.44/I.159):⁷⁷ an image that becomes 'le parti *tutte* ne sono in *bell'*armonia composte' (AM.I.36, FE.I.49, OP.I.103, italics added). In a similar manner, and in place of Winckelmann's description of 'men of superb and vigorously designed forms' (GES.I.44/I.159),⁷⁸ Amoretti and Fea speak more effusively of 'uomini *più* robusti e *meglio* formati' (AM.I.36, FE.I.49, OP.I.104, italics added). Nor is such textual manipulation limited to adjectives, but rather also involves the addition of emphatic adverbs as in the following sentence: 'la testa *anche* del più vile plebeo può servir di modello in qualunque più sublime quadro storico' (AM.I.36, FE.I.49, OP.I.103). The addition of 'anche' here, not present in Winckelmann's original, highlights yet further the regularity of beauty in Italy by emphasizing how *even* a plebeian head was beautiful (GES.I.44/I.159, italics added).

Thus, whilst Winckelmann was already complimentary when discussing the city of Rome, the Italian landscape, and the native people, Amoretti and Fea, through many methods of textual manipulation, still domesticated his views, presenting them as yet more attractive.

⁷⁶ 'Blumen [...], die je trockener der Boden, und je wärmer der Himmel ist, desto stärkeren Geruch haben'.

⁷⁷ 'die Teile derselben [sind] in Uebereinstimmung'.

⁷⁸ 'Menschen von prächtigen und stark bezeichneten Formen'.

III.7.6. Ancient Greek art and society

The final subject on which the translations domesticate Winckelmann's views is ancient Greece. Long-standing rival to ancient Rome, yet object of effusive acclaim in the *Geschichte*, the translators render Winckelmann's views on Greece more attractive to an Italian readership by diluting the German scholar's praise and undermining his justifications for apparent Greek immorality. There are four specific contexts in which this occurs.

Firstly, the Italian translations diminish Winckelmann's central belief in the 'the superiority which art acquired among the Greeks' (GES.I.222/I.286).⁷⁹ Whilst the translators retain the laudatory tone, they simultaneously remove all suggestions of 'superiority' over others: 'L'alto grado di perfezione, a cui l'arte si sollevò presso quella nazione' (AM.I.176, FE.I.240, OP.II.184). In a similar manner, Amoretti and Fea completely ignore the words 'of a Greek master' in Winckelmann's description of a caryatid of the Augustan period. Depriving the Greeks of this merit, Winckelmann's 'but we probably possess a still better monument of a Greek master of the age of Augustus' (GES.II.787/II.294)⁸⁰ becomes simply 'un altro monumento, forse più pregevole de' sin qui mentovati e verosimilmente opera de' tempi d'Augusto, ancor ci rimane' (AM.II.266, FE.II.332, OP.III.696).

Secondly, as well as art, the translators lessen Winckelmann's commendation of other aspects of ancient Greek culture. This includes the Greeks' humane and joyful dispositions; their exceptional physical conformations; and, as an event combining these two qualities, their enjoyment of the Olympic Games. Describing this tradition, Winckelmann affirms: 'When the Olympic Games occurred, at which all Greece harmoniously assembled to share in the general hilarity, all hostilities ceased and were forgotten for some days, even in times of the greatest

⁷⁹ 'de[r] Vorzug, welchen die Kunst unter den Griechen erlangt hat'.

⁸⁰ 'Allein wir haben vielleicht noch ein besseres Denkmal eines griechischen Meisters von Augustus Zeit'.

exasperation' (GES.I.228/I.289).⁸¹ The idyllic image of these games is, however, undercut by Fea in a footnote where he explains that, despite such claims that 'all hostilities ceased', the Spartans were in fact restricted from attending due to nothing more than an unpaid fine (FE.I.246, OP.II.196). As well as the Olympic Games, Winckelmann further pays tributes to 'theatrical representations and other games' (GES.I.226/I.288)⁸² that the Greeks enjoyed: customs which are, however, again devalued by a particularly severe footnote in Fea's work. Indeed, Fea's wide-reaching comment here (as he describes the Arcadians as 'feroci' and other Greeks as 'molli' in the same passage) suggests his resolve to criticize the rival ancients in any way possible:

Presso gli Arcadi, che per la qualità del clima più freddo, ed aspro erano i più feroci tra i Greci, i giuochi, e la musica si usavano più che altrove per acquistare questa dolcezza d'indole, che loro mancava naturalmente (Polibio). Coi pubblici giuochi si era avuto anche in mira di conciliare l'unione, e la concordia fra le diverse nazioni della Grecia (Strabone); e promuovere gli esercizi del corpo per aver buoni guerrieri in un clima, che generalmente poteva rendere i corpi molli ed effeminati. (FE.I.244, OP.II.192)

Thirdly, the translations negate Winckelmann's efforts to vindicate the Greeks' immoral activities in warfare, including in particular his praise of the Athenians for not fulfilling their initial intention to put to death the male population of Mytilene. The Athenians originally pronounced this decree due to the Mytilenians' responsibility for the crisis in Lesbos: 'this city had thrown off its allegiance, and been the leader in the rebellion of the whole island against their [the Athenians'] supremacy' (GES.I.227/I.289).⁸³ Yet they revoked this decision: an act that Winckelmann commends, claiming that it was dictated by their abhorrence of cruelty. The German scholar even implies that this demonstrates the Athenians' humanity: 'they repented

⁸¹ 'Ja in der größten Erbitterung der Gemüter wurden alle Feindseligkeiten aufgehoben und auf einige Tage vergessen, wenn die olympischen Spiele einfielen, wo alle Griechen einmütig zu der allgemeinen Freude zusammen kamen'.

⁸² 'theatralische[n] und andere[n] Spiele[n]'.

⁸³ 'weil diese Stadt sich ihrer Untertänigkeit entzogen, und die Anführer der Empörung der ganzen Insel wider sie [Athenians] gewesen waren'.

of it, declaring it to be an inhuman decree' (GES. I.227/I.289).⁸⁴ Winckelmann's suggestion is, however, undermined by the Italian translators, who, in contrast, seek to expose the Greeks' immorality. Indeed, through annotation, Fea boldly refutes the integrity of this final decision, as he affirms that the Athenians' change of heart was not simply due to 'un puro sentimento di umanità', but was 'perchè si capì, che Mitilene non era tanto rea quanto si era creduta; e per altre ragioni d'interessi politici' (FE.I.245, OP.II.195). Moreover, both translators seek to dismiss the Greeks' abhorrence of cruelty. Fea reminds readers in the same footnote that, despite the revocation of this particular decree, the Greeks were no strangers to cruelty – 'quanti esempi di crudeltà, e di barbarie non ci racconta Omero?' (FE.I.245, OP.II.195) – whilst both translators add the adjective 'troppo' to describe the cruelty of the inhuman decree: 's'avvidero, anzi dichiararono che *troppo* crudele era stato il decreto' (AM.I.180, FE.I.245, OP.II.195, italics added). The addition of this adjective is a subtle instance of textual manipulation, yet one that again diminishes Winckelmann's argument. Hinting at a yet more callous army, it implies that the Athenians abandoned their original plan not merely due to its inhumanity – the inference being that this would not have swayed them – but rather to the *extent* of its cruelty.

Fourthly, the Italian translators also seek to undermine Winckelmann's idea of the 'refined' Greeks' aversion to violent fighting games (GES.I.145/I.227).⁸⁵ Indeed not only do Amoretti and Fea omit this adjective when describing the 'Greci' (AM.I.118, FE.I.170, OP.II.20), but Fea further reveals in an accompanying footnote that human sacrifices had once been a common occurrence in Greece: 'v'era una legge presso di loro che ordinava sacrifici di vittime umane, e che una volta di fatti erano in uso ne' funerali' (FE.I.170, OP.II.20). Similarly, later in his work Fea provides a loyal translation of Winckelmann's notion that, whilst the Greeks were against gladiator fights, 'the Romans, however, finally succeeded in introducing them even at

⁸⁴ 'Kaum aber war dieser Befehl abgegangen, da es sie gereute, und sie erklärten selbst diesen Entschluß für grausam'.

⁸⁵ Die 'gesittete[n] Griechen'.

Athens' (GES.I.227/I.289),⁸⁶ before again challenging this through annotation. Indeed, he notes in parallel that 'Riferisce Luciano che erano gli Ateniesi, i quali volevano introdurre presso di loro questo genere di spettacoli ad imitazione del popolo di Corinto' (FE.I.245, OP.II.194), promptly undercutting any suggestion of Greek refinement.

Lastly, in addition to the above four instances of undercutting Winckelmann's praise and justification of the Greeks, the translators also seize on the extremely rare instances where the German scholar makes less-than-positive remarks concerning the Greeks, in order to worsen the reputation of their rivals. Winckelmann's approval of Gaius Cotta's assertion in Cicero's dialogues that 'among the great numbers of young persons at Athens, there were only a few possessing true beauty' (GES.I.46/I.160),⁸⁷ for example, is not especially positive in the German version. Yet, through employment of the superlative, Amoretti and Fea render it even less so in the Italian: 'fra tutta la numerosa gioventù d'Atene *pochissimi* v'aveano, che dir si potessero veramente belli' (AM.I.37, FE.I.50, OP.I.106, italics added). In a similar manner, Winckelmann discusses the 'unseasonable reverence towards the works of Greek artists' (GES.I.603/II.162),⁸⁸ by which he refers to a misguided disinclination to correctly label substandard Greek art as Greek. As discussed in the previous chapter, Winckelmann argued this led to the categorization of poor quality art as Roman and thus to the erroneous concept of a specific Roman style of art. Whilst not intrinsically pejorative towards the Greeks, this does imply that Greek art is not always to be praised: an idea again rendered even more negative by the Italian translators. Indeed, rather than simply describing such veneration as 'unseasonable', Amoretti and Fea imply a more fundamental error in such admiration: 'una mal intesa venerazione, in cui si hanno le opere de' greci artisti' (AM.II.119, FE.II.148, OP.III.158-59).

⁸⁶ 'endlich aber führten die Römer diese Spiele selbst zu Athen ein'.

⁸⁷ 'daß zu dessen Zeit unter der Menge junger Leute zu Athen nur einzelne wahrhaftig schön gewesen'.

⁸⁸ 'ein[e] unzeitig[e] Ehrfurcht gegen die Werke griechischer Künstler'.

Thus, whilst Amoretti and Fea in general translate Winckelmann's text accurately, they domesticate his views through subtle textual manipulation and annotation, in order to render, where possible, the Italophobic and Graecophile nature of his original less offensive and more attractive to their Italian readers.

III.8. NATIONALISM

Having thus demonstrated *how* these translators foreignized and predominantly domesticated Winckelmann throughout their translations, the motivation behind such decisions requires examination. In light of Winckelmann's Graecophile and anti-Roman views, as well as the historical context of the period – an era which saw a rise in discontentment at Italy's divided peninsula – I contend that Amoretti's and Fea's alterations to the text were inspired by an early sense of nationalism. There are five reasons for this.

The first is the simple reason that Amoretti's and Fea's overall response to Winckelmann in the translations – both in foreignizing and domesticating him, his works, and his views – appears always to have Italy at the centre of its concerns. In relation to Winckelmann qua scholar and his works, this manifests in two antithetical ways. On the one hand, Fea demonstrates xenophobia in his 1783-84 translation as he purposefully ostracizes Winckelmann by drawing attention to his otherness. On the other hand, the translators attempt to attribute credit to Italy through the renationalization of Winckelmann and his work. Indeed, the translations ascribe to Rome the crucial role of inspiring the *Geschichte*, stating that it was 'ragionata su i vetusti monumenti che qui per la maggior parte conservansi' (AM.I.vii). This concern for the native patria is further apparent in the domestication of Winckelmann's views. From Etruria and ancient Rome to modern Italian scholars, artists, and the peninsula more broadly, Italy is shielded from the negativity present in the *Geschichte*. The

hidden agenda of nationalism thus clearly overrides the translators' aim of accuracy stated in their prefaces.

Secondly, turning to the specific methods of domesticating Winckelmann's views, the nationalistic drive shines through in the duality of the translations' approach. The translators not only glorify Italy but they also deny Greece the superiority which it enjoyed in the *Geschichte*. This two-fold reaction is what one would expect from an openly nationalistic tract: patriotism in flaunting the excellence of their own country and jingoism in diminishing the excellence of their ancient rival.

Thirdly, the translators' lives themselves afford further credence to the argument of a nationalistic motive. After all, not only were Amoretti and Fea strongly opposed to Napoleon, before involvement with the regime became necessary for both of them in order to further their careers, but to repeat Ronald Ridley's description, Fea was 'the leading champion of the protection of Rome's classical heritage'.⁸⁹ Indeed, in his role as Commissario delle Antichità, he sought passionately to protect Italy's heritage, introducing, as discussed above, highly significant edicts to further this cause.

Fourthly, one can also eradicate other possible motives for Amoretti's and Fea's modifications to the text, including any personal antagonism against Winckelmann. It is of great significance that the translators do not simply alter *Winckelmann's* views but also defend their native country by modifying the similarly Italophobic views of others. Brief consideration of how the translations treat Heyne's *Elogio* in a similar way to the *Geschichte* will suffice to show that nationalism was the motivating cause.⁹⁰ Textual manipulation is again a key tactic here. Where Heyne suggests a backwardness on the part of Italian scholars, for instance, claiming that 'this assessment [of the age and originality of a piece of art] is not yet universal

⁸⁹ Ridley, *Eagle and the Spade*, p. 32.

⁹⁰ Such consideration of Heyne's *Elogio* could of course be expanded to the rest of his oeuvre, demonstrating the potential to apply the conceptual framework employed in this thesis to other scholars and their works.

and is hardly ever utilized by Italian antiquarians',⁹¹ Amoretti and Fea ignore the adjective 'Italian', referring instead simply to 'antiquari': 'anzi si ometton sovente dagli antiquari' (AM.I.I-li, FE.I.lxxvii, OP.I.xx). Moreover, immediately thereafter the translators demonstrate yet further omission by excluding the following sentence criticizing Italian restorer, Bartolomeo Cavaceppi: 'Cavaceppi led the antiquarian enthusiasts to error in this [identifying originality], rather than trying to carefully instruct them'.⁹² Turning from people to the peninsula itself, when discussing Winckelmann's experiences in Rome, Heyne also admonishes the Italian city for its inability to provide Winckelmann with adequate or enough books for his work: 'upon flicking through the indexes of the books, of the classics and later editions that he used, it is staggering how much he lacked good editions'.⁹³ Perhaps unsurprisingly, Fea modifies this statement in an accompanying footnote. Indeed, he not only disproves the idea: 'sappiamo di certo che in Roma leggeva [Winckelmann] continuamente il più che poteva', but further affords praise to Rome's collection by highlighting how the German scholar in fact had the opportunity to read texts which 'non ha potuto vedere prima di venire in Italia, e in questa città' (FE.I.lxxiv, OP.I.xvi).

Fifthly, one can also eliminate xenophobia towards Germany exclusively as the motive, as the translations disclose a more general nationalist drive which also affects their presentation of other nations. Indeed a clear example of this is the evident reluctance to praise French scholars in all three *Storie*. Despite Winckelmann's own complex relationship with

⁹¹ Heyne, *Lobschrift*, p. 25. MT: 'Diese Beurteilung ist noch nicht überall, und von den Italiänischen Antiquaren fast gar nicht angewendet worden'.

⁹² Heyne, *Lobschrift*, p. 25. MT: 'Cavaceppi hat hierin die Liebhaber des Altertums eher irre zu führen, als gründlich zu belehren gesucht'.

⁹³ Heyne, *Lobschrift*, p. 24. MT: 'Man erstaunt, wenn man die Verzeichnisse der Bücher, der Klassiker und der Ausgaben, die er gebraucht hat, durchläuft, wie sehr ihm überall die guten Ausgaben gefehlt haben'.

French critics and in particular Anne Claude de Caylus,⁹⁴ he is complimentary towards Caylus in the *Geschichte*: praise that the Italian translators, by contrast, make clear efforts to decrease. There are, for example, at least four instances of the omission of Winckelmann's laudatory adjectives in the Italian translations: with Amoretti and Fea translating, 'the celebrated Count Caylus' (GES.I.100/I.197)⁹⁵ and 'the estimable Count Caylus' (GES.I.520/II.61)⁹⁶ consistently as 'il (signor) conte di Caylus' or a similar title (for example, AM.II.67, FE.II.83, OP.II.1005). Moreover, while Winckelmann invites the reader to 'take the trouble to compare our [his and Caylus'] opinions' on an Aristotelian passage on the different painting styles of Polygnotus, Pauson and Dionysius (GES.I.589/II.111),⁹⁷ implying that the same attention be granted to Caylus' as to his own work, all such recognition of the French scholar is lost in the Italian translations. Amoretti and Fea completely fail to make reference to Caylus, grouping him simply amongst 'degli altri': 'mi contenterò di quì esporre la mia opinione, lasciando al lettore la cura di confrontarla coll'interpretazione *degli altri*' (AM.II.67, FE.II.83, OP.II.1006, italics added).

To conclude, nationalism played a fundamental role in Amoretti's translation, Fea's translation, and in the augmented version of the *Storia* included later in the *Opere*. This is evident in the translators' conflicting ostracization and renationalization of Winckelmann and his *Geschichte*, and in their modification of the text to render it more attractive to the Italian reader. Moreover, beyond the response to Winckelmann, such a motive is further supported by the translators' pro-Italian translation of Heyne's essay, their reactions to French scholars, and even their early reluctance to accept Napoleon. It is plain that in this unstable political

⁹⁴ Winckelmann's dislike of the French is noted above: see Chapter III, p. 136. Moreover, there is not the scope to explore his relationship with Caylus here, yet its complexity is evinced by his harsh criticism of Caylus in personal correspondence, alongside his simultaneous indebtedness to and admiration of much of the French scholar's thought. See Élisabeth Décultot, 'Winckelmann e Caylus: alcuni aspetti di un dibattito storiografico', in *Paesaggi europei*, pp. 37-60 (p. 40).

⁹⁵ 'der berühmte Graf Caylus'.

⁹⁶ 'de[r] würdig[e] Graf Caylus'.

⁹⁷ 'der Leser mag sich die Mühe nehmen, uns beide über jene Stelle gegen einander zu halten'.

period, spanning pre- and early Risorgimento, Amoretti and Fea used foreignization and more predominantly domestication as tools by which to fulfil their nationalistic agenda and present Winckelmann in the manner most favourable to the Italian peninsula.

III.9. CONCLUSION

To conclude, I have shown that the translations demonstrate foreignization and domestication of Winckelmann, his works and his views, and have argued that this was the result of the translators' nationalism. Having undertaken a close and detailed analysis of both Riedel's 1776 German edition and the three *Storie*, it is now possible to derive a number of overarching and comparative observations concerning the Italian response to Winckelmann in the medium of translation.

As to the principal division in the framework of this thesis, between domestication and foreignization, it is strikingly clear that the response to Winckelmann overwhelmingly consisted of domestication. There are only two methods of foreignization in the translations: presenting Italy as a foreign country to Winckelmann, and drawing attention to the *Geschichte's* German origins. By contrast, there are five methods of domestication: portraying Italy as Winckelmann's homeland; renationalizing the original *Geschichte* as a product of Italy; presenting the translations as Italian *Storie* to be used in preference to the original; textual manipulation; and annotation. In fact, looking at the translations as a whole, the first three of these methods of domestication even counterbalance the limited instances of foreignization. This heavy tilting towards domestication differs from the response to Winckelmann seen in the media of art scholarship and artistic journals, as will be explored in Chapters IV and V. Yet one can already identify that there was a strong drive for the domestication of Winckelmann at both the start and end of the period examined by this thesis – Amoretti and Fea's translations having been published towards the beginning, and the *Opere* at the very end.

Turning next to the pattern within domestication, the vast majority of instances of this reaction take the form of the translators domesticating Winckelmann's views. It must be acknowledged that the translations are, on the whole, faithful translations of the *Geschichte*. However, it is also beyond doubt that there are a significant number of deliberate changes to Riedel's 1776 German edition. The cumulative effect of these individually subtle modifications to the *Geschichte* is to present Winckelmann's views on a wide array of subjects as more attractive to the Italian readership. It is somewhat surprising that translations domesticate Winckelmann's views to the extent that they do, given that all three translations stated that a core objective was accuracy. Whilst they claimed to be correcting errors in Winckelmann's work, they were in fact adding their own, purposeful inaccuracies in their translations. I have suggested that the reason for this apparent contradiction is nationalism: their desire to defend and praise the Italian peninsula essentially overrode the desire for precision.

Exploring in greater detail how the translations domesticate Winckelmann's views, there is more glorification of Italy than denial of Greek superiority. Recalling the six subject matters, five of these involve domestication by improving the presentation of Italy: Etruscan art and society; ancient Roman art and society; modern Italian artists; modern Italian scholars; and the peninsula and its people. Only one subject matter concerns an elevation of Italy through criticism of its rival, ancient Greece. Of course, both manifestations of domestication present Italy in a more attractive light and accord with the explanation of nationalism, but it is notable that the translations were principally concerned with the favourable presentation of Italy; they had the patria at the centre of their concerns.

When measured against the plethora of instances of domestication of Winckelmann's views, there are comparatively few instances of domestication of the *Geschichte* and its author, though they are nonetheless powerful. The limited number of examples is unsurprising, given that the medium of translation provided far greater opportunity to engage

with Winckelmann's views. What is notable is the long-term impact of the translators' attempt to renationalize Winckelmann's oeuvre. Examination of academic journals in Chapter V, a medium which provided more scope for these forms of domestication, confirms that these efforts were largely successful. Following the translations, Italian readers viewed Winckelmann through the lens of Fea, who was seen almost as an alternative, Italian author of the *Geschichte*. In a very real sense, therefore, the translations brought Winckelmann's text into domestic scholarship.

Returning to an assessment of the overall response to Winckelmann in this medium, there is another noteworthy trend in the development of the translations over time: in each new edition, there is a yet more nationalistic response to Winckelmann, whether in the form of foreignization or domestication. As compared with Amoretti's translation Fea increased the overall level of both foreignization and domestication. His preface accounts for the sole examples of foreignization of Winckelmann and his work: a different form of response to Amoretti, but no less nationalistic. In addition, Fea increased the domestication of Winckelmann's views, in particular through his extensive annotation. In turn, the *Opere* retained all of the domestication of the German scholar's views found in Fea's earlier edition but simultaneously exhibited even more domestication of the author and his works. In line with the suggestion that nationalism was the driving force behind both foreignization and domestication, I suggest that the heightened response in the *Opere* reflects the increased intensity of nationalism by 1830-34. This, of course, accords with the history of the period, as nationalism increased following the fall of Napoleon and continued to escalate in the period approaching Italian Unification.

CHAPTER IV:
WINCKELMANN IN ITALIAN ART LITERATURE

[Ci sono delle] distinzioni di età, di scuole, e di stili, già fissate ingegnosamente [...] da Winckelmann e dall'istesso Lanzi; sulle quali molti troppo stretti si tengono, e non sanno partirsene ancora.

Girolamo Amati (GA.XII.356)

IV.1. INTRODUCTION

In light of the foreignization and domestication uncovered in the Italian translations of Winckelmann's *Geschichte*, I will now examine the presence of and reactions to Winckelmann in the yet broader medium of Italian art literature. This was, after all, the sphere in which Winckelmann himself wrote, as he is commonly considered to have founded the discipline of art history. With his *Geschichte*, he introduced a new emphasis on the historical development of ancient art, beyond artists' biographies.¹

There is naturally not the scope to consider all art writers here, so this chapter will focus on five case studies: writers of art history that demonstrate an extended response to the German scholar. In selecting these case studies, a number of criteria were employed: choosing writers who were active between 1755 and 1834, and who – in order to facilitate an examination of their response to Winckelmann – also devoted at least some attention to ancient art. Catalogues or essays examining specific monuments will not be considered here and every scholar selected has at least one principal work in their oeuvre which, like Winckelmann's own *Geschichte*, sought to explore the history of art in an extended fashion. The criteria further exclude another two categories of art literature. First, writers who had a separate, overarching aim in composing their oeuvre: most commonly constituting part of a dialogue with another contemporary.² Second, intellectuals largely writing towards the end of

¹ Artists' biographies were commonplace in this period, having been introduced in the Renaissance by Vasari.

² Examples of art writers omitted for this reason (and in some cases also other criteria) are: Giuseppe Spalletti (Mengs) and Francesco Inghirami (Giuseppe Micali). The scholars in parentheses are those to which Spalletti and Inghirami were principally responding. On Spalletti and Mengs, see Benedetto Croce, *Aesthetic: As Science of Expression and General Linguistic* (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1995), p. 269. On Inghirami and Micali, see De Francesco, *The Antiquity of the Italian Nation*, pp. 67-72.

the period, who demonstrate inspiration from Winckelmann, yet had most clearly adopted these ideas at a remove, through another Italian scholar.³

On the basis of these criteria, the five case studies that I will explore in this chapter are Giovanni Battista Piranesi, Giambattista Gherardo D'Arco, Francesco Milizia, Luigi Lanzi, and Leopoldo Cicognara, focusing on the central and most appropriate works in each scholar's expansive oeuvre. These writers afford a broad analysis of art literature in this period as they cover a range of art forms: from painting, sculpture, and architecture to art found in archaeological discoveries. They further cover the span of time here investigated: from Piranesi writing in the 1760s to Cicognara, who published a second edition of his *Del bello: ragionamenti* in 1825. Moreover, and perhaps most significantly, all five art writers engage with Winckelmann in different ways: overtly and covertly, with and without agreement, and all focusing on different elements of his writing, be it his arguments concerning the origins of art, the external circumstances he believed necessary to art, or even his opinions on the masters of the Italian Renaissance. Analysis of these five scholars' key works thus allows for a balanced investigation of the responses to Winckelmann in Italian art literature.

The attention that these writers and their relationships with Winckelmann have received in scholarship will be explored in due course. This, of course, differs from figure to figure, yet all such work in this area nevertheless shares the same lacuna: there is a distinct lack of attention to both *how* the writers reacted to Winckelmann and, in light of their wider aims, *why* they did so. In assessing the considerable evidence in all five oeuvres that Winckelmann was not simply treated as a neutral subject, but, as in Chapter III, was rather foreignized and domesticated, I intend to fill the gap in scholarship. I will thus first explore how

³ Art writers omitted for this reason (and sometimes other criteria) include Melchiorre Delfico. Delfico's work, *Nuove ricerche sul bello*, demonstrates clear Winckelmannian influence. However, as his annotations show, this influence was plainly sourced through Cicognara. See Delfico, *Nuove ricerche sul bello* (Naples: Agnello Nobile, 1818).

such methods of foreignization and domestication manifest in the works of Piranesi, D'Arco, Milizia, Lanzi, and Cicognara, before second considering their motives behind such responses.

IV.2. EXISTING SCHOLARSHIP

Before examining the reactions to Winckelmann, however, I will briefly outline the state of existing scholarship in this area. As alluded to above, the consideration that these art writers have received in scholarship – their work in general and their engagement with Winckelmann – differs from figure to figure, each of which I will now discuss separately.

Piranesi is the writer who has garnered the most attention, particularly in English scholarship. This includes early studies by Wilton-Ely, Wittkower, and James Lees-Milne, which, whilst outdated and inaccurate in some respects, are useful sources of background information, especially when read in parallel with the more recent work by Kantor-Kazovsky, who affords an updated, detailed exploration of Piranesi's written work. In relation to Piranesi and Winckelmann, two articles have been published: 'Piranèse et Winckelmann: Un conflit théorique pour la primauté dans l'art (1755-1765)' by Vassiliki Petridou,⁴ and 'Winckelmann, Piranesi and the Graeco-Roman Controversies' by Ralph Stern.⁵ These articles predominantly consider the scholars' opposing beliefs and objectives, as well as some similarities between their works. They do not, however, examine *how* Piranesi engaged with Winckelmann and, moreover, how this contributed to his broader aims: a subject missing from Piranesi scholarship and one which I will explore in detail in this chapter.

In contrast to Piranesi, D'Arco is an art writer, on whom – despite the fascinating relevance of his art-historical work to this investigation – close to no scholarship has been

⁴ Vassiliki Petridou, 'Piranèse et Winckelmann: Un conflit théorique pour la primauté dans l'art (1755-1765)', in *Athènes Ville Capitale*, ed. by Y. Tsiomis (Athens: Ministère de la culture-caisse des fonds archéologique, 1985), pp. 44-46.

⁵ Ralph Stern, 'Winckelmann, Piranesi and the Graeco-Roman Controversies: A late exchange in the "Querelle des anciens et des modernes"', *Architectura*, 33 (2003), 62-94.

dedicated. Indeed, the limited background information is here sourced mainly from Corrado Vivanti, who authored the *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* article on his life and works in 1961.⁶ I will thus provide here both a much-needed study of D'Arco's art-historical text and the first consideration of the fundamental role that Winckelmann plays in this work.

A number of articles examining Milizia's art literature appeared between the 1950s and 1980s, by Ulivi, Bigi, Zampetti, and Prozzillo. As in Piranesi scholarship, these are useful in part, yet are outdated, written in a very different context to today. In more recent times, Milizia has received renewed attention. In 2002 a monograph appeared entitled *Francesco Milizia e la cultura del Settecento*,⁷ based on an identically-named conference held in Bari in 1999, after which Pasquali published a largely biographical article in 2005.⁸ Yet, as regards Winckelmann and Milizia more specifically, research is still markedly low. Marolda published an article on 'Milizia, Winckelmann e le "immagini spirituali"' in 1986,⁹ though this – in stark contrast to this chapter – largely concentrates on Winckelmann and Milizia's similarities and differences in opinion on iconology, allegory, and language, with attention, too, on Milizia's *Del Teatro*.¹⁰ I am not aware of any other contributions to the discussion. Thus, as well as bringing Milizia to the English language for the first time, I intend in this chapter to augment the limited understanding of the relationship between Milizia and his contemporary, Winckelmann.

Early scholarship on Lanzi includes contributions from Giulio Natali and a dissertation on Lanzi's history of art and Etruscology authored by Bartolomeo Nogara in 1910.¹¹ Since then,

⁶ Corrado Vivanti, 'Arco, Giovanni Battista Gherardo d'', in *Dizionario biografico*, III (1961), 789-93.

⁷ *Francesco Milizia e la cultura del Settecento*, ed. by Mariella Basile Bonsante and Grazia Distaso (Galatina: Congedo, 2002).

⁸ Susanna Pasquali, 'Francesco Milizia a Roma, 1761-1798', in *Antonio Canova, la cultura figurativa e letteraria dei grandi centri italiani*, ed. by F. Mazzocca and G. Venturi, 2 vols (Bassano del Grappa: Istituto di ricerca per gli studi su Canova e il neoclassicismo, 2005), I, 89-101.

⁹ Paolo Marolda, 'Milizia, Winckelmann e le "immagini spirituali"', *La Rassegna della letteratura Italiana*, 3 (1986), 537-45.

¹⁰ Milizia's *Del teatro: Trattato completo, formale e materiale del teatro* is not examined in this chapter given its unrelated subject matter.

¹¹ Giulio Natali, 'Il Varrone del secolo XVIII', in *Idee, costumi, uomini del Settecento: studi e saggi letterarii* (Turin: Società tipografico-editrice nazionale, 1926), pp. 363-86; Bartolomeo Nogara, 'L'abate Luigi Lanzi e

however, there has been a distinct rise in interest in Lanzi in modern scholarship, as attested by the two recent monographs entitled *La storia pittorica di Luigi Lanzi: arti, storia e musei nel Settecento* (2003) and *Le fila del tempo: il sistema storico di Luigi Lanzi* (2006) by scholars, Chiara Gauna and Massimiliano Rossi, respectively.¹² This is not to mention the attention he receives in more general works on eighteenth-century art history, such as that by Bickendorf and Kaufmann. All such scholars make, often interesting, allusions to Lanzi's relationship with Winckelmann's work, yet there is as yet no discrete examinations on these two writers. I will thus explore how Lanzi reacted to the German scholar and how this related to his wider objectives.

Lastly, there are a number of informative sources on Cicognara, written by Pappalardo, Haskell, and Fedi, who, despite focusing on Cicognara rather than Winckelmann and Cicognara, make brief mention of Winckelmann when discussing the Italian scholar's Classicism and aesthetics. This changed in 2016, as Stefano Ferrari published the first and long-required examination on Winckelmann and Cicognara. This article is crucial to the understanding of the relationship between these scholars. He investigates in detail important aspects such as the history behind Cicognara's reading of Winckelmann, the clear inspiration he draws from the German scholar's work, as well as his often-overlooked criticism of Winckelmann, largely encouraged by his knowledge of Heyne.¹³ With this important source in mind, I seek to expand Ferrari's work by identifying further examples of Winckelmann's influence on Cicognara and assessing the connection between Cicognara's patriotism and his responses to the German scholar. Indeed, whilst Ferrari alludes to Cicognara's nationalism when discussing his effusive admiration for Canova, he does not continue to relate this patriotic sentiment to his broader engagement with Winckelmann.

l'opera sua negli studi etruscologici e di storia dell'arte' (dissertation, Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia, 1910).

¹² Massimiliano Rossi, *Le fila del tempo: il sistema storico di Luigi Lanzi* (Florence: L. S. Olschki, 2006).

¹³ See Chapter III.3.7.

Having thus introduced my five case studies, the criteria on which I selected them, and the existing scholarship surrounding them, it is now necessary to contextualize these choices. This includes a brief examination of the wider scholarly scene, 1755-1834 – including some of the writers that did not meet the criteria set out at the start of this chapter – followed by a more extensive consideration of my five chosen art writers.

IV.3. CONTEXT: ART WRITERS AND THEIR WORKS

IV.3.1. Art literature, 1755-1834

Largely inspired by the heightened interest in art and archaeology – as a result of the Grand Tour, the development of museums, and the new excavations at Herculaneum, Pompeii, and Paestum – the amount of art literature produced markedly increased in this period.¹⁴

It was during this time that Visconti published his well-known *Museo Pio-Clementino*,¹⁵ together with numerous other writers, who published on art, its history, and its aesthetics. The format such texts took was wide-ranging. There were localized art-histories of a particular city or region, including, for example Anton Maria Zanetti's *Della pittura veneziana* (1771), just as there were other publications that concentrated on individual pieces of art, as was the focus in Stefano Raffe's *Osservazioni sopra alcuni antichi monumenti esistenti nella villa dell'eminentissimo Signor Cardinale Alessandro Albani* (1821). Moreover, there was a rise in works on aesthetics, too, as Giuseppe Spalletti and Melchiorre Delfico reveal with their respective *Saggio sulla bellezza* (1765) and *Nuove ricerche sul bello* (1818), to name but a few.

¹⁴ Jukka Jokilehto, 'A History of Architectural Conservation' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of York, 1986), p. 91 <http://www.iccom.org/ifrcdn/pdf/ICCROM_05_HistoryofConservation00_en.pdf> [accessed 18 September 2017].

¹⁵ It should be noted that Visconti's work is not examined here given the likely biased nature of his views in light of his working for Napoleon. For information on this and Visconti in general, see Salvatore Settis, 'Da Centro a periferia: l'archeologia degli italiani nel secolo XIX', in *Lo studio storico del mondo antico nella cultura italiana dell'Ottocento*, ed. by Leandro Polverini (Naples: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, 1993), pp. 301-34 (p. 316).

In the same period as, and in many ways related to, this increase of interest in art history and aesthetics, there were also a number of scholars who responded publicly to Winckelmann's writings. These include the previously mentioned Domenico Augusto Bracci, whose heated disputes with Winckelmann were canvassed in Chapter II,¹⁶ as well other scholars such as Carlantonio Pilati and Giovanni Battista Casanova.¹⁷ Pilati's response to Winckelmann, for example, was complex, as he recognized the merits of his work, yet was also not hesitant to criticize the German scholar for what he believed to be weaknesses, especially including 'lo scarso peso che egli [Winckelmann] concede all'esperienza artistica'.¹⁸

As explored above, the aim of this chapter is to focus on case studies that bring these two areas of interest together: concentrating accordingly on Piranesi, D'Arco, Milizia, Lanzi, and Cicognara, whose works of art literature demonstrate an extended response to the German scholar. Before examining this response, however, it is important here to contextualize these writers – their works, their beliefs, and their scholarly agendas – each of which I will now consider in turn.¹⁹

IV.3.2. Giovanni Battista Piranesi

Giovanni Battista Piranesi (1720-78) began his career as an artist and continued throughout his life to produce collections of sketches and engravings. He was extremely proud of Rome and its heritage and attempted in his artistic work to demonstrate the city's distinction. When, however, in the mid-eighteenth century, the superiority of ancient Greece over Rome began to be advocated in earnest by various scholars across Europe (including, for instance, Caylus, Le

¹⁶ See Chapter II, p. 96.

¹⁷ For Casanova's reaction to Winckelmann, see Edoardo Tortarolo, 'Un critico italiano di Winckelmann: Giovanni Battista Casanova', in *Il settecento tedesco*, pp. 393-416.

¹⁸ Ferrari, 'Egli eccellente storico', p. 421.

¹⁹ Whilst the dates of all first publications are given in these introductory sections – as it is significant to note the scholarly context in which the works originated – the art writers' final non-posthumous editions have, as far as possible, been consulted in this analysis. This is in order to allow for any revisions that the art writers themselves made to their original works, and thus does not include simple reprints.

Roy, and, of course, Winckelmann), Piranesi turned to apologetic writing. This swiftly developed, as Wilton-Ely notes, into 'a vigorous polemical defence of Romanità'.²⁰ He wrote a number of works, the principal four of which are: *Della magnificenza ed architettura de' Romani* (1761), *Parere su l'architettura* (1765), *Della introduzione e del progresso delle belle arti in Europa ne' tempi antichi* (1765), and *Ragionamento apologetico in difesa dell'architettura egizia e toscana* (1769).

Piranesi's first major tract, *Della magnificenza*, is predominantly a defence of ancient Rome and Etruria, written in both Latin and Italian. In this work, Piranesi criticizes the exaggerated ornamentation of the Greeks, praising instead the simplicity of Italic art. The *Della magnificenza* was publicly criticized three years later by French scholar, Jean-Paul Mariette, who penned a letter entitled 'Lettre de M. Mariette sur un Ouvrage de M. Piranesi concernant les Antiquités Romaines' in the *Gazette littéraire de l'Europe*.²¹ Mariette here not only seeks to reaffirm Greek supremacy over Italic and Roman art, but further refutes Piranesi's criticisms of Greek ornamentation, clarifying that it was Greek art that valued simplicity.²² Piranesi responded in 1765 with his *Osservazioni sopra la Lettre de M. Mariette aux auteurs de la Gazette Littéraire de l'Europe* (1765).²³ He also published in the same year his two essays, *Parere* and *Della introduzione*. Without admitting his reversal of thought, Piranesi alters his theoretical argument in the *Parere*. Indeed in this tract— which is structured as a debate between the Philhellene, Protopiropo, and Piranesi's mouthpiece, Didascalo²⁴ — he proclaims, without introduction, his new theory in favour of ornamentation and opposed to severity in

²⁰ John Wilton-Ely, 'The Art of Polemic: Piranesi and the Graeco-Roman Controversy', in *La Grecia antica: mito e simbolo per l'età della grande rivoluzione. Genesi e crisi di un modello nella cultura del Settecento*, ed. by Philippe Boutry (Milan: Guerini, 1991), pp. 121-30 (p. 123).

²¹ Pierre Jean Mariette, 'Lettre de M. Mariette sur un ouvrage de M. Piranesi concernant les antiquités romaines', *Gazette Littéraire de l'Europe*, 3 (Sept-Dec 1764), 232-62.

²² Mariette, p. 239, and Dora Wiebenson, *Sources of Greek Revival Architecture* (London: A. Zwemmer, 1969), p. 47.

²³ Giovanni Battista Piranesi, 'Osservazioni di Gio. Battista Piranesi sopra la lettre de Monsieur Mariette aux auteurs de la Gazette Littéraire de l'Europe', in *The Polemical Works*, pp. 1-8. In accordance with the criteria outlined at the beginning of this chapter, this direct response to another scholar is not examined here.

²⁴ Wilton-Ely, 'The Art of Polemic', p. 125.

architecture, the latter of which he now argues originated with the Greeks. Finally, in 1769 his *Ragionamento* appeared. This essay, which constitutes the introduction to a collection of plates entitled, *Diverse maniere d'adornare i cammini ed ogni altra parte degli edifizii desunte dall'architettura egizia, etrusca e greca*, was addressed to a wide audience through parallel texts in Italian, French, and English.²⁵ Piranesi's philosophy develops yet further here as he affirms his views on eclecticism. Whilst Piranesi's aim throughout his oeuvre was to defend Italian production and advance the art of his day, in the *Ragionamento* this latter aim entails encouraging artists and architects to draw inspiration from an eclectic range of ancient sources. This principally involves Etruscan and some Roman art, but also includes, as he now accepted the Romans themselves had done (RA.15),²⁶ Egyptian and Greek work, too (RA.33).

Piranesi never refers to Winckelmann in his work and was writing before the Italian translations of the *Geschichte*. Yet, with the *Gedanken* in French translation (1755) at his disposal throughout his period of writing,²⁷ and the *Geschichte* (1766)²⁸ and *Monumenti* (1767) also available for his later *Ragionamento*, the view that Piranesi's arguments are at least partly a response to Winckelmann has become commonplace in scholarship.²⁹ To some extent this belief is based on misguided reasoning. For example, the claim that Piranesi was directly influenced by Winckelmann in the *Della magnificenza* simply lacks convincing evidence.³⁰

²⁵ Wilton-Ely, 'The Art of Polemic', p. 130. I refer to the *Ragionamento*, rather than the *Diverse maniere*, throughout this chapter as it is in this essay (rather than the associated collection of plates) that Piranesi develops his antiquarian discussion.

²⁶ Wittkower, 'Piranesi's Architectural Creed', in *Studies in the Italian Baroque*, ed. by Rudolf Wittkower (London: Thames and Hudson, 1975), pp. 236-46 (p. 246), and Cristofani, pp. 113-15.

²⁷ See Chapters I, n. 77 and II p. 98.

²⁸ This 1766 edition refers to the first French translation (completed by Sellius), see Chapter III.3.3.

²⁹ Piranesi's use of the French editions of Winckelmann's work is assumed given his knowledge of the language (exemplified by his exchange with Mariette), and his activity in the sphere. See Cristofani, pp. 111-12. Moreover, the French translations of the *Gedanken* and *Geschichte* have been consulted to confirm the presence in these translations of all passages employed when identifying Piranesi's reactions to Winckelmann. *Gedanken*: Winckelmann, 'Pensées sur l'imitation des Grecs dans les ouvrages de peinture & de sculpture', *Nouvelle Bibliothèque Germanique*, 18 (Oct-Dec 1755), 302-29 (pp. 303, 315, 322, 326), and the *Geschichte*: Winckelmann, *Histoire de l'art*, trans. by Sellius: I, 62-64; II, 186-87.

³⁰ Scholars who suggest as such include: Wilton-Ely, *The Mind and Art of Giovanni Battista Piranesi* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1978), p. 79, and Petridou, p. 45.

Nevertheless, despite these incongruities in the evidence presented (the details of which are beyond the scope of this investigation) it is clear, on analysis of Piranesi's work, that Winckelmann was an important point of reference, particularly towards the end of his oeuvre. Indeed, in addition to a small number of likely Winckelmannian references in Piranesi's 1765 essays, the majority of influence can be identified in his *Ragionamento*, when more of Winckelmann's key texts were available.

IV.3.3. Giambattista Gherardo D'Arco

Giambattista Gherardo (1739-91) was born to a noble lineage in Arco, Trentino. He spent much of his young life in Mantua and eventually settled there, becoming increasingly involved in local politics, before eventually being called to the Mantuan government.³¹ Known for his Enlightened views, 'il maggiore esponente della cultura illuministica a Mantova',³² D'Arco was a passionate reader of Montesquieu and, despite not nourishing revolutionary sentiments, was convinced of the possibility of societal reform, particularly through economic modernization.³³ The economic principles about which D'Arco felt most passionate are reflected in his writings. In his *Dell'armonia politico-economica fra la città ed il suo territorio*, for example, his condemnation of mercantilism is plain,³⁴ as is his disapproval of a country's or city's wealth being solely in the hands of a few. Correspondingly, he also supported free trade, as demonstrated in his essay, *Del diritto ai transiti*, and further spoke out against the damage to society caused by isolated economic nuclei in his *Dell'influenza del Ghetto nello Stato*, which has often been misinterpreted as anti-Semitic.³⁵

³¹ Vivanti, *Le campagne del Mantovano nell'età delle riforme* (Milan: Feltrinelli, 1959), pp. 76-77.

³² Vivanti, *Le campagne*, p. 240.

³³ Vivanti, *Dizionario biografico*, p. 790.

³⁴ Paolo Bernardini, *La sfida dell'uguaglianza: gli ebrei a Mantova nell'età della rivoluzione francese* (Rome: Bulzoni, 1996), p. 63.

³⁵ Vivanti, *Dizionario biografico*, p. 791.

Alongside economics, D'Arco also entered 'nel dibattutissimo tema postwinckelmanniano Grecia-Italia',³⁶ by publishing in 1785 his *Della patria primitiva delle arti e del disegno*. As the title suggests, D'Arco's objective in this work was to uncover the real origin, the 'prima culla' of art (DPP.6). Inspired by scholars Guarnacci and Tiraboschi (DPP.15), he even hoped to end the Greek-Roman debate with this tract:

[...] pur sciolta essa non sarebbesi nè posto fine alle disquisizioni, se prima io non prometteva formalmente all'adunanza tutta di esaminare e discutere se dir si debba, che la Italia stata sia debitrice alla Grecia, o la Grecia all'Italia così riguardo all'introduzione come rispetto all'avanzamento dell'arti del disegno. (DPP.17)

Pronouncing that it is most 'verosimile, che la Grecia sia stata debitrice all'Italia' (DPP.74), D'Arco believed that Italy was not only art's 'prima culla' but the origin of its advancement, too: an argument he develops through discussion of why opposing scholars (predominantly including Winckelmann) erred.

D'Arco's awareness of and reference to Winckelmann's work is central to *Della patria*. He frequently makes mention of 'il Wink', 'il Winkel', and 'il Winkelmann', and often virtually replicates the Italian translation of the *Geschichte*.³⁷ This is almost certainly Fea's edition, as writing soon after the second translation's publication, D'Arco reveals that he was sent his own copy and that he only trusted the new version: 'io credeva poter affidarmi soltanto alla nuova' (DPP.18).

IV.3.4. Francesco Milizia

Francesco Milizia (1725-98) was an art historian born in Oria, in the modern region of Puglia. In 1761 he moved to Rome, where he developed an enthusiastic interest in architecture,

³⁶ Sandra Pinto, 'La promozione delle arti negli Stati italiani dall'età delle riforme all'Unità', in *Storia dell'arte italiana*, ed. by Giulio Bollati and others, 12 vols (Turin: Einaudi, 1979-83), VI.2 (1982), 791-1079 (p. 826).

³⁷ Compare, for example, (DPP.76-77) and (FE.I.169).

especially that of the ancient Greeks.³⁸ He served here as Superintendent of the Farnese lands in the Papal State,³⁹ yet retired from the position in 1782 to concentrate on writing. Milizia was a successful author, whose main works include: *Memorie degli architetti antichi e moderni* (1781); *Dell'arte di vedere nelle belle arti del disegno secondo i principii di Sulzer e di Mengs* (1781); and *Roma delle belle arti del disegno: parte prima dell'architettura civile* (1787).

Memorie degli architetti antichi e moderni did not have this title or even bear Milizia's name until the third and fourth editions in 1781 and 1785. It was initially published anonymously as *Le vite de' più celebri architetti d'ogni nazione e d'ogni tempo precedute da un saggio sopra l'architettura* in 1768,⁴⁰ followed by a French edition two years later.⁴¹ Despite the clear Vasarian inspiration behind this title, Milizia in fact explores here not only Italian but European production more broadly and concentrates, too, on architecture rather than biographical specifics. The time period of his analysis spanned from the ancient period to the modern day. Turning then from a historical to a theoretical focus, Milizia's *Dell'arte di vedere*, first published in 1781, is a differently structured work. He discusses sculpture, painting, architecture, and engraving in four respective chapters, in which he describes and advances his opinion on a number of specific examples of art. He adds a *Riflessioni* to the sculpture chapter, too, which constitutes a more general consideration of his aesthetic principles. Despite the title's reference to Mengs and Sulzer, the ideas therein are commonly considered, as indeed Zampetti and Natali both affirm, to reflect rather 'gli impulsi' 'della sua personalità', 'del suo

³⁸ Alexander Grönert, 'Francesco Milizia: Principj Di Architettura Civile', in *Architectural Theory: From the Renaissance to the Present*, ed. by Bernd Evers and Christof Thoenes (London: Taschen, 2003), pp. 184-87 (p. 184). Milizia also demonstrated an appreciation for Gothic art, yet his philo-Hellenic views are naturally most relevant here.

³⁹ There is disagreement in scholarship as to whether Milizia accepted this position. The information here is sourced from Grönert, p. 184, yet Natali claims Milizia never accepted the Superintendent role, preferring to keep to his studies, Natali, 'Il Don Chisciotte del bello ideale', in *Idee, costumi, uomini*, pp. 341-56 (p. 344).

⁴⁰ Francesco Milizia, *Le vite de' più celebri architetti d'ogni nazione e d'ogni tempo precedute da un saggio sopra l'architettura* (Rome: Paolo Giunchi Komarek, 1768).

⁴¹ Natali, 'Il Don Chisciotte', pp. 343, 348, and Francesco Milizia, *Notizie di Francesco Milizia scritte da lui medesimo con un catalogo delle sue opere* (Bassano: Remondini, 1804), p. xii.

genio e le lezioni della natura'.⁴² Returning to a more historiographic approach six years later, Milizia structures *Roma delle belle arti* chronologically, focusing here solely on Italian architectural history and production. After a short introduction to some key architectural principles, this analysis again covers a broad period of time, from the Italic architecture under the Etruscan kings up until the seventeenth century. As Milizia himself states in his autobiography, this work was written 'per secondare poi le premure di un amico di alto rango il Cav. Zulian Ambasciatore Veneto presso la S. Sede', as a guide for visitors to Rome.⁴³ Moreover, accounting for the latter half of its title 'Parte prima dell'architettura civile', this tract – prior to censorship arising from his anticlerical views, to be discussed in due course – had been intended to be the first of subsequent 'parti'.⁴⁴

Despite praising Rome's ancient resources, Milizia also demonstrated, in both his *Roma delle belle arti* and other works, a thorough disenchantment with the Rome of his day. Not only was its modern art humiliating in light of its past glories (RBA.206), but Milizia was further indignant at the futility of the academies to improve the situation and at the destruction of ancient art that was occurring in Rome. This last complaint, in particular, prompted great animosity towards the Papacy, whom he believed was responsible for much of this destruction. Collectively, Milizia's embittered views concerning the state of Rome affected the publication of his work.⁴⁵ Indeed, as the conclusion to his *Roma delle belle arti* earned him the label of heretic, for example – 'Questa descrizione delle fabbriche Romane è dalla Cloaca Massima alla Sagrestia di S. Pietro: dall'ottimo al pessimo' (RBA.205) – this, as indicated above, thwarted any plans to publish further volumes.

⁴² Pietro Zampetti, 'Francesco Milizia uomo e critico d'arte', in *Sensibilità e razionalità nel Settecento*, ed. by Vittore Branca, 2 vols (Florence: Sansoni, 1967), II, 675-90 (p. 682), and Natali, 'Il Don Chisciotte', p. 353.

⁴³ *Notizie di Francesco Milizia*, p. vi; Pasquali, p. 98.

⁴⁴ Italo Prozzillo, *Francesco Milizia: teorico e storico dell'architettura* (Naples: Guida, 1971), p. 10.

⁴⁵ Ferruccio Ulivi, 'Francesco Milizia scrittore', *Paragone*, 31 (1952), 3-18 (pp. 16-17), and Natali, *Il Settecento*, 5th edn, 2 vols (Milan: Vallardi, 1960), I, 653.

In light of the disappointing nature of present society, Milizia's objective was to raise the level of contemporary architecture by both subjecting it to permanent critique and promoting essential theoretical principles.⁴⁶ He believed this could be achieved through the reestablishment of the academies,⁴⁷ as well as through tracts like those he was producing (aimed both at architects and the wider public).⁴⁸ Combined, he hoped this would lead to a 'ritorno dell'architettura alla purezza delle forme classiche sotto la guida della filosofia e della ragione'.⁴⁹ The principles that Milizia encouraged in his tracts were, unlike Piranesi's and D'Arco's, sympathetic to Winckelmann's philo-Hellenic views: aiming himself to 'rimettere quest'arte sul gusto greco, che è veramente il vero, il bello'.⁵⁰

Despite uncertainty surrounding Milizia's knowledge of the German language,⁵¹ the publication dates of his works confirm that the following of Winckelmann's texts – albeit at different stages in his writing and in French and Italian translations – were available to him. These are: the *Gedanken*, *Geschichte*, *Monumenti*, and moreover given his architectural focus, Winckelmann's *Anmerkungen über die Baukunst der alten Tempel* and the *Anmerkungen über die Baukunst*. Whilst this alone renders Milizia's knowledge of Winckelmann's texts probable, his reading of such works is all the more likely when one considers his personal relationship with Winckelmann. Indeed, securing for himself the role as 'un sicuro protagonista della scena neoclassica italiana',⁵² Milizia was a member of the same circle of art enthusiasts as Winckelmann, Mengs, and De Azara. Milizia's reading of Winckelmann is finally established in

⁴⁶ Grönert, p. 186.

⁴⁷ Grönert, p. 187.

⁴⁸ Prozzillo, p. 155.

⁴⁹ Prozzillo, p. 9.

⁵⁰ He states as such in a letter to Sangiovanni, 05/04/1788, see Natali, 'Il Don Chisciotte', p. 349.

⁵¹ Pasquali argues that Milizia's German knowledge can be presumed as he was later involved in translating Mengs' *Gedanken über die Schönheit und den Geschmack in der Malerei*, yet other scholars such as Joshua C. Taylor express doubt concerning these abilities: Pasquali, pp. 94-95, and Taylor, 'Francesco Milizia: The Art of Seeing in the Fine Arts of Design According to the Principles of Sulzer and Mengs (1781)', in *Nineteenth-Century Theories of Art*, ed. by Joshua C. Taylor (London: University of California Press, 1987), pp. 27-40 (p. 29).

⁵² Marco Russo, *Francesco Milizia e il teatro del suo tempo: architettura, musica, scena, acustica* (Trento: Università degli Studi di Trento, 2011), p. 15.

his later work, *Dizionario delle belle arti del disegno*, 1797, through his rare but overt references here to the German scholar.⁵³ The nature of these remarks, which need not be examined here, is brief: including suggestion of Winckelmann's misidentification of the Flora Farnese;⁵⁴ censure for his overly-positive and blinkered attention on ancient art;⁵⁵ and two acerbic remarks on Winckelmann's Etruscan research. As regards the latter, Milizia mocks, for example, Winckelmann's failure to comment on the artistic value of the Etruscan paintings in the tombs of ancient Tarquinia: 'su l'arte sta zitto, Bravo'.⁵⁶ Whilst fleeting, such references to the German scholar are nevertheless significant as confirmation of Milizia's familiarity with Winckelmann's work.

The overall rarity of such references to Winckelmann is, however, worthy of note. Indeed, the few examples in the *Dizionario* are so exceptional that acclaimed scholar Emilio Bigi understandably overlooks them, stating Milizia 'non cita mai [...] il nome di Winckelmann'.⁵⁷ Winckelmann's name appears in the *Dizionario* – in which, fittingly, Milizia's aim was to collate the views of important European academics in a then-modern encyclopaedic format⁵⁸ – yet is absent from the rest of his oeuvre. In his other works, where Milizia both reveals his own opinions and noticeably engages in far greater detail with Winckelmann's ideas, it is significant that he conceals the inspiration afforded him by the German scholar and his writing.

⁵³ Francesco Milizia, *Dizionario delle belle arti del disegno*, 2 vols (Bassano: [n.pub.], 1797), hereafter: *Dizionario*.

⁵⁴ *Dizionario*, II, 278.

⁵⁵ *Dizionario*, II, 1.

⁵⁶ *Dizionario*, II, 120.

⁵⁷ Emilio Bigi, 'Francesco Milizia: Nota Introduttiva', in *Critici e storici della poesia e delle arti nel secondo settecento*, ed. by Emilio Bigi (Milan: Ricciardi, 1960), pp. 1031-42 (p. 1036).

⁵⁸ This thesis does not examine Milizia's *Dizionario* since, like a catalogue, it provides a brief commentary on a large number of different subjects rather than a fuller, more focused discussion.

IV.3.5. Luigi Lanzi

Luigi Lanzi (1732-1810) was born in Le Marche and moved to Rome at the age of seventeen. He pursued philosophy and theology at the Collegio Romano and was ordained.⁵⁹ Later in Florence, Grand Duke Leopold appointed Lanzi in 1775 as custodian of his cabinet of medals and gems in the Royal Gallery of Florence (later the Uffizi).⁶⁰ This prompted Lanzi's life-long 'interessi paralleli [...] per la storia della pittura, delle antichità e delle lingue antiche'.⁶¹ On account of his work in reorganizing the Duke's collections, and moreover the success of his newly-launched writing career, Lanzi's responsibility at the Gallery continued to increase, leading to his eventual appointment as director and head antiquary.⁶² During this period, in which (as I have already noted in the previous chapter) he assisted Fea in his translation of Winckelmann's *Geschichte*, Lanzi also travelled frequently, with a sojourn in Rome from 1784 to 1790.⁶³ In 1797 Lanzi sought distance from the conflict caused by Napoleon's campaign by moving to Udine. He however returned to Florence in 1801, where he ingratiated himself – through scholarly publications – with the new government.⁶⁴ Indeed, as Capanni affirms, he was granted 'dai nuovi governi [...] nel 1808, la presidenza della sezione della Crusca nell'Accademia Fiorentina'.⁶⁵

In 1789, Lanzi published his *Notizie preliminari circa la scoltura degli antichi, e i varii suoi stili*.⁶⁶ In this short essay he devotes considerable attention to Etruscan sculpture but continues, too, to trace its development under the Greeks and Romans. Moving then from

⁵⁹ Fabrizio Capanni, 'Lanzi, Luigi Antonio', in *Dizionario biografico*, LXIII (2004), 675-77 (pp. 675-76).

⁶⁰ Thomas Roscoe, 'Biographical Notice of the Author', in *Luigi Lanzi: The History of Painting in Italy from the Period of the Revival of the Fine Arts to the End of the Eighteenth Century*, trans. by Thomas Roscoe, 3rd edn, 3 vols (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1852), I, 1-9 (p. 3).

⁶¹ Gauna, p. 44.

⁶² Roscoe, p. 4.

⁶³ See Chapter III p. 114. Capanni, p. 676.

⁶⁴ Roscoe, p. 8.

⁶⁵ Capanni, p. 677.

⁶⁶ Natali, 'Il Varrone', p. 379. The *Notizie preliminari* was first published in English in 1785 as 'Preliminary Account of the Sculpture of the Ancients and their Various Styles', in which form it was not successful. Lanzi thereafter added the *Notizie preliminari*, in Italian, to the second part of another of his works entitled *Saggio di lingua etrusca* (1789). See Gauna, p. 49.

sculpture to painting, Lanzi's most famous work is his *Storia pittorica della Italia: dal risorgimento delle belle arti fin presso al fine del XVIII secolo*, the first full edition of which was published in 1795-96,⁶⁷ followed by a subsequent 'edizione definitiva' in 1809.⁶⁸ Lanzi here records the history of painting from the decline of the Roman Empire to the present day. With a markedly historical (as opposed to aesthetic) focus, Lanzi divides his exploration into schools, which he in turn analyses by epoch⁶⁹. Finally, still demonstrating his 'interessi paralleli', Lanzi continued his Etruscan research in the later stages of his life, publishing in 1806 his *De' vasi antichi dipinti volgarmente chiamati etruschi*. As evident from the title, he reassesses here the publicly labelled Etruscan vases, proving their Greek origin.⁷⁰ Unlike Piranesi and D'Arco, Lanzi shows no hesitation in granting the Greeks this invention and in fact demonstrates in his other works his belief (much like Winckelmann) that both the Etruscans and Romans imitated Greek sculpture and painting (NP.xviii, SP.II.8).

Analysis of Lanzi's agenda is simplified by his own delineation of his clear objectives in the *Storia pittorica*: aims that are further visible throughout his oeuvre. The first aim was to 'fornire una storia alla Italia, che interessa la sua gloria' (SP.I.xvi). He sought, as he overtly proclaimed, to produce an artistic alternative to Tiraboschi's seminal history of Italian literature: 'Questo bel tratto di paese ha già, mercè del Cav. Tiraboschi, la storia delle sue lettere; ma desidera ancora quella delle sue arti' (SP.I.xvi-xvii).⁷¹ Of a more practical nature, Lanzi's second aim was to 'giovare all'arte' (SP.I.xx). He believed it necessary to take guidance from that which had previously inspired art's improvement or decline (SP.I.xx-xxii), which he in turn claimed was best achieved through attention to examples rather than principles. Turning

⁶⁷ Giovanni Previtali, *La fortuna dei primitivi: Dal Vasari ai neoclassici* (Turin: Einaudi, 1964), pp. 141-44.

⁶⁸ Capanni, p. 677.

⁶⁹ Despite the clear Vasarian quality to such a structure, Lanzi in fact rejected all such biographies of artists, as will be explored in due course: see Chapter IV, n. 120.

⁷⁰ Capanni, p. 676, and Stiebing Jr., p. 156.

⁷¹ Gabriele Bickendorf, *Die Historisierung der italienischen Kunstbetrachtung im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert* (Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1998), p. 345. This inspiration from Tiraboschi likely accounts for the frequent references to literature, and especially poetry, in Lanzi's *Storia pittorica*.

from art to art literature, Lanzi's third and final objective was to 'agevolare la cognizione delle maniere pittoriche' (SP.I.xxii). Be it the aspiring connoisseur, traveller, artist, or merely (educated) reader, Lanzi hoped that his audience, having read his text, could observe a painting and with ease assign it 'se non ad un certo autore, almeno ad un certo gusto' (SP.I.xxii).⁷² To achieve this final objective and abbreviate the research and reading of hopeful students (SP.I.xxix-xxx), Lanzi refers the reader to specific paintings from which one could study each epoch, tracing, as Gauna affirms, 'le complesse genealogie dello stile'.⁷³

In contrast to Piranesi and Milizia, it is not difficult to identify the sources enabling Lanzi's engagement with the German scholar, having most likely become familiar with his ideas during his studies in Rome.⁷⁴ Not only does Lanzi explicitly cite Winckelmann's major works (including, of course, Fea's translation of the *Geschichte*),⁷⁵ but he also refers to his lesser known writings and even his letters.

IV.3.6. Leopoldo Cicognara

Leopoldo Cicognara (1767-1834) was born in Ferrara and studied in Modena, before moving to Rome when he was twenty years old. There he became member of *L'Accademia del Campidoglio*, as well as various other academies, and enjoyed many learned contacts. At the onset of the first Napoleonic campaign, however, Cicognara moved back to Ferrara, was included in the delegation that met Napoleon, and thereafter elected to a number of political positions.⁷⁶ Despite being implicated in the publication of an anti-French text, leading to a

⁷² Bickendorf, p. 353, and Gauna, p. 202.

⁷³ Gauna, p. 130.

⁷⁴ Capanni, p. 676.

⁷⁵ See Chapter IV, p. 198.

⁷⁶ Giandomenico Romanelli, 'Cicognara, Francesco Leopoldo', in *Dizionario biografico*, XXV (1981), 421-28 (pp. 421-23).

short exile and imprisonment,⁷⁷ Cicognara was pardoned in 1804 and the following year was even appointed *Consigliere di stato del regno d'Italia* in Milan.⁷⁸ On moving back to Rome two years later, however, Cicognara left political life and devoted himself to the arts.⁷⁹ He wrote about his artistic interests and later in Venice became president of *L'Accademia Reale di Belle Arti*. This was a didactic and public role affording him responsibility for the protection, promotion, and production of art. Cicognara was member of other academies, too, yet eventually became disillusioned by the bureaucracy involved, thus resigning from the Academy and distancing himself from public life in 1825. He spent the remainder of his life writing articles and letters.⁸⁰

The most famous of Cicognara's works is his *Storia della scultura*, which, as Ruffini asserts, was the first of its kind: 'prima di lui non si avevano intorno alla storia della scultura che memorie sconnesse'.⁸¹ Cicognara was encouraged to write this work by Pietro Giordani, whose guidance throughout the process amounted, as Haskell argues, 'almost to a collaboration between the two men'.⁸² The title of the first volume, published in 1813, was *Storia della scultura dal suo risorgimento in Italia sino al secolo di Napoleone: per servire di continuazione alle opere di Winckelmann e di d'Agincourt*. Yet, due to Austrian censorship in the later, dramatically altered political environment,⁸³ the end date changed from 'sino al secolo di Napoleone' to 'sino al secolo XIX' in the second and third volumes (1816-18) and finally to 'fino al secolo di Canova' in a new edition, which appeared 1823-25.⁸⁴ Cicognara's focus of attention in the *Storia* is Italian sculpture from the medieval era to the present day

⁷⁷ Romanelli, 'Leopoldo Cicognara e la politica delle belle arti', in *Canova, Cicognara, Foscolo*, ed. by Giulio Carlo Argan and others (Venice: Arsenale, 1979), pp. 35-47 (pp. 39-40).

⁷⁸ Romanelli, *Dizionario biografico*, p. 423.

⁷⁹ Romanelli, *Dizionario biografico*, pp. 423-24.

⁸⁰ Romanelli, *Dizionario biografico* pp. 424-27.

⁸¹ F. P. Ruffini, *Ricordo di Leopoldo Cicognara* (Modena: Carlo Vincenzi, 1875), p. 8.

⁸² Francis Haskell, 'Cicognara eretico', in *Giuseppe Jappelli e il suo tempo*, ed. by Giuliana Mazzi, 2 vols (Padova: Liviana, 1982), I, 217-25 (p. 217).

⁸³ Romanelli, 'Leopoldo Cicognara e la politica', p. 36.

⁸⁴ Romanelli, *Dizionario biografico*, p. 424.

and, in contrast to Lanzi's geographical approach focusing on different schools of art, is structured entirely chronologically.⁸⁵ Moreover, as Cicognara himself highlights (SS.I.36), despite this concentration on the modern period, his views on the ancients are also made evident: 'l'antico in Cicognara è un comune denominatore di tutta la grande e vera arte'.⁸⁶ Whilst expressing pride and even seemingly defence for the Etruscan arts, which were 'lunge dall'essere bambine fra noi anche in rimoti tempi' (SS.I.62), Cicognara principally supports the supremacy of the Greeks 'non [...] sorpassati da alcun'altra nell'eleganza e nel gusto' (SS.I.177). He again (like Lanzi and Winckelmann) maintains that the Etruscans and Romans imitated Greek production, leading to the decline of art (SS.I.150-51, 167).

Cicognara's oeuvre is vast, yet another of his principal works is his *Del bello: ragionamenti*. Published five years before the *Storia della scultura*, in 1808, this constitutes a 'zibaldone filosofico', in which one finds the aesthetic precedents of his magnum opus 'nella loro crudezza'.⁸⁷ Hesitant to compose a tract on beauty, 'che troppo malagevole mi sembra', Cicognara was nevertheless enthusiastic to demonstrate the fruits of his reading, contemplation, and observation: leading thus to the format of *Del bello* as a collection of 'Ragionamenti Accademici' (DB.18). The subjects covered include: 'Della natura e dell'arte'; 'Della grazia', 'Del sublime'; and 'Del bello ideale', amongst others.

Like Lanzi, Cicognara sought to bring glory to his native peninsula through his *Storia della scultura*. Indeed he deliberately chose sculpture as his focus as he believed Italy to be supreme in this art form – he triumphantly quotes Giordani: 'la scultura è singolarmente nostra' (SS.I.6) – and he insisted, too, that such a work be written by an Italian (SS.I.26). This was, however, by no means his only aim. Rather, throughout his oeuvre, Cicognara demonstrates plain intentions to educate, inspire, and encourage advancement. He clarifies in

⁸⁵ Gauna, p. 207.

⁸⁶ Sergio Samek Ludovici, 'Cicognara, Leopoldo', in *Enciclopedia biografica e bibliografica "italiana", Serie 4: storici, teorici e critici delle arti figurative (1800-1940)* (Rome: Tosi, 1942), pp. 103-06 (p. 105).

⁸⁷ Ludovici, p. 103.

Del bello, for example, how he sought with these essays to inspire artists and students of the belle arti to pursue further research.⁸⁸ Indeed he claims that he would be ‘contento abbastanza, se dal mio dire ne emergerà in altri lodevole curiosità, e nobile audacia, che possa essere coronata da più felice successo in queste metafisiche indagini’ (DB.19). Such an intention is repeated in the *Storia della scultura*, too, where Cicognara moreover widens his audience. Aiming to ‘di tenere un linguaggio che non solo giovar potesse all’Artista, ma che il Filosofo, il Politico, il Letterato, il Scienziato, l’Archeologo vi trovassero qualche pascolo’, Cicognara hoped to stimulate ‘altri avanzamenti dell’umano ingegno’ (SS.I.19).

Finally, in a similar manner to Lanzi, it is not difficult to prove Cicognara’s awareness of Winckelmann’s oeuvre, which (through Fea’s translation) he most likely first discovered in Rome between 1788 and 1789.⁸⁹ Not only does Cicognara refer to Winckelmann on numerous occasions in both *Del bello* and the *Storia della scultura* – constituting the subject of entire sections in the latter with subheadings such as ‘Opere di Winckelmann’ (SS.I.30) and ‘Influenza di Winckelmann’ (SS.VII.62) – but Winckelmann is even noted as Cicognara’s inspiration in the *Storia*’s main title.

IV.4. REACTIONS TO WINCKELMANN IN ITALIAN ART LITERATURE

Having thus outlined the five art writers’ areas of expertise, principal works, and objectives, I will now explore the foreignization and domestication of Winckelmann evident throughout their oeuvres.

Before turning first to the foreignization of Winckelmann qua scholar, it is helpful to note one recurring feature in the art scholars’ reactions to Winckelmann. Namely, their frequent engagement with one central Winckelmannian principle: the relevance of external

⁸⁸ Rosa Pappalardo, ‘Le idee estetiche di Leopoldo Cicognara’, *Siculorum Gymnasium*, 5 (1954), 256-63 (pp. 256-57), and Francesca Fedi, *L’ideologia del bello: Leopoldo Cicognara e il classicismo fra Settecento e Ottocento* (Milan: Franco Angeli, 1990), p. 100.

⁸⁹ Ferrari, ‘Cicognara e Winckelmann’, pp. 98-99.

circumstances, such as climate and politics, to a nation's artistic development. As noted in Chapter II, Winckelmann himself was likely inspired in this idea by classical sources, as well as Vasari, when advancing his reasons for the supremacy of Greek art.⁹⁰ However, there are two reasons why the examples given in this chapter should be understood as reactions to Winckelmann, even when he is not expressly cited. The first is that Winckelmann revitalized the notion that external circumstances influenced the quality of art, prompting a discourse amongst art scholars in the eighteenth- and nineteenth-centuries. The second is that, as I have established, the art scholars considered were undoubtedly familiar with Winckelmann's oeuvre and were on plentiful other occasions reacting to the German scholar. Thus, despite Winckelmann having himself drawn on prior scholarship, I contend that the art scholars' engagement with this principle reflects a reaction to Winckelmann.

IV.5. FOREIGNIZATION: OSTRACIZING WINCKELMANN FROM ITALIAN SCHOLARSHIP

Of all art writers here examined, Milizia demonstrates the clearest example of foreignizing Winckelmann. The method by which he achieves this is through replicating his views yet simultaneously ostracizing the German scholar from Italian scholarship. Milizia copies – almost plagiarizes – Winckelmann's writing without providing any mention of his source, as explained above.⁹¹ In doing so, he accentuates Winckelmann's otherness by denying the German scholar the familiarity that he affords his native sources of inspiration.

In order to prove Milizia's foreignization of Winckelmann, as opposed to his inattention to the German scholar's writing, I will explore here several instances that demonstrate his covert replication of Winckelmann's works. This is first evident in the structure of his *Memorie's* 'Libro primo: Degli architetti antichi', which closely replicates Winckelmann's

⁹⁰ See Chapter II, p. 79.

⁹¹ As explained in Chapter IV.3.4., there were a very few references to Winckelmann in Milizia's more encyclopaedic work, *Dizionario*, yet no such references in the other, principal works of his oeuvre.

pattern of rise and decline in Greek art, as comparison of their chapter titles reveals. Whilst employing Pericles rather than Phidias (the latter of whom was a sculptor and thus not relevant to his history of architecture), Milizia, like Winckelmann, uses both this epoch and that of Alexander the Great as turning points:

On art from the earliest times to the age of Phidias
On art from the age of Phidias to the time of Alexander the Great
On art after the age of Alexander the Great to its decline
On Greek art under the Romans and under the Roman Emperors.⁹²

Cap. I. Degli Architetti prima di Pericle, cioè 450. prima dell' Era Volgare
Cap. II. Degli Architetti dal tempo di Pericle fino ad Alessandro Macedone, cioè dal 450. fin al 300.
Cap. III. Degli Architetti da Alessandro il Grande fin ad Augusto, cioè 300. anni prima, e fino all'Era Volgare
Cap. IV. Degli Architetti da Augusto fin alla decadenza dell'Architettura, cioè dal principio dell' Era Volgare fin al IV. Secolo. (ME.I.xi)

In truth, the whole of Milizia's *Memorie* mirrors Winckelmann's structure, as Grönert affirms. Milizia identifies art's rise and decline from the Greeks to the Romans, the Renaissance to the Baroque, and even to his hopes for modern art.⁹³ He also affords the most praise to the exact same two artistic periods that Winckelmann extols above all others: Greek art in the fourth and fifth centuries BC and the High Renaissance. Yet this broader system cannot be attributed to Winckelmann alone. Other sources of inspiration behind such a pattern are also important to consider, not least including Vasari, whose significance Milizia confirms:

Quel, che ha reso rinomato e benemerito il Vasari, è l'opera ch'ei fece delle Vite de' Professori del Disegno. Senza questa sua fatica, che cosa ora si saprebbe circa la Storia dell'Arti e degli Artisti celebri? (ME.II.30)

⁹² 'Von der Kunst der ältesten Zeiten bis auf den Phidias

Von der Kunst, von den Zeiten des Phidias an, bis auf Alexander den Großen

Von der Kunst nach Alexanders Zeiten, und von der Abnahme derselben

Von der Griechischen Kunst unter den Römern und unter den Römischen Kaisern'.

The 1776 edition does not include a contents page but the subjects were discussed in the same order in the 1764 edition, so this is taken from the latter's contents page: Winckelmann, *Geschichte* (1764), I, xxxvii-xxxix. Translations are my own.

⁹³ Grönert, p. 187. A similar pattern is also evident in Milizia's *Roma delle belle arti*, albeit restricted solely to Italian history.

This reference to other sources such as Vasari by no means negates Winckelmann's influence, rather it further demonstrates the German scholar's foreignization. Indeed, despite Winckelmann being, as I have demonstrated, a key source of inspiration behind the structure of the *Memorie*, Milizia separates him from natives such as Vasari, ostracizing him from Italian scholarship.

As well as drawing masked inspiration from Winckelmann in relation to the history of artistic development, Milizia further appropriates the German scholar's explanations as to why art flourished under the Greeks. Indeed his account of the success of Greek art in *Dell'arte di vedere*, for instance, is remarkably similar to Winckelmann's equivalent in the *Geschichte*:

The superiority which art acquired among the Greeks is to be ascribed partly to the influence of climate, partly to their constitution and government, and the habits of thinking which originated therefrom, and, in an equal degree also, to respect for the artist, and the use and application of art. [...] among no people has beauty been prized so highly as among them.⁹⁴ (GES.I.222-24/I.286-87)

I Greci pel loro clima, e per la costituzione del loro governo ebbero il vantaggio di vedere la natura umana in assai miglior aspetto: la videro bella, e la resero ancora più bella per l'amore e per la stima che nudrirono per la bellezza e per la grazia. (DAV.39)

Not only does he note here the significance of the Greeks' climate, government, and esteem for beauty, but Milizia's appropriation of Winckelmann's principles is even further apparent in the order of mention: just as the German scholar refers first to 'the influence of climate' and then to 'constitution and government', Milizia, too, begins his discussion of Greek supremacy through reference to their 'clima' and 'governo'. Nor, as Scianatico confirms, was this veiled Winckelmannian argument limited to *Dell'arte di vedere*, but was repeated in Milizia's *Dizionario*, too. Indeed, despite focusing on the *Gedanken* rather than the *Geschichte*, Scianatico states that in his *Dizionario*: 'Clima, politica, istituzioni determinarono grazie alla

⁹⁴ 'Die Ursache und der Grund von dem Vorzug, welchen die Kunst unter den Griechen erlangt hat, ist theils dem Einfluss des Himmels, theils der Verfassung und Regierung, und der dadurch gebildeten Denkungsart, wie nicht weniger der Achtung der Künstler, und dem Gebrauch und der Anwendung der Kunst unter den Griechen, zuzuschreiben'. [...] unter keinem Volk ist die Schönheit so hoch, als bei ihnen, geachtet worden'.

libertà – è lo schema dei *Gedanken*, che Milizia segue da vicino – l’eccezionale fioritura dell’arte greca e il suo carattere “sublime”.⁹⁵

Moreover, there is much to suggest that Milizia also adopted many other artistic principles from Winckelmann. Such a claim, of course, requires caution, as many of Winckelmann’s principles have their roots in Hellenic and other philo-Hellenic works – Winckelmann read widely – just as Milizia also consulted a range of sources. He himself labels his first *Le vite* as ‘una specie di mosaico’.⁹⁶ Nevertheless the strikingly close correspondence of a number of their principles suggests Milizia’s clear Winckelmannian inspiration. Various examples could be provided here, as Milizia emphasizes, like Winckelmann, the importance of art’s simplicity and unity, as well as professing the same contradictory opinions as regards the merits and vices of imitation. Yet, to focus on one example, his explanation of ornamentation reveals particular similarities to that which Winckelmann advances. Just as Winckelmann places artistic value on uncluttered art and commends the ability to ‘survey and measure it with a glance, and comprehend and embrace it in a single idea’ (GES.I.261/I.310),⁹⁷ so Milizia likewise highlights the importance of such transparency. He defines the principle of ‘euritmia’ as ‘la corrispondenza delle parti simili, le quali sieno tali e tante da un lato come dall’altro, e similmente disposte, affinché *tutto si scorga ad un colpo d’occhio senza stento*’ (RBA.12, italics added).⁹⁸ He even claims that such ‘euritmia’ is ‘viziosa, dove gli oggetti non si scuoprono ad una occhiata, ma si han da trovare progressivamente’ (RBA.12): further mirroring Winckelmann’s censure of works that must be considered ‘in separate pieces’, which he

⁹⁵ Giovanna Scianatico, ‘Arte e natura nel Dizionario di Francesco Milizia’, in *Francesco Milizia e la cultura del Settecento*, pp. 73-83 (p. 77).

⁹⁶ Prozzillo, p. 41, who cites *Le vite*, p.78.

⁹⁷ ‘wenn es unser Geist wie mit einem Blick übersehen und messen, und in einem einzigen Begriff einschließen und fassen kann’.

⁹⁸ For another example of Milizia praising art that can be grasped in one glance, see (RBA.119).

compares to long journeys interrupted ‘by many inns at which a stop can be made’ (GES.I.261/I.310-11).⁹⁹

Finally, as well as thus providing him with a structure of historical development and principles for its justification, the innovatory nature of Winckelmann’s poetic prose was a further source of inspiration for Milizia. In the *Memorie degli architetti*, for instance, he employs the image of ‘un principio d’immortal gioventù’ to articulate a still-extant ‘freshness’ of the architecture at the time of Pericles (ME.I.28-29): an image with which no reader of Winckelmann can but be reminded of the reference to ‘eternal youth’ in Winckelmann’s discussion of the ideal portrayal of the Gods. Indeed, in discussing ideal beauty, the German scholar famously asks, ‘to human nations, what attribute could be more suitable to sensual deities, and more fascinating to the imagination, than an *eternal youth*?’ (GES.I.273/I.320, italics added).¹⁰⁰ In light of the already evident Winckelmannian influence, this is almost certainly an appropriation, consciously or otherwise, of the German scholar’s poetical flair. Nor did this stop there, as arguably the most brazen instance of Milizia’s plagiarism of Winckelmann’s writing is his replication of the well-known description of the Laocoon statue, which continued from the *Gedanken* to the *Geschichte*.

Pare che cerchi di concentrare intorno al suo cuore tutta la forza della mente contro i tormenti che gli gonfiano i muscoli, e gli stirano terribilmente i nervi. Il petto appena si solleva, il ventre è compresso, i fianchi sono incavati [...] Virgilio lo fa urlare, anzi muggire come un toro immolato a morte. Ma la nostra statua non ispalanca la bocca: par che sospiri profondamente. Dunque lo scultore è stato più filosofo del poeta, e pare come diretto da Socrate, che maneggiò anche lo scarpello, e seppe sì ben soffrire. [...] Qui è esteriormente grande; ma a guisa del mare, che dagli uragani più veementi non è agitato che nella superficie, e internamente è in calma. (DAV.14)

Not only does Milizia characterize Laocoon’s inner response to the struggle in the same manner as Winckelmann – ‘striving to collect the conscious strength of his soul to bear it’ – but he further recounts the almost identical physical effect of such pain on the statue’s body. He

⁹⁹ ‘was wir geteilt betrachten müssen’, ‘durch viele Herbergen, in welchen wir anhalten können’.

¹⁰⁰ ‘Was konnte menschlichen Begriffen von sinnlichen Gottheiten würdiger, und für die Einbildung reizender sein, als der *Zustand einer ewigen Jugend* [...]?’.

states, just as Winckelmann does, how it was ‘while the muscles are swelling and the nerves are straining with torture’ that ‘the determined spirit is visible in the turgid forehead, [and] the chest [...] distended by the obstructed breath’ (GES.II.699/II.230).¹⁰¹ Like his German predecessor, Milizia also compares the dreadful noise of Virgil’s ‘terrible scream’ to the contrasting heavy breathing or ‘oppressed sighing’ of the stone figure (GED.24/42),¹⁰² and in doing so emphasizes the statue’s honourable representation of suffering. Indeed, just as Winckelmann describes Laocoon as suffering like Sophocles’ Philoctetes (GED.24/42), Milizia comments, too, on the sculptor’s philosophical depiction of Laocoon as victim. Lastly, Milizia employs an almost identical simile to that which Winckelmann uses in his *Gedanken* to compare Laocoon’s controlled suffering to the sea, choppy on the surface yet calm underneath:

Just as it always remains calm in the depths of the sea, however much it may rage on the surface, so the expression of Greek figures, whatever passions they may be subject to, reveal a great and placid soul. This soul is depicted in the face of Laocoon.¹⁰³ (GED.24/42)

It is therefore apparent that Milizia was not, as Pasquali has sought to fashion him, a ‘distruttore di vecchi principi e, insieme, quale fondatore di nuovi’.¹⁰⁴ Rather, as the structure of his *Memorie*, his aesthetics, and even his iconic imagery most evidently reveal, Milizia makes substantial use of Winckelmann’s writing, whilst choosing deliberately to foreignize the German scholar. With his similarly philo-Hellenic views and his aims to reform the decaying Rome of his day by encouraging a return to Greek ideals, Milizia appropriates Winckelmann’s

¹⁰¹ ‘[das] Bild eines Mannes [...], der die bewußte Stärke des Geistes gegen denselben zu sammeln sucht; und indem sein Leiden die Muskeln aufschwellt, und die Nerven anzieht, tritt der mit Stärke bewaffnete Geist in der aufgetriebenen Stirne hervor, und die Brust erhebt sich durch den beklemmten Atem’.

¹⁰² ‘schreckliches Geschrei’; ‘ein [...] beklemmtes Seufzen’.

¹⁰³ ‘So wie die Tiefe des Meers allezeit ruhig bleibt, die Oberfläche mag noch so wüten, eben so zeigt der Ausdruck in den Figuren der Griechen bei allen Leidenschaften eine große und gesetzte Seele. Diese Seele schildert sich in dem Gesicht des Laocoons’.

¹⁰⁴ Pasquali, pp. 99-100.

ideas to a such an extent that he could justifiably be labelled an Italian Winckelmann, yet still he denies him any recognition, ostracizing him from Italian scholarship.

It could be argued that Piranesi also attempted to foreignize Winckelmann through the same method. After all, much like Milizia, he evidently refers to Winckelmann without providing any confirmation of this source. Yet accepted opinion instead suggests that Piranesi was precluded from explicitly identifying the German scholar rather than making a deliberate decision not to do so. This was due to his vehement criticism of Winckelmann's work, in contrast to Milizia's acceptance thereof. As Stern explains, 'systems of patronage shielded Winckelmann from the attacks which Piranesi directed against Laugier and Le Roy'.¹⁰⁵ Petridou, too, confirms that – given both Piranesi's and Winckelmann's positions amongst the cultural and ecclesiastical elite – Piranesi could not overtly condemn the German scholar. She states:

As a protégé of Pope Clement XIII, he [Piranesi] was not able to openly oppose either the librarian of Cardinal Albani or the *Commissario delle Antichità della Camera Apostolica*: the latter of which was an office to which he perhaps aspired after the publication in 1756 of his work *Le Antichità Romane*.¹⁰⁶

Accordingly, since this exclusion was not a deliberate decision by Piranesi, I will not argue that this amounts to foreignization of Winckelmann qua scholar. This does not, however, preclude any foreignization on Piranesi's part. On the contrary, Piranesi nonetheless plainly foreignizes Winckelmann's views, a form of foreignization that I will now consider.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁵ Stern, pp. 64-65.

¹⁰⁶ Petridou, p. 46. MT: 'Come protégé du pape Clément XIII, il ne peut s'opposer ouvertement au bibliothécaire du cardinal Albani, ni au commissaire officiel de la Chambre Apostolique de toutes les antiquités de Rome, charge à laquelle il aspirait peut-être après la publication en 1756 de son ouvrage: *Le Antichità Romane*'.

¹⁰⁷ It should be noted that, whilst Piranesi's inability to expressly criticize Winckelmann is the accepted opinion, neither Stern nor Petridou provide any evidence of this limitation imposed on Piranesi. Thus, if evidence emerged revealing that this was instead a deliberate decision, Piranesi's clear response to Winckelmann, without any explicit acknowledgement of the German scholar, could also be considered foreignization of Winckelmann qua scholar.

IV.6. FOREIGNIZATION: DISPLAYING WINCKELMANN'S ITALOPHOBIA

It will be recalled that foreignization of Winckelmann's views entails drawing attention to his opinions that are offensive to Italy. There is one method by which several art writers achieve this, comprising two complementary aspects: they present the German scholar's opinions selectively, emphasizing the offensive elements, and in turn reject them to defend the peninsula and its heritage. The first aspect distorts the overall impression of Winckelmann's views by giving disproportionate attention to his Italophobia relative to that found in his original works. The second aspect presents these views as attacks on Italy that must be resisted. As I will now explore, this bipartite method is employed by D'Arco, Cicognara, Piranesi, and Milizia.

D'Arco's *Della patria* is entirely based around selecting Winckelmann's Graecophile and Italophobic views and rejecting them to defend Italy's heritage. Indeed he immediately demonstrates the first aspect of this foreignizing method – the selective presentation of Winckelmann's offensive views – by summarizing the German scholar's twofold Graecophile argument just ten pages into his work. That is, D'Arco introduces Winckelmann's beliefs that, whilst the Greeks were not responsible for the *origin* of art in Etruria (although it was still inspired by the Pelasgians and other Greek colonies), they did promote the *advancement* of Etruscan art (DPP.15): both of which deny the Etruscans the key role in their artistic production. Such views even dictate the structure of D'Arco's essay, as indicated by the titles of the first and second chapters of *Della patria*:

Capitolo 1: Se dir si debba che l'Italia alla Grecia o la Grecia all'Italia sia stata debitrice dell'introduzione dell'Arti del Disegno. (DPP.19, italics added)

Capitolo 2: Se dir si debba, che l'Italia stata sia debitrice alla Greca, o la Greca all'Italia riguardo all'avanzamento e progressi dell'Arti del Disegno. (DPP.73, italics added)

Moreover, further revealing the role of Winckelmann's views as goad and focus of concentration in D'Arco's writing, all three chapters begin with reference, respectively, to

‘L’Autore della storia dell’arti del disegno’; ‘lo Storico dell’Arti del Disegno’; and ‘il Winkel.’ (DPP.19,73,114). Moreover, even individual subchapters, or ‘articoli’, yet further refer to his German antagonist: ‘Articolo III: Se gli Argomenti e prove, mercè cui il Winkel. si studia appoggiare la propria opinione, abbiano valore a sostenerla’ (DPP.47).

Whilst D’Arco’s selection of Winckelmann’s offensive views is thus evident, the second aspect of this foreignization is of course crucial: his efforts to reject the German scholar’s Italophobia and defend Italy’s heritage. D’Arco demonstrates two techniques through which he achieves this, the first of which is his overt repudiation of Winckelmann’s beliefs. Reiterating again Winckelmann’s argument concerning the origin and advancement of Etruscan art, for instance, D’Arco follows this by asserting his very different, ‘ben lungi, che col Winkel.’, and ‘assai più verosimile’ theory. He proposes instead that Greece was indebted to Italy both for the origins and advancement of its art:

[...] uopo sarà convenire, che ben lungi, che col Winkel. tener si possa che se le arti degli Etrusci non denno ai Greci l’origine, lor debbono però il loro avanzamento (loc. citat.), dee bensì più tosto stabilirsi come assai più verosimile, che la Grecia sia stata debitrice all’Italia siccome rispetto all’introduzione così riguardo a progressi che sommi vi ebbero le arti suddette. (DPP.74)

Elsewhere, D’Arco’s abundant use of negatives also renders plain his rejection of Winckelmann’s reasoning behind the foreign origin of Etruscan art. Indeed, having recounted Winckelmann’s belief that Etruscan art was inspired by the arrival in Italy of the Pelasgians, and other Greek colonies, named by some ‘Tyrrhenians’ (GES.I.137/I.221),¹⁰⁸ D’Arco affirms: ‘non può negarsi veramente che con minore inverosimiglianza da lui non s’attribuisca tal trasporto a queste Colonie che non alla prima de’ Pelasgi’ (DPP.43).

The second technique that D’Arco employs is his emphasis on the weaknesses of the German scholar’s approach. This includes, amongst various other reproaches, suggestions of Winckelmann’s inconsistency in argument; his prioritization of quantity over quality; and his

¹⁰⁸ ‘Tyrrhener’.

lack of erudition. One such example of Winckelmann's inconsistency of argument concerns his views on the Etruscans. D'Arco questions how the German scholar, having denied Etruscan art the achievement of perfection, can immediately thereafter allude to a contrastingly positive notion of Etruria's power, wealth, and artistic merit in a period when the Greeks had only just begun their first productions. In truth, Winckelmann's views are not inconsistent here: he simply believed Etruscan art to have flourished before that of the Greeks and to have reached a high level without achieving perfection. Yet D'Arco nevertheless renders Winckelmann's claim questionable through such remarks as the following rhetorical question:

E in vero come mai asserir si può, che presso una nazione in mezzo alla quale le Arti del Disegno pervennero al più bel fiore, e prosperaron così, che opere n'uscissero degne di essere decantate per mirabili, sollevate non sianvisi ad una certa perfezione? (DPP.77)

Many examples of such reproaches were inspired by Heyne, to whom D'Arco refers on numerous occasions in *Della patria*. For instance, just as Heyne censures Rome's inability to provide Winckelmann with adequate reading material for his work, as explored in the previous chapter, D'Arco also discusses the dangers of this lack of erudition that Winckelmann faced in Rome. Not only did it deny him the opportunity 'di entrare in quelle critiche disquisizioni che l'opera sua desiderava', but it even led to his imprecision: 'gli errori sì di Cronologia che di veracità degli avvenimenti, onde al dire dell'economiato [Heyne] nella parte storica è ripiena l'opera del Winkelman' (DPP.117).¹⁰⁹ Thus, D'Arco foreignizes Winckelmann's views through selectively presenting his Graecophile and Italophobic theories on the origins and advancement of art and disproving them using two techniques.

This method of foreignizing Winckelmann's views is further evident in Cicognara's oeuvre. Indeed, despite this not being a central part of his work – in contrast to that of D'Arco – he nevertheless also selects the German scholar's anti-Italian views in order to defend his *patria* against them. This is notable, for example, in his discussion of the effect of melancholy

¹⁰⁹ It is interesting to note how D'Arco interprets this lack of reading as a criticism of Winckelmann, whilst Fea considers it an attack on Rome: see Chapter III, p. 148.

on art: a trait that Winckelmann, when discussing both Egyptian and Etruscan art, argued stifled artistic progression. Cicognara imitates Winckelmann almost exactly in his suggestion that this disposition had a negative effect on Egyptian art, claiming that the Egyptians demonstrated ‘un carattere piuttosto inclinato alla tristezza ed alla malinconia, non poteansi ottenere produzioni che pareggiassero le greche’ (SS.I.148). Yet, in stark contrast, he objects later in his *Storia della scultura* to Winckelmann’s same argument concerning the Etruscans. Indeed despite agreeing with the German scholar that Etruscan art flourished for a lesser time than under the Greeks, Cicognara disagrees with Winckelmann ‘attribuendo siffatta diversità unicamente all’indole melanconica e trista degli Etruschi, derivata dal loro culto e dalle lor costumanze, non meno che dalla continua necessità di battersi coi loro vicini’ (SS.I.152). He proceeds to disprove the German scholar’s claim, questioning how Etruscan culture could have been inferior to the Greeks if they shared the same Gods and heroes: ‘le quali cagioni non so quanto possano giudicarsi sussistenti tosto che vogliasi riflettere, che i numi e gli eroi della Grecia erano presso che i medesimi con quelli dei popoli dell’Etruria’ (SS.I.152). Cicognara thus plainly foreignizes Winckelmann’s view.

Moreover, continuing this vindication of Etruscan culture, Cicognara further defends Etruria’s climate and government from Winckelmann’s suggestions of their inferiority to those of the Greeks. Indeed, whilst Winckelmann does not overtly refer to the lower standard of Etruria’s climate or political structure – he in fact praises Etruscan government as I will discuss in due course – he nevertheless makes plain throughout his oeuvre the pre-eminence, above all others, of Greek climate and politics. In response to the German scholar’s beliefs, however, (which he explicitly refers to in this discussion) Cicognara suggests that, in comparing Etruria to ancient Greece, ‘molta analogia eravi di clima, e non molto poi era diversa la forma sin di governo’. He even asserts, in stark contrast to Winckelmann’s beliefs, that Etruria enjoyed

greater freedom than their Greek counterparts, highlighting the errors of the German scholars' views as follows:

Gioverebbe l'osservare, che quando i Greci furono soggetti ai Romani stettero assai peggio *reducti in provinciam* sotto il governo dispotico di un pretore o di un proconsole; laddove l'Etruria fu trattata a colonie e municipi, vale a dire, con amministrazione interna affatto libera. (SS.I.152)

Thus, much like his predecessor, Cicognara purposefully chooses Winckelmann's offensive views in order to reject them, by which he defends the peninsula's Etruscan heritage.

Piranesi and Milizia employ the same method as D'Arco and Cicognara in foreignizing Winckelmann's views. In doing so they do not refer to Winckelmann by name (as already discussed), yet this is a superficial difference: the views that they select and reject are unmistakably Winckelmannian, and thereby inform the readership's reception of the German scholar's views just as if he had been referenced overtly.

In *Della introduzione*, for instance, Piranesi clearly selects Winckelmann's offensive views on the Greek origins of art and the Italian imitation of such originals:

[...] alcuni, nuovi nelle istesse arti [...] si son dati co' loro scritti ad esortare quei che han voglia di rendersi singolari in codeste arti, di andare ad apprendere in Grecia: e perchè? Perchè l'Italia le aveva apprese da' Greci, e perchè in Italia pochi sono i monumenti antichi, in paragone di quei che l'ornavano, e ch'erano stati fatti, da chi poi? Da chi, volendo imitare i Greci, altro non avea saputo far, che la scimia [sic]. (DI.18)

Indeed, despite there being no reference to Winckelmann, this assertion closely echoes his views on the Romans' imitation of Greek art. Moreover, Piranesi continues thereafter to refer to 'un di loro, che si è fatto capo degli altri con tutta la sua gran parzialità per cotali frammenti' (DI.18): commonly believed to indicate the German scholar.¹¹⁰ After all, Winckelmann was the first to posit a 'system' of Greek art (GES.I.ii/I.107),¹¹¹ rendering probable the allusion to him as leader, and his adoration of famous fragments such as the *Torso Belvedere* was also well

¹¹⁰ Wilton-Ely, 'Editorial notes', in *Observations on the Letter of Monsieur Mariette: With Opinions on Architecture, and a Preface to a New Treatise on the Introduction and Progress of the Fine Arts in Europe in Ancient Times* (LA: Getty Institute, 2002), pp. 142-53 (p. 147).

¹¹¹ 'Lehrgebäude'.

known. Having thus selected this particularly anti-Roman view, Piranesi continues to defend his native art by casting doubt on Winckelmann's and other Graecophiles' questionable priorities in constantly sending scholars to Greece. Piranesi claims that the 'capo degli altri' especially was making a mockery of his students through needlessly sending them to Greece when 'ei sa pure, che degli studenti in Grecia [...] e in tutte le altre parti, ove i Greci poterono avere sparso de' semi delle loro arti, ve ne sono andate le processioni, e tutti, com'egli, hanno portato le stesse cose' (DI.18). Thus, by drawing attention to Winckelmann's offensive views, as well as to the flawed practices of his Hellenism, Piranesi clearly seeks to defend his native art from the German scholar's accusations.

In a similar manner Piranesi in his *Ragionamento* selects Winckelmann's anti-Etruscan views, only to reject them immediately. He refers anonymously to 'i dispregiatori de' Toscani' who 'non vogliano persuadersi, che altro che in Grecia siansi perfezionate le arti, ne da altre mani, che Greche, siansi esercitate con maestria, e con grazia' (RA.25), a view that he thereafter staunchly refutes. He affirms:

Or io senza voler punti sminuire il merito de' Greci sostengo, che l'opere Toscane di cui ho ragionato fin quì, e che tanto veggonsi celebrate da Plinio, nè furono, nè poterono essere opera de' Greci. (RA.25)

Whilst referring to a plural 'dispregiatori' rather than a single opponent here, it is difficult to deny the veiled reference to Winckelmann (even if amongst others) when one considers his core belief that Etruscan art did *not* attain 'the highest state of perfection' that Greek art had achieved. Indeed, the German scholar clearly asserts in the opening chapters of the *Geschichte* that, in Etruscan art, 'this point was not reached' (GES.I.144/I.226).¹¹² Thus it is evident that the German scholar's offensive views were Piranesi's not so secret target here, which he condemns to the defence of Italy's Etruria.¹¹³

¹¹² 'die höchste Vollkommenheit'; 'aber dieses nicht geschehen ist'.

¹¹³ Cristofani, p. 119.

Piranesi repeats this same foreignization of Winckelmann's views later in the *Ragionamento*, by stating: 'Ella è per vero dire una legge ingiusta quella, che alcuni ci vorrebbero imporre di non far nulla, che Greco non sia' (RA.32-33). As Luigi Grassi verifies, Piranesi is most evidently responding to (and condemning) here Winckelmann's famous call for artists to imitate the Greeks: 'the only way for us to become great, and, if indeed it is possible, inimitable, is through the imitation of the ancients [Greeks]' (GED.8/32).¹¹⁴ Piranesi's extended negative 'non far nulla, che Greco non sia' even mirrors Winckelmann's emphatic 'only'. His desire to select and reject Winckelmann's offensive views is unmistakable.

Thus, whilst, as Cristofani asserts, it 'rimane ipotetico [...] quanto abbia influito un'eventuale polemica nei confronti del Winckelmann, mai citato espressamente',¹¹⁵ Piranesi's anonymous opponents – be it 'un di loro', 'dispregiatori de' Toscani', or the even the more nebulous 'alcuni' – clearly refer to or at least include Winckelmann. It is plain that, in his attempts to defend his heritage from the Graecomania of the late eighteenth century, Piranesi – particularly in his later *Ragionamento* – foreignizes Winckelmann's views by selecting those of an Italophobic nature with the sole aim of disproving his reasoning.

Finally, whilst a rarity in Milizia's oeuvre, which (as explored above) was centred on the replication of Winckelmann's *Geschichte*, even Milizia in the *Memorie degli architetti* provides an example of this method of foreignizing Winckelmann's views: here in relation to Renaissance rather than ancient art. Indeed, Milizia selects evidently Winckelmannian views on Michelangelo's supposed weakness in drawing gentle figures, from which he defends the Renaissance artist:

Dal Cupido, dal dilicato Bacco, e dalle membra gentilissime di questa Pietà ben si vede quanto sia insussistente il giudizio di coloro, che han caratterizzato Michelangelo atto solamente ad effigiare uomini forti, robusti e feroci, e non morbidi Adoni con dolcezza e soavità. (ME.I.191)

¹¹⁴ Luigi Grassi, *Teorici e storia della critica d'arte*, 3 vols (Rome: Bonsignori, 1997), III, 114. See Chapter II, n. 75 for the German original.

¹¹⁵ Cristofani, p. 119.

Michelangelo is perhaps the only one of whom one could say that he matched the achievements of antiquity, but only in his strong muscular figures and in bodies of the heroic period, not in figures of gentle youths or women, which become Amazons in his hands.¹¹⁶ (GED.20/39)

His ‘uomini forti, robusti e feroci’ mirror Winckelmann’s ‘strong muscular figures’, just as his ‘morbidi Adoni con dolcezza e soavità’ echo the latter’s ‘figures of gentle youths or women’. Thus, whilst employing, as Piranesi had, an impersonal antagonist – ‘il giudizio di coloro’ – Milizia plainly foreignizes Winckelmann’s views. He selects the German scholar’s offensive sentiments on Michelangelo and refutes them to the defence of the Renaissance artist.

Thus, D’Arco, Cicognara, Piranesi and Milizia all demonstrate foreignization of Winckelmann’s views through the same method. They select his views that were offensive to Italy, reject them and, in doing so, defend their native heritage from such judgements.

IV.7. DOMESTICATION: THE *GESCHICHTE* IN ITALIAN ART LITERATURE

Turning to the opposite reaction of domestication, I will now explore the methods these art writers used to domesticate Winckelmann’s oeuvre in Italian art literature of the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries. This form of domestication involves two methods, both of which Lanzi and Cicognara employ. They emphasize the familiarity of Winckelmann’s writing amongst Italians and also present their own works as continuations of his *Geschichte*: methods by which they present Winckelmann’s oeuvre as less foreign, and even Italian.

I will first explore how Lanzi and Cicognara underscore the familiarity of Winckelmann’s oeuvre amongst Italian readers. Lanzi, for example, alluding most likely to the *Geschichte*, draws attention to it being ‘fra le mani di tutti’: ‘Son concorsi a migliorare il gusto i libri, che ora stanno fra le mani di tutti, del Winckelmann e del Mengs’ (SP.II.278). Through claiming as

¹¹⁶ ‘Michael Angelo ist vielleicht der einzige, von dem man sagen könnte, daß er das Altertum erreicht; aber nur in starken muskulösen Figuren, in Körpern aus der Helden-Zeit; nicht in zärtlich jugendlichen, nicht in weiblichen Figuren, welche unter seiner Hand zu Amazonen geworden sind’.

such, he domesticates Winckelmann's magnum opus by presenting it not as foreign, but rather as widely read and familiar to Italians. In a similar manner, Cicognara also suggests the popularity of Winckelmann's writing in Italy through highlighting how 'ognun sa' about his (and Mengs' and D'Agincourt's) works: 'Intanto lo stesso Mengs, Winckelmann, d'Agincourt andavano preparando opere grandiose sia nella teoria delle arti, sia nella storia delle medesime, come ognun sa' (SS.VII.50). Like Lanzi, Cicognara domesticates Winckelmann's writing, highlighting how it was a subject of common knowledge in Italy.

As introduced above, Lanzi and Cicognara also domesticate Winckelmann's oeuvre by casting their own publications as continuations of Winckelmann's work, presenting the German scholar's work not as foreign, but as a key element to Italy's own art literature. I will now examine their respective efforts in turn. Lanzi, for instance, reveals the inspiration provided by the *Geschichte* in his *Storia pittorica*, as he clarifies how his decision to divide his *Storia pittorica* 'separatamente' into schools is based on Winckelmann's approach of 'partitamente' describing each nation's art:¹¹⁷

Convieni, a fare una piena istoria di Pittura, trovar modo da allogarvi ogni stile per vario che sia da tutti gli altri; nè a ciò ho saputo eleggere miglior partito, che tessere separatamente la storia di ogni scuola. Ne ho preso esempio da Winckelmann ottimo artefice della storia antica del disegno, che tante scuole partitamente descrive, quante furono nazioni che le produssero. (SP.I.ix-x)

Moreover, demonstrating Winckelmann's presence in his wider oeuvre, too, Lanzi similarly highlights the applicability of the German scholar's cyclical pattern of rises and declines 'sia per le arti maggiori che per le arti minori' and thus to ancient vases, too.¹¹⁸ Indeed he reiterates in *De' vasi antichi*, the progression from 'l'infanzia dell'artefice che ancor non vide buoni esemplari', to an improvement when 'si veggon poi cangiare in meglio e il disegno e i caratteri', before then the decline, when 'finalmente s'incontrano certi stili d'imitazione; ove il cattivo

¹¹⁷ Lanzi's overt presentation of his own work as a continuation of the *Geschichte* is all the more notable given that modern scholars such as Bickendorf question the true applicability of Winckelmann's system to the *Storia pittorica*: Bickendorf, p. 354.

¹¹⁸ Gauna, p. 128.

misto col buono fa avvertir che l'autore vide il buono, ma non seppe imitarlo o non volle' (DVA.28). Nor does he do so without clarifying Winckelmann's role here. Rather, simultaneously verifying again the Winckelmannian inspiration behind the *Storia pittorica*, Lanzi confirms how this similar system in *De' vasi antichi* is also 'su la scorta [...] di Winckelmann' (DVA.9):

Questo andamento dell'arte del disegno, fondato nella natura, comprovato da Winckelmann nella scultura antica, e forse da me nella *Storia della italiana pittura*, non può trasandarsi in proposito di figuline dipinte.¹¹⁹ (DVA.28)

Furthermore, whilst Lanzi himself does not always cite the German scholar in such an overt manner, other elements of his broader plan further support his claim to have 'preso esempio da Winckelmann'. For instance, his rejection of dictionaries and biographies of artists, as they do not provide 'il sistema della istoria pittorica',¹²⁰ demonstrates clear Winckelmannian influence, as he too shunned biographies in search of a 'system' (GES.I.ii/l.107).¹²¹

il sistema della istoria pittorica: niuno di essi espone que' quadri, per così dire, ove a colpo d'occhio si vede tutto il seguito delle cose [...] Molto meno vi si trovano quell'epoche e que' cangiamenti dell'arte, che sopra ogni cosa cerca un lettore pensatore: perciocchè quindi apprende ciò che ha contribuito al risorgimento o alla decadenza; ed è anco aiutato così a conservare nella memoria la serie, e l'ordine de' racconti. (SP.I.v-vi, italics added)

Lanzi's intention to explore not only art's rise and decline, but the reasons for them, 'ciò che ha contribuito', is also reminiscent of the German scholar, who of course placed great emphasis on external circumstances. Thus, even where Winckelmann is not acknowledged, such

¹¹⁹ Gauna, p. 128.

¹²⁰ Despite the arguably Vasarian structure of his *Storia pittorica* (see Chapter IV, n. 69), this rejection of dictionaries and biographies demonstrates Lanzi's departure from Vasari. Whilst this apparent contradiction has been discussed in scholarship – see Previtali, p. 139 and Bickendorf, pp. 276-77 – this thesis is only concerned with how Lanzi chose to present his relationship with Winckelmann. Thus, in this case, the focus of attention is the similarity between Lanzi's rejection of artists' biographies and Winckelmann's equivalent stance.

¹²¹ 'Lehrgebäude'.

statements as these substantiate Lanzi's claims to be continuing his magnum opus. As Massimiliano Rossi affirms, 'La storia pittorica è inconcepibile senza la *Geschichte*'.¹²²

Moreover, just as Lanzi (justifiably) declares the broader structure of his *Storia pittorica* and *De' vasi antichi* to be continuations of Winckelmann's work, he also introduces his *Notizie preliminari* as yet another extension of Winckelmann's *Geschichte*. Indeed, justifying his use of Winckelmann's observations through the lack of evidence of ancient sculpture, Lanzi asserts 'in esso io farò uso delle osservazioni dell'Abate Winckelmann, e del Cavalier Mengs' (NP.i-ii), and continues, too, to declare that he will add to and even disagree with Winckelmann's work where necessary. Given the reference here to the same subject matter as Winckelmann, rather than simply a shared methodology, Lanzi's Winckelmannian inspiration is arguably even more apparent in this essay than in his other works. Through a combination of both overt and unreferenced allusions to the German scholar, Lanzi traces the development of ancient art from Egypt to Rome, just as Winckelmann does in the *Geschichte*. He not only cites (and imitates) the German scholar's treatment of the Egyptians – 'Winckelmann ne distinse tre epoche' (NP.ii) (GES.I.65/I.173) – but further continues to adopt his views on the advancement of Etruscan production. He reiterates in great detail Winckelmann's ideas on the figures of the second period of Etruscan art. This includes the German scholar's identification of 'the strong marking of muscles and of bones' (GES.I.180/I.251)¹²³ or, as Lanzi identically states, 'un soverchio risentimento di ossa e di muscoli' (NP.xii), as well as Winckelmann's belief that the productions of this second style were 'mannered' (GES.I.184/I.254). Like Winckelmann, Lanzi even argues that such mannerism constitutes a 'mancanza del carattere' (NP.xii). Whilst I will not list all such replications, Lanzi further repeats many of Winckelmann's views related to Greek art, including both the timing of the most noble period of statuary – 'Ella fu il prodotto

¹²² Rossi, p. 106.

¹²³ 'die starke Andeutung der Muskeln und der Knochen'.

di circa 150. anni, quanti ne corsero da Pericle e da Fidria fino a' tempi di Alessandro il grande e di Lisippo' – and the crucial role of the Grecian climate (NP.xxvi).

It is thus plain that by fittingly styling his publications, especially his *Storia pittorica* and *Notizie preliminari*, as continuations of Winckelmann's writing, Lanzi domesticates Winckelmann's work. He fashions it as the prototype to his own, and in doing so presents it as familiar, as part of Italian scholarship.

Writing soon after Lanzi, Cicognara also employs this method of domesticating Winckelmann's oeuvre. One need only turn to the title of his *Storia della scultura dal suo risorgimento in Italia fino al secolo di Canova: per servire di continuazione alle opere di Winkelmann e di d'Agincourt* for evidence of his efforts to embrace Winckelmann's work and present his own as a continuation. As regards the period he considers, Cicognara himself explains how it was on consulting both Winckelmann's and D'Agincourt's works – which examined ancient and medieval art, respectively – that he resolved to write a study that continued these explorations.¹²⁴ Beginning his analysis in the twelfth century, his *Storia della scultura* traces artistic development through to the present day:

Come tutte le altre arti ebbe le sue vicende, la storia delle quali è stata lo scopo di due grandi opere che precedettero queste storiche ricerche, l'una del celebre Winckelmann e l'altra del signor d'Agincourt, e lo scorrerle rapidamente mi porterà con più ordine all'epoca dalla quale io intendo voler dipartirmi. (SS.I.145)

Further clarifying his *Storia della scultura*'s status as a 'continuazione', Cicognara also refers again to Winckelmann and D'Agincourt when justifying his decision to concentrate solely on sculpture. Indeed, in order to reassure his readers of this restricted scope, Cicognara confirms that there will inevitably still be some consideration of architecture and painting, allowing him to announce his work as an extension of Winckelmann's and D'Agincourt's writing:

D'altronde poi a conforto degli Artisti e delle Arti convien riflettere che riesce impossibile d'entrare in alcuni esami sul progresso e sulle vicende della Scultura

¹²⁴ Jean Baptiste Seroux d'Agincourt, *L'Histoire de l'art par les monuments, depuis sa décadence au quatrième siècle jusqu'à son renouvellement au seizième*, 6 vols (Paris: Treuttel et Würtz, 1823).

prendendola dal suo risorgere in Italia, senza parlare dell'architettura e della pittura, colle // quali ebbe comune, oltre la culla, anche la maggior parte del suo alterno andamento. Queste ragioni ci mossero senza alcuna difficoltà ad annunciare il nostro lavoro come una continuazione delle opere di Winckelmann e di d'Agincourt. (SS.I.22-23)

His identification of Winckelmann's *Geschichte* as a model for his own work does not, however, end there, as Cicognara continues to pre-empt and defend his *Storia della scultura* from any future censure. Despite his above statement, for example, he anticipates potential claims that there was a lack of attention afforded to other art forms, rendering his work distant from Winckelmann's and D'Agincourt's example. Thus, to justify yet further his *Storia's* status as a 'continuazione' of their works, Cicognara clarifies that, whilst his two predecessors of course wrote 'dell'architettura e della pittura', they themselves simply made assumptions on these art forms based on of their preferred, 'a preferenza', sculptural research. In a bid to protect his work from criticism, this clearly dilutes his previous suggestion of a strict requirement to consider other art forms:

E se in tutta la sua estensione non può dirsi che questo lavoro (perchè non comprende esplicitamente la storia di tutte le arti) serva realmente alla continuazione delle citate opere, io farò riflettere al mio lettore, come gli storici anteriori, e specialmente il primo [Winckelmann], avendo dirette le loro profonde ricerche sui monumenti, hanno trovato che poco rimaneva di antiche pitture, e sui preziosi più durevoli avanzi della Scultura hanno dovuto dirigere a preferenza i loro studi, instruendo quasi per deduzione sullo stato delle altre arti. (SS.I.26-27)

Examined together, these two arguments demonstrate Cicognara's plain desire, using whatever means possible, to affirm the similarity of his work to that of Winckelmann (and D'Agincourt).

Cicognara did not always pronounce his use of Winckelmann so overtly; in fact, references to Winckelmann are rare throughout his work. Whilst erroneous in her counting, Fedi effectively demonstrates the scarcity of direct allusion to Winckelmann by commenting

that in the whole of Cicognara's oeuvre, he 'è menzionato solo due volte'.¹²⁵ Such infrequency of references to the German scholar is, however, by no means indicative of the actual influence of Winckelmann in Cicognara's writings. Rather, having established him as a model, many subsequent instances of Cicognara's Winckelmannian inspiration simply occur without identification of their source. Indeed, as Ferrari affirms, although references to the German scholar often appear in 'sezioni più generali, dove il richiamo è in apparenza meno esplicito', 'il loro dialogo risulta comunque ininterrotto e durevole, estendendosi a quasi tutta la trattazione dell'opera'.¹²⁶ Nor, as Fedi emphasizes, was this a phenomenon restricted to Winckelmann. Cicognara frequently failed to cite his sources, without – it should be noted – any hidden agenda. He was not attempting to plagiarize, 'non cercasse in alcun modo di nascondere la loro influenza', but rather confesses to his negligent practices at the beginning of his *Storia della scultura*:¹²⁷

Talvolta sarà accaduto persino che memorando alcun passo di scrittore letto di recente, pel coincidere nelle sue opinioni su quell'argomento, ci siamo appropriati il suo pensare e il suo dire, omettendo forse anche di citarlo. (SS.I.15-16)

With this in mind, Cicognara's examination of the development of art under the Egyptians, Etruscans, Greeks, and Romans throughout the fourth chapter of the *Storia's* first volume supports – despite his intermittent reference to the German scholar – his clear intention to follow in Winckelmann's footsteps. Much like Lanzi, he even structures this around 'perfezione' and 'decadenza': the timing of which, 'ai tempi di Pericle' and then 'verso il mille' (SS.I.68), mirrors the *Geschichte*.¹²⁸ Moreover, Cicognara's claim is yet further confirmed by Pietro Giordani, who (as I clarified in the contextual introduction above) had a key role in the *Storia della scultura*. On reading Cicognara's initial plans for this work, Giordani himself

¹²⁵ Fedi, p. 100.

¹²⁶ Ferrari, 'Cicognara e Winckelmann', p. 107.

¹²⁷ Fedi, p. 100.

¹²⁸ Despite the different structure of *Del bello*, these periods of rise and decline are noted in this earlier work, too (DB.358-62).

asserted, 'Sappiate che il piano di Winckelmann per la *storia antica* sottosopra non mi dispiace'.¹²⁹

Finally, whilst, I will not examine every example that endorses Cicognara's pronouncement of his *Storia della scultura* as a continuation of Winckelmann's *Geschichte*, his aesthetics demonstrate 'una decisa impronta winckelmanniana'.¹³⁰ Indeed, despite the above-noted difficulty in identifying the source of artistic principles, his emphasis on such principles as unity, simplicity, wholeness, proportion, and the merits of the human form reveal a clear 'fedeltà al precetto della *Edle Einfalt und stille Größe*'.¹³¹ a loyalty made all the more credible given Cicognara's own recognition of Winckelmann as a model. This is not to mention Cicognara's emphasis – again like Lanzi – on the crucial role that external circumstances played in Greek art's success. In a plainly Winckelmannian manner, he orders his readers, when contemplating the 'l'eccellenza degli artefici greci', to 'riflettere [sic] che l'agilità del loro [Greeks'] ingegno, la dolcezza del loro clima, l'immaginoso del loro culto, la loro legislazione, ed ogni loro costumanza infine potevano influire bastevolmente per costituirli il primo popolo del mondo' (SS.I.154).¹³² Thus, like Lanzi, Cicognara – again with good reason – presents his work as a 'continuazione' of Winckelmann's oeuvre, or rather as Ludovici states the 'figlia diretta della *Storia dell'arte presso gli antichi* del Winckelmann'.¹³³ Through doing as such he domesticates the *Geschichte*: by both referring to and employing the German scholar's approach, he renders Winckelmann's work less foreign and more familiar to Italian readers.

¹²⁹ Quoted from a letter written to Cicognara, 19/12/1809, see Ferrari, 'Cicognara e Winckelmann', p. 107.

¹³⁰ Fedi, p. 202.

¹³¹ Fedi, p. 202. I have retained the German in this quotation as it refers to Winckelmann's famous phrase, 'noble simplicity and calm greatness', which appears at Chapter II, n. 71. Such principles can be found throughout Cicognara's oeuvre. See, for example: simplicity (SS.VI.93); wholeness (SS.V.169), (DB.330); proportion (DB.130); and praise of the human form (DB.37). See also Rossi, p. 192.

¹³² Cicognara expands on the role of Greece's climate (in a markedly Winckelmannian fashion) in *Del bello*, see (DB.351).

¹³³ Ludovici, p. 103.

To conclude this examination of the domestication of Winckelmann's oeuvre, Lanzi and Cicognara emphasized the familiarity of Winckelmann's work in Italy by highlighting his extensive Italian readership and by presenting their own works as 'continuazioni' of the German scholar's writing. Through employing these two methods, they domesticated Winckelmann's oeuvre, presenting it as far less foreign, and arguably even according it a place in Italian scholarship.

IV.8. DOMESTICATION: REMODELLING WINCKELMANN'S IDEAS

As well as domesticating Winckelmann's oeuvre, the art writers of the period also domesticated his views. As in the previous chapter, this involved efforts to present Winckelmann's opinions as more attractive to the Italian readership. The writers achieved this through four different methods. First, they employed textual manipulation in order to render Winckelmann's views less offensive. Second, the writers misappropriated Winckelmann's opinions by purporting to agree with them but in fact altering their original meaning to disparage their rivals, the Greeks. The third method, which I term transposition, involves the art writers approving of a Winckelmannian principle yet presenting it as more attractive by applying it to a new Italian context where it was not employed by Winckelmann. Fourth, similarly to transposition, the art writers again approved of a Winckelmannian principle but, by this method, actively defied the German scholar's views concerning its application. Notwithstanding Winckelmann's claim to the contrary, the writers employed his concept to the praise of Italy and in doing so rendered it more attractive. This final method is referred to as transmutation. I will now explore these four methods in turn.

The first method, textual manipulation, is the same method employed by Amoretti and Fea to make subtle alterations to domesticate Winckelmann's *Geschichte*, as discussed in the previous chapter. In quoting Fea's edition, however, Lanzi clearly intends to dilute the

Graecophile nature of Winckelmann's views to an even greater extent. Fea had already omitted the idea of 'beauty' from Winckelmann's notion that beauty in the drawing of the nude can be learnt from Greek examples. Yet Lanzi further denies the Greek statues any beauty. Again through omission, he translates Winckelmann's (and Fea's) 'four or five *of the most beautiful* statues' as 'quattro o cinque statue':

In our day the beautiful drawing of the nude body might be learned from four or five of the most beautiful statues, yet drapery must be studied on a hundred. One statue is rarely found to resemble another in its drapery.¹³⁴ (GES.I.448/II.49)

A' nostri tempi, dove a' giovani artisti possono proporsi quattro o cinque *delle più belle* statue per istudio nel nudo, ben cento se ne possono additar loro per istudiare il panneggiamento. È ben raro, che trovinsi due statue alla stessa maniera vestite. (FE.I.449, italics added)

Winck. T. I, pag. 449. A' nostri tempi ove a' giovani artisti posson proporsi quattro o cinque statue per lo studio del nudo, ben cento se ne possono additar loro per istudiare il panneggiamento. È ben raro che trovinsi due statue alla stessa maniera vestite. (NP.xxviii)

Lanzi thus makes a subtle alteration to Winckelmann's wording in order to dilute its Graecophile nature and present his view as more attractive to an Italian reader. Given the medium of art literature, however, such textual manipulation was not particularly common, since it could only occur when the Italian art writers quoted Winckelmann directly. Nevertheless other methods developed in its place.

In relation to the second method, D'Arco domesticates Winckelmann's views on early Greek art by purporting to agree with them, but in fact altering his original message. For instance, on discussion of the origins of art, D'Arco not only highlights Winckelmann's admission that Etruscan art developed before that of the Greeks and thus flourished when Greek art was merely beginning, but further replicates an example that Winckelmann himself employs to demonstrate Greek art's backwardness in this very early period. Like Winckelmann,

¹³⁴ 'wenn zu unsern Zeiten die Schönheit der Zeichnung des Nackenden aus vier oder fünf der schönsten Statuen zu erlernen wäre, so muß der Künstler die Bekleidung in hundert derselben studieren. Denn es ist selten eine der andern in der Bekleidung gleich, da sich hingegen viele nackte Statuen völlig ähnlich finden'.

D'Arco comments (also citing Socrates) on the sculptor, Daedalus, whose works would be ridiculed today given the development of skill and quality since his time:

We can form some idea of his works from the opinion of the sculptors of the time of Socrates, as quoted by him. "If Daedalus," he says, "should live again, and produce works similar to those which pass under his name, he would, as the sculptors say, be an object of ridicule".¹³⁵ (GES.I.11/I.138)

Nè è già da credere, che dell'Erme fossero di molto più eleganti quelle statue, che col nome di Dedali dai Greci chiamaronsi, benchè celebrate tanto e commendate; imperciocchè allo scrivere del Winkel. stesso soleano gli Scultori della Grecia de' bassi tempi dire, che se Dedalo tornasse al mondo, ed opere facesse simili a quelle, sarebbe messo a fischiare. (DPP.101)

As is evident from the similarity of these passages – 'would [...] be an object of ridicule'; 'sarebbe messo a fischiare' – D'Arco appears to be faithfully adopting Winckelmann's example. He, however, alters its purpose. D'Arco takes this idea out of context and utilizes it, not simply to explain the beginnings of ancient Greek art, as in Winckelmann's work, but as a criticism of the Greeks. He exploits Winckelmann's idea, using it to imply immediately thereafter that the Greeks required the aid of the Etruscans to achieve progress: 'allor quando le arti Etrusche recate vennero nella Grecia, ritrovar poteronsi a quel grado di perfezione addotte, in virtù del quale la vista dell'opere loro giovar potè ai progressi dell'arti Greche' (DPP.101). He thereby domesticates Winckelmann's views: rendering them more attractive to Italian readers by misappropriating his comments on early Greek art in order to suggest the important and even necessary role that Italic art had in the progress of their rivals.

The third method used to domesticate Winckelmann's views – transposition – involves art writers agreeing with a concept expressed by Winckelmann and applying it to a new Italian context in order to praise Italy: a method employed by both Lanzi and Cicognara. Transposition often (yet not exclusively) involves Winckelmann's ideas concerning external circumstances. After all, as I will explore in due course, Winckelmann himself reapplied some circumstances

¹³⁵ 'Von den Werken dieses Künstlers gibt die Meynung der Bildhauer von Socrates Zeit, welche er anführet, einigen Begriff; wenn Dädalus, sagt er, wieder aufstehen sollte, und arbeiten würde, wie die Werke sind, die unter dessen Namen gehen, würde er, wie die Bildhauer sagen, lächerlich werden'.

he believed crucial to the success of Greek art to later Italian periods. Following Winckelmann, Lanzi and Cicognara highlight the applicability of such circumstances to yet further Italian regions and periods and, in doing so, present Winckelmann's views as even more attractive to the Italian reader.

Cicognara, for example, despite not referencing the German scholar, transfers the markedly Winckelmannian notion of politics affecting artistic production from its original Greek context in the *Geschichte* to Italian art's early rise from Nicola Pisano to Donatello. He even overtly compares Italy's political safeguarding of arts to that of Greece, demonstrating a plain example of the transposition of a view expressed by Winckelmann in order to commend historical Italy:

Quando risorse l'Italia e riacquistaronsi i diritti che i cittadini avevano perduti, risvegliossi il nobile principio di emulazione per la gloria, si protesse la religion dominante, le arti ritornarono a cingere il trono di splendore, a render più augusta la patria, più venerato l'altare, e per quelle medesime cause che la politica le protesse saggiamente nella Grecia e nel Lazio,¹³⁶ le vedremo noi pure prosperar nuovamente con più varietà di forme e con maggior estensione in tutta l'Italia moderna. (SS.III.97-98)

Similarly, Lanzi was also inspired by Winckelmann's notion of external circumstances. Indeed, it is plain to see the error in Nogara's assertion that 'ciò che manca invece all'opera del Lanzi è l'indagine delle molteplici ragioni storiche che preparano e seguono il cammino dell'arte, non soltanto quelle politiche [...] ma anche e più quelle naturali di razza e di clima'.¹³⁷ After all, amongst various examples, Lanzi transposes the Winckelmannian belief in climate's influence on art to the specific case of Renaissance Pisa. Referencing the Arno in an arguably Dantesque phrase, Lanzi describes Pisa's climate as 'friendly' to art: 'Da che in Pisa rigermogliò l'arte della pittura, non ebbe forse quella città pittor sì valente [Orazio Rimanaldi]; nè molti migliori ne nacquero in riva all'Arno, clima sì amico alle arti.' (SP.I.257). Clearly approving of Winckelmann's concept, Lanzi extends its application here by transposing it to a more

¹³⁶ He discusses Lazio at the time of Carlo IV (SS.III.21-22).

¹³⁷ Nogara, p. 25.

attractive and familiar context to the Italian reader. Moreover, turning to the more modern period of 1795 – when, after Winckelmann’s death, the first edition of the *Storia pittorica* was produced – Lanzi further transposes to the Rome of his day the Winckelmannian belief in the significant effect that respect for and encouragement of art had on ancient Greek production. When discussing the reasons for Greek art’s supremacy, as noted in Chapter II, Winckelmann emphasizes the importance both of the public rewards given to artists and the opportunities for them to display their works (GES.I.237,231/I.295,291): ideas Lanzi clearly echoes. Indeed, praising the Roman school of his day, Lanzi, too, extols the ‘pubblici premi dati a’ più meritevoli [...] accompagnati da’ componimenti de’ letterati e da festa pubblica in Campidoglio’, as well as ‘l’uso di esporre in pubblico le pitture alla vista di un popolo’ (SP.II.278-79). Thus, be it politics, climate, or recognition of art, Cicognara and Lanzi domesticated Winckelmann’s views by transposing notably Winckelmannian principles from their original Greek context to different periods and regions of Italian artistic production, employing them in a manner more attractive to their Italian readers.

Beyond external circumstances, Cicognara also transposes elements of Winckelmann’s pattern of rise and decline in Greek art onto that of the Renaissance. This was a similarity between these two artistic periods that Winckelmann himself, especially when discussing the art of drawing, had already pronounced:

In general the fate of art in modern times is, as regards periods, similar to that of antiquity. In it likewise there have occurred four principal changes;¹³⁸ there is this difference only, that modern art did not fall gradually from its height, as among the Greeks; but as soon as it had reached, in two great men, the utmost degree of elevation at that time possible [...] it fell again and at once. Until Michael Angelo and Raphael, the style was dry and stiff; the highest point to which art attained, after its restoration, was in these two men; after an interval, in which a bad taste prevailed, came the style of the imitators; this was the period of the Caracci and their school, with its followers, and it extended unto Carlo Maratti.¹³⁹ (GES.I.505/II.153-54)

¹³⁸ These four principal changes refer to the improvement of art (in three stages) and the final, fourth stage of decline through imitation.

¹³⁹ ‘Das Schicksal der Kunst überhaupt in neuern Zeiten ist, in Absicht der Perioden, dem im Altertum gleich: es sind ebenfalls vier Hauptveränderungen in derselben vorgegangen, nur mit diesem Unterschied, daß die

Yet, as well as simple imitation of this parallel between Greek and Renaissance art – which Cicognara and Lanzi demonstrate on a number of occasions in their works¹⁴⁰ – Cicognara implies an even closer correspondence than Winckelmann does between these two artistic periods. He achieves this by transposing to the Renaissance comments that Winckelmann only made when describing the development of Greek art. For instance, whilst Winckelmann asserts in the *Geschichte* that Greek art's decline was inevitable due to the high level of unattainable perfection that the Greeks achieved, so Cicognara transposes this image from its original Greek context to describe instead the unavoidable decline of art after Michelangelo. The similarity of these images is unmistakable:

Inasmuch therefore as art could not advance, it must go backwards, because in it, as in all the operations of nature, we cannot think of any stationary point.¹⁴¹
(GES.I.490/II.143)

[...] un confine, nel quale impossibile riesca il mantenersi, e divenga necessario da quello retrogradare, è indubitato che la Toscana non ebbe più grandi ingegni che la mantenessero in quel credito, che le avevano sopra di ogni altra nazione procurato le opere di scarpello. (SS.VI.87)

In doing as such, Cicognara transposes the suggestion of unsurpassable excellence from Winckelmann's original Greek context to Italy's Renaissance production: clearly domesticating the German scholar's idea.

Scholarship has not yet noted the method of transposition in Lanzi's work, yet examination here of this method in Cicognara's *Storia della scultura* affirms Ulivi's assertion

Kunst nicht nach und nach, wie bei den Griechen, von ihrer Höhe herunter sank, sondern so bald die den ihr damals möglichen Grad der Höhe in zwei großen Männern erreicht hatte, [...] so fiel sie mit einmal plötzlich wieder herunter. Der Stil war trocken und steif bis auf Michael Angelo und Raphael; auf diesen beiden Männern besteht die Höhe der Kunst in ihrer Wiederherstellung: nach einem Zwischenraume, in welchem der üble Geschmack regierte, kam der Stil der Nachahmer; dieses waren die Caracci und ihre Schule, mit deren Folge; und diese Periode geht bis auf Karl Maratta'.

¹⁴⁰ Lanzi, for example, in explaining art's development from roughness to a more diligent style, chooses no other than Greek sculpture and Italian painting as examples: 'Questo corso ha tenuto la pittura in Italia; e la scultura in Grecia' (NP.xxxvii). Moreover, for more on Cicognara's approval of the rise and decline pattern in both ancient and Renaissance art, see Potts, 'Winckelmann's *History of Art* in its Eighteenth-Century Context' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Warburg Institute, University of London, 1978), pp. 487-88.

¹⁴¹ 'Es mußte also die Kunst, in welcher, wie in allen Wirkungen der Natur, kein fester Punct zu denken ist, da sie nicht weiter hinausging, zurück gehen'.

that Winckelmann's image of the well-structured society of the Greeks provided Cicognara with 'luogo a raffronti con la "felice" situazione dell'Italia'.¹⁴² Moreover, this method verifies Giordani's identification of a Winckelmannian flavour to Cicognara's *Storia*. Indeed, although greatly underestimating the inspiration provided by Winckelmann, Giordani in a letter in 1810 also identified the role that such outside influences as 'vicende politiche' had in Cicognara's work:

fai una storia non da artista solamente, ma da artista e da filosofo. Però seguitando, ad ogni epoca troverai nelle vicende politiche, nelle opinioni, negli studi, ne' costumi, ne' vizi di ciascun secolo le cause del variare di quest'arte: e mostrerai come tutto è connesso e dipendente. Il buon Winckelmann ne diede appena due o tre cenni fuggitivi e superficiali nella sua opera: ma non era questa la radice di essa, e perciò non fu nutrita di quel succo.¹⁴³

Lanzi and Cicognara thus agreed with, adopted, and transposed to Italy Winckelmann's views on both the external circumstances benefitting the progress of Greek art and the pattern of its development. By doing so, I contend that they succeeded in rendering them more attractive and relatable to the Italian reader.

The fourth and final method of domesticating Winckelmann's views is transmutation, whereby the art writers adopted a Winckelmannian principle but defied the German scholar in applying it to the benefit of the peninsula. It is arguable that this method is particularly blatant in its domestication, insofar as it converts what were offensive views in Winckelmann's original into examples of great praise for Italy. In D'Arco's *Della patria*, for instance (much of which, as explored above, was instead centred on foreignizing Winckelmann's views) one nevertheless notes markedly Winckelmannian ideas in his discussion of the 'situazione felice del paese abitato dagli Etrusci':

[...] senza entrare in alcuna particolarità circa la parte dell'Etruria, in cui prima e più felicemente è da credersi fiorissero le arti del disegno, presi a far osservare come dalla situazione felice del paese abitato dagli Etrusci, dall'antichità dello stabilimento di un civile Governo, dall'eccellenza della forma di questo, dall'estensione e vastità de'

¹⁴² Ulivi, *Settecento neoclassico* (Pisa: Nistri-Lischi, 1957), p. 307.

¹⁴³ Letter to Cicognara dated 21/04/1810, see Ferrari, 'Cicognara e Winckelmann', p. 107.

Domini, dalla qualità del sistema di religione dominante e degli oggetti del pubblico culto, dalla celebrità della nazione, e per fino dal suo lusso medesimo argomentar si può che antichissime fossero le arti suddette presso gli Etrusci. (DPP.13)

Echoing Winckelmann's emphasis on the significance of external circumstances to art's success, D'Arco highlights here the positive contribution of Etruria's 'civile Governo' by adopting Winckelmann's identical view. Indeed, just as Winckelmann praised the Greek political climate, so too he commended the 'democratic' Etruscan government which, by involving all Etruscan individuals, was able to 'elevate their genius and perception, and render both fit for the practice of the arts' (GES.I.142/I.224-25).¹⁴⁴ Departing from this, however, D'Arco's celebration of the 'qualità [...] degli oggetti del pubblico culto' in Etruria constitutes an alteration to Winckelmann's original. Whereas the German scholar elsewhere highlights the positive impact that a nation's customs can have on their artistic production, he specifically denies the Etruscans any such accolade. He even states that:

The disposition of the Etruscans appears to have been more tinged with melancholy than was the case with the Greek race, —as we may infer from their religious services and their customs. [...] This conjecture is grounded, in the first place, on the[ir] practice of soothsaying [...]. Furthermore, we might infer a temperament of this kind from the sanguinary fights at their burials.¹⁴⁵ (GES.I.144-45/I.226-27)

D'Arco thus adopted here Winckelmann's notion of customs affecting art, but drastically defied his views on its application, modifying it from an offensive idea to one affording Etruria additional praise.

Also demonstrating transmutation, Cicognara adopted another of Winckelmann's external circumstances and revised its application. The external circumstance in question is the role of climate to art's success. Winckelmann commended the Italian and the Grecian climate as being beneficial to art (again revealing his own comparisons between the two). Yet he believed that the former was inferior to the latter:

¹⁴⁴ 'democratisch'; 'den Geist und den Sinn erheben, und beide geschickt machen zur Übung der Künste'.

¹⁴⁵ The Italophobic nature (and original German) of this comment is noted in Chapter II.4.4.

He who has never visited these countries can form his own conclusions as to the intellectual organization of their inhabitants, by observing that their acuteness increases as the climate grows warmer. The Neapolitans are still more acute and artful than the Romans; the Sicilians are more so than the Neapolitans; but the Greeks surpass even the Sicilians.¹⁴⁶ (GES.I.45/I.160)

Only the Greek sky provided the perfect balance between hot and cold. Cicognara, however, adopted and revised the application of Winckelmann's concept. He agreed with Winckelmann's idea that temperate climate, even Greek climate, was conducive to high calibre art, yet he disregarded the German scholar's claim that Italy's climate was inferior. Indeed, he instead asserted that his native climate was no less favourable for art: 'queste sono tante bellezze, che vengono dal nostro clima, non minori di quelle, che agli occhi de' greci artisti brillavano, quando le arti erano in fiore presso di loro' (DB.349). Thus, through adopting Winckelmann's concept, yet revising its attribution, Cicognara, like D'Arco before him, domesticated the German scholar's idea for the benefit of his Italian readers.

On examination of the four methods that Lanzi, Cicognara, and, to a limited extent, D'Arco used to domesticate Winckelmann's views, it is plain that their aims were twofold. On the one hand, the art writers suppressed the competition from Italy's long-standing rival, the Greeks. This they achieved both by denying Greek art the praise that Winckelmann afforded it (textual manipulation) and by implying a reliance on Italic art not present in the German scholar's original (misappropriation). On the other hand, however, they extended and altered the application of Winckelmann's concepts in order to afford greater praise to Italian art of all ages (transposition and transmutation). Thus, be it criticism of the Greeks or praise of the native patria, Lanzi, Cicognara, and D'Arco plainly succeeded in rendering Winckelmann's views more attractive to their fellow Italians.

¹⁴⁶ 'Wer auch niemals diese Länder gesehen hat, kann aus der zunehmenden Feinheit der Einwohner, je wärmer das Klima ist, von selbst auf die geistreiche Bildung derselben schließen: die Neapolitaner sind feiner und schlauer noch, als die Römer, und die Sicilianer mehr, als jene; die Griechen aber übertreffen selbst die Sicilianer'.

IV.9. NATIONALISM

Having thus explored the different methods by which all five writers – Piranesi, D’Arco, Milizia, Lanzi, and Cicognara – foreignized and domesticated Winckelmann in their works, I will now examine the reason behind these responses. As in the previous chapter, I contend that the motive was a shared nationalism.

After all, both the foreignization and domestication of Winckelmann reveal patriotic intentions. First, in relation to foreignization, Milizia’s technique of ostracizing Winckelmann from his work, as well as his methods – together with Piranesi, D’Arco, and Cicognara – of highlighting and rejecting his views demonstrate plain attempts to separate the German scholar. They ostracized him from Italian scholarship to defend their heritage from his Italophobic claims. Second, in relation to domestication, not only did Lanzi and Cicognara take up the mantle from Winckelmann and continue his pioneering work in their own Italian scholarship, but they – together with D’Arco – also used various methods to render the German scholar’s views less offensive and more attractive to Italian readers. Thus, whilst on the surface contradictory, both methods prove that the native peninsula was at the forefront of these writers’ minds when engaging with the German scholar. Be it Piranesi’s criticism of the ‘dispregiatori de’ Toscani’, D’Arco’s ‘assai più verosimile’ theory of the Italian origins of art, Milizia’s covert Winckelmannian inspiration, Cicognara’s ‘continuazione all’opere di Winkelmann’, or Lanzi’s description of Pisa’s climate as ‘amico alle arti’ – all art writers engaged with Winckelmann, his works, and his views in the manner most beneficial to their native peninsula.

As similarly confirmed in the previous chapter, it is also plain in the work of these art writers that such a response to Winckelmann was not caused either by a particular aversion to Winckelmann or German scholars as a whole. After all, to take Piranesi and D’Arco as examples – as the writers who most fundamentally disagreed with and criticized Winckelmann’s ideas –

they condemned a number of other people for their Hellenism. Piranesi's entire *Osservazioni*, for example, is a repudiation of the French scholar, Mariette's Graecophile opinions, just as D'Arco grouped and censured Winckelmann with both his native, Heyne and the French, Villoison, on a number of occasions in his *Della patria*.

With these alternative explanations discounted, I will now identify further evidence to support the proposed motive of nationalism, here in relation to each art writer. Indeed in addition to the patriotism evident in the above examination of their lives, their oeuvres all reveal a clear desire to praise and defend Italy's artistic heritage.

As has been explored, Piranesi's whole oeuvre was based around demonstrating the respective antecendence and superiority of Etruscan and Roman art in relation to their rivals, the Greeks. This involved defence of their art and culture, together with attacks on the society of ancient Greece, including Piranesi's efforts to highlight, for instance, the barbarous living conditions of the Greeks and their emphasis on war over civilization (DM.cvii). Aptly labelled 'la sua difesa nazionalistica' by Wittkower,¹⁴⁷ Piranesi also extended this to the Rome of his day. He repeats in *Della magnificenza*, *Della introduzione*, and *Ragionamento* how the city boasts superior spoils to anywhere else, and speaks in the *Ragionamento* of 'la Scuola Romana [...] la madre del buon gusto, e del perfetto disegno, che è quel distintivo per cui sulle altre signoreggia' (RA.33).

Given his markedly similar aims, D'Arco's nationalism is revealed in much the same manner. Like Piranesi, his *Della patria* was focused around verifying Italian art's antecendence to that of the Greeks. He asserts, for example, that for 'la prima patria e nutrice dell'arti del disegno' 'non è per mio avviso da cercarsi fuori dell'Italia' (DPP.12). Together with these 'affermazioni di orgoglio nazionale',¹⁴⁸ as Natali terms them, D'Arco also criticized Italy's rivals,

¹⁴⁷ Wittkower, 'Piranesi e il gusto egiziano', in *Sensibilità e razionalità nel Settecento*, ed. by Vittore Branca, 2 vols (Florence: Sansoni, 1967), II, 659-74 (p. 667).

¹⁴⁸ Natali, *Il Settecento*, p. 416.

highlighting in particular the deceitful methods of the ancient Greeks to appropriate the merits of others. D'Arco reveals plain nationalism, to which he almost confesses himself, as he alludes to the 'rara modestia' (DPP.7), the rarity of any scholar promoting the authority of a nation other than his own.

Milizia's oeuvre was decidedly different to that of Piranesi and D'Arco, as he agreed with Winckelmann and imitated many of his fundamental ideas. Nevertheless, he, too, reveals a patriotic motivation. Indeed, like D'Arco he almost admits this himself as, just as he highlights his aim to improve art and 'rimettere quest'arte sul gusto greco', he also declares: 'chi desidera ch'ella [Italia] vegga e agisca a perfezione, ha patriottismo'.¹⁴⁹ Furthermore, it appears Milizia's nationalistic aims succeeded, as his audience included well-known figure of the Risorgimento, writer and politician, Vincenzo Gioberti, who proudly asserts: 'Nelle arti il giudizio diritto e sicuro di F. Milizia [e l'ingegno straordinario di A. Canova] cominciarono un'età novella ed educarono al vero Bello, anche fuori degli artifici, il gusto della nazione'.¹⁵⁰ In fact, this claim itself suggests a wider nationalism in Italy, as it is their native Milizia's ideas that are applauded as leading 'il gusto della nazione' to true beauty, despite them being, as shown, largely Italian replications of Winckelmann's views.

In light of the French Revolution and later still the French occupations, politics and nationhood increasingly became subjects of attention in the period in which many of Lanzi's and Cicognara's works were published. Accordingly, Lanzi's staunch patriotism is evident throughout his oeuvre: a sentiment which, as Gauna affirms, demonstrates his desire to defend 'la legittimità della sua [Italy's] tradizione messa in crisi dall'avanzata della cultura

¹⁴⁹ Natali, 'Il Don Chisciotte', p. 349. Natali cites here a later edition of the *Memorie degli architetti antichi e moderni*, included in the *Opere complete di Francesco Milizia*, 9 vols (Bologna: Cardinali and Frulli, 1826-28), V (1827), 7-497 (pp. 463-65).

¹⁵⁰ Natali, 'Il Don Chisciotte', p. 353; Natali cites here Vincenzo Gioberti, *Pensieri e giudizi sulla letteratura italiana e straniera*, ed. by F. Ugolini (Florence: Barbèra, 1887), p. 298.

francese'.¹⁵¹ Indeed, as introduced above, Lanzi declares in the *Storia pittorica* that the first of his aims was to 'fornire una storia alla Italia, che interessa la sua gloria' (SP.I.xvi). Inspired and encouraged by Tiraboschi, Lanzi believed his native land deserved further recognition and thus sought to extend the celebration of Italy's history from its literary to its pictorial past.¹⁵² He was, moreover, proud of the peninsula's art and optimistic about their artistic future. Speaking of Canova, for example, Lanzi demonstrates nothing but faith in his native homeland: 'egli ha provato col fatto, che la Fortuna può torre alla Italia i capi d'opera, non però il Genio onde riprodurgli' (SP.III.293).

Finally, Cicognara's oeuvre reveals perhaps the most overt nationalism of the art writers here analysed. His praise for Italian art is effusive, and his views on Italian productions being 'uno de' migliori frutti dell' ingegno umano' (SS.I.5) determined the Italo-centric subject of his *Storia della scultura*, 'divagando ben poco da quanto si è operato in Italia per non allontanarci appunto dalla sorgente più pura onde trarre le cognizioni più esatte' (SS.I.48). Such nationalistic views even influenced Cicognara's aforementioned decision to write specifically on the history of sculpture, as whilst still being 'il centro' in painting (SS.I.23), Cicognara believed Italy was without rivals in sculpture: 'la scultura è singolarmente nostra' (SS.I.6). Ostensibly influenced by the widespread concern regarding Italy's backwardness in this period – Cicognara further highlighted his fear that foreigners would seize their scholarly opportunities to write about the history of Italian art. Indeed, reiterating the objection he raised in *Del bello*, that more foreigners than Italians were composing theoretical tracts, despite the latter's superiority of knowledge and skill (DB.13-14), Cicognara reveals his almost jingoistic desire to protect Italian scholarship by demanding that the *Storia della scultura* be written by an Italian. He affirms:

¹⁵¹ Gauna, p. 10.

¹⁵² Natali, 'Il Varrone', p. 383.

A vero dire ne stringeva il timore che potesse sorgere qualche altro rispettabile straniero, il quale prendendo a trattare l'epoca più gloriosa per l'Italia ci gravasse della incuria di affidar sempre all'altrui penna i fasti di questa nostra nazione maestra di tutta l'Europa incivilita. (SS.I.26)

Thus, the broader nationalistic objectives evident in the works of these five art writers, together with both their criticism of other examples of European Hellenism and the period in which they were writing, all support my argument that Piranesi, D'Arco, Milizia, Lanzi, and Cicognara engaged with Winckelmann in the manner they considered most auspicious for the Italian peninsula.

IV.10. CONCLUSION

I have shown through close examination of five case studies that Italian art literature of the late-eighteenth to the early-nineteenth centuries exhibits a multifaceted response to Winckelmann, his works, and his views. This medium demonstrates both foreignization and domestication: two reactions that I have argued were equally driven by the same nationalistic motivation.

Looking at the case studies as a whole, there is a more even balance between foreignization and domestication than that observed in the medium of translation,¹⁵³ although domestication is again the more common reaction. There are two methods of foreignization: ostracizing Winckelmann from Italian scholarship and selectively presenting and rejecting his views in a manner that highlights the offensive elements. Conversely, the art writers achieve domestication through six methods: emphasis on the familiarity of Winckelmann's works to Italians; portrayal of their work as a continuation of the *Geschichte*; textual manipulation; misappropriation of Winckelmann's views; transposition; and transmutation. These methods of domestication contradict and outweigh the methods of foreignization. Whereas the first

¹⁵³ See Chapter III.9.

method of foreignization would distance the German scholar from Italian scholarship, the first two methods of domestication cultivate an intimacy between the two. Similarly, whilst the second method of foreignization highlights the contentious nature of Winckelmann's views, this is countered by the four other methods of domestication, which present Winckelmann's views in a more attractive light to an Italian audience. Further, of all the methods employed by the art writers here examined, the most significant in number and effect are those which domesticate Winckelmann's oeuvre and his views.

Whilst the medium as a whole discloses some degree of parity between foreignization and domestication, when considered individually the art writers each strongly favour one reaction or the other. Three of the art writers predominantly foreignize Winckelmann: Milizia ostracizes the German scholar and D'Arco, Piranesi, and Milizia all select and reject his views. By contrast, Lanzi and Cicognara account for most instances of domestication. The only exceptions to this sharp division are a few examples of domestication by D'Arco and of foreignization by Cicognara.

It is also significant to note the greater variation in both reaction and method employed by the five art writers, as compared with the translations of the *Geschichte*. Indeed, whilst it is interesting that art literature mirrors one particular method central to the Italian translations of the *Geschichte* (namely, textual manipulation), the vast majority of methods in art literature build on those seen in Chapter III. For example, the translators only *domesticated* Winckelmann's views, which they achieved through the methods of textual manipulation and annotation. The five art critics, however, both domesticate and foreignize the German scholar's views, and do so through more varied methods, demonstrating an even greater preparedness to modify the presentation of Winckelmann's views. A second example of this evolution in method concerns the domestication of Winckelmann's oeuvre. The translators had renationalized the *Geschichte* as a product of Italy and presented their translations as

Italian *Storie* to be used in preference to the original: methods which those in art literature complement. The art writers not only further familiarized the *Geschichte* but they also presented Italian scholarship as taking up the mantle of this work. As might be expected given the greater flexibility of this medium compared to translation, the five art writers thus demonstrated more diversity of methods, building on those of Amoretti and Fea.

One particular aspect of this evolution, spanning several art critics and forms of reaction, is the greater element of deception which the art writers were prepared to utilize. The reactions in the translations are mainly subtle changes, affecting nuance in the presentation of Winckelmann's views. Yet several methods in art literature are more dramatic. Perhaps most interestingly, Milizia seeks to foreignize Winckelmann not through open dialogue, but instead by (conspicuously) refusing to reference the German scholar at all. In addition, the methods of transposition, misappropriation, and transmutation involve the application of a Winckelmannian concept to an area where Winckelmann himself had, respectively: not applied it, not meant to apply it, and specifically denied its application. Of these, transmutation is the most blatant, plainly reversing how Winckelmann intended for a concept to be applied.

However, despite the increased divergence in the range of methods, the reactions in art literature share the translations' primary focus on Winckelmann's views, as opposed to the author himself or the *Geschichte*. This accords with expectation: art literature was one of the fields in which Winckelmann's ideology and innovation was most significant, so it is natural that Italian art writers would engage with the detail of Winckelmann's views. What is noteworthy, however, is the compounding effect of domestication: the Hellenistic and Italophobic aspects of Winckelmann's views were first softened by the translators, and then *further* reduced by those art writers working from the translations.

A final point of comparison between the five art writers collectively is that the trend over time reveals an increasing intensity of reaction to Winckelmann, together with a reversal in its orientation from foreignization to domestication. The earliest three art writers demonstrate an initially subdued foreignizing reaction which, interestingly, became more heightened following the publication of Amoretti and Fea's translations: Piranesi, in the 1760s; D'Arco, in 1785; and Milizia, writing predominantly in the period 1785-90. The two later art writers exhibit an even stronger reaction, but now directed their efforts towards domesticating Winckelmann: Lanzi, in 1795-1810; and Cicognara, in 1808-25. The progressively increasing intensity of response can be understood as reflecting a rise of nationalism during the period examined since, as I have argued in the Nationalism section above, both foreignization and domestication are motivated by nationalism. The reasons for the more abrupt change from foreignization to domestication are less clear. However, this might plausibly stem from a knee-jerk reaction to foreignize and disassociate Winckelmann, followed by domestication and a cautious adoption of his scholarship.

To conclude, I have shown that there is a duality in the response to Winckelmann in Italian art literature in the period 1755-1834, with numerous instances of both foreignization and domestication motivated by nationalism. This is founded on close examination of five art writers whose responses to Winckelmann have hitherto been the subject of little or no research. It is thus clear that the nationalistic reactions of foreignization and domestication were not limited to but extended beyond the Italian translations of Winckelmann's *Geschichte*.

CHAPTER V:
WINCKELMANN IN ROME'S
ARTISTIC JOURNALS

*Tutta Roma [...] gli artisti, e gli amatori hanno il comodo di
profittare dei lumi del dotto Brandenburghese.*

Anon (GBA.II.12)

V.1. INTRODUCTION

Broadening the scope of investigation even further, the treatment of Winckelmann in artistic journals also demands attention. Written and read by those of the scholarly sphere, yet aimed at a wider audience than the book trade, such journals were an unprecedented method of extending knowledge of the arts beyond the hands of a few. From such sources, we are not only able to uncover what was being reported on Winckelmann at the time but we are able, too, to assess how the periodicals responded to the German scholar.

In order thus to examine the responses to Winckelmann in this broad sphere, the focus of this analysis will be ten of the principal artistic journals produced in Rome between 1779 and 1834. As in the preceding chapter, this corpus was chosen according to a number of criteria. First, to investigate a workable cross-section of this vast field, this chapter concentrates solely on Rome, Italy's 'maggior centro artistico'.¹ Second, whilst the corpus spans the majority of the period examined in this thesis, there is one qualification. In this medium analysis begins in 1779 since, whilst some of Winckelmann's writings were known in Italy before the Italian translations (as detailed in Chapter II), art journals are at one remove from the specific sphere of art literature to which Winckelmann contributed. As a result, attention has been directed towards the period following Amoretti's translation (1779) when the discourse surrounding the German scholar would be expected to increase. Third, through extensive secondary research – consulting catalogues, monographs, journals, and scholarship of the period – ten journals were selected specifically due to their significance in Roman culture at the time and the appropriate subjects covered.

¹ Olga Majolo Molinari, *La stampa periodica romana dell'Ottocento*, 2 vols (Rome: Istituto di studi romani, 1963), I, p. lxxiv.

The ten journals examined are: *Efemeridi letterarie*, *Antologia romana*, *Giornale delle belle arti*, *Memorie per le belle arti*, *Monumenti antichi inediti*, *Memorie enciclopediche romane*, *Memorie enciclopediche sulle antichità e belle arti*, *Giornale arcadico*, *Effemeridi letterarie*² and the *Memorie romane*.³

Winckelmann's presence in these journals is indisputable. Indeed, there are, in this time period, at least 54 articles specifically on subjects related to Winckelmann. These range from Heyne's *Elogio* and Huber's French translation to specific articles on his writings: the *Storia*, the *Monumenti*, and even a full reproduction of his Herculaneum letters.⁴ Further, such articles represent a relatively minor proportion of the attention Winckelmann receives in the journals. Quite apart from these, there are over 530 references to the German scholar dispersed throughout the publications. These provide commentary on his views, his patronage, his life in Italy, and his influence on scholarship, as well as a large number of connoisseurial references that quote Winckelmann's observations on different pieces of ancient art.

Yet looking beyond Winckelmann's presence in these Roman artistic periodicals, there is considerable evidence on closer examination of these sources that Winckelmann was not treated merely as a neutral subject. Rather – just as I have demonstrated to be the case in the translations of the *Geschichte* and in Italian art literature – the journals of this period also foreignized and domesticated the German scholar. This chapter will thus first investigate how the editors and contributors reacted to Winckelmann in this newly developing medium, before second exploring their motives behind such decisions.

² As noted in the Glossary, in order to avoid confusion with the earlier *Efemeridi letterarie*, underlining is used throughout to identify the *Effemeridi letterarie*.

³ The titles given here are abridged; full titles are provided in Chapter V.3. below.

⁴ These texts are all introduced in Chapter III.3.3. and III.3.7.

V.2. EXISTING SCHOLARSHIP

In order to facilitate a thorough analysis of the reception of Winckelmann in this broad sphere of eighteenth- to nineteenth-century artistic journalism, it was necessary to compile a digitized library of journals and to produce encoded, searchable text. This essential preparatory work perhaps explains why – despite the undeniable significance of artistic journalism to our understanding of the art scholarship of the period – research in this area has been markedly low.⁵

There are numerous catalogues listing the journals produced in this period, but there are far fewer in-depth studies, with a notable lack of monographs. Indeed, Caffiero and Monsagrati remarked in 1997 that ‘una storia del giornalismo in Italia [...] si è affermata relativamente tardi e, quanto all’area romana, è stata penalizzata dall’indisponibilità di monografie di supporto’.⁶ Since then a number of seminal studies have been produced – including those by Rolfi-Ozvald, Meyer, Ricuperati, and Molinari, all of which I refer to in due course – yet there is still much to be researched. Moreover, existing studies tend to focus on the better-known journals (such as the *Antologia romana* or the *Giornale delle belle arti*), leading to stilted progress, as details about the lesser-known periodicals remain obscure.⁷ This is true, too, of the scholars involved in these periodicals. Whilst all members of the (often large) editorial teams necessitate investigation, it is the better-known editors, as Rolfi-Ozvald affirms, that receive the most attention, exacerbating yet further the imbalanced scholarly advancement in this sphere.⁸

⁵ See, for example: Marina Caffiero and Giuseppe Monsagrati, ‘Introduzione’, in *Dall’erudizione alla politica: Giornali, giornalisti ed editori a Roma tra XVII e XX secolo*, ed. by Marina Caffiero and Giuseppe Monsagrati (Milan: FrancoAngeli, 1997), pp. 7-15 (p. 7), and Maria Cardillo, ‘Le “arti sorelle” nelle “Memorie per le belle arti” (1785-1788)’, *Nuovi Annali della Scuola Speciale per archivisti e bibliotecari*, 25 (2011), 113-29 (p. 117).

⁶ Caffiero and Monsagrati, ‘Introduzione’, p. 7.

⁷ Of the ten journals here examined (listed in Chapter V.1.), the first five receive far more attention in modern scholarship than the latter five which were produced later, in the early nineteenth century.

⁸ Serenella Rolfi-Ozvald, *Agli amatori delle belle arti. Gli autori: il laboratorio dei periodici a Roma tra Settecento e Ottocento* (Rome: Campisano, 2012), p. 87. Throughout the thesis, references to Rolfi-Ozvald’s name alone all refer to this main text.

Winckelmann's presence in the Roman artistic journals of the period is also understudied. This is not to say that there is no recognition of his treatment in such publications. After all, again predominantly focusing on the more researched journals, contemporary scholars, Perini, Ferrari, Cantarutti, and Lukoschik discuss his presence in the *Antologia romana* and *Efemeridi letterarie*, just as Barroero and Rolfi-Ozvald comment on the attention he receives in the *Giornale delle belle arti* and *Memorie per le belle arti*. All such studies, however, can be classified into one of two categories: those concerned with the artistic journals of the period and those focused more broadly on Winckelmann. A specific investigation into the German scholar's reception in Rome's artistic periodicals is still lacking: a lacuna that this chapter will begin to fill. In doing so, this also constitutes the first English language study of these periodicals.

V.3. CONTEXT: ART JOURNALS AND THEIR EDITORS

V.3.1. The rise of artistic periodicals

Before examining the responses to Winckelmann, I will first provide background information in order to contextualize the art journalism of the period, both in Italy, and more specifically in Rome. Indeed, it should be remembered that the distribution of all journals, including those focused on art and antiquity, was low. Even the most successful periodicals were only accessible to the higher social classes, largely to Italian scholars, who constituted a marginal proportion of the population.⁹

Moreover, the development of this scholarly sphere in Italy was simultaneously inspired and plagued by the Italian scholars' angst, similar to that noted in other media, that Italy's periodical press was less advanced than that of other countries in Europe. Indeed, the

⁹ *La stampa periodica Milanese della prima metà dell'Ottocento: testi e concordanze*, ed. by Remo Bindi and Eugenio Picchi, pp. vii-viii; Rolfi-Ozvald, p. 36; and Giuseppe Ricuperati, 'Periodici eruditi, riviste e giornali di varia umanità dalle origini a metà Ottocento', in *Letteratura italiana*, ed. by Alberto Asor Rosa, 8 vols (Turin: Einaudi, 1982-2000), I (1982), 921-43 (p. 941).

result of various different factors, including the political changes of the period and even the division of the peninsula,¹⁰ this slower progress was, as Caffiero and Monsagrati affirm, a 'preoccupazione [...] condivisa da tutti i giornali settecenteschi'.¹¹

Nevertheless, with Italy's leading printing centres established in Venice, Florence, Rome, and Milan,¹² the eighteenth century saw, as Fattorello remarks, the birth of the 'primi veri saggi della letteratura periodica, il più vitale e più popolare strumento o letterario o politico di cui si giovano i popoli'.¹³ Of the different genres of journals, those focused on art and antiquity did not develop immediately. Yet, as Rolfi-Ozvald affirms, artistic and antiquarian scholars came to realize the potential of this new medium in the 1780s, after which the number of such publications rapidly increased:

Sono gli anni in cui, da parte di gruppi intellettuali legati al mondo delle arti si prese coscienza della necessità di dover fornire quel commercio, e quella politica, di strumenti atti a indirizzarlo e favorirlo. L'atto di fondazione dei periodici artistici, rispondendo a quell'intento dichiara il punto di vista in equilibrio tra "commercio" e modello di gusto.¹⁴

Whilst they had begun to advance, the Napoleonic occupation, or the 'frattura degli anni napoleonici' (1796-1814), caused great hindrance to the development of cultural periodicals, as the censorship imposed by the French significantly altered the focus of the journals produced.¹⁵ Indeed, many periodicals on art and antiquity ceased publication completely in the final years of the eighteenth century, only to be replaced by political publications. The period saw a 'lento mutamento del profilo giornalistico stesso', as Lukoschik describes it, which – reflecting the French control over the society – 'va riducendo gli spazi

¹⁰ Ricuperati, 'Periodici eruditi', pp. 942-43; Francesco Fattorello, *Il giornalismo veneziano nel '700*, 2 vols (Udine: La rivista Letteraria, 1932), I, 14-15; and Luigi Piccioni, 'Introduzione', in *Giornalismo letterario del Settecento* (Turin: Unione, 1949), pp. 9-19 (p. 17).

¹¹ Caffiero and Monsagrati, 'Introduzione', pp. 9-10.

¹² Ricuperati, 'I giornali italiani del XVIII secolo: Studi e ipotesi di ricerca', *Studi Storici*, 25.2 (1984), 279-303 (p. 285).

¹³ Fattorello, I, 13.

¹⁴ Rolfi-Ozvald, 'Note sulle fonti ufficiose e ufficiali per la storia della circolazione delle opere e degli artisti (1787-1844)', in *Roma fuori di Roma: l'esportazione dell'arte moderna da Pio VI all'Unità, 1775-1870*, ed. by Giovanna Capitelli and others (Rome: Campisano, 2012), pp. 31-49 (p. 32).

¹⁵ Rolfi-Ozvald, 'Note sulle fonti', p. 31.

dedicati alle comunicazioni culturali in favore dei resoconti di contenuto politico'.¹⁶ As demonstrated by the later journals discussed in this chapter, however, this 'frattura' of course came to an end in 1814, after which cultural and artistic journalism continued again to develop.¹⁷

As apparent from the four major printing centres, journalism was by no means limited to Rome, yet, for the current investigation, the Roman journals provide the most suitable case study. After all, not only was it the city in which Winckelmann himself wrote the majority of his works, but it was the city, with its museums, academies, international scholars, and Grand Tour tourists, that was most committed to art and antiquity at the time.¹⁸ It was thus this commitment, research, and 'fervid' production that Roman journals were able to capture:

Nella seconda metà degli anni Ottanta del XVIII secolo nascono, infatti, i primi giornali romani specializzati nel campo artistico-antiquario, che, come già avvertito da Lanzi, rappresentano una delle fonti più preziose per ricostruire un momento eccezionalmente fervido della produzione, discussione e ricerca nel settore artistico e antiquario della città Eterna.¹⁹

Besides this extensive material available to the Roman periodicals, however, it is also important to note the other impetus that led them to focus on art and antiquity: Papal censorship. Indeed, as Molinari confirms, such censorship had significant control over the general thinking of Rome, especially that concerned with philosophy and politics:

Le peculiari condizioni di Roma, centro della cattolicità, sede del pontificato, dove la censura vigilava in maniera più severa che altrove sulle manifestazioni del pensiero in generale e in particolare sulle dottrine filosofiche e politiche, dove i rapporti culturali con l'estero erano ridotti a poca cosa.²⁰

¹⁶ Rita Unfer Lukoschik, 'Prolegomeni allo studio del transfer culturale tra Italia e Germania nelle riviste del settecento italiano', in *Il settecento tedesco*, pp. 317-91 (pp. 365-66).

¹⁷ See Chapter II.2.

¹⁸ Cardillo, pp. 113-14.

¹⁹ Susanne Adina Meyer, "'Briefe aus Rom". La produzione artistica romana tra fine Settecento e inizio Ottocento nelle riviste tedesche', in *Paesaggi europei*, pp. 247-71 (p. 249).

²⁰ Molinari, I, pp. lxxii-lxxiii.

It was thus only natural that erudite journalism would turn to the sheltered spheres of antiquarianism and archaeology, making use of the abundant material that the city had to offer.

Thus, with this broader context in mind, I will now explore the background and composition of the ten Roman artistic journals examined in this chapter, an understanding of which is crucial in assessing the periodicals' responses to Winckelmann.

V.3.2. Efemeridi letterarie di Roma (1772-98, 1806)

The *Efemeridi* was published weekly from 1772 until 1798, ceasing publication just months after the proclamation of the Roman Republic.²¹ The principal focus of the journal was book reviews and each issue was divided into the cities from which the reviewed books originated. Rome was given priority, with every issue beginning with a Roman publication, followed first by those from other Italian cities, and finally by those from further afield. In 27 years the collaborators reviewed over 5,000 books,²² covering a wide range of subjects, from ancient and modern art – the journal was ‘fortemente impegnata a difendere la cultura archeologica e neoclassica romana’ – to biographies and even sciences (EF.I.PR).²³

The breadth of subject matter in the *Efemeridi* is reflected in the diversity of those involved in its production. It was founded and financed by doctor and scholar, Gian Ludovico Bianconi, who employed salaried compilers.²⁴ First was scholar, Giacinto Cerutti, who worked with him from 1772 to 1775. Cerutti was then succeeded by lawyer, Vincenzo Bartolucci, who

²¹ Carlo Capra, ‘Il giornalismo nell’età rivoluzionaria e napoleonica’, in *La stampa italiana dal Cinquecento all’Ottocento*, ed. by V. Castronovo e T. Tranfaglia (Rome: Laterza, 1976), pp. 373-537 (p. 460); Molinari, I, 345-46; and Ricuperati, ‘Giornali nell’Italia dell’“ancien régime”’, in *La stampa italiana dal Cinquecento all’Ottocento*, pp. 67-372 (p. 313).

²² Marina Caffiero, ‘Le “Effemeridi letterarie” di Roma (1772-1798): Reti intellettuali, evoluzione professionale e apprendistato politico’, in *Dall’erudizione alla politica*, pp. 63-101 (p. 67). It should be noted that, as is clear from the dates in her title, Caffiero uses ‘Effemeridi’ to refer to the early *Efemeridi*, which is instead referred to with a single ‘f’ throughout this thesis.

²³ Ricuperati, ‘Giornali nell’Italia dell’“ancien régime”’, p. 313.

²⁴ Gaetano Gasperoni, *La storia e le lettere nella seconda metà del secolo XVIII* (Jesi: Tipografia Editrice Cooperativa, 1904), p. 32.

remained in post until 1778, after which he was replaced by mathematician, Gioacchino Pessuti. When Bianconi died in 1781, Pessuti replaced him as overall director of the journal.²⁵ It was under Pessuti that the *Efemeridi* returned for a final issue in 1806, intended as a report of the works published since the start of the century.²⁶ Furthermore, Gian Cristofano Amaduzzi, a wide-ranging scholar, whose interests included antiquity and ancient Greek,²⁷ was also highly influential in the *Efemeridi*'s development. Labelled its 'vera anima' and 'spiritus rector' by Caffiero and Cantarutti respectively,²⁸ Amaduzzi was 'per lo meno a pari titolo con il loro fondatore'.²⁹ He provided continuity on Bianconi's death, as well as a wealth of content through his extensive scholarly contacts.³⁰ Indeed, whilst the articles of the journal are anonymous,³¹ a number of contemporary art scholars collaborated in the *Efemeridi*, including the previously discussed Luigi Lanzi.³²

The *Efemeridi*, as Caffiero confirms, had strong ties to the Papacy. Amaduzzi's former patron was Clement XIV,³³ and, with the exception of the first three years, the journal also coincided 'con l'intero, lungo, pontificato di Pio VI: e con questo pontificato, e con le sue scelte culturali e politiche, la rivista sostanzialmente si identifica'.³⁴ Yet, despite these ties, Bianconi and Amaduzzi also sought a balance between Catholicism and Enlightenment values.³⁵ After

²⁵ Caffiero, pp. 72, 76-77, and Giuseppe Pignatelli, 'Cerutti, Giacinto', in *Dizionario biografico*, XXIV (1980), 67-70 (pp. 68-69).

²⁶ Molinari, I, pp. lxxvi, 345-46, 349, and *Catalogo collettivo dei periodici di archeologia e storia dell'arte*, ed. by Rosalba Grosso and Antonella Aquilina (Rome: Biblioteca dell'Istituto Nazionale di Archeologia e Storia dell'Arte, 1992), p. 87.

²⁷ Angelo Fabi, 'Amaduzzi, Giovanni Cristofano', in *Dizionario biografico*, II (1960), 612-15 (p. 612).

²⁸ Caffiero, p. 83, and Giulia Cantarutti, 'L'"Antologia Romana" e la cultura tedesca in Italia', in *Il settecento tedesco*, pp. 257-315 (p. 267).

²⁹ Cantarutti, p. 267.

³⁰ Caffiero, p. 83.

³¹ Caffiero, p. 65.

³² Giovanna Perini, 'Nuove fonti per la Kunstliteratur settecentesca in Italia: I giornali letterari', *Annali della scuola normale superiore di Pisa*, 14.2 (1984), 797-827 (p. 820), and Caffiero, pp. 85-86.

³³ Fabi, p. 613.

³⁴ Caffiero, p. 64.

³⁵ Ricuperati, 'Politica, cultura e religione nei giornali italiani del '700', in *Cattolicesimo e lumi nel settecento italiano*, ed. by Mario Rosa (Rome: Herder, 1981), pp. 49-76 (p. 61), and Cantarutti, pp. 276-77.

all, they hoped to appeal to the progressive Roman society promoted by Pius VI himself, the wider Italian culture, and the European *Repubblica delle lettere*.³⁶

Finally, it is especially noteworthy in the context of this investigation that not only was this journal close to Fea, but Bianconi and Amaduzzi also had connections to Winckelmann.³⁷ Amaduzzi met with Winckelmann on numerous occasions in Rome and was extremely knowledgeable about his life and works,³⁸ whilst Bianconi, despite not perhaps being so factually knowledgeable, enjoyed an ‘intenso rapporto personale’ with the German scholar.³⁹ As well as being central to Winckelmann’s move to Rome, Bianconi was his correspondent and advisor for the remainder of his life.⁴⁰

V.3.3. Antologia romana (1774-98)

The *Antologia* was published weekly from 1774 to 1798.⁴¹ The team in charge of this journal was much the same as that of the *Efemeridi*. Bianconi was again founder and Pessuti and Amaduzzi held positions of responsibility and influence.⁴² The journals also shared a number of contributors, with the addition, in the *Antologia*, of Vincenzo Monti and respected naturalist, Lazzaro Spallanzani.⁴³

This association between the two journals was by no means kept secret. Not only did printer and distributor, Gregorio Settari, make it explicit, as he labelled the *Antologia* a

³⁶ Caffiero and Monsagrati, ‘Introduzione’, pp. 10-11.

³⁷ Ferrari, ‘L’eredità culturale’, p. 35.

³⁸ Ferrari, *Il rifugiato*, pp. 75-77.

³⁹ Ferrari, ‘Romagna erudita’, p. 113.

⁴⁰ Perini, pp. 810-11; Caffiero, pp. 74-75; and Ricuperati, ‘Giornali nell’Italia dell’“ancien régime”’, p. 312.

⁴¹ Rolfi-Ozvald, p. 36.

⁴² Caffiero, p. 72; Cantarutti, p. 258; Perini, pp. 802-03, 805; and Ricuperati, ‘Giornali nell’Italia dell’“ancien régime”’, p. 315.

⁴³ Perini, p. 805; Ricuperati, ‘Giornali nell’Italia dell’“ancien régime”’, pp. 316-17; and Gasperoni, p. 34.

‘compimento’ of the *Efemeridi*,⁴⁴ but the *Antologia* itself also declared its inclusion of material not incorporated by the *Efemeridi*:

Comprendendo questo foglio qualunque materia, la quale non abbia luogo nelle Efemeridi replichiamo, che anche le Belle Arti saranno da noi sinceramente, ed imparzialmente esaminate, come si è fatto fin’ora, servendoci di quei lumi, che qualche applicazione ad esse ci ha somministrati. (AR.I.PR)

Indeed, liberated from the focus on reviews, the *Antologia* was able to cover a broader range of material than the *Efemeridi*, which the editors organized by subject rather than by city.⁴⁵ The topics covered range from geography and science to theatre and, of course, the *belle arti* and antiquarianism.⁴⁶

The *Antologia*’s ethos was the same as that of the *Efemeridi*. The principal compilers, with their ties to the Papacy, again sought a balance between Catholic and Enlightenment values.⁴⁷ Reflecting the latter focus, a key objective in the *Antologia* was to share material from foreign journals with its Italian readers: ‘Abbiamo il piacere di avvisarli, che si sono da noi prese nuove misure per avere dalla Francia, e dalla Germania ulteriori materiali, coi quali si arricchirà sempre più l’Antologia’ (AR.I.PR).

Finally, given Bianconi’s and Amaduzzi’s connections to Winckelmann, Neoclassicism was also central to the *Antologia*: largely expressed through the letters of these two scholars.⁴⁸ In fact, as Perini powerfully highlights, the significance of the *Antologia* to the spread of Neoclassicism in Rome cannot be overstated:

Certo, uno studio accurato dell’*Antologia romana* non può cambiare l’immagine del neoclassicismo a Roma: ma, senza l’*Antologia*, questa stessa immagine sarebbe stata, se non inconcepibile e impossibile, almeno assai diversa.⁴⁹

⁴⁴ Cantarutti, p. 259, and Caffiero and Monsagrati, ‘Introduzione’, p. 10.

⁴⁵ Cantarutti, p. 265, and Perini, p. 805.

⁴⁶ Cantarutti, p. 258.

⁴⁷ Ricuperati, ‘Politica, cultura e religione’, p. 61.

⁴⁸ Ricuperati, ‘Giornali nell’Italia dell’“ancien régime”’, p. 316.

⁴⁹ Perini, p. 827; see also Cantarutti, p. 272.

V.3.4. Giornale delle belle arti e della incisione, antiquaria, musica, e poesia (1784-88)

The *Antologia* and *Efemeridi* were antecedents to a further three important journals of the late eighteenth century.⁵⁰ The first of these was the *Giornale delle belle arti*, which appeared weekly between 1784 and 1788.⁵¹ As the extended title suggests, the *Giornale* explored the arts (both ancient and modern) in a broad sense, with every instalment divided into sections treating a different art form.⁵²

Given the anonymous ownership of the undertaking, it is far more difficult to trace the scholars involved in the *Giornale* than those in the *Efemeridi* and the *Antologia*. The Papal dedication and the printing announcements, for instance, were all signed by the printer of the journal, Arcangelo Casaletti.⁵³ Despite this obscurity, however, the three principal scholars generally associated with the *Giornale* are poet and writer on the arts, Giuseppe Carletti,⁵⁴ artist and student of Mengs, Raimondo Ghelli,⁵⁵ and scholar, Francesco Becattini.⁵⁶ As in the journals above, there were also a number of other scholars involved, whose contributions in the *Giornale* are both signed and anonymous.⁵⁷ Indeed, whilst not confirmed, it is believed that Giovanni Gherardo De Rossi, and Onofrio Boni were collaborators for a year before turning to the *Memorie per le belle arti* explored below.⁵⁸ Much like its forerunners, and perhaps even intensified by the fact that many of the authors were members of the *Accademie* of the period, Neoclassical aesthetics were a key part of the *Giornale's* focus.⁵⁹

⁵⁰ Cantarutti, p. 272.

⁵¹ Liliana Barroero, 'Periodici storico-artistici romani in età neoclassica: le "Memorie per le Belle Arti" e il "Giornale delle Belle Arti"', in *Roma: Il tempio del vero gusto. La pittura del settecento romano e la sua diffusione a Venezia e a Napoli*, ed. by Enzo Borsellino and Vittorio Casale (Florence: Edifer, 2001), pp. 91-99 (p. 91).

⁵² Barroero, p. 93.

⁵³ Rolfi-Ozvald, pp. 87-88.

⁵⁴ Rolfi-Ozvald, p. 98.

⁵⁵ Rolfi-Ozvald, p. 97.

⁵⁶ Rolfi-Ozvald, p. 98.

⁵⁷ Barroero, p. 93.

⁵⁸ Rolfi-Ozvald, p. 100.

⁵⁹ Barroero, p. 94.

In ethos the *Giornale* was conservative,⁶⁰ and, as demonstrated by both its dedication to Pope Pius VI and sponsorship from various different Cardinals, it enjoyed strong links to the Vatican.⁶¹

V.3.5. Memorie per le belle arti (1785-88)

Another of the three periodicals inspired by the *Antologia* and *Efemeridi* is the monthly-published *Memorie per le belle arti*,⁶² which appeared a year after the *Giornale* but which closed at the same time.⁶³ Focusing here on modern art, the *Memorie*, like the *Giornale*, examined art in its wider sense. Indeed the preface affirms that ‘le Memorie concernenti la Pittura, la Scultura, l’Architettura, l’Incisione sì in gemme, che in rame, la Poesia, e la Musica, che sono gli oggetti di quest’opera’ (MBA.I.iii).⁶⁴

In contrast to the *Giornale*, there is a far clearer view of the scholars involved in the *Memorie*,⁶⁵ many of whom also wrote for the *Antologia*.⁶⁶ Led by the above-mentioned scholar of the arts, Giovanni Gherardo De Rossi,⁶⁷ the editorial team also consisted of controversial intellectual, Onofrio Boni,⁶⁸ and after him, architect, Leonardo De Vegni.⁶⁹ Other collaborators included Giuseppe Carletti, whose prominence in the *Giornale* has already been outlined,⁷⁰ as well as a number of other distinguished scholars of the period, such as Gaetano Marini, Luigi Lanzi, and Jean Baptiste Seroux d’Agincourt.⁷¹ Each contributor focused on areas of the journal related to their interests and expertise, with, for example: De Rossi writing primarily on painting and sometimes sculpture; De Vegni on architecture; Boni on architecture and engraving; and Carletti on music and poetry.⁷² These different art forms even had their own prefaces in the journal.⁷³ Moreover, again possibly resulting from the membership of many of

⁶⁰ Luisa Materassi, ‘Girolamo Zulian: the collection, the man and his world’, in *Roman Art, Religion and Society: New Studies from the Roman Art Seminar*, Oxford 2005, ed. by Martin Henig (Oxford: Archaeopress, 2006), pp. 141-94 (p. 175).

⁶¹ Barroero, p. 95.

the contributors to the artistic academies of the period,⁷⁴ there was a clear emphasis on Neoclassical art.

The *Memorie* was printed by the well-known Niccolò and Marco Pagliarini of Rome and was co-financed by both Abbondio Rezzonico, art enthusiast and nephew of Pope Clement XIII, and Cardinal and Secretary of State, Ignazio Boncampagni Ludovisi.⁷⁵ Despite its distinguished patrons with clear links to the Catholic Church, the *Memorie* was not, however, dedicated to the Pope.⁷⁶ More progressive in outlook than the *Giornale*, De Rossi's journal was in favour of Enlightenment values arriving predominantly from France.⁷⁷ Indeed, as will be explored in due course, the journal highlighted and encouraged the philosophical conception of art developing in the period (MBA.I.1-2).

Turning to the journal's aims, the *Memorie* sought to keep readers informed of Rome's new artistic productions and to encourage artists to create new work (MBA.I.iii-iv). Its motto was to inspire: 'Admonere voluimus non mordere: prodesse non laedere'.⁷⁸ The *Memorie* also

⁶² Cantarutti, p. 272.

⁶³ Rolfi-Ozvald, p. 33.

⁶⁴ There are inconsistencies in the pagination of this journal. There is one preface entitled 'Agli Amatori delle Belle Arti', the pages of which, as above, will be indicated by lower-case Roman numerals (pp. iii-iv). Further, there is another preface on painting (as Rolfi-Ozvald, p. 103 affirms), entitled 'Prospetto dell'opera' (pp. 1-9), after which the journal continues through January-December as usual. This latter preface and the pages thereafter will be indicated by Arabic numerals.

⁶⁵ Rolfi-Ozvald, p. 87.

⁶⁶ Perini, pp. 798-99.

⁶⁷ Meyer, p. 249.

⁶⁸ Bonfioli, p. 84. See Chapter III, p. 115, for the public dispute between Boni and Fea.

⁶⁹ Rolfi-Ozvald, pp. 151-52; Cardillo, p. 118; and Lorenzo Finocchi Gheri, 'De Vegni, Leonardo Massimiliano', in *Dizionario biografico*, XXXIX (1991), 549-52 (pp. 549-50).

⁷⁰ Rolfi-Ozvald, p. 100, and Cardillo, pp. 118-19.

⁷¹ Rolfi-Ozvald, p. 149, and Cardillo, p. 124.

⁷² Cardillo, p. 118, and Gheri, p. 550; there is a difference of opinion as to the sections that De Vegni curated. Whilst Cardillo argues he focused on sections relating to 'disegno e pittura', Gheri argues instead that he curated those on architecture. Given that De Vegni was an architect, I employ the latter, more probable view.

⁷³ Rolfi-Ozvald, p. 103.

⁷⁴ Barroero, p. 94.

⁷⁵ Cardillo, pp. 117, 119.

⁷⁶ Barroero, p. 95.

⁷⁷ Materassi, p. 175.

⁷⁸ Cardillo, p. 120; this motto is repeated on every title page and is translated into Italian by Cardillo: 'abbiamo voluto esortare non criticare, giovare non offendere'.

delineates two additional objectives in its preface on painting: ‘i due oggetti di queste nostre memorie saranno la Critica, e l’Istoria’ (MBA.I.3).⁷⁹ First, criticism: demonstrating the journal’s pedagogical intent, the editors and contributors shared with the readers the methods they themselves used to judge arts.⁸⁰ Second, history: by ensuring a platform for Rome’s modern artwork, the *Memorie* here endeavoured to ensure that Roman art received, in future histories of art, the ‘stima universale’ it deserved (MBA.I.4-8).

Appearing at the same time and with the same interest in a broad range of arts, the *Memorie* and *Giornale* are often discussed together in scholarship. The *Giornale* even lifted whole articles from De Rossi’s journal.⁸¹ Yet despite this pairing, not only was there inevitable competition between the two publications,⁸² but also stark differences in their contrastingly progressive and conservative outlooks, which, in truth, rendered a merger impossible. Indeed, hinting in the journal’s preface at a ‘sì bel progetto’ which had ‘troncato nel suo nascere’ due to ‘la discordia in mezzo agli Autori’ (MBA.I.iii), the *Memorie* refers here to an initiative of art scholar, Seroux d’Agincourt, supported by Abbondio Rezzonico, which had intended to bring together a number of scholars, including Carletti and De Rossi, to form a large journal ‘sulle Belle Arti, e sulle opere che producevano gli Artisti moderni’. As alluded to in the preface’s mention of a ‘truncated’ project’, however, this plan did not transpire.⁸³ The scholars De Rossi, Carletti, and Guattani could not agree, leading instead to three separate journals: the *Memorie*; the *Giornale* explored above, and, as will be introduced in due course, the *Monumenti antichi inediti*.⁸⁴ The *Memorie* was the only journal to continue receiving support from Rezzonico, as it was the publication that kept most closely to his original aim by focusing

⁷⁹ Barroero, p. 96.

⁸⁰ Cardillo, p. 120.

⁸¹ Rolfi-Ozvald, pp. 120-21.

⁸² Barroero, pp. 94-95.

⁸³ Rolfi-Ozvald, pp. 90-91.

⁸⁴ Rolfi-Ozvald, pp. 90-91; Barroero, p. 92; and Cardillo, p. 119.

on modern art (MBA.I.iii),⁸⁵ whilst the *Monumenti antichi inediti* concentrated on archaeology and antiquity,⁸⁶ and the 'onnicomprendivo' *Giornale* sought 'una sorta di continuità ideale tra il passato ed il presente'.⁸⁷

Finally, of particular note to this investigation are the roles of both the *Memorie* and the *Giornale* in the conflict between Boni and Fea. The subject of this feud was Fea's undertaking as translator and in particular the third volume of his *Storia*, both of which, as noted in Chapter III, Boni criticized for a number of reasons.⁸⁸ Boni's censure appeared in instalments in the *Memorie* from March to June 1786,⁸⁹ to which Fea responded in the *Giornale* between July and December of the same year.⁹⁰ The dispute then ended outside of journalism, with Boni's reply entitled *Lettera di Bajocco al ch. signor Abate Carlo Fea giureconsulto* (1786).

V.3.6. Monumenti antichi inediti ovvero Notizie sulle antichità e belle arti di Roma (1784-89, 1805)

The third journal inspired by the *Antologia* and the *Efemeridi* is the *Monumenti antichi*.⁹¹ First published in 1784, the same year as the *Giornale*, the *Monumenti antichi* appeared monthly until 1789,⁹² and (like the *Memorie*) was printed by the Pagliarini brothers.⁹³ In accordance with the journal's parameters, 'ristretto alla classe dell'Antiquaria', the focus of this journal was ancient art (MAI.I.v) and, as is clear from its title (to be explored in due course), its objective was to continue Winckelmann's own *Monumenti* (MAI.I.v-vi).

⁸⁵ Cardillo, p. 119.

⁸⁶ Cardillo, p. 117.

⁸⁷ Barroero, pp. 92-93.

⁸⁸ See Chapter III, p. 115 for Boni's objections.

⁸⁹ See instalments in (MBA.II.65-145).

⁹⁰ See instalments in (GBA.III.235-396).

⁹¹ Cantarutti, p. 272.

⁹² Molinari, II, 632; Rolfi-Ozvald, p. 33; and *Catalogo Collettivo*, p. 131.

⁹³ Cardillo, p. 117.

Giuseppe Antonio Guattani, writer and archaeologist, who was to become ‘una delle personalità più in vista nei circoli dotti e artistici di Roma in quest’epoca’,⁹⁴ was owner and overall editor of the *Monumenti antichi*, supported by Francesco Piranesi.⁹⁵ He was also the journal’s principal author,⁹⁶ yet sought external contributions and assistance when his own knowledge was lacking. His sources included, for instance, Lanzi, D’Agincourt,⁹⁷ and Visconti,⁹⁸ as well as a range of contributions from abroad, in an attempt to impart a ‘respiro internazionale’ to the journal.⁹⁹ As was customary, he dedicated the first volume to Pius VI.¹⁰⁰

Not least due to Guattani’s following of Winckelmann’s *Monumenti*, he moved away from the encyclopaedic nature of the *Antologia* and *Efemeridi* based on the assemblage of scholarly articles and extracts from books to, as Rolfi-Ozvald describes it, a ‘tipologia ibrida, tra giornale di scavo e raccolta di saggi brevi d’antiquaria’.¹⁰¹ Indeed, even Amaduzzi, key collaborator in the two preceding journals, recognized this innovation and applauded Guattani’s courage to break from the mould; the finished product was a ‘miniera inesaurita di tanti insigni monumenti, e reggia de’ più bei modelli dell’arte’ (EF.XIV.65).¹⁰²

Whilst the *Monumenti antichi* was originally produced between 1784 and 1789, on returning to Italy in 1804, Guattani seized the opportunity to relaunch the journal the following year (MES.I.3).¹⁰³ Dedicated to Luigi Marconi, Guattani’s sponsor at the time (MAI.VII.n.p.),¹⁰⁴ this seventh volume was not published by Pagliarini, but by Pietro Paolo Montagnini Mirabili, who had recently come into possession of some of Winckelmann’s documents previously kept

⁹⁴ Stella Rudolph, *Giuseppe Tambroni e lo stato delle belle arti in Roma nel 1814* (Rome: Istituto di Studi Romani, 1982), p. 81.

⁹⁵ Rolfi-Ozvald, pp. 40, 87.

⁹⁶ Barroero, p. 91.

⁹⁷ Rolfi-Ozvald, p. 31.

⁹⁸ Pier Paolo Racioppi, ‘Guattani, Giuseppe Antonio’, in *Dizionario biografico*, LX (2003), 507-11 (p. 507).

⁹⁹ Racioppi, p. 507.

¹⁰⁰ Rolfi-Ozvald, pp. 30-31.

¹⁰¹ Rolfi-Ozvald, p. 38.

¹⁰² Rolfi-Ozvald, p. 38.

¹⁰³ Molinari, II, 632-33, and *Catalogo Collettivo*, p. 131.

¹⁰⁴ See the journal’s dedication entitled ‘Al Signor Luigi Marconi’, and Rosella Carloni, ‘Marconi, Luigi’, in *Dizionario biografico*, LXIX (2007), 797-99 (p. 798).

in the Villa Albani.¹⁰⁵ Despite its revival, however, the *Monumenti antichi* did not continue beyond 1805.

V.3.7. Memorie enciclopediche romane sulle belle arti, antichità ec. (1806-10)

A year after the closure of the *Monumenti antichi*, Guattani turned his attention to another, new journal, the *Memorie enciclopediche romane*, which he published every two months until 1810.¹⁰⁶ As before, Guattani was not only the sole owner and editor,¹⁰⁷ but together with some outside contributions – the journal published a plea for ‘*Notizie d’ Arti [...] per alimento di questi fogli ormai lieti*’ (MER.I.132) – he again authored the majority of the periodical himself.¹⁰⁸ As with the previous publication, Guattani was supported in this venture by Francesco Piranesi.¹⁰⁹ He dedicated the *Memorie enciclopediche romane* to the new Pope Pius VII,¹¹⁰ whose support for Guattani is apparent in his 1804 invitation to become perpetual secretary of both the Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia and the Accademia di San Luca: positions that provided Guattani with ample material for the periodical.¹¹¹

In stark contrast to its precursor, the focus of this journal was modern art: a continuation of the ‘gli annali de’ sullodati Sig. Boni e De Rossi’ (the *Memorie*) as Guattani later claims (MES.I.3).¹¹² The layout of the journal was both geographical and thematic. Three main geographical sections, entitled ‘Roma’, ‘Notizie italiane’, and ‘Notizie estere’, were in turn organized into thematic subdivisions on subjects including painting, sculpture, and

¹⁰⁵ Rolfi-Ozvald, pp. 43-44.

¹⁰⁶ Rolfi-Ozvald, p. 49.

¹⁰⁷ Rolfi-Ozvald, p. 87.

¹⁰⁸ Molinari, II, 586-87.

¹⁰⁹ Rolfi-Ozvald, p. 46.

¹¹⁰ Rolfi-Ozvald, ‘Note sulle fonti’, p. 31.

¹¹¹ Lee Sorenson, ‘Guattani, Giuseppe Antonio’, *Dictionary of Art Historians* <<https://dictionaryofarthistorians.org/guattanig.htm>> [accessed 16 February 2017], and Rudolph, p. 81.

¹¹² This focus broadens in the final instalment, see the final paragraph in this section, Chapter V.3.7.

architecture, as well as other slightly broader segments on such topics as academies, the publication of art scholarship, and the art trade.

With this focus on modern art, Guattani aimed to increase contemporary artists' fame, promote the spread of taste, and encourage increased trade: areas he considered lacking in the journals of his day (MER.I.1).¹¹³ He also encouraged protection of art and support for modern artists (MER.I.2). One modern artist whom Guattani plainly revered is Canova, to whom he makes reference in the first article on sculpture and numerous times thereafter, demonstrating the publication's interest in Neoclassical art.

The final volume, published in 1810, requires discrete attention for two reasons. First, it demonstrates a particular association with the Napoleonic regime. Not only was this volume dedicated to the 'Genio sovrumano e benefico' of Napoleon, but it also showcased the excavation and restoration that he, as Emperor, promoted.¹¹⁴ Further, Guattani even received a generous subsidy, 'un vistoso abbonamento all'anzidetta Calcografia' (MES.I.3), from Joseph-Marie de Gérando, a Baron under Napoleon.¹¹⁵ Thus on examination of its content, a potential bias should certainly be borne in mind. Second, despite the *Memorie enciclopediche's* declaration to be focusing on modern art, this began to falter by the fifth issue. By Guattani's own admission, and perhaps influenced by the interest in ancient art fostered by Napoleon, he altered the focus in this instalment and examined ancient monuments alongside their modern counterparts: 'Ne compilai un 5. volume, ove insieme agli oggetti moderni ebbero luogo molti e molti capitali monumenti di antichità' (MES.I.3). For economic reasons, however, the *Memorie enciclopediche romane* thereafter ceased publication (MES.I.3-4).

¹¹³ See also Rolfi-Ozvald, 'Note sulle fonti', p. 33.

¹¹⁴ Racioppi, p. 509.

¹¹⁵ Racioppi, p. 509, and Rolfi-Ozvald, p. 77.

V.3.8. Memorie enciclopediche sulle antichità e belle arti di Roma (1817, 1819)

Given the re-emergence of ancient art in the otherwise modern-focused *Memorie enciclopediche romane*, Guattani sets out his new aim to ‘riprendere le dette Memorie sul piede dell’ultimo tomo, che unisce l’Antiquaria alle Arti’, and to explore both antiquity and modern art in the third journal of his ‘trilogy’: *Memorie enciclopediche sulle antichità* (MES.I.4). Indeed, the inversion of wording in the title, from ‘sulle belle arti, antichità’ to ‘sulle antichità e belle arti’, marks this renewed attention on the ancients.

Striving to continue Winckelmann’s *Monumenti*, and of course his own *Monumenti antichi*, Guattani included numerous engravings in his *Memorie enciclopediche sulle antichità*. Indeed, basing his methods ‘sulla maniera del Winckelmann, la più a proposito in tali materie, la più piacevole ed istruttiva’ (MES.I.3), he analysed monuments tavola after tavola throughout the periodical, whilst also making frequent reference to recent excavations and academy reports (MES.I.4).¹¹⁶ As above, the inclusion in the journal of academy reports and insights into their activities were all made possible by Guattani’s Pope-appointed positions in the Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia and the Accademia di San Luca.

The *Memorie enciclopediche* was produced monthly and, whilst calling for contributions from those with knowledge on recent discoveries – in order that the journal might provide ‘ai posteri una completa memoria a dispetto del tempo che fin d’adesso ne opera rabbiosamente la distruzione’ (MES.I.164) – Guattani was again the principal author.¹¹⁷ There were two volumes in total, published in 1817 and 1819, after which Guattani retired from journalistic activity.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁶ Rudolph, p. 81.

¹¹⁷ Molinari, II, 586-87.

¹¹⁸ Rolfi-Ozvald, p. 63.

V.3.9. Giornale arcadico di scienze, lettere, ed arti (1819-68)

The *Giornale arcadico* was first published in 1819: the same year, as Rolfi-Ozvald notes, that Guattani ceased publishing, leaving a gap in the market.¹¹⁹ It was long-lived, running until 1868.¹²⁰ Whilst there were slight changes to the pattern over this extended period, the *Arcadico* generally appeared every three months.¹²¹ The subjects dealt with became the titles of the principal sections of each instalment: 'letteratura', 'scienze', 'belle arti', and often also 'varietà', under all of which there were various individual contributions.

This periodical was founded by a large group of prominent scholars, 'figure di spicco della antiquaria, letteratura e dell'Accademia di San Luca',¹²² composed of 'direttore', Pietro Odescalchi,¹²³ who was also sponsor of the undertaking,¹²⁴ 'principale animatore', Giulio Perticari,¹²⁵ and with them, Salvatore Betti, Luigi Biondi, Bartolomeo Borghesi, Pietro Carpi, Antonio Nibby, and Giuseppe Tambroni.¹²⁶ Moreover, as well as its numerous founders, the *Arcadico* enlisted a wide range of similarly scholarly contributors, from Vatican librarian, Girolamo Amati, to doctor of medicine, Domenico De Crollis, all of whom are listed in the first issue of the year to which they contributed.¹²⁷

The *Arcadico* dedicated a 'posto distinto ai ragguagli dell'Architettura, della Scultura, e della Pittura' (GA.I.144), which included ancient, modern, and of course Neoclassical production.¹²⁸ The objectives were both to safeguard the memory of 'i fatti più egregi' and the

¹¹⁹ Rolfi-Ozvald, p. 63.

¹²⁰ Alessandro Galante Garrone, 'I giornali della Restaurazione 1815-1847', in *La stampa italiana del Risorgimento*, ed. by V. Castronovo e T. Tranfaglia (Rome: Laterza, 1978), pp. 3-246 (p. 66), and Molinari, I, 436-38. Volumes up to and including 1834 have been examined for this study.

¹²¹ Molinari, I, 436.

¹²² Rolfi-Ozvald, p. 84.

¹²³ 'Nota de' compilatori del giornale' (GA.I.n.p.).

¹²⁴ Mario Scotti, 'Betti, Salvatore', in *Dizionario biografico*, IX (1967), 724-26 (p. 724).

¹²⁵ Garrone, p. 67.

¹²⁶ Rolfi-Ozvald, p. 84.

¹²⁷ Molinari, I, 437.

¹²⁸ Rolfi-Ozvald, pp. 63-64.

‘uomini illustri’ for future generations, and to provide inspiration for current artists to produce art (GA.I.144).

The editors sought with the *Giornale arcadico* to defend Classicism. The periodical was an example of traditionalist erudition,¹²⁹ which, as the title’s allusion to the *Accademia degli Arcadi* suggests,¹³⁰ was disengaged from modern life:

Questo titolo era già, di per sé, significativo, per il suo richiamarsi a una tradizione che, dopo qualche momento di splendore, era ormai consunta, e comunque fuori del tempo, estranea ai problemi della società contemporanea.¹³¹

The editors promoted the preservation of good literary taste, which they argued was arrived at through study of the classics,¹³² and not through innovations such as the Enlightenment introduced in foreign cultures, or the ‘cattivo gusto’ present in foreign texts.¹³³ Moreover, the *Arcadico*’s contentious positions were not limited to this ‘bigotta devozione al passato’ and xenophobia, but further included severe denunciations of Romanticism,¹³⁴ naturally causing great tension with contemporary Romantic scholars.¹³⁵

Despite being controversial, however, the editors of the *Arcadico* ensured that the journal always kept within what was ‘lecito discutere nella capitale dei papi’.¹³⁶ Thus, to the dismay of the publication’s many adversaries, the journal was never prohibited and, likely due to its conservative stance, in fact enjoyed the defence of the Papacy.¹³⁷

¹²⁹ Molinari, I, p. lxxvii.

¹³⁰ Garrone, pp. 66-67; the *Accademia degli Arcadi* was founded in Rome in 1690 as a reaction against Baroque poetics and in defence of classical models: see Camilletti, *Classicism and Romanticism*, p. 34.

¹³¹ Garrone, pp. 66-67.

¹³² Viviana Jemolo, ‘Biondi, Luigi’, in *Dizionario biografico*, X (1968), 534-35 (p. 534).

¹³³ Marco Manfredi, ‘Odescalchi, Pietro’, in *Dizionario biografico*, LXXIX (2013), 154-56 (p. 154), and Molinari, I, p. lxxvii.

¹³⁴ Garrone, pp. 67-68, and Molinari, I, p. lxxvii. See, for example, Carlo Botta’s censure of Romantic scholars in (GA.XXXVII.367).

¹³⁵ Garrone, pp. 141-42.

¹³⁶ Ugo Foscolo, ‘La letteratura periodica italiana’, in *Edizione Nazionale delle Opere di Ugo Foscolo*, 22 vols (Florence: Le Monnier, 1933-94), XI.2: *Saggi di letteratura italiana*, ed. by Cesare Foligno (1958), pp. 327-98 (p. 394); sourced from Garrone, p. 67.

¹³⁷ Garrone, p. 67, and Molinari, I, 436.

V.3.10. Effemeridi letterarie di Roma (1820-23)

In 1820 the *Effemeridi* was launched by a different group of scholars to the earlier *Efemeridi*, and with a minor change in spelling, as 'Efemeridi' became 'Effemeridi'. Published quarterly and running until 1823, there were thirteen volumes in total.¹³⁸ Largely composed of announcements and reviews of both Italian and foreign works, the journal covered a wide range of subjects, including ancient and modern art, theology, literature, and science (EFF.I.PR).

The key scholars behind the launch of the *Effemeridi* were Nicola D'Apuzzo, Luigi Metaxà, Gaetano Cavalletti, Antonio Nibby, and publisher, Filippo De Romanis (EFF.V.415-16).¹³⁹ Yet there were, of course, a number of other contributors involved, including familiar names such as Cicognara, Guattani, De Rossi, and Fea,¹⁴⁰ as well as Giuseppe Melchiorri,¹⁴¹ 'tutta la famiglia de' nostri Visconti' (EFF.V.415-16), and Luigi and Clemente Cardinali.¹⁴²

The *Effemeridi* had the same classical ethos as the *Giornale arcadico*, but was far less violent in its abhorrence of Romanticism.¹⁴³ It was also more receptive to the Enlightenment than its contemporary, as indeed is corroborated by Giacomo Leopardi's preference to publish in the *Effemeridi* over the *Arcadico*, the latter of which displayed a backward Classicism that he considered incompatible to his Enlightened standpoint.¹⁴⁴ There was inevitably competition between these two similar journals and, albeit triggered by personal rivalries and jealousies rather than differences in orientation, the above-noted Antonio Nibby and Filippo De Romanis were defectors from the *Arcadico*.¹⁴⁵

¹³⁸ Molinari, I, 348-49.

¹³⁹ Molinari, I, p. lxxvii.

¹⁴⁰ (EFF.VI.29); (EFF.IV.322); Molinari, I, 349.

¹⁴¹ Rolfi-Ozvald, pp. 64-65.

¹⁴² Nicola Parise, 'Cardinali, Clemente', in *Dizionario biografico*, XIX (1976), 782-84 (p. 782).

¹⁴³ Garrone, p. 68.

¹⁴⁴ Manfredi, p. 154.

¹⁴⁵ Molinari, I, p. lxxvii.

V.3.11. Memorie romane di antichità e di belle arti (1824-27)

On termination of the *Effemeridi*, Luigi Cardinali, Clemente Cardinali, Giuseppe Melchiorri, and Pietro Ercole Visconti – all of whom, as noted above, were involved in some manner in the former journal – founded a new publication: the *Memorie romane*.¹⁴⁶ This undertaking adhered to the wishes of Placido Zurla, Cardinal Vicar of Rome, who wished to see printed an examination of the arts and antiquity that was both broader and more detailed than previous examples.¹⁴⁷ The *Memorie romane* was thus produced for four years from 1824 to 1827.¹⁴⁸

As evident from the title, the *Memorie romane* explored both antiquity and the arts: ‘una sezione sarà antiquaria, l’altra tratterà le cose d’arte’, the latter of which naturally included discussion of the principal Neoclassical artists of the time (MR.I.5). The two sections comprised a number of articles and letters written by both the editors and a variety of other scholars, including Guattani, De Rossi, Nibby, and Bartolucci.¹⁴⁹

The editors sought here to continue the work of Guattani, whom they praised for his journalistic ventures, which were welcomed ‘per molti anni con applauso degli artisti e de’ letterati’ (MR.I.5).¹⁵⁰ Since his publications, the editors believed that something was missing from artistic journals. Indeed, as they state in the preface, even the recently published *Effemeridi* ‘mancava ogni mezzo spedito pel quale i lontani potessero conoscere le cose nostre di antichità e di arti: dal quale i nostri e archeologi e artisti potessero sperare allargata prontamente presso i lontani la fama della loro industria, e de’ loro studi’ (MR.I.5). Thus the *Memorie romane*’s main aim was to fill this lacuna and to share with foreigners the work of Rome’s artists and archaeologists.

¹⁴⁶ Molinari, I, p. lxxiii.

¹⁴⁷ Rolfi-Ozvald, pp. 64-65.

¹⁴⁸ Molinari, II, 589; as Molinari states, ‘La periodicità non è indicata’ for this periodical.

¹⁴⁹ Molinari, II, 589.

¹⁵⁰ See also Rolfi-Ozvald, pp. 64-65.

The *Memorie romane* was, as Garrone notes, a typical example of a journal that obeyed ‘il peso della censura e l’irrigidirsi delle tradizioni in una città come Roma’.¹⁵¹ Avoiding the more progressive views developing throughout Europe, the periodical aimed its attention rather ‘all’archeologia, alle arti, all’epigrafia latina, all’erudizione pura’.¹⁵² Thus, in light of this compliance, as well as the *Memorie romane*’s creation ‘su espressa richiesta’ of Placido Zurla, it is no surprise that the journal was well known in the upper echelons of the Papal curia.¹⁵³

V.4. REACTIONS TO WINCKELMANN IN ROME’S ARTISTIC JOURNALS

Having established the composition, ethos, and objectives of these ten journals, I will now explore their reactions to Winckelmann, starting with their efforts to foreignize the German scholar and then turning to the forms of domestication.

V.5. FOREIGNIZATION: WINCKELMANN AS AN INFERIOR ‘OTHER’

Rome’s artistic journals employed two related methods to foreignize Winckelmann qua scholar: first, highlighting his inferiority when compared to native scholars; and, second, emphasizing his German origins and therefore his otherness.

The first method, underscoring Winckelmann’s inferiority to Italians, suggests a marked difference between him and ‘us’, or more often, ‘our’ Italian critics. For instance, in discussing Winckelmann’s *Anmerkungen über die Baukunst*, an anonymous article in the *Memorie per le belle arti* comments on how his studies therein are ‘inferiori a quelle, che si leggono in Leon Battista Alberti, nel Serlio, nel Palladio’ (MBA.II.67), a subordination which the author continues to elucidate. Indeed he even implies that there is a ‘need’, ‘bisogna confessare’, to

¹⁵¹ Garrone, p. 66.

¹⁵² Garrone, p. 66.

¹⁵³ Rolfi-Ozvald, p.65.

remind readers that Winckelmann's Italian predecessors had dealt with the same material 'molto più copiosamente, e dottamente':

Per giuste che sieno le poche osservazioni fatte dal Winckelmann in tutti questi articoli, per quanta erudizione abbia tratta dai Classici per dirci che alcune fabbriche erano nella Grecia, e in Roma, o di mattoni crudi, [...] o di marmo, e cose simili, bisogna confessare, che l'Alberti, il Palladio, e lo Scamozzi molto più copiosamente, e dottamente hanno trattato queste materie, come ognuno da sè può riscontrare. (MBA.II.69)

The second method through which the Italian periodicals foreignize Winckelmann is by drawing attention to his German origins. His foreign background is made evident in a number of examples where Winckelmann is classed with his compatriots. In the *Memorie enciclopediche romane*, for example, he is grouped with German natives on discussion of Schlichtegroll's new book – 'rende rispettabile il nome del Signor *Schlichtegroll*, con avvicinarlo ai prodi suoi connazionali *Winckelmann*, *Trippel*, *Ekhel* [...]' (MER.I.159, italics added) – just as both in the same journal and elsewhere he is associated with his contemporaries, Mengs and Sulzer. Often considered a trio of writers on aesthetics, comments on 'i più sublimi trattati sulle Arti [...] dei Sulzer, dei Winckelmann, dei Mengs' (MER.III.57) were common.¹⁵⁴

Further underscoring his foreign descent, journal editors also label Winckelmann 'tedesco' and 'Brandenburg(h)ese'.¹⁵⁵ These two terms appear relatively infrequently, yet they recur in the majority of publications as a constant reminder of his German origins: 'Brandenburg(h)ese' in such periodicals as *Giornale delle belle arti*, *Giornale arcadico*, *Effemeridi*, and *Memorie romane*, and 'tedesco' in almost all of the periodicals here explored. It could be argued that Winckelmann's identification of and grouping as German is almost inevitable when discussing a foreign scholar, yet it should be noted that such choices are the result of deliberate decisions on the part of editors and authors. Indeed, some journals go

¹⁵⁴ See also (MR.III.321) and (MBA.I.1).

¹⁵⁵ As clarified in Chapter II.3.1., Winckelmann was born in Stendal, which was then in the Margraviate of Brandenburg: see Harloe, p. 7. There are also (far less frequent) examples of Winckelmann labelled 'Sassone' (due to his time spent in Dresden, Saxony).

beyond simply highlighting Winckelmann's German origin and simultaneously emphasize the difference of background between him and his contemporary Italian scholars. Luigi Cardinali, for instance, whilst discussing a group of Italian and foreign scholars in the *Memorie romane*, strikingly contrasts Winckelmann – 'quel brandeburgese che tessè la storia delle arti presso gli antichi' – with Cicognara: 'colui che dal risorgimento la condusse [la storia delle arti] insino a noi, e questo è italiano' (MR.II.x), after which he continues to applaud his native land (MR.II.x-xi).

This focus on Winckelmann's foreign origins promotes distance between him and native Italian scholarship: a distance that becomes even further pronounced when journal authors combine this with the aforementioned emphasis on his inferiority compared to Italian scholars. Visconti is a common and enduring example of the art journals simultaneously highlighting Winckelmann's otherness and lesser status as a scholar, in order to elevate a native Italian. This is demonstrated in a review of Visconti's work 'su due mosaici antichi istoriati' in the *Efemerdi*. The anonymous author highlights here not only Winckelmann's German origins, 'antiquario Tedesco', but also the superiority of 'il nostro dotto Italiano', who 'destroyed' Winckelmann's identification with well-founded criticism:

Non è da omettersi che il Signor Abate ha cammin facendo, distrutto con critica assai ben fondata una opinione del Winckelmann intorno ad un insigne gruppo di due statue [...]. Quel celebre antiquario Tedesco le aveva spiegate per Pilade ed Oreste, ma il nostro dotto Italiano pretende che la figura principale rappresenti Antinoo favorito d'Adriano, e la subalterna Mercurio. (EF.XVII.390)

This foreignization clearly persisted throughout the period examined, as thirty-four years later the *Effemeridi* of 1822 also employs Visconti as a superior, native guide through which to review Winckelmann's *Monumenti*, or rather the discoveries of the 'Brandeburgese'. The author, Clemente Cardinali, states: 'nostra principal guida in questo lavoro fu quell' Ennio Quirino Visconti che tanto seppe migliorare e promuovere le scoperte del Brandeburgese' (EFF.VIII.256-57). As is often the case, Cardinali continues here not only to afford Visconti

further praise, but moreover to highlight his *italianità*, making his comparison with Winckelmann all the more evident: 'quel Visconti di cui si onora chiunque crede che a se tocchi parte di gloria Italiana, o si pregia di ciò che onora la umana spezie' (EFF.VIII.257). In a similar manner, the *Giornale arcadico* of 1819 – through quoting an extract from Dionigi Strocchi's 'Elogio di E.Q. Visconti' – also compares the German scholar's abilities to Italian Visconti's superior level of accuracy. Indeed commenting on a sharp-eyed observation of 'nostro Autore', Visconti, Strocchi directly contrasts this to the error of the 'antiquario Brandeburghese': 'Winkelmann ha ravvisata una Giunone marziale là dove il nostro Autore scopre Vulcano al noto segno della tanaglia, che all'antiquario Brandeburghese parve una forbice' (GA.II.14).

Finally, although Boni does not specifically highlight Winckelmann's German origins in the following passage in the *Memorie per le belle arti*, he clearly excludes him from 'nostri antichi Italiani', as he continues to express the self-sufficiency (and thus superiority) of the Italians:

Sempre più verremo a confermare la nostra opinione, che i nostri antichi Italiani non hanno da ceder niente al Wink. nell'Antiquaria architetonica, perchè letterati grandissimi, e valentissimi artisti che *non trattarono la materia per lo più superficialmente, e da semplici Architetti*, come l'Annotatore dell'Edizione Romana di questo autore vorrebbe, che si credesse. (MBA.II.194)

Whilst in the context of his polemic with Fea (the italic words are quoted from the preface to the third volume of Fea's *Storia*) Boni nevertheless very plainly professes here that in architectural antiquarianism, Italy had no need for Winckelmann, 'non hanno da ceder niente al Wink.': a most apparent example of his ostracization.

Thus, I have shown that Roman artistic journals used two methods (both separately and combined) to foreignize Winckelmann: demonstrating the excellence of their native scholarship and protecting it from his foreign influence.

V.6. FOREIGNIZATION: ILLUMINATING WINCKELMANN'S CONTENTIOUS VIEWS

Aside from Winckelmann as a well-known figure, the art journals of this period also foreignized his views, which they achieved through one method, comprising the same two aspects identified in the preceding chapter.¹⁵⁶ Namely, they drew attention to his offensive opinions and defended their heritage from his Italophobia.

The *Giornale arcadico* and the *Monumenti antichi*, for example, highlight Winckelmann's Italophobic views regarding the Etruscans and the Romans, before proceeding to defend against them. Beginning with Etruscan art, there was much debate in the late eighteenth century as to the origins of vases recently discovered in Southern Italy. Most Italians believed they were Etruscan, yet through reprinting an essay that Alberto Bellenghi read to the *Accademia romana di archeologia*, the *Arcadico* highlights Winckelmann's contrary opinion. He denied the ancient Italians this handiwork and instead ascribed the vases to the Greeks. Immediately drawing attention to Winckelmann's offensive views, the *Arcadico* thereafter seeks to defend their native patria, which they achieve by again quoting Bellenghi, who denied any Italian agreement: 'Malgrado però dell'opposizione del Winkelmann alla corrente opinione, questi vasi tuttavia serbano la denominazione di etruschi' (GA.XXXVIII.211).

In a similar manner, in an anonymous article, likely authored by Guattani, the *Monumenti antichi* draws attention to Winckelmann's anti-Roman views by highlighting his criticism of the shape and size of Marcus Aurelius' ears. Whilst this may appear trivial, the *Monumenti antichi's* response, which condemns Winckelmann as 'inconsiderate', suggests that offending the likeness of a Roman Emperor was not taken lightly. Indeed the article continues to defend against Winckelmann's comment by emphasizing the proportionality of his other features:

¹⁵⁶ See Chapter IV.6.

Gli orecchi sono proporzionati, ma non dimostrano quella particolare profondità nel meato uditorio, che inconsideratamente l'insigne Winkhelmann ha supposta in quest'organo dell'Imperatore. [...] La bocca fatta con proporzione, e tutto l'insieme costituisce il ritratto di un giovane Imperatore. (MAI.VII.23)

In the same volume, the *Monumenti antichi* also includes another anonymous tract in which the author, we again presume Guattani, discusses a statue of Emperor Tiberius that he claims to originate from the time 'del furioso Caligola' (MAI.VII.79). Immediately making mention of Winckelmann's negative opinion on art of this period – 'crede Winckelmann che le arti soffrissero molto sotto di lui' – this leads to a defence of Caligula, as the author proceeds to refute this anti-Roman suggestion. Indeed, following this with 'io per gli antichi scritti molto diversamente ne penso', the article describes the growth of Roman art under Caligula, from his beautiful coins to his decrees ordering the transportation of art from Greece. The author then concludes this article with the following statement, in which, implying a nationalistic aspect to this foreignization, he endeavours to both boast about and defend Italian heritage from not only Winckelmann's opinions on Caligula, but from his wider Hellenism, too:

Tutto in somma comprova l'amore di Cajo Caligola per le arti, il quale unito all'ispezione di tante belle sculture esuli dalla Grecia, avrà molto contribuito alla perfezione dello scarpello Latino, che rende pienamente verificato il detto di Quintiliano, di avere i Latini superato i Greci, e di servire a' posteri di addottrinamento. (MAI.VII.80)

These comments must be considered in the context of the journal's publication. After all, as explained above, this issue of the *Monumenti antichi* was published under and even dedicated to Napoleon, who was naturally eager to protect the Roman art he had acquired during his campaigns. The position of Winckelmann, however, remains the same: whatever the incentive, the journal draws attention to and defends against the offensive nature of Winckelmann's arguments, thus foreignizing his views.

Furthermore, such foreignization is not limited to Winckelmann's views on the ancients, but rather extends also to his criticism of Michelangelo. Indeed the *Memorie per le*

belle arti, or rather Onofrio Boni, as Barroero confirms, simultaneously highlights and objects to Winckelmann's damning reviews of the Renaissance artist.¹⁵⁷ Boni admits that Michelangelo erred – 'Non pretendiamo nè scusare, nè dissimulare i difetti' – and even agrees with Winckelmann that the moderns were guilty of 'il cattivo gusto'. Yet he is disheartened that the German scholar accused Michelangelo of the same 'gusto', particularly in light of Winckelmann's contradictory argument that Michelangelo's successor, Borromini, was guilty of introducing this vice into Italian art. Moreover, given the prominent role of this passage in the Boni-Fea conflict, Boni not only criticizes Winckelmann here, but Fea, too, which in fact further highlights the offensive nature of the German scholar's views. After all, by bemoaning how Fea did not provide Michelangelo with the defence that he required, Boni in turn emphasizes the need to protect the artist's legacy from Winckelmann's inaccuracies:

Solo avremmo gradito, che il Sig. Ab. Fea notando queste cose, che appartengono alla Storia delle Arti, avesse difeso Michelangelo dalla taccia, che contradicendo anche a sè stesso gli dà il Wink, di fondatore del cattivo gusto Borrominesco; e ben lo meritava il Pittor della Cappella Sistina, lo Scultore dei Depositi Medicei, l'Architetto del Vaticano, cui devono, dopo che risorsero le Arti sorelle, molte più bellezze, che difetti. (MBA.II.97)

I have thus demonstrated that a range of journals of the period foreignized Winckelmann's views, shedding light on their offensive nature in order to uphold both ancient and modern Italian artistic production.

V.7. DOMESTICATION: WINCKELMANN AS ONE AMONGST THE ITALIANS

In direct contrast to the previously-discussed foreignization of Winckelmann qua scholar, achieved by drawing attention to his otherness, there are also clear efforts throughout the Italian artistic journals to domesticate Winckelmann by presenting him as less foreign, and even Italian. This is achieved through two methods: first, by suggesting that Winckelmann had

¹⁵⁷ Barroero, p. 94.

become Roman; and, second, by categorizing him with Italians rather than foreigners. This second method can be divided into three different techniques: the journals included Winckelmann in otherwise distinctly Italian groups; they compared him to celebrated Italian figures; and they even suggested an estrangement between him and his native Germans.

The first method is especially apparent in statements made by contributors to the *Giornale arcadico*, who indeed suggested that Winckelmann had *become* Roman. In one such example, Vatican librarian, Girolamo Amati, refers to the ‘Sassone che fattosi abate romano’ (GA.XLIII.226), demonstrating not only his ‘change’ in nationality, but, as was also befitting his new surroundings, his adoption of the title of ‘abate’.¹⁵⁸ A year later in this same journal, Amati reveals this opinion again. Reviewing news from Trieste, he sketches Winckelmann’s life in three crucial stages: born German, he became Roman, before ultimately dying in Trieste:

il Winckelmann, che nato alemanno, fattosi romano, produr seppe inestimabili tesori dalla scienza degli Albani, aprì un linguaggio fino ad allora sconosciuto sulle Arti del nostro bello, e cadde imprevedutamente sotto barbara e vil mano in Trieste. (GA.XLIV.190)

Moreover, whilst these suggestions of Winckelmann’s new Roman identity clearly imply his belonging amongst native scholars, other journals of the period – albeit not as overtly as Amati – similarly domesticate the German scholar through the Italian titles they afford him. In contrast to ‘Brandeburghese’ and ‘tedesco’, Winckelmann is on many occasions labelled both ‘Giovanni’ and, as above, ‘Abate’. Neither of these demonstrates domestication in their own right. After all, it was common custom to domesticate, in the Venutian sense of the term, foreign authors’ names and Winckelmann had indeed become an abbot. Nevertheless, the regularity with which some journals employed such terms does suggest a desire to present the

¹⁵⁸ Winckelmann described himself as a ‘prussiano romano’ in a letter to Salomon Gessner (14/11/1761): a letter that the journal editors, and in this case Amati, may well have read (Amati here is writing in 1829, long after Winckelmann’s ‘Briefe an seine Freunde’, letters to his friends, were published in German in 1777-80 and quickly translated into French in 1781). Whether he had read it or not, however, what is significant is that Amati further promoted the idea. See (OP.IX.538) and Martin Disselkamp, *Die Stadt der Gelehrten: Studien zu Johann Joachim Winckelmanns Briefe aus Rom* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1993), p. 3.

German scholar as more Italian to the native reader. Indeed, both the *Efemeridi* and the *Effemeridi* should be remembered here for the above-average frequency with which they refer to Winckelmann as 'Abate' and 'Giovanni', respectively.

Turning to the second method by which the artistic journals domesticated Winckelmann – that of categorizing him with Italians – the first technique involves his inclusion in groups of otherwise Italian scholars, again presenting him as belonging to Italy. Beginning with the *Antologia*, for example, such lists as the following, which appears in an anonymous eulogy for Jacopo Martorelli, demonstrate a total disregard for the fact that he was foreign, or in any sense separate from the others:

I dotti Prelati Assemani, Borgia, Garampi, e Guarnacci ebbero per lui una stima distinta. Lami, Bianchi, Gori, Facciolati, Winckelmann già defunti, e i viventi Passeri, Olivieri, e Paciaudi gli furono attaccatissimi. (AR.IV.260)

In fact, the evident ease with which the author includes him here amongst solely Italian scholars further suggests that Winckelmann had to all intents and purposes 'become' one of the Italians. This is true, too, of a later example in the same journal, in which Guattani, in the capacity of author rather than editor, introduces his new work, *Agli amatori delle antichità romane, e della greco-romana architettura*. When commenting on works on antiquity that he had previously read but intended to surpass, Guattani, as above, insouciantly includes Winckelmann in an otherwise Italian list:

La lettura de' classici, de' regionari, e di tutti i moderni che ne hanno scritto come Donato, Nardino, Venuti, Winkelman ec. [...] mi hanno agevolata la via onde combinare l'erudizione coll'arte, e farne un libro di gusto. (AR.XXI.198)

Nor was this a technique employed solely by journals like the *Antologia*, which had personal connections to Winckelmann, but was rather a common and enduring practice. Indeed architect, Luigi Canina, for example, discussing the Forma Urbis Romae in the *Memorie romane* (1825), similarly includes Winckelmann with no hesitation as an interlocutor amongst his Italian predecessors and contemporaries:

Il Serlio, il Palladio, che ne videro maggiori avvanzi ne delinearono una pianta non di molto mancante, e segnatamente questo ultimo, che fu poi copiato da altri con poche variazioni; Sante Bartoli e Bellori, Mirri e Carletti, Winckelmann, ed ultimamente l'architetto Deromanis trattarono delle camere esistenti sotto al piano di queste terme di opera anteriore a Tito, e delle celebri pitture che ancor ivi rimangono. (MR.II.119)

Furthermore, through his inclusion in the Italian antiquarian studies of the period, Winckelmann also assumed in a number of journals the role of an authoritative figure. Together with native scholars, he was a point of reference for the confirmation of facts and opinions. When discussing a medal made out of ivory in the *Monumenti antichi*, for example, Guattani refers to Winckelmann and Buonarroti to confirm the antiquity of works of ivory. Not only is this another example of Winckelmann's inclusion amongst Italian scholars, but it further reveals Guattani's respect for his opinion:

Che poi lavori in tal materia vantino un'epoca tanto antica quanto quella della Scultura medesima, con buoni documenti ce lo assicura Winkelmann *nella Storia dell'Arte*, e prima di lui il Buonarroti ne' *Medaglioni*. (MAI.IV.9)

In a similar manner, in 1823 the *Giornale arcadico* published a letter that the scholar Napione sent to Visconti, in which he attempts to reassure Visconti through reference to Winckelmann's authority. Entitled 'Rarità de' vasi sacri gentileschi di argento', Napione here discusses, as per the title, how antiquarians of the period were concentrating on bronze rather than silver vases in their studies on pagan sacrifices. Napione believed this was indeed the right decision and thus to reassure Visconti, whose research had the same emphasis, he refers to Winckelmann who similarly focused on 'bronzi soltanto':

Non è meraviglia pertanto, se nè da lei, sig. abate stimatissimo, nè da verun altro antiquario, che io sappia, di vasi di argento [...] si fa menzione, che abbiano servito a sacrifici gentileschi. [...] e di bronzi soltanto ragiona il Winckelmann nella storia delle arti del disegno; nè in tutta la medesima tratta di proposito di lavori di argento tuttora esistenti. (GA.XX.362)

Indeed 'di bronzi soltanto ragiona il Winckelmann' plainly reveals Napione's confidence in the German scholar's views, which we assume he believed Visconti would share. Thus, as well as

simple inclusion amongst Italians, Winckelmann was on a number of occasions hailed as a figure of authority.

Further indicating Winckelmann's standing in Italian scholarship, he was not, as will already be apparent, grouped with common Italian critics, but rather only with those of prominent status. Indeed this is especially confirmed in the *Effemeridi* as Clemente Cardinali embraces him, with Marini, Visconti, and many others, as one of the 'gloriosi nomi' (EFF.V.160). Moreover, in publishing the *Atti dell'Accademia Romana di Archeologia*, 1821, this same journal points to the idea that Pius VI's Rome was able to forgo an academy due to the insight of Winckelmann and key Italian scholars. This demonstrates not only the German scholar's inclusion with the most distinguished Italian critics, but also his central role within Rome's scholarship, accentuated, too, by the positioning of Winckelmann's name at the beginning of the list:

A Pio sesto felicissimo sino agli ultimi periodi del regno e della vita non fu bisogno di una accademia, quando Winkelmann, Visconti, Marini, Zaccaria, Lanzi, e Morcelli mandavano tanta luce, che qualunque in loro guardasse non poteva torcere dal buon sentiero.¹⁵⁹ (EFF.V.5)

There are also similarly inclusive examples in which Winckelmann is not classed in a group, but with one notable Italian scholar, implying – through the suggestion of their equality – his true integration into Italy's art scholarship. A striking example of this more intimate grouping can be noted in the *Giornale arcadico*, where – despite previous foreignizing examples of Visconti placed above Winckelmann, and building on the aforementioned groups, both of which include Visconti – Nibby groups Winckelmann and Visconti together. He even states that, having revived archaeology through their 'basi più solide', the two scholars together brought 'onore e gloria' to Italy:

Questa taccia può darsi a molti degli eruditi de' tre ultimi Secoli; poichè in essi l'archeologia era caduta nel più vile disprezzo quando sorsero a rialzarla sopra basi più

¹⁵⁹ Commas have been added.

solide i luminari della erudizione del secolo decorso, e di questo nel quale viviamo, Winckelman, ed Ennio Quirino Visconti, onore e gloria di questa nostra patria. (GA.II.47)

As it would be commonly assumed that a person who brings honour to a country belongs to that same land, this is a forceful example of Winckelmann's integration and indeed of the *Arcadico's* efforts to domesticate the German-born scholar.

The second technique by which Rome's art journals categorized Winckelmann as Italian was through likening the German scholar to prominent Italian figures. This again not only presented him as less foreign but as a person of great distinction and fame in Italy. Such comparisons include a variety of Italian personalities, from statesmen to intellectuals, and even poets. In an anonymous article in the *Memorie per le belle arti*, for example, Winckelmann's skill in recognizing the esteem that gems and engraved stones deserved is compared to that of none other than Florentine statesman and patron of the arts, Lorenzo de' Medici. Just as Medici chose to collect precious gems and to introduce engraving in Florence, so Winckelmann interpreted in just three stones of Stosch's collection the development of sculpture from its infancy to its perfection:

Nè vide poi male nelle belle Arti il Magnifico Lorenzo de' Medici, avidissimo di ogni più scelto, e raro monumento dell'Antichità, quando le raccolse con tanta spesa, e stabilì in Firenze l'arte d'inciderle [...] come ancora, per tacere di tanti altri, vidde assai bene il celebre Winkelman quando sulle gemme intagliate del solo gabinetto del Barone di Stosch seguì [...] l'arte della Scultura della sua infanzia alla sua maggior perfezione, e bellezza nelle tre più singolari pietre di detta raccolta, rappresentanti l'Ercole, il Bacco, e l'Atalanta. (MBA.I.47-48)

Similarly, in 1789 the *Efemeridi* included an anonymous review of Pozzetti's 'Elogio dell'Abate Ridolfino dei Marchesi Venuti', in which the author, through reference to the two famous villas 'casa Albani' and 'casa d'Este', likens Venuti to Ariosto and Winckelmann to Tasso:

L'eccellentissima casa Albani, ove il Venuti ebbe un onorifico asilo, ed ove ve l'ebbe poi il Winkelman, può vantarsi di aver posseduto questi due primi antiquari del nostro secolo, siccome la serenissima casa d'Este a cui essa coi vincoli del sangue è congiunta, a ragione si gloria di aver avuto alla sua corte i due luminari maggiori dell'epica moderna poesia. L'Ariosto ed il Tasso. (EF.XVIII.243)

The personification here of the villas: able to feel glory, 'si gloria', and to boast, 'può vantarsi', at having housed the respective pairs – Winckelmann and Venuti, and Ariosto and Tasso – indicates the standing of all four figures. Further, the comparison of Winckelmann to this pillar of Italian poetry, his inclusion with learned Venuti, and the emphasis on his Italian lodgings all clearly domesticate him as less foreign and more familiar to Italian readers.

Finally, the third technique of categorizing Winckelmann with Italians was to separate him from other Germans and Europeans. For instance, in listing in the *Effemeridi* the scholars responsible for restoring archaeological scholarship, Giuseppe Melchiorri chooses here to include Winckelmann, 'ai quali doveva pur premettersi Winckelmann', whilst simultaneously expressing disregard for 'gli espositori tedeschi':

Ricorda quindi quali sieno stati i restauratori della buona maniera di scrivere le archeologiche osservazioni, e di illustrare i monumenti antichi, e fa memoria frà i primi degli Accademici Ercolanesi, Visconti, Zoega, Lanzi, ai quali doveva pur premettersi Winckelmann, ed a quali non dovevano aggiugnersi gli espositori tedeschi, e francesi, i quali nelle illustrazioni delle antichità figurate non ci sembrano valere gran fatto. (EFF.IX.284)

The juxtaposition here of Winckelmann and 'gli espositori tedeschi' provides a striking example of the renationalization of the German-born scholar, grouped now with Visconti and Lanzi over those of his native origin.

I have therefore demonstrated that Rome's artistic journals domesticated Winckelmann qua scholar through two methods. Not only did they suggest Winckelmann became Roman, but they firmly categorized him amongst native Italians. Indeed the three techniques by which the journals achieved the second method reveal the extent to which they endeavoured almost to conceal his foreign origins by presenting him instead as familiar to their Italian readership.

V.8. DOMESTICATION: WINCKELMANN'S OEUVRE AND ITS ITALIAN EXISTENCE

Just as the Italian art journals domesticated Winckelmann qua scholar, so, too, did they domesticate his oeuvre (particularly his *Geschichte*). This was achieved through five different methods, all of which presented Winckelmann's writing as less foreign, and in most cases even Italian. The first two methods concern the original *Geschichte*. The first emphasizes how Winckelmann had written his *Geschichte* in Rome, and the second highlights the familiarity of this work amongst Italians. The next two methods focus on the Italian translations of the *Geschichte*: the third presenting the Italian translators' role as no less significant than that of Winckelmann, and the fourth going a step further, by suggesting the superiority of the Italian translations to the original. The fifth and final method relates to the journals themselves, with the editors establishing their publications as continuations of the German scholar's work.

Turning to the first method, a number of journals – including notably the *Antologia* and the *Efemeridi* – were eager to demonstrate how this seminal work had been written in their own city of Rome. In the *Efemeridi*, for example, an anonymous reviewer of the French translation by Huber, whilst also praising Rome as the source of beauty, immediately highlights the *Geschichte*'s Roman origins: 'composta da lui in Tedesco, alla sorgente stessa del bello, cioè in Roma' (EF.VIII.94). In fact, he even suggests in his notable opening sentence that, given these origins, any glory Winckelmann achieved through his works was applicable to Rome, too: 'Tutto ciò che interessa la gloria di Winkelman, riguarda ancora quella di Roma, e delle sue magnificenze' (EF.VIII.94). In a similar manner and in the same volume of the *Efemeridi*, another, also anonymous, reviewer of Heyne's *Lobschrift* continues to afford great significance both to the Roman inspiration behind Winckelmann's work and to the role this played in his success. Indeed, whilst Winckelmann had 'fatto epoca [...] nella scienza antiquaria', the overriding message here is that he would not have been able to do so without the opportunities that Rome provided him: 'in nessun altro luogo potrassene meno dubitare, che

in Roma, dove egli visse sì lungo tempo, e sopra i di cui monumenti ha saputo spargere sì grande, e sì nuova luce' (EF.VIII.37). Thus, whilst it is necessary to be mindful of the possible connection between these suggestions and the editors' own relationships with Winckelmann when indeed he lived in Rome, this emphasis on the Rome-born success of the *Geschichte* clearly presents it as vastly less foreign, even as Roman.

Developing this idea, these same editors published in the *Antologia* the peninsula's first announcement of Fea's forthcoming translation,¹⁶⁰ in which an again unknown author not only highlights the *Geschichte*'s Roman origins, but further suggests that the Romans had almost an entitlement to read this work. Indeed, in light of the incentive provided by their 'vetusti monumenti', the author here shares the frustration of Winckelmann's first Italian translators (discussed in Chapter III) that their compatriots were compelled, or 'costretti' to read in a foreign language a work created in and inspired by their native country:

I dotti Monaci Cisterciensi dell'Imperial Collegio di S. Ambrogio di Milano riflettendo saggiamente, che non fosse cosa convenevole, che gl'Italiani fossero costretti a leggere in lingua straniera una fatica di tanto merito, ideata, e scritta in Italia, e ragionata su i vetusti monumenti, che vi si ritrovano. (AR.IX.127-28)

He even professes confusion that the *Geschichte* was initially written in German: 'fu dall'Autore distesa, non si sà perche [sic], nell' idoma tedesco' (AR.IX.127), revealing the extent to which domestication obscured its foreign origins. To him and, as Ferrari affirms, to many scholars and antiquarians in Italy, Winckelmann and his magnum opus belonged: 'alla cultura italiana e romana e solo in minima parte a quella oltremontana'.¹⁶¹

Articles discussing new translations of the *Geschichte* naturally dwindled following the publications of the first French and Italian editions, yet Rome's art journals continued nevertheless to highlight the Italian origins of Winckelmann's work. Demonstrating how entrenched this idea was, forty years after the above-cited *Antologia* article the *Effemeridi*

¹⁶⁰ Ferrari, 'L'eredità culturale', p. 18.

¹⁶¹ Ferrari, 'L'eredità culturale', p. 19.

again emphasizes the importance of Rome in three articles devoted to Montagnini's new edition of Winckelmann's *Monumenti*. Clemente Cardinali upholds here the same suggestions as above: underscoring how, as Winckelmann's *Monumenti* was also inspired by Rome's ancient monuments, the Romans had a certain entitlement, 'permesso', to this work, too. Indeed he emphasizes this right to or even ownership of the *Monumenti* by employing here the first-person plural, declaring that Winckelmann treated 'le cose che più direttamente ci appartengono' and even maintaining that, as the ancient monuments are 'le cose nostre' (EFF.VIII.256), so the *Monumenti* is 'nostra anch'essa'. He states:

Molte lodi ne raccolse meritamente l'autore: e molte grazie se ne vogliono retribuire al Signor Montagnani che quest'opera ripose in commercio. Le quali grazie gli si debbono da noi Romani in ispecie, che trascurate alcuna volta le cose che più direttamente ci appartengono, lasciammo che al di là degli Apennini si facessero ristampe di opere laudatissime, che addì nostri seppe produrre questa Roma: e tanto avremmo permesso di questa del Winckelmann che a buon diritto può dirsi nostra anch'essa. (EFF.VIII.255)

Beyond casting it as less foreign, Cardinali – like his predecessors before him – presents Winckelmann's *Monumenti* as both inspired by and belonging to the city of Rome.

The second method of domesticating Winckelmann's oeuvre, together with the emphasis on the Roman *source* of his works, was to highlight the *impact* his writing had throughout the peninsula. That is, through drawing attention to Winckelmann's Italian readership, the authors and editors presented his work not as foreign but as widely read and thus familiar. The *Giornale delle belle arti*, for example, suggests that the whole of Rome was reading his work, referring to the 'utile lettura della Storia delle Arti del Disegno' in which 'trovasi in oggi tutta Roma occupata' (GBA.II.12).¹⁶² In a similar manner, in an essay 'sui vasi etruschi o italogreci recentemente scoperti' read to the *Accademia dell'Archeologia* and subsequently reprinted by the *Giornale arcadico*, Amati expresses disapproval of his

¹⁶² Rolfi-Ozvald, p. 124.

contemporaries' attachment to Winckelmann's writing due to their consequent neglect of primary sources:

Non tornerebbe ad infinitamente maggior utile nostro il risalire alle prime fonti, piuttostochè restare attaccati a poche linee del Winckelmann, contraddette, abbattute oggidì solennemente dalla potenza incontrastabile del fatto? (GA.XLV.31)

Whilst criticizing this dependency on Winckelmann, Amati nevertheless domesticates his work here by underscoring its recognition amongst Italian readers. Moreover, Guattani also suggests in the *Memorie enciclopediche romane* that Winckelmann's Graecophile views had taken hold: 'Sogliamo, è vero, per massima d'Antiquaria stabilita dal Winkelmann, e ricevuta dagli eruditi, ricorrere nello spiegare gli antichi monumenti a fatti Greci, qualora si possa' (MER.IV.41). Not only does he indicate here, through his use of the first-person plural, that he and his fellow scholars referred to Winckelmann's Greek-centric principles, but he notes, too, that Winckelmann's antiquarianism was accepted: 'ricevuta dagli eruditi'.

Further emphasizing the impact of the *Geschichte*, the art journals also look beyond the general readership of Winckelmann's works to his more illustrious readers. Indeed in the *Effemeridi*, Cardinali highlights how 'la erudizione classica di Winkelmann' (EFF.XI.100) inspired Canova – perhaps the most lauded Neoclassical artist of the period – in his restoration of taste: revealing not only Canova's familiarity with Winckelmann's work, but also Winckelmann's centrality to Italy's cultural development. Similarly, whilst Visconti has been discussed thus far both as surpassing and grouped with the German scholar, the art journals of the period further make reference to his reading of Winckelmann's writing. Just as Guattani in the *Memorie enciclopediche romane* claims Visconti's observations on ancient flooring were 'dopo le osservazioni del Winkelmann' (MER.V.88), the *Giornale arcadico* quotes Napione, who also demonstrates how Visconti's comments on pre-manufactured urns and sepulchres reveal his adoption of Winckelmann's equivalent ideas (GA.XX.113-14).

The third method through which the periodicals domesticated Winckelmann's oeuvre was by focusing on the posthumous *Italian* editions of his works. After all, with attention largely directed towards Fea's translation, the Italian authorship of Winckelmann's works as circulated in the peninsula provided the journals with a clear opportunity to present his writing as less foreign. In order, therefore, to draw attention to this Italian authorship, the journals sought to afford Fea and his role the same import as Winckelmann. This even includes criticism, as is the case in the *Giornale arcadico* when, expressing disappointment that Winckelmann was not familiar with the extended edition of a work written by Gabriele Barrio, Amati includes Fea in this sentiment, too:

Maggiormente però stupir dobbiamo del Winckelmann, uomo che aveva dedicato sì lunghi studi all'istoria dell'arte, non che del suo annotatore nella edizione romana [...] non conoscesse l'edizione accresciuta dell'opera del Barrio. (GA.XLIII.226)

In truth, Amati continues to clarify that it was Winckelmann's lack of knowledge that he was particularly shocked by – 'precipuamente stupir dobbiamo del Sassone che fattosi abate romano, ed alunno di quegl'immortali Albani, non conoscesse l'edizione' – yet the inclusion of Fea alongside Winckelmann nevertheless demonstrates his conviction that this was almost an equal partnership (GA.XLIII.226). Similarly, an anonymous author in the *Giornale delle belle arti* also conveys this idea of equality between Winckelmann and Fea. In discussing Fea's *Storia*, as well as another of his works, the *Opere di Antonio Mengs*, which is the subject of the article here, the contributor begins by extolling Winckelmann and Mengs for reforming taste and transforming antiquarianism, before proceeding immediately thereafter to praise Fea. Indeed he adds with conviction how Italian art scholarship is no less obliged to Fea for his tireless care and diligence:

[...] questi due uomini illustri, alle fatiche, e studi dei quali più che ad altri mai le belle arti debbono la riforma del loro gusto, e l'antiquaria una nuova direzione. Ma non meno saranno obbligate le belle arti, e l'antiquaria, e questi stessi Autori, all'inflessa cura, e diligenza del Signor Avvocato Fea, che col darci nuove edizioni tanto migliorate

delle loro opere, ci ha dato il mezzo di profittarne con più sicurezza, e vantaggio.
(GBA.V.46)

Such instances are clear examples of domestication, as through implying that Fea's importance is equivalent to that of the original author, they render Winckelmann's work far less foreign, and even partly Italian.

Furthermore, this inclusion of Fea with Winckelmann extends to occasions when it is unnecessary or even incorrect to add reference to the Italian translator, demonstrating the desire to include him regardless of circumstance. The *Giornale arcadico*, for instance, includes in 1828 Bellenghi's already-noted essay on Etruscan vases, which, again demonstrating the links this journal had to the academies, Bellenghi had previously read to the *Accademia romana di archeologia*. In this he discusses the Vatican collection of vases and lists some of the leading names who had illustrated these pieces, including Montfaucon, Hancarville, Passeri, and Winckelmann. This list refers simply to those who had worked on these ancient vases, with no reference to the overall merits of any of these scholars. Upon noting Winckelmann in the list, however, Bellenghi adds reference to Fea, 'alla cui il sig. avv. Fea. nostro socio tempo fa appose eruditissime note' (GA.XXXVIII.232). Evidently redundant in this context, this comment demonstrates Bellenghi's determination to refer to the Italian translator regardless of the inopportune occasion. Moreover, in a markedly similar manner, an anonymous author in the *Memorie enciclopediche romane*, most probably Guattani, adds the following footnote 'vedi l'annotatore Romano di Winkelmann' when discussing Dionysius of Halicarnassus' treatment of Polykleitos and Phidias (MER.V.82). This was a customary annotatory practice when Fea had added annotation to Winckelmann's original, yet reference to the 'annotatore' is, in this case, unwarranted, as Fea directly translated Winckelmann, adding no footnote or innovation. Far from being customary, this instead reveals the author's wish to afford Fea a greater role than he in truth had.

Given this continued emphasis on the Italian authorship of the *Storia*, it could even be argued that in some journals Fea's edition overshadows Winckelmann's original. This is especially true of his additional third volume. The *Efemeridi*, for instance, devotes six articles to Fea's translation of the *Geschichte*, three of which concentrate on his third volume alone, and the conclusion of which makes no mention of Winckelmann at all:

In queste [...] abbiamo dovuto ammirare uno straordinario impegno del Sig. Ab. Fea nel fare senza risparmio di una ostinata fatica, di spese grandi, e diligenze minutissime un'edizione corretta, nitida, vaga, e interessante per gli eruditi, per le belle arti, e per l'onore della città, in cui tanto si procura di far rifiorire il buon gusto, e la maestà degli antichi. (EF.XV.84)

Whilst this focus on Fea may have been anticipated here, as the *Efemeridi* was particularly close to the Italian translator, it is nevertheless clear from the wide-ranging examples discussed above that such concentration on Fea as author was common throughout the periodicals.¹⁶³ The Roman art journals plainly endeavoured to domesticate Winckelmann's *Geschichte*: masking its foreign nature by drawing attention to its Italian authorship as frequently as possible.

Turning to the fourth method of domestication, the art journals went beyond affording significance to the Italian authorship of Winckelmann's works read in the peninsula by also underscoring the superiority of these Italian editions. Even Amoretti's translation, which received limited attention in the periodicals of the time, was praised for its increased accuracy. For instance, the anonymous author of the *Antologia*'s 'avviso librario' promoting Fea's edition nevertheless commends the considerable improvements that the Cistercian monks implemented, 'corredandola di non poche erudite annotazioni, colle quali o ne viene emendato, o confermato qualche tratto; o vengono fatte nuove osservazioni non indifferenti' (AR.IX.128). This thus presents the first Italian *Storia* as a new, improved version of Winckelmann's original.

¹⁶³ Ferrari, 'L'eredità culturale', p. 35.

To an even greater extent, Fea's superior 'bella edizione romana' (GBA.II.65) received constant attention in the artistic journals of the period. Claiming that Winckelmann's original was 'troppo noto', for example, the *Efemeridi* confirms its sole focus on the three-volumed, new and improved Roman edition: 'non parleremo del fondo dell'opera di Winkelmann, che è troppo noto, ma soltanto dei pregi, che adornano questa Romana edizione' (EF.XIV.129). The anonymous author here praises Fea for the annotations he adds to his *Storia* – 'le molte notizie aggiuntevi di monumenti inediti, e di erudizioni peregrine, ci fanno conoscere la critica, e la perizia dell'editore nell'antiquaria, e nella filologia' – and continues, when his second volume appears, to commend 'l'instancabile sua diligenza':

Sono incredibili le diligenze come nel primo tomo, così anche in questo usate dal Sig. Ab. Fea per rendere la versione italiana con quella esattezza e scrupolosità, che si deve, rincontrandola [...] minutamente coll'originale tedesco. (EF.XIV.129)

Such remarks are particularly frequent in the *Efemeridi*. Indeed, five years later and in an article on an entirely separate subject, 'Descrizione dei circhi, particolarmente di quello di Caracalla, e dei giuochi in essi celebrati', there is another, similar reference to the achievement of Fea's *Storia* and again to the 'tante correzzioni, supplementi, ed aggiunte' he provides (EF.XIX.225). Yet in no way was such praise of this Italian version restricted to the journal close to Fea. Indeed, whilst Ferrari claims that, outside of the *Efemeridi*, 'la seconda edizione dell'opera non conosce praticamente altre segnalazioni di rilievo fra le riviste italiane del secondo Settecento',¹⁶⁴ such a statement is extremely misleading. It detracts from the extensive attention dedicated throughout the periodicals to Fea's 'corretta e accresciuta' *Storia* (MAI.IV.14): from the aforementioned examples emphasizing the Italian authorship of Winckelmann's work to numerous instances of the journals commending Fea's improved translation. Even the *Memorie per le belle arti*, edited by Fea's antagonist, Onofrio Boni, professed its 'obbligazione grandissima' for the 'faticose, e diligenti ricerche, colle quali gli

¹⁶⁴ Ferrari, 'L'eredità culturale', p. 35.

riuscì di far comparire adorne di tante nuove correzioni, ed erudizioni le opere del Winkelmann' (MBA.IV.45). Moreover, as well as his accuracy, the Italian periodicals also afforded Fea praise for his inclusion of illustrations in the *Storia*. In discussing Winckelmann's *Anmerkungen über die Baukunst der alten Tempel*, for example, which Fea translated in his third volume of the *Storia*, the *Memorie per le belle arti* expresses great approval for the engravings that Fea includes, with which 'gli eruditi saranno molto contenti, comparendo detto tempio alla luce per la prima volta nelle sue vere misure' (MBA.II.115). Further, as alluded to above, Fea's third volume alone was a subject of great acclaim in Italian art journals of the period. Indeed, another anonymous writer in the *Efemeridi* suggests that the 'indice delle tavole in rame' that Fea provides in the third volume, given the unedited monuments he includes and his 'non poche dotte osservazioni', could be considered 'una continuazione de' monumenti inediti di Winkelmann' (EF.XV.73), suggesting that even Fea's indices supplemented Winckelmann's oeuvre. Thus, through presenting Winckelmann's work as a less foreign, more Italian corpus that had been improved and expanded by native scholars, the journals of the period clearly domesticated it, rendering it more attractive to Italian readers.

Nor did this stop there, as the *Efemeridi* further commends Fea for *perfecting* Winckelmann's *Geschichte*. Indeed, hinting again at the Roman origins of Winckelmann's original, the journal's first article on Fea's translation begins with the words, 'La storia delle arti del disegno di Giovanni Winckelmann composta dall'autore in Roma, attendeva nella medesima la sua perfezione, e la presente ristampa soddisfa tale aspettazione' (EF.XIII.169). Such a comment is significant as, whilst articulated by this journal close to Fea, it is not only consistent with the comments made by other journals examined above, but is moreover a striking example of the confidence Fea's contemporaries had in his Italian edition of Winckelmann. The unnamed author even continues to claim that it was an honour to Rome:

Noi che con piacere vediamo la presente edizione superare in accuratezza gli originali medesimi, non possiamo che esortare il Sig. Ab. Fea a proseguire con egual calore e diligenza un'opera tanto interessante a beneficio della letteratura e delle belle arti, e ad onore de' torchi Romani, della quale fa l'elogio il solo piano, e lo assicuriamo che gli autori si augureranno i commentari fatti da mano così esperta. (EF.XIII.178)

Thus, not only does the *Efemeridi* again present Fea's *Storia* as an improved, Roman work, but it even suggests it achieves perfection.

Finally, beyond the new and improved Italian translations of his writing, the fifth method by which the journal editors domesticated Winckelmann's works was through promoting their own periodicals as continuations of his writing. By doing so they presented the German scholar's oeuvre as an integral part even of Rome's artistic journalism. For instance, as alluded to above and as indeed is apparent from its title, Guattani aimed with his *Monumenti antichi* to continue Winckelmann's work of the same name. Demonstrating his respect for the German scholar by referring to him as 'immortal', Guattani overtly professes this objective in the *Monumenti antichi's* preface: 'si sa che l'immortal Winkelmann aveva in animo di seguitare la sua Opera de' monumenti inediti; quella medesima, che ha spianato la strada alla idea presente' (MAI.I.v-vi). He even published his journal 'nella stamperia Pagliarini', in the same printing house that Winckelmann, as a friend of Marco Pagliarini, had his own *Monumenti* produced.¹⁶⁵ Guattani's intentions to continue Winckelmann's work are evident in the format of his journal. Much like the German scholar's *Monumenti*, it focuses on engravings, which Guattani individually discusses, commenting on the identification of the piece, aesthetic and technical details, and any relevant scholarly information. He even adopts many of Winckelmann's practices of identification, claiming on several occasions that if Winckelmann can use a certain approach to identify ancient works of art, so can he. In discussing a statue of Ino nursing Bacchus, for example, Guattani here affirms exactly this: 'se Winkelmann potè riconoscere nella bella statua della villa Albani Leucota nutrice di Bacco; possiamo anche noi

¹⁶⁵ Rolfi-Ozvald, pp. 38, 74. As noted in Chapter III.3.3., Fea also published his *Storia* with the Pagliarini brothers.

riconoscerla in questo ammirabile marmo' (MAI.VII.32). Repeating this approach later in the same volume, Guattani similarly justifies his identification of a piece as Apollo the hunter through Winckelmann's equivalent reasoning behind his own recognition of an Apollo as shepherd:

La figura, nella quale riconosciamo il figlio di Latona, siede sopra un rustico sasso, ed ha un cane ai piedi o compagno nella caccia, o guardiano dell'armento. Il detto basta a noi per caratterizzarlo cacciatore, come bastò a Winckelmann il pedo rintorto nell'Apollo Ludoviso, per riconoscersi un Apollo pastore. (MAI.VII.158-59)

Such examples demonstrate faith in and respect for Winckelmann's scholarship, as well as an eagerness to continue in his footsteps.

Furthermore, beyond simply a continuation of Winckelmann's work, Guattani presents his *Monumenti antichi* as a distinctly Italian sequel. Indeed, having directly lifted his title from Winckelmann's *Monumenti*, Guattani adds reference not only to 'Roma' but also to the 'belle arti' in the caption, 'ovvero Notizie sulle antichità e belle arti di Roma'. In much the same way as the already-discussed addition of 'disegno' to the titles of Amoretti's and Fea's translations,¹⁶⁶ this inclusion of 'Roma' and 'belle arti' immediately renders the journal, and indeed the model introduced by Winckelmann, more Italian and thus more familiar.¹⁶⁷ One need only look at the journals here analysed to note that over half of them refer to the 'belle arti' in their titles. Moreover, just as Amoretti and Fea make amendments to Winckelmann's *Geschichte*, Guattani also seeks to emphasize the improvements he makes to Winckelmann's *Monumenti*: 'chi ha avuto il coraggio di azzardare una somma non indifferente in simile impresa [...] ha in animo di migliorarla, ed accrescerla nell'eleganza, e nel merito' (MAI.I.vi). This included illustrations as, whilst Winckelmann of course provided engravings in the original, Guattani included three tavole of 'sempre piu' corrette' engravings each month (MAI.I.v).¹⁶⁸ He

¹⁶⁶ See Chapter III, p. 127.

¹⁶⁷ Rolfi-Ozvald, p. 39.

¹⁶⁸ Rolfi-Ozvald, p. 39.

hoped, after all, to achieve the same success as Winckelmann, even attempting, as Rolfi-Ozvald asserts, to gain the approval of some scholars that his German predecessor had not.¹⁶⁹

Guattani forsook his goal of continuing Winckelmann's model when compiling his second journal, yet later revived it in his *Memorie enciclopediche sulle antichità*. As he implies in his preface, he again seeks to continue Winckelmann's model here: a model that he considers to be 'la più a proposito in tali materie, la più piacevole ed istruttiva' (MES.I.3).

Guattani was not, however, the only editor to align his periodicals with Winckelmann's work. Editors of the *Memorie per le belle arti* – De Rossi, Boni, and De Vegni – also associated their journal, which was again published by Marco Pagliarini, with the German scholar's oeuvre.¹⁷⁰ This was not to the same extent as Guattani's attempts, yet the editors nevertheless refer immediately in the introduction, or 'il "manifesto" programmatico della rivista',¹⁷¹ to 'lo spirito filosofico' that particularly influenced the works of Winckelmann, Sulzer, and Mengs:

Lo spirito filosofico, che domina nell'età nostra, ha esteso anche su questi oggetti i lumi della Filosofia, e il Winkelman, il Sulzer, il Mengs hanno esaminato la natura delle Arti con nuove idee, e nuovo metodo. (MBA.I.1)

They continue to discuss this new spirit and methodology throughout this introduction, through which it becomes evident – not least in their hope that such an approach would ensure art's revival (MBA.I.2) – that this was a spirit they aimed to replicate: a spirit that is, as Barroero affirms, apparent throughout the journal.¹⁷²

Thus by these five methods the journals domesticated Winckelmann's oeuvre from multiple angles: the original *Geschichte* was rendered Roman and its Italian readership was emphasized; the role of the translator was elevated and the Italian *Storie* lauded as superior; and the journals themselves were fashioned as the Italian legacy of Winckelmann's works.

¹⁶⁹ Rolfi-Ozvald, pp. 39-40. This included Anne Claude de Caylus, with whom (as discussed in Chapter III, n. 94) Winckelmann had a complex relationship.

¹⁷⁰ The *Memorie per le belle arti* and Guattani's *Monumenti antichi* are the only journals here examined that were published by the Pagliarini brothers.

¹⁷¹ Barroero, pp. 95-96.

¹⁷² Barroero, pp. 95-96, 99.

V.9. DOMESTICATION: TAILORING WINCKELMANN'S OPINIONS FOR ITALY

The Italian art journals also domesticated Winckelmann's views in this period, presenting them as both less offensive and more attractive to the peninsula and its heritage. In order to achieve this, they employed two methods. The first involved the deliberate avoidance of Winckelmann's Italophobic opinions and the second – termed transposition – reworked his views on ancient Greece to the benefit of Italy (a method already observed in Chapter IV).

Through the first method, Rome's artistic journals selected Winckelmann's non-controversial, even pro-Italic views, in order to avoid his contentious opinions.¹⁷³ When discussing Etruscan art, for example, the *Giornale arcadico* quotes Napione, who justifies his claim that the identification 'greco-etrusco' overlooks the complexities of Italian artistic history by citing Winckelmann's 'ben fondato' (and pro-Italic) view that Etruscan art flourished before that of the Greeks. Napione speaks of 'l'accennato pensiero del Winckelmann, che cioè prima ancora che nella Grecia, le arti figurative fiorissero in Italia' (GA.XXVI.331). This is a fair account of Winckelmann's opinion, but is notably without mention of the German scholar's central, yet less attractive belief that Etruscan art failed to reach the level of perfection that Greek art achieved. In fact, further demonstrating his disregard for Winckelmann's Italophobic belief, Napione even terms the style of an Etruscan gem the 'stile perfetto' (GA.XXVI.314-15). In a similar manner, perhaps even more remarkable is the account of Venuti and Winckelmann in the *Efemeridi's* already cited anonymous review of Pozzetti's euology for Venuti. Indeed, having discussed how both Venuti and Winckelmann spent time in the Villa Albani, the author here continues to delineate their similarities:

¹⁷³ Whilst there are similarities between the technique of omission (textual manipulation) identified in Chapters III.7. and IV.8. and the method discussed here, there is a key difference. The former refers to the manipulation of Winckelmann's text whilst still presenting it as (a translation of) his original words. By contrast, the art journals do not purport to relay Winckelmann's own words but, by omission, they put forward a selective account of his views.

questi due eruditissimi filologi, che con tante elaboratissime loro opere hanno cotanto illustrato la storia delle belle arti, e le magnificenze dell'antica e della moderna Roma. (EF.XVIII.243)

This is an extremely selective description of Winckelmann's work, which, in only commenting on his work on ancient and modern Rome, disregards entirely the Hellenism and indeed Italophobia upon which Winckelmann's whole system of art was based. Lastly, the *Antologia* again profited from the personal relations between Winckelmann and its founder by publishing a series of letters that between 1758 and 1763 Winckelmann sent to Bianconi, reporting on the latest discoveries in Rome, Herculaneum, and Pompeii.¹⁷⁴ Even these letters, however, are not simple reproductions of the originals, but are rather, as Perini affirms, 'un abile montaggio, a furia di tagli e aggiunte'.¹⁷⁵ Indeed, in order to achieve the image of Winckelmann that was 'affatto ideale di studioso tutto calma olimpica e imperturbabile operosità' – the 'stilizzazione perfettamente neoclassica' that the editors sought – the letters underwent significant alteration.¹⁷⁶ This involved efforts to ensure clarity, omission of private details, and, as Bianconi himself clarifies, the exclusion of offensive remarks: 'fossero levati quà, e là certi periodi, che avrebbero offeso alcuni letterati viventi, che l'Autore capriccioso, o non amava, o non istimava' (AR.VI.9).¹⁷⁷ Indeed, in an attempt to domesticate Winckelmann's views, the *Antologia* excluded his Italophobic comments about the previously-discussed Neapolitan antiquarians,¹⁷⁸ as well as his denunciations of individual Italian scholars. This, for instance, included a slur against Bottari, which, Perini explains, 'l'amicizia tanto del Bianconi quanto dell'Amaduzzi per il defunto monsignore non poteva né gradire né tollerare'.¹⁷⁹ It is thus

¹⁷⁴ Ferrari, 'Il *Nachlaß* italiano di Winckelmann: bilancio storiografico e nuove prospettive di ricerca', *Archivio storico italiano*, 643.1 (2015), 65-88 (pp. 81-82), and Ferrari, 'Romagna erudita', pp. 112-13.

¹⁷⁵ Perini, p. 812.

¹⁷⁶ Perini, pp. 812-13. Whilst a detailed comparison between the original letters and those printed in the *Antologia* would, as Perini suggests, be very interesting, there is not the scope to do so in this investigation.

¹⁷⁷ Perini, pp. 812-13, and Ferrari, 'Romagna erudita', pp. 112-13.

¹⁷⁸ See Chapter II, n. 158.

¹⁷⁹ Perini, pp. 812-13.

evident that the journal editors – here and throughout the period – domesticated Winckelmann's views by deliberately overlooking his central Italophobic opinions.

Turning to the second method employed to domesticate Winckelmann's views, the periodicals transposed his praise of Greek art onto their own Italian counterparts. The *Giornale delle belle arti*, for instance, reprints a letter written by art scholar Guglielmo della Valle in which he plainly adopts the notably Winckelmannian belief in the significance that climate had to the success of artistic production.¹⁸⁰ Whilst Winckelmann, of course, employed this concept to exalt the art-inspiring environment of Greece, della Valle transposes it here to underscore the similarly ideal climate of ancient Italy. Indeed, writing to Lanzi – who, as previously explored, also adapted Winckelmann's views in such a manner – della Valle clarifies how it was Italy's 'cielo amico' that led to the Egyptian influence in early Italian art. He suggests that many Egyptians relocated to the temperate Italian peninsula enticed by the balanced climate:

Ora tornando a noi, dico, che tali tegole, le quali hanno più miglia di anni di esistenza, mostrano chiaramente la derivazione dell'arte dall'Egitto in questa nostra patria, recatavi dagli antichi popoli venuti ad abitarla, e mostrano, che essa è dal Cielo amico destinata per coltivarla con successo. (GBA.V.149)

In a similar manner, in the *Giornale arcadico* Betti quotes Gazzera, who also transposes Winckelmann's principles on Greek art, here to praise Italian contemporary production. Focusing on Canova's bust of Sappho, Gazzera highlights Sappho's indeterminate beauty, which 'al dir di Winkelman, non soffre altri punti o altre linee che le tendenti ad effigiare l'una e semplice bellezza', as well as her 'profilo greco', which 'a norma de' canoni del Winkelman' was also vital to beauty. He thus exploits here Winckelmann's Greek-centric aesthetics to praise modern Roman production (GA.XIII.287-88). Finally, Guattani in his *Memorie enciclopediche romane* also demonstrates transposition of Winckelmann's views, again

¹⁸⁰ For the Winckelmannian nature of this principle, see Chapters II, p. 79 and IV.4.

focusing on his notion of external circumstances when explaining what made Rome every aspiring artist's most coveted destination. He affirms:

Dal contenuto di queste memorie è facile il comprendere com'esser debba contenta la culta Europa del profitto, che fanno i rispettivi individui, ch'ella invia a questa Madre scuola delle Arti, mercè il nuovo sistema di studiare introdottovi, le lodevoli pratiche dell'insigne Accademia di San Luca, l'assistenza, ed impegno de' capi d'arte, i comodi, il clima, e quella certa emulazione, che indispensabilmente sorge fra gli Studiosi delle differenti Nazioni. (MER.III.144)

Guattani himself makes no hint to the Winckelmannian origin of such ideas here. Yet, especially in light of his above-discussed objective to continue Winckelmann's work, the advantage that he suggests Rome affords artistic production – principally through its climate and its respect for art – plainly indicates that he, too, transposed the German scholar's Graecophile views in order to commend his homeland.¹⁸¹

Thus, whether through selective choice or transposition, the journals demonstrate clear efforts to domesticate Winckelmann's views by rendering them less offensive and more attractive to an Italian readership.

V.10. NATIONALISM

Having thus demonstrated *how* the Roman artistic journals of the period foreignized and domesticated Winckelmann, I will now consider the motive behind these reactions. As in previous chapters, I argue that this is attributable to a pre-Unification nationalism.

In the *Memorie per le belle arti* Onofrio Boni directly denies the role of nationalism, or 'amor della nazione', in his criticism of Winckelmann:

Ed affinchè non sembri, che l'amor della nazione ci faccia scomparire il Wink. nell'antiquaria Architettonica accanto ai nostri Italiani, nomineremo con gran piacere Francesco Blondel, Architetto di Luigi il Grande'. (MBA.II.92-93)

¹⁸¹ Rolfi-Ozvald, p. 30.

Yet, contrary to this, the reactions to Winckelmann explored in this chapter all suggest a nationalistic intent both to defend and acclaim the native peninsula, especially Rome. Beginning with the methods of foreignization, the xenophobic ostracization of Winckelmann qua scholar demonstrates the journals' desire to protect native scholarship, just as the suggestions of his inferiority disclose their objective to elevate Italian scholars. Indeed, in several instances Winckelmann's inadequacy is juxtaposed with Visconti's excellence, patently using Winckelmann to bring glory to Italy.¹⁸² Complementing this, the journals' foreignization of Winckelmann's views – drawing attention to his criticism of Etruscan, Roman, and Renaissance art and defending their native heritage from this Italophobia – demonstrates yet further the 'amor delle nazione' underpinning the periodicals' reactions to Winckelmann. As regards domestication, not only do the periodicals claim Winckelmann for Italy by suggesting that he *became* Roman and was one amongst Italian scholars, but the methods used to domesticate his works all demonstrate attempts to appropriate Winckelmann's successes for their own Italian scholarship. This they achieve through numerous methods: from the renationalization of Winckelmann's original as an Italian achievement to the commendation of their superior translations. Finally, the careful selection of Winckelmann's views and the transposition of his praise of the ancient Greeks to Italians bring to light the journals' clear intent to engage with his views in the manner most beneficial to Italy. In reporting on Winckelmann, the editors evidently had the native peninsula at the forefront of their minds.

The contention that nationalism is the underlying motivation for these reactions is further supported by the implausibility of alternative explanations and by the broader nationalistic sentiment which permeates the journals' treatment of subjects other than Winckelmann.

¹⁸² This is particularly true of the *Effemeridi*, which is perhaps not surprising, given the previously mentioned role of 'tutta la famiglia de' nostri Visconti' (EFF.V.415-16) in this journal.

As to the former, it is possible to dismiss the notion that the reactions to Winckelmann were motivated by either a dislike of him specifically or a particular anti-German attitude. Whereas Boni, in the extract above, endeavours to use his praise of French scholar, Blondel, as evidence that his disapproval was only aimed at Winckelmann and no other foreign scholars, the periodicals in fact frequently demonstrate a nationalistic agenda by separating themselves from other European figures, including the French. As previously explored, for example, in the preface to the *Memorie romane* Luigi Cardinali enhances his commendation of Cicognara by underscoring his Italian rather than German or French origins (MR.II.x). Indeed, immediately after highlighting the foreign origins of Mengs, Winckelmann, and D'Agincourt by labelling them 'quei sassone', 'quel brandeburgese', and 'quel francese' respectively, Cardinali tellingly introduces the native Cicognara with the phrase, 'questo è italiano'.

Turning to the broader nationalism permeating the Roman periodicals, these publications repeatedly laud Italy and, in particular, 'gran Roma' (EF.I.PR). In the majority of journals this manifests in the prefaces: the point at which they set out their agendas. Many periodicals underscore the vast amount of ancient art found in Rome. The *Effemeridi*, for example, suggests that the constant discoveries kept the city fresh: 'parendomi ben fatto illustrare le meraviglie che fecero i nostri avi, e quelle principalmente che risorgono dal nostro suolo, per le quali quest'alma città ringiovenisce ogni giorno' (EFF.I.PR). A number of editors highlight, too, the attraction that Rome represented for scholars of other nations; this was after all the period of the Grand Tour. In the *Memorie enciclopediche romane*, Guattani remarks on how 'da per tutto valorosi giovani concorrono in folla per istruirsi a questa universale Maestra: Ginnasio perenne ed immutabile delle Arti, *Roma*' (MER.I.1), just as the *Memorie romane* emphasizes the longevity of this attraction. Indeed the latter's preface notes that Rome 'è stato e sarà oggetto di curiosità e di studio a' filologi, agli antiquari, agli artisti, sino a che la civiltà umana non si spenga affatto nella barbarie' (MR.I.PR).

The *Giornale arcadico* – perhaps one of the most emphatic in its commendation of the primacy of Rome – continues such tributes. Indeed the journal’s abhorrence of foreign innovation frequently leads to contentious remarks on the ‘la centralità di Roma nei confronti delle diverse e incontrollabili “opinioni” degli stranieri e dei romantici attardati’.¹⁸³ Moreover, much like the examples above, the *Arcadico* underscores the value that Rome conferred on its visitors. As a source of civilization, it patriotically asserts that ‘Roma [...] fu e sarà sempre a buon diritto reputata la scuola principale delle Belle Arti, e il centro, dal quale esse spandono il loro lume sopra tutti i paesi inciviliti’ (GA.I.144).¹⁸⁴ In fact, it is in citing this same quotation that Rolfi-Ozvald confirms how this (and other such examples from journals’ prefaces) reveal a nationalistic motive. She suggests that the artistic journals intentionally ‘conditioned’ history to exhibit Rome as the hub of all artistic achievement:

Nonostante i diversi punti di vista e la ricchezza di dati, nell’ampia cronologia [1787-1844] che fa da sfondo a questa riflessione emerge un’immagine intenzionalmente condizionata della storia dell’emporio scritta dai giornali. Una storia che si colora di dichiarato nazionalismo in epoca di Restaurazione in cui diviene più evidente, dato il nodo strategico di un sistema artistico al traino di un pubblico situato “oltremonti”, il ritorno politico d’immagine di Roma nel suo ruolo di “lume” della cultura classica e di “scuola” delle arti.¹⁸⁵

Moreover, the *Arcadico* provides further support for the contention that there was an underlying nationalism pervading the artistic journals by even suggesting itself that this medium played an important role in the spread of nationalistic sentiment. As the journal affirms, it was through this medium that Roman scholars could celebrate and reveal to foreigners their own research; the excellence of their artists; and the abundance of noble works in Rome:

ha avuto ed ha tuttora dotte Opere periodiche per mezzo delle quali far conoscere agli stranieri l’incremento degli studi, il valore degli Artefici, e l’abbondante copia di nobili e sublimi lavori, che ogni giorno vede uscire da numerose officine ad arricchire i Musei e le Gallerie di tutto il Mondo. (GA.I.144)

¹⁸³ Rolfi-Ozvald, p. 64.

¹⁸⁴ Rolfi-Ozvald, p. 64.

¹⁸⁵ Rolfi-Ozvald, ‘Note sulle fonti’, p. 36.

A final reason that corroborates the influence of nationalism in the periodicals is the publications' clear intent to defend Italy from its already-noted reputation as backward compared to other European countries. For instance, Luigi Cardinali in the *Memorie romane* emphasizes how the peninsula was not 'grama [...] per conto delle istituzioni che propagano le arti ai molti senza nè dispendio nè pericolo di errore' (MR.II.x). Nor is this limited to the *Memorie romane*. Rather the journals of the period frequently reveal a determination to verify that Italy and Rome were by no means inferior. The *Efemeridi*, for example, not only begins every volume with a segment on Roman publications but further dedicates the majority of the journals' reviews to works produced in Rome, through which it hoped to prove that the Roman culture was keeping pace with other Italian and foreign developments. As Caffiero affirms:

questa scelta precisa, che la redazione motivava esplicitamente con il desiderio di sottolineare la quantità e il rilievo della produzione libraria cittadina, costituiva già da sola il segno evidente dell'intenzione del gruppo redazionale di operare, attraverso il periodico, per inserire la cultura romana all'interno delle grandi correnti intellettuali, italiane e straniere, contemporanee e, comunque, per dimostrarne la non estraneità e la vivacità.¹⁸⁶

Thus the broader nationalistic sentiment present in these journals, from their xenophobia towards French scholars to their defence and commendation of Italy, supports my argument that the reactions to Winckelmann in this medium were motivated by nationalism. Indeed, there is even a marked similarity between how the periodicals reveal their broader nationalism and the methods they employ in their treatment of Winckelmann. Just as excluding or renationalizing Winckelmann's foreign identity mirrors the broader xenophobia, overlooking or manipulating his anti-Italian ideas parallels the general glorification and defence of the peninsula. I therefore contend that the native patria was at the centre of the editors' and contributors' concerns when foreignizing and domesticating the German scholar.

¹⁸⁶ Caffiero, pp. 67-68.

V.11. CONCLUSION

I have thus shown through analysis of a select corpus of Rome's artistic journals that this medium exhibits both foreignization and domestication of Winckelmann in the period considered, and have further argued that nationalism was the ultimate motivation behind both reactions.

Assessing the corpus as a whole, domestication is the more prevalent reaction in the art journals, in line with the media of translation and art scholarship. There are only three methods of foreignization: emphasizing Winckelmann's foreign origins; presenting him as inferior to the native Italians; and selectively presenting and rejecting Winckelmann's views in a manner that highlights their offensive nature to the Italian readership. Thus the journals demonstrate a relatively limited foreignization of Winckelmann qua scholar and his views. By contrast there are no fewer than nine methods of domestication. The journals domesticate Winckelmann himself through two methods: by suggesting that Winckelmann was born German but became Roman, and by categorizing him with Italians rather than foreigners. Moreover, the journals employ five methods to domesticate Winckelmann's oeuvre: highlighting that the *Geschichte* was written in Rome; emphasizing the *Geschichte*'s Italian readership; affording the Italian translators the same significance as the original author; indicating the superiority of the Italian editions; and seeking to continue the legacy of Winckelmann's works in the journals themselves. Finally, there are two methods which domesticate Winckelmann's views: deliberately omitting mention of his offensive views; and transposing his views to the benefit of Italy.

The overall effect is that the medium of artistic journalism has a clear preponderance of domestication, closer to the (im)balance observed in the translations, rather than the more

balanced response seen in art literature.¹⁸⁷ Not only are there generally more instances of domestication, but the methods of domestication often counterbalance the methods of foreignization. For example, the two methods used to present Winckelmann as Italian (or at the very least more familiar) outweigh the comparatively limited examples emphasizing the otherness of the German scholar. This overall propensity to domesticate rather than foreignize is moreover even more notable in this medium, given the range of different foci, editorships, and agendas of the ten journals considered. It is thus certainly accurate to say that, within the broadest medium analysed in this thesis, Winckelmann was ‘più conosciuto fra noi pe’ suoi dotti scritti, per le sue cariche romane, e per la sua tragica fine, che per la sua origine, e pe’ suoi studi Tedeschi’ (AR.VI.9).

As to the forms of reaction, foreignization and domestication in the journals were primarily directed towards Winckelmann qua scholar and his oeuvre. This contrasts with the media of translation and art literature, where reactions typically arose from Winckelmann’s views. However, in context, the different focus of the journals is readily understandable. The medium of translation necessarily centred on Winckelmann’s views, and provided only limited scope for discussion of the scholar and his works. Similarly, it was through the lens of his views that art literature engaged with Winckelmann. The journals, however, provided an avenue for more discursive treatment of the German scholar and his works. Thus in the newly developing medium of art journalism there was informative discussion of Winckelmann and his works alongside articles engaging, sometimes only in passing, with the substance of his views.

Turning to an analysis of the methods observed in the journals, two features are noteworthy. The first is that not only do the methods span almost all of the possible forms delineated in the conceptual framework of this thesis – the only response *not* seen in the journals is foreignization of Winckelmann’s oeuvre – but the sheer number of them is in itself

¹⁸⁷ See Chapters III.9. and IV.10.

striking. Indeed, I have identified twelve methods in artistic journalism, as compared with seven in Chapter III and eight in Chapter IV. In many instances a particular form of foreignization or domestication is achieved by a variety of methods. For example, the journals render the *Geschichte* more familiar from every conceivable perspective: the original is renationalized as Italian; the Italian translations are favoured; and the journals are presented as a continuation of this now firmly Italian legacy. This feature of the journals is again explicable by reference to the nature of the medium. An artistic journal could (though certainly would not always) reflect the views of a number of scholars who had responded to Winckelmann in differing ways since the medium was sufficiently flexible to express varying perspectives.

The second notable feature is the connection between methods employed in art journalism and those used in the media of translation and art literature. I have already identified that certain methods observed in art literature can be linked to those seen in the translations.¹⁸⁸ In a similar manner, a significant number of methods seen in Rome's art journals can be understood as variants of methods seen in either (or both) of those two media. For example, in relation to methods of foreignization, instances where the art journals ostracize Winckelmann mirror the few examples where the translations emphasize his otherness. Similarly, the highlighting and rejecting of Winckelmann's offensive views is a method already observed in art literature. Turning to domestication, Rome's art journals again emulate methods seen in Chapters III and IV, but also supplement these with new, complementary methods. For instance, suggestions that Winckelmann became Roman echo the attempts to portray Italy as Winckelmann's (true) homeland in the translations. Yet art journalism goes further: through the multifaceted method of grouping Winckelmann with Italians, he is specifically distinguished from foreigners and even associated with prominent

¹⁸⁸ See Chapter IV.10.

Italian figures. In relation to Winckelmann's oeuvre, as already noted, art journalism uses a variety of methods to renationalize the *Geschichte* as Italian, thereby expanding attempts in the translations and art literature to render Winckelmann's works more familiar. Finally, not only do the journals domesticate Winckelmann's views through transposition, a method observed in art literature, but they also omit his more offensive opinions entirely through the new method of selective omission.

In assessing whether there are any patterns in this medium, it is possible to make one comparative observation about the ten journals considered. Within the chosen corpus, three journals display a particular propensity to domesticate Winckelmann: the *Efemeridi*, the *Effemeridi*, and the *Giornale arcadico*. I argue, of course, that nationalism is the underlying motivation behind the overall foreignization and domestication of the German scholar. Yet, still consistent with this, in these three journals there may be an additional, more prosaic reason for the strength of domestication in particular. Namely, the close relationship between Winckelmann and Bianconi (editor of the *Efemeridi*) and all three journals' links to Fea.¹⁸⁹ Indeed the *Effemeridi* and the *Giornale arcadico* make their connection with Fea especially plain by referring to him as 'nostro socio' (EFF.IX.4, GA.38.232).

Further, it is possible to identify two patterns over time. First, whilst there is a strong response to Winckelmann throughout the journals (taking both foreignization and domestication collectively), the periodicals published towards the end of the period do tend to display a heightened response to Winckelmann. Second, now distinguishing between the two reactions, there is greater domestication at the start and (particularly) at the end of the period – as is clear from the early *Efemeridi* and the later *Effemeridi* and *Arcadico* identified immediately above – whilst conversely there is more foreignization in the intervening years. This increased foreignization is exemplified by the *Monumenti antichi*, as the seventh, 1805,

¹⁸⁹ Ferrari, 'L'eredità culturale', p. 35.

volume demonstrates far more foreignization than the earlier 1784-89 volumes. The historical circumstances of the period provide a possible explanation for this: the marked Napoleonic presence in the peninsula from 1796-1814 may well have given rise to an undercurrent of xenophobia that extended to the reception of Winckelmann.

Finally, having demonstrated in the previous section that nationalism was the cause of Winckelmann's foreignization and domestication in Rome's artistic journals (through reference both to their reactions to Winckelmann and the more general 'amor della nazione'), I will conclude by noting a broader significance to this argument. That is, looking to the wider sphere of journalism, this contention challenges the more common view that the development of political journalism marked the rise of Italian nationalism:

Si spiega per la prima volta tutta l'ala del giornalismo politico e l'opera del giornale è tanto vasta e tanto grande quanto è stata quella della Rivoluzione e della storia, poichè allora soltanto il giornalismo trovò nelle nuove ragioni della sua attività uno scopo che ancora non aveva conosciuto.¹⁹⁰

Instead, the present examination reveals that not only did a nationalistic sentiment permeate artistic periodicals – extending even to the reception of Winckelmann – but it did so prior to the growth of their political counterparts during the Risorgimento.

¹⁹⁰ Fattorello, I, 18.

CHAPTER VI:

CONCLUSION

*Winckelmann è molto più italiano del concittadino di Ariosto.*¹

Niccolò Tommaséo, *Bellezza e civiltà*, 1857

VI.1. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

As outlined in the Introduction, the analytical starting point to this thesis was the dilemma Winckelmann posed to Italian art scholars. Given his inescapable presence in Italian society and art scholarship, Italian contemporaries were compelled to engage with him, yet in doing so they had to confront his contentious, Italophobic views. In light of this dilemma, the research question posed was: how did Italian scholarship respond to Winckelmann, his works, and his views between 1755 and 1834, and why did it respond in such a way.

Having now examined the reception of Winckelmann in the three different media of translation, art literature, and artistic periodicals, I have demonstrated that there were two reactions to Winckelmann during this period: foreignization and domestication. Despite the antithetical nature of these reactions – presenting Winckelmann, his works, and his views as less and more attractive to an Italian readership, respectively – I maintain that both these reactions were motivated by an early nationalism. Through both foreignizing and domesticating Winckelmann, scholars reveal a clear desire to defend Italy's supremacy.

To review how I arrived at this answer, I first introduced the study in Chapter I: clarifying its objectives and parameters; positioning this research in the wider field of study; and establishing the conceptual framework to be used throughout the investigation. I also outlined here the theory informing this framework: that of Anthony D. Smith, Lawrence Venuti, Edward Said, and William G. Sumner. Perhaps most notably, I expounded the significant modifications that I have made to Venuti's concepts of foreignization and domestication when reappropriating his terminology from translation theory to Reception Studies.

¹ Ferrari, 'Cicognara e Winckelmann', p. 113.

In Chapter II, I contextualized the examination. I provided historical background to the period of analysis and introduced Winckelmann, his aesthetics, and his works. I further delineated the aforementioned dilemma that Winckelmann posed by synthesizing existing research on his presence in Italy and adding a study of the Italophobic views that I identified through my own close reading of the *Gedanken* and the *Geschichte*. Attention then turned to the three media of translations, art literature, and artistic periodicals.

In Chapter III, I explored the reactions to Winckelmann in three Italian translations of the *Geschichte*: that published by Amoretti in 1779; Fea in 1783; and the final edition included in the extensive twelve-volumed *Opere* that appeared in 1830-34. In this medium, I identified two methods that the translators employed to foreignize Winckelmann and five methods by which they domesticated the German scholar, and I argued that overall there was far more domestication than foreignization in this sphere. As regards the forms which this domestication took, the vast majority of examples were those rendering his *views* more attractive, achieved through both annotation and numerous techniques of textual manipulation. As explained in this third chapter, the focus on his views is seemingly due to the medium, which did not afford the opportunity for discussion of the scholar or his works outside of the paratexts.

Chapter IV concentrated on the response to Winckelmann in art literature, which I explored through reference to Piranesi, D'Arco, Milizia, Lanzi, and Cicognara. According to the criteria set out at the beginning of this chapter, the five case studies were carefully selected to facilitate a broad examination of the reception of Winckelmann in the sphere in which he himself wrote and considerably contributed to its advancement. In this medium I distinguished two methods of foreignization and six of domestication; there was again more domestication than foreignization. However, the relative strength of the two reactions is dependent on more than just the number of methods: it is also, crucially, influenced by the number of instances of

that method and their forcefulness. Accordingly, whilst there were more methods of domestication than in the previous chapter, there was in fact a greater balance between the two reactions of foreignization and domestication due to the extensive examples of the scholars foreignizing Winckelmann's views. Moreover, despite art literature affording more opportunity to engage with Winckelmann qua scholar and his works than the translations, the art writers again chose to react far more to the German scholar's ideas. This is particularly evident in the domestication of his views, achieved through the varied methods of textual manipulation, misappropriation, transposition, and transmutation.

Finally, Chapter V examined the reactions to Winckelmann in ten Roman artistic periodicals. These were the *Efemeridi letterarie*, *Antologia romana*, *Giornale delle belle arti*, *Memorie per le belle arti*, *Monumenti antichi inediti*, *Memorie enciclopediche romane*, *Memorie enciclopediche sulle antichità e belle arti*, *Giornale arcadico*, *Effemeridi letterarie* and the *Memorie romane*. As outlined in the chapter, the parameter of Rome was set to allow a reasonable analysis of such a vast field, whilst the ten journals were chosen based on their significance in Roman culture at the time, the subjects covered, and their dates of publication. In this analysis of artistic periodicals, I detected three foreignizing and nine domesticating methods. This medium thus exhibited more domestication than foreignization, although there was (again despite the number of methods) a greater balance of reaction than in the translations. In contrast to the two preceding media, however, the predominant subject of attention in the periodicals was not Winckelmann's views but Winckelmann qua scholar and his oeuvre. As suggested in the chapter's conclusion, such an emphasis is perhaps explained by the more conversational nature of the learned medium, which was less concerned with the intricacies of Winckelmann's views than the media of translation and art literature.

In the Nationalism sections of Chapters III, IV, and V, I argued that the motivation behind both foreignization and domestication was nationalism. Through exploration of all

three media, it is plain that even in the pre- and early Risorgimento periods the safeguarding of Italy's supremacy was at the forefront of scholars' minds when engaging with Winckelmann. In foreignizing him and his oeuvre, the Italian scholars emphasized his otherness in order to ostracize and diminish the weight of his Italophobia, whilst in domesticating Winckelmann and his works, the Italian scholars claimed credit for Italy for the German figure's achievements. These are naturally very different reactions yet they both demonstrate the shared aim of presenting the German scholar and his works in the manner most auspicious to the Italian peninsula, be it through defending their heritage or claiming credit for their own scholarship. Similarly, both when foreignizing and domesticating Winckelmann's views, they protected Italy's history and artistic prowess: either by highlighting and rebutting his offensive views, or by diluting and manipulating his opinions to the defence and praise of their heritage. Thus it is strikingly clear that across these three distinct media Italian scholars invariably reacted to Winckelmann in a manner most auspicious to Italy. This lends strong support to my core argument that these reactions were driven not by a variety of unconnected motives, but rather by a *shared*, underlying motivation of nationalism.

I supplemented this primary contention for nationalism, again in the Nationalism sections, by reference to three main arguments, together with evidence specific to each of the media examined. The first argument is that the turbulent political climate and the perceived backwardness of Italian scholarship in this period drove art scholars to be especially conscious of the position of Italy. The second is that the various agendas of the scholars (whether avowed, hidden, or even denied) reveal that the peninsula was at the centre of their concerns. Finally, in support of nationalism, I considered alternative explanations for the response identified, in particular animosity towards Winckelmann or Germany specifically, but, on analysis, was able to discount them. Thus I was, and indeed am, able to affirm that the response to Winckelmann in Italian art scholarship was motivated by nationalism.

VI.2. IDENTIFYING PATTERNS

Turning to an examination of foreignization and domestication across the spheres of art scholarship here considered, of the two reactions there is – in line with my core argument – certainly more domestication. Of the three media, the preponderance of domestication is most starkly evident in the translations, whilst the greatest balance between the two reactions is visible in art literature.

The methods in each medium are subtle (perhaps explaining why scholars have hitherto overlooked them), yet they nevertheless reveal significant, deliberate choices that affect the presentation of Winckelmann. It is striking that there is such similarity between the methods used over very different media. Indeed, to take domestication of Winckelmann's oeuvre as an example, the translations emphasize both how Winckelmann penned the *Geschichte* in Rome and how the translations as Italian *Storie* should be used in preference to the original. Art literature in turn underscores the familiarity of Winckelmann's publications in Italy and presents their own scholars' writings as continuations of Winckelmann's work. In the broadest medium – the artistic periodicals – all four methods are identifiable. The methods thus display similarity and evolution as the medium becomes broader. Another example of evolution is the domestication of Winckelmann qua scholar: which developed from comments on Italy being the German scholar's 'seconda patria' in the translations (OP.I.5-6) to bold comparisons between Winckelmann and the esteemed Torquato Tasso and Lorenzo de' Medici in the periodicals (EF.XVIII.243, MBA.I.47-48).

Whilst these comparisons have thus far been across media rather than temporal there are two clear patterns in the reactions as the period progresses. First, there is an increasing intensity of reaction over time and second, there is a change in orientation towards domestication in the latter part of the period analysed.

First, the intensity of reaction – the frequency and strength of domestication and foreignization, collectively – increased across all three media over time. This is especially clear in the translations, as the *Opere* simply added to the reactions already evident in Fea's translation produced at the beginning of the period. Yet such an increase in intensity is also evident in art literature, as the reactions indubitably increased in Lanzi's and Cicognara's works from those of earlier writers such as Piranesi and Milizia. This pattern is less clear in the artistic periodicals, but it in no way contradicts: indeed, the number of reactions to Winckelmann in the journals of the nineteenth century is more than double that in the late eighteenth-century equivalents. I contend that the reason for this increased intensity across the media is nationalism. After all, as both foreignization and domestication were motivated by nationalism, any increase in reaction implies a rise in nationalistic response, arguably explained in the later phase of the period by the increased unease in society as the Risorgimento began.

Second, it is apparent that every medium concludes with an increased tilt towards domestication. The domestication evident in the translations of Amoretti and Fea increased in the *Opere*; Lanzi and Cicognara demonstrated almost exclusive domestication in contrast to the foreignizing texts of Piranesi, D'Arco, and Milizia; and later journals, the *Effemeridi letterarie* and the *Giornale arcadico*, are two of the most domesticating of all periodicals examined. This is moreover compounded by the fact that – as the majority of scholars in the spheres of art literature and artistic periodicals consulted Amoretti's and Fea's translations – any domestication evident in these two media built on the already-achieved domestication in the Italian *Storie*.

The pattern of orientation in Chapters III and V reveals a possible correlation with the Napoleonic era (1796-1814). Indeed pre-Napoleon the translations and journals domesticated Winckelmann, implying that, prior to invasion when Italy was not actively threatened, the priority was to adopt achievements for their own scholarship. After all, as previously noted,

Italian writers were all too aware that their output was markedly behind that of other European countries. During the period of French domination, however, these two media ignored or foreignized the German scholar, respectively: implying in the journals particularly a desire – as their Italian identity was threatened – to establish a clear ‘him’ and ‘us’ dialogue in order to defend Italy. Finally, after the dissolution of this threat, both the translators and periodicals returned to domesticating Winckelmann, his works, and his views, arguably due to a focus on building an Italian identity as the peninsula began the journey to Unification. Art-writing, despite demonstrating the same clear slant towards domestication towards the end of the era, does not appear to follow the same three-stage pattern as the other two media. There are many possible reasons for this, not least including the fact that individual scholars’ preferences may certainly have been less representative of the mood of society than, for instance, a medium such as journalism, which published contemporaneously with societal developments.

VI.3. CONTRIBUTION TO KNOWLEDGE

Turning from the patterns evident in this analysis, I will now situate the findings of my investigation within the current scholarship. This thesis has made five principal contributions, which predominantly add to but also challenge existing literature.

Firstly, the dilemma: by discerning overlooked Italophobic views that are key to Winckelmann’s history of art and combining them – through synthesizing existing research – with the knowledge of Winckelmann’s presence in Italy, I have identified a hitherto unobserved dilemma in Winckelmann’s reception. In doing so, I both supplement future research and call into question previous work on Winckelmann’s reception in Italy, as this dilemma not only represents a new factor that needs to be borne in mind, but a complexity that is missing from the (albeit limited) extant research. Moreover, beyond scholarship, this

dilemma also reveals an aspect to Winckelmann's past reception that is overlooked by the simplistically positive view of him evident today across different spheres of Italian culture and education.

Secondly, I have distinguished two reactions to Winckelmann that have not before been identified: foreignization and domestication. This challenges the existing focus on a linear – positive or negative – response to Winckelmann by revealing a far more complex dynamic. Indeed, beyond simply agreeing or disagreeing with him, his works, or his views, art scholarship responded by altering how he was presented to the Italian readership. This is noteworthy in two senses. It demonstrates a more active response on the part of art scholarship, through manipulating how attractive or unattractive he was to appear to its readers. Moreover, it reveals an invariable act of relating Winckelmann to Italy: examining not how right or wrong he, his works and his views were but how befitting they were to Italy. To elucidate this further, an example of the limits of the alternative, linear study of positive and negative responses to Winckelmann can be noted in Ferrari's conclusion to his article on Winckelmann and Cicognara. Ferrari here notes Niccolò Tommaséo's description of Winckelmann – 'Winckelmann è molto più italiano del concittadino di Ariosto' – as an example of 'un confronto [post publication of the *Opere*] non più costruito sulle riserve, le diffidenze e i sospetti, ma basato sull'esplicito riconoscimento dei reali meriti dello storico dell'arte prussiano'.² Yet, as the conceptual framework used in this thesis demonstrates, such a quotation reveals far more than approval. Indeed, in accordance with the domesticating slant discerned towards the end of the period, Tommaséo is in this quotation appropriating and domesticating Winckelmann for Italy: a far more intriguing decision than Ferrari proposes, particularly in light of Tommaséo's well-known patriotic views.

² Ferrari, 'Cicognara e Winckelmann', p. 113.

This leads to my third original suggestion that Winckelmann inspired a nationalistic response in Italian art scholarship. Whilst this nationalistic perspective is new to the study of Winckelmann's Italian reception, this demonstration of him as a catalyst for Italian nationalism adds to the existing scholarship on his stimulation of nationalistic sentiments in France and Germany. However, as explained in Chapter I, there is a stark difference in how Winckelmann was employed in these countries. Winckelmann and his views were not assumed into the Italian nationalistic discourse in the same way that the French, for example, adopted his concept of the significance of liberty for their own ideas of a free society. Rather, the nationalism inspired in Italy was as a result of a contrasting rejection of Winckelmann's Hellenism and Italophobia and defence of the *patria* against them.

Fourthly, in arguing that Winckelmann inspired these nationalistic reactions, I offer a fresh perspective on the prevailing view that Theodor Mommsen was the first major catalyst to Italian nationalism in antiquarian studies. This thesis does not deny that Mommsen played a crucial (perhaps even unparalleled) role in heralding Italian nationalism: a conventional position that has the support of eminent scholars such as Arnaldo Momigliano, Henrik Mouritsen, and Axel Körner. Indeed, as Mouritsen notes, by tracing Roman history from the Roman Republic to Julius Caesar in his *Römische Geschichte* (1854-85), Mommsen 'created a version of the classical past that could serve as a suitable model for contemporary efforts to unite Italy'.³ Yet whilst Mommsen had a decisive impact on Italian nationalism in the mid-nineteenth century, I have demonstrated that he was by no means the first antiquarian to inspire such sentiments in Italy. Winckelmann had provoked nationalism as early as the 1760s, albeit through the aforementioned negative approach of inspiring nationalism through his *contentious* views against which an emergent Italy reacted rather than providing views that were cordially received into the nationalistic discourse. In this way, I suggest that any notion

³ Mouritsen, p. 46.

that Mommsen was the first instrumental figure in the development of nationalism in Italian antiquarian studies does not provide the full picture. Italian antiquarianism did not have to wait until the second half of the nineteenth century for a 'nationalistic emphasis, deriving from the Italian reception of [...] Mommsen'.⁴ Rather, examination of Winckelmann's role in Italian art scholarship demonstrates that, through the combination of his presence and contentious views, he had heralded Italian nationalism in antiquarian studies some decades earlier. Furthermore, as well as this specific focus on the catalysts of Italian nationalism, this research also adds to existing study in a broader sense, by shedding new light on just how far-reaching the spread of nationalism was in Italian art scholarship of this early period. Indeed this investigation evinces the extent of this nationalistic sentiment in the pre- and early Risorgimento years, permeating even as far as Winckelmann's reception.

Fifthly and finally, in the process of conducting this investigation, I have brought to light a number of sources that have been overlooked both as regards Winckelmann's reception and as works of scholarly interest more generally. Thus, through compiling the detailed contextual sections at the beginning of each chapter, in order to build profiles of the writings and objectives of each scholar and journal, this thesis extends beyond Winckelmann to supplement existing understanding of the overall Italian art scholarship of this period. This is especially true of D'Arco in Chapter IV and the *Effemeridi letterarie* in Chapter V, for which secondary material is particularly scarce.

VI.4. EXPANDING THE INVESTIGATION

Having listed these contributions, it should be noted that this is of course not a comprehensive investigation of Winckelmann's reception in Italian art scholarship. Rather, a number of

⁴ Körner, p. 131.

parameters were set to ensure a manageable study: parameters which I will here delineate, before identifying how the investigation could be broadened in the future.

Concentrating first on the conceptual framework, this thesis explores a particular, overlooked type of response to Winckelmann – foreignization and domestication – and thus does not examine how far Italian scholarship purely approved or disapproved of Winckelmann. For the same reason, unless otherwise useful, it does not contend to engage with or critique any existing treatment of the linear (positive and negative) reception of the German scholar. Similarly, as well as choosing precisely *how* to pursue this research, limits were also set on *what* to examine. The motives behind these were explored at the beginning of the thesis, yet I will here reiterate the limitations. This investigation is naturally restricted temporally – it covers solely the period from 1755 to 1834 – as well as geographically, as I confine my research to Northern and Central Italy, including the Papal States. In addition, just as Winckelmann’s reception in this thesis is based on his five main and most applicable works, with principal focus on the *Geschichte*, the three media of translation, art literature, and artistic periodicals were all chosen to form a cross-section of the key spheres of Italian art scholarship. As a result, with the most apposite sources and spheres of interest selected for this study, it is naturally not known whether the findings made in this thesis would be replicated to the same intensity outside of these parameters.

Accordingly, there are a number of ways in which this study could be extended. For example, as noted in the Introduction, I chose to conclude my analysis with the publication of the *Opere* (1830-34), after which Italian art scholarship appeared to have exhibited a less pronounced response to Winckelmann than during the period I have considered.⁵ Nevertheless, in light of the nationalistic emphasis of my argument, it would be constructive to examine Winckelmann’s reception in the thirty years leading up to Unification (1861). Not only

⁵ See Chapter I.7., p. 59.

would this facilitate a comparison between the later period and that explored by this thesis, but it would allow for a better understanding of the reasons for this diminished interest. It would be particularly interesting to assess whether the response to Winckelmann was more neutral, which would indicate that foreignization and domestication had succeeded in dissolving the dilemma. Further, especially after the publication of the *Opere*, the corpus of Winckelmann's works could also be extended to assess the potential Italian response to any of his secondary or lesser-known works. Moreover, Winckelmann's reception in Southern Italy is a subject I intend to explore in the future. Indeed, given his indubitable presence in the area, both physically during his four trips to the ancient sites and thereafter in scholarship, not to mention the polemic he caused with his scathing letter on the excavations at Herculaneum,⁶ this would most likely be a fruitful area of research.

Given the breadth of this study, it was of course also necessary to make appropriate selections from the media here examined. To allow for a close analysis of subtle changes in the translations, for example, it was essential to select key, extended extracts, yet in the future more passages could be analysed. Further, there are far more case studies in art literature and artistic periodicals from which to choose. Indeed, whilst the oeuvres of Raffei and Visconti did not correspond to the criteria set in Chapter IV, analysis of their responses to Winckelmann would afford a yet fuller picture of his reception in the scholarship of the period. Similarly an extension of the corpus of art journals beyond Rome would allow for analysis of other well-known periodicals of the time, such as *Novelle letterarie* (Florence), *Giornale de' letterati di Pisa* (Pisa), and *Biblioteca italiana* (Milan), to name but a few. This could certainly be achieved through the digitization and use of OCR outlined in Chapter I. In addition to this, new media are yet to be analysed. The examination could remain in the sphere of art scholarship – as lectures given at the various academies in Rome and throughout Italy provide another

⁶ See Chapter II, n. 158.

potential medium – or it could move further afield to media not so obviously associated with the German scholar, including, for example, poetry, literature, and the visual arts.

Finally, it would be interesting to apply the conceptual framework employed throughout this examination to other scholars, to assess if their reception in Italy corroborates these findings. A natural option for such an extension of analysis would be Heyne. After all, as noted in Chapter III, Amoretti and Fea employed textual manipulation in their translation of Heyne's *Elogio di Winckelmann*, with a view here, too, to rendering it more attractive to their Italian readership.

VI.5. STIMULUS FOR RESEARCH IN ASSOCIATED FIELDS

I will end by outlining how this thesis can inspire new developments in the associated fields of study: Winckelmann Studies, Nationalism Studies, and Wider Studies into Italian Art Scholarship.

As regards Winckelmann Studies, suggestions for associated future work have already been canvassed. Whatever route is taken, however, the dilemma and the consequent complexity of response to Winckelmann must be borne in mind, both when critiquing existing investigations into his Italian reception, which predominantly consider a linear pattern of approval and disapproval, and when pursuing further research.

Nationalism Studies is another area closely related to this investigation and one to which this thesis provides much scope for further research. Whilst, as noted above, scholarship has focused on the role of Mommsen in catalysing Italian nationalism in the mid-nineteenth century, this thesis brings to the fore the extent to which such sentiments infiltrated art scholarship during the *Sette-* and *Ottocento*: even inspired by Winckelmann. In doing so, it suggests that there is a greater wealth of early nationalism within antiquarian studies, which is deserving of scholarly attention.

Finally, whilst Wider Studies into Italian Art Scholarship often overlook the eighteenth- to nineteenth-centuries as a period of relatively little significance, this thesis has demonstrated on the contrary that it was a far more fruitful period than generally supposed. By examining just five case studies of Piranesi, D'Arco, Milizia, Lanzi, and Cicognara, it has revealed that, especially in Art Historiography, there is in fact a wealth of important work in this period: opening doors to future research. Indeed this thesis has shown that even in relation to these five scholars, there is still far more to be explored, particularly as regards D'Arco and Milizia, on whom information is sparse. The context sections at the beginning of Chapter IV thus provide a springboard for any further research on these writers' oeuvres and their contributions to art history. Lastly, whilst Winckelmann is widely acknowledged as a founding figure in art history, this thesis demonstrates that, when researching Italian Art Historiography, awareness of Winckelmann's general influence is not enough. As I have established, the response to Winckelmann in Italy was nuanced and, in order to truly assess it, knowledge of the dilemma and the consequently complex reactions he inspired is crucial.

Having thus reiterated my contributions to knowledge, as well as outlining the different ways in which I hope this examination will inspire future research, it seems appropriate to conclude this thesis on Winckelmann's reception in Italian art scholarship, 1755-1834, by quoting the German scholar. When in 1761 Winckelmann labelled himself a '*prussiano romano*' he could never have anticipated how accurate this label would prove to be.⁷ Not only did he become an integral part of Roman society during his lifetime but, through the predominant domestication of him, his works, and his views, Winckelmann's critical legacy in Italian art scholarship was indeed that of a Prussian made Roman.

⁷ Already cited in Chapter V, n. 158, Winckelmann described himself as such in a letter to Salomon Gessner, 14/11/1761, (OP.IX.538).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary sources

Winckelmann's works

Winckelmann, Johann J., 'Anmerkungen über die Baukunst der Alten', in Josef Eiselein, ed., *Johann Winckelmanns Sämtliche Werke*, 12 vols (Donauöschingen: Verlage deutscher Klassiker, 1825-29), II (1825), pp. 331-471

- 'Anmerkungen über die Baukunst der Alten Tempel zu Girgenti in Sicilien', in Josef Eiselein, ed., *Johann Winckelmanns Sämtliche Werke*, 12 vols (Donauöschingen: Verlage deutscher Klassiker, 1825-29), II (1825), pp. 303-29
- *Anmerkungen über die Geschichte der Kunst des Altertums* (Dresden: Walther, 1767)
- *Briefe*, ed. by Walter Rehm, 4 vols (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1952-57)
- *Description des pierres gravées du feu Baron de Stosch* (Florence: Bonducci, 1760)
- *Geschichte der Kunst des Altertums*, 2 vols (Dresden: Walther, 1764)
- *Geschichte der Kunst des Altertums*, ed. by F.J. Riedel, 2 vols (Vienna: Akademischen Verlag, 1776)
- *Monumenti antichi inediti spiegati ed illustrati* (Rome: Pagliarini, 1767)
- *Monumenti antichi inediti spiegati ed illustrati*, ed. by Pietro Paolo Montagnani-Mirabili, 2nd edn (Rome: Carlo Mordacchini, 1821)
- *Sendschreiben von den Herculanischen Entdeckungen* (Dresden: Walther, 1762)
- *Winckelmanns Briefe an seine Freunde*, ed. by Karl Wilhelm Daßdorf, 2 vols (Dresden: Waltherischen Hofbuchhandlung, 1777- 80)

Winckelmann's works: English and other modern translations consulted

Winckelmann, Johann J., *The History of Ancient Art*, trans. by Henry Lodge, 2 vols (London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle & Rivington, 1881)

- *History of the Art of Antiquity*, trans. by Harry Francis Mallgrave (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2006)
- *Letter and Report on the Discoveries at Herculaneum*, trans. by Carol C. Mattusch (Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum, 2011)
- *Pensieri sull'imitazione*, ed. and trans. by Michele Cometa (Palermo: Aesthetica, 1992)
- 'Thoughts on the Imitation of Greek Works in Painting and the Art of Sculpture', in David Carter, ed. and trans., *Johann Joachim Winckelmann on Art, Architecture, and Archaeology* (Rochester: Camden House, 2013), pp. 31-55

Winckelmann's works: French and Italian translations produced in the period examined

As explained in the Glossary, given the significant attention afforded to the Italian translations in this thesis (in particular, in Chapter III), they are referred to and referenced throughout as the work of Amoretti and Fea.

Amoretti, Carlo, *Storia delle arti del disegno presso gli antichi*, 2 vols (Milan: Monastero di S. Ambrogio Maggiore, 1779)

Fea, Carlo, ed., *Opere di G. G. Winckelmann: Prima edizione italiana completa*, 12 vols (Prato: Fratelli Giachetti, 1830-34)

——— *Storia delle arti del disegno presso gli antichi*, 3 vols (Rome: Pagliarini, 1783-84)

Winckelmann, Johann J., *Histoire de l'art chez les anciens*, trans. by Gottfried Sellius, 2 vols (Amsterdam: E. van Harreveld, 1766)

——— *Histoire de l'art chez les anciens*, trans. by Henrik Jansen, 2 vols (Paris: Barrois, 1793)

——— *Histoire de l'art de l'antiquité*, trans. by Michael Huber, 3 vols (Leipzig: Breitkopf, 1781)

——— 'Pensées sur l'imitation des Grecs dans les ouvrages de peinture & de sculpture', *Nouvelle Bibliotheque Germanique*, 18 (Oct-Dec 1755), 302-29

——— 'Remarques sur l'architecture de l'ancien temple de Girgenti en Sicile', in Hendrik Jansen, ed. and trans., *Lettres Familieres De M. Winckelmann*, 2 vols (Amsterdam: Couturier, 1781), I, pp. 270-92

Contemporary artistic journals

Efemeridi letterarie di Roma, 22 vols (1772-98, 1806)

Antologia Romana, 24 vols (1774-98)

Giornale delle belle arti e della incisione, antiquaria, musica, e poesia, 5 vols (1784-88)

Memorie per le belle arti, 4 vols (1785-88)

Monumenti antichi inediti ovvero Notizie sulle antichità e belle arti di Roma, 6 vols (1784-89, 1805)

Memorie enciclopediche romane sulle belle arti, antichità ec., 5 vols (1806-10)

Memorie enciclopediche sulle antichità e belle arti di Roma, 2 vols (1817, 1819)

Giornale arcadico di scienze, lettere, ed arti, 211 vols (1819-68), 1-65 (1819-34)

Effemeridi letterarie di Roma, 13 vols (1820-23)

Memorie romane di antichità e di belle arti, 4 vols (1824-27)

Other primary sources

Bracci, Domenico Augusto, *Dissertazione sopra un clipeo votivo spettante alla famiglia Ardaburia* (Lucca: Venturini, 1771)

——— *Memorie degli antichi incisori che scolpirono i loro nomi in gemme e cammei con molti monumenti inediti di antichità, statue, bassirilievi, gemme*, 2 vols (Florence: Gaetano Cambiagi, 1784-86)

Cicognara, Leopoldo, *Le Belle Arti* (Ferrara: Giuseppe Rinaldi, 1790)

- *Catalogo ragionato dei libri d'arte e d'antichità posseduti dal conte Cicognara*, 2 vols (Pisa: Niccolò Capurro, 1821)
- *Del bello: ragionamenti* (Pavia: Pietro Bizzoni, 1825)
- *Storia della scultura dal suo risorgimento in Italia fino al secolo di Canova: per servire di continuazione all'opere di Winkelmann [sic] e di d'Agincourt*, 7 vols (Prato: Giachetti, 1823)
- D'Agincourt, Jean Baptiste Seroux, *L'Histoire de l'Art par les monuments, depuis sa décadence au quatrième siècle jusqu'à son renouvellement au seizième*, 6 vols (Paris: Treuttel et Würtz, 1823)
- D'Arco, Giambattista G., *Della patria primitiva dell'arti del disegno* (Cremona: Lorenzo Manini, 1785)
- Delfico, Melchiorre, *Nuove ricerche sul bello* (Naples: Agnello Nobile, 1818)
- De Staël, Germaine, 'Sulla maniera e la utilità delle traduzioni', *Biblioteca italiana*, 1 (1816), 9-18
- Giordani, Pietro, 'Un Italiano risponde al Discorso della Staël', in Egidio Bellorini, ed., *Discussioni e Polemiche sul Romanticismo*, 2nd edn, rev. by Anco Marzio Mutterle, 2 vols (Bari: Laterza, 1975), I, pp. 16-24
- Heyne, Christian Gottlob, 'Lobschrift auf Winckelmann', in Arthur Schulz, ed., *Die Kasseler Lobschriften auf Winckelmann* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1963), pp. 14-29
- 'Über die Künstlerepochen bei Plinius', in *Sammlung antiquarischer Aufsätze*, 2 vols (Leipzig: Weidmann, 1778-79), I (1778), pp. 165-235
- Lanzi, Luigi, *De' vasi antichi dipinti vogliamamente chiamati etruschi: dissertazioni tre* (Florence: Fantosini, 1806)
- *La Real Galleria di Firenze* (Florence: Francesco Moücke, 1782)
- *Luigi Lanzi: The History of Painting in Italy, from the Period of the Revival of the Fine Arts to the End of the Eighteenth Century*, trans. by Thomas Roscoe (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1852)
- 'Notizie preliminari circa la scoltura degli antichi, e i varii suoi stili', in *Saggio di lingua etrusca e di altre antiche d'Italia per servire alla storia de' popoli, delle lingue, e delle belle arti*, 2 vols (Rome: Pagliarini, 1789), II.2, pp. i-xliv
- *Saggio di lingua etrusca e di altre antiche d'Italia per servire alla storia de' popoli, delle lingue, e delle belle arti*, 2 vols (Rome: Pagliarini, 1789)
- *Storia pittorica della Italia: dal risorgimento delle belle arti fin presso al fine del XVIII secolo*, 6 vols (Bassano: Remondini, 1809)
- Mariette, Pierre J., 'Lettre de M. Mariette sur un ouvrage de M. Piranesi concernant les antiquités romaines', *Gazette Littéraire de l'Europe*, 3 (Sept-Dec 1764), 232-62
- *Traité des pierres gravées*, 2 vols (Paris: the author, 1750)
- Milizia, Francesco, *Dell'arte di vedere nelle belle arti del disegno secondo i principi di Sulzer e di Mengs* (Genova: Caffarelli, 1786)
- *Dizionario delle belle arti del disegno*, 2 vols (Bassano: [n.pub.], 1797)

- *Le vite de' più celebri architetti d'ogni nazione e d'ogni tempo precedute da un saggio sopra l'architettura* (Rome: Paolo Giunchi Komarek, 1768)
- *Memorie degli architetti antichi e moderni*, 2 vols (Venice: Remondini, 1785)
- *Principi di architettura civile*, 3 vols (Bassano: Remondini, 1785)
- *Roma delle belle arti del disegno: parte prima dell'architettura civile* (Bassano: Remondini, 1787)
- 'Memorie degli architetti antichi e moderni', in *Opere complete di Francesco Milizia risguardanti le belle arti*, 9 vols (Bologna: Cardinali and Frulli, 1826-28), v (1827), pp. 7-497
- *Notizie di Francesco Milizia scritte da lui medesimo con un catalogo delle sue opere* (Bassano: Remondini, 1804)
- *Opere complete di Francesco Milizia risguardanti le belle arti*, 9 vols (Bologna: Cardinali and Frulli, 1826-28)
- Piranesi, Giovanni B., 'Della introduzione e del progresso delle belle arti in Europa ne' tempi antichi', in John Wilton-Ely, ed., *The Polemical Works, Rome 1757, 1761, 1765, 1769* (Farnborough, Hants: Gregg, 1972), pp. 17-23
- *Della magnificenza ed architettura de' Romani* (Rome: [n.pub], 1761)
- *Observations on the Letter of Monsieur Mariette: With Opinions on Architecture, and a Preface to a New Treatise on the Introduction and Progress of the Fine Arts in Europe in Ancient Times*, trans. by Caroline Beamish and David Britt (LA: Getty Institute, 2002)
- 'Osservazioni di Gio. Battista Piranesi sopra la lettre de Monsieur Mariette aux auteurs de la Gazette Littéraire de l'Europe', in John Wilton-Ely, ed., *The Polemical Works, Rome 1757, 1761, 1765, 1769* (Farnborough, Hants: Gregg, 1972), pp. 1-8
- 'Parere su l'architettura', in John Wilton-Ely, ed., *The Polemical Works, Rome 1757, 1761, 1765, 1769* (Farnborough, Hants: Gregg, 1972), pp. 9-16
- 'Ragionamento apologetico in difesa dell'architettura egizia, e toscana', in *Diverse maniere d'adornare i cammini ed ogni altra parte degli edifizi desunte dall'architettura egizia, etrusca e greca* (Rome: Salomoni, 1769), pp. 1-35
- Von Murr, C. G., 'Verzeichniß der Fehler der Wiener Ausgabe von Winckelmanns Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums', *Journal zur Kunstgeschichte und zur allgemeinen Litteratur*, 8 (1780), 30-56
- Vasari, Giorgio, *Le opere di Giorgio Vasari: pittore e architetto aretino*, ed. by Giovanni Masselli, 2 vols (Florence: D. Passigli e soci, 1832-38)

Secondary sources

- 'About Humanities Commons', *Humanities Commons* <<https://hcommons.org/about/>> [accessed 10 February 2018]
- 'Busto di Antinoo: Ludovisi Collezione', Museum label, Palazzo Altemps [photograph taken 10 September 2013]

- 'Daniela Fioravanti', *Aracne editrice*
<<http://www.aracneeditrice.it/aracneweb/index.php/autori.html?auth-id=297024>> [accessed 27 April 2017]
- 'Il Grand Hotel Duchi D'Aosta', *Primo Turismo: Friuli, Venezia, Giulia*
<<https://www.turismofvg.it/it/41878/Grand-Hotel-Duchi-D-Aosta>> [accessed 9 September 2017]
- 'Sei lezioni di Salvatore Settis. Terza lezione: Arte classica, libertà, rivoluzioni, la lezione di Winckelmann', *Arte & Design*, Rai Cultura <<http://www.arte.rai.it/articoli-programma/sei-lezioni-di-salvatore-settis-terza-lezione-arte-classica-libert%C3%A0-rivoluzioni-la-lezione-di-winckelmann/19958/default.aspx>> [accessed 9 September 2017]
- Agosti, Giacomo, *La nascita della storia dell'arte in Italia* (Venice: Marsilio, 1996)
- Aichele, George, 'Edward W. Said', in Vincent B. Leitch, ed., *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism* (NY: W.W.Norton, 2001), pp. 1986-90
- Allroggen-Bedel, Agnès, 'La scultura greca come modello e simbolo: le idee di J. J. Winckelmann e la politica culturale dopo la rivoluzione', in Philippe Boutry, ed., *La Grecia antica: mito e simbolo per l'età della grande rivoluzione, genesi e crisi di un modello nella cultura del Settecento* (Milan: Guerini, 1991), pp. 183-90
- Alter, Peter, *Nationalism* (London: Edward Arnold, 1994)
- Anderson, M. S., *Europe in the Eighteenth Century: 1713-1789*, 4th edn (Oxon: Routledge, 2014)
- Armstrong, Christopher, *Julien-David Leroy and the Making of Architectural History* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2012)
- Armstrong, John, 'Nations before Nationalism', in John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, eds, *Nationalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), pp. 140-47
- Ashcroft, Bill and Pal Ahluwalia, *Edward Said* (London: Routledge, 2009)
- Assunto, Rosario, *L'antichità come futuro: studio sull'estetica del neoclassicismo europeo* (Milan: U. Mursia, 1973)
- Banton, Michael, 'Ethnocentrism', in Athena S. Leoussi, ed., *Encyclopaedia of Nationalism* (London: Transaction, 2001), pp. 80-81
- Barasch, Moshe, *Modern Theories of Art, 1: From Winckelmann to Baudelaire* (NY: New York University Press, 1990)
- Barroero, Liliana, 'Periodici storico-artistici romani in età neoclassica: le "Memorie per le Belle Arti" e il "Giornale delle Belle Arti"', in Enzo Borsellino and Vittorio Casale, eds, *Roma: Il tempio del vero gusto. La pittura del settecento romano e la sua diffusione a Venezia e a Napoli* (Florence: Edifer, 2001), pp. 91-99
- Bazin, Germain, *Storia della storia dell'arte: da Vasari ai nostri giorni* (Naples: Guida editori, 1993)
- Bazley, Thomas, *Crimes of the Art World* (California: Praeger, 2010)
- Beard, Mary, and John Henderson, *Classical Art: From Greece to Rome* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001)

- Berengo, Marino, ed., *Giornali veneziani del Settecento* (Milan: Feltrinelli, 1962)
- Bernabei, Franco, 'La letteratura artistica', in Girolamo Arnaldi and M. Pastore Stocchi, eds, *Storia della cultura veneta*, 6 vols (Vicenza: Neri Pozza, 1979-86), v.1 (1985), pp. 485-508
- Bernabei, Franco, and Chiara Marin, eds, *Critica d'arte nelle riviste lombardo-venete (1820-1860)* (Treviso: Canova, 2007)
- Bernardini, Paolo, *La sfida dell'uguaglianza: gli ebrei a Mantova nell'età della rivoluzione francese* (Rome: Bulzoni, 1996)
- Bertoldi, Susanna, *I Musei Vaticani: conoscere la storia, le opere, le collezioni* (Vatican City: Edizioni Musei Vaticani, 2010)
- Bickendorf, Gabriele, *Die Historisierung der italienischen Kunstbetrachtung im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert* (Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1998)
- Bigi, Emilio, 'Francesco Milizia: Nota Introduttiva', in Emilio Bigi ed., *Critici e storici della poesia e delle arti nel secondo Settecento* (Milan: Ricciardi, 1960), pp. 1031-42
- Bindi, Remo, and Eugenio Picchi, eds, *La stampa periodica milanese della prima metà dell'ottocento: testi e concordanze* (Pisa: Giardini, 1983)
- Boccaro, Nadia, and Alberto Postigliola, eds, *Periodici italiani d'antico regime* (Rome: Società italiana di studi sul secolo XVIII, 1986)
- Bonfioli, Mara, 'Boni, Onofrio', in *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, 88 vols (Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 1960-2017), xii (1971), pp. 84-85
- Burke, Peter, *Tradition and Innovation in Renaissance Italy: A Sociological Approach* (London: Fontana, 1974)
- Butler, E. M., *The Tyranny of Greece over Germany: A Study of the Influence Exercised by Greek Art and Poetry over the Great German Writers of the Eighteenth, Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1935)
- Caffiero, Marina, and Giuseppe Monsagrati, 'Introduzione', in Marina Caffiero and Giuseppe Monsagrati, eds, *Dall'erudizione alla politica: Giornali, giornalisti ed editori a Roma tra XVII e XX secolo* (Milan: FrancoAngeli, 1997), pp. 7-15
- Caffiero, Marina, 'Le "Effemeridi letterarie" di Roma (1772-1798): Reti intellettuali, evoluzione professionale e apprendistato politico', in Marina Caffiero and Giuseppe Monsagrati, eds, *Dall'erudizione alla politica: Giornali, giornalisti ed editori a Roma tra XVII e XX secolo* (Milan: FrancoAngeli, 1997), pp. 63-101
- Camilletti, Fabio, *Classicism and Romanticism in Italian Literature: Leopardi's Discourse on Romantic Poetry*, 2nd edn (Oxford: Routledge, 2016)
- 'Toward an Archaeology of Italian Modernity: Rethinking the Classicist/Romantic Quarrel', in Gabriella Romani and Jennifer Burns, eds, *The Formation of a National Audience in Italy, 1750-1890: Readers and Spectators of Italian Culture* (Maryland: Farleigh Dickinson University Press, 2017), pp. 101-116
- Camporeale, Giovannangelo, 'Winckelmann e l'arte etrusca: attualità di alcuni giudizi', in Maria Fancelli, ed., *J. J. Winckelmann tra letteratura e archeologia* (Venice: Marsilio, 1993), pp. 119-32

- Cantarutti, Giulia, 'L'"Antologia Romana" e la cultura tedesca in Italia', in Giulia Cantarutti and others, eds, *Il settecento tedesco in Italia: Gli italiani e l'immagine della cultura tedesca nel XVIII secolo* (Bologna: Mulino, 2001), pp. 257-315
- Capanni, Fabrizio, 'Lanzi, Luigi Antonio', in *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, 88 vols (Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 1960-2017), LXIII (2004), pp. 675-77
- Capra, Carlo, 'Il giornalismo nell'età rivoluzionaria e napoleonica', in V. Castronovo e T. Tranfaglia, eds, *La stampa italiana dal Cinquecento all'Ottocento* (Rome: Laterza, 1976), pp. 373-537
- Cardillo, Maria, 'Le "arti sorelle" nelle "Memorie per le belle arti" (1785-1788)', *Nuovi Annali della Scuola Speciale per archivisti e bibliotecari*, 25 (2011), 113-29
- Carlioni, Rosella, 'Marconi, Luigi', in *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, 88 vols (Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 1960-2017), LXIX (2007), pp. 797-99
- Carmassi, Carlo, *La letteratura tedesca nei periodici letterari italiani del primo ottocento (1800-1847)* (Pisa: Jacques, 1984)
- Carter, David, 'Introduction', in Johann J. Winckelmann, *Johann Joachim Winckelmann on Art, Architecture, and Archaeology*, trans. by David Carter (Rochester: Camden House, 2013), pp. 1-28
- Cary, Joseph, *A Ghost in Trieste* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993)
- Ceserani, Giovanna, *Italy's Lost Greece: Magna Graecia and the Making of Modern Archaeology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012)
- Consoli, Gian Paolo, 'Architecture and History: Vico, Lodoli, Piranesi', *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome: Supplementary Volumes*, 4 (2006), 195-210
- Coppi, Antonio, *Cenni biografici di Carlo Fea* (Rome: [n.p.], 1836)
- Cosatti, Amelia, *I periodici e gli atti accademici italiani dei secoli XVII e XVIII posseduti dalla biblioteca* (Rome: Accademia nazionale dei lincei, 1962)
- Cristofani, Mauro, *La scoperta degli etruschi: archeologia e antiquaria nel '700* (Rome: Consiglio nazionale delle ricerche, 1983)
- Croce, Benedetto, *Aesthetic as Science of Expression and General Linguistic* (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1995)
- *Problemi di estetica e contributi alla storia dell'estetica italiana* (Bari: Laterza, 1923)
- *Storia della storiografia Italiana nel secolo decimonono* (Bari: Laterza, 1930)
- Cuaz, Marco, 'Giornali e gazzette', in Girolamo Arnaldi and M. Pastore Stocchi, eds, *Storia della cultura veneta*, 6 vols (Vicenza: Neri Pozza, 1979-86), v.1 (1985), pp. 113-29
- Curtius, Ludwig, 'Johann Joachim Winckelmann, 1717-1768', in *Johann Joachim Winckelmann: 1768/1968* (Bad Godesberg: Inter Nationes, 1968), pp. 5-19
- DaCosta Kaufmann, Thomas, 'Before Winckelmann: Toward the Origins of the Historiography of Art', in Gerhild Scholz Williams and Stephan K. Schindler, eds, *Knowledge, Science and Literature in Early Modern Germany* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996), pp. 71-89

- *Toward a Geography of Art* (London: University of Chicago Press, 2004)
- De, Soham, and others, 'The Inevitability of Ethnocentrism Revisited: Ethnocentrism Diminishes As Mobility Increases', *Scientific reports*, 5 (2015)
<<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4672305/#b4>> [accessed 19 July 2017]
- De Felice, Renzo, 'Carlo Amoretti', in *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, 88 vols (Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 1960-2017), III (1961), pp. 9-10
- De Francesco, Antonio, *The Antiquity of the Italian Nation: The Cultural Origins of a Political Myth in Modern Italy, 1796-1943* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013)
- 'Introduction', in Antonio De Francesco, ed., *In Search of Pre-Classical Antiquity: Rediscovering Ancient Peoples in Mediterranean Europe, 19th and 20th c.* (Leiden: Brill, 2016), pp. 1-18
- De Mattei, Roberto, *Pius IX*, trans. by John Laughland (Herefordshire: Gracewing, 2004)
- Décultot, Élisabeth, 'Généalogie d'un malentendu: la place de Winckelmann dans les panthéons littéraires français et allemand à la fin du XVIII^e siècle', in Thomas W. Gaehtgens and others, eds, *L'Art et les normes sociales au XVIII^e siècle* (Paris: Editions de la Maison des sciences de l'homme, 2001), pp. 15-28
- *Johann Joachim Winckelmann: enquête sur la genèse de l'histoire de l'art* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2000)
- 'Winckelmann e Caylus: alcuni aspetti di un dibattito storiografico', in Giulia Cantarutti and Stefano Ferrari, eds, *Paesaggi europei del Neoclassicismo* (Bologna: Mulino, 2007), pp. 37-60
- Disselkamp, Martin, *Die Stadt der Gelehrten: Studien zu Johann Joachim Winckelmanns Briefe aus Rom* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1993)
- Distaso, Grazia, 'Francesco Milizia e la riforma del teatro nel Settecento', in Mariella Basile Bonsante and Grazia Distaso, eds, *Francesco Milizia e la cultura del Settecento* (Galatina: Congedo, 2002), pp. 33-51
- Donohue, A. A., 'Winckelmann's History of Art and Polyclitus', in Warren Moon, ed., *Polykleitos, the Doryphoros, and Tradition* (Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1995), pp. 327-53
- Duggan, Christopher, *A Concise History of Italy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994)
- Dyson, Stephen, *In Pursuit of Ancient Pasts: A History of Classical Archaeology in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006)
- Espagne, Michel, 'Il ruolo della traduzione nella genesi del Neoclassicismo', in Giulia Cantarutti and others, eds, *Traduzioni e traduttori del Neoclassicismo* (Milan: FrancoAngeli, 2010), pp. 13-22
- Fabi, Angelo, 'Amaduzzi, Giovanni Cristofano', in *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, 88 vols (Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 1960-2017), II (1960), pp. 612-15
- Fanizza, Franco, 'Privato e pubblico nella concezione architettonica di Francesco Milizia', in Mariella Basile Bonsante and Grazia Distaso, eds, *Francesco Milizia e la cultura del Settecento* (Galatina: Congedo, 2002), pp. 138-44

Fattorello, Francesco, *Il giornalismo veneziano nel '700*, 2 vols (Udine: La rivista Letteraria, 1932)

Fedi, Francesca, *L'ideologia del bello: Leopoldo Cicognara e il classicismo fra Settecento e Ottocento* (Milan: Franco Angeli, 1990)

Fehl, Philipp, 'The Fondo Cicognara in the Vatican Library: Inventing the Art Library of the Future', in Adriaan Wessel Reinink and Jeroen Stumpel, eds, *Memory & Oblivion: Proceedings of the XXIXth International Congress of the History of Art Held in Amsterdam, 1-7 September 1996* (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1999), pp. 43-56

Fernie, Eric, *Art History and its Methods: A Critical Anthology* (London: Phaidon, 1995)

Ferrari, Stefano, 'L'Antiquario nella Cultura Europea del Sei-settecento', *Atti della Accademia Roveretana degli Agiati*, 250 (2000), 191-214

—— 'Carlo Amoretti e la Storia delle Arti del Disegno (1779) di Winckelmann', in Giulia Cantarutti and Stefano Ferrari, eds, *Paesaggi europei del Neoclassicismo* (Bologna: Mulino, 2007), pp. 191-212

—— 'Christian G. Heyne e la ricezione di Winckelmann nell'Italia del secondo Settecento', *Neoclassico*, 19 (2001), 75-101

—— 'Cicognara e Winckelmann: continuità e critica della storia dell'arte', *Intersezioni*, 34.1 (2014), 97-114

—— 'Da Vienna a Milano: genesi e reazioni alla prima traduzione della Storia delle Arti del Disegno di Winckelmann', in Helmut Meter and Furio Brugnolo, eds, *Vie Lombarde e Venete: Circolazione e trasformazione dei saperi letterari nel Sette-Ottocento fra l'Italia settentrionale e l'Europa transalpina* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2011), pp. 259-72

—— "'Egli eccellente storico, egli ottimo critico, ...": Carlantonio Pilati interprete dell'opera di Winckelmann', in Giulia Cantarutti and others, eds, *Il settecento tedesco: Gli italiani e l'immagine della cultura tedesca nel XVIII secolo* (Bologna: Mulino, 2001), pp. 417-65

—— 'L'eredità culturale di Winckelmann: Carlo Fea e la seconda edizione della "Storia delle Arti del Disegno presso gli Antichi"', *Roma moderna e contemporanea*, 10.1-2 (2002), 15-48

—— 'Jagemann e il doppio transfert di Winckelmann', in Jörn Albrecht and Peter Kofler, eds, *Die Italianistik in der Weimarer Klassik: Das Leben und Werk von Christian Joseph Jagemann (1735-1804)* (Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 2006), pp. 242-57

—— 'Joseph von Sperges e la ricezione austriaca di Winckelmann', in Giulia Cantarutti and Stefano Ferrari, eds, *L'Accademia degli Agiati nel Settecento europeo: irradiazioni culturali* (Milan: FrancoAngeli, 2007), pp. 219-40

—— 'Il *Nachlaß* italiano di Winckelmann: bilancio storiografico e nuove prospettive di ricerca', *Archivio storico italiano*, 643.1 (2015), 65-88

—— "'Un'opera che fa onore al secolo sè dicente illuminato": Carlo Fea e la riedizione della Storia delle Arti del Disegno di Winckelmann (1783-84)', in F. Mazzocca and G. Venturi, eds, *Antonio Canova: la cultura figurativa e letteraria dei grandi centri italiani: III settimana di studi canoviani* (Bassano del Grappa: Istituto di ricerca per gli studi su Canova e il Neoclassicismo, 2005), pp. 257-80

—— *Il piacere di tradurre: François-Vincent Toussaint e la versione incompiuta dell'Histoire de l'art chez les anciens di Winckelmann* (Rovereto: Edizioni Osiride, 2011)

- *Il rifugiato e l'antiquario: Fortunato Bartolomeo De Felice e il 'transfert' italo-elvetico di Winckelmann nel secondo Settecento* (Rovereto: Osiride, 2008)
- 'I traduttori italiani di Winckelmann', in Giulia Cantarutti and others, eds, *Traduzioni e traduttori del Neoclassicismo* (Milan: FrancoAngeli, 2010), pp. 161-74
- 'Il transfert di Winckelmann nella "Romagna erudita" (1762-1784)', in Paola Delbianco, ed., *Atti della decima giornata amaduzziana* (Cesena: Il Ponte Vecchio, 2013), pp. 95-119
- 'Le transfert italien de Johann J. Winckelmann pendant la seconde moitié du XVIIIe siècle', *Recherches germaniques*, 33 (2003), 1-19
- Firpo, Giulio, 'Roma, etruschi e italici nel "secolo senza Roma"', in G. Urso, ed., *Patria Diversis Genibus Una? Unità politica e identità etniche nell'Italia antica* (Pisa: Ets, 2008), pp. 267-304
- Fisher, H. A. L., *A History of Europe* (London: Edward Arnold, 1936)
- Forte, Valeria, 'Archaeology and Nationalism: The Trojan Legend in Etruria' (unpublished master's thesis, University of Texas, 2008), <https://uta-ir.tdl.org/uta-ir/bitstream/handle/10106/1819/Forte_uta_2502M_10074.pdf?sequence=1> [accessed 24 August 2017]
- 'Etruscan Origins and Italian Nationalism', *Studia Universitatis Babes-Bolyai – Studia Europaea*, 1 (2011), 5-18
- Foscolo, Ugo, 'La letteratura periodica italiana', in Cesare Foligno, ed., *Edizione Nazionale delle Opere di Ugo Foscolo*, 22 vols (Florence: Le Monnier, 1933-94), xi.2: *Saggi di letteratura italiana* (1958), pp. 327-98
- Galante Garrone, Alessandro, 'I giornali della Restaurazione 1815-1847', in V. Castronovo e T. Tranfaglia, eds, *La stampa italiana del Risorgimento* (Rome: Laterza, 1978), pp. 3-246
- Gasperoni, Gaetano, *La storia e le lettere nella seconda metà del secolo XVIII* (Jesi: Tipografia Editrice Cooperativa, 1904)
- *Settecento italiano, contributo alla storia della cultura* (Padova: A. Milani, 1941)
- Gatti, Andrea, 'Il Neoclassicismo: la riscoperta dell'antico', in Carlo Bertelli, ed., *La storia delle arte*, 3a: *Dal Neoclassicismo alla metà del Novecento* (Milan: Pearson Italia, 2012), pp. 7-62
- Gauna, Chiara, *La storia pittorica di Luigi Lanzi: arti, storia e musei nel Settecento* (Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 2003)
- Gerrit-Bruer, Stephanie, 'Winckelmanns Leben als Gelehrter in Rom', in *Winckelmann Museum Stendal: Ausstellung zur Biographie Johann Joachim Winckelmanns* (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1996), pp. 80-94
- Gherzi, Lorenzo Finocchi, 'De Vegni, Leonardo Massimiliano', in *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, 88 vols (Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 1960-2017), xxxix (1991), pp. 549-52
- Gioberti, Vincenzo, *Pensieri e giudizi sulla letteratura italiana e straniera*, ed. by F. Ugolini (Florence: Barbèra, 1887)
- Gollwitzer, Michael, 'Francesco Milizia, Del teatro: ein Beitrag zu Ästhetik und Kulturgeschichte Italiens zwischen 1750 und 1790' (unpublished thesis, Universität zu Köln, 1969)
- Grassi, Luigi, *Costruzione della critica d'arte* (Rome: Ateneo, 1955)

- *Teorici e storia della critica d'arte*, 3 vols (Rome: Bonsignori, 1997)
- Gregory, Desmond, *Napoleon's Italy* (New Jersey: Fairleigh Dickinson, 2001)
- Gretz, Michael F., 'Italy', in *Encyclopaedia of the Age of Political Revolutions and New Ideologies, 1760-1816*, 2 vols (Westport: Greenwood, 2007), 1, pp. 356-59
- Griener, Pascal, *L'esthétique de la traduction: Winckelmann, les langues et l'histoire de l'art, 1755-1784* (Geneva: Droz, 1998)
- Grönert, Alexander, 'Francesco Milizia: Principi di architettura civile', in Bernd Evers and Christof Thoenes, eds, *Architectural Theory: From the Renaissance to the Present* (London: Taschen, 2003), pp. 184-87
- Gross, Hanns, *Rome in the Age of Enlightenment: The Post-Tridentine Syndrome and the Ancient Regime* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990)
- Grosso, Rosalba, and Antonella Aquilina, eds, *Catalogo collettivo dei periodici di archeologia e storia dell'arte* (Rome: Biblioteca dell'Istituto Nazionale di Arceologia e Storia dell'Arte, 1992)
- Guidi, Alessandro, 'Nationalism without a nation: the Italian case', in Margarita Díaz-Andreu and Timothy Champion, eds, *Nationalism and Archaeology in Europe* (London: UCL Press, 1996), pp. 108-18
- Güthenke, Constanze, *Placing modern Greece: the dynamics of Roman Hellenism, 1700-1840* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008)
- Harloe, Katherine, *Winckelmann and the Invention of Antiquity: History and Aesthetics in the Age of Altertumswissenschaft* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013)
- Harris, Judith, *Pompeii Awakened: A Story of Rediscovery*, 2nd edn (London: I. B. Tauris, 2015)
- Haskell, Francis, 'Cicognara eretico', in Giuliana Mazzi, ed., *Giuseppe Jappelli e il suo tempo*, 2 vols (Padova: Liviana, 1982), 1, pp. 217-25
- 'Leopoldo Cicognara e la cultura del neoclassicismo', in Elena Bassi and others, eds, *Venezia nell'età di Canova 1780-1830* (Venice: Alfieri, 1978), pp. 319-20
- Haskell, Francis, and Nicholas Penny, *Taste and the Antique: The Lure of Classical Sculpture, 1500-1900* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981)
- Hatfield, Henry Caraway, *Winckelmann and his German critics, 1755-1781* (New York: King's Crown Press, 1943)
- Heres, Gerald, 'Winckelmann, Bernini, Bellori: Betrachtungen zur "Nachahmung der Alten"', *Forschungen und Berichte: Staatliche Museen zu Berlin*, 19 (1979), 9-16
- Herold, J. Christopher, *The Age of Napoleon* (London: Phoenix, 2002)
- Heywood, Andrew, *Global Politics*, 2nd edn (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014)
- Holzer, Angela Cornelia, *Rehabilitationen Roms: Die römische Antike in der deutschen Kultur zwischen Winckelmann und Niebuhr* (Heidelberg: Winter, 2013)
- Honour, Hugh, *Neo-Classicism* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968)
- Howard, Seymour, 'Albani, Winckelmann and Cavaceppi: The Transition from Amateur to Professional Antiquarianism', *Journal of the History of Collections*, 4.1 (1992), 27-38

- Irwin, David, 'Introduction', in *Winckelmann: Writings on Art*, ed. by David Irwin (London: Phaidon, 1972), pp. 3-57
- Jemolo, Viviana, 'Biondi, Luigi', in *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, 88 vols (Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 1960-2017), x (1968), pp. 534-35
- Jokilehto, Jukka, 'A History of Architectural Conservation: The Contribution of English, French, German and Italian Thought towards an International Approach to the Conservation of Cultural Property' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of York, 1986)
<http://www.iccrom.org/ifrcdn/pdf/ICCROM_05_HistoryofConservation00_en.pdf> [accessed 18 September 2017]
- Juneja, Monica, 'Imaging the Revolution: Gender and Iconography in French Political Prints', *Studies in History*, 12 (1996), 1-65
- Junod, Philippe, 'Art Criticism', in Michael Delon, ed., *Encyclopedia of the Enlightenment* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013), pp. 110-15
- Justi, Carl, *Winckelmann und seine Zeitgenossen*, 2nd edn, 3 vols (Leipzig, Vogel, 1898)
- Kantor-Kazovsky, Lola, *Piranesi as Interpreter of Roman Architecture and the Origins of his Intellectual World* (Florence: L. S. Olschki, 2006)
- Killinger, Charles L., *The History of Italy* (Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press, 2002)
- Kohn, Hans, *The Idea of Nationalism: A Study in its Origins and Background* (New Brunswick: Transaction, 2005)
- Körner, Axel, *Politics of Culture in Liberal Italy: From Unification to Fascism* (London: Routledge, 2009)
- Kultermann, Udo, *The History of Art History* (New York: Abaris Books, 1993)
- Kunze, Max, ed., *Die Etrusker: Die Entdeckung ihrer Kunst seit Winckelmann* (Ruhpolding: Rutzen, 2009)
- ed., *Johann Joachim Winckelmann. Neue Forschungen. Eine Aufsatzsammlung* (Stendal: Winckelmann Gesellschaft, 1990)
- "'Winckelmann – Ein Fanatiker der Alten" (Diderot)', in Philippe Boutry, ed., *La Grecia antica: mito e simbolo per l'età della grande rivoluzione, genesi e crisi di un modello nella cultura del Settecento* (Milan: Guerini, 1991), pp. 173-81
- Lees-Milne, James, *The Age of Adam* (London: B.T. Batsford, 1947)
- Leoussi, Athena A., 'Making Nations in the Image of Greece: Classical Greek Conceptions of the Body in the Construction of National Identity in Nineteenth-Century England, France, and Germany', in Thorsten Fögen and Richard Warren, eds, *Graeco-Roman Antiquity and the Idea of Nationalism in the 19th Century* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2016), pp. 45-70
- Leppmann, Wolfgang, *Winckelmann* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1971)
- LeVine, Robert A., and Donald T. Campbell, *Ethnocentrism: Theories of Conflict, Ethnic Attitudes, and Group Behaviour* (London: Wiley, 1972)
- Lingo, Estelle Cecile, *François Duquesnoy and the Greek Ideal* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007)

Ludovici, Sergio Samek, 'Cicognara, Leopoldo', in Almerico Ribera, ed., *Enciclopedia biografica e bibliografica italiana*, 21 vols (Rome: Tosi, 1936-47), iv: *Serie 4: storici, teorici e critici delle arti figurative, 1800-1940* (1942), pp. 103-06

Lukoschik, Rita Unfer, 'Prolegomeni allo studio del transfer culturale tra Italia e Germania nelle riviste del settecento italiano', in Giulia Cantarutti and others, eds, *Il settecento tedesco in Italia: Gli italiani e l'immagine della cultura tedesca nel XVIII secolo* (Bologna: Mulino, 2001), pp. 317-91

Luzzi, Joseph, *Romantic Europe and the Ghost of Italy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008)

——— 'The Task of Italian Romanticism: Literary Form and Polemical Response', in Paul Hamilton, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of European Romanticism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), pp. 377-89

Manzella, Ivan di Stefano, 'Bartolomeo Borghesi e Luigi Biondi: appunti di una ricerca preliminare', in Alda Calbi, ed., *Bartolomeo Borghesi, scienza e libertà: atti del colloquio internazionale AIEGL (1981)* (Bologna: Pàtron, 1982), pp. 429-60

Marchand, Suzanne L., *Down from Olympus: Archaeology and Philhellenism in Germany, 1750-1970* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996)

Marchetti, Ada Gigli, and others, eds, *Editori italiani dell'Ottocento: Repertorio*, 2 vols (Milan: FrancoAngeli, 2004)

Marco Manfredi, 'Odescalchi, Pietro', in *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, 88 vols (Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 1960-2017), LXXIX (2013), pp. 154-56

Marin, Chiara, *La voce della critica: la pubblicazione delle arti nella stampa lombardo-veneta (1800-1848)* (Treviso: Canova, 2011)

——— 'Schede delle riviste', in Franco Bernabei and Chiara Marin, eds, *Critica d'arte nelle riviste lombardo-venete 1820-1860* (Treviso: Canova, 2007)

Marmor, Max, and Alex Ross, *Guide to the Literature of Art History 2* (Chicago: American Library Association, 2005)

Marolda, Paolo, 'Milizia, Winckelmann e le "immagini spirituali"', *La Rassegna della letteratura Italiana*, 3 (1986), 537-45

Marvin, Miranda, *The Language of the Muses: The Dialogue between Roman and Greek sculpture* (LA: J. Paul Getty Museum, 2008)

Mascioli, Frederick, 'Anti-Roman and Pro-Italic Sentiment in Italian Historiography', *Romantic Review*, 33.4 (1942), 366-84

Materassi, Luisa, 'Girolamo Zulian: the collection, the man and his world', in Martin Henig, ed., *Roman Art, Religion and Society: New Studies from the Roman Art Seminar, Oxford 2005* (Oxford: Archaeopress, 2006), pp. 141-94

Mattusch, Carol C., 'Introduction', in Johann J. Winckelmann, *Letter and Report on the Discoveries at Herculaneum*, trans. by Carol C. Mattusch (LA: Getty Publications, 2011), pp. 1-61

McCarthy, Conor, *The Cambridge Introduction to Edward Said* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010)

- Meriggi, Marco, 'Italy', in Otto Dann and John Dinwiddy, eds, *Nationalism in the Age of the French Revolution* (London: Hambledon, 1988), pp. 199-212
- Meyer, Susanne Adina, "'Briefe aus Rom". La produzione artistica romana tra fine Settecento e inizio Ottocento nelle riviste tedesche', in Giulia Cantarutti e Stefano Ferrari, eds, *Paesaggi europei del Neoclassicismo* (Bologna: Mulino, 2007), pp. 247-71
- "'Una gara lodevole": Il sistema espositivo a Roma al tempo di Pio VI', *Roma moderna e contemporanea*, 10.1-2 (2002), 91-112
- 'Il giudizio del pubblico e il ruolo dei critici: il panorama europeo e il caso romano', in Anna Maria Rao and Alberto Postigliola, eds, *Il settecento negli studi italiani: problemi e prospettive* (Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 2010), pp. 323-37
- Mocenigo, Filippo N., *Della letteratura veneziana del secolo XIX* (Venice: L. Merlo, 1901)
- Molinari, Olga Majolo, *La stampa periodica romana dell'Ottocento*, 2 vols (Rome: Istituto di studi romani, 1963)
- Momigliano, Arnaldo, 'Tesi per una discussione sugli studi classici in Italia e i loro problemi metodici', in *Terzo contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico*, 2 vols (Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1966), I, pp. 803-05
- Morolli, Gabriele, *"Vetus Etruria": il mito degli etruschi nella letteratura architettonica nell'arte e nella cultura da Vitruvio a Winckelmann* (Florence: Alinea, 1985)
- Morrison, Jeffrey, *Winckelmann and the Notion of Aesthetic Education* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996)
- Mouritsen, Henrik, 'Modern nations and ancient models: Italy and Greece compared', in David Ricks and Roderick Beaton, eds, *The Making of Modern Greece: Nationalism, Romanticism, and the Uses of the Past, 1797-1896* (London: Ashgate, 2009), pp. 43-49
- Murray, Peter, 'Art and Architecture', in A. Goodwin, ed., *The New Cambridge Modern History*, 14 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957-79), VIII (1965), pp. 96-114
- Namowicz, Tadeusz, *Die aufklärerische Utopie: Rezeption der Griechenauffassung J. J. Winckelmans um 1800 in Deutschland und Polen* (Warsaw: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 1978)
- Natali, Giulio, 'Il Don Chisciotte del bello ideale', in *Idee, costumi, uomini del Settecento: studi e saggi letterari* (Turin: Società tipografico-editrice nazionale, 1926), pp. 341-56
- *Il Settecento*, 5th edn, 2 vols (Milan: Vallardi, 1960)
- 'Il Varrone del secolo XVIII', in *Idee, costumi, uomini del Settecento: studi e saggi letterari* (Turin: Società tipografico-editrice nazionale, 1926), pp. 363-86
- Newby, Zahra, 'Art History and Aesthetics', in Edward Bispham and others, eds, *Edinburgh Companion to Ancient Greece and Rome* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006), pp. 49-56
- Nicholls, David, *Napoleon: A Biographical Companion* (California: ABC-CLIO, 1999)
- Noether, Emiliana Pasca, *Seeds of Italian Nationalism, 1700-1815* (New York: AMS, 1969)
- Nogara, Bartolomeo, 'L'abate Luigi Lanzi e l'opera sua negli studi etruscologici e di storia dell'arte' (unpublished thesis, Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia, 1910)

- North, John Harry, *Winckelmann's 'Philosophy of Art': A Prelude to German Classicism* (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars, 2012)
- Olson, Roberta, 'Art for a new audience in the Risorgimento: a meditation', *Journal of Modern Italian Studies*, 18.2 (2013), 211-24
- O'Neal, William B., 'Francesco Milizia, 1725-1798', *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, 13 (1954), 12-15
- Orrells, Daniel, 'Burying and Excavating Winckelmann's *History of Art*', *Classical Reception Journal*, 3.2 (2011), 166-88
- Ottonello, Franco, *Cultura filosofica nella stampa periodica dell'Italia meridionale della prima metà dell'Ottocento*, 2 vols (Milan: Marzorati, 1977-80), I (1977)
- Pappalardo, Rosa, 'Le idee estetiche di Leopoldo Cicognara', *Sicilorum Gymnasium*, 5 (1954), 256-63
- Parise, Nicola, 'Cardinali, Clemente', in *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, 88 vols (Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 1960-2017), XIX (1976), pp. 782-84
- Pasquali, Susanna, 'Francesco Milizia a Roma, 1761-1798', in F. Mazzocca and G. Venturi, eds, *Antonio Canova: la cultura figurativa e letteraria dei grandi centri italiani*, 1, *Venezia e Roma* (Bassano del Grappa: Istituto di ricerca per gli studi su Canova e il neoclassicismo, 2005), pp. 89-101
- Pearson, Raymond, *The Longman Companion to European Nationalism, 1789-1920* (Oxford: Routledge, 2014)
- Pelzel, Thomas, 'Winckelmann, Mengs and Casanova: A Reappraisal of a Famous Eighteenth-Century Forgery', *The Art Bulletin*, 54.3 (1972), 300-15
- Perini, Giovanna, 'Nuove fonti per la *Kunstliteratur* settecentesca in Italia: I giornali letterari', *Annali della scuola normale superiore di Pisa*, 14.2 (1984), 797-827
- Petridou, Vassiliki, 'Piranèse et Winckelmann: Un conflit théorique pour la primauté dans l'art (1755-1765)', in Y. Tsiomis, ed., *Athènes Ville Capitale* (Athens: Ministère de la culture-caisse des fonds archéologique, 1985), pp. 44-46
- Piccioni, Luigi, 'Introduzione', in Luigi Piccioni, ed., *Giornalismo letterario del Settecento* (Turin: Unione, 1949), pp. 9-19
- Pignatelli, Giuseppe, 'Cerutti, Giacinto', in *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, 88 vols (Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 1960-2017), XXIV (1980), pp. 67-70
- Pinto, John A., *Speaking Ruins: Piranesi, Architects, and Antiquity in Eighteenth-Century Rome* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2012)
- Pinto, Sandra, 'La promozione delle arti negli Stati italiani dall'età delle riforme all'Unità', in Giulio Bollati and others, eds, *Storia dell'arte italiana*, 12 vols (Turin: Einaudi, 1979-1983), VI.2 (1982), pp. 791-1079
- Pommier, Édouard, *Winckelmann, inventeur de l'histoire de l'art* (Paris: Gallimard, 2003)
- 'Winckelmann et la vision de l'Antiquité classique dans la France des Lumières et de la Révolution', *Revue de l'art*, 83 (1989), 9-20

- Potts, Alex, 'Introduction', in Johann J. Winckelmann, *The History of the Art of Antiquity*, trans. by Harry Francis Mallgrave (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2006), pp. 1-53
- *Flesh and the Ideal: Winckelmann and the Origins of Art History* (London: Yale University Press, 1994)
- 'Winckelmann's *History of Art* in its Eighteenth-Century Context' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Warburg Institute, University of London, 1978)
- Previtali, Giovanni, *La fortuna dei primitivi: Dal Vasari ai neoclassici* (Turin: Einaudi, 1964)
- Preziosi, Donald, *The Art of Art History: A Critical Anthology*, 2nd edn (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009)
- Prozzillo, Italo, *Francesco Milizia: teorico e storico dell'architettura* (Naples: Guida, 1971)
- Racioppi, Pier Paolo, 'Guattani, Giuseppe Antonio', in *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, 88 vols (Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 1960-2017), lx (2003), pp. 507-11
- Riall, Lucy, *The Italian Risorgimento: State, Society and National Unification* (London: Routledge, 1994)
- Ricuperati, Giuseppe, 'I giornali italiani del XVIII secolo: Studi e ipotesi di ricerca', *Studi Storici*, 25.2 (1984), 279-303
- 'Giornali nell'Italia dell'"ancien régime"', in V. Castronovo and T. Tranfaglia, eds, *La stampa italiana dal Cinquecento all'Ottocento* (Rome: Laterza, 1976), pp. 67-372
- 'Periodici eruditi, riviste e giornali di varia umanità dalle origini a metà Ottocento', in Alberto Asor Rosa, ed., *Letteratura italiana*, 8 vols (Turin: Einaudi, 1982-2000), I (1982), pp. 921-43
- 'Politica, cultura e religione nei giornali italiani del '700', in Mario Rosa, ed., *Cattolicesimo e lumi nel settecento italiano* (Rome: Herder, 1981), pp. 49-76
- Ridley, Ronald T., *The Eagle and the Spade: The Archaeology of Rome during the Napoleonic Era 1809-1814* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992)
- 'Fea, Carlo', in *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, 88 vols (Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 1960-2017), xlv (1995), pp. 518-28
- *The Pope's Archaeologist: The Life and Times of Carlo Fea* (Rome: Quasar, 2000)
- Rolfi-Ozvald, Serenella, *Agli amatori delle belle arti. Gli autori: il laboratorio dei periodici a Roma tra Settecento e Ottocento* (Rome: Campisano, 2012)
- 'Note sulle fonti ufficiose e ufficiali per la storia della circolazione delle opere e degli artisti (1787-1844)', in Giovanna Capitelli and others, eds, *Roma fuori di Roma: l'esportazione dell'arte moderna da Pio VI all'Unità, 1775-1870* (Rome: Campisano, 2012), pp. 31-49
- Romanelli, Giandomenico, 'Cicognara, Francesco Leopoldo', in *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, 88 vols (Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 1960-2017), xxv (1981), pp. 421-28
- 'Leopoldo Cicognara e la politica delle belle arti', in Giulio Carlo Argan and others, eds, *Canova, Cicognara, Foscolo* (Venice: Arsenale, 1979), pp. 35-47

- Roncalli, Francesco, 'Gli etruschi nella cultura italiana dell'Ottocento', in Leandro Polverini, ed., *Lo studio storico del mondo antico nella cultura italiana dell'Ottocento* (Naples: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, 1993), pp. 361-68
- Roscoe, Thomas, 'Biographical Notice of the Author', in Luigi Lanzi, *Luigi Lanzi: The History of Painting in Italy from the Period of the Revival of the Fine Arts to the End of the Eighteenth Century*, trans. by Thomas Roscoe, 3rd edn, 3 vols (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1852), I, pp. 1-9
- Rossetti de Scander, Domenico, *Il sepolcro di Winckelmann in Trieste* (Venice: Alvisopoli, 1823)
- Rossi Pinelli, Orietta, 'Carlo Fea e il chirografo del 1802: cronaca, giudiziaria e non, delle prime battaglie per la tutela delle "Belle Arti"', *Ricerche di storia dell'arte*, 8 (1978-79), 27-41
- Rossi, Massimiliano, *Le fila del tempo: il sistema storico di Luigi Lanzi* (Florence: L.S. Olschki, 2006)
- Rotondi, Claudia, "'Rendere facili le verità utili": Dalla Società patriottica all'Istituto lombardo (1776-1859)', in Massimo M. Augello and Marco E. L. Guidi, eds, *Associazionismo economico e diffusione dell'economia politica nell'Italia dell'Ottocento: Dalle società economico-agrarie alle associazioni di economisti*, 2 vols (Milan: FrancoAngeli, 2000), I, pp. 39-62
- Rudolph, Stella, *Giuseppe Tambroni e lo stato delle belle arti in Roma nel 1814* (Rome: Istituto di Studi Romani, 1982)
- Rudowski, Victor Anthony, 'Lessing contra Winckelmann', *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 44 (1986), 235-43
- Ruffini, F. P., *Ricordo di Leopoldo Cicognara* (Modena: Carlo Vincenzi, 1875)
- Russo, Marco, *Francesco Milizia e il teatro del suo tempo: architettura, musica, scena, acustica* (Trento: Università degli Studi di Trento, 2011)
- Said, Edward W., *Culture & Imperialism*, 2nd edn (London: Vintage, 1994)
- *Orientalism*, 5th edn (London: Penguin, 2003)
- Salmeri, Giovanni, 'L'antiquaria italiana dell'Ottocento', in Leandro Polverini, ed., *Lo studio storico del mondo antico nella cultura italiana dell'Ottocento* (Naples: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, 1993), pp. 267-98
- Sandys, John Edwin, *A History of Classical Scholarship: The Eighteenth Century in Germany and the Nineteenth Century in Europe and the United States of America*, 3 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010)
- Schleiermacher, Friedrich, 'On the Different Methods of Translating', trans. by Susan Bernofsky, in Lawrence Venuti, ed., *The Translations Studies Reader*, 3rd edn (Oxford: Routledge, 2012), pp. 43-63
- Schlosser, Julius von, *La letteratura artistica: manuale delle fonti della storia dell'arte moderna*, ed. by Otto Kurz, trans. by Filippo Rossi (Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1956)
- *Sull'antica storiografia italiana dell'arte*, ed. by Sergio Bettini, trans. by Maria Ortiz (Vicenza: Neri Pozza, 1969)
- Schulz, Arthur, 'Winckelmann in Italien', in *Winckelmann und seine Welt* (Berlin: Akademie, 1962), pp. 51-89

- Scianatico, Giovanna, 'Arte e natura nel *Dizionario di Francesco Milizia*', in Mariella Basile Bonsante and Grazia Distaso, eds, *Francesco Milizia e la cultura del Settecento* (Galatina: Congedo, 2002), pp. 73-83
- *Neoclassico* (Rome: Marzorati, 2000)
- Scotti, Mario, 'Betti, Salvatore', in *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, 88 vols (Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 1960-2017), ix (1967), pp. 724-26
- Settis, Salvatore, 'Da Centro a periferia: l'archeologia degli italiani nel secolo XIX', in Leandro Polverini, ed., *Lo studio storico del mondo antico nella cultura italiana dell'Ottocento* (Naples: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, 1993), pp. 301-34
- Sichtermann, Hellmut, 'Winckelmann in Italien', in Thomas W. Gaehtgens, ed., *Johann Joachim Winckelmann, 1717-1768* (Hamburg: Meiner, 1986), pp. 121-60
- Smith, Anthony D., 'Nationalism', in Athena S. Leoussi, ed., *Encyclopaedia of Nationalism* (London: Transaction, 2001), pp. 222-25
- *Nationalism: Theory, Ideology, History* (Cambridge: Polity, 2010)
- Snyder, Louis L., *Encyclopaedia of Nationalism* (London: St James Press, 1990)
- Sohm, Philip, *The Artist Grows Old: The Aging of Art and Artists in Italy, 1500-1800* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007)
- Sorenson, Lee, 'Guattani, Giuseppe Antonio', in *Dictionary of Art Historians* <<https://dictionaryofarthistorians.org/guattanig.htm>> [accessed 16 February 2017]
- Sorensen, Lee, 'Milizia, Francesco', in *Dictionary of Art Historians* <www.dictionaryofarthistorians.org/miliziaf.htm> [accessed 13 September 2017]
- Soussloff, Catherine M., *The Absolute Artist: The Historiography of a Concept* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997)
- Spadoni, Orinto L., *The Etruscans: An Historical and Critical Notice of the Origin, Development and Civilization of the Early Italian Race* (Rome: L. Piale, 1887)
- Stern, Ralph, 'Winckelmann, Piranesi and the Graeco-Roman Controversies: A late exchange in the "Querelle des anciens et des modernes"', *Architectura*, 33 (2003), 62-94
- Stiebing Jr., William H., *Uncovering the Past: A History of Archaeology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994)
- Stoll, Heinrich Alexander, *Winckelmann: seine Verleger und seine Drucker* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1960)
- Stolley, Kathy, *The Basics of Sociology* (Connecticut: Greenwood, 2005)
- Sumner, William G., *Folkways: A Study of the Sociological Importance of Usages, Manners, Customs, Mores, and Morals* (New York: Mentor, 1960)
- Sweet, Rosemary, *Cities and the Grand Tour: The British in Italy c.1690-1820* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012)
- Taylor, Joshua C., 'Francesco Milizia: The Art of Seeing in the Fine Arts of Design According to the Principles of Sulzer and Mengs (1781)', in Joshua C. Taylor, ed., *Nineteenth-Century Theories of Art* (London: University of California Press, 1987), pp. 27-40

- Tea, E., 'Romanità in Carlo Fea', *Roma*, 15 (1937), 269-91
- Tortarolo, Edoardo, 'Un critico italiano di Winckelmann: Giovanni Battista Casanova', in Giulia Cantarutti and others, eds, *Il settecento tedesco: Gli italiani e l'immagine della cultura tedesca nel XVIII secolo* (Bologna: Mulino, 2001), pp. 393-416
- Treves, Piero, 'Introduzione', in Piero Treves, ed., *Lo studio dell'antichità classica nell'Ottocento* (Milan: Ricciardi, 1962), pp. vii-xl
- Ulivi, Ferruccio, 'Francesco Milizia scrittore', *Paragone*, 31 (1952), 3-18
- *Settecento neoclassico* (Pisa: Nistri-Lischi, 1957)
- Valsecchi, Franco, 'Nation, Nationalität, Nationalismus im Italienischen Denken', *Historische Zeitschrift*, 210 (1970), 14-33
- Varouxakis, Georgios, 'Patriotism', in Athena S. Leoussi, ed., *Encyclopaedia of Nationalism* (London: Transaction, 2001), pp. 239-42
- Venturelli, Aldo, 'I periodici e la diffusione della cultura tedesca nel settecento in Italia', in Alberto Postigliola, ed., *Periodici italiani d'antico regime* (Rome: Società italiana di studi sul secolo XVIII, 1986), pp. 81-87
- Venturi, Lionello, *Il gusto dei primitivi* (Turin: Einaudi, 1972)
- *Storia della critica d'arte* (Turin: Einaudi, 1974)
- Venuti, Lawrence, 'Local Contingencies: Translation and National Identities', in Sandra Bermann and Michael Wood, eds, *Nation, Language, and the Ethics of Translation* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005), pp. 177-202
- 'Translation, Community, Utopia', in Lawrence Venuti, ed., *The Translations Studies Reader*, 3rd edn (Oxford: Routledge, 2012), 468-88
- *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*, 2nd edn (Abingdon: Routledge, 2008)
- Viroli, Maurizio, *For Love of Country: An Essay on Patriotism and Nationalism* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995)
- Vivanti, Corrado, 'Arco, Giovanni Battista Gherardo d', in *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, 88 vols (Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 1960-2017), III (1961), pp. 789-93
- *Le campagne del Mantovano nell'età delle riforme* (Milan: Feltrinelli, 1959)
- Wangenheim, Wolfgang von, *Der verworfene Stein: Winckelmanns Leben* (Berlin: Matthes & Seitz, 2005)
- Wiebenson, Dora, *Sources of Greek Revival Architecture* (London: A. Zwemmer, 1969)
- Will, Frederic, *Intelligible Beauty in Aesthetic Thought: From Winckelmann to Victor Cousin* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1958)
- Wilton-Ely, John, 'The Art of Polemic: Piranesi and the Graeco-Roman Controversy', in Philippe Boutry, ed., *La Grecia antica: mito e simbolo per l'età della grande rivoluzione: genesi e crisi di un modello nella cultura del Settecento* (Milan: Guerini, 1991), pp. 121-30
- 'Editorial notes', in John Wilton-Ely and others, eds, *Observations on the Letter of Monsieur Mariette: With Opinions on Architecture, and a Preface to a New Treatise on the*

Introduction and Progress of the Fine Arts in Europe in Ancient Times (LA: Getty Institute, 2002), pp. 142-53

—— ‘Giovanni Battista Piranesi’, in Cara D. Denison and others, eds, *Exploring Rome: Piranesi and his Contemporaries: Catalogue* (London: MIT Press, 1993), pp. xxv-xxxii

—— ‘Introduction’, in John Wilton-Ely, ed., *The Polemical Works of Piranesi, Rome 1757, 1761, 1765, 1769* (Farnborough, Hants: Gregg, 1972), pp. v-ix

—— ‘Introduction’, in John Wilton-Ely and others, eds, *Observations on the Letter of Monsieur Mariette: With Opinions on Architecture, and a Preface to a New Treatise on the Introduction and Progress of the Fine Arts in Europe in Ancient Times* (LA: Getty Institute, 2002), pp. 1-86

—— *The Mind and Art of Giovanni Battista Piranesi* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1978)

—— *Piranesi, Paestum & Soane* (London: Prestel, 2013)

—— ‘Vision and Design: Piranesi’s “Fantasia” and the Graeco-Roman Controversy’, in Georges Brunel, ed., *Piranèse et les Français: colloque tenu à la Villa Médicis, 12-14 Mai 1976* (Rome: Elefante, 1978), pp. 528-45

Wittkower, Rudolf, ‘Piranesi e il gusto egiziano’, in Vittore Branca, ed., *Sensibilità e razionalità nel Settecento*, 2 vols (Florence: Sansoni, 1967), II, pp. 659-74

—— ‘Piranesi’s Architectural Creed’, in Rudolf Wittkower, ed., *Studies in the Italian Baroque* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1975), pp. 236-46

—— ‘Piranesi’s “Parere su l’architettura”’, *Journal of the Warburg Institute*, 2 (1938), 147-58

Zampa, Giorgio, ‘Prefazione’, in Giorgio Zampa, ed., *Johann Joachim Winckelmann: Lettere Italiane* (Milan: Feltrinelli, 1961), pp. ix-il

Zampetti, Pietro, ‘Francesco Milizia uomo e critico d’arte’, in Vittore Branca, ed., *Sensibilità e razionalità nel Settecento*, 2 vols (Florence: Sansoni, 1967), II, pp. 675-90