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Abstract

DEVELOPING ITALY: PHOTOGRAPHY AND NATIONAL IDENTITY DURING THE RISORGIMENTO, 1839-1859

by

Beth Saunders

Adviser: Maria Antonella Pelizzari

The introduction of photography to Italy in 1839 coincided with the nationalist movement known as the Risorgimento, which began with a series of Constitutionalist uprisings in 1820 and culminated in political Unification in 1861. Photography thus developed alongside a country in the making, and the project of building a nation was historically entwined with the new technology. This dissertation analyzes the impact of photography on the political movement that made Unification possible, emphasizing how early photographers engaged and expanded upon the iconographic traditions of prints, paintings, and literature in order to envision the Italian nation. By depicting politically charged monuments, sites, and figures in modern and life-like images that circulated among local and international audiences, photography made a significant contribution to constructing and disseminating a national discourse during the Risorgimento.

Framing this history between the invention of photography in 1839 and the Second War of Independence in 1859, I examine the production and reception of photography among Italy’s scientific communities, publishing industry, and artistic circles in order to demonstrate how those cultural networks seized upon the medium as a potential vehicle for propagating nationalist political goals. Initially, the subjects of early photographs repeated the iconography of Italy that had previously been established in prints and paintings, such as historically significant monuments, distinctive landscapes, and peasant figures. I argue, however, that during the
Risorgimento, this iconography served as the foundation of a shared Italian identity, and demonstrate how early photographers added to it a new repertoire of nationalist images comprised of Risorgimento battle scenes and living allegories in the form of staged patriotic tableaux. Whereas previous studies of photography and the Risorgimento have focused primarily on the images of political heroes that circulated after the Second War of Independence in 1859, this thesis is the first to examine critically the contribution of early photographers to the development of a shared identity before that important date.

In order to elucidate the cultural significance that photography held during the Risorgimento, I present case studies of several representative figures: the botanist Antonio Bertoloni (1775-1869), the physicists Macedonio Melloni (1798-1854) and Gaetano Fazzini (1806-1878), and the optician Giovanni Battista Amici (1786-1863), who, through transregional and transnational scientific networks, spread the earliest information about the invention of photography, arguing for its utility to the economic progress of Italy; the print publisher Ferdinando Artaria (1781-1843), who issued an early commercial series of aquatints based on daguerreotypes that portrayed Milan as an exemplary modern Italian city; the pioneering photographer Stefano Lecchi (1804-1863?) whose documentation of the aftermath of the defense of the Roman Republic in 1849 contributed to the personal commemoration of the Risorgimento; the painter and photographer Giacomo Caneva (1813-65) whose staged peasant studies and allegorical scenes resonated with the development of a national art within Italy; and the editor, engraver, and photographer Luigi Sacchi (1805-61) who photographed throughout the Italian peninsula, depicting Italy’s monuments as a source of shared history, and thus national identity.

Through these case studies, I engage with the influential ideas of the historian Alberto Mario Banti, who argues that during the Risorgimento a canon of popular literature mobilized Italy’s
shared past through similar characters, motifs, and narratives that created recognizable cultural symbols. My thesis is that the recognition of a collective experience through photographs made a significant contribution to shaping the nation.
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INTRODUCTION

Developing Italy

On October 8, 1839 Enrico Jest, an optician and mechanic at the Gabinetto di fisica of the Regia Università di Torino, publically demonstrated the new invention of the daguerreotype a mere two months after its inventor, the French artist Louis-Jacques-Mandé Daguerre, made knowledge of the process public. Jest had constructed his own camera and, among his early photographic records, he framed the dome of a landmark building in Turin, the Gran Madre di Dio, rising up against rolling Alpine foothills (Figure 0.1). Reporting on this event, the newspaper Gazzetta Piemontese emphatically noted, “…the French daguerreotype is already rendered Italian by him, and perhaps in some aspects superior to the French version…”1 The rhetoric of this statement intentionally mirrored the nationalist subject of Jest’s daguerreotype.

Constructed between 1818 and 1831, the Gran Madre di Dio was designed by the architect Ferdinando Bonsignore (1767-1843) in neoclassical style, and this Pantheon-inspired edifice was commissioned by the restored Savoy monarchy in 1814 in order to celebrate the departure of Napoleon from Italy.2 The inscription across the façade’s entablature, visible in the highly detailed daguerreotype, reads “ORDO POPULUSQUE TAURINUS OB ADVENTUM REGIS” (“By the order of public decree, dedicated to the return of the king.”) The structure thus symbolized the expulsion of foreign rule and a return to order that united civic and religious life in the capital of the Kingdom of Sardinia. Jest’s public demonstration of the daguerreotype, a

French invention rendered Italian, relied upon the symbolic associations of the Gran Madre di Dio in order to confer a patriotic message (and perhaps ingratiate the photographer to the Savoy monarch.) As the earliest surviving photograph made in Italy, this daguerreotype thus foregrounded the importance of nationalism to the medium’s early history.

Within the Italian peninsula, the introduction of photography coincided with the nationalist movement known as the Risorgimento, which began with a series of Constitutionalist uprisings in 1820 and culminated in Italy’s political Unification in 1861. Thus photography developed alongside a country in the making, and the project of building a new nation was historically entwined with the new technology. This dissertation argues that from the moment of its introduction to Italy, photography, working in conjunction with other media, including illustrated magazines, prints, and painting, made a significant contribution to the Risorgimento by constructing and disseminating images that inspired devotion to the national cause. Framing this history between the invention of photography in 1839 and the Second War of Independence in 1859, I examine photography’s production and reception among Italy’s scientific communities, publishing industry, and artistic circles in order to demonstrate how those cultural networks seized upon photography as a potential vehicle for propagating nationalist political goals.

In Italy, photographs initially circulated primarily among an elite audience through one-of-a-kind daguerreotype plates and private albums, but early efforts to print daguerreotypes in illustrated magazines and commercial series formed the basis of a market for photography, which gained increasing momentum in the era of paper negatives (roughly 1845 to 1855). Initially, the subjects of these photographs repeated the iconography of Italy that had previously been established in prints and paintings, which included historically significant monuments, distinctive landscapes, and peasant figures. During the Risorgimento, however, this iconography
served as the foundation of a typology of the nation, and early photographers added to it a new repertoire of nationalist images comprised of Risorgimento battle scenes and living allegories in the form of staged patriotic tableaux. Whereas previous studies of photography and the Risorgimento have focused primarily on the images of political heroes that circulated after the Second War of Independence in 1859, this thesis is the first to examine critically how photography articulated and contributed to the development of a shared identity before that important date – an identity which was essential to the struggle for an autonomous Italian nation.

News of the invention of photography first spread through the scientific community. Like their counterparts in France and Great Britain, Italy’s scientists viewed photography as a research tool and a modern means of visual communication that held great potential for publicizing new discoveries. Furthermore, photography offered a practical tool whose application might unite the peninsula’s disparate regions under the banner of economic progress and put Italy on the same footing as Europe’s more industrialized nations. The year 1839 marked not only the public announcement of the invention of photography, but also the inaugural Congress of Italian Scientists, an annual meeting (held between 1839 and 1847) that brought together scientists from throughout the peninsula to share research and promote industrial advancement. On this occasion, leading scientists took part in a demonstration of the daguerreotype, an event that positioned the new medium as an aid to scientific, and thus economic, progress within Italy.

Further confirming the impact of photography among Italy’s scientific community, many of the first interlocutors and experimenters on the peninsula were scientists who maintained direct contact with the British inventor of photography, William Henry Fox Talbot, and with French scientists who were part of Daguerre’s inner circle. The physicists Macedonio Melloni (1798-1854) and Gaetano Fazzini (1806-1878), the botanist Antonio Bertoloni (1775-1869), and
the optician Giovanni Battista Amici (1786-1863), working in Naples, Bologna, and Florence, respectively, were instrumental in relaying the practical information about photographic processes that made the earliest experiments in Italy possible. These first examples included daguerreotypes of sculptures, monuments, and views, which often survive only as engravings or lithographs made from the original daguerreotypes, as well as contact prints of plants that suggested the utility of photography for taxonomic classification. I argue that the goal of creating a visual taxonomy or typology of Italy’s geographic and cultural artifacts, which compelled the Italian scientific community’s experiments with photography, contributed to identifying and promoting national identity.

In order for photography to fulfill its promise as a vehicle of modern progress, its earliest practitioners understood that it needed to circulate widely. Within Italy, a well-established publishing industry quickly seized upon the commercial potential of photography by producing prints from daguerreotypes, which enabled these one-of-a-kind objects to be reproduced before the widespread adoption of paper negatives in the late 1840s eclipsed the genre. Significantly, many of Italy’s leading publishers maintained close ties to the scientific community from whom they received first-hand information about photography, and with whom they shared liberal political views and economic goals. In Milan, the publisher Ferdinando Artaria (1781-1843) produced one of the earliest series of prints from daguerreotypes in the history of photography. His *Vues d'Italie d'après le daguerréotype* (1840-1847) aimed beyond the traditional tourist market to depict not only canonical views, but also modern public works and sites of leisure that held a powerful civic resonance and even political significance among a “bourgeois public
sphere.” By capitalizing on the direct relationship of photography to reality, as well as the medium’s novelty, Artaria’s series modernized and thus revitalized the vedute genre, and offered a coherent vision of a culturally unified nation.

The revolutions of 1848-49 further transformed an emergent national iconography as artists began to engage overtly with political themes. Just as the scientific community quickly grasped the practical potential of photography, Italy’s artistic communities – working within both art academies and informal networks – understood photography as a significant discovery in image making. Although not initially considered an art in its own right, photography quickly became integrated with existing practices, and many painters and printmakers experimented with the new medium. In Italy, artists particularly favored paper negatives, which had the advantage of not only producing multiple positive prints, but could also easily be included among portfolios as the basis for paintings. Furthermore, the innate realism of photography provided a seemingly natural source material for art works that addressed contemporary life.

In this genre, the pioneering photographer Stefano Lecchi (1804-1863?), who trained as a painter and worked in southern France, Naples, and Rome, produced an unprecedented series of photographs documenting the aftermath of battles in defense of the Roman Republic. As the first war photographs in history, Lecchi’s reportage provided a visual resource for fellow artists, and inspired individual patriotism through circulation in private albums. Likewise, the painter and photographer Giacomo Caneva (1813-65), who was educated in Venice and relocated to Rome, produced photographs of the Roman Campagna, peasants, and narrative tableaux inspired by historical events that, I argue, served as allegories for Risorgimento politics. Caneva sold his
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photographs commercially, and they appealed particularly to Rome’s artistic community, including the young “painter-soldiers” that he counted as friends.

Notably, both Lecchi and Caneva exchanged information about photography with an international group of photographers who traveled to Italy in this period, including Reverend Calvert Richard Jones (1804-1877) and George Wilson Bridges (1788-1863), both colleagues of Talbot, as well as the so-called Roman School of Photography, which included French, British, and Italians within its informal circle. Rome’s photographic community was one of the most professional in Italy at this time, providing a wider network of commercial distribution and offering its members the opportunity to exhibit their photographs internationally, thus spreading Lecchi and Caneva’s innovative contributions to the new medium among a wider audience at home and abroad.

The Milanese editor, printmaker, and photographer Luigi Sacchi (1805-61) represents in a single figure the significance of Italy’s scientific, publishing, and artistic communities to the dual development of photography and nationalism from 1839 to 1859. After an early artistic training at the Accademia di Belle Arti di Brera, he worked closely with his brother Giuseppe and cousin Defendente Sacchi, supplying illustrations for their various journalistic endeavors. The family members were influential figures in the Milanese publishing industry, and Luigi Sacchi served as editor for the illustrated edition of Alessandro Manzoni’s landmark historical novel The Betrothed (1840), a key nationalist text. The Sacchis were also active participants in the Congress of Italian Scientists. Throughout their pursuits, they remained deeply committed to civic improvement and education. For example, Luigi Sacchi maintained close ties to the Brera Academy, promoting the use of photographs as pedagogical aids, and producing friendship portraits of “painter-soldiers” who had fought in the Roman Republic and Milan’s revolution, the
Cinque Giornate of 1848. Sacchi built upon the historicist iconography of Italy’s preeminent Romantic painter Francesco Hayez in order to infuse his photographs with civic resonance. Furthermore, Sacchi’s self-directed and self-published series of salt prints from calotype negatives, Monumenti, vedute e costumi d’Italia (1852-1855) represents a summa of Italian history viewed through the lens of its architectural monuments, both extending and exceeding Artaria’s earlier project through its scope and photographic veracity.

This dissertation analyzes the impact of photography on the political movement that made Unification possible, emphasizing how early photographers engaged and expanded upon the iconographic traditions of prints, paintings, and literature in order to envision the Italian nation. By depicting politically charged monuments, sites, and figures in modern and life-like images that circulated among local and international audiences, photography made a significant contribution to constructing and disseminating a national discourse during the Risorgimento.

The Risorgimento

At the time of photography’s introduction, the Italian peninsula remained divided by the political boundaries established during the 1816 Congress of Vienna, held after the fall of the Napoleonic Empire (Figure 0.2). In northern Italy, the Savoy monarchy controlled the Kingdom of Sardinia, which included the territories of Piedmont and Sardinia, while Lombardy-Venetia was part of the Austrian Hapsburg Empire. Spanish Bourbon monarchs ruled the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies in the south, and the Pope held Temporal Power in the central Papal States, which bordered the nearby Duchies of Tuscany, Lucca, Parma, and Modena. Both geographically and ideologically, the French Revolution and Napoleonic period had a significant impact on the
direction of Italian politics in the nineteenth century, and planted the seeds of the Risorgimento. The term *Risorgimento* means “revival” or “resurrection,” and intentionally echoes that of *Renaissance*, thus implying Italy’s return to greatness after a period characterized by foreign domination, economic stagnation, and perceived cultural decline. The Risorgimento encompassed a lengthy and complex struggle for Italy’s political autonomy, which even at the moment of political Unification never appeared a foregone conclusion.

In 1796, Napoleon invaded the Italian peninsula and established a series of Republics under French administration. Stimulated by the Enlightenment ideals of the French Revolution, the Italian Republics received constitutions, and citizens were granted equal protection under the law. Napoleon ended the Pope’s Temporal Power, confiscated church property for the state, suppressed religious orders, and established new state-administered institutions, such as schools, that had previously fallen under religious authority. By 1805, Napoleon brought nearly the entire peninsula under his control and declared himself monarch of the Kingdom of Italy. Thus, for the first time since the Roman Empire, all of Italy was politically united and provided with an efficiently operating model of state governance as well as an entirely new professional class of educated lawyers trained in its administration. Significantly, the revolutionary ideals of liberty, equality, and freedom inspired a young generation of Italian intellectuals such as Vittorio Alfieri
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(1749-1803), Ugo Foscolo (1778-1827), and Giacomo Leopardi (1798-1837) to write passionately about Italy’s glorious shared past and cultural traditions, shaping Italian patriotism.

After the collapse of the Napoleonic Empire and the Congress of Vienna, which restored Europe’s nations and territories to their pre-Napoleonic borders, the Restoration governments faced difficult choices about how many of Napoleon’s reforms should remain. Many Italians hoped for constitutional governments that would allow the same level of increased autonomy they had experienced under French rule. These desires were, however, unfulfilled, and the old order of aristocratic privilege reinstated. In most regions the Church regained control over public education. On the other hand, some of the French interventions into municipal administration and infrastructure continued, including the legal and tax systems, local police, and construction of roads, canals, and ports. In many cases, censorship during the early years of the Restoration was fairly mild, and the press, social clubs, and civic associations were permitted to operate with little government interference.

Nevertheless, the economic circumstances among most Italians proved dire after Napoleon’s rule, which had amounted to twenty years of constant war. Insufficient infrastructure and an oppressive system of tolls and customs taxes at every border inhibited trade across regions. The greatest grievances against Restoration governments came from the administrators who had lost their jobs and public roles, and the young lawyers, economists, and journalists disenchanted with the refusal of constitutional representation. It was from these professional classes that a revolutionary movement gained the greatest traction in the form of secret societies. Among these, the most significant operating in Restoration Italy was the Carbonari (charcoal-burners), which had the largest presence in the South. These societies engaged in charitable activities, but also promoted constitutionalism and a unified country. A Carbonari revolt in
Naples in 1820 resulted in the brief establishment of a constitutional government in the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, and in 1830-31 rebellions and student demonstrations broke out across the Papal States, Parma, and Modena. The Austrian army quelled these latter insurrections, but the Restoration governments had proven vulnerable.

Whereas the secret societies remained localized in their efforts, the concept of an Italian nation grew in significance among intellectual circles during the 1830s. Giuseppe Mazzini (1805-1872), a lawyer from Genoa, emerged as a leading ideologue of Italian nationalism. He founded a political party known as Giovane Italia (Young Italy) and its eponymous journal used bold rhetoric to proclaim Italy’s historic unity and promote insurrection against Restoration regimes. In general, rhetoric played a powerful role in the national movement. Progressive journalists and intellectuals extolled the greatness of Italy’s past as a model for civic engagement in the present, particularly the self-governing comune of the late Medieval and Renaissance periods, which had flourished both economically and artistically. This emphasis on the past led to the birth of the historical novel and the valorization of Italian literature and language, through which figures like Dante emerged as powerful symbols of national identity. The promotion of a shared culture among Italian intellectuals was accompanied by a more pragmatic desire for economic and industrial progress, which Italy’s political fragmentation had impeded. Unlike Mazzini, however, these moderate intellectuals did not necessarily believe that a unified state was required to meet their goals. In 1843, the priest Vincenzo Gioberti (1801-1852) published an influential book advocating that Italy should be unified into a confederation of states ruled by the Pope. Although many moderates rejected the notion of Papal authority, this “neo-guelph” idea of a federation of states gained traction. Anti-clerical moderates from Piedmont such as the
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6 Vincenzo Gioberti, Del Primato Morale e Civile degli Italiani (Brussels: Stampe de Melline, 1843.)
writer and artist Massimo D’Azeglio (1798-1866) reacted to Gioberti’s plan, proposing the “neo-
ghibelline” solution of an Italian federation ruled by Piedmont’s King Carlo Alberto.\(^7\)

Thus, by the 1840s, the nascent idea of Italian nationalism had developed into a more or
less coherent program aimed at achieving some level of unity, and several events marked this
revolutionary decade. In 1846, the newly elected Pope Pius IX gave amnesty to political
prisoners, thus granting tacit approval and legitimacy to the nationalist cause, which encouraged
patriots throughout Italy. In early 1848, the Milanese took advantage of a politically and
financially weakened Austria to boycott tobacco products and the lottery, a major source of
income for the Hapsburg regime. At the same time in Sicily, a popular revolt demanded that
Ferdinand I reinstate the 1820 constitution. Upon his refusal, the Sicilians established their own
provisional government, which was repressed by military force. Nonetheless, the King granted a
constitution, and the Pope, the Grand Duke of Tuscany, and Carlo Alberto of Piedmont followed
suit. The Hapsburgs, however, refused any capitulations, and the Milanese exploited uprisings in
Vienna to rebel against Austrian forces during five days of urban warfare, known as the Cinque
Giornate. Taking advantage of Milan’s disorganized provisional government, an opportunistic
Carlo Alberto invaded Lombardy, seeking to annex it to Piedmont under the guise of uniting
Italy. By summer of 1848, the Austrians had defeated Carlo Alberto’s forces and regained
control of Lombardy, forcing the Piedmontese King to abdicate his throne.

In Venice, the lawyer Daniele Manin (1804-1857) instated a successful democratic
republic after a brief insurrection against Austrian forces occupying the city. Seeking military
assistance against Austria, the Venetian Republic voted for annexation to the Kingdom of
Piedmont. Thus, after Carlo Alberto’s abdication, the city of Venice defended its fledgling

\(^7\) The terms neo-guelph and neo-ghibelline reference pro- and anti-papal political factions in
Medieval Italy.
autonomy from Austria for another year. Responding to the conflict between Piedmont and Austria, Pius IX refused to take sides and issued an allocution against the war in April 1848 that effectively destroyed his image as a reformer, and introduced a blatantly anti-clerical sentiment within the national cause. The situation in Rome quickly unraveled, precipitated by the assassination of the Prime Minister, Pellegrino Rossi, and the Pope fled to Gaeta. Since revolution in the rest of Italy had failed, democrats and revolutionaries focused their attention on the city, where an elected Constituent Assembly abolished the Pope’s Temporal Power and declared the Roman Republic. This constitutional government lasted only briefly; the Pope called upon France to defend his position through military force, and despite a heroic defense of the city led by Giuseppe Garibaldi (1807-1882), the Republic fell on July 3, 1849. The failed revolutions of 1848-1849, nonetheless, began a new phase in the Risorgimento. Both liberals and moderates had a sense that change was possible, though it became clear that the Pope would no longer support a national movement, and that neither the Piedmontese army nor one comprised of Italian volunteers would be enough to expel Austria from the peninsula.

The years between 1849 and 1859 were characterized by increased government repression as constitutions were revoked, the press censored, and freedom of speech and assembly restricted. Numerous patriots sought political exile in Piedmont or abroad, finding an especially sympathetic refuge in Great Britain, where Mazzini had steadily built support for the Italian cause. The presence of exiled patriots in Piedmont, where the new King Vittorio Emanuele II had maintained the constitutional monarchy, made this region Italy's political center. Within this climate, the journalist Camillo Benso di Cavour (1810-1861) emerged as a powerful leader. Taking advantage of Italian liberals’ disaffection, Cavour successfully redirected their belief in the Italian national cause to support a monarchical solution, helping to form the
National Society. This organization promoted unification, and served as a propaganda machine for a Piedmont-led state. Cavour also sought a political alliance with Napoleon III, and the two held a clandestine meeting in July 1858 where they agreed that France would fight alongside Piedmont to expel the Austrians from Italy in exchange for control of Savoy and Nice.

During the summer of 1859, Austria declared war on Piedmont for refusing to withdraw its troops from the Piedmont-Lombardy border. The Piedmontese forces, accompanied by volunteers organized by the National Society, defeated Austria at the Battle of Magenta on June 4, 1859, which signaled Italy’s Second War of Independence. Piedmontese and French troops successfully expelled Austrian forces from Lombardy, but with heavy losses on both sides. The July 8, 1859 Peace of Villafranca gave Lombardy to Piedmont, but in a betrayal to Cavour, the French ceded Venice to the Austrians. Throughout the spring of 1860, plebiscites were held across central Italy, and Tuscany and Emilia annexed to Piedmont, leaving only Venice, Rome, and the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies divided from the new nation.

Leading a volunteer corps of one thousand soldiers, known as the “Mille,” Garibaldi set out for Sicily from Genoa in May 1860, and led a successful revolution against the Bourbon monarchy in Palermo and Naples, intending to march north to liberate Rome from Papal authority and unite Northern and Southern Italy. Realizing that to allow Garibaldi to unite Italy rather than Vittorio Emanuele II would jeopardize an already fragile unity, Cavour advised the King to lead Piedmontese forces through the Papal States, and meet Garibaldi north of Naples, where the general conferred with a handshake his support of Vittorio Emanuele II’s authority. Thus, by 1861, plebiscites in Southern Italy confirmed annexation to the newly established Kingdom of Italy. In 1866, Venice joined the Italian state, and Rome finally followed in 1871. Ultimately, the moderate solution to the Italian question prevailed, and one of the many
difficulties facing leaders of the fledgling nation was uniting the democrats disillusioned by their compromised ideals.

Although Italy was politically united, the problem of cultural unification remained. The strength of local and regional identities outweighed allegiance to the new nation, and the sense of national belonging still needed to be solidified.⁸ Within this context, the figure of Garibaldi became a rallying point for a new imagery focused on the heroes and martyrs of the Risorgimento.⁹ Whereas during the Restoration, Romantic artists such as Francesco Hayez and writers like Alessandro Manzoni had turned to Italian history as a powerful means for constructing a national identity that would propel political action, after Unification contemporary figures and commemoration of Risorgimento battles assumed that role. This study argues that the emergence of the new medium of photography was a critical, but hitherto unacknowledged, step in this process of nation building.¹⁰ Photography provided a facticity and modernity that other media could not, and thus resonated with contemporary events and transformed a nationalist mythology into a tangible reality that inspired political action.

National Identity

While there is a vast amount of literature on the Risorgimento, scholars have only recently begun to focus on the role of the visual arts on this process of nation building. This new

⁸ For example, as Banti points out, the majority of Italians were not even unified by language, but instead spoke a number of local and regional dialects that could differ as significantly as modern Romance languages do. Alberto Mario Banti, *La Nazione del risorgimento: parentela, santità e onore alle origini dell'Italia unità.* (Turin: Einaudi, 2000), 24. On this subject, see also: Michele Colombo and John J. Kinder, “Italian as a Language of Communication in Nineteenth Century Italy and Abroad,” *Italica* 89, no. 1 (Spring 2012), 109-121.


¹⁰ The term “decade of preparation” has become a common descriptor for the years between the First and Second Wars of Italian Independence. On its use, see: Riall, *Risorgimento*, 29.
The historiographical mandate for research into the cultural implications of the Risorgimento derives largely from the work of the historian Alberto Mario Banti. While previous studies on Italian national identity concentrated primarily on the period after 1861, when the fledgling Italian government instituted a programmatic regime of national rituals and symbols to engage the illiterate masses, Banti has shifted emphasis to the culture of Restoration Italy. By extending the important concept that national identity is invented rather than innate, pioneered by historians such as Benedict Anderson and Eric Hobsbawm, Banti has brought renewed focus to the early decades of the nineteenth century, before Italy’s political Unification. This temporal shift has resulted in a more nuanced understanding of the factors contributing to the Risorgimento and its political and cultural outcomes.

Banti argues that during the Risorgimento a canon of popular literature mobilized Italy’s shared past through similar characters, motifs, and narratives that created recognizable cultural symbols. These symbols functioned as “deep images,” particular historic or literary events that resonated with individuals’ own experience of family, kinship, and religion to inspire an emotional connection to the idea of Italy. As Banti writes, “They are pictures, allegorical systems, and narrative constellations incorporating a set of specific values that belong to the very
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11 Alberto Mario Banti, La Nazione del Risorgimento; Alberto Mario Banti and Roberto Bizzocchi, eds., Immagini della nazione nell'Italia del Risorgimento (Roma: Carocci, 2002.)
12 Benedict Anderson, Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism (London: Verso, 1983); Eric J. Hobsbawm, The Invention of Tradition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.) Anderson argued that shared language and media, especially newspapers, constructed a sense of belonging to an “imagined community,” and that nationalism developed out of this social formation. Hobsbawm articulated the way that nationalism relies upon a foundation of shared traditions that are understood as ancient, innate, and natural, but are often inventions of the modern era.
13 Banti’s influential text has yet to be translated into English, but a summary of his key points can be found in: Alberto Mario Banti, “Deep Images in Nineteenth-Century Nationalist Narrative,” Historian 8 (2008): 54-62.
core of the nationalist belief.”14 Through these “deep images,” the nation was conceived as an extension of the family, and thus inspired loyalty and motivated political action at great personal risk. Taking as a starting point the idea that the development of national identity is necessarily a precursor to political Unification, this dissertation (informed by Banti’s premise) argues that early photographs engaged with the “deep images” initially established in literature and painting, and built upon this iconography, thus contributing to nation-building.

Notably, the literary canon central to Banti’s argument was produced by and disseminated primarily among progressive elites and the educated urban class of Italy’s Northern cities, who became the protagonists of the Risorgimento. Rather than reaching the masses, the Bantian canon spread within what the philosopher and sociologist Jürgen Habermas has defined as a “bourgeois public sphere,” “made up of private people gathered together as a public and articulating the needs of society with the state.”15 According to Habermas, during the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in Europe public opinion formed through rational debate carried out in cafés, professional societies, social clubs, and the press. Historians of the Risorgimento have articulated the direct link between the emergence of this “public sphere” within Restoration Italy and political action.16 I argue that it was among this same “public sphere” that knowledge of photography circulated. This study demonstrates that photography’s interaction with scientific, literary, and artistic networks contributed to fulfilling the political goals of a powerful liberal elite that formed public opinion and led Italy’s nationalist movement.

15 Habermas, The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere, 176.
In particular, Banti argues that the leading intellectuals of the Risorgimento looked to shared cultural traditions that might overcome the stultifying economic, linguistic, and political boundaries that separated Italy’s regions. In doing so, they proposed a direct relationship between kinship and national bonds predicated upon Italians’ belief in a larger Christian family. Thus, foreign occupation became likened to an attack on the family, a slight to which the natural response was vengeance and retribution.\(^17\) In this way, the young soldiers who sacrificed their lives for the protection of their national family were viewed analogously to Christian martyrs, and the national cause became a righteous one.\(^18\) Writers and patriots therefore employed key themes and symbols of Catholicism that resonated among all Italians, transforming a nascent national identity into a viable political movement through the replication of these symbols across popular novels, plays, figurative paintings, and – I argue – photographs. Writing of the importance of the arts in nineteenth-century Italy, Banti asserts:

> One witnesses the creation of a mythology, of a symbolism, of a historical reconstruction of the Italian nation, which has exceptional communicative force; this comprehensive mythography had, in fact, the power to touch the minds and hearts of a significant portion of public opinion on the peninsula, so as to spread the idea of the actual existence of a subject—the Italian nation—which, in fact, seemed very difficult to identify. Not only this: the message was of such power as to convince many toward dangerous action in its name, risking exile, imprisonment, and life.\(^19\)

\(^{17}\) Banti, *La Nazione del Risorgimento*, 77-108. Banti explored these themes further in his *L'onore della nazione: identità, sessuali e violenza nel nazionalismo europeo dal XVIII secolo alla grande guerra* (Torino: Einaudi, 2005.)


\(^{19}\) Banti, 30. “Si assiste, cioè, alla creazione di una mitologia, di una simbologia, di una ricostruzione storica della nazione italiana che ha in sé un’eccezionale forza comunicativa; questa complessiva mitografia ebbe, infatti, il potere di toccare la mente e il cuore di una parte non trascurabile dell’opinione pubblica della penisola, tanto da diffondere l’idea dell’effettiva esistenza di un soggetto—la nazione italiana—che, nei fatti, sembrava molto difficile da identificare. Non solo: il messaggio fu così potente da convincere molti ad agire pericoloso in suo nome, rischiando l’esilio, la prigione, la vita.”
Banti’s emphasis on cultural production has brought a greater sense of continuity to the study of the Risorgimento, linking the Restoration period and that of political Unification. While Banti’s argument focuses primarily on literary texts, his work has inspired a renewed impetus for scholarship on Italian Romanticism more broadly, ranging from opera to history painting and print culture. Adrian Lyttelton’s essay “Creating a National Past: History, Myth, and Image in the Risorgimento,” in the multi-authored volume *Making and Remaking Italy: The Cultivation of National Identity around the Risorgimento* (2001) has been inspirational in framing this project thematically. Lyttelton focuses on the myth-making strategies of Risorgimento history painting that were employed to represent an essential identity out of the diverse languages, cultures, and politics of the Italian peninsula. Ferdinando Mazzocca’s research into the political context of the prominent Romantic painter Francesco Hayez’s career has also contributed significantly to the understanding of the role of the arts in developing a nationalist iconography, with the 2011 exhibition *Hayez nella Milano di Manzoni e Verdi* highlighting the correspondences among Romantic literature, opera, and painting in Milan.

---


This interdisciplinary study provides a valuable example of how political imagery manifested across a range of visual and written texts produced and circulated within the same public sphere.

Despite the abundance of new research into the cultural dimensions of the Risorgimento, the role of photography has been relatively limited. In part, this absence is because the history of photography in Italy is itself a relatively new field of inquiry, and a coherent body of authors and images is still being brought to light through archival scholarship and discoveries within institutional holdings. In addition, the relative fragility of daguerreotypes and early paper prints, which are the focus of this dissertation, has resulted in the survival of far fewer examples than likely circulated. Publications focusing specifically on the relationship of photography to the Risorgimento, therefore, tend to focus on the iconic portraiture of Garibaldi and other prominent political figures made after the Second War of Italian Independence in 1859. By that date the photographic processes of wet collodion on glass negatives and albumen prints significantly decreased exposure times, allowing photographers to capture people in outdoor settings with greater ease and to distribute prints in much larger quantities. For example, Lucy Riall and Gian Luca Fruci have emphasized the cultic nature of Risorgimento celebrity promulgated through cartes-de-visite portraits and the popular press in images that were used to consolidate national unity after the fact. By focusing instead on the period preceding Unification, this dissertation places the origins of such nationalist iconography within an earlier moment than has hitherto

been recognized, uncovering the existence of national symbols in photographs of historic monuments, theatres of war, natural landscapes, and staged narrative scenes.

**Italian Photography**

In approaching the topic of photography and nationalism within Italy, one might well begin by questioning precisely how scholars have addressed the history of Italian photography. Canonical histories of nineteenth-century photography, particularly within English language scholarship, have marginalized Italy, and Italian historians rarely address the work of individual photographers in relationship to larger social and political considerations.²⁶ Carlo Bertelli and Giulio Bollati’s study presents an exception, attempting to discern what is particular to Italian photographic culture.²⁷ Influenced by the writing of Walter Benjamin, the authors see an unrealized radical potential in photography’s earliest period. They argue that weak political unity led to the basest attempts to consolidate national identity through repetitive, and even demeaning, images produced by both local and foreign authors after 1861.²⁸ Their thesis demands further examination of how those stereotypical representations formed in the first place, which in turn suggests that we must look to the period preceding Unification for answers.

Addressing that earlier moment, Marina Miraglia has argued that Italy’s political situation at the time of photography’s invention requires a different narrative than those of the

---

²⁸ Benjamin’s essay “The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction” was translated into Italian for the first time in 1966.
powerful industrialized nations that have been central to photography’s historiography. Like Bertelli and Bollati, Miraglia emphasizes Italy’s different economic and political position with regard to the superpowers of France, Great Britain, and the United States – a comparison that inevitably leaves Italy lagging behind those countries industrially and democratically. In contrast, this study suggests that these comparative “weaknesses” might illuminate something distinctive rather than deficient about the Italian case, and therefore examines how political and cultural life intertwined with the development of photography in Italy during the period preceding Unification.

Inspired by the critical approaches of the above authors, Maria Antonella Pelizzari’s *Photography and Italy* (2011) provides the first general history of Italian photography written in English. Her survey explores political and cultural contexts across regions from the origins of photography through the present day. In doing so, she acknowledges the “polycentric, even somewhat foreign, character” of Italian photography that was especially apparent at the origins of the medium. Her polycentric account helps to explain the proliferation of region-specific studies by Italian scholars. While providing detailed facts of individual photographers’ biographies and technological advancements, the localized emphasis of such texts attests to the still incomplete nature of the history of photography in Italy.

Indeed, the historical replication of the country’s regional divisions in photographic archives, which is itself a product of the regional and piecemeal character of the Risorgimento,
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31 Pelizzari, *Photography and Italy*, 7.
has been a major hurdle to research on Italian photography. This dispersion of material makes research extremely difficult and often unwieldy, such that there is no single institution that houses the most significant resources on early Italian photography, but instead they are distributed among a practically innumerable number of municipal archives, academies, museums, and local libraries. This dissertation, therefore, brings together research on individual groups of negatives, photographs, and albums from archives throughout Italy, Great Britain, France, and the United States (please see the Bibliography for a detailed list). For example, accurate information about the number of photography studios operating in a given Italian city in a given year simply does not exist. Studies of the photographic industry in Italy that might correspond to those of France by Anne McCauley’s or of Great Britain by Steve Edwards are not possible, and perhaps, not relevant given the different circumstances of Italy’s industrialization during the earliest years of the medium.

The literature on nineteenth-century photography in Italy typically emphasizes the continued impact of travel (specifically the Grand Tour) and Romanticism as major influences in the medium’s development, both in terms of subject matter and the spread of knowledge about photography. While it is true that both local and foreign photographers replicated in
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35 The most significant sources on the subject are: Piero Becchetti, Fotografì e Fotografia in Italia, 1839-1880 (Rome: Quasar: 1978); Marina Miraglia, et al, eds. Fotografia italiana dell’Ottocento (Florence: Alinari, 1979); Marina Miraglia, “Note per una storia della fotografia italiana (1839-1911)”; Italo Zannier, Segni di luce (Ravenna: Longo, 1991); Italo Zannier, Storia della Fotografia Italiana (Rome: Laterza, 1986). Foreign publications on nineteenth-century Italian photography often emphasize the Grand Tour practically to the exclusion of all other
photographs the picturesque views of Italy’s cities and monuments based on printed and painted examples, tourist imagery was not the sole focus of Italian photographers. This concentration of scholars on tourist images has resulted in a lack of knowledge about the networks through which information on photography was communicated within Italy, as well as an inclination to read all images as explicitly created for foreign viewers.\(^{36}\) Working against these trends, the exhibition catalogue *L’Italia d’argento 1839-1859: Storia del dagherrotipo in Italia* (2003) provides a more nuanced interpretation. In this volume, the editors Maria Francesca Bonetti and Monica Maffioli discuss the dissemination of daguerreotype technology in Italy in relationship to scientific communities and print media, and address the development of the earliest daguerreotype studios in Italy. Their initial research into the subject has provided a set of images and authors that has proven critical to my argument. In addition, their emphasis on the scientific community offered a methodological model that I have expanded upon in my study, which focuses on individual photographers while identifying the importance of the professional networks within which they worked. The catalogue *Éloge du Négatif* intends a similar overview of the calotype in Italy to that of the daguerreotype in *L’Italia d’argento*, but does not approach the topic with same critical depth.\(^{37}\) Its publication in French rather than Italian further underscores the general lack of context. Among them are: Ulrich Pohlmann and Guy Cogeval, eds. *Voir l’Italie et mourir: photographies et peintures dans l’Italie du XIXe siècle* (Paris: Skira-Flammarion, 2009); Wendy M. Watson, *Images of Italy: Photography in the Nineteenth Century* (South Hadley, Mass: Mount Holyoke College Art Museum, 1980.)

\(^{36}\) An important exception to this lack of political context is Giulio Bollati, “Note su fotografia e storia,” in *Storia d’Italia Annali 2: l’Immagine fotografica 1845-1945* (Turin: Einaudi, 1979), 5-54. Bollati describes his own task not as a history of Italy via photographs, nor a history of photography in Italy, but an intermediary narrative that seeks to find “un modo di vedere italiano” (an Italian way of seeing) that is distinct from other models, especially those of France and Great Britain.

regard within Italy toward its own photographic history. Nevertheless, the publication brings together a set of images from Italian and French collections that proved valuable to my research.

**Transnationalism**

Despite the literature outlined above, an in-depth account of the development of photography in Italy between 1839 and 1859 is still lacking. In addition, deeper knowledge of the means by which photography circulated is necessary to understand the extent of the medium’s impact on national culture. Due to its lack of political unity, the Italian case presents a more complex relationship among photography and its local, national, and international audiences than other European models. Rather than setting out to define “un modo di vedere italiano” (“an Italian way of seeing”), this study suggests that the fragility of the Italian nation and consequently, of Italian photography, disrupts the monolithic nation-based narratives that dominate photography’s history, and demands a transnational approach. Because photography was invented in France and Great Britain, its introduction to Italy necessarily occurred through encounters and interactions among local and foreign individuals. Furthermore, the development of a distinct Italian national identity developed both within and across the peninsula's regional borders, and also in contradistinction to the rest of Europe. This dissertation, therefore, argues that in order to explicate the particular significance of photography to Italy, it is necessary to place this study within a broader European context. My argument is therefore also informed by recent scholarship in Italian Studies that focuses on the international influences that made
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38 Bollati, “Note su fotografia e storia,” 6.
Unification possible. The renewed interest in the culture of the Restoration has inspired a closer examination of the cosmopolitan nature of Italy’s nationalist movement. This research has shed new light, for example, on the impact of scientific positivism on politics in the nineteenth century. Since leading Italian intellectuals were attuned to new discoveries and advances across Europe, they recognized in Italy’s lack of unity an impediment to scientific, and thus socio-economic, progress, and took up the national cause as a corrective to the problem. Many of Italy’s earliest photographers were also scientists, and in this regard, Silvana Patriarca’s exploration of nineteenth-century statistics has proven invaluable to this thesis by providing an avenue for exploring their motivations for practicing the new medium. Patriarca demonstrates how Italy’s statisticians created a holistic and seemingly neutral account of Italy’s economic and social state that proved its relative inferiority in comparison to the rest of Europe. This statistical stock-taking in turn served as a sort of call to arms for Italian intellectuals, inspiring political commitment. These leading scientists and theorists succeeded in promoting the idea of national unity precisely by relying on the inherent facticity of their method. Photography likewise provided an ostensibly objective instrument for envisioning Italy in response to what Italians viewed as the distortions of foreign representations. Furthermore, many of Italy’s first

photographers, such as Luigi Sacchi, came from precisely the same milieu of scientists and statisticians that is the focus of Patriarca’s study.

Although the details of photography’s simultaneous invention in France and Great Britain have been revisited numerous times, very little attention has been paid to its reception outside these centers. As François Brunet has recently pointed out, nationalism informed the rhetoric surrounding photography’s invention despite widespread interest among early practitioners in the potential of the new visual medium to become a universal language. The lesson, Brunet suggests, is for current scholars to reconsider the origins of photography as a global phenomenon. His imperative is timely given the wealth of new material on the development of photography within individual countries. Still, these recent publications raise important historiographical questions that have led curator and photography historian Joel Smith to observe that, “the nation-based history tends to tell a generic narrative with strangely familiar landmarks.” Indeed, this dissertation revisits many of the key protagonists (such as Talbot) and themes familiar to historians of photography, placing them in relationship to their Italian counterparts. It does so, however, not only in order to give voice to previously marginalized figures, but also to demonstrate that photography developed as a collective and international enterprise rather than


as a result of a single individual’s or national invention. By situating the Italian case within a broader transnational context, this dissertation also provides a model for rethinking the parameters of the nation-based narrative.

The first chapter traces photography’s dissemination among scientific communities from 1839 to 1844, focusing on the botanist Antonio Bertoloni, physicists Macedonio Melloni and Gaetano Fazzini, and optician Giovanni Battista Amici. These key figures made public announcements and participated in demonstrations of photographic processes at scientific meetings, such as the Congress of Italian Scientists, which were also reported in specialist periodicals and illustrated magazines. In addition, this chapter emphasizes the importance of transnational exchange for photography’s early development, which is traced through private correspondence and the first experiments with paper photography in Italy. These examples reveal that the discourse surrounding photography’s invention was one of nationalist competition, which compelled Italy’s scientists to respond in kind by adopting photography as a tool of progress and cultural unity beyond regional borders.

Chapter two investigates the role of Italy’s publishing industry in disseminating some of the earliest photographic images produced on the peninsula. I examine Ferdinando Artaria’s series of aquatints based on daguerreotypes, *Vues d’Italie d’après le daguerréotype* (1840-1847), within the context of the existing Italian market for *vedute* and guidebooks. While earlier studies have focused on the technological innovation of Artaria’s publication, an iconographic analysis of individual plates from the series shows that it departed from a strictly tourist view to feature sites that held contemporary cultural significance to a Milanese “bourgeois public sphere.” In order to demonstrate this local dimension, I compare Artaria’s endeavor to two contemporaneous series of prints from daguerreotypes that featured images of Italy, the French publisher Noël-
Marie-Paymal Lerebours’ *Excursions Daguerriennes* (1840-43) and the British philologist Alexander John Ellis’s planned (but uncompleted) volume *Italy Daguerreotyped* (ca. 1841-1845) for which he employed two of the first daguerreotypists working in Rome, Lorenzo Suscipj and Achille Morelli. In order to distinguish Artaria’s aims from the foreign gaze represented by those examples, this chapter also discusses the publication *Milano e il suo territorio* (1844), which reproduced fourteen views from *Vues d’Italie d’après le daguerréotype*. Commissioned by Milan’s municipal government and produced by its leading intellectuals, this guide book presented an erudite text on the history and socio-economic make-up of that city aimed at an audience comprised not of foreign travelers, but of a distinguished group of scientists and scholars from throughout Italy. This chapter demonstrates that Artaria leveraged the modernity and truthfulness associated with photography to depict Milan as a progressive and model Italian city.

Chapter three delineates the early history of the paper negative in Italy, arguing for the central role of Stefano Lecchi (1805-1863?) in its development. Whereas previous studies of the calotype in Italy have emphasized the importance of foreign photographers and the tourist market, an investigation of Lecchi’s career, which took him to the South of France, Naples, and Rome, suggests the deeper significance of transnational contacts to the development of photography not only in Italy, but also throughout Europe. Through a close reading of an album of Lecchi’s photographs, which combines tourist views of Rome and Pompeii with scenes depicting ruins after the battles of the Roman Republic (1849), this chapter analyzes how the peninsula’s political fragmentation impacted the development of photography and Risorgimento politics in analogous ways. Namely, just as the growth of Italian nationalism occurred against a backdrop of foreign intervention, so did a local photographic practice emerge as part of larger
international developments. In addition, this album demonstrates how photography’s memorial function made it an ideal medium of personal commemoration and individual patriotism during the Risorgimento.

Chapter four investigates the relationship between photography and international artistic communities in Rome through the central figure of Giacomo Caneva, a perspective painter trained at the Venetian Academy. This chapter analyzes his landscape photographs in the Campagna and studies of Roman peasants within the context of the Roman Republic (1848-49). Caneva’s elaborate staged tableaux, which sold commercially and circulated among Rome’s artistic community, are some of the earliest examples of the genre in photography’s history. I argue that Caneva composed these scenes as Risorgimento allegories in relationship to an iconography of Italian nationalism emerging concurrently in painting and print media. These photographs in turn served as source material for many artists whose work explored patriotic imagery. His association with a number of soldier artists, including the Venetian vedutista Ippolito Caffi (1814-1866), known for depicting patriotic themes, helps illuminate the political content of this work. Caneva’s photographs stand as powerful evidence of the nationalist impulse that was shared among many contemporary artists and intellectuals during this period.

The final chapter focuses on the career of Luigi Sacchi, an artist trained at the Brera Academy in Milan, who was well known as an editor and engraver for the illustrated weekly Cosmorama pittorico and the illustrated edition of Alessandro Manzoni’s historical novel I Promessi sposi (1840), a landmark patriotic text. Sacchi’s familial and institutional connections to Milan’s leading intellectuals inspired his turn to photography as a powerful tool for promoting patriotic messages. His previous experience in publishing, both locally and internationally, influenced his photographic series Monumenti, vedute e costumi d’Italia (1852-1855), which
depicted cultural patrimony from throughout the peninsula in order to educate Italians about their shared heritage. This chapter reinstates the thesis of this dissertation, proving how early photographers such as Sacchi contributed to nation building during the Risorgimento.

The case studies considered in this dissertation demonstrate how photographers adapted and expanded upon “deep images” from media such as literature and painting, validating those constructions through the facticity of photography, and thus creating a novel and realistic picture of Italy as a modern nation. Their photographs circulated among the same networks – the scientific community, the publishing industry, and artistic circles – that produced many of the Risorgimento’s most ardent supporters, and through which devotion to the national cause reached a wider public sphere. The iconography established by these early photographers formed the basis for a commercial photographic practice in Italy, which would be exploited on a mass scale after Unification (1861).
CHAPTER ONE

First Impressions: The Introduction of Photography to Italy

First Impressions

On January 7, 1839 François Arago (1786-1853), the secretary of France’s Académie des sciences, publicly announced the invention of photography by the artist Louis-Jacques-Mandé Daguerre (1787-1851). Word of this exciting breakthrough spread quickly through Europe’s scientific communities and the international press; on the Italian peninsula, the Gazzetta privilegiata di Milano published the news a mere week later.45 Throughout the spring of 1839, Italy’s newspapers continued to report on photography, while its scientists clamored for updates from their colleagues in Paris. Although practical details of the daguerreotype process remained elusive until August of that year, when they were made available during a public demonstration, the basic premise was understood: it was now possible to permanently capture an image of reality on a chemically-coated metal plate placed in the back of a camera obscura, an optical device that had been used as a drawing aid by artists since the Renaissance. Named for the inventor, these photographs were called “daguerréotypes.” Just days after Arago’s initial announcement, news also broke of a competing technique developed by the British philologist and polymath William Henry Fox Talbot (1800-1877). Talbot’s method, called photogenic drawing, later improved and termed by its inventor, “the calotype,” was distinct from Daguerre’s because it used paper instead of a metal plate, and produced a negative image that could then be reproduced to make multiple positive prints, unlike the one-of-a-kind daguerreotype. This nearly

simultaneous announcement thus sparked a nationalistic competition between France and Great Britain for primacy in photography’s invention.

Within the first year of its announcement, information about photography circulated throughout Europe primarily through an elite scientific community. At the same time, in Italy, a growing nationalist impulse brought intellectuals from all over the peninsula together to discuss how science might contribute to economic development, and thus allow Italians to compete with the industrialized nations of France and Great Britain. Italy’s scientists evaluated photography as an ideal tool for achieving their progressive goals, because it had the potential to spread knowledge of scientific discoveries among a “bourgeois public sphere,” and in turn promote industrial and economic growth.46 The examples discussed in this chapter indicate that the modern invention was immediately understood as critical to science because of its accuracy, its utility in taxonomic classification, and its ability to reproduce and circulate images in multiple to a learned audience.

This chapter focuses on key figures from Italy’s scientific community who disseminated knowledge about photography and participated in the first photographic experiments on the peninsula. I analyze early accounts of the daguerreotype process published in Italy within scientific journals and illustrated magazines, Italian translations of French daguerreotype manuals, and the first attempt in Italy to reproduce the daguerreotype using the existing printmaking technique of lithography. In addition, this chapter also examines the introduction of paper photography through an album of photogenic drawings made by Talbot and compiled by the botanist Antonio Bertoloni. This album is also exceptional because it contains the three

earliest surviving paper photographs produced in Italy. Finally, an additional group of photogenic drawings and calotypes that the English inventor sent to the optician Giovanni Battista Amici proves the Italian scientific community’s continued interest in the medium. While both Daguerre’s and Talbot’s techniques offered the ability to reproduce an image with an unprecedented level of truthfulness, my analysis of these examples demonstrates that the daguerreotype was prized especially for its clarity and accuracy, and paper photographs were favored for their potential to circulate in multiple among educated audiences. Together, these varied documents establish that photography’s evidentiary quality bolstered its utility as an aid to nineteenth-century science. Within Italy, the identification and classification through photographs of visual typologies -- including not only native plants but also cultural patrimony such as sculptures and monuments -- held symbolic resonance to the idea of the nation, providing a potential tool of identity building more potent than earlier engraving.

The Congress of Italian Scientists

Throughout Europe, institutional networks facilitated the exchange of information about photography. Among them, art and science academies were particularly critical to photography’s reception, since the new technology was understood as both a potential art form and an aid to scientific investigation. This was no less the case in Italy, despite the lack of a centralized scientific institution like France’s Académie des sciences or Great Britain’s Royal Society. Although Italy’s scientific community was dispersed across numerous regional and local academies, these organizations remained unified by a shared history and interest in improving
Italy’s economy. As photography historians Monica Maffioli and Luigi Tomassini have noted, photography’s introduction occurred amidst growing debates among leading Italian intellectuals about the relationship between scientific positivism and economic progress, raising the need for transregional initiatives that would strengthen infrastructure and industry. Photography was thus valued for its potential to support this unifying process.

Although reports on photography appeared frequently in the Italian press throughout the spring of 1839, practical information remained scarce. The first treatises to publish details about Daguerre’s process were issued in France beginning in September of that year. This long-awaited information paved the way for an intense period of experimentation within the Italian scientific community. For example, on September 2, 1839 the Florentine physicist Tito Puliti (1809-1870) made Italy’s first daguerreotypes, depicting sculptures and monuments, at the Regio Museo di Fisica e Storia Naturale di Firenze. He then displayed them at the annual exposition of Florence’s Accademia di Belle Arti in a room otherwise dedicated to perspective (or view) painting. This presentation conceptually aligned the daguerreotype with the pictorial legacy of

---

50 Other successful experiments were also carried out that fall by the opticians Enrico Jest in Turin, Alessandro Duroni in Milan, the scientists Gaetano Fazzini in Naples, Carlo Fontana in Trieste, Francesco Zantedeschi and Francesco Malacarne in Venice, and Tommaso Zannini in Padua. The camera used by Puliti is still housed at the Museo Galileo in Florence. Although none of Puliti’s daguerreotypes have been traced, records of his production attest to their status as the
Albertian linear perspective, and thus positioned photography in direct lineage with earlier Italian scientific and artistic achievements. Vincenzo Antinori, director of the Regio Museo di Fisica e Storia Naturale, highlighted the significance of this occasion in a letter to the Accademia’s president, noting that it was the first time that daguerreotypes had been included in an art exhibition, and proclaiming Tuscany’s prescient interest in the new medium.51

Puliti repeated his experiments in public demonstrations in October 1839 during the First Congress of Italian Scientists held in nearby Pisa, a professional meeting that showed a significant public expression of cross-regional unity among Italy’s scientific community, with representatives in attendance from throughout the peninsula. Whereas before the eighteenth century science academies in Italy had been private organizations with members elected through invitation and with the main purpose of collaborative experimentation, by the nineteenth century, they had become semi-public institutions geared toward the presentation of individual research. In that period, governments throughout Italy assumed administrative control over existing academies in regional and provincial capitals alike, lending them official imprimatur.52 The earliest daguerreotypes made in Italy. Atti della prima riunione degli scienziati italiani tenuta in Pisa nell’ottobre del 1839 (Nistri, Pisa, 1840), 18; See also: “Sabina Bernacchini, “L’introduzione del dagherrotypo all’Imperiale e Regio Museo di Fisica e Storia Naturale di Firenze,” AFT: Rivista di Storia e Fotografia no. 47 (Anno 2008): 49-54; Monica Maffioli, “Note per una storia della dagherrotipia in Toscana,” in L’Italia d’Argento 1839-1859: Storia del Dagherrotipo in Italia, ed. Maria Francesca Bonetti and Monica Maffioli (Florence: Alinari, 2003), 226; Ferruccio Malandrini, “Tito Puliti,” in Segni di Luce: Alle origini della fotografia in Italia vol. 1, ed. Italo Zannier (Ravenna: Longo Editore, 1991), 137-140.

51 This letter is partially reproduced in: Bernacchini, “L’introduzione del dagherrotypo all’Imperiale e Regio Museo di Fisica e Storia Naturale di Firenze,” 50-51.

52 Significantly, Baldini and Besana point out that not all state sponsorship was equal. In the case of Padua, Parma, and Modena, for example, the government intervened in the structure of pre-existing academies, whereas in Turin and Florence, the government simply gave official recognition to existing academies. In Naples, the government established a new academy, while Rome, Liguria and Lombardy lacked these new forms of academies altogether. Baldini and Besana, “Organizzazione e funzione delle accademie,” 1313-1317.
character of scientific pursuit in Italy mirrored the rest of Europe, and their shared purpose united Italy’s scientists in the face of geo-political barriers.

The organization of the Congress of Italian Scientists thus reflected both the existing unity of the scientific community and a desire for a singular institutional body within Italy, an idea first put forth under Napoleon. As noted above, the Congress was an annual meeting of scientists from throughout the peninsula and from abroad. It was sponsored by different Italian cities between 1839 and 1847, until political revolutions halted the trans-regional proceedings. Significantly, the Congresses were not exclusively the domain of university- or academy-affiliated scientists, but open to members from the professional classes, trade, and agriculture, signaling the group’s emphasis on the practical application of science. The Congress was also shaped according to the model of a more elite scientific organization, the Società Italiana delle Scienze, also called the Società dei Quaranta (Society of the Forty). Founded by the mathematician Antonio Lorgna (1730-1796) in 1798, this Society was formed on the principle that Italy’s fragmentation hindered scientific progress, and that a centralized organization comprised of the forty most important Italian scientists would create a network of exchange that might in turn strengthen and promote innovation and discovery. A precursor to the more broadly populist Congresses of Italian Scientists, the first proceedings of the Società dei Quaranta asked why, given Italy’s historic excellence in the sciences, did it lag behind other European nations. Responding to his own inquiry, Lorgna reflected, “Is it the root cause of the Italians being separated, and in practice divided of their true capabilities, that they cannot bear the fruit, which their union would indubitably bring about?”53 The solution to this problem, he suggested, would

53 “O sarebbe di ciò ragione radicale l’essere separate gl’Italiani, e nell’esercizio divisi delle proprie forze; tal che non può aversene il frutto, che all’unione di loro verrebbe fatto di mettere
be, “if every part were to come together, this would be the most valid and secure method of reconciling the promotion of the Sciences with the good of the nation…”\textsuperscript{54} This founding text boldly promoted the vision of a unified nation—a unity necessary for Italy to maintain a tradition of excellence in the face of foreign advancements in the burgeoning fields of science, technology, and industry.

Headquartered in Modena, the Society was outside the bounds and official patronage of any particular government, and many of its members (which included Macedonio Melloni, Antonio Bertoloni, and Giovanni Battista Amici, all discussed in this chapter) actively participated in uprisings during the Risorgimento by holding political offices within revolutionary governments. In addition to its Italian members, the Society had a transnational character, including among its ranks twelve foreign members of the likes of Arago, Jean-Baptiste Biot, David Brewster, George Cuvier, Michael Faraday, John Herschel, and Alexander von Humboldt. Both the Società dei Quaranta and the Congress of Italian Scientists served as important professional networks linking Italy’s leading scientists to the latest discoveries abroad. Furthermore, both institutions served as models of self-governance, demonstrating how national unity might function on a practical level. For example, the rotating location of the Congress’s annual meetings allowed each region to take on an executive role, and highlighted local areas of expertise at the same time that it fostered a sense of collegiality among all Italian contributors.\textsuperscript{55}

\textsuperscript{54} “Ma se dobbiam convenire per una parte, esser questo il messo più valido e sicuro onde conciliare col promovimento delle Scienze il bene delle nazioni; e non possiamo dissimulare dall’altra, che lo svantaggio d’Italia è l’aver ella le sue forze disunite; come tentarne l’unione?” Lorgna, \textit{Memorie di matematica e fisica della Società Italiana} tomo I (Verona: Dionigi Ramanzini, 1782), iv.

\textsuperscript{55} For background on the scientific congresses, see: Giuliano Pancaldi, \textit{I Congressi degli scienziati nell’età del positivismo} (Bologna: Editrice Bologna, 1983) and Maria Pia Casalena, “The Congress of Italian Scientists between Europe and the Risorgimento (1839-75),” \textit{Journal of
A poster advertising the initial Congress in Pisa demonstrates how key symbols from Italy’s shared past served as unifying motifs for the fledgling association (Figure 1.1). It lists the participants not by local affiliation, but alphabetically and by scientific field. Placing the Grand Duke of Tuscany Leopold II at the center of the composition, the poster emphasizes his progressive leadership in hosting the event. The unmistakable landmark of Pisa’s cathedral complex is visible in the distance, and Galileo presides at the apex of the composition as a symbol of Tuscany’s—and by extension Italy’s—rich scientific legacy.

The figure of Galileo served as a unifying motif resonant with Italian history, and was central to the inaugural Congress’s promotion. The consecration of a statue of the famous astronomer at the Università di Pisa (Figure 1.2) became an important ceremonial focus of this professional meeting, where attendees received a commemorative medal of the event featuring Galileo’s profile on one side and Pisa’s cathedral complex on the reverse (Figure 1.3). Significantly, an article from the Milan-based illustrated weekly periodical Cosmorama pittorico reported on the Congress and articulated the potency of Galileo as a national symbol by reproducing engravings of both statue and medal for its readers. Discussing the consecration ceremony for the statue, the author recorded:

The most heart-felt jubilation appeared on the faces of everyone at that illustrious gathering, a celebration truly grand and national. It is indescribable the emotion demonstrated on that propitious day by the Italian scholars, who felt in their chests the warm love of glorious patria, remembering the discoveries and the

*Modern Italian Studies* 12, no. 2 (2007): 153-188. Casalena notes, “Taken as a whole, the congresses offer a specific adaptation of the concept of national science, in which the usual divisions between disciplines could make way for a 360-degree understanding of reality. More ‘positive’ (that is, fact-based) than theoretical, more ‘useful’ (that is, applicable to the realms of economics or legislation) than illustrious, Italian science would be revived through debate and confrontation. While recognizing the authority of those who held specialized credentials of study and prestigious institutional standing, other figures could and should still join, in a constructive spirit, in the work of the traveling academy.” (p. 163)
sufferings of the great Galileo, as they offered him the most magnificent tribute of eternal memory and just admiration.56

This report reveals the extent to which nationalistic rhetoric characterized the use of the figure of Galileo at the Congress, thus disseminating a message of common heritage and goals across regional boundaries. Galileo served as an ideal rallying figure for intellectuals during the Risorgimento. Since Galileo had been persecuted by the Inquisition for his heliocentric theory, he provided a symbolic icon for an entire generation of scientists who felt stifled by the continued influence of the Church under conservative Restoration regimes. Such appropriation of Galileo as a “mascot” for the event evinces the central role of the scientific congresses in a growing nationalist discourse that was based upon past achievements, and the role of visual media in fashioning an accompanying iconography of national heroes. Early photography also became part of this process. Significantly, the physicist Tito Puliti, who demonstrated the daguerreotype at the First Congress, produced several daguerreotypes of Pisa’s cathedral complex. This was the same site where Galileo allegedly performed his experiment on gravity for a group of university students (recorded in his treatise *On Motion* of 1589), and this connection was not likely to go unnoticed by participants at the event.

The official presentation of the invention of photography at the First Congress inaugurated it as a potential force for pursuing Italian scientists’ progressive goals. Indeed, subsequent congresses held discussions of photography and its wide variety of applications. Through both the Congress’s ideological roots in the Society of the Forty and in the promotion

56 “Il giubilo più cordiale appariva sul volto di tutta quella illustre adunanza, raccolta a festa veramente grande e nazionale. È indescrivibile l’emozione provata in quell faustissimo giorno dai dotti italiani, che sentivano in petto caldo amore di patria gloria rimembrando le scoperte ed i patimenti del massimo Galileo, all’atto che offrivagli il più magnifico tributo di memoria non peritura e di giusta ammirazione.” Alfonso Frisiani, “Il Congresso di Pisa,” *Cosmorama pittorico* 5, no. 52 (1839): 410.
surrounding the event, Italian history and cultural heritage served to unify the scientific community around a common agenda. At this critical moment in the life of Italy’s scientific community, photography offered a new means of articulating a shared past, as well as a tool for modern progress. The Congress of Italian Scientists thus provided a de-facto national stage for debates about photography, serving a similar role to France’s Académie des sciences in disseminating information about the new medium.

**Macedonio Melloni and the Discourse on Reproducibility**

Arago’s report on the daguerreotype delivered to the French Chamber of Deputies on July 3, 1839 is a key text for reconstructing how this technology was understood in its time. In this account, which reached a wider audience through its publication within manuals on Daguerre’s process in autumn of that year, Arago gave a brief history of the invention of the daguerreotype, and detailed the pictorial possibilities it offered to art, science, and society.57 Within Italy, on November 15, 1839, the physicist Macedonio Melloni (1798-1854) addressed the Regia Accademia delle Scienze in Naples with his own report on the daguerreotype, borrowing heavily from Arago.58 Melloni therefore served as an intermediary, translating Arago’s text from French into Italian, and presenting his own opinion on the prospective importance that this process held for his fellow scientists.

Arago’s account described the underlying technology involved in Daguerre’s discovery, noting the importance of Giambattista Della Porta’s use of the portable *camera obscura* and the eighteenth-century discovery of the light-sensitivity of silver chloride. He also discussed the partnership between Daguerre and Nicéphore Niépce (1765-1833), who had begun photographic experiments as early as 1814, leading to the invention of the daguerreotype. Arago indicated that the particular importance of this process was its capacity to record large quantities of visual information almost instantaneously and with complete accuracy. As an example, he explained that archeologists could produce perspectival elevations of monuments and copies of inscriptions, such as Egyptian hieroglyphics, without human error, thus preserving historic monuments for posterity. Arago also extolled the potential for the daguerreotype to serve as studies for artists and to aid in a range of scientific experiments including optics, photometry, astronomy, biology, geology, and meteorology.\(^5^9\) His testimony thus outlined the innumerable practical applications of photography by promoting its ability to truthfully reproduce the world.

In order to understand the motives for this report, it is critical to remember that it followed on the heels of the French secretary’s introduction of a bill to grant Daguerre and Isidore Niépce (the son of Daguerre’s collaborator) a life annuity for the invention. In that earlier presentation, Arago noted, “No patent that can be taken out will protect their invention. As soon as knowledge of it be acquired, every body may apply it to their own purpose. ... The process will, therefore, either become the property of every body, or forever remain a secret.”\(^6^0\) After the

\(^5^9\) Here, I use the current scientific terminology for the activities described in Arago’s report. His descriptions of these fields fall primarily under the umbrella term of “natural philosophy” used at the time.

initial announcement of photography’s invention, numerous claimants from other countries came forward asserting that they too had invented photography.\textsuperscript{61} While many of these statements were unsubstantiated, Talbot’s invention of paper photography had proven true. Arago’s introduction of the bill was a means of publically and officially recognizing Daguerre (and to a lesser extent Niépce) as photography’s inventor, and, by extension, securing the French primacy of the introduction of a pictorial technology that seemed poised to take over the world. Arago made this last point clear in his plea for the Chamber to approve the bill, arguing, “You will, we feel confident, participate in an idea which has already excited general sympathy, and you will never suffer us to allow any foreign power to have the glory of having bestowed on the learned and artistick [sic] world one of the most wonderful discoveries of which our country can boast.”\textsuperscript{62}

Arago’s nation-driven account has reverberated throughout the historiography of photography. Here, however, the aim is to consider Italy’s response to the nationalist rhetoric underpinning photography’s introduction. Indeed, Melloni’s discussion of the daguerreotype bears many similarities to his French colleague’s, closely following the latter’s structure and “talking points.” Like Arago, Melloni discussed the history of the invention, tracing the same key figures and moments (Della Porta, the knowledge of the light-sensitivity of silver salts, the partnership between Daguerre and Niépce) in an explanation that results in an almost literal translation from the original French into Italian. Melloni too advocated for the application of the

daguerreotype to a variety of practical pursuits in the arts and sciences, and he even used Arago’s example of copying Egyptian hieroglyphics. Such a direct inspiration is not surprising given that Melloni had a direct connection to Arago from his time spent in exile in Paris in the 1830s. Melloni’s biography thus provides insight into the close association between science and politics within Restoration Italy and his motives for appropriating Arago’s text in Italian terms.

Melloni’s biography is in fact exemplary of the liberal climate that pervaded scientific institutions throughout the Italian peninsula at the time of the invention of photography. He had initially trained as a painter at the Regia Accademia di Belle Arti di Parma, while also taking lessons in physics and mathematics (Figure 1.4). In 1819, he traveled to Paris to continue his artistic education, studying engraving under Charles Clément Balvay (1756-1822) and delving more seriously into scientific studies at the École Polytechnique. Upon his return to Parma in 1823, he became a professor of theoretical-experimental physics, eventually attaining the position of department chair as well as director of the Gabinetto Fisico. Melloni initiated his scientific career at a time of great turmoil in his native region. Despite high regard for the sciences, government censorship of the press compounded by the election of the reactionary Pope Gregory XVI had led to political uprisings throughout Central Italy in the 1830s. The success of France’s July Revolution further fueled these insurrections, and the new King Louis Philippe promised support to Italian revolutionaries fighting against Austrian military actions. Responding to this political climate, Melloni incited his students to participate in public demonstrations. His outspoken political beliefs led to his expulsion from the university, and the offer of a position in the brief revolutionary government. Because of these events, he faced exile.

upon Duchess Maria Luisa’s reinstatement by Austrian forces. Subsequently, Melloni settled in Paris, where his home served as a meeting place for other Italian exiles, becoming a center of republican support of Giuseppe Mazzini’s cause. In 1839, his colleagues Alexander von Humboldt and Arago pled to Louis Phillipe to intercede on Melloni’s behalf, allowing him to return to Italy where he was appointed head of the meteorological observatory and conservatory of technical arts in Naples. This professional ascendancy was short-lived, however; the Bourbon monarchy stripped Melloni of all his government positions and confined him to his house in Portici (Campania) as a result of his participation in the constitutional uprisings of 1848-1849.64

The physicist was part of a generation of educated elites, born during the Napoleonic period, who came of age at the beginning of the Restoration. Inheriting the republican ideals of their parents, these intellectuals strove for industrial and economic progress, and the practical

64 Melloni was remembered for his revolutionary politics and transnational contacts long after the Risorgimento. An intriguing episode from 1920—on the heels of World War I—reveals these lasting nationalist themes. At a conference in San Remo, a representative of the recently annexed province of Zara (present-day Croatia) presented an unpublished letter purportedly written from Abraham Lincoln to Macedonio Melloni in 1853. The letter (later debunked as a forgery) commences by alluding to Melloni’s wide network of colleagues as well as his politics: “Humboldt has given me the message you sent me through Mr. Faraday, of your desire to have my thoughts concerning the political reorganization of Europe. I admire all you have suffered for science and still more what you have suffered for the independence and liberty of your beloved country.” Lincoln continues, “We were all on the road to the forming of a single race when suddenly there fell upon the civilized world that epoch of deep darkness, that epoch of barbarism, obscuring the glorious light of immortal, eternal Rome—that Rome which has given civilization to the entire world, that Rome which has even made America a civilized nation and which has nourished us morally by her indisputable laws, that Rome which in my opinion will be, in the more or less distant future, the luminous capital of the United States of Europe. It is criminal to obstruct the normal course [of] the development of nations and block the foundation of the Future United States of Europe.” The letter recasts Lincoln’s role as “the Great Emancipator” on the terms of Italian nationalism, conceptually linking the American Civil War and Italy’s long process of Unification. In the early days of Italian fascism, Melloni’s fame as international scientist and exiled patriot were thus deployed to advance the cause of empire through Dalmatia’s full annexation to Italy. This episode further exposes the nationalist discourse that shaped photography’s introduction through Italy’s scientific community. Abraham Lincoln to Macedonio Melloni, Springfield, Ill., 1853, in Macedonio Melloni, Carteggio (1819-1854), ed. Edvige Schettino (Firenze: Olschki, 1994), 460-462.
application of scientific knowledge toward these goals. Melloni’s contact with an international community of intellectuals in Paris also situates the Italian patriot within the broader context of nineteenth-century liberalism, and his report on the daguerreotype reflects these cosmopolitan values. Facilitated by his close associations with Arago and the Académie des sciences, solidified during his years of exile in Paris, Melloni effectively positioned himself as liaison and custodian of photography’s entree into Italy, and has been regarded as such in subsequent literature on the subject.

Melloni’s efforts to disseminate his account of the invention of photography throughout Italy via personal correspondence and publications betray his ambitions to follow in Arago’s footsteps. He published his report in Naples shortly after delivering it to the Regia Accademia, and it was soon re-printed in Parma and Rome in early 1840.65 He also sent copies to colleagues in Italy and abroad.66 In a letter to his friend, the patriot Pasquale Berghini, he explicitly stated his desire to emulate Arago:

All the brochures without handwritten notes are for you: among these you will find: two copies of a paper that I read here at the Academy of Sciences about the Daguerreotype. If you would like to read it, you would do me a true favor. I have tried to imitate the


66 For example, Melloni sent his Relazione, which he referred to as “the first treatise on the history of the daguerreotype” (“le premier traité de l’histoire du Daguerréotype”), to a colleague in Geneva, along with an account of his experiments on the chemical action of the solar spectrum on daguerreotype plates. Melloni to Auguste de la Rive, Naples, April 4, 1840, in Macedonio Melloni, Carteggio (1819-1854), 220-221.
popular discourses of Arago in the manner of our esteemed Galilei: I want you to be a severe judge, but do not forget that I give them to you as a first attempt.\textsuperscript{67}

Here, Melloni indicates a desire “to imitate Arago in the manner of Galileo” (to paraphrase), or in other words, to imitate the French example in Italian, in order to reach a larger audience than the scientific community of which he was part.

Melloni’s account departed most significantly from Arago’s through his emphasis on reproducibility – expressed both in terms of the daguerreotype’s direct relationship to reality and in a desire to see daguerreotype images reproduced and disseminated. This latter interest was spurred by recent experiments carried out in France by the physician Alfred Donné (1801-1878), who developed a technique for producing engravings directly from a daguerreotype plate.\textsuperscript{68}

Donné had sent these examples of images made from these chemically etched daguerreotype plates to the Académie des Sciences, asserting that among other uses, they might reproduce architectural views.\textsuperscript{69} Melloni wrote of Donné’s experiments, “now it is possible to produce on metal and with the sole action of light and some chemical reactions, independently of any aid traced from the arts of drawing, some lines, more or less wide and deep, totally analogous to the work of ordinary etching, and to afterwards copy a few examples of them on paper,” and thus concluded, “the daguerreotype, joined to the method of Dr. Donné, should clearly spread itself among every class of scientist, and even among those persons who are ignorant even of the first

\textsuperscript{67}“Tutti gli opuscoli senza indicazioni scritte a mano sono per te: tra questi troverai: due copie di un lavoro che ho letto qui all'Accademia delle Scienze intorno al Dagherrotipo: se ti piacesse di percorrerlo mi faresti un vero favore. Mi son provato ad imitare le dissertazioni popolari d'Arago coi modi del nostro sommo Galilei: giudica pure severamente come desidero: ma non dimenticare che te le do per un primo tentativo.” Melloni to Pasquale Berghini, Naples, December 1839, \textit{Macedonio Melloni, Carteggio (1819-1854)}, 216.


\textsuperscript{69}Carolyn Bloore, “Photography and Printmaking 1840-1860” (PhD diss., University of Reading, 1991), 11.
elements of physics.” Melloni indicated a clear awareness that the daguerreotype’s significance lay in its capacity to not only reproduce the world more faithfully than existing mediums could, but also suggested that in order to achieve the medium’s full potential, the resulting images needed to circulate widely. Donné’s method, therefore, offered a possible avenue for overcoming what was seen as the daguerreotype’s primary limitation, its lack of reproducibility.

Traditional narratives about photography and its relationship to prints maintain that the medium replaced earlier printmaking techniques because it presented a more faithful copy of the original than could previously be obtained, thus rendering older techniques obsolete. However, the many parallel and combined uses of printmaking, photography, and painting over the course of the nineteenth century dispute this causal trajectory. Stephen Pinson, for example, has argued that Arago specifically promoted the non-reproducible quality of the daguerreotype to the French government as an advantage, precisely because it could not be widely circulated as a

---

70 “ora, si possono produrre su metallo e per la sola azione della luce e di alcuni chimici reagenti, indipendentemente da qualunque soccorso tratto dalle arti del disegno, degli scavi? più o meno larghi e profondi totalmente analoghi ai lavori dell’incisione ordinaria, e trarne poscia parecchi esemplari su carta. […] Il Dagherrotipo congiunto al metodo tipografico del dottor Donnè, deve evidentemente spargersi fra ogni classe di scienziati, e persino tra le persone che ignorano anche i primi elementi di fisica.” Melloni, Relazione, 214. Melloni’s quotation emphasizing the reproduction of daguerreotypes has also been cited in Bonetti, “D’après le Daguerreotype…L’immagine dell’Italia tra incisione e fotografia,” in L’Italia d’argento, 33.


means of anti-government propaganda.\textsuperscript{73} Taking into consideration Pinson’s argument, Melloni’s desire that the daguerreotype (or, photography more generally) “spread among every class of scientist, and even among those persons who are ignorant of the first elements of physics,” might be viewed as a radical proposition to put knowledge into the hands of the people.\textsuperscript{74} Although photography did not truly become a mass medium until later in the nineteenth century, Melloni recognized its potential to communicate ideas even among uneducated audiences more convincingly than other media. Melloni’s account demonstrates that photography represented a new means of spreading knowledge and that he recognized, together with his scientific community, that this technology would impact the politics of liberalism during the Risorgimento.

The Daguerreotype “Rendered Italian”

Melloni’s translation of Arago’s account into Italian was one important step in the reception of photography within the peninsula. The publication in Italian of the specific details of Daguerre’s process, recorded in his 1839 manual \textit{Historique et description des procédés du Daguerréotype et du diorama}, was also key to the understanding of the new medium.\textsuperscript{75} This publication included Arago’s account, step-by-step directions for making a daguerreotype, and engraved illustrations of the process based on original drawings by Daguerre. The publisher Alessandro Monaldi issued the first Italian edition of the manual, which included the same

\textsuperscript{74} “spargersi fra ogni classe di scienziati, e persino tra le persone che ignorano anche i primi elementi di fisica.” Melloni, \textit{Relazione}, 214.
\textsuperscript{75} \textit{Historique et description des procédés du Daguerréotype et du diorama, par Daguerre, Peintre, inventeur du Diorama, officier de la Légion-d’Honneur, membre de plusieurs Académies, etc., etc.,} (Paris: Susse Frères, Éditeurs, 1839), repr. (Paris: Lerebours, Opticien de l’Observatoire, Place du Pont-Neuf, 1839).
elements, in Rome in 1840. A comparison of this early Italian edition to its French prototype reflects the license with which Italian engravers modified Daguerre’s illustrations through a specifically local visual culture, demonstrating the medium’s potential for depicting and distributing images of cultural patrimony.

The editors Susse Frères, based in Paris, first published Daguerre’s manual in September of 1839. Within less than a year, over forty versions in different languages had been issued worldwide. Because the French government had publicly revealed technical details of the process, no single publisher had a strong claim to copyright over the material, and an estimated nine thousand copies of the brochure were distributed within the first months of its publication. The engraved illustrations found in the French manuals published by Susse Frères (Figure 1.5) and Alphonse Giroux (Figure 1.6), both of whom had specific contracts with Daguerre for their editions, depict daguerreotype plates in the process of being developed and fixed, and correspond in the manual to an explanatory text. The illustrations show the key steps in the process of making a daguerreotype, from sensitizing the copper plate to exposing it to light in a camera obscura, and finally, to fixing the image using mercury vapors. In the engravings, the images on the example daguerreotypes represent landscape scenes. These landscapes, which are presumably original to Daguerre’s drawings that formed the basis for the engravings, also appear in the

---

76 Descrizione Pratica del nuovo istromento chiamato il daguerrotipo coll’aiuto del quale si riproducono spontaneamente le immagini della natura ricevute nella camera oscura, non già con I colori, ma bensì con una estrema finezza di gradazioni di tinte Nuova scoperta del Sig. Daguerre pittore, inventore del Diorama, ufficiale della Legione d’Onore, membro di varie accademie ec. ec. Prima traduzione italiana (Roma: Alessandro Monaldi Tipografo, 1840), repr. Piero Becchetti, Roma in Dagherrotipia (Rome: Edizioni Quasar, 1979), 177-194.
illustrations of early British and American translations of the manual from the same period.79 By comparison, the plates accompanying Monaldi’s Italian translation of the manual render Daguerre’s original drawings Italian by replacing the generic landscapes in the Susse Frères edition with vedute of the Capitoline Hill from the Forum, and the piazza and façade of St. Peter’s (Figure 1.7).80 While this is a minor detail of an otherwise faithful translation of the original manuscript, the creative insertion of recognizable landmarks demonstrated a desire among Italian audiences to adopt the new medium as a means of representing their own cultural patrimony.

In his 1839 lecture, Melloni had, in essence, proposed this idea, noting, “everyone wishes to have this precious instrument in his hands, all long to use it, as quickly as possible, to copy not only prints, drawings, statues, monuments, but oil paintings by our most famous artists…”81 Both Melloni’s account and the Italian translation of Daguerre’s manual emphasized the daguerreotype’s ability to copy, preserve, and thus, promote the glory of Italy’s past with an unrivaled veracity. In a period characterized by foreign domination, which was increasingly

---


80 *Descrizione Pratica del nuovo istromento chiamato il daguerrotipo*, 194.

81 “…ognuno vorrebbe avere tra le mani questo prezioso strumento, ognuno bramerebbe impiegarlo, il più presto possibile, a ritrarre non solo stampe, disegni, statue, monumenti, ma i quadri ad olio de’ nostri piú celebri artisti…” Melloni, *Relazione*, 225.
viewed among Italy’s scientists as an impediment to socio-economic progress, this shared past provided an important unifying function.  

The Daguerreotype “Rendered Popular”

In December 1839, the Neapolitan illustrated magazine *Poliorama pittoresco* published translated excerpts and illustrations from Daguerre’s manual in an issue dedicated entirely to the new invention. *Poliorama pittoresco* was a weekly variety magazine illustrated with lithographs that featured articles on a wide variety of topics including art, history, biography, geography, travel, literature, and scientific discovery. The magazine was intended to entertain and educate an urban bourgeois readership. Whereas Melloni’s report and the publication of Daguerre’s manual in Italian represented key steps in the reception of photography among Italy’s scientific community, the introduction of the daguerreotype within *Poliorama pittoresco* signified a further phase in this process by making that information available to a broader non-specialized public.

The contributors to this issue of the magazine made their intentions clear, writing, “…the strictly scientific account Melloni read in our Academy of Sciences takes everyone with a desire to race in the same arena. We come together here only to render popular a discovery, which has caused
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quite a stir...”83 In other words, rather than attempting to contribute to the specialized discourse on the new medium dominating Europe’s scientific institutions, they proposed to explain the daguerreotype in “popular” terms. Although here, “popular” must be understood as an elite audience of educated readers, nonetheless, by interpreting the scientific discovery for a general audience, the magazine’s editors responded to Melloni’s prediction that photography might “spread among every class of scientist, and even among those persons who are ignorant of the first elements of physics...” 84

It is important to remember that Melloni made that statement specifically in reference to using Donné’s method to print daguerreotype images. In fact, the December 1839 issue of *Poliorama pittoresco* featured a reproduction of a daguerreotype, realized through lithography for this particular magazine. The illustration (Figure 1.8) depicts one of the first successful daguerreotypes made in Naples by the physics professor and architect Gaetano Fazzini (1806-1878) on December 14, 1839 as part of a demonstration within the offices of *Poliorama pittoresco*.85 Fazzini had trained as a physicist in his native Vieste (Puglia) and in London with the esteemed British scientist Michael Faraday, and taught the subject at a school in Naples run by his older brother Lorenzo, a mathematician. He allegedly traveled to Paris in the fall of 1839...

83 “… la memoria severamente scientifica dell’italiano Melloni letta nella nostra accademia delle scienze, tolgono a ognuno il desio di più correre il medesimo aringo. Noi qui solo convenimmo per rendere popolare una scoverta, che fè tanto rumore…” Antonio Fazzini, “Poche parole sul dagherrotipo,” *Il Poliorama pittoresco*, 4, no. 19 (December 21, 1839): 150.
to learn the daguerreotype directly from its inventor. Whether or not Fazzini knew Daguerre personally, he certainly had the expertise as well as connections within scientific communities in Naples and abroad that help explain his early interest in photography. Unfortunately, no daguerreotypes made by Fazzini have survived, so it is difficult to judge his level of commitment or success with the medium. Nonetheless, the example of Fazzini provides further evidence of the significance of Italy’s scientific networks to disseminating information about photography within the first year of its invention.

The illustration of Fazzini’s daguerreotype, which the magazine claims is a faithful reproduction, records a still life of sculptures of Italian literary figures grouped on a tabletop to create a tableau resonant with Italian history and its humanist legacy. The arrangement of statuary in Fazzini’s image bares striking similarities to early examples by Daguerre and his associate Giroux, including a contemporaneous French example recently rediscovered at the Biblioteca di Imola (Figure 1.9). Scholars such as Julia Ballerini and Geoffrey Batchen have analyzed similar daguerreotypes for their self-consciously artistic staging, arguing that those still life arrangements of medieval French sculptures represented photography’s potential to collect, copy, and preserve cultural patrimony. Throughout Europe, Romanticism inspired a new

relationship between the individual and history, expressed in a number of ways, including the
desire to preserve artistic heritage as a form of collective – and especially national – memory.\textsuperscript{89} I
argue that Fazzini adopted his pictorial strategy from Daguerre, but turned his camera toward
subjects that would hold specific significance to his Italian audience.

Although other scholars have referenced this lithograph as an important artifact of early
experiments with photography in Italy, this dissertation is the first to identify and interpret the
subject of the illustration. In this image, a bust of Dante lies on its side beside a statuette copy of
a sculpture of an orator, and prominently included in the foreground at left is a bust of the poet
Torquato Tasso (Figure 1.10). A tall oil lamp known as a \textit{lucerna} separates Tasso’s bust from the
others. Such lamps were common throughout the Roman world, and had been excavated at
Pompeii, which led to their popularity during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The lamp
thus references the classical tradition embodied by the nearby statue of an orator. It depicts a
rhetorician with arms folded to restrain his gestures while giving a speech, and bears a striking
resemblance to that of Aeschines discovered at Pompeii in the eighteenth century (Figure 1.11),
and celebrated by the sculptor Antonio Canova as one of the most important antiquities in
Naples.\textsuperscript{90} Rather than surving a functional purpose, the lamp instead connotes the inspiration and
genius embodied by the orator, Tasso, and Dante—important Italian luminaries (\textit{primi lumi})—
and perhaps even symbolizes the “light writing” of photography. The entire tableau, therefore,
allegorizes photography as a new kind of visual language. By including a bust of Dante, Fazzini

\textsuperscript{764-776; Julia Ballerini, “Recasting Ancestry: Statuettes as Imagined by Three Inventors of
Photography,” in \textit{The Object as Subject: Essays on the Interpretation of Still Life}, ed. Anne
\textsuperscript{89} A classic text on this subject is Stephen Bann, \textit{Romanticism and the Rise of History} (New
York: Twayne Publishers, 1995.)
212-215; Francis Haskell and Nicholas Penny, \textit{Taste and the Antique} (New Haven: Yale
proposed that photography might also serve a unifying function, since the poet’s work was so highly regarded that the Tuscan dialect in which it was written became the common language of all educated Italians. In fact, at the time that Fazzini made his daguerreotype, the figures of Dante and Tasso were viewed as national poets who provided an artistic, spiritual, and even patriotic model for a new generation of Romantic writers attempting to reinvigorate Italian literature.91

The literary character of the daguerreotype’s composition was further enhanced by the content accompanying its reproduction within the pages of Poliorama pittoresco. In addition to printing basic information about daguerreotype technology, the magazine also included poems written in the style of humanist encomia that extolled the virtues of the daguerreotype by comparing Daguerre to the likes of Della Porta and Christopher Columbus.92 On the relative importance of the Frenchman, however, the magazine made its position clear, noting, “Daguerre would be inconceivable without the Neapolitan Giambattista Della Porta; and the daguerreotype would be inconceivable without the camera obscura.”93 This statement and the iconography of Fazzini’s daguerreotype provide further evidence that from an early date Italian scientists viewed photography as a tool for promoting Italian achievement, which in turn bolstered a sense of national identity.

Through Fazzini’s daguerreotype and the magazine’s other literary references, this special issue of Poliorama pittoresco implied that photography represented a new visual language with the potential to unify Italians by representing shared cultural traditions. The self-stated mission of the editors of Poliorama pittoresco to explain the daguerreotype on “popular”

93 “Daguerre era impossibile senza il Napolitano Giambattista della Porta; e il Dagherrotipo senza la Camera oscura.” Antonio Fazzini, “Poche parole sul dagherrotipo,” 150.
terms underscores this unifying mission. The format of the illustrated magazine as a genre was of particular significance because it took the invention of photography out of an elite scientific realm and introduced it to a broader educated public. The sociologist Jürgen Habermas has examined the relationship between the development of the press in eighteenth-century Europe and the development of a “bourgeois public sphere.” For Habermas, the public who gathered in coffee houses, social clubs, and salons to debate the ideas expressed in contemporary periodicals formed public opinion, which in turn influenced politics by giving voice to society’s grievances against the government. In Italy, the formation of a public sphere through the press occurred later than in other parts of Europe, beginning around 1815. During the 1830s and 1840s especially, a variety of new periodicals and journals, including Poliorama pittoresco, proliferated throughout Italy’s urban centers, where they contributed to a growing nationalist discourse. A cover illustration from the Milan-based illustrated magazine Cosmorama Pittorico’s 1839 volume, for example, features a group of bourgeois readers engrossed in a variety of journalistic material in the social setting of a reading room, participating in this new media landscape (Figure 1.12).

Illustrated magazines first emerged in London and Paris during the early 1830s from publishers seeking to extend their readership to include a growing middle class audience. Capitalizing on advances in printmaking technology, illustrated magazines seamlessly combined typography and images to create a dynamic viewing experience for readers. Notably, the
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94 Habermas, The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere, 72-73.
format and content of illustrated magazines was surprisingly homogenous across Europe. However, Italian editors modeled their publications after early successes in the genre, such as London’s *Penny Magazine* (1832), Leipzig’s *Pfennig-Magazin* (1833), and Paris’s *Le Magasin pittoresque* (1833). Cheaply made, each eight-page issue was priced for high-volume circulation, making it accessible for the petit-bourgeoisie. Rather than reporting on current events, these variety periodicals included travelogues, biographies, historical accounts, and articles about technological and scientific breakthroughs. In his study of illustrated magazines in Great Britain, Gerry Beegan has demonstrated the central role of repetition in the success of the genre. The magazines included serialized stories across issues, and reused illustrations in different literary contexts. These strategies, which were certainly practical in reducing production costs, also constructed an alternate vision of reality within the magazine’s pages that was shared among a “knowing” readership. In this way, illustrated magazines became a social experience that contributed to the development of an “imagined collectivity” of readers.

Whereas in France and Great Britain, illustrated magazines already reached a mass audience by the 1840s, in Italy wide-scale illiteracy (at the time of Unification, about seventy-five percent of Italy’s population of 25 million remained illiterate) and a lack of an industrialized...
national press limited their distribution.\textsuperscript{100} The readers of illustrated magazines were, therefore, primarily an educated urban elite. As Lucy Riall has pointed out,

\begin{quote}
…writers, journalists and editors – along with some artists and scientists – effectively constituted a good part of the ‘public sphere’ in Restoration Italy. From the eighteenth century onwards, it was they who had negotiated new public spaces and established a degree of autonomy for themselves from the centres of political power. After 1815, and despite the harsh constraints of press censorship, it was through the associations and publications of such autonomous intellectuals, scientists and artists that ideas of liberalism and national identity were first circulated and debated.\textsuperscript{101}
\end{quote}

It was precisely this same community of writers and intellectuals who produced \textit{Poliorama pittoresco}. The appearance of a special issue of this illustrated magazine dedicated to introducing the daguerreotype to the public sphere demonstrates that this community of readers recognized the invention as a prospective tool for promoting Italian nationalism.

\textit{Poliorama pittoresco} was not the only periodical in Italy to report on the daguerreotype, but it was perhaps the most innovative in its approach. Despite the fact that Fazzini’s daguerreotype only appeared in the pages of the magazine as a lithographic reproduction, the illustration would likely have been many readers’ first visual encounter with the new medium. Although magazine illustrations based on photographs appeared in publications in France, Great Britain, and the United States during the 1840s, they did not become commonplace until the 1850s, and did not appear with any regularity in Italy until the 1870s.\textsuperscript{102} Nonetheless, this early effort on the part of the magazine’s editors to reproduce and thus disseminate the daguerreotype demonstrates that they recognized that photography’s privileged relationship to reality could

\textsuperscript{100} Lucy Riall, \textit{Garibaldi Invention of a Hero} (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), 135.
\textsuperscript{101} On the use of the Italian language in nineteenth-century Italy, see also: Michele Colombo and John J. Kinder, “Italian as a Language of Communication in Nineteenth Century Italy and Abroad,” \textit{Italica} 89, no. 1 (Spring 2012): 109-121.
\textsuperscript{102} Lucy Riall, \textit{Garibaldi}, 137.
\textsuperscript{102} \textit{L’Illustrazione Italiana} (1875-1962) was the first national periodical within Italy to make frequent use of photographic reproductions, and the first that can be said to have reached a mass audience.
transform the cultural symbols of Italy’s shared history into a meaningful iconography of Italian unity. The publishing industry, working in tandem with the scientific community, therefore, not only disseminated key information about the daguerreotype, but also demonstrated its relevance to the nationalist discourse emerging within the public sphere.

**Fragile Contacts: Antonio Bertoloni and William Henry Fox Talbot**

Despite the early interest within Italy surrounding the daguerreotype expressed in the above examples, the peninsula’s economic circumstances precluded the level of industry necessary to support mass production of copper plates, cases, and chemicals that made the daguerreotype a nearly “democratic” medium in countries like Great Britain, France, and the United States. While daguerreotype studios were certainly a feature of Italian cities from as early as 1840, and itinerant daguerreotypists plied their trade throughout the peninsula, paper photography ultimately attained the mass production and distribution that put Italy on equal footing with other nations. Talbot’s negative-positive photographic process was, therefore, critical to realizing the progressive goals of Italy’s scientific community, by offering the possibility for scientists to easily exchange photographic specimens through letters, and thus effectively disseminate their discoveries. His correspondence with the botanists Antonio Bertoloni and Michele Tenore and the optician Giovanni Battista Amici, therefore, signifies another important step in the reception of photography and its practical application within Italy.

---


Throughout 1839, reports of Talbot’s invention had appeared alongside news of the daguerreotype in the Italian press. For example, *Il Lucifero*, a weekly scientific journal published in Naples, employed a staff reporter posted at the Académie des sciences in Paris to give almost weekly updates about that institution’s debates over both the daguerreotype and paper-based photography. Italian scientists viewed with skepticism Talbot’s method of producing photogenic drawings because they were initially unable to replicate his results. Whereas the French government had proactively supported Daguerre’s invention by granting him an annuity and making details of the process widely known, the British government did not do the same for Talbot. Furthermore, to his own detriment, Talbot took out a patent for his invention and attempted, in vain, to protect it. Thus within the first few years of its invention, the method was practiced primarily by those who had learned it directly from Talbot or his associates.

Significant for the spread of paper photography in Italy, Talbot reached out personally to several Italian scientists with whom he was acquainted. He had first met a number of them during trips to Italy in 1822-1823 and 1833. Therefore, when he sent samples of his photogenic drawings to Bertoloni, Tenore, and Amici, he was continuing a correspondence with members of an international scientific community with whom he had associated for nearly two decades. Letters from these Italian scientists indicate that Talbot’s process was initially little understood on the continent, where information coming from France was more readily available. For example, Tenore, a botanist at the Università di Napoli, received a packet of three photogenic drawings from Talbot in the summer of 1839. In response, he wrote:

107 For Talbot’s travel in Italy, see: Larry Schaaf, *Out of the shadows: Herschel, Talbot & the invention of photography* (New Haven: Yale University Press), 23-44.
because of the publication of Daguerre’s process, everyone, because they were disillusioned, would have forgotten about the hopes that we had nurtured about the advantages of this extremely complicated, difficult, and costly discovery. We had not forgotten that in making a comparison between your process and that of Mr Daguerre, Mr Arago had thrown the greatest disfavour on yours, saying that your drawings completely faded when exposed to the light. Very recently we read in the Paris newspapers that a Mr Bayard, at the Martiniquan exhibition, had put in photogenic drawings on paper, obtained by a different process than that of Daguerre, that everyone had admired. It does not say if Bayard’s method has any connection with yours: but the newspapers call it his discovery. In fact, after the presumed invalidity of your drawings, we would not have been able to say that we had found any resemblance; but after having seen your drawings which are very beautiful and which resist perfectly the action of the light, we are tempted to believe that Bayard has seized upon your process. The universal library of Nice has published the process of drawings which it says are yours, but those who tried to reproduce them did not succeed. This is why I am writing to you to ask you, providing that you will not make a secret of your discovery, that you write me a very detailed explanation so that we can adopt it, especially to draw objects from natural history with the aid of the solar microscope.\textsuperscript{108}

Such a letter must have been a harsh blow to Talbot, since it reveals the extent to which Daguerre’s invention garnered the majority of critical attention, yet Tenore made clear that Italian scientists were eager to achieve the same positive results in their own experiments as those they read about in the press. Tenore presented Talbot’s photogenic drawings at the Reale Istituto di Incoraggiamento delle Scienze e delle Arti in Naples, and reported upon his correspondence with the Englishman in the journal \textit{Il Lucifero}.\textsuperscript{109} It was even through Tenore that Melloni was able to include Talbot’s method in his account of the daguerreotype read at the Regia Accademia delle Scienze in Naples. Tenore’s letter is evidence of the importance of transnational scientific networks in the dissemination of knowledge about photography within Italy.

\textsuperscript{108} Michele Tenore to W. H. F. Talbot, September 30, 1839, Document number: 3941, \textit{The Correspondence of William Henry Fox Talbot}, http://foxtalbot.dmu.ac.uk/. None of the photogenic drawings Talbot sent to Tenore have been located.

\textsuperscript{109} Marina Miraglia, “Regno delle Due Sicilie,” in \textit{Fotografia Italiana dell’Ottocento} (Milan: Electa, 1979), 133.
As a further effort to promote his process, between June 1839 and June 1840, Talbot sent thirty-six photogenic drawings and related correspondence to the botanist Antonio Bertoloni (1775-1869), who compiled these “specimens,” along with three examples made using the same method by an Italian pharmacist named “Tassinari,” into an Album di disegni fotogenici, now known as The Bertoloni Album (Figure 1.13). Previous scholarship has regarded this artifact of paper photography primarily as evidence of Talbot’s efforts to promote his invention in response to Daguerre’s growing fame, an interpretation that has nonetheless obscured the album’s significance to Italy, where it was originally compiled. Bertoloni was one of Talbot’s frequent Italian correspondents, and one of the most noteworthy Italian scientists of his time (Figure 1.14). Born in Sarzana (Liguria) in 1775, he studied medicine at Pavia and Genoa before his appointment as chair of botany at the University of Bologna in 1815. Bertoloni’s greatest
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110 See: Malcolm Daniel, “L’Album Bertoloni,” in Fotografia & fotografia a Bologna, 1839-1900, ed. Giuseppina Benassati and Angela Tromellini (Bologna: Grafis Edizioni, 1992), 73-78; Graham Smith, “Talbot and Botany: The Bertoloni Album,” History of Photography, 17, no. 1 (Spring 1993): 33-48; Maria Francesca Bonetti, “Talbot et l’introduction du calotype en Italie, in Eloge du negatif: les débuts de la photographie sur papier en Italie, 1846-1862, ed. Gilles Chazal (Paris: Paris musées, 2010), 25-35. The Bertoloni Album is preserved at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, where the curator of prints William M. Ivins, Jr. acquired it from a London bookseller in 1936. While Daniel positions the album as a significant object of the early history of photography in Bologna, as its presence in a catalogue dedicated to nineteenth-century photography in that city suggests, it has never held a prominent position in histories of photography in Italy. Smith’s essay similarly points to the album’s significance for Bologna, but primarily focuses on its relationship to Talbot. These studies demonstrate that it is only by leaving Italy that the album has received attention. Such historic disregard for Italy’s own photographic history has delayed investigation of significant artifacts like The Bertoloni Album. For example, Daniela Palazzoli’s brief essay on Italy in Helmut Gernsheim’s 1981 book The Origins of Photography offered the first authoritative account of Italian photography’s origins in an English-language publication, yet misspelled Tassinari’s name as “Faggiarani,” and his identity has remained obscure until now. While existing sources provide significant details regarding the correspondence between Bertoloni and Talbot, only Maria Francesca Bonetti has addressed its Italian context by tracing the larger history of paper photography in Italy, albeit within a French publication.

contributions to Italian botany were his extensive herbarium and his landmark multi-volume publication *Flora Italica*, which brought together for the first time an exhaustive account of flora across the regions of Italy.\footnote{112} Scholars have regarded this print corpus of Italian plants as exemplary of the same burgeoning nationalist spirit as the scientific congresses.\footnote{113} Likewise, it corresponds to similarly encyclopedic efforts in the visual arts to depict sites from throughout the peninsula, such as those found in illustrated magazines.

Due to Bertoloni’s prominence within the field of botany, when Talbot wrote to the Italian about his invention of photography in June 1839, he explained it in terms of its potential usefulness to the discipline. Talbot wrote, “I am taking advantage of this opportunity to send you a little package of my photogenic drawings – I think that this new art invented by me will be a big help to Botanists – especially the drawings that I am doing with the solar microscope.”\footnote{114} The sentiment of this letter demonstrates how important validation from the international scientific community was for Talbot at this early stage. Nonetheless, despite his efforts to demonstrate otherwise, botanists initially regarded Talbot’s photogenic drawings (Figures 1.15-1.17) of little practical value because, as contact prints made by placing the leaf directly on light-sensitized paper, they lacked the color and definition of internal structures that provided the necessary information for taxonomic classification.\footnote{115} Despite these flaws, Talbot’s photographic


\footnote{113} Valerio Giacomini, “Antonio Bertoloni.”

\footnote{114} W. H. F. Talbot to Antonio Bertoloni, June 1839, Document number: 3887, *The Correspondence of William Henry Fox Talbot*, http://foxtalbot.dmu.ac.uk/.

\footnote{115} For considerations of the utility of Talbot’s photogenic drawings of plants to botanists, and their resemblance (or lack thereof) to traditional botanical illustration, see: Carol Armstrong, *Scenes in a Library: Reading the Photograph in the Book, 1843-1875* (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1998), 153-60; Carol Armstrong, “Cameralless: From Natural Illustrations and Nature Prints to Manual and Photogenic Drawings and Other Botanographs” in *Ocean Flowers*, ed.
“specimens,” as he called them, held the benefit of easy transportability and they could be copied in subsequent positive photographic prints, and – in theory, if not in practice – disseminated widely. If brought to perfection, his photogenic drawings offered a surrogate for real botanical specimens that would allow the botanist to keep his own most important specimens while circulating copies among colleagues at home and abroad, which would in turn advance scientific discovery.

More than other scientific fields during the mid-nineteenth century, botany relied heavily on personal contacts among scientists, since in order to compile specimens for taxonomic classification botanists collected and exchanged specimens with a vast network of professionals and amateurs linked through correspondence. Attesting to the transnational character of the discipline, the botany section at the Italian scientific congresses included the largest number of international participants. Indeed, Talbot and Bertoloni frequently sent each other botanical specimens for their respective collections. Paper photography in particular lent itself to this type of transcontinental exchange. For example, Talbot’s friend, the astronomer John Herschel sent to Julia Margaret Cameron in Calcutta twenty-four photographs that he had made using his own
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variation on Talbot’s process. Bertoloni’s herbarium, which served as the study collection for his botanical atlas, relied on knowledgeable amateurs like Talbot to provide samples from far-off places in Italy and abroad. An example of one of the many specimens he sent to Bertoloni shows how each was dutifully dried, mounted on paper, and labeled according to convention (Figure 1.18). In this regard, The Bertoloni Album is a key example of the intersecting personal and professional networks through which knowledge of photography initially spread. Furthermore, it provides evidence of the desire among Italian scientists to both participate in this moment of invention and to utilize the new medium to further their own scientific endeavors.

In addition to botanical “specimens,” Talbot sent Bertoloni photogenic drawings depicting lithographs, lace, statuettes, and his home at Lacock Abbey, among other subjects, in order to demonstrate the versatility of his method. These examples included cameraless images made by placing an object directly on a sheet of photo-sensitized paper and exposing it to light, as well as images made using a camera obscura. Among these demonstrations of photography’s potential usefulness, two photographs in particular emphasize the personal connection between the correspondents. Figure 1.19 depicts a table set for breakfast. In this photograph, Talbot has positioned the camera slightly above the table, as though the viewer were approaching a seat at the abundantly laid table, in a sense inviting Bertoloni to share a meal in an image symbolic of friendly contact. In turn, Bertoloni annotated the image with the descriptive title, “Tavola

118 Colin Ford, “‘To startle the eye with wonder and delight’: The Photographs of Julia Margaret Cameron,” in Julia Margaret Cameron: The Complete Photographs (Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum, 2003), 42.
119 Science historian Anne Secord argues that botanical illustrations served as a form of scientific spectacle, which helped popularize botany and thus foster a community of knowledgeable amateurs. These individuals collected plant specimens, supporting professionals’ work. Botanical illustrations themselves were never meant to replace specimens, but functioned as aids to taxonomic classification, and were used in tandem with the thing itself. Secord, “Botany on a Plate,” 32-35.
parecchiata per colazione a Thé,” so that this album page functions as a form of conversation between the two men across great distance.

Figure 1.20 depicts Talbot’s garden at Lacock Abbey, and he has labeled it “mio giardino” on the back (a rare use of Italian, since his letters to Bertoloni were penned in French.) The garden would have been a point of pride for a botanist, and Bertoloni had lauded Talbot in a previous letter for his success at growing foreign plants in his English garden.120 The botanical garden, like Bertoloni’s herbarium, collected local and exotic species within one space, much in the same way that his Flora Italica bound samples from Italy’s disparate regions into a singular geographic totality. Both of these examples thus served a unifying function that is also echoed in the format of a photographic album. The botanist’s system of taxonomic classification, which involved the identification of common traits through visual comparison, was a means of unifying and ordering discrete specimens within a whole collection. The Bertoloni Album preserves Talbot’s specimens – of plants and other subjects alike – with a similarly systematic approach that demonstrates photography’s capacity to accurately record, reproduce, and circulate images, which would be of great use to scientists.

Bound in red leather and embossed in gold on the cover, Bertoloni’s Album di disegni fotogenici is a personal rather than an official document. Reading this object in its totality helps illuminate Bertoloni’s reception of photogenic drawing, since he was the curator of the album’s contents, appearance, and organization. While the layout reflects the botanist’s professional point of view, it is clear that this is not a scientific notebook, but a personal commemoration of its creator’s participation in a moment of historical significance.121 Studies on the use of albums in

121 Graham Smith has also noted that Bertoloni’s organization of this album reflects his scientific
the nineteenth century have demonstrated their importance for analyzing the original contexts of viewing and reception of early photographs. For example, the sequential placement of photographs in an album often reveals an underlying narrative structure, while annotations and captions frame the meaning of the photographs, revealing the album as the sum of its parts. In this particular case, Bertoloni carefully pasted each photogenic drawing onto the album pages in chronological order of receipt, and transcribed their subjects in ink below each photogenic drawing. He translated the identifications from Talbot’s annotations into Italian or Latin for botanical specimens, thereby distinguishing his interest in some photographs as personal versus professional. The process of labeling each botanical image, which has been isolated and identified like a specimen in his herbarium, reflects the scientist’s method of collecting and organizing these objects for further study.

The texts that Bertoloni interspersed throughout the album provide further documentation of this Italian scientist’s engagement with early photography. For example, a clipping from the journal Ricoglitore di cognizione utili begins the sequence of photogenic drawings, and suggests the prominence of nationalist rhetoric within early reports on the medium:

Much has been written in the past months in both English and French newspapers on the new method of disegni fotogenici (photogenic drawings), namely to portray an object or a landscape, etc. by the action of light on prepared paper. This method has remained a secret for some time, but from published reports it seems that this English training, but does not discuss or reproduce the three images by Tassinari in this context. Smith, “Talbot and Botany,” 39.

method differs from the French…. One longed for results of this art produced also in Italy... 123

The article also indicates that Talbot had sent Bertoloni copies of Some Account of the Art of Photogenic Drawing, a scientific paper which the botanist presented publically at the Accademia delle Scienze dell’Istituto di Bologna in July of 1839. 124 Furthermore, a post-script to a second article from the same journal inserted into the album proves that some of the photogenic drawings had been made available by Bertoloni for public viewing at the journal’s editorial offices in Bologna. 125 By including these clippings in the album, Bertoloni preserved a record of his role as protagonist in the introduction of paper photography to Italy. Significantly, just as Fazzini had demonstrated the daguerreotype in the editorial offices of Poliorama pittoresco before it was printed in the magazine’s pages, Bertoloni also disseminated information about Talbot’s process and made examples available for the learned community of which he was part.

At the end of this sequence, Bertoloni placed a transcript of a talk given by Carlo Passerini at the Regio Museo di Fisica e Storia Naturale in Florence in May 1840, which

123 “Molto fu scritto ne’ mesi trascorsi dai giornali tanto Inglesi che Francesi sulla nuova maniera di disegni fotogenici, di effigiare cioè mediante l’azione della luce sopra una carta preparata un oggetto qualunque, un paesaggio ec. Tale arte si mantiene tuttavolta un segreto, ma dalle relazioni pubblicate sembra il metodo inglese sia diverso dal Francese…Dopo tutto ciò si desideravano per anco in Italia prodotti di cotale arte.” Luigi Vaccà, “Arti,” Ricoglitore di Cognizione Utili, 2, no. 6 (15 July 1839): 25 (repr. in Daniel, “L’Album Bertoloni,” 74.)
124 In order to celebrate Bertoloni’s importance within the scientific community, the Commissione dell’Università in Bologna honored the botanist on his ninetieth birthday by paying for his portrait to be taken by the photography studio Heyland and Deroche, and in his funeral oration for Bertoloni, Camillo Versari mentioned the communications with Talbot: “Talbot quickly involved our Antonio in his discovery, and sent him copies of plants and other things, or the first photographs viewed by us.” (“Talbot partecipava ben presto al nostro Antonio la sua scoperta, e spedivagliene copie di piante e di altro, o le prime fotografie vedute tra noi.”) Quoted in Angela Tromellini, “Deroche, Hyppolyte (att. 1860-70 ca.) Antonio Bertolonio. (esec. 1865),” in Fotografia & fotografi a Bologna, 1839-1900, Giuseppina Benassati and Angela Tromellini, eds. (Bologna: Grafis Edizioni, 1992), 170.
reported on Puliti’s ongoing experiments with photography in Tuscany. Inscribed by its author Passerini, this text attests to Italian scientists’ shared interest in photography as well as the communication of findings across Italy’s regional divides.\textsuperscript{126} This notice functions to divide the album content by separating Talbot’s original examples from three contact prints (Figures 1.21-22) made by a local colleague of Bertoloni, identified as Tassinari. Bertoloni’s undated annotation, “Primo tentativo fatto in Italia del Sig. Tassinari farmacista e chimico in Castel Bolognese,” clarifies that these images represent the “first attempts” at photography on paper made in Italy, and thus confirm local scientific experimentation with the new invention.

Clearly, Tassinari’s selection of botanical subjects for his experiments was based on Talbot’s model, but his initial trials were imperfect and technically flawed. The fact that one has completely faded demonstrates the difficulty of fixing the image at this time. The penciled notes “sal” and “salina” found in the corners document Tassinari’s experimentation, indicating the scientist’s inductive method of trial-and-error as he tested the light sensitivity of salt and saline solutions. In the photogenic drawing at the top of the album page, the contours of a leaf are clearly delineated and some veins visible, while the bottom image of a leaf and blade of grass reveals their internal structures.\textsuperscript{127} Bertoloni’s annotation, “first attempts,” suggests the botanist’s


\textsuperscript{127} Pasted together on the album page, these prints bear a striking similarity to another album page produced by Dr. Julius Fritzsche while working under commission from the Russian botanists Karl von Baer and Fyodor Brandt. The scientists wanted to know if photographs could be used to depict natural history. Like Bertoloni, they were among the many recipients of personal correspondence about photogenic drawing circulated by Talbot and his family in the early 1840s. Having purchased the necessary chemicals from the art supplier Ackermann and Co. in London, Fritzsche concluded that photography was only useful, but perhaps of little service, to botanists. Schaaf, “Invention and Discovery: First Images,” 39-40.
sense of pride in bearing witness to the first experiments with paper photography in Italy and his comprehension of photography’s impact to science.

Bertoloni’s annotation does not provide Tassinari’s full name, but rather his occupation and place of residence, as pharmacist and chemist in Castelbolognese. The identity of Tassinari has come to light only recently, revealing the extent of Bertoloni’s scientific community. Most likely, this is Sebastiano Tassinari, pharmacist at Castelbolognese, who attained his degree in chemistry under Antonio Bertoloni at the Studio di Bologna. As I was able to verify, notebooks kept by Tassinari from 1839 to 1840 contain annotations of chemistry experiments and references to Talbot’s method, which support the theory that he created these photogenic drawings.

128 Arturo Frontali and Andrea Soglia, Tassinari Miei...Storia di una famiglia di scienziati romagnoli (Faenza: Tipografia Faentina Editrice, 2012), 46. To my knowledge, this local biography of the Tassinari family is the first publication to identify Sebastiano Tassinari. Sebastiano’s brother Giacomo, who also studied under Bertoloni, taught chemistry, botany, and pharmacy, and kept a large herbarium. It is possible that Giacomo and Sebastiano collaborated on experiments with photography, however the attribution to Sebastiano rests on Bertoloni’s identification of the photogenic drawings’ author as pharmacist “in Castelbolognese” (the preposition signifying that he was at that time the resident pharmacist) rather than “da Castelbolognese,” which would signify a pharmacist from Castelbolonese. A 1941 article in the Bologna newspaper Il Resto del Carlino identifies the pharmacy at Imola where Sebastiano’s brother Giacomo worked as a center of patriotism, and honors him for his contributions to the movement, such as hiding political refugees from papal police, and famously conspiring with other liberals to hang a plaque in honor of the patriot (and would-be assassin of Napoleon III) Felice Orsini outside the Ospedale in 1858. Sebastiano served as mayor of Imola after Unification. Romeo Galli, “Giacomo Tassinari (1812-1900),” Il Resto del Carlino, October 8, 1941.

129 E-mail message to Andrea Soglia, April 6, 2012; Sebastiano Tassinari, Notebooks, 1839-1840, Private Collection of Tassinari Family, Imola, Italy. An anonymous pamphlet on the daguerreotype published in Bologna in September 1839, which includes a note on Talbot’s technique, indicates the possibility that photogenic drawings had already been successfully created there between June, when Bertoloni received the first specimens from Talbot, and September, when the process was published. Sebastiano’s notebooks further support this timeline, but given the chronological ordering of The Bertoloni Album as a whole, it seems likely that they date from 1840, between May (when Passerini sent news of the experiments in Florence) and June (when Talbot sent the final packet of his photogenic drawings). “Daguerrotipo. Scoperta
The three contact prints in Bertoloni’s album are the earliest extant paper-based photographs produced in Italy, and rare examples of the numerous experiments carried out in scientific circles within the first year of photography’s announcement. Even though these are the only photographs traceable to Tassinari, his contribution represents a case study of the transnational contacts between amateurs and professionals that characterized the development of science and photography in this period. The choice of subject matter was clearly informed by Talbot’s example, and reveals the Italian scientist’s interest in paper photography and its practical applications. Furthermore, by preserving these examples within such a carefully organized album, Bertoloni expressed the value he believed the invention held toward scientific progress. His addition of Tassinari’s “first attempts” alongside Talbot’s articulates a desire for Italy’s scientific community to apply the new medium to its own pursuits.

**First Attempts: Giovanni Battista Amici and William Henry Fox Talbot**

During the same time that Talbot and Bertoloni corresponded about photography, the English inventor also maintained contact with the renowned optician Giovanni Battista Amici (1786-1863). Amici participated in early photographic experiments performed at the Florentine academy by his son, the physicist Vincenzo Amici, together with Tito Puliti. As previously noted, Puliti had created the first successful daguerreotypes in Italy in the physics section of the First Congress of Italian Scientists in Pisa, where Vincenzo Amici acted as president. In this case, the long-standing correspondence between the elder Amici and Talbot highlights the Italian

Ottico’pittorica per ottenere le immagini degli oggetti col mezzo della luce, metodo dei signori Daguerre e Niepce con note sul metodo di Talbot per preparare le carte fotofeniche,” (Bologna: Tipi del Nobili e Comp., imprimatur: 31 ago. 1839 – 4 set. 1839), repr. Zannier and Costantini, *Cultura fotografica in italia*, 64-68; Palazzoli, “Origins of Photography in Italy,” 167 also discusses this anonymously authored pamphlet.
scientific community’s sustained interest in paper photography as Talbot developed his method further into the calotype process, which he revealed publically in 1841. This improvement relied on exposing to light paper coated with light-sensitive silver iodide to produce a latent image. The paper was then developed in order to make visible the photographic negative from which multiple positive prints could then be made. Even more than his photogenic drawings, the calotype offered the potential for photographs to obtain wide-scale circulation, a fact that impressed the Italian scientists with whom Talbot shared the invention.

As a founder of the scientific congresses, Amici (Figure 1.23) was one of its most ardent promoters and ubiquitous participants, and from 1839 to 1844 he utilized those meetings as a platform for discussing new information on photography, encompassing both Daguerre’s and Talbot’s inventions. Utilizing his numerous foreign contacts, he placed himself at the center of discussions on the new medium, receiving first-hand accounts of the latest developments to the daguerreotype from the Parisian optician Noël-Marie-Paymal Lerebours. In his role as head of the astronomical observatory in Florence, Amici also personally presided over numerous photographic experiments. While little visual evidence of this flourishing photographic activity

130 For example, Amici translated a January 9, 1839 article on Arago’s initial report published in the newspaper *Monde Savant*. Giovanni Battista Amici, “Estratto dall’ *Echo du Monde Savant* sulla relazione fatta da Arago all’Accademia delle Scienze di Parigi il 7 gen. 1839 sulla scoperta del Sig. Daguerre,” Fondo G. B. Amici, Biblioteca Estense, Modena (hereafter cited as Fondo Amici), cartella 1173, carta 14171. Further evidence of Amici’s interest in photography includes his notes on Humboldt’s experiments with the daguerreotype gathered from various media sources, which are annotated with a shopping list of photography chemicals in, “Appunto su un’esperienza fatta da Humboldt sul daguerrotipo,” Fondo Amici, cartella 1173, carta 14169-14170; Experiments with making a daguerreotype through a telescope during a solar eclipse on July 8, 1842 at the Royal Museum of Florence, in Giuseppe Bianchi, “Gran-Ducato di Toscana, Firenze 8 Luglio,” *Gazzetta di Firenze* no. 82 (Saturday, July 9, 1842): 3, Fondo Amici, cartella 1183, carta 14593; Correspondence with Angelo Secchi, which includes two salt prints of the moon taken through a telescope, and Amici’s annotation of the timeline of Talbot’s publications on paper photography, Fondo Amici, cartella 969, carta 7068.
remains, epistolary sources, and the extant salt prints and photogravures circulated amongst the Florentine scientific community attest to his central role in these activities.

Photography’s value as an evidentiary tool for communicating scientific information drove Amici’s engagement with the medium, and even though research on this scientist’s grasp of early experiments in photography has been conducted by Graham Smith and Alberto Meschiari, these scholars have not explored the ultimate significance of Amici’s deep and sustained engagement with photography, nor have they fully articulated the optician’s relationships to a substantial network of photography’s key protagonists, which made the spread of photography to Italy possible.131 Talbot had first encountered Amici when he purchased a microscope built by the Modenese scientist on his first journey to Italy in 1822.132 This was no surprise given the optician’s fame, and additionally, his home and atelier were sites of numerous encounters amongst scientists and gentleman amateurs over the course of the mid-nineteenth century.133 Their names dutifully recorded in his account books, Amici hosted many of these luminaries in the midst of their continental Grand Tours, and they sought his prized lenses, microscopes, telescopes, and camerae lucidae. Amici often employed this latter instrument to

133 For an overview of Amici’s various personal and professional contacts, see: Alberto Meschiari, ed., Il Libro de’ conti del laboratorio di Giovanni Battista Amici e altri documenti inediti (Firenze: Edizioni Tassinari, 2003).
trace the visages of his family or illustrious guests to his home, a pastime not unlike Bertoloni’s botanical exchanges, which fostered community by blending science and entertainment, inductive experimentation and leisure. Amici’s reputation was also enhanced by his membership in the aforementioned Società dei Quaranta, which was headquartered in his hometown of Modena. Amici held a prominent place within that city’s political landscape, where he was invited to serve in the provisional government established there after the 1830 uprising. Since he never officially took office, he did not face punishment after Duke Francesco IV’s restoration. His 1831 offer of a position in Florence from the Grand Duke of Tuscany, while not a mandated exile, was a politically auspicious relocation.134

Amici’s international scientific milieu and advanced knowledge of optics garnered his central position within debates on photography, but it was also partially a product of good timing. In 1839, after several years of lapsed contact, the optician renewed his friendship with a number of scientists, including Talbot, by sending invitations to the inaugural Congress of Italian Scientists.135 While Talbot regretfully declined the offer, he capitalized on the opportunity to have his work discussed at this meeting by sending photogenic drawings that he hoped Amici would present to his colleagues:

As I fear that I will not be able to be present at the scientific meeting that will take place this year in Pisa, I would like to send you a package of my photogenic drawings as an expression of my esteem for the Italian scientists. Would you be willing to take the trouble

---

of receiving this dispatch and of distributing it amongst the members of the scientific meeting as you see fit.”

The package unfortunately did not arrive in time to be displayed at the Congress, but Amici nevertheless discussed Talbot’s invention at the meeting in relationship to Puliti’s demonstration of the daguerreotype.

Furthermore, and perhaps surprisingly, Talbot’s correspondence with Amici reveals his frustration with the status of science in his own country: “I see that the meeting in Pisa met with much favour by your Grand Duke: here it is the opposite, for never do the government or the monarch express any personal interest in science; and although they do nothing to discourage it at least they do very little to encourage it.” The bitterness of this sentiment highlights further Talbot’s motivation at reaching out to the Italian scientific community: his desire for recognition (and, perhaps, financial compensation), something Daguerre certainly benefitted from in France. Conversely, Amici’s letters provided Talbot with information about the daguerreotype’s reception in Italy. He informed Talbot, for example, of Puliti’s earliest experiments with the daguerreotype, which were exhibited at the annual exposition of Florence’s Accademia di Belle Arti in September of 1839. “In our museum, the day after news reached us of Mr. Arago’s notice about Daguerre’s method which was printed in the gazette, a satisfactory result was obtained and numerous views of buildings and statues were copied. But we are yet in the infancy of a fine

---


137 *Atti della prima riunione degli scienziati italiani*, XXIX.

discovery which promises great advantages to the fine arts and perhaps greater still to physical science.” 139

Talbot’s difficulties in obtaining official recognition for his photogenic drawing and later the calotype were a result of both his own secrecy, and his desire for recognition foremost within the scientific establishment rather than with a broader public. His letters, which contrast the lack of support by the British government to that of the French, or even the Grand Duke of Tuscany, reveal the importance of political patronage for the advancement of science in this period of nationalism. Talbot’s positive assessment of the state of science in Tuscany also demonstrates the importance of Italy’s scientific academies for creating a distinctly modern institutional apparatus on par with, and even in advance of, other European academies. This study of the particular relationship between Talbot and Amici confirms the modernity of the scientific congresses in Italy before Unification, thus contradicting the widely held perception that Restoration Italy was characterized by intellectual decline.140 It also provides further evidence that the Congresses represented a successful model for national cooperation on the peninsula.

Amici’s assessment of Talbot’s process was diplomatic, if not laudatory, and largely echoed Tenore’s reaction to the photogenic drawings he had received. Amici thus responded to Talbot:

Those which you sent to me through the Government Post and which, as you know, reached me several months after your much-valued letter, were viewed and quite praised by many people in my home. The Daguerre drawings are certainly surprising and it does not seem possible to reach such precision of contour on the paper but I tell you that some of our skillful painters consider the Talbot drawings superior in their strength and in the ease with which the Artist can alter them by hand here and there, according to

requirement, in order to create a picture of good effect. On the other hand, as well as having a price which is much lower than that of the silver-encrusted plates, the paper can be transported with greater ease on long journeys.\textsuperscript{141}

The transportability of paper photography was a significant factor in its adoption within Italy, the locus of an ever-present population of travelers and artists. Indeed, Talbot took advantage of friends and relatives who traveled to Italy, including his cousin, the diplomat William Fox-Strangways, the scientist Charles Babbage, and his own sisters, in order to promote his process. Between late 1841 and 1842, Talbot sent Amici nineteen calotypes and related correspondence documenting the new discovery.\textsuperscript{142} Amici presented these examples during a report to the Accademia dei Georgofili in Florence in February of 1842.\textsuperscript{143} The portraits particularly impressed him, including one of Talbot’s assistant, Nicolaas Henneman (Figure 1.24). Writing to Talbot, Amici revealed his excitement, “We should be quite happy if we could create portraits equal to the two you sent me recently which are quite beautiful, and have drawn the admiration of many artists who have come to see them in my house.”\textsuperscript{144} This letter, together with the one reported earlier, reveals the significance of Amici’s home as a meeting-place for an international group of artists, scientists, and educated aristocrats that shared in his photographic exchanges.


\textsuperscript{142} These photographs are preserved at the Biblioteca Estense in Modena. Smith, “Talbot and Amici,” 188-193. For more on William Fox Strangways, see: Christopher Lloyd, “Picture Hunting in Italy: Some Unpublished Letters,” \textit{Italian Studies} 30 (1937): 42-68.

\textsuperscript{143} Smith, “Talbot and Amici,” 191; \textit{Atti dell’I. e R. Accademia Economico-Agraria dei Georgofili di Firenze}, vol. 20 (Tipografia Galileiana: Florence, 1842), 15-16. Amici’s transcription of Talbot’s letters on the calotype from the \textit{Literary Gazette}, which he presented under the title, “delle ricerche del Sig. Talbot per imprimere colla luce le immagini degli oggetti sopra la carta,” is preserved in Fondo Amici, cartella 1205, carta 15057.

The subjects of the photographs Talbot sent to Amici were comparable to those previously send to Bertoloni, and included images of sculptures, Lacock Abbey, and still lifes. A notable exception to this was the addition of portraits, made possible by the reduced exposure times of his calotype process. Talbot’s salt print of a bust of Napoleon in profile (Figure 1.25) and a facsimile of the frontispiece to a publication of engravings by Luigi Rossini titled *Le Antichità dei Contorni di Roma* (Figure 1.26) are examples of how photographic images communicated politically-loaded messages. An image of Napoleon would of course be a loaded subject in nineteenth-century Italy, which had been under Napeoleonic rule from 1796-1814. During this period, the Treaty of Tolentino had seen the removal to Paris of hundreds of Italian antiquities, most significantly sculptures from the Vatican. Taken as plunder, Italy’s cultural heritage was transferred to the Louvre, where it held symbolic resonance in the capital of a new empire modeling itself on ancient Rome. Thus, engravings from the early Restoration period of ancient sites and antiquities in Italy, such as Rossini’s *Le Antichità dei Contorni di Roma*, emphasized the re-establishment of Rome as cultural capital following the Treaty of Paris, when Italy’s patrimony was returned.

These examples are not to suggest that Talbot was consciously sending politically-motivated photographs, but to convey that during this period, cultural artifacts such as sculpture and architecture were not neutral images, but, as Fazzini’s daguerreotype also revealed, held powerful resonance shaped by specific historical circumstances that in turn constructed national identities. Talbot’s selection of the sculptures and prints as subjects highlighted the easy


reproducibility of his own process, which unlike the daguerreotype, could generate multiple identical copies. His choice also shows photography’s capacity to catalogue, reproduce, and circulate these images. Most significantly, Talbot’s photograph of the printed page demonstrates that the medium could serve as a more truthful copy of an original than existing methods. In 1843, Talbot’s confidant Tenore made precisely this argument, which is worth quoting at length for what it reveals about both the status of paper photography in relation to the daguerreotype, and its potential utility:

By substituting paper for Daguerrian metallic plates, in addition to minimizing spending, one draws from them the other major advantage of being able to fit into one portfolio some hundreds of drawings. Precious then above all, and preferable to the French process, that of Talbot’s will have to be considered for depicting facsimiles of ancient scrolls, codices, autographs, signatures, and ancient papers and all important material, which are able to be reproduced with immense ease, making it possible that by disseminating those copies among the learned, illustrations, comments, and decipherments will result, and therefore new light will be shed on ancient texts, and important applications will be gathered for a number of useful disciplines.

In the meantime, it is necessary to recognize how, in spite of evident advantages, Talbot’s discovery still today remains almost uniquely confined to his hands. Too many are occupied with the perfecting of Daguerre’s discovery; the physicists and chemists of other nations, it seems, have forgotten entirely that of the English physicist. That can at least be ascertained from a most thorough examination of the journals and writings that one wishes to consult. I will not try to push further my inquiries, but I am of the opinion that because this examination has been less extensive in other nations, our chemists would be better suited occupying them with this pursuit. One should, therefore, in practicing new and positive research, take up Talbot’s method, and apply it with the same facility and with the same success that has crowned the wisdom and the doctrine of its illustrious discoverer.147

147 “Col sostituire la carta alle lamine metalliche Dagherriane, oltre al minorarne la spesa, l’altro maggior vantaggio se ne trae di poterne restringere in un portafoglio qualche centinaio di disegni. Prezioso poi sopra tutto, e preferibile al processo francese, dovrà questo del Talbot ritenersi, per ritarne fac-simili di antiche pergamene, di codici, di autografi, di firme e di carte antiche ed importanti d’ogni materia, le quali potendosi multiplicare con immensa facilità, faranno sì’ che, col divulgarsene le copie tra gli eruditi, se ne provocheranno le illustrazioni, i commenti, le deciferazioni, e quindi nuovo lume ne potrà riverberare sulla letteratura antica, ed importanti applicazioni se ne potranno raccogliere per una folla di utili discipline.

Uopo è frattanto confessare come, a malgrado di sì evidenti vantaggi, il trovato del Talbot ne sia finoggi rimasto quasi unicamente confinato nelle sue mani. Troppo occupati dei
This quotation reveals that Tenore was keenly aware of the importance of Talbot’s negative-positive process for the advancement of knowledge. He also suggested that by focusing their efforts on exploiting that aspect of the new medium in particular, Italians would be able to position themselves ahead of other nations. In other words, what was at stake in the nationalist pursuit of photography was harnessing the new medium’s potential as a medium of visual communication.

Within the first two years following the invention of photography, Italy’s scientific community demonstrated a keen interest and participated in an active dialogue about the new medium. The individual scientists discussed within this chapter relied on their personal and professional contacts across Europe, as well as the newly formed Congress of Italian Scientists, to exchange information about photography and report on their own experiments and findings. This evidence demonstrates a strong desire to use photography to accomplish the liberal goals that united Italy’s scientists. This same community recognized that, in order to improve Italy’s industrial, economic, and social position with respect to Great Britain and France, they needed to gain the support of the peninsula’s educated elite. Because of its ability to reproduce and circulate images with unprecedented veracity, photography represented a potent means of communicating to this public sphere, and thus of promoting a national identity, revealed in

perfezionamenti del trovato del Daguerre, i fisici ed i chimici delle altre nazioni par che abbiano affatto obbliato quello del fisico inglese. Ciò almeno può raccogliersi dal più accurato esame dei giornali e delle scritture che se ne vorranno consultare. Non cercherò di spinger oltre le mie inchieste; ma son d’avviso che per esserne stato meno esteso l’esame presso le altre nazioni convenir possa a’ nostri chimici d’occuparsene a preferenza. Si tratterebbe perciò di praticare nuove e positive ricerche onde impadronirsi del metodo del Talbot, ed applicarlo colla stessa facilità e collo stesso successo che ne ha coronato la sagacità e la dottrina del suo illustre scopritore.” Michele Tenore, “Riflessioni sopra diversi argomenti di Scienze Fisiche,” Rendiconti della R. Accademia delle scienze fisiche e matematiche di Napoli, tomo II anno II (Napoli: Stab. Tip. Dell’Aquila, 1843), 8-9, repr. in Zannier and Costantini, Cultura Fotografica in Italia, 113.
images of shared cultural heritage, that would consolidate support for the scientists’ progressive cause.
CHAPTER TWO

“A True Picture”: The Printed Daguerreotype in Italy

-- Oh, there you are with your bundle of newspapers, what’s happening today?

-- Nothing; the world eats, drinks, sleeps and wanders, as in the past. Whoever wants news has to take the trouble of inventing it.

-- Oh, bah! You who have wings and could fly from one end to the other of the world, you don’t recall a little gossip to tell me? It seems that you have never been outside of the walls of Milan. What the heck! Have you forgotten your job?

-- I understand, you too are cosmopolitan. You’d like to know those things that happen to our neighbors across the Alps and over the sea, and are not satisfied with the news in our country.

[...]

-- Here is a beautiful discovery that might be equal to that of Mr. Daguerre. And since we are talking of Daguerre, I can tell you that Mr. Artaria has opened an association for a series of views among the most picturesque of Milan, made with the daguerreotype, and printed in aquatint. Ah, but I forgot that you are not interested in news from Milan; Too bad since I have something new to tell. Enough then, I will tell you about the daguerreotype in Turin.148


“-- Oh, eccovi col fardello delle notizie, che cosa c’è di nuovo?
-- Nulla; il mondo mangia, beve, dorme e passeggia come per lo passato. Chi vuol avere novità, bisogna darsi la briga d’inventarle.
-- Eh, baje. Voi che avete l’ali e volate da un capo all’altro del mondo, non sapete raccogliere Quattro ciancie da raccontarci? Sembra che non siate mai uscita delle mura di Milano. Che diamine! Avete dimenticato il vostro uffizio?
-- Ho capito, anche voi siete cosmopolita. Desiderate sapere che cosa fanno i nostri vicini d’oltr’alpe e d’oltre mare, e non v’accontentate delle notizie del nostro paese.
[...]
-- Ecco un bel ritrovato che può star a pari a quello del signor Daguerre. E giacchè siamo caduti a parlare di Daguerre, vi dirò che il signor Artaria ha aperto un’associazione ad una serie di vedute tra le più belle e pittoresche di Milano, fatte col Dagherrotipo, e incise all’acqua tinta. Ah, ma dimenticava che non volete saper nulla di cose milanesi; mi dispiace, perchè ne ho di nuove da raccontare. Basta, vi parlerò del Dagherrotipo di Torino X.”
The links between Italy’s scientific community and its successful print trade resulted in one of the earliest and most ambitious examples of photographic printing in the history of the medium, the Milanese publisher Ferdinando Artaria’s (1781-1843) series of aquatints after daguerreotypes *Vues d’Italie d’après le daguerréotype* (1840-47), hereafter *Vues d’Italie*. This series represents one of the first attempts anywhere to reproduce the unique daguerreotype plate in a print publication. First incorporating views of Milan and Lombardy, it eventually expanded to include ninety-five landmarks and landscapes from throughout the entire Italian Peninsula. In essence, Artaria’s series re-configured the *vedute* tradition through photography, unifying Italy’s disparate regions in a format both familiar and novel. Notably, the art historian Carlo Quintavalle has discussed Artaria’s project as part of a larger impulse to catalogue the emerging nation that was visible across all fields of intellectual production in this period, and which played a significant role in shaping a sense of national belonging. This chapter argues that while Artaria’s series did provide the important function of picturing a shared patrimony for an Italian audience, it served most potently as a tool of Milanese bourgeois self-fashioning that positioned the city as a model of Italian modernity.

By comparing Artaria’s series to similar examples in France and England, including Noël-Marie-Paymal Lerebours’s *Excursions daguerriennes: Vues et monuments les plus remarquables du globe* (1840-44) and Alexander John Ellis’s planned, but uncompleted, publication *Italy Daguerreotyped* (1840-1841), this chapter demonstrates that Artaria’s *Vues d’Italie* diverged from those foreign examples most significantly in its emphasis on Milan as a flourishing modern city. This is most recognizable in *Milano e il suo territorio* (1844), a guidebook illustrated with fourteen aquatints after daguerreotypes of Milan culled from Artaria’s

larger series *Vues d’Italie*. Significantly, the city of Milan funded this publication in honor of the Sixth Congress of Italian Scientists held there in 1844, providing further evidence of the strong collaboration between Italy’s scientific and publishing communities.

Previous scholarship on Artaria’s *Vues d’Italie* in English-language publications is scant, and generally places the series within the context of travel views marketed to tourists, citing it in relationship to Lerebours’s project, but with little investigation into the content and form of the series itself.\(^{150}\) Italian scholarship has given more attention to Artaria’s endeavors, most appreciably in the exhibition catalogue *L’Italia d’Argento 1839/1859*, where Donata Falchetti, librarian at the Braidense archive in Milan, provides highly detailed information regarding the chronology and circumstances of the publication. The catalogue’s editors, including Monica Maffioli and Maria Francesca Bonetti, convincingly argue for *Vues d’Italie*’s significance in the history of early photography within Italy.\(^{151}\) Indeed, the publication set the standard for later endeavors by Luigi Sacchi (discussed in Chapter Five) and the Alinari firm, which has become synonymous with the codification and replication of Italy’s monuments through the language of photography.

Building on their scholarship, this chapter maps the interactions between Italian and foreign authors and audiences who engaged with Artaria’s *Vues d’Italie* and the printed daguerreotype more generally, demonstrating how the series articulated a range of local and


national identities within the international context of its creation and reception. In order to explicate these issues, I situate Artaria’s *Vues d’Italie* within the modern culture of Restoration Milan by focusing on the inclusion of the publisher’s views within the guidebook *Milano e il suo territorio* (1844). This publication visualized the Milanese intelligentsia’s progressive agenda for the economic and social future of Lombardy, promoting this vision as an example for the rest of Italy. Furthermore, although Artaria’s prints were made using the technique of aquatint engraving, the fact that they were derived from daguerreotypes bolstered their reception as truthful representations, and thus ensured their propagandistic value.

“*A True Picture*: Ferdinando Artaria’s *Vues d’Italie d’après le Daguerreotype*

Ferdinando Artaria (1781-1843) was part of a family of print publishers active in Milan from 1805, specializing in maps, guidebooks, views, and sheet music. Artaria’s was one of the first print shops in Milan to profit from the recent invention of lithography (in 1796) and received permission from the government to operate a press as early as 1813. The family’s shop at n. 110 via S. Margherita was located in a lively commercial area a short distance from Teatro alla Scala near other bookstores and print purveyors. Ferdinando ran the business with the help of his two sons, Pasquale and Epimaco, until his death in 1843 when Pasquale assumed control over the business. Under Pasquale’s influence, the Artaria firm had published earlier series of aquatint and lithograph views as well as guidebooks, such as *Nouveau Guide du Voyager en Italie* (New Guide to Travelers in Italy) (1831) and *Description de la Ville de Milan et des ses*

---

Environs (Description of the City of Milan and its Environs) (1832). These publications, originally in French and later released in Italian versions, underscore both the renewed interest in travel to Italy that occurred after the Congress of Vienna in 1815, and Italians’ growing desire to explore regions outside their own. In a notice to readers within the Italian version of the latter guide, Pasquale proudly wrote, “The description of Italy has already formed for three centuries one of the richest and most appreciated subjects by which learned men, both countrymen and foreigners, have occupied themselves.” This text suggests that their endeavor in photographic reproduction was not created solely with the tourist in mind, but also a burgeoning national audience of fellow countrymen.

Artaria had also produced aquatint vedute beginning as early as 1814. The firm employed the artist Federico Lose and his partner Carolina to create sketches of sites in Lombardy, including the picturesque Lake Como. In 1834, he published the series Viaggio pittorico in Italia (Souvenirs d’Italie), which was an edition of smaller format views by the engraver Johann Falkeisen. A landscape painter and printmaker from Basel, Falkeisen trained in Paris, and worked in Milan until 1843. He also engraved plates for Vues d’Italie, along with Louis Cherbuin and Francesco Citterio. The continuity between Artaria’s earlier production of guides, maps, and prints, and the later photographic views, including the artists in their employ, helped to guarantee the series’ success since purchasers trusted the quality of the family’s brand.

Artaria advertised the use of daguerreotype equipment in his shop as early as December of 1839. It is, therefore, likely that he or his sons experimented with the medium and could have

produced the daguerreotypes that provided the basis for the Vues d’Italie. There were also
daguerreotypists active in Milan beginning in the fall of that year, when the optician Alessandro
Duroni traveled to Paris to obtain two daguerreotype cameras. In November, Duroni produced
daguerreotypes of the city’s Duomo, the Arco della Pace, and the Palazzo Raimondi. Reporting
in the Gazzetta Privilegiata di Milano, the journalist Alfonso Frisiani noted of these
daguerreotypes, “The group of views resembles anything from niello-work on steel or a very fine
drawing to an aquatint worked on a mirror.” Here, Frisiani describes the daguerreotype’s
appearance by relating it to a medium more immediately familiar to his audience, the aquatint,
revealing the close conceptual association photography had to printmaking. Musing on the
potential of the new medium in December 1839, he concluded,

How satisfactory must this possession be to the traveler, or to a woman, who, wishing to
make an album of the most beautiful views that have made an impression, can demand to
nature to draw them with the same perfection as that which created them? I think that this
discovery will soon become a personal necessity, indispensable to every family, so that
everyone can immortalize those places, those happiest situations, that they might
remember the best days of their lives!

Frisiani’s forecast that the camera would quickly become a personal necessity was prescient.

Imagining a traveler or a bourgeois woman compiling an album of precious memories, he points
to the modern desire for photographic views among an Italian audience, a desire to which Artaria
responded.

157 “L’assieme della veduta rassomiglia ad una niellatura in acciaio, o ad un finissimo disegno,
all’acqua tinta, lavorato su di uno specchio.” Alfonso Frisiani, “Esperimenti fatti col
daguerrotipo a Milano,” Gazzetta privilegiata di Milano n. 337 (December 3, 1839), quoted in
Italo Zannier and Paolo Costantini, ed., Cultura Fotografica in Italia: Antologia di testi sulla

158 “Di quant’odisfazione non deve essere questa proprietà, a un viaggiatore, ad una signora,
che volendo formarsi un Album, delle più belle vedute che la colpirono, obbliga l’istessa natura a
disegnarle colla perfezione con cui le ha create? Io penso, che questo ritrovato, diverrà fra poco
un mobile necessario, indispensabile ad ogni famiglia, potendo ognuno così eternare i luoghi, le
più felici situazioni, che ricordano i più bei giorni della sua esistenza!” Quoted in Zannier and
Costantini, Cultura Fotografica in Italia, 82.
Artaria issued *Vues d’Italie* beginning in April of 1840, with advertisements appearing in the *Gazzetta Privilegiata di Milano*, and the series was widely reported in other Milanese newspapers and journals.\(^{159}\) The first images were of Milan and Lombardy, followed in 1842 by scenes of Tuscany and Rome. By 1847, the series comprised ninety-five views from Venice to Naples.\(^{160}\) Artaria’s prints after daguerreotypes were made using a method quite similar to the production of a typical engraving.\(^{161}\) The daguerreotype served as the initial sketch, and was directly traced onto thin paper, ruining the photographic image in the process, since at this early stage, the chemical surface of the daguerreotype plate was so vulnerable to physical contact that, “the proof had to be framed instantaneously or it risked being spoiled at any moment, even by the rubbing of a fly’s wing.”\(^{162}\) The engraver then transferred the image to a steel plate through dotting, filled in shadows and details, and added clouds, skies, and figures that the slow exposure time of the daguerreotype process made impossible to capture.\(^{163}\) An example of a tracing after a daguerreotype from the George Eastman House in Rochester, New York, shows how such tracings were comprised of topographical detail through simple contours (Figure 2.1).
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\(^{159}\) This date is exceptional as it suggests that Artaria’s prints reached the public before Lerebours’s. The first advertisement for Lerebours’ publication appeared on August 20, 1840 in *La Presse*. See: Beaumont Newhall and Robert Doty, “The Value of Photography to the Artist, 1839,” *Image: The Bulletin of the George Eastman House* 11, no. 6 (1962): 27; Falchetti, “Ferdinando Artaria e Figlio Editori,” 185.

\(^{160}\) Some sources identify 119 plates in the series, which continued to be published into the early 1850s. I include only those plates deposited at the Biblioteca Nazionale Braidense, where it was officially registered with the Imperial Royal Office of Censors and Review. The initial edition was consigned to the library in May 1841. The I. R. Stamperia was active from 1821 until 1848. By law, all publications had to be listed, and the register included title, city, publisher, and price. See: Falchetti, “Ferdinando Artaria e Figlio Editori,” 185.

\(^{161}\) This process is explained in: Carolyn Bloore, “Photography and Printmaking 1840-1860” (PhD diss., University of Reading, 1991), 38.


\(^{163}\) Bloore, “Photography and Printmaking,” 56.
Unfortunately, none of the original daguerreotype plates from Artaria’s *Vues d’Italie* have survived, probably because they were destroyed during the transfer.

The translation of an original in the process of reproduction was not new to printmakers or artists of the time. Gerry Beegan has convincingly argued, for example, that over the course of the nineteenth century, wood engravers working from photographs adapted their style using new visual codes that signaled the photographic origins of their illustrations.\(^{164}\) Systems of line width and length, cross-hatching, or stippling were already the engraver’s shorthand for ideas like movement, light and shadow, and mass. Over time, these codes adapted to signal the precise detail and unique tonality of daguerreotypes. At the early date of Lerebours’s publication, a visual shorthand signifying “after a daguerreotype” had yet to be fully established, and the prints contain traditional codes of engraved *vedute* including cloudy skies and *staffage* figures, which would be impossible to capture in a daguerreotype. The title or supplementary text accompanying the image was, therefore, necessary to drive home to the viewer the novel means of production, hence, the common phrase designating them “after a daguerreotype.”

In his analysis of the earliest prints after daguerreotypes published in France’s *L’Illustration*, Thierry Gervais has argued that the context of the illustrated magazine helps reveal that for viewers there was essentially no distinction between prints after daguerreotypes or prints after drawings. Gervais argues that in the burgeoning visual culture of modern Paris, they were all merely *images*.\(^{165}\) Taking a slightly different approach, Michael Leja writes, “We can understand these images as print simulations of photographs, or as hybrids of the two media, or—as I have come to prefer—as double images, having the identity of both photograph and

---


Like Gervais, Leja’s mode of interpretation does not seek to demarcate a clear boundary between media, but nevertheless insists upon some level of respective autonomy. The paradox of the print after a daguerreotype is that it is at once both a photograph and a print, and neither of them; it is thus most easily described as an image. Oliver Wendell Holmes perhaps best articulated this particular slippage as “the divorce of form and substance.” The both/neither nature of the print after a daguerreotype presents a challenge to scholars just as it did to its original viewers, yet, I argue that it was precisely the genre’s character as simultaneously both and neither that compelled viewers to read new and multiple meanings from otherwise familiar images. The print after the daguerreotype implied the truthfulness of a photograph at the same time as it allowed for freedom of interpretation due to the artist’s rendering of the subject. In the case of Artaria’s Vues d’Italie, this novel format offered its audience of Milanese bourgeoisie a powerful means of self-fashioning.

An 1840 text devoted to Macedonio Melloni’s account of advancements to the daguerreotype (discussed in Chapter One) specifically noted Artaria’s series as an important example of using the daguerreotype plate as a print matrix. The text also provided information about this publisher’s business model and the costs: Artaria issued the first twenty-five prints in the series through subscription at the price of two Austrian lire (the currency in Milan at the time) for black and white, six for hand-colored with a quick wash of watercolor in the skies, and eight for prints mounted to board and hand-colored in watercolor or tempera. The author noted,

It seems an excellent decision that of misters Artaria, who combined in the
aforementioned illuminated copies the detail of the daguerreotype (the reproduction of
shadows is most delicate) with the colors that are appropriate to each of them, thus
transforming a design (disegno), which although very accurate, displays only white and
gradations of tone, into a true picture in color.\textsuperscript{168}

In this text, the author uses the term disegno, meaning drawing, design, or composition, to
describe the daguerreotype image. This reference to traditional image-making techniques
suggests that Artaria’s hand-colored views achieved a “truer” picture than the daguerreotype
alone could provide by depicting reality in full color. For example, Lombardy’s Lake Como
would have been nearly impossible to capture with a daguerreotype, which tended to overexpose
in the blue spectrum, and would thus pale in comparison to the lavishly painted print (Figure 2.2).
The reference to disegno, or drawing, in the above quotation was also particularly fitting since
ten of the views in Artaria’s series were not based on daguerreotypes at all, but rather on artist’s
sketches, with captions making their non-photographic origins clear. For example, the text
included with the interior view of La Scala indicates that the print derived from a drawing by the
painter Luigi Bisi (Figure 2.3).\textsuperscript{169} In addition, the designation “Le Daguerréotype” appears at the
top center of the margin of those prints in the series that were made from daguerreotypes.

\textsuperscript{168} “Ottimo divisamento ci sembrò quello dei signori Artaria di riunire nelle suddette copie
miniate le particolatirà del Dagherrotipo (la riproduzione delle tinte più dilecate) coi colori che
sono propriei a ciascuno di essi, trasformando così un disegno, che sebbene esattissimo, non
presenta anche del bianco e delle tinte più o meno oscure, in un vero quadro a colori.”

“Relazione intorno al dagherrotipo di Macedonio Melloni,” \textit{Biblioteca Italiana o sia giornale di
letteratura, scienze ed arti compilato da vari letterati} 97, no. 25 (1840): 200.

\textsuperscript{169} Incidentally, Bisi was a professor of perspective painting at the Brera Academy, where a
daguerreotype camera was acquired from Alphonse Giroux in 1840 under his direction. See:
Roberto Cassanelli, “La fotografia delle origini a Milano e il caso dell’Accademia di Brera” in
\textit{Lo sguardo della fotografia sulla città ottocentesca: Milano 1839-1899}, ed. Silvia Paoli, (Turin:
Allemandi, 2010), 20.
One of the most significant attractions of Artaria’s series was the engravers’ skillful translation of the scenes from daguerreotype into print. A contract for thirty of the Italian views signed by Cherbuin reveals something of the means of production:

I declare my obligation to engrave for your account and ownership a total of thirty plates in aquatint, after the plates from the Daguerreotype Camera which will be progressively delivered to me, representative of views in Italy, based on those dimensions and the types corresponding precisely to the series of views of Milan and its environs which at present I am engraving for your account. It will be my responsibility to clarify the outlines of the objects represented, from the above mentioned plates, transporting them to the copper plates and therein execute the analogous shades with the addition of clouds and of necessary harmonious marks, according to you.170

The expectation for the production of these prints was that the engraver would copy the daguerreotype image onto copper plates, including the tones, but then embellish the scenes with temporal effects and the addition of figures under the Artaria firm’s direction.

At this early period in photography’s history, exposure times were too long to clearly record movement, so that the addition of figures in Artaria’s series reflects printmaking conventions rather than faithfully reproduces the original daguerreotypes. The uniformity of size and appearance among the plates in Vues d’Italie lent cohesion to the series and mimicked the mechanical quality of photography, while Cherbuin’s addition of “necessary harmonious marks” fulfilled the audience’s expectations for picturesque detail.171 In fact, for nineteenth-century viewers, the addition of skies, figures, and color was sometimes thought to reflect reality more

170 “dichiaro obbligarmi solidamente ad incidere per loro conto e proprietà il numero di 30 rame in aquatinta, dietro le lastre delle Macchina Daguerrotype che saranno progressivamente a rimettermi, rappresentanti delle vedute in Italia, ritenuto che le dimensioni ed il genere corrisponda precisamente a quelle della serie di vedute in Milano e suoi contorni che attualmente sto incidendo per il loro conto. Sarà mio incarico di dilucidare i contorni degli oggetti rappresentati, dalle lastre suddette, trasportarli sul rame ed ivi eseguire le ombre analoghe con l’aggiunta del cielo e delle macchiette occorrenti concertati seco loro,” quoted in Falchetti, “Ferdinando Artaria e Figlio Editori,” 185.
than the stilled, seemingly vacant cities found in daguerreotypes. One review of Artaria’s series revealed this sentiment, noting, “…that is not to say that it is just as some will inadvertently suppose at first, that artists shall become useless one day or the other. Never! The views that we discuss demonstrate this. If he who transfers to the plate and engraves it is not a skillful artist, the benefit offered by the daguerreotype will be weak or perhaps null…” Cherbuin was well-known for his expertise in rendering local color, those incidental details of character and street life that inflected vedute with heightened realism. Maria Francesca Bonetti has noted that Artaria specifically chose the engravers for their abilities in depicting clothing and characterization of figures, skills that greatly contribute to the overall effect of Artaria’s series.

Based on the selection of sites, Vues d’Italie seems to have been aimed primarily at a local audience; namely, Milan’s bourgeoisie. In fact, forty-eight of the ninety-five plates in the series depicted the city’s monuments and its environs. Lombardy was among the wealthiest regions of Italy during the Restoration. Milan had been the capital of the Cisalpine Republic and the short-lived Kingdom of Italy (1805-1814), and saw the greatest benefit of Napoleon’s public works projects and administrative reforms. Although the return to Austrian rule brought increased policing and taxation, Milan maintained an economically advantageous position due in

172 “…non è a dire, giusta quanto taluno inavvedutamente in sulle prime suppose, che gli artisti debbano per esse divenire inutile un giorno o l’altro. Non mai! Le vedute di cui teniamo parola, valgano a dimostrarlo. Se chi le trasportò sul rame e le incise non fosse stato un artista Valente, il soccorso offerto dal Daguerreotipo sarebbe riuscito debole o fors’anco nullo…” G. I.
173 After leaving his native Basel for Milan in 1835, he shared a workspace with Falkeisen, who likely introduced him to Artaria. An album of his promotional materials and sketches held in the Achille Bertarelli collection in Milan demonstrates the variety of his output, from vedute to reproductions of Academic painting to advertisements for local factories. Ironically, the same photographic views that he helped popularize would begin to put him and his fellow engravers out of business by the 1870s, when he worked almost exclusively in advertising. See: Clelia Alberici, “Luigi Cherbuin e un suo album di incisioni e litografie in parte inedit,” in Raccolta delle Stampe A. Bertarelli Rassegna di studi e di notizie 7, no. 6 (1979): 9-42.
part to the success of Lombardy’s silk industry. A rising middle-class of wealthy landowners and professionals populated both the countryside and city during the 1830s and 1840s, and Milan had a strong professional class of doctors, engineers, and teachers. Under the Austrian regime, primary education was free and mandatory, and literacy rates were much higher than in other parts of Italy. Despite widespread censorship under Austrian governance, the literary community in Milan built the foundations of Italian Romanticism, and the city had a flourishing publishing industry of which Artaria was part. The Austrian government also completed many of the new constructions begun under Napoleon, and developed railroads in the region, including the completion of the Milan to Monza line in 1840. Overall, Milan’s rising middle class was well-educated, prosperous, and engaged in civic life.\textsuperscript{175}

In many respects, from its mode of production to its subjects, Artaria’s \emph{Vues d’Italie} reflects Milan’s unique position within Italy as a whole. Although the series includes the city’s Cathedral and Santa Maria delle Grazie, both of which could stand in as the most recognizable landmarks of the city, it also depicts a number of recently-built structures. For example, \textit{l’Arco della Pace} (Figure 2.4) the first plate in the series, represents the neoclassical monument begun by Napoleon and only consecrated in 1838 by Ferdinando I, Emperor of Austria and King of Lombardy-Veneto, to commemorate the 1815 Peace of Europe.\textsuperscript{176} An article in \textit{La Moda} explicitly discussed local interest in Artaria’s views of Milan’s monuments:

\begin{quote}
and when this series of the principal views of Milan, which the Artaria firm intends to publish will be completed, it will form, in our opinion, one of the most delightful collections that could be possessed, not only by lovers of the fine arts in general, nor only the foreigner desirous of carrying with him infallible memories of the countries he has
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{175} For an overview of the social and political climate in Lombardy during the Restoration, see: Harry Hearder, “Lombardy and Venetia,” in \textit{Italy in the Age of the Risorgimento, 1790-1870} (New York: Longman, 1983), 16-42.

\textsuperscript{176} For historical background on l’Arco della Pace, see Gjlla Giani, \textit{l’Arco della Pace di Milano} (Milan: Di Baio Editore, 1988).
traveled, but even for one who, far from his native land, desires to have reproduced
detailed images of those places to which he cannot return, save with his thoughts.\textsuperscript{177}

This text invites the reader to imagine, in essence, an exile from his native land, for whom
accurate and artfully produced photographic views are precious reminders of a homeland from
which he is separated. Indeed, not only travel, but also the displacement caused by political exile,
was a reality for many intellectuals in Milan and throughout Italy during the Restoration.
Regardless, the text indicates that the principal views of Milan were not merely intended as
tourist souvenirs, but a means of connecting to one’s civic identity.

Rather than the peasants who so commonly dotted the foregrounds of printed views from
this era, the groups of figures milling around monuments in \textit{Vues d’Italie} represent the
bourgeoisie interacting within Milan’s urban landscape. The close attention to the panorama of
street life in the Milanese views was part of a larger trend to catalogue city types appearing in art
and literature in other European capitals of the time, notably Paris and London. The plate
featuring the exterior of the La Scala opera house (1778), for example, seems less of an
architectural view and more of a character sketch of Milan itself: strolling bourgeoisie in top hats,
peasants, peddlers, shopkeepers and even a lamplighter contribute to the overall effect of a slice
of life captured instantaneously, something that photography at the time was still incapable of
doing (Figure 2.5). The detail with which the figures are depicted places the viewer’s focus on
their interaction within the urban setting. In fact, the vantage point of this image replicates the
perspective looking from the address of Artaria’s shop toward the nearby La Scala. One can

\textsuperscript{177}“e quando questa serie delle principali vedute di Milano, che la ditta Artaria si propone di
pubblicare, sarà condotta a termine, formerà a nostro giudizio, una delle più dilettevoli raccolte
che posseder possa non solo l’amatore in genere delle arti belle, non solo lo straniero desideroso
di portar seco non fallibil memoria dei paesi da lui percorsi, ma eziandio per colui il quale
lontano dal paese nativo desidera possedere riprodotta l’immagine precisa di quei luoghi cui egli
non può ritornare che col pensiero.” W., “Tre nuove vedute all’aqua tinta,” \textit{La Moda} 5, no. 72
(September 7, 1840), 185.
imagine a Milanese gentleman or lady pausing in front of the shop window to examine the latest prints on sale, and receiving an excited sense of *déjà vu* upon realizing that this print showed the precise view from where s/he stood. This particular print after a daguerreotype established its authenticity not only by the accuracy of its reproduction, but by means of its audience’

The interactive quality of the view of La Scala can also be found in the publicity surrounding *Vues d’Italie*. Artaria solicited suggestions in Milanese newspapers for the subjects that would be included in the series. In two prints, he even collaborated with local businesses, placing advertisements for hotels within views of the city. The signs for l’Hotel Reichmann and l’Hotel de la ville feature prominently in views of the Corso di Porta Romana (Figure 2.6) and the Corso Francesco (Figure 2.7), respectively, are listed in the prints’ captions.178 Just as the rich characterization of figures enlivened Artaria’s prints, so did visual references that evoked the modern experience of walking through the city’s streets. Rather than diminishing the realism implied by the daguerreotype origins of the prints in *Vues d’Italie*, these artistic additions enhanced their truthfulness for a knowing audience. The innovative visual strategies thus reflected and contributed to a distinctly Milanese identity.

Artaria’s series *Vues d’Italie* not only helped establish a visual iconography for Milan, but it also included other northern cities like Genoa and Padua, which had historically made less of a visual imprint on the minds and in the *vedute* marketed to tourists. Like the Milanese series, many of these subjects are characterized by modern constructions and an emphasis on social life and public works, such as Genoa’s neoclassical Teatro del Carlo Felice (completed 1828), which echoes the significance of Milan’s La Scala (1778). In Padua, the Caffè Pedrocchi (completed
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178 Pelizzari, *Photography and Italy*, 18; Falchetti, “Ferdinando Artaria e Figlio Editori,” 188.
1842) (Figure 2.8) was already a well-known meeting-place for northern Italian intellectuals, and played a central role in literary Romanticism and Risorgimento politics. It was also a collaborative project that brought together numerous important architects and painters, who decorated its lavish interior in a mélange of historicist styles that evoked Italy’s Etruscan and Roman past. As a compendium of modern Italy, Artaria’s series brought together an illustrious history and a prosperous present in a novel format that combined modern technology with artistic traditions.

The multiple plates depicting theaters, amphitheaters, and arenas suggest the vibrancy of associational life in 1840s Milan. Marco Meriggi has argued that during the Restoration, participation in social life and public entertainments played an important role in engendering a “spirit of association” that contributed to political involvement in the Risorgimento.179 Meriggi, building upon Habermas’s concept of the public sphere, demonstrates that whereas earlier in the Restoration the Austrian regime used spectacles to distract Milan’s elite, during the 1830s cafés, reading rooms, theaters, and arenas grew in significance and provided public spaces in which citizens could interact and engage in meaningful discussions about their city.180 In particular, he points to the shift in formal associations from Casinos, which had previously provided members with a place to play cards, enjoy festivals, and the like, to new philanthropic societies and organizations that provided models for self-governing, like the Congress of Italian Scientists.181 The growing importance of public meeting spaces for the social and intellectual life of Milan’s bourgeoisie likely motivated the inclusion of such sites in *Vues d’Italie*. In addition to the subject
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181 Meriggi, “Lo spirito d’associazione,” 87-149.
matter, the innovative means of Artaria’s production, which included soliciting audience participation in the development of the series through notices in the local press, contributed to the formation of a shared Milanese identity that was characterized by its modernity.

**Excursions Daguerriennes and Prints “after” Daguerreotypes**

While Artaria’s engravers inflected the Milanese scenes of *Vues d’Italie* with a sense of the city’s modern appearance, that was not the case for the entire series. A comparison between *Vues d’Italie* and another early example of photographic publishing, Noël-Marie-Paymal Lerebours’ *Excursions Daguerriennes: Vues et Monuments les plus Remarquables du Globe* (1840-1844) reveals that plates depicting scenes from locations outside of Lombardy in the former series tended to conform more closely to stereotypical tourist views, and thus confirms the primary importance of the Milanese views in Artaria’s series to their local audience.

*Excursions Daguerriennes* is the best-known early commercial enterprise uniting printmaking and photography, and the largest-scale work of its kind. The selected prints were culled from an estimated 1800 daguerreotype plates produced by multiple photographers shortly after the announcement of the daguerreotype process. Lerebours’s series appealed to the existing market for printed views of famous sights and tourist destinations, while capitalizing on photography’s unique relationship to reality. Theodore Maurisset’s famous image of *Daguerrèotypomania* (Figure 2.9) cleverly illustrates the excitement surrounding this aspect of photography.

---

new medium as photographers set out in droves to capture foreign lands using the camera for the first time. In order to obtain his views, Lerebours employed photographers traveling to foreign locales from Niagara Falls to St. Petersburg, and exchanged daguerreotypes among individuals within his wider professional network.

The plates in *Excursions Daguerriennes* depict views from throughout Europe and the Near East, with France and Italy represented by the most images; in volume one alone, there are twenty-four Italian subjects out of sixty total plates. For example, one Italian view depicts the Porto Ripetta in Rome (Figure 2.10), and includes a small plaque within the image engraved with Lerebours’s signature, declaring his role as author of the series, though not of this particular image.¹⁸³ Lerebours thus staked his claim on foreign soil by-proxy, and illustrated to his audience that a photograph was an acceptable substitute for a first-hand encounter. In fact, throughout *Excursions Daguerriennes*, draftsman and engravers received credit for their labor, since their signatures appear beneath the images. The photographers’ names were not recorded, however, which suggests that the daguerreotype was subsumed into a larger process and visual economy that privileged the artistry of the engraver over the mechanical operations of photography.

*Excursions Daguerriennes* was a monumental feat of photographic publishing. In its exhaustive scope and employment of numerous artists (and many unnamed photographers), it followed the example of earlier print series, most notably Taylor and Nodier’s multivolume *Voyages Pittoresques et Romantiques dans l’Ancienne France* (*Picturesque and Romantic Travels through Old France*) issued from 1827 to 1833, to which Daguerre had been a contributor. The aim of such publications was to supply upper middle class consumers with a

visual portal to another place, whether of memory for those who had traveled themselves, or of the imagination for those who had not.\textsuperscript{184} Publishers attracted audiences through novelty, whether by depicting a particular place for the first time, employing famous artists and draftsmen to supply the engravers with subjects, or like Lerebours, through a novel means of production. Overall, the selection of views as well as individual compositions reflected the tastes and expectations of their consumers, which were shaped by factors such as gender, education, class, and national identity, and informed by other media, including illustrated magazines, guide books, and painting. What the photograph offered within this panorama was heightened immediacy, a guarantee of truthfulness and authenticity that stood in for the viewer’s “being there,” and superseded the artist’s presence with the unwavering eye of the camera.

A comparison of a Venetian view from Artaria’s \textit{Vues d’Italie} to one published in Lerebours’ \textit{Excursions Daguerriennes} highlights their respective approaches to depicting Italy in this new format. In a Venetian scene from \textit{Excursions Daguerriennes} (Figure 2.11), the engraved additions include several groups of figures (and pigeons) populating the foreground. A fisherman, or perhaps gondolier, appears to proposition a finely dressed woman, while a barefoot child begs money from a man in Turkish garb. Next to moored boats at the left, a group of men includes one figure reclining on his side, his head cradled in his hands. This image of the peasant or fisherman at rest would be repeated in souvenir views throughout the nineteenth century, reaffirming the tourist’s Orientalizing stereotype of \textit{dolce far niente} under a Mediterranean sun. Indeed, this plate clearly portrays Venice as an exotic foreign culture. Notably, a similar approach characterizes a view of Venice’s from Artaria’s series; a plate depicting the Rialto bridge (Figure 2.12), for example, repeats many of the same tropes as Lerebours’s.

Although Italian views comprised about one third of the total number of plates in *Excursions Daguerriennes*, only one represented Milan. A comparison of this view of the façade of Milan’s Duomo in Lerebours’s series (Figure 2.13) to that in Artaria’s (Figure 2.14) also reveals a number of similarities. Both depict the church’s lively piazza populated by groups of bourgeoisie strolling or paused in conversation. Artaria’s composition takes a slightly oblique and elevated vantage point toward the Duomo rather than the frontal view of Lerebours’s, giving increased attention to the more recently constructed buildings with street level shops framing the piazza. Despite this minor difference, the compositions both convey a sense of vibrancy around the static Gothic monument that is the city’s most recognizable landmark.

Tourist views are created to make unfamiliar and far-off places comprehensible to the traveler, to reassure her/his preconceived ideas about a place, and to delight with the pleasure of recognizing famous landmarks. For the foreign traveler, Milan was a cosmopolitan city in a way that other Italian cities were not: cafés and conversation replaced antiquities and artifacts as the primary draws.\(^{185}\) This comparison reveals that Artaria’s depiction of Milan in fact adhered to foreign expectations of the city, largely because social experiences and associational life were defining characteristics by which Milanese identified themselves in relationship to other cities in Italy. Furthermore, whereas Milan played a minor role in the tourist’s itinerary covered by *Excursions Daguerriennes*, it was the main focus of Artaria’s *Vues d’Italie*, thus, even though Artaria’s series represented views from throughout Italy, it reflected a distinctly Milanese self-image, which necessarily developed in contingency to other Italian and national identities. Just as a foreign traveler to Italy carried expectations for the people and places s/he would encounter, so

\(^{185}\) Jeremy Black, *Italy and the Grand Tour* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 37. Black observes that for British travelers, Milan was noteworthy foremost for its opera, musical performances, and friendly society.
did local audiences. The pleasure of recognition in Artaria’s series was multivalent, appealing to foreign expectations at the same time that it fashioned an urban identity for the local Milanese consumer within a wider Italian context.

An Italian Connection to *Excursions Daguerriennes*

Due to the geographic and technical scope of *Excursions Daguerriennes*, Lerebours was connected to an international network of early practitioners of photography. His experiments with the daguerreotype became known in Italy through his relationship with the optician Giovanni Battista Amici. Amici was not only an important interlocutor of photography’s introduction to Italy through his active role in spreading knowledge of Talbot’s paper process (discussed in Chapter One); he also held a central position within the growing international research on printing the daguerreotype. He had maintained an epistolary exchange about photography with his fellow optician Lerebours from as early as June 1839, when he had written to his French colleague, “All here are curious to know the art of the daguerreotype, of which everyone in Paris speaks!”¹⁸⁶ The sustained interest of Amici and the Italian scientific community in the prospect of photographic publishing as a means of accurate visual communication triggered many of the earliest experiments with photography in Italy. This intense period of research peaked in September of 1844 at the Sixth Congress of Italian Scientists in Milan, where Amici, because of his continued relationships with these foreign correspondents, reported on several new advancements in photographic publishing.

Experimentation with the daguerreotype amongst scientific circles in Florence was greatly aided by Amici’s relationships with colleagues in France. Through him, Lerebours provided valuable information on developments happening in Paris, including chemical formulas for improving exposure times and fixing the photographic image.\footnote{Giovanni Battista Amici to Vincenzo Antinori, Florence, undated, Fondo G. B. Amici, Biblioteca Estense, Modena (hereafter cited as Fondo Amici), cartella 1125, carte 8426-8427; cf. footnote 515 in Edizione Nazionale delle opera e della corrispondenza di Giovanni Battista Amici, 254-255.} Conversely, Amici served as intermediary with Italian scientists and aristocrats engaged in photographic research. For example, in 1842, he helped Count Grifeo, the foreign minister from Naples, obtain two daguerreotype cameras from Lerebours.\footnote{Giovanni Battista Amici to Noël-Marie-Paymal Lerebours, November 13, 1842, in Edizione Nazionale delle opera e della corrispondenza di Giovanni Battista Amici, 266.} During his travels through Northern Europe in the summer of 1844, Amici solidified these friendships with his foreign colleagues. In London, he reconnected with Talbot, who gave him two copies of The Pencil of Nature that he presented at the 1844 Congress in Milan. In Paris, Lerebours introduced him to the physicist Hippolyte Fizeau at his home, where the three jointly made portrait daguerreotypes. Later that year, Lerebours himself journeyed to Milan to attend the scientific congress, and gave Amici two signed prints demonstrating Fizeau’s recently-patented method of photogravure that were formally exhibited to the other attendees.\footnote{Atti della sesta riunione degli scienziati italiani tenuta in Milano nel settembre del 1844 (Milano, Pirola, 1845), 68.} Fizeau’s process of electroplating used an electrical current to build up copper deposits on the surface of a daguerreotype, which was then run through a press as though it were a traditional etching plate.\footnote{Carolyn Bloore, “Photography and Printmaking,” 28-34; William Tobin, The Life and Science of Léon Foucault: The Man Who Proved the Earth Rotates (Cambridge, U. K.: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 28-37.} In fact, three of the plates in Lerebours’s Excursions Daguerriennes were produced by Fizeau’s method of electroplating,
which, nonetheless, proved too difficult and costly to be a viable means of photographic publishing in large print runs.\footnote{In a “Notice to Subscribers” Lerebours announced the success of Fizeau’s discovery, and wrote, “We thought that the subscribers to Excursions Daguerriennes would be grateful to us if they were the first to be brought the estimable result…” Noël-Marie-Paymal Lerebours, “Notice to Subscribers,” Excursions Daguerriennes: Vues et Monuments les plus Remarquables du Globe, Vol. II, 1841-1843, quoted in Bloore, “Photography and Printmaking,” 38. In the end, Fizeau’s method was only used for three of the plates because of the difficulty of the technique. The other 111 prints in the two-volume series were produced from aquatints after daguerreotypes, which was the more widespread means of reproducing and disseminating daguerreotype images described above.} During his presentation to the Congress in Milan, Amici discussed Fizeau’s process alongside prints published by Alfred Donné that reproduced daguerreotypes made in a solar microscope by his colleague, the physicist Léon Foucault.\footnote{Graham Smith, “Talbot and Amici: Early Paper Photography in Florence,” History of Photography 15, no. 3 (Autumn 1991): 191-192; Carlo Matteucci to W. H. F. Talbot, October 7, 1844, The Correspondence of William Henry Fox Talbot, http://foxtalbot.dmu.ac.uk/, document number: 5522. W. H. F. Talbot, The Pencil of Nature (London: Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans, 1844); Alfred Donné and Léon Foucault, Cours de microscopie complémentaire des études médicales. Anatomie microscopique et physiologie des fluides de l’économie. Atlas execute check accents d’après nature au microscope-daguerréotype (Paris: Ballière, 1845); Atti della sesta riunione degli scienziati italiani tenuta in Milano, 68. Talbot had given Amici two copies of The Pencil of Nature when the optician visited London in the summer of 1844, one of which was dedicated to the Grand Duke of Tuscany, and is now located at the Biblioteca Nazionale di Firenze. Talbot also sent a copy to the Italian physicist Carlo Matteucci in October 1844.} The Italian optician likely became aware of Donné and Foucault’s collaboration through his own relationship to Lerebours and Fizeau, further demonstrating the importance of these international connections to the spread of information about photography to Italy.

The photogravures by Fizeau that Amici presented at the Congress depict a sculptural bust and a bas-relief from a medieval French monument, and thus articulate the same ideas of reproduction and patrimony as the examples by Daguerre, Talbot, and Fazzini discussed in the previous chapter. Such images prove the nationalist agenda embedded within the discourse of early photographic processes. One of these prints represents a portrait bust by David D’Angers...
of Baron Georges Cuvier (Figure 2.15), an anatomist, paleontologist, and Napoleonic-era educational reformer who had died in 1833. Fizeau therefore presented Amici with a subject appropriate for the meeting of an international scientific community—Cuvier had been a member of the Società dei Quaranta—which suggested to an Italian audience Fizeau’s own nation’s scientific accomplishments through the surrogate French presence. The second print (Figure 2.16) depicts a French Gothic bas-relief of the type concurrently being identified for restoration and systematically cataloged in the preservationist endeavors of the architect Viollet-le-Duc, and soon after by the government-commissioned photographic enterprise of the Mission Héliographique. These images demonstrate that visual language in which this international group of scientists communicated was consistently inflected by the respective cultural and intellectual patrimony of its participants as a means of proving photography’s usefulness as historical and scientific record. Furthermore, by using sculpture (a multiple) as his subject, Fizeau visually symbolized the reproducibility of photography as a medium.

Amici’s photographic exchange with the Swiss financier and diplomat Jean-Gabriel Eynard (1775-1863), who learned the daguerreotype process in Paris in the autumn of 1839, sheds further light on the Italian optician’s relationship to this circle of photographers connected to Lerebours, offering new insight into the collaborative production of Excursions
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193 Albert Boime, Art in the Age of Counterrevolution, 1815-1848 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 309-311. The original marble bust of Cuvier is located at the Louvre. D’Angers was the leading neoclassical sculptor in France during this time, and designed the pediment relief depicting France’s great men for the Panthéon (1830-37), which includes Cuvier.

194 Christine Boyer, “La Mission Héliographique: Architectural Photography, Collective Memory and the Patrimony of France, 1851,” in Picturing Place: Photography and the Geographical Imagination, eds., Joan Schwarz and James Ryan (London and New York, I.B. Tauris, 2003), 21-54. I have not been able to identify the subject of this photogravure. It depicts a set of four bas-reliefs in situ. The collection of the New York Public Library preserves a similar photogravure of the North Portal of Notre-Dame. Lerebours also produced architectural daguerreotypes for Viollet-le-Duc, some of which survive as engravings.
Daguerrriennes.\textsuperscript{195} In an undated letter from Amici to Vincenzo Antinori, the director of the Regio Museo in Florence, Amici wrote, “Apropos of the daguerreotype, I made an exchange with Sig. Eynard of two of our panoramas of Florence for three views executed by him in Rome. We have gained in this exchange, if nothing else, one more plate, and our panoramas can be repeated here.”\textsuperscript{196} Amici’s laboratory account book marks the date of this meeting as June 1840, when he visited, “with his wife and other relatives of a Professor Pictet from Geneva.”\textsuperscript{197} Eynard was therefore one of the earliest foreign photographers to practice the daguerreotype in Italy. Significantly, in Amici’s letter to Antinori, he expressed that the benefit of his trade with Eynard of two views of Florence for three of Rome lay not in the subjects but in the net increase of plates acquired. In fact, the practical consideration of where to obtain daguerreotype plates for their experiments was a key issue among Florentine scientists in this early period. For example, Lerebours had supplied the industrially-produced plates that Tito Puliti used in his earliest experiments, which were of a higher quality metal than those typically used in Florence that had to be flattened and burnished entirely by hand.\textsuperscript{198} This very basic practical consideration of


\textsuperscript{196} Giovanni Battista Amici to Vincenzo Antinori, Florence, undated, Fondo Amici, cartella 1125, carte 8426-8427.

\textsuperscript{197} Alberto Meschiari, Il libro de’ conti del laboratorio di Giovanni Battista Amici e altri documenti inediti (Florence: Tassinari, 2003), 205.

\textsuperscript{198} This fact is alluded to in “Notice on photogenic images and on copper etchings made voltaically, presented at the R. Accademia dei Georgofili on 3 May 1840 by the member D. Carlo Passerini, joined by professor of zoology of I. e R. Museo di Firenze,” repr. in Malcolm Daniel, “L’Album Bertoloni,” in Fotografia & fotografì a Bologna, 1839-1900, ed. Giuseppina Benassati and Angela Tromellini (Bologna: Grafis Edizioni, 1992), 74; Giovanni Battista Amici to Vincenzo Antinori, Florence, undated, Fondo Amici, cartella 1125, carte 8426-8427. Amici also lamented in a letter to Vincenzo Antinori, the director of the Regio Museo in Florence, that Lerebours had only sent him twelve of the thirty-six daguerreotype plates that he had ordered.
materials underscores the importance of transnational exchange to the development of photography in Italy. Amici’s connections offered not only information and images but also substance, and travelers to Italy like Eynard played an important role in providing access to photographic equipment.

Although the subjects of Eynard’s Roman daguerreotypes are known from letters, no extant Italian daguerreotypes can definitively be attributed to him. A large body of his later photographic work survives, however, including a self-portrait depicting the dignified gentleman posed in front of his home in Geneva, his arm resting on a table bearing a framed full-plate daguerreotype of the Temple of Saturn and the Temple of Vespasian and Titus in the Roman Forum (Figure 2.17). Eynard produced a large number of self-portrait photographs, and this particular staging indicates his continued pride in his early endeavors with the daguerreotype as well as his personal connection to Italy, where he had made his fortune as a merchant and banker while living in Genoa.

Eynard represents a hitherto unacknowledged link between Italian scientists experimenting with photography in Florence, and a group of Swiss photographers that had also trained with Lerebours. Letters Eynard sent from Italy to his son Jacques in Switzerland provide evidence as to how these connections formed. Since Eynard had learned photography in Paris in fall of 1839, it is quite likely that he would have come into contact with Lerebours, who gave instructions on the daguerreotype, and supplied the necessary materials. Furthermore, Lerebours praised Eynard’s daguerreotypes in his 1843 publication *Traité de photographie, derniers perfectionnements apportés au daguerréotype*, which proves the two were acquainted with each

from Paris. These sources suggest that Lerebours consistently supplied daguerreotype plates to the Florentine community in 1839 and 1840.
other’s work if not personally. In Eynard’s letters from Italy, he discussed experiments with making daguerreotypes in Rome including portraits and views of the Arches of Constantine and Septimius Severus, the Trevi Fountain, and ancient sarcophagi. Eynard’s missives indicate that he sent several of these daguerreotypes to Benjamin Delessert, a contemporary who was also from a politically influential family of financiers interested in science and the arts. Delessert was one of the founding members of the Société Héliographique along with Lerebours. Furthermore, Lerebours maintained professional relationships with two other members of Eynard’s Swiss milieu: the astronomer Marc Secretan (1804-1867) and his collaborator, the painter and engraver Frederik von Martens (1806?-1885?) who engraved several of the plates for Excursions Daguerriennes.

Given the dates of Eynard’s travel to Rome (1839-1840), as well as his contacts with Amici, Delessert, and Lerebours, it is possible that Eynard may have supplied some of the daguerreotypes that formed the basis for engravings of Rome in Lerebours’ Excursions Daguerriennes. The timing aligns with the publication schedule, since Eynard had already sent daguerreotypes to Delessert and his son as early as March of 1840. Lerebours issued the first volume of his publication beginning in January of 1841, and at least two extant daguerreotype plates of Rome produced for the series can be dated to before December of 1840 (Figures 2.18

---


200 Published in Philippe Kaenel, “Je crois que l’art est fait pour quelque chose de plus,” 12.


The cohesiveness of Lerebours’s *Excursions Daguerriennes* belies the vast network of individuals who made the project possible. Amici’s acquaintance with Eynard is further evidence of the international exchange transmitted through him into Florence and then throughout Italy via his presentation at the 1844 Congress of Italian Scientists in Milan. That occasion thus also became a key moment in the development of photographic printing within Italy.

**“Accurate Transcripts”: Giovanni Battista Amici and Alexander John Ellis**

Since the daguerreotypes that formed the basis for Lerebours’s publication were ruined during the printing process, precious few examples remain with which to compare the prints. This is also the case for Artaria’s series, leaving the question of who made them unanswered. A useful counter-example to these print series, therefore, is the set of one hundred and fifty-nine daguerreotypes of Italy, which were created by and under the direction of the British philologist Alexander John Ellis (Figure 2.20) for a planned publication to be titled *Italy Daguerreotyped*. Ellis matted, framed, and stored them in a purpose-built cabinet, which is now preserved at the
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203 These daguerreotypes were sold in Antoine Claudet’s shop in London. Karen Hellman, “Antoine Claudet, a Figure of Photography, 1839-1867,” (Ph. D. diss., The City University of New York, 2010), 36-39; Buerger, *French Daguerreotypes*, 33. Buerger identifies an additional daguerreotype of St. Peter’s located at the George Eastman House as one of the extant plates used by Lerebours.

204 Known daguerreotypes of Italy associated with Lerebours’s publication include *Porto Ripetta, Rome*, 1840, The Robinson Library, University of Newcastle upon Tyne (part of a group purchased from Claudet by Hugh Lee Pattinson) and a variant at the National Media Museum, Bradford (Royal Photographic Society Collection, by descent from Talbot, likely from Claudet); *St. Peter’s* ca. 1839, labeled “The first photograph ever taken” (ie. of this particular view of Rome), George Eastman House, Rochester; from private collection of Mrs. C. F. Wolters, and a variant at The Robinson Library, University of Newcastle upon Tyne; *Campo Vacino à Rome*, n. d., National Media Museum, Bradford (Royal Photographic Society Collection, by descent from Talbot, likely purchased or gift from Claudet) with Lerebours/ Claudet & Houghton inscriptions on mat; See: Buerger, *French Daguerreotypes*, 35; Hellman, “Antoine Claudet, a Figure of Photography, 1839-1867,” 36-39.
Whereas Lerebours’s series presented its audience with a compendium of the world’s most incredible monuments and sights, of which Italian views were only one, albeit significant, part, Ellis’s project – like Artaria’s – focused specifically on the subject of Italy.

Ellis recorded his motivations and aspirations for undertaking “the laborious task of daguerreotyping” Italy in notes that he likely intended to present as a prospectus for his publication. For Ellis, the accurate representation of reality achieved by daguerreotypes presented a more truthful reflection of Italy’s famous monuments than existing printed views. Photography would thus both mitigate the traveler’s disappointment when a monument failed to live up to legend, and provide the antiquarian with a more accurate tool for study upon return to England. Relying upon the understanding that the mechanical daguerreotype necessarily recorded reality without “that rage for embellishing” typical of artistic interpretation, Ellis was
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205 Piero Becchetti, *Roma in Dagherrotipia* (Rome: Edizioni Quasar, 1979), 34-38; Paolo Costantini, “Dall'immagine elusiva all'immagine critica. La raccolta Ellis e la costruzione dell'immagine fotografica a Venezia,” *Fotologia* 3 (July 1985): 12-29; Roger Taylor, “Early Daguerreotypes of Italy,” in *Making of the Modern World: Milestones of Science and Technology*, ed., Neil Cossons (London: Science Museum, 1992); Alexander John Ellis, Manuscript, 1845. Object file, National Media Museum Bradford, U. K. Much of the information on Ellis derives from Roger Taylor’s research, and from Ellis’s prospectus and master list preserved in the object file at the National Media Museum, Bradford, U. K., where this author accessed them. The daguerreotypes are housed in wooden frames, and stored within a purpose-built cabinet. They entered the collection of the Science Museum directly through Ellis’s descendants in 1890. It should be noted that Taylor has doubts as to whether the daguerreotypes in the NMM collection are the originals or later copy daguerreotypes. Taylor points out that they are corrected for lateral inversion, which, he argues, likely would not have been done for daguerreotypes destined for publication. Three of the plates (by each of the three authors) have been un-housed and examined by a conservator, and the plate marks on each are different. If one were to produce copy negatives of an entire body of daguerreotypes, I surmise that they would use the same type of plates bought in bulk at once. Viewing these daguerreotypes personally, I don’t see the visual evidence that would support these being copy daguerreotypes, however, I do not think a final assessment can be made until the entire collection has been examined by a conservator.

206 Ellis, Manuscript.
determined that the prints in his publication be “accurate transcripts” of the monuments they depicted.\(^{207}\) As noted above, however, the process of printing from a daguerreotype involved a skilled engraver’s translation of the image to the printed page, and this rarely occurred without some form of artistic interpretation. It is possible that Ellis never completed his publication because the methods of photographic printing available to him were inadequate to meet the requirement of accuracy that he desired.

Ellis was, not surprisingly, connected to Amici. Amici’s laboratory account book for November 1840 records the first evidence of Ellis’s activity in Italy, when he purchased a *camera lucida* from the optician. A daguerreotype depicting a sweeping view of Florence taken from the balcony of Amici’s residence within the Casa Demidoff is tangible proof of their contact, as well as the friendly cooperation that characterized interactions among this elite group of early practitioners of photography in Italy (Figure 2.21). Amici most likely collaborated with Ellis, who inscribed the verso of the plate, “Florence. View from the Castle Demidoff…Prof. Amici.” This daguerreotype, taken from the Oltrarno, depicts the city’s most recognizable landmarks: the Duomo and tower of the Palazzo Signoria.\(^{208}\) Amici and Ellis had corresponded about their respective photographic experiments before this encounter.\(^{209}\) As the previous chapter indicated, Amici’s son, Vincenzo, had conducted numerous trials with Tito Puliti, and Amici had written to Ellis then, observing, “My son occupies himself with much success and possesses a numerous collection of portraits executed in a few short seconds, and almost instantaneously.”\(^{210}\) Count Anatole Demidoff, the influential aristocrat and art collector within whose home Amici
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\(^{207}\) Ellis, Manuscript.

\(^{208}\) Maffioli, “Note per una storia della dagherrotipia in Toscana,” 233.

\(^{209}\) This correspondence is held in the Fondo Amici of the Biblioteca Estense in Modena, Italy.

\(^{210}\) “Mio figlio se ne occupa con molto successo e possiede una numerosa raccolta di ritratti eseguiti in pochi minuti secondi di tempo, e quasi instantaneamente.” Giovanni Battista Amici to Alexander John Ellis, Fondo Amici, cartella 1128, carta 9078.
resided, served as another important member of this Florentine photographic circle. Demidoff frequently traveled between his residences in Paris and his villa outside Florence, and acted as courier transporting daguerreotypes and photographic materials back and forth from France. An inverted Florentine cityscape covered in snow (Figure 2.22), most likely also taken from the Casa Demidoff and attributed to Vincenzo, further indicates the close personal and professional collaborations that occurred in Amici’s immediate circle in this period.

Ellis’s exchanges with Amici provide a wealth of information about his activities in Italy, and outline his photographic itinerary. The handwritten inscriptions on the versos of his daguerreotypes as well as the evidence of Amici’s letters and private account books prove that Ellis was present in Rome from at least the end of January 1841. The earliest two daguerreotypes he made there date from that February and March, and he produced a number of views in Naples, Pompeii, Paestum, and Pozzuoli in April and early May, returning to Rome by June, when his photographic activity reached its most prolific period. After passing through Florence at the end of the month, when he and Amici made their collaborative daguerreotype previously discussed, he stopped in Venice in July. He sent his final letter to Amici from Austria at the end of August. All told, Ellis’s journey, documented in photographs, lasted about ten months.

211 Additional correspondence between Amici and Demidoff related to the daguerreotype includes Fondo Amici, cartella 336, carte 2664-2698. At the time, Amici was living in Demidoff’s home in Florence (the Casa Demidoff on Via Renai). Demidoff also employed one of the earliest daguerreotypists working in Italy, a “Cavalier” Iller who produced a series of at least 18 daguerreotypes of the architecture and grounds of Demidoff’s villa of San Donato. They originally decorated the villa’s entryway, and were sold by his heir at auction in 1880. The locations of only four are still known. Three are in private collections, one of which was purchased from Sotheby’s, New York, April 7, 2008, lot 64. Another, titled Maisonette Pour Cerfs, Parc de San Donato is in the Harrison D. Horblitt Collection of Early Photography, Houghton Library, Harvard University. See: Palais de San Donato. Deuxième partie. Objets d’ameublement du rez-de-chaussée (Florence, 1880), 461; Anne Anninger and Julie Melby, Salts of Silver, Toned with Gold: The Harrison D. Horblitt Collection of Early Photography, ed. Victoria Alexander, (Cambridge: The Houghton Library, Harvard University, 1999), 142.
Contributing greatly to this narrative of transnational exchange and collaborative production among early practitioners, Ellis did not make all the daguerreotypes in his collection, but rather, he purchased and commissioned examples by local Rome-based photographers, whose names he carefully indicated on the verso of forty-eight plates: Lorenzo Suscipj and Achille Morelli. Suscipj operated a store in the center of Rome, at 182 via del Corso, advertising views for sale and daguerreotypes on commission in the newspaper Il Tiberino as early as February 1840. The vast majority of daguerreotypes that Suscipj and Morelli produced on commission for Ellis date to June of 1841, though others were likely made the previous year. While Suscipj embarked on a long photographic career, notably documenting Guido Reni’s Aurora in 1855, exhibiting enlarged portraits in Florence in 1861, and becoming official photographer to Prince Umberto and Princess Margherita in 1872, Achille Morelli remains one of the many obscure figures of photography’s early period. Piero Becchetti hypothesized that Morelli might have been a dilettante, since no other daguerreotypes have been traced to him. Although it may not be possible to securely identify him, contemporary guides to Rome list a “Morelli Achille, placcheista, via del Pozzetto n. 159,” an address a short walk from Suscipj’s store. Placcheista is a generic term for a metalworker who specializes in the production and preparation of metal plates of the type used for signage or printmaking. This trade seems a likely one for a daguerreotypist, particularly considering that commercial daguerreotype plates were not readily available in Italy at the time.

212 Of the 159 daguerreotypes in the Ellis collection, 23 are by Suscipj, 25 by Morelli, and 77 by Ellis. A further 34 do not bear an author’s name.
While planning his publication, Ellis made detailed notes that specified that one of the engravings would be doubled in size to combine two daguerreotypes into a single panoramic view. Although the manuscript makes no other mention of a panorama in the series, both Suscipij and Morelli succeeded in producing extraordinary multi-plate panoramas of the city that are some of the earliest examples of the format in the history of photography. While the panorama as a visual form predated the invention of photography, combining the genre with the accuracy of the daguerreotype would have offered viewers a heightened sense of “being there” without having to leave their own homes. Utilizing full-plate and unconventionally sized daguerreotypes, Suscipij’s panorama depicted the rooftops and monuments of Rome from the convent of San Pietro in Montorio atop the Janiculum, Rome’s highest hill. The panorama extends across eight daguerreotypes, spanning a 180 degree view from St. Peter’s to Monte Testaccio (Figure 2.23). Morelli’s consists of thirteen plates (Figure 2.24), which when placed end to end depict the city viewed from the tower of the Campidoglio, allowing the viewer’s gaze to follow the horizon clockwise from Santa Maria in Aracoeli a full 360 degrees to the Palazzo dei Conservatori. Neither panorama is seamless, but rather the inconsistencies in plate sizes indicate that the camera would have been rotated slightly to capture each successive segment of the landscape, with overlapping areas of the panorama cut from the plates after they were developed. Ellis’s addition of frames around the daguerreotypes further disrupts their intended visual continuity, nonetheless, they serve as a remarkable monument to their authors’ ingenuity and ability. 

Becchetti has hypothesized that Ellis desired to include a photographic panorama of Rome within his series because of his familiarity with a 360-degree panorama from the Capitoline created by R. R. Reinagle and displayed in London’s Strand in 1802.\(^{215}\) In 1818, H. A. 

Barker and J. Burford also exhibited a panorama of the same subject. These examples demonstrate that the tower of the Campidoglio was a popular vantage point for the view it offered of the city, and that it had assumed an established iconography by the 1840s. Ellis’s interest in the panorama was, therefore, fully of its time. As scholars of panoramas have argued, the immersive visual experience was part of a wider transformation in the viewing subject’s relationship to reality that contributed to the creation of a modern spectator. Other media like photography and illustrated magazines also shaped this transformation, which demanded viewers reorient themselves within both a new media landscape and their literal surroundings. Additional proof of this modern vision is the wood-engraving panorama of London after a series of daguerreotypes made by Antoine Claudet, which was published in the Illustrated London News on January 1843.

Since Ellis expected to feature only sixty of the 159 daguerreotypes in his collection, and intended to focus primarily on architecture, it is possible that the panoramas were never intended for printing, but for Ellis’s personal collection. While Morelli and Suscipj’s panoramas anchor Rome’s monuments within the fabric of the city’s topography, Ellis designed Italy
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219 Hellman, “Antoine Claudet, a Figure of Photography, 1839-1867,” 71-72.
Daguerreotyped as a compendium of singular monuments. Incredible feats of technical skill at this early moment in photography’s production, Suscipij’s and Morelli’s panoramas convey an overwhelming amount of architectural and topographical detail, perhaps exceeding the level of skill available to reproduce them. Their panoramas represent a new means of comprehending the world that the unprecedented accuracy of the medium of photography helped make possible: a thoroughly modern vision that appealed to foreigners and Italians alike.

Although he employed Italian photographers, Ellis aimed his publication squarely at an audience of like-minded British travelers. Specifically, he conceived of it as a companion to William Brockedon’s *Hand Book for Travellers, from London to Naples*, and the two publications were even meant to be of the same dimensions (9 x 15 inches).²²⁰ Brockedon’s book guided the reader along the traditional Grand Tour route taken by a British traveler from London through France across the Alps and along the Italian coast to Rome. It included descriptions of each region’s distinguishing historical, artistic, and cultural features, and Brockedon illustrated it with thirty engravings after his own drawings. Many of Brockedon’s illustrations reflect precisely the artist’s embellishment that Ellis’s publication sought to correct. For example, his view of Monte Cavallo on the Quirinal Hill uses the ancient equestrian statues as a backdrop for a scene of local color: peasants gather to converse and to watch a Punch and Judy-style puppet show (figure 2.25). The engraving features loose, broken contours, echoing the style of a sketch, and thereby signals to the viewer their basis in Brockedon’s own first-hand drawings of the site. Ellis intended his views as both complement and corrective to this vision of Italy. Their photographic origins offered his audience of travelers, antiquarians, and “all who wish to know

---

what the buildings of Italy really are,” an assurance of their accuracy with which even the artist’s claim of having been there could not compete.

Ellis’s publication was to include sixty steel engravings transferred from his daguerreotypes and issued beginning January 1, 1845 divided into twenty fascicles of three plates each. Presenting fewer locales than Brockedon, he intended to illustrate Rome, Pisa, Florence, Naples, Pompeii, Paestum, Pozzuoli, Venice, and Milan, with Rome taking up a full third of the subjects. Whereas Brockedon emphasized picturesque elements in his compositions and included numerous distant views of cities and their characteristic surrounding landscapes, Ellis planned to focus on specific monuments. This emphasis was due to his personal interest in Italy’s architecture as his primary subject, but it was also necessarily an effect of the slow exposures that precluded the capture of street life, as his own view of Monte Cavallo makes evident (Figure 2.26).

He planned for his engravings to be accompanied by brief descriptions, sometimes even including the dimensions of the monuments they portrayed. Notably, each print was to bear a note explaining the vantage point from which the photograph was taken, further ensuring the accuracy of the prints. Ellis carefully labeled each original daguerreotype on the verso with precisely this information, and often included the date, time, and weather conditions of the exposure in such a manner that a viewer of the photograph could retrace the photographer’s steps, verifying the truthfulness of his representations. These handwritten notes likely would have served as captions to the published engravings after each daguerreotype. As Ellis wrote in his prospectus, “It is submitted that the engravings now offered furnish that verisimilitude which is required by the traveler, who wishes for reminiscences, the antiquarian who desires historical
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evidence of the state of buildings as existing at known times, and to all who wish to know what
the buildings of Italy really are.”

In other words, he believed that reminiscence, evidence, and
knowledge were photography’s salient features, and would bring a novel truth to the distortions
of the artistic interpretations in previous media.

Although Ellis’s notes include three views of Milan, he never traveled there. Instead, he
planned to seek permission from Artaria to reproduce three of the firm’s prints after
daguerreotypes from the series *Vues d’Italie.* Ellis’s awareness of that publication suggests
that Artaria had already gained international prestige for his early foray into photographic
printing, and that the series served, like Lerebours’s *Excursions Daguerriennes,* as a model for
his project. In addition, Ellis recognized that the products of local daguerreotypists often
surpassed his own efforts to document Italy, such as those by Suscipj and Morelli in Rome. Ellis
thus not only relied upon the truthfulness of photography, but also the authenticity implied by
using Italian makers to ensure that his prints after daguerreotypes would be “accurate transcripts”
of Italy.

**Milano e il suo territorio**

Both Lerebours’s *Excursions Daguerriennes* and Ellis’s uncompleted *Italy
Daguerreotyped* aimed to represent Italy and its famed historical monuments for an audience
primarily comprised of foreigners. As I have argued above, Artaria’s series *Vues d’Italie* instead
provided a vision of Italy that appealed to foreign tourists at the same time that it focused on sites
of primary significance to Milan’s bourgeoisie. The importance of Artaria’s series as a tool of
identity formation for this local audience is best understood through an examination of the
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guidebook *Milano e il suo territorio*, published by Giacomo Pirola in an edition of 1500 on the occasion of the Sixth Congress of Italian Scientists held in Milan in 1844. This publication was funded by the city of Milan, and copies were distributed as gifts to attendees of the Congress. The book reproduced in a smaller format fourteen of the principle views of Milan executed as aquatint engravings after daguerreotypes and originally printed as part of Artaria’s series *Vues d’Italie* (Figure 2.27). Significantly, the Milan Congress was the same meeting attended by Lerebours, where Amici presented other examples of photographic publishing, including Talbot’s *The Pencil of Nature*, daguerreotype photogravures by Fizeau, and Donné’s prints of Leon Foucault’s daguerreotypes made in the solar microscope. Artaria’s prints thus took their place at this occasion as an Italian counterpart to those British and French examples.

The photographic engravings in *Milano e il suo territorio* augmented an authoritative and erudite text detailing the historical, cultural, and social life of Milan from its origins to the present, written by a variety of contributors composed of the city’s leading intellectuals. The liberal writer and historian Cesare Cantù (later the author of the multi-volume chronicle *Storia degli Italiani*) was the book’s leading contributor. His introductory “Historical Sketch” of Milan traces the city’s heritage from pre-Roman times, asserting throughout its narrative a singular Milanese identity despite a legacy of foreign rule, and this text is peppered throughout with wood engravings depicting elements of the city’s Medieval and early Renaissance art and architecture. These decorative flourishes were accomplished by a new printmaking technique known as polytypy pioneered in Milan by the printmaker and photographer Luigi Sacchi (which will be discussed in greater depth in Chapter Five). The richly decorated text corresponded visually to the illustrated novels and periodicals that flourished throughout Italy in this period, and like the
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photographic illustrations, would have been viewed as a thoroughly modern means of visual communication serving the important purpose of educating the reader. The introduction and the chapters that followed Cantù’s historical prelude comprise a text at once analytical and data-driven, Romantic and patriotic. Artaria’s prints from daguerreotypes, which seamlessly combined photography’s documentary power with artistic interpretation, were therefore ideally suited to the book’s overall strategy. Their inclusion within *Milano e il suo territorio* connects the Artaria firm to Cantù and other members of Milan’s liberal intellectual community. As Francesca Bonetti has argued, this book “signals a very significant moment in the history of the daguerreotype, inasmuch as it signifies the first evidence, in Italy, of a public commission that exploited the new medium for its strategies of communication.”

The interwoven visual and verbal narrative of *Milano e il suo territorio* is a testament to the context in which Artaria’s daguerreotype images were applied, appearing alongside other new printmaking technologies, in order to bolster a text brimming with civic pride.

The publication of prints from Artaria’s series within *Milano e il suo territorio* was not the publisher’s first attempt to capitalize on the scientific community’s interest in the daguerreotype. The Tuscan plates of *Vues d’Italie* were issued by popular demand concurrently with the Third Congress of Italian Scientists held in Florence in 1841, and they were then republished a year later as a separate series. The timing of Artaria’s Padua views also coincided with the Congress held there in 1842. Significantly, organizers of the Padua Congress produced a guidebook in honor of that occasion, and presented as a gift to the attendees. That publication appealed to the scientists’ liberal political views, and in addition to providing

---

information about the history, monuments, topography, and commerce of the city, it included chapters dedicated to public social spaces like theaters and especially the Caffè Pedrocchi, where many of the Congress’s meetings took place. Michele Kier produced the illustrations that accompanied the text, which were traditional lithographs based on artist’s sketches. This guide formed a model for the one produced by the organizers of Milan’s 1844 Congress, though the Milanese iteration raised the stakes in terms of both its exhaustive content and lavish production.

One of the predominant features of the content of Milano e il suo territorio is the use of statistics in the form of indexes, charts, and lists. These statistics recount everything from population, geographic characteristics, and military expenditures to the amount of olive oil consumed in a given year. Presented as a means of comprehensively understanding every aspect of the city of Milan and its inhabitants, these “patriotic statistics” were part of a widespread trend within Italy’s scientific communities, and performed a universalizing function that, as Silvana Patriarca has argued, contributed to the formation of a national identity before Unification. As she writes, “the statistical descriptions of Italy produced before unification were an overt historical weapon in the hands of Italian reformers and patriots: by responding to the ‘false’ images produced by foreign observers and to the ‘useless’ representations of antiquarians, they aimed at establishing Italy’s ‘true picture.’” Furthermore, she asserts, “in Italy statistics not only performed a work of ideological and political legitimation, but also contributed to the creation, the ‘production,’ as it were, of the Italian nation, that is of the very entity that they were
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supposed to describe.\textsuperscript{230} The same ideology also underlay Artaria’s larger project. By bringing together views of cities from throughout the peninsula, Vues d’Italie had provided a comprehensive vision of Italy. Furthermore, Artaria’s use of the objective daguerreotype -- a ‘true picture’ -- mirrors the claims to objectivity of statistics, giving the resultant images heightened credibility. It was precisely their assumed veracity that made Artaria’s images appealing illustrations for a text concerned with scientific objectivity, as was the case in Milano e il suo territorio.

Italian statisticians made up a large contingent within the Congresses of Italian Scientists, generally as part of the section devoted to agronomy and technology, where their concerns often focused on gathering data relevant to social welfare, agricultural production, and industry, with an eye toward progressive intervention.\textsuperscript{231} The content of Milano e il suo territorio echoes these issues, with chapters dedicated specifically to statistics, public hygiene, and education, among other fields of enquiry. Artaria’s views appear printed full page at the beginning of each chapter, and typically depict a subject relevant to its respective theme. For example, Milan had a particularly proud tradition of public services, and especially of medical care, including free vaccines and rural access to doctors.\textsuperscript{232} A chapter devoted to “Hygiene” thus outlines a history of the city’s hospitals’ institutional structure as well as a statistical accounting of maladies, mortality rates, and numbers of medical workers in the city. Artaria’s view of the Ospedale Maggiore, founded by Francesco Sforza in the late fifteenth century, provides the introductory image to this chapter (Figure 2.27f). The authority of the didactic text within Milano e il suo territorio was thus bolstered by the facticity of the illustrations, since the prints based on

\textsuperscript{230} Patriarca, Numbers and Nationhood, 4.
\textsuperscript{231} Patriarca, Numbers and Nationhood, 125-130.
\textsuperscript{232} Heider, “Lombardy and Venetia,” 35.
daguerreotypes were understood to be more truthful representations of reality than those based solely on artist’s sketches.

The plates depicting Milan in Artaria’s *Vues d’Italie*, from which the examples in *Milano e il suo territorio* originate, represented proportionately the largest number in the series by far. They also encompassed a wide variety of subjects including monuments from the civic, social, and religious life of the city, which, I have argued, appealed to a knowing audience comprised of Milan’s bourgeoisie. *Milano e il suo territorio* provides further evidence of how Artaria’s views contributed to a distinctly Milanese self-fashioning, since the publication was compiled by that city’s leading journalists and intellectuals. The distribution of this book at a meeting of Italian scientists offered attendees from other regions of the peninsula a comparative model with which to engage when considering the larger agenda of the Congresses: the advancement of science and thus socio-economic progress within Italy. *Milano e il suo territorio* utilized the accuracy of photography to bolster the validity of its didactic text, and to thus spread progressive goals by promoting Milan as an exemplary modern Italian city.
CHAPTER THREE

Stefano Lecchi: A Photographic Pilgrimage of War

An Italian, a native of Lecco, Lombardy, [Lecchi] rendered great services to photography. His name figures honorably in the reports submitted to the Academy of Sciences in Paris since 1844, illustrating his photographic method of using dried paper with iodine bromide for negatives. I remember how he loved to propagate in Rome photographic ideas and I remember well how in his long life he had not been able to procure a livelihood for his old age. The misfortunes which therefore struck him inhibited him in carrying out his method which is not without merit. He died in misery.233

Stefano Lecchi’s “Great Services to Photography”

Shifting focus from the cosmopolitan center of Milan to revolutionary Rome, this chapter examines how Italy’s First War of Independence from 1848-1849 imbued existing monuments and sites with new political and symbolic resonance, as they became, literally, a battleground. Throughout Europe, 1848 marked a significant turning point in the abolishment of monarchy and the development of the modern democratic nation state. This was no less the case in Italy, where rebellions against the Hapsburgs in Vienna sparked a chain of uprisings leading to the establishment of constitutional governments throughout the peninsula. In Rome, a Council of Deputies initially elected by the Pope eliminated his temporal authority, established a constitution, and declared the Roman Republic in February 1849. In response, the Pope called upon his supporters, including Austria, France, Spain, and Naples, to advance their armies on

Rome. Giuseppe Garibaldi led volunteer forces in a stunning defeat of the Neapolitan army outside Rome, and impressively held back the advanced military defenses of some 12,000 French troops under General Oudinot for almost a month. Fighting waged throughout June of 1849, when the beleaguered Garibaldian forces were forced to retreat, and the short-lived Roman Republic fell. Nonetheless, Garibaldi’s heroic defense of the Roman Republic became a flashpoint for Italy’s national movement, and sparked a Romantic fervor that resonated throughout Europe and America.234

The photographer Stefano Lecchi (1804-1863?) is best remembered for his series of photographs documenting the aftermath of the defense of the Roman Republic in 1849, which comprise the earliest surviving examples of war reportage recorded on paper negatives worldwide. Despite this achievement, Lecchi has received little notice in histories of photography outside of Italy, and his success recording Risorgimento battles has been eclipsed by the narratives of photographers who covered larger conflicts, including Roger Fenton in Crimea (1855), Felice Beato in India (1857-1859), and Alexander Gardner during the U.S. Civil War (1861-1864). As a result of this incomplete narrative, the contribution of other authors and the representation of other histories than those of Great Britain, France, and the United States have been marginalized.

Even within Italian sources, Lecchi remains a celebrated but elusive figure.235 Although he was an early adopter of paper photography, and therefore an important reference point for the

development of Talbot’s process within the peninsula, little evidence remains of either his biography or the “misfortunes” that prevented him from professional success while working in Rome in the 1840s and 1850s. This chapter relies on new biographical information in order to provide a comprehensive analysis of Lecchi’s career and thus proposes a different reading of this photographer, not only as chronicler of the aftermath of battles in Rome, but also as a significant promoter of Talbot’s paper process within Italy and innovative experimenter with the medium. This re-evaluation situates Lecchi within a transnational network of photographers and patrons who endorsed Talbot’s invention, and demonstrates how this cosmopolitanism was a significant dimension of his patriotism. Lecchi’s career therefore provides a noteworthy case study for examining the development of Italian national identity within a broader international context.

Lecchi produced forty-one negatives in his series documenting the aftermath of the defense of the Roman Republic. This chapter concentrates on a particular photographic album (Getty Research Institute 2002.R.45*) that presents thirty of Lecchi’s salted paper prints from that series together with eleven topographical views. The history of this album’s provenance in and of itself provides proof of the transnational connections among the Risorgimento’s participants and audiences. Titled on the spine *Fotografi di Roma* in embossed gilt lettering, the bound folio-sized album contains the dated inscription “E. C. // Rome Pal. Caetani 7 br 20, 1849.”236 This inscription attests to the close association of two aristocrats, the influential Roman
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236 Strangely, the album’s title reads “Photographers of Rome” rather than “Photographs of Rome” (Fotografie di Roma). Most likely, this is an accidental misspelling resulting from the
nobleman, Michelangelo Caetani, and the British art collector Edward Cheney, shortly after the fall of the Roman Republic. Caetani apparently presented the album to Cheney in his Roman Palazzo a mere three months after the battles, but it remains unclear whether Caetani compiled it himself. Nonetheless, this album, and in particular the network of personal and professional allegiances that its examination reveals, has a political significance that reframes the given narrative of Lecchi’s project in terms of its transnational origins and its importance to individual patriotic devotion.

Whereas scholars have convincingly argued that Republican allegiance motivated Lecchi to make his war photographs, Cheney and Caetani were politically moderate, holding sympathies toward the Pope and favoring the establishment of a constitutional monarchy in Italy rather than a Republic. The album is thus a record of the complex and cosmopolitan history of the Risorgimento rather than an unequivocal memento of revolutionary sentiment. Furthermore, the album’s unusual combination of tourist views and war reportage demonstrates Lecchi’s innovative attempt to engage with current events within the topographical canon of “views of Rome.” Although photography’s facticity made it a powerful medium of reportage, I argue that this private album reveals that the primary significance of Lecchi’s battle photographs to his contemporaries was for personal memory rather than historical documentation. In this regard, Lecchi’s compositions are fundamental to the Risorgimento’s nationalist cult, because they emphasize the significance of martyrdom and acts of bearing witness to the commemoration of war.\(^{237}\) The album *Fotografì di Roma* demonstrates how the events of the Risorgimento

expanded the existing canon of Italy’s historical monuments to include new sites identified with contemporary political actions. Through memorialization, these sites were imbued with deeper historical and spiritual meaning that contributed to the collective memory of the founding of the Italian nation.

“To Propagate Photographic Ideas:” Stefano Lecchi’s Early Career in France

Before Lecchi’s critical reappraisal, his was but one name to have contributed to photography’s technological progress, noted but largely forgotten amidst many others in the records of France’s Académie des Sciences, rather than remembered through his photographs. Lecchi’s critical fortune in the twentieth century has in general been tied to Risorgimento narratives and moments of patriotic nostalgia. Although prints from his Roman Republic series had made their way into at least two institutional collections by the end of the nineteenth century, they were all but forgotten in the early twentieth. His photographs appeared as reproductions (the original prints having been lost) in the Mostra del Risorgimento (1911), mounted on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of Unification, and the postwar Mostra della Fotografia (1953).238 This latter exhibition focused on the history of Rome through early photographs, highlighting Risorgimento photographs as evidence of the continuity of the city’s resilience and its importance to Italian history. Lecchi’s name was therefore kept alive on his work’s merit as historical documentation. It is also within this context that the art historian Lamberto Vitali revived Lecchi as a leading figure of photography’s early period, publishing reproductions of his

images of the Roman Republic in the 1979 book *Il Risorgimento nella fotografia*, a volume which was part of a new editorial initiative on the history of photography issued by the Einaudi publishing house. Lecchi’s appearance in these exhibitions and books demonstrates how Italian scholars evaluated his photographs primarily in terms of historical record. Retracing the available biographical evidence, however, Lecchi emerges as an ambitious figure, not only because of his decisive role documenting the events of the Roman Republic, but also because of his important position as an interlocutor among French, British, and Italian developments in photography. The poor condition in which his photographs have survived has concealed a powerful eye for composition, and a breadth of engagement with the medium that is remarkable for his time.

Lecchi was born in the territory of Milan or Lecco (near Lake Como) around 1805 and died before 1863, possibly in 1859, the last year when his local parish recorded his presence in Rome. Although historical sources identify him as a painter, there is no evidence of his having attended the Accademia di Belle Arti di Brera in Milan, which was Lombardy’s premiere art academy; he may have only apprenticed, rather than had a formal artistic training. Lecchi began making photographs sometime around 1842 when he presented a method of hand-coloring daguerreotypes to the Académie des Sciences in Paris. He worked in the south of France until

---

239 Notably, this was the same publisher responsible for the multi-authored and multi-volume scholarly magnum opus *Storia d’Italia* of the same period. Vitali, *Il Risorgimento nella fotografia*, 13.


around 1846, when he relocated to Naples, documenting Pompeii under official Bourbon patronage. From at least 1849, Lecchi resided in Rome. There is little indication that Lecchi was connected to the so-called “Roman School of Photography,” which will be discussed at greater length in the following chapter, but he must have been acquainted with the foreign and local photographers operating there. Surprisingly, he never ran a commercial studio in the city despite his interest in pursuing photography as a profession. Rome was a center of photographic activity with a constant stream of potential clients among the tourists and artists passing through, yet comparatively few photographs by Lecchi made after 1849 survive with respect to those of his contemporaries, perhaps due in part to his lack of commercial distribution. According to the earliest source for his biography, an 1863 treatise on photography by the renowned goldsmith and amateur photographer Augusto Castellani, Lecchi was a promising figure who fell into misfortune despite his skill and tenacity.242 By 1858, he lived in a monastery with his daughter Adelaide, and it is unclear whether the cause was illness or financial trouble. Soon after, he fell into obscurity.243
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243 Most scholars have assumed that Lecchi died by the early 1860s, but a recent news article has alleged that Lecchi may have relocated to Malta, where a carte de visite portrait of Garibaldi has been discovered bearing on its verso the studio address of an S. Lecchi. The man who discovered this also purportedly has found a document signed by an S. Lecchi and Achille Lecchi (which is the name of Lecchi’s son.) This document is, however, in a private collection. Although this provides a tantalizing epilogue to Lecchi’s career, more convincing evidence of this connection needs to be made public and verified. It seems particularly suspect given Castellani’s claim in 1863 that Lecchi had died in obscurity. See: Giovanni Bonello, “Stefano Lecchi tracked down to Malta in 1860s,” Times of Malta (February 14, 2016) http://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20160214/life-features/Stefano-Lecchi-tracked-down-to-Malta-in-1860s.602418
Within his brief and somewhat mysterious career, however, Lecchi was actively engaged with photography. He adopted both the daguerreotype and his own technique of paper negatives (essentially a modification of Talbot’s process), presented improvements to these processes at scientific meetings, held patents for inventions, and courted the patronage of powerful figures. The earliest notices for his activities in France date to the summer of 1840, and new evidence indicates that before taking up photography he operated a diorama in Marseille and Toulouse.\(^{244}\)

An article published in a local newspaper advertised:

> Now here is Mr. Lecchi, an Italian painter, who, understanding the merit of this invention, has devoted himself entirely to this genre of painting. Since arriving in our city he has recently submitted for public scrutiny three large canvases demonstrating a real talent and representing: the interior of Saint-Etienne-du-Mont, a view of Naples with an eruption of Vesuvius, and The Inauguration of the Temple of Solomon.\(^{245}\)

According to the notice, his canvases were, “remarkable for the agreement between shadows and highlights, for their aerial harmony,” and, “the illusion [was] complete.”\(^{246}\)

Before his experiments with photography, Daguerre invented and operated the diorama, a spectacular form of entertainment that displayed large canvases painted with opaque and
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\(^{244}\) Jean-Roger Soubiran, “Peinture et Photographie en Provence (1850-1870),” in Leclere: Tableaux Provençal (Marseille: October 20, 2013), 58. Soubiran lists several notices in local newspapers for a “M. Lecchi” and his diorama, but does not identify him as Stefano Lecchi. These notices name Lecchi as “Etienne” (French for Stefano), a painter from Italy. See also: La Sémaphore (September 5, 1840): 2; Le Toulonnais (December 9, 1840); Le Toulonnais (December 25 1840.)


transparent pigments subjected to shifting lighting conditions.\textsuperscript{247} He opened the first diorama in Paris in 1822 with his partner, the painter Charles Marie Bouton. Lecchi may have seen the Paris diorama first-hand before it burned down in March of 1839. Regardless, its success had led to imitations throughout Europe during the 1830s, and Lecchi was apparently savvy regarding the public’s taste for the entertainment. Significantly, the interior of Saint-Etienne-du-Mont, the subject of one of Lecchi’s dioramas, was also among the most popular of Daguerre’s canvases.

Lecchi’s interest in the multi-media spectacle of the diorama might have also provided a background for his early experiments with the hand-colored daguerreotype, since both mediums relied on techniques of layering watercolor washes to create their effects. A brief article in the \textit{Journal de Toulouse} of October 1842 served as his retirement notice from the diorama. The article discusses Arago’s presentation of Lecchi’s method of hand-coloring daguerreotypes to the Académie des Sciences in Paris.\textsuperscript{248} This contribution to the ongoing scientific discourse on photography is proof of Lecchi’s relevant position within an international circle of early experimenters with the daguerreotype process. Indeed, commentators on the medium frequently lamented the inability of early daguerreotypes to reproduce reality in full color.\textsuperscript{249} This deficiency led to the creation of a variety of techniques for applying pigment to the developed


\textsuperscript{248} “Casino des Beaux-Arts,” \textit{Journal de Toulouse Politique et Littéraire} 38, no. 246 (October 23, 1842): 4. The same article also explains that the diorama had been taken over by a M. Morandi, a harpist from Livorno. Operating the facility as the “Casino des Beaux Arts,” Morandi played popular music to accompany such visual spectacles as the showing of Napoleon’s ashes in the Invalides, midnight mass in the church of Saint-Etienne-du-Mont, the eruption of Vesuvius, and the dedication of the temple of Solomon. It seems likely that Lecchi sold his entire operation to M. Morandi, including his painted canvases.

daguerreotype plate. Most of these methods, including Lecchi’s, were merely variations of the same basic idea. Photographers and colorists used tracing paper to keep paint within the proper areas, and applied dry pigment mixed with gum arabic onto the plate by blowing or dissolving it in a liquid solution so that it could be brushed in thin layers onto the photograph’s surface. Notably, the latter was the same technique employed to build up tones in oil painting, or to provide the translucent washes of color upon which the diorama’s illusions relied.

Lecchi gained international renown through promoting his color process, and became associated with painterly effects within the medium of photography. His “daguerreotype-watercolor” method involved the application of local color to shadows, producing a realistic gradation of translucent tones across the photograph’s surface, and it is possible that upon the purported merit of his technique, Lecchi received permission to make daguerreotypes of Flemish masterpieces in Belgium in 1843. Reproducing paintings by Rubens and Van Dyck, he was praised in the art press for the large number of successful daguerreotypes he made in a single day. Whether these daguerreotypes were hand-painted and sold commercially or translated to prints is uncertain, but Lecchi’s efforts to record artworks famed for textured impasto and chiaroscuro -- difficult subjects for early photography -- demonstrate his ambitious and innovative experimentation with photography’s capacities and limitations and a desire for notoriety among the photographic community.
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250 Henisch, *The Painted Photograph*, 21 and 33. Johann Baptist Isenring (1796-1860) of Switzerland invented the method, which was then adapted by a variety of practitioners, notably Richard Beard who took out a patent for the technique in Great Britain in 1842.
252 None of Lecchi’s daguerreotypes survive. A quarter-plate daguerreotype of an engraving after Rubens’s *Descent from the Cross* (1612-14) sold at auction in 1994 (Christie’s, May 12, 1994, lot 2). The catalogue entry posits that the daguerreotype could be by Lecchi.
Returning to Provence, Lecchi continued to explore the medium’s possibilities, patenting a periscopic lens and taking up paper photography.\(^{253}\) It was within this context that the Reverend Calvert Richard Jones encountered his work in December of 1845. A contemporary of Talbot, Jones was traveling the continent on a photographic Grand Tour, having learned the calotype method directly from its inventor.\(^{254}\) He wrote to Talbot,

> At Lyons, Avignon, and Marseilles I saw some Photographs which the Shopkeepers at the houses where they were exposed, represented as being paper Dags, but which, from certain identical stains on different copies, I discovered to be a kind of Talbotype; they appeared to be quickly done, as several figures appeared. They were done by an Italian, named Leuchi [sic], who is prepared to reveal his method whenever a certain number (how many I know not) of persons shall have agreed to give him 100 francs each: I did not see him, but all the Photographers I have met with are delighted with my paper specimens. You need not be the least alarmed lest I shd [sic] reveal anything to these gentlemen.\(^{255}\)

Jones’s letter proves that already in 1845 Lecchi had mastered both the daguerreotype and his own process of paper negatives utilizing iodine bromide. A further notice from the bulletin of the Académie de Nîmes indicates that Lecchi’s name figured prominently within discussions of paper photography in Southern France. At the April 4, 1846 meeting of that institution, he was

\(^{253}\) Lecchi invented a new type of periscopic lens intended to measure the precise focal length needed for portraits, reported in “Nuovo apparecchio fotografico di Lecchi,” Annali di Fisica, chimica e matematica coi bulletin di farmacia e di tecnologia diretti da Gianalessandro Majocchi 19, no. 3 (1845): 112 and Edmond de Valicourt, Nouveau manuel complet de photographie sur métal, sur papier et sur verre contenant toutes les découvertes de MM. Nièpce et Daguerre, F. Talbot, Herschell, Hunt, Blanquart-Evrard, Nièpce de St.-Victor, Fizeau, Claudet, baron Gros, Humbert de Molard, Legray, etc., etc. (Paris: Roret, 1851), 14.


listed alongside Marc-Antoine Gaudin as a photographer, “bringing to perfection the technique of paper photography.”

During the proceedings, a Mr. Frossard exhibited positive prints by Talbot of porcelain, crystal, and an antique bust, as well as a view of the Maison-Carrée of Nîmes by Lecchi. Frossard announced at the meeting that Lecchi was being given a “mission to the Orient” by the French government. No evidence of such a commission has been traced, and it is possible that one was never planned, but merely boasted about to increase Lecchi’s renown.

This rediscovered evidence of Lecchi’s time in France provides new insight into the origins and mechanics of his professional career. Clearly, he hoped to turn a profit from his own experiments and adaptations of the medium, since he sold his photographs commercially in cities throughout Southern France and sought patents. Lecchi’s strategy of revealing his technique only by subscription speaks of the showman’s flair for self-promotion if not outright hucksterism, and demonstrates the diverse modes through which he hoped to make photography into a lucrative enterprise. Lecchi engaged in many of the same forms of speculative enterprise that Stephen Pinson has demonstrated motivated Daguerre’s diverse artistic career. For example, Lecchi’s
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256 Procédés-verbaux de l’académie royale du gard. (Nîmes: Imprimerie ballivet et fabre, 1846), 56.
257 Procédés-verbaux de l’académie royale du gard, 56. There is no indication that Stefano (or “Etienne”) Lecchi obtained such a commission in the Archives Nationales de France, though Isotta Poggi asserts that he worked in Tunisia. Isotta Poggi, “‘And the Bombs Fell for Many Nights,’ Stefano Lecchi’s photographs of the 1849 Siege of Rome in the Cheney Album,” in Photo Archives and the Nation, ed. Tiziana Serena and Costanza Caraffa (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015), 203-219. Several oil sketches depicting North Africa or the Near East and signed “Lecchi” have sold at auction in recent years. Although the signature on the paintings appears to closely match that found on Lecchi’s photographs, they may be the work of an “A. Lecchi,” or Achille Lecchi, possibly Lecchi’s son. See Christie’s South Kensington, June 2, 2009 (Lots 731 and 734) and Sotheby’s Colonnade, January 26, 1994 (Lot 63). Achille Lecchi was an Orientalist painter born in Rome and active in Alexandria, Egypt. See: L.A. Balboni, Gli Italiani nella civiltà Egiziana del secolo XIX: storia, biografia, monografie (Alexandria: V. Penasson, 1906), 330 and 342.
experience operating the diorama and producing hand-colored daguerreotypes provided notoriety that allowed him to obtain official sponsorship in Belgium and perhaps even a French government commission. Throughout his short career, Lecchi relied upon his personal and professional connections to obtain local as well as international patronage rather than establish a permanent commercial studio.

“Mr. Lecchi’s Method:” Paper Photography and Patronage at Pompeii

Calvert Jones was not the only photographer from Talbot’s immediate circle to encounter Lecchi in his travels. The Reverend George Wilson Bridges, a correspondent of Talbot’s who had learned the calotype process from both its inventor and Jones, met Lecchi while traveling through the Mediterranean and photographing famous sites for a planned publication.259 Bridges wrote to Talbot about this episode in August 1847, “In Naples I met with a Sig. Lechie [sic], a Milanese - who is teaching the art at 600 francs - one only lesson: - a poor Optician in Toledo, paid that sum - & by some means obtained the whole process in writing: - from him I have it & have seen some very superior negative & possitives [sic] worked by it: - but have yet been too ill to try it myself.”260 Apparently, Lecchi maintained his tactic of releasing information about his process through subscription or payment, but had increased the prices, probably seeking to profit from the wealth of travelers eager to make their own photographic souvenirs of Italy.

Bridges certainly found merit in the method, noting, “Lechie's skies are perfect - & he succeeds on paper of very inferior quality - no spots seeming to appear, or injure the process.”\textsuperscript{261} This praise for Lecchi’s photographs stood in contrast to Bridges’s own mixed results with Talbot’s calotype. While abroad, Bridges had difficulty printing his negatives, sending them back to England, where Talbot’s assistant Nicolaas Henneman processed them. Consequently, Bridges was delayed in seeing his final prints, and in making improvements to his technique. Providing further evidence of Lecchi’s stature within the international photographic community at this time, Bridges also reported to Talbot about an amateur photographer who had paid to learn Lecchi’s process on a photographic excursion to Baia and Pozzuoli. That photographer, recorded in his letter to Talbot as an “A. M. Fays,” is most likely the same Baron A. Fays whose views of Venice and Florence were published by the renowned French printer in Lille, Louis Désiré Blanquart-Evrard, in his \textit{Recueil photographique} of 1854.\textsuperscript{262} This commercial photographic publication included souvenir views of sites throughout Europe and the Mediterranean, sourced from the amateur and professional photographers for whom Blanquart-Evrard printed negatives. Lecchi’s skill with paper photography had, therefore, garnered recognition in photographic circles in France, Italy, and Great Britain, helping to spread knowledge of the technique across Europe. Bridges’s and Jones’s encounters with Lecchi, and in particular their acknowledgement that he was not only using his own variation of Talbot’s

\textsuperscript{261} George Wilson Bridges to William Henry Fox Talbot, August 28, 1847, \textit{The Correspondence of William Henry Fox Talbot}, http://foxtalbot.dmu.ac.uk/, document number: 5985.

method, but having a great deal of success with it, demonstrate his central role in disseminating information about the new medium to an international audience.

In addition to providing valuable evidence of paper photography’s diffusion within Italy, Bridges’s letters to Talbot relay important information about Lecchi’s activities in Naples. Bridges wrote, “He is employed now by the King of Naples in copying at Pompeii - but I have some 4 or 5 taken there equal to his. - His advantage seems to be that he makes use of any inferior paper, and is more certain of good productions. - I saw him take 14 one morning at Pompeii without one failure.” Bridges’s admiration for Lecchi’s prolific output echoes the earlier acclaim for his Belgian daguerreotypes, and reinforces the difficulties of early photographic processes, especially in hot climates. This account also highlights the attraction of Pompeii for photographers. As the previous chapter discussed, Alexander John Ellis had photographed in Pompeii as early as 1841, and the site continued to draw both amateur and professional photographers throughout the nineteenth century. The prevalence of photographers at the archeological site may have inspired an atmosphere of friendly competition among those vying for court patronage or commercial advantage.

The antiquities of Pompeii were a closely guarded source of financial and cultural caché for the Bourbon regime. Access to visit, study, draw, or photograph the archeological site required official permission, often obtained through the assistance of foreign diplomats resident among the court. This is further proven by the fact that Bridges hoped to gain the favor of the Bourbon regime, especially its monarch Ferdinand II, writing to Talbot of his photographs, “The king of Naples was so pleased with one of them, that he has given me permission to copy, move or measure throughout the kingdom – of which I shall again take advantage,” and, “I sent you

lately one or two good copies – and have made a few which I shall take to the King of Naples, (of Pompeii) – who is infinitely pleased even with the negatives – especially those of the frescoes lately discovered.” A reverend by profession, Bridges saw photography as a potentially lucrative, but still respectable, commercial pursuit. Support from the King of Naples would enable him to produce photographic views otherwise unavailable on the commercial market, and thus increase the salability of his publication.

The Roman wall frescoes uncovered at Pompeii beginning in 1748 were among the most treasured archeological discoveries at the site, providing a historical basis for earlier neoclassical artists’ style and compositions. For visitors of the Romantic period, the encounter with Pompeii’s frescoes enhanced the viewer’s experience, offering a glimpse into the past, since volcanic mud and ash had preserved the vibrant pigments and decorative elements in situ. Calvert Jones’s hand-colored print of a traveler paused in the doorway to the House of Sallust (Figure 3.1), where frescoes had been excavated between 1805 and 1809, conveys Pompeii’s (and photography’s) unique capacity to preserve time. Here, Jones provides a meditative reflection on Pompeii’s storied past in vivid color, even alluding to the city’s fate through the watercolor embellishment of a plume of smoke emitting from Vesuvius in the background. Jones incorporated these additional picturesque details into his painted photographs to increase their commercial appeal; he too hoped to sell his photographs through Talbot’s Reading Establishment.

Official documents indicate that Lecchi visited Pompeii in July of 1847, employed not by King Ferdinand II, as Bridges reported, but by Infante Sebastián Gabriel Bourbon y Branzaga of

Portugal and Spain (1811-1875).\textsuperscript{266} Sebastián Gabriel had been stripped of his titles during Spain’s Carlist Wars and was thus living in exile in Naples with his wife, the Bourbon Princess Maria Amalia. Lecchi’s photograph of bakery ovens in Pompeii’s Casa del Forno, which is included in the album \textit{Fotografi di Roma} despite its depiction of a site outside of Rome, is one of only two surviving examples from this group (Figure 3.2).\textsuperscript{267} Although the precise details of Lecchi’s commission are not known, it is possible that his prior experience reproducing Flemish paintings in photographs contributed to his employment at Pompeii. Both Sebastián Gabriel and Lecchi were listed as affiliated members of the Reale Accademia delle Belle Arti di Napoli as late as 1855, and it is quite likely that they first encountered each other through that organization or the broader artistic community active in Naples.\textsuperscript{268} Lecchi’s official recognition by a royal patron indicates that shortly after his arrival in that city he had already achieved a significant level of artistic and professional status.

\textsuperscript{266} Real Museo e Scavi permessi per trarre copie e calchi, June 15, 1847, Pompei Giornali degli Scavi, Archivio del Ministero della pubblica istruzione del Regno delle due Sicilie, Archivio di Stato di Napoli, 354 II (1), 1842-1848; Copia del Giornale redatto dai Soprastanti de’ Reali Scavi di Pompei della settimana, July 4-10, 1847, Pompei Giornali degli Scavi, Archivio del Ministero della pubblica istruzione del Regno delle due Sicilie, Archivio di Stato di Napoli, 333 II (10) 1847-1847.

\textsuperscript{267} The other is a street in Pompeii with figure from the collection of Ruggiero Pini in Como, cited in Paoli, “Veduta e ‘Reportage,” 44. The 1846 date inscribed by Lecchi on the back of the Casa del Forno conflicts with that of the documents in the Archivio di Stato di Napoli. Lecchi either mistakenly or strategically wrote 1846, potentially wishing to emphasize the early date of his work there. It is possible that he had already made photographs at Pompeii before the official commission by Sebastián, though I was unable to find any documents confirming his presence at Pompeii before July 1847.

\textsuperscript{268} AA.VV. \textit{Almanacco Reale del Regno delle Due Sicilie per l’anno 1855} (Naples: Stamperia Reale, 1855), 506 and 508. It is perhaps through Sebastián Gabriel that Lecchi’s photographs can also be traced to the collection of the Bourbon princess Marie-Caroline, the Duchesse de Berry. See: \textit{Promenade méditerranéenne. Collection photographique de la duchesse de Berry. Les années 1850} (Paris: Choppin de Janvry et associés, 2007), pl. 38. The Duchesse de Berry also owned photographs of Italy by Baron Fays and photographers of the Roman School including Giacomo Caneva.
Sebastián was one of the most prominent collectors and patrons of Spanish and Neapolitan art in the nineteenth century, and it seems natural that the prince would want to add photographic reproductions of Pompeii’s artistic treasures to his collection. Furthermore, he was himself an amateur painter, lithographer, and photographer, who during the 1860s recorded portraits of European royalty in his own photographic studio and laboratory inside his Madrid palace.\textsuperscript{269} Inventories of the laboratory indicate that he first became interested in photography while exiled in Naples, making his earliest purchases of cameras and photographs in that city.\textsuperscript{270}

Sebastián Gabriel’s patronage also links Lecchi to a circle of Spanish artists working in both Rome and Naples in the late 1840s. For example, two separate collections of salt prints compiled by the Spanish artists Bernardino de Montañés and Luis de Madrazo preserve prints from the same negative of the bombed façade of the Villa Savorelli (Figure 3.3), Garibaldi’s headquarters during the Roman Republic. As a patron to contemporary artists, Sebastián Gabriel knew both Montañés and Madrazo personally. Additionally, Montañés and Madrazo also collected works by photographers of the Roman School, especially those of Giacomo Caneva, which will be discussed in the following chapter. This view of the Villa Savorelli has previously been attributed to Caneva, however, Lecchi’s connection to Sebastián Gabriel, and thus to an extended network of Spanish artists working in Italy, suggests that the prints may in fact be from a variant negative of the frontal view of the villa in Lecchi’s series of the Roman Republic, which is included in \textit{Fotografi di Roma} (Figure 3.4).\textsuperscript{271} Regardless, Lecchi’s relationship to the

\textsuperscript{270} Gomez, “Un fotógrafo aficionado,” 19.
\textsuperscript{271} Hernández Latas, José Antonio, and Piero Becchetti. \textit{Recuerdo de Roma (1848-1867): fotografías de la colección Bernardino Montañés (1848-1867)} (Zaragoza: Diputación de
Bourbon prince demonstrates that he was part of a larger community of artists living and working in Italy, who began to use photography as studies for paintings. This relationship is all the more important since these previously unacknowledged artistic connections add further dimension to Lecchi’s career, emphasizing that his photographs of the Roman Republic did not emerge *sui generis*, but were part of a longer involvement with photography, their compositions engrained by his training as a painter.

Lecchi’s association with the Bourbon court may have held unintended consequences for the photographer when the political situation in Naples reached a boiling point. In fact, in addition to his comments on the state of photography in Italy, Bridges’s letters to Talbot provide a window into rising tensions between constitutionalists and the monarchy there. His letter of August 28, 1847 cautioned, “From hence all letters are very uncertain especially double ones - so I forbear enclosures - The police have been throwing Maltese letters & papers into the sea - afraid of the reports from Rome - In Calabria there is some stir, but here all quiet.” With revolutionary fervor spreading, the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies would not remain quiet for long. The Bourbon regime had been toppled by revolution in 1820-21, which resulted in a nine-month constitutional government. This earlier episode provided a valuable lesson for King Ferdinand, who retained support of his military during the uprisings of 1848-49, something he had failed to

---

272 In addition, two of Lecchi’s photographs of the Villa Borghese are preserved in the Fondo Vittorio Avondo of the Galleria d’arte moderna in Torino. Pierangelo Cavanna, *Vittorio Avondo e la fotografia* (Turin: Edizioni Fondazione Torino Musei, 2005), pl. 64 and 65. Attributed tentatively to Giacomo Caneva, they in fact reproduce the same images as two signed prints in the J. Paul Getty Museum (84.XP.768.13) and those in the album *Fotografì di Roma*.

do in the earlier revolution, thus making Southern Italy the first territory to be restored successfully to its monarch.

Paranoia over potential revolution not only filtered into the letters of gentleman travelers, but also colored their perception of the Italian landscape. The long exposure times of early photographs rarely allowed for a human presence within the frame unless strategically posed, nevertheless, soldiers captured at their posts frequently appeared as stalwart and eternal guardians of Italy’s famed architecture. In one of Jones’s views, for example, his watercolor embellishment to the print fixes royal soldiers mid-formation along the seaside promenade adjacent to one of Naples’s historic military fortresses, the Castel dell’Ovo (Figure 3.5). Jones’s brush adds definition to the otherwise blurred movement of figures, creating a rhythmic march into the Neapolitan cityscape, which is paralleled by trees standing like sentinels along the left edge of the composition.

In fact, many of the picturesque compositions Bridges and Jones produced in Malta and Southern Italy casually betray the international economic and political forces driving the Risorgimento. One of the factors motivating Bridges’s stay in the region was to be nearer to his son stationed with the Navy in Malta, Britain’s military headquarters in the Mediterranean. Great Britain was the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies’ most important trade partner, and the colony at Malta held a strategic position for protecting Britain’s commercial interests. Due to this financial stake, Britain variously played an antagonistic and a protective role with respect to Southern Italy, defending its privileged trade relationship against the other major competitors, Austria and France.274 Viewed in this light, Bridges’s and Jones’s portraits of British soldiers posted among the palm trees of Malta or the shipyards and marinas of Naples invoke a history of British

military and marine art (Jones had in fact begun his artistic career as a marine painter in Wales) that commemorated and valorized British imperialism. These values are especially resonant in Bridges’ staged self-portrait in Malta in which a British naval flag forms the backdrop to a tableau of genteel domestic life featuring his uniformed son (Figure 3.6).

Foreign interest in Italy, and especially British involvement in the Risorgimento are an important though not fully acknowledged context framing Lecchi’s documentation of the Roman Republic in 1849. One wonders why his image of Pompeii’s Casa del Forno, for example, would find its way into the British-owned album *Fotografi di Roma* among images of Risorgimento battle ruins. As the Italian peninsula moved closer to revolution, the competing nationalist claims of France and Great Britain also played out at the level of the photographic image. The soldiers that had lately appeared as mere *staffage* figures in scenes of Italy’s ancient past emerged as protagonists in contemporary political events recorded by Lecchi’s camera. Their presence left an indelible mark on traditional depictions of the Italian landscape. By the time Lecchi reached Rome between 1847 and 1848, he came armed with an arsenal of *bona fides* in the form of international contacts, influential patrons, and perhaps most importantly, a growing catalogue of photographs to lure new customers.

*Fotografi di Roma: a Photographic Pilgrimage of War*

Some of the most dramatic and devastating fighting during the defense of the Roman Republic occurred on the Janiculum hill along the western bank of the Tiber, and in the nearby district of Trastevere, where untrained citizens including women and children took up arms against French troops. The shelled ruins of villas, destroyed farmhouses, and bombed bastions lining Rome’s city walls atop that hill form the subjects of Lecchi’s series depicting the
aftermath of the Roman Republic. The album *Fotografi di Roma*, now preserved at the Getty Research Institute, includes thirty examples from this important series, as well as photographs depicting traditional monuments and views of Rome and one of Pompeii. The salt prints are mounted individually to the album pages except for two panoramas comprised of two joined salt prints each, and are accompanied by handwritten captions in ink identifying the subjects in Italian at the lower right corner of each page. As an object, the album’s carefully organized structure and luxury format presents a cohesive record of the defense of the Roman Republic that speaks to its maker(s)’ understanding of the significance of the historic event, and desire to memorialize it.

In a recent study, Isotta Poggi has regarded this album as a “Garibaldian epic poem,” and an artifact of Lecchi’s Republican views. By comparing the album to published accounts of the battles and contemporaneous illustrations, she asserts its value as reportage, thus echoing other scholars’ interpretations of the larger series. My argument diverges from hers by instead emphasizing the importance of Lecchi’s series to personal acts of commemoration. Furthermore, it bears emphasis that Lecchi did not publish or distribute his battle photographs commercially, rather, the *Fotografi di Roma* album is but one of three known bodies of these photographs, all of which circulated privately. Instead of straightforward reportage, which is essentially informational in nature, Lecchi’s compositions constructed a new iconography of monuments and sites symbolically sanctified by the heroes and martyrs of the Roman Republic. An examination of the individual images and the narrative structure of *Fotografi di Roma* reveals

---

275 These include three photographs of Villa Borghese and its gardens, the Roman Forum, the Arch of Septimius Severus, Arch of Constantine, Temple of Vesta, Castel Sant’Angelo, and the Church of S. Giovanni in Laterano. The album also contains one photograph of Pompeii, discussed above.

276 Isotta Poggi, “‘And the Bombs Fell for Many Nights,’” 206.
that Lecchi’s photographs stimulated personal emotional involvement in the Risorgimento, which in turn contributed to the development of a collective memory of the founding of the nation.

Lecchi’s coverage of the aftermath of the Roman Republic lays forth a virtual itinerary through the battlefield, allowing the viewer to retrace soldiers’ movements through a series of frames. The documentary richness of his photographs has allowed Maria Pia Critelli to demonstrate how closely Lecchi’s photographs parallel visually the battle’s key episodes as they were recorded in contemporaneous literary sources. Culled from the larger series, Fotografi di Roma retains the same narrative arc; however, the album format enforces a more specific temporal logic upon them, contextualizing the battle scenes within Rome’s topography. To turn the pages of the album Fotografi di Roma is not only to retrace the soldiers’ (and Lecchi’s) footsteps, but also to embark upon a secular pilgrimage through sites of battlefield martyrdom and to follow a traditional Christian (and thus Grand Tour) pilgrimage route through the city.

The sequence of photographs in Fotografi di Roma thus propels the viewer virtually through Rome’s topography, initiating at the northernmost point of the city before moving south toward the Piazza del Popolo and Villa Borghese, where French troops had made camp. This trajectory was also among the most well-trod paths into Rome. During the Counter Reformation, Pope Sixtus V had transformed the city’s urban plan to facilitate the flow of pilgrims, tourists, and Papal retinues along proscribed ceremonial routes that began at the main city gate at Rome’s northernmost point. Likewise, Fotografi di Roma commences with a view of the Ponte Molle, and continues with two photographs depicting the bridge from vantage points successively farther from the structure (Figures 3.7-3.9). This spatial telescoping initiates the album’s

---

narrative, which is framed by a meditation on Christian sacrifice. While many of Lecchi’s compositional strategies exploit the camera’s objective perspectival renderings, others draw strength from their resonance with motifs drawn from religious and history paintings. In this example, a young boy stands before three wooden crosses marking makeshift graves amidst farmland on the outskirts of Rome (Figure 3.7). Behind him, the Ponte Molle’s distinctive tower rises in the form of a triumphal arch. Flanked by two sculptures of the Baptism of Christ, it frames a view of the dome of St. Peter’s. The photograph resonates with the site’s significance to Roman history: this is the spot of Emperor Constantine’s conversion, where he received the vision of the cross to which he credited his victory over Maxentius. The sculptures and dome of St. Peter’s attest to the legacy of Constantine’s victory and Rome’s continuity as the capital of the Christian world. Lecchi’s composition and framing in this photograph emphasize the symbolism of the site.

In Lecchi’s composition the three humble crosses, a reference to Christ’s crucifixion, mark the deaths of three soldiers, and thus take on the mythological weight of Constantine’s victory, ordained by God. The standing figure, who Marina Miraglia has identified as a “pilgrim,” commemorates the sacrifice of contemporary martyrs. But martyrs to which cause, one wonders, that of the Pope or of the Republic? Building upon Alberto Mario Banti’s analysis of the way Risorgimento ideology transmogrified fundamental aspects of Christianity into a cult of the Italian nation, the historian Lucy Riall has argued that it is the “mix of religious and revolutionary metaphor that defined the nationalist movement in Italy.” While shared religious values created a powerful basis for a national mythology, the fact that revolutionaries were

---

literally at war with the Pope complicated the picture, since both sides relied on similar narratives of Christological sacrifice. Lecchi’s photograph is itself ambiguous in this regard. As I argue throughout this chapter, Lecchi’s photographs place the events of the Roman Republic within a much grander sweep of history that is at once general and also eternal, commemorating the moment by appealing to familiar iconographic models. The sequence of the album *Fotografi di Roma* further illuminates the significance of this photograph by inserting it within not only the Roman Republic series, but among views of important religious and ancient sites.

The majority of images depicting the battles were made on the Janiculum, where Lecchi systematically moved his camera from the damaged villas occupied by Garibaldi’s troops, along the city walls, to the successive breaches to Republican bastions. If the slow exposure times of early photography prevented Lecchi from capturing the drama of battle, this limitation also pushed him toward dramatic perspectives that draw the viewer into the ruined spaces where war was waged. In his *Breccia sulle Mura di Roma* (Figure 3.10), for example, Lecchi placed his camera at the intersection of two low walls, one of which recedes in steep foreshortening toward the collapsing masonry of the Leonine wall. Lecchi used the visual device of a prominent foreground plane combined with a strong orthogonal to bring the viewer into the composition and direct his/her attention to the site of strategic military action. In several photographs this low vantage point accentuates the monumentality of the city walls, which provided a defensive perimeter for Garibaldi’s troops. For example, in Figure 3.11, the camera was positioned on the walls themselves, allowing for sweeping panoramas of the landscape, as well as a visual inventory of armaments abandoned in the trenches below.

Shadows echoing across pockmarked facades tell the story of the artillery fire that swept across the area’s grand villas, which had been used as military headquarters. In his photograph of
the Casino Barberini (Figure 3.12), for example, Lecchi placed his camera perpendicular to the edifice, allowing a crumbling exterior wall to cast a shadow on the freshly revealed interior and its late Rococo paneled walls. His view of the Orangerie of the Villa Borghese (Figure 3.13) also emphasized the evisceration of these genteel buildings, highlighting the disjuncture between the delicacy of their painted interiors and the rubble that exposes them. In some cases, Lecchi used pencil to add definition to the buildings, heightening contrast and clarifying the boundaries between the still standing architecture and its ruins. The oppositions between architecture and ruin, old and new, contained within Lecchi’s photographs make literally and symbolically evident the historical rupture that turned a suburban landscape into a battlefield.

Another striking photograph made on the Janiculum depicts damage to the medieval convent and church of San Pietro in Montorio, which sits on the spot believed to be the location of St. Peter’s crucifixion. The dramatic silhouette of the ruined tower suggests the symbolism of the site, and adds an additional emotional impact to a location already associated with martyrdom and pilgrimage (Figure 3.14). The album’s itinerary through the battle sites ends with a photograph depicting the city gate at the Lateran (Figure 3.15), which defined Rome’s southern axis, and from which French troops withdrew from the city. This photograph is succeeded by seven vedute concluding with a view of the church of San Giovanni in Laterano (Figure 3.16). It is therefore bookended by the Northern and Southern points on Garibaldi’s route through Rome, and anchored by sites traditionally associated with Christian pilgrimage.

In his photographs, Lecchi presented viewers with sites transformed not just by the events of 1849, but mediated by his personal vision of them. Through his interpretation, they might be regarded as “sites of memory,” a term coined by the historian Pierre Nora in the 1980s. According to Nora, the modern era is defined by the rupture between memory and history,
between deeply felt personal bonds with tradition and the mere recording of past events. In his view, “these lieux de mémoire are fundamentally remains, the ultimate embodiments of a memorial consciousness that has barely survived in a historical age that calls out for memory because it has abandoned it.”

Secular rituals of commemoration are therefore acts of reasserting and defining one’s identity within a larger collectivity, because cultural memory has effectively replaced individual memory. It is for this reason, then, that the political revolutions of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries inspired the development of new forms of commemoration based on nationalism. The nation thus overtook in significance the role previously held by kinship bonds and local identities. Taking into account Nora’s theories, Lecchi’s photographs, as “sites of memory,” ritualized and legitimized Italian nationhood by tying individual experience to historical events. Scholars have noted that Lecchi’s series depicts battle sites as “new ruins” of Rome by framing them with the same monumentality as the city’s ancient monuments. Fotografi di Roma makes this process visible. By creating an analogy between battle remains and ancient ruins, Lecchi also expressed an association between current events and Rome’s past.

Pilgrimages to honor the war dead emerged as a widespread practice in the nineteenth century, and was not unique to the Risorgimento. Writing on the relationship between the commemoration of war and national identity, the historian John R. Gillis has noted, “In the course of the nineteenth century nations came to worship themselves through their pasts, ritualizing and commemorating to the point that their sacred sites at times became the secular

---

equivalent of shrines and holy days.”

During the French Revolution, which in many ways provided an iconographic model for Italian nationalism, this sacralization of state politics was perhaps epitomized by the transformation of the church of St. Geneviève into the secular cathedral and mausoleum of the Panthéon. During the Risorgimento, and especially in the years following Unification, patriotic pilgrimages emerged as popular expressions of national unity. Garibaldi’s house on Caprera, for example, became a tourist destination in his own lifetime, and Vittorio Emanuele II’s burial in Rome’s Pantheon in 1884 was accompanied by a national pilgrimage.

Indeed, to visit the Janiculum today is to travel across streets named for those who died there, and to encounter almost innumerable statues and monuments to fallen heroes, erected not only in the years after Unification, but well into the twentieth century. A modernist martyrium constructed during Mussolini’s rule to commemorate those who died in the Roman Republic demonstrates how this earlier history continued to be resurrected for political aims in the twentieth century. A square monument of white travertine (Figure 3.17), it aesthetically and symbolically echoes the geometric harmony of Bramante’s Tempietto at the adjacent church of S. Pietro in Montorio. Lecchi’s photographic pilgrimage of war, the first of its kind, not only became a standard genre within Italian photography over the course of the nineteenth century, as I will discuss further in chapter five, but it also helped establish for the first time in photography an iconography of commemoration that linked individual experience to the Risorgimento, inspiring patriotism.


**Fotografi di Roma and Risorgimento Transnationalism**

Recent scholarship on the Risorgimento has emphasized the movement’s cosmopolitan nature, represented not only by foreign powers’ presence within the peninsula, but also through Italian political exiles abroad, and mass media’s extensive coverage of Garibaldi’s military exploits.²⁸⁴ The defense of the Roman Republic in particular came to epitomize the Italian national cause as a whole, since Westerners viewed Rome not only as the center of Catholicism, but also as the cradle of civilization. The provenance of *Fotografi di Roma* and the transnational network that it implies reveals this complex cosmopolitan history.

Michelangelo Caetani is at the center of the photographic exchange involved in *Fotografi di Roma*, and a key to understanding its cultural and historical context. He also represents further evidence of the élite clientele to whom Lecchi catered. Scion of one of the oldest noble families of Rome, the intellectual Caetani was not only a patron of the arts, but had trained in woodworking in the neoclassical sculptor Pietro Tenerani’s workshop. He served as a mentor to both Augusto Castellani and his father Fortunato Pio Castellani, who had opened the family’s lucrative jewelry shop on the via del Corso in 1814. Caetani was essentially a silent partner in the firm, providing financial backing, promoting Castellani’s jewels among his wealthy international friends, and even producing designs for the firm’s productions. Caetani was also particularly well connected to the British aristocracy, which was a result of his personal life, since his second

and third wives were English. It is within this context that Caetani and Edward Cheney became acquainted. The aristocratic Cheney settled in Rome in 1827, integrating into Italian society and dedicating himself to the collection and study of Italian Renaissance art, particularly Venetian sculpture. For many British travelers, Cheney served as their entry and guide to Roman high society. Sharing a passion for history, literature, and art, Cheney and Caetani maintained a long friendship characterized by a candid correspondence. Caetani’s drawing room was epicenter of Roman social life during the mid-nineteenth century, and he played host to a revolving coterie of aristocrats, royals, artists, and intellectuals. It was within his home, for example, that Stendhal first encountered examples of the daguerreotype in 1842.

That Caetani participated in the burgeoning development of photography, even exchanging photographs with European heads of state, is no surprise. The new invention was the talk of Europe, and Caetani was as deeply invested in the mechanical arts as his friend Augusto Castellani. Castellani’s personal involvement in early photography within Italy forms the core of his Manuale di fotografia su carta (1849), which is a brief history of photography in the form of a memoir based on the young goldsmith’s experience dabbling in paper negatives. Only two of Castellani’s experiments with photography survive; one depicts a view from a window on via del Corso (most likely taken from an upper story of his family’s shop) (Figure 3.18), and the other,

---

the Castel Sant'Angelo. This latter bears an inscription “Composed by Augusto Castellani, executed by light, the fifth of May, 1851, on the solemnity of his name day, to his dear father.”

Castellani’s training as a goldsmith, which required a rigorous knowledge of chemistry, would have been fitting background to experiments with photography, and the family business, located in the bustling commercial district, would have been nearby a growing number of photographic studios already in 1850.

Cheney too had connections to photographic circles through his brother Robert Henry Cheney and his nephew Alfred-Capel Cure, both of whom experimented with calotypes in the late 1840s and 1850s. An albumen print of Ludlow Castle by Edward Cheney (Figure 3.19) suggests his own involvement with photography, and reflects an interest in subject matter drawn from England’s picturesque landscapes and ruins that is similar to examples by Capel Cure. Given this background, the album of Lecchi’s photographs therefore links the professional photographer to an intimate circle of patrons and amateur photographers working in Rome, who took their experiences further abroad.

Lecchi’s photographs of the Roman Republic have often been viewed as evidence of his support for the Republican cause, but the circle of patrons surrounding the Getty album demands a more nuanced history. Of the two other sets of photographs from the series in public collections, Rome’s Biblioteca di Storia Moderna e Contemporanea preserves forty-one salted paper prints originally in the collection of Alessandro Calandrelli, while the Achille Bertarelli collection of the Musei Civici in Milan houses twelve prints that were originally owned by

---

289 Castellani’s view of via del Corso survives only as a modern print. Tittoni, et al. *Il Risorgimento dei Romani*, 37 and 83.
Agostino Bertani.\textsuperscript{292} The holdings in Milan reflect a reception of these views that was shaped by their owner’s commitment to the patriotic cause. Bertani was a Milanese physician who had taken part in the revolutions of the Cinque Giornate and the Roman Republic, and his written captions indicate that his set was destined for a private realm of commemoration rather than public consumption. Indeed, Jesse White Mario, a British supporter of Mazzini and Garibaldi, recorded in her memoirs that the photographs hung in Bertani’s home in Genoa, where he was living in exile.\textsuperscript{293} Calandrelli also played an active role in the Risorgimento, serving as colonel during the Roman Republic, and part of the triumvirate with Livio Mariani and Aurelio Saliceti after Mazzini was discharged. The album format of \textit{Fotografi di Roma} is further testament to the private circulation of Lecchi’s photographs among a small circle of patrons. Caetani’s own political leanings, and those of his immediate circle, however, are less heroically Republican than those of Bertani and Calandrelli, though no less patriotic.

The political turmoil of the Risorgimento threatened the \textit{status quo} for Romans of Caetani’s social position.\textsuperscript{294} Just as Pius IX was unprepared for the challenges posed by the democratic principles that underpinned revolutionary action in the Papal States (in part for fear of losing his temporal power) so were élites like Caetani, who benefitted from Papal patronage. Caetani was made Commander of the Papal Fire Brigade in 1833. Among Rome’s nobility, this purely ceremonial position was, nonetheless, considered the highest civic honor possible. His letters suggest a man well aware that he was living through a pivotal historical moment in which the old world order was crumbling around him. Writing to Cheney in 1848, Caetani voiced his

\textsuperscript{292} On the provenance of these collections, see: Maria Pia Critelli, “Le ‘Nuove Rovine’ di Roma,” 25; Paoli, “Veduta e ‘Reportage,’” 44.
\textsuperscript{293} Paoli, “Veduta e ‘Reportage,’” 45.
frustrations, "If my children did not require so many people with the family, and luggage, and care and expense, I would turn to England and would leave this political volcano, which is to destroy all of Italy and Europe, to vent."295 In the spirit of this letter, Caetani’s correspondence with Cheney includes candid discussions of the political situation in Rome throughout the Risorgimento, and indicates the international concern for Italy’s future, especially among British audiences. He found the Republican cause distasteful, and maintained loyalty to the Pope and above all Rome, even though he recognized that the Pope’s loss of temporal power was inevitable. Ultimately, the conservative Caetani, like many in his position, placed his support behind the Savoy monarch Vittorio Emanuele II, though he did not demonstrate this allegiance publically until the imminent ascendancy of the Piedmontese King to the Italian throne.

Castellani did not come from the same elite background as Caetani, though his family had attained as high a position as could be desired in a city that still lacked a proper middle class.296 Castellani held more liberal political views than his mentor, though he was still a moderate. His father, Fortunato Pio, had been offered a position in the constitutional government in 1848, but declined it, instead using the opportunity to obtain a position for Augusto in the Civic Guard. Although Pius IX instituted this military unit to maintain civic order within Rome, many of its members joined the revolutionary cause. Augusto fought with Garibaldi in the defense of Rome, seeing battle at the Villa Gabrieli, across from the Quattro Venti on the Janiculum – storied sites that appear in Lecchi’s photographs. After this experience, Augusto retreated from politics while his brother and business partner Alessandro became more deeply entrenched in the revolutionary cause. The two brothers were arrested in 1853 on sedition

charges, and Augusto, who had ceased direct involvement in politics, only stayed out of prison by relying on his father’s good connections. Alessandro, on the other hand, was imprisoned, committed to an asylum, and exiled. He became a committed Mazzinian while abroad. After 1859, Augusto joined the National Committee, an organization that supported Rome’s alliance to the Italian Kingdom, and kept close ties with the circle of moderate British supporters surrounding Massimo D’Azeglio.297

Caetani’s ambiguous politics and his allegiance to Vittorio Emanuele II is perhaps revealed most ostentatiously through a scandal involving his good friend Augusto.298 Castellani and Caetani showed their support of a monarchical solution to Italian nationhood by designing and producing presentation swords for Vittorio Emanuele II and Napoleon III. Not surprisingly, this gesture so angered the Pope that Napoleon III had to place the Castellani family under French military protection. During the 1850s and 1860s, Augusto, leading the family business, also demonstrated his hope for a unified Italy through more subtle means, producing jewelry and decorative objects based on historic Italic models from the family’s collection of Roman and Etruscan antiquities.299 He reflected, “under the guidance of our master Michelangelo Caetani, we formulated the program for our [new] direction and decided to completely give up foreign-made goods, forging ahead efficaciously with copies after the works of Italian goldsmiths of the classical epochs. We declared war on [prevailing] fashion and we won.”300 These much sought-after jewels, created using painstakingly reconstructed historical techniques of metalworking, became clandestine symbols of political allegiance, and were favored by the likes of Robert and Elizabeth Barrett Browning, themselves vocal supporters of a unified Italian state. Furthermore,

in the 1860s, Augusto began to produce original designs based on examples from his collection of peasant jewelry, recognized as, “The National Jewellery of Italy.” As this history demonstrates, the notion of using Italy’s rich historical and vernacular traditions as models for national imagery was not restricted to any one medium, but rather permeated Italian culture in this period.

Lecchi’s album *Fotografi di Roma* reflects the intertwined personal and professional relationships among Caetani, Castellani, and Cheney, as well as those between photography and politics during the Risorgimento. Considering Castellani’s interest in photography, it is likely that he knew Lecchi personally, perhaps helping him gain a clientele among the jeweler’s influential colleagues. Tracing this network illuminates the complex international political and social context in which Lecchi produced and distributed his photographs. Although this album provides further evidence that private circulation limited the impact of Lecchi’s photographs, it nonetheless links him to a wider political and artistic network engaged with nationalist projects. Ultimately, the album’s provenance might imply that Lecchi, like Caetani, sensed the way the winds of change were blowing, but did not want to make such a bold proclamation of alliance to the Republican cause for fear that his career and status would be jeopardized, a notion borne out by history, since in the end a moderate solution to the Italian cause prevailed. Just as Lecchi had sought more traditional forms of patronage in Pompeii, he also did so in Rome, catering to an elite clientele through personal networks rather than commercial or explicitly political avenues.

301 Susan Weber Soros, “‘Under the Great Canopies of Civilization’: Castellani Jewelry and Metalwork at International Exhibitions,” in *Castellani and Italian Archaeological Jewelry*, ed. Susan Weber Soros and Stefanie Walker (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), 252-253. Intriguingly, Ludovico Tuminello made a series of photographs of this jewelry at the Exposition Universelle in Paris in 1867. Tuminello had fought in the Roman Republic and then went into exile in Turin. These photographs, as well as his connections to Giacomo Caneva discussed in the following chapter, suggest an even more complex network of photographer-patriots working in Rome in this period.
and this history, therefore, sheds new light on the necessary practical support that photographers sought at this time.

**Aftermath of War: Prints “Traced from the Daguerreotype”**

The Siege of Rome occurred during a transitional moment in the way that war was depicted and conveyed to the masses. By the late-nineteenth century, illustrated journals, the proliferation of the periodical press, the invention of the telegraph, and photography fed a public hungry to receive the news of the day quickly and preferably accompanied by spectacular images. In the 1840s, however, this new panorama of visual communication remained in its infancy. As Martha Sandweiss has demonstrated for daguerreotypes of the Mexican-American War (1846-1848), the stilled scenes of empty battlefields and soldiers’ tombs that appeared in early photographs could neither be easily reproduced for a mass audience, nor did they reflect the public’s expectations of what war *should* look like.302 Print media better captured the imagination of its audience because it conveyed the heroism of personal sacrifice and the drama of battle as it was understood through the familiar iconography of history painting, and circulated in multiple. Early photographs were often translated into print form in order to disseminate images of war to a broader audience, and were enhanced by their relationship to printed narrative accounts. As the previous chapter discussed, this process of translation often transformed the content and meaning of the original images, and resulted in a combination of photography’s facticity with established tropes of war imagery.

---

Similarly, Lecchi’s photographs were co-opted as the basis for a series of prints documenting the Roman Republic. Scholars have argued that Lecchi’s photographs served as “bare documents” that could be appropriated and manipulated to support either side of the conflict, especially as the photographic images were translated into prints, and their narratives mediated by different ideologies.\(^{303}\) It has been well discussed that photography, as a “message without a code,” always relies on what is outside the frame to convey meaning.\(^{304}\) In the case of prints based on photographs, not only does the information conveyed by accompanying text or captions alter the meaning of the image, but so too does artistic intervention, by inserting additional information into the image. Whereas in the examples of prints after photographs cited in the previous chapter the unique daguerreotype plate was destroyed in the process of translation, Lecchi’s paper photographs, printed in multiples, survived. A comparison of Lecchi’s photographs to the prints made after them demonstrates that the representation of battle that photography was capable of at this time did not yet meet the expectations of viewers who were accustomed to an iconography conventional to paintings and print, nonetheless, the private circulation of Lecchi’s photographs recounted above suggests that they were regarded as more than “bare documents.” Rather, they served as precious mementos – relics, even – that connected individuals to a moment of great historic significance with more truth than even the assurance that a print was “after a daguerreotype” could offer.

Lecchi’s photographs, despite their reproducibility, were nearly as limited in their distribution as daguerreotypes of war. The fragility of these earlier processes, and the cost of printing under difficult conditions in Rome, contrasts the mass distribution of photography occurring a decade later during the American Civil War, when images of body-strewn

---

\(^{303}\) Pelizzari, *Photography and Italy*, 33.

battlefields brought home the realities of war in an unprecedented way through commercial albums, touring photography exhibitions, and publication as wood engraving in the illustrated press. Certainly, these photographs, and the scale of the events they covered, reached much larger audiences than the Roman conflict garnered. The period of the Risorgimento between 1848 and 1861 also coincided with the transition from paper to glass negatives and albumen prints. Therefore, Lecchi’s photographs should be viewed as part of this intermediate moment in which photographers first attempted to apply the adaptability and reproducibility of paper negatives to the documentation of war, shaping an iconography of the Risorgimento that was based on prior models of prints and paintings, but also seeking a visual language particular to photography. It was the paper negative that made Lecchi’s series possible in the first place, since it was a much cheaper and easily transportable medium than the daguerreotype, and could produce multiples. Lecchi’s topographic retracing of key battle sites thus presaged a much wider production and circulation of such images documenting the victorious battles that marked Italian Unification. Among them are Gustave Le Gray’s photographs of Garibaldi’s Sicilian campaign, the Battle of Magenta that decided victory against the Austrians in Milan, and eventually, Ludovico Tuminello and Gioacchino Altobelli’s views of the Breach of the Porta Pia, which

---

marked the definitive end to the Pope’s temporal power and Rome’s addition to the Kingdom of Italy.306

While nineteenth-century photographs of war employed an iconography inherited from other sources, they were also bound by the constraints of the medium.307 Figures were often absent presences. The slow exposure times of daguerreotypes and paper negatives made capturing the action of battle an impossibility, and the hefty cameras and equipment necessary for preparing glass negatives proved impractical and perilous in the midst of a skirmish. Visually, many of the best-known images of battle in nineteenth-century photographs are hauntingly sparse, and almost necessarily require text to illuminate the significance of their content. For example, a daguerreotype of the barricades after the uprisings in Paris of 1848 is populated by ghostly blurs of milling bystanders (Figure 3.20), and Roger Fenton’s *Valley of the Shadow of Death* (Figure 3.21) acquires much of its impact from the poetic resonance of its title and its author’s first-hand descriptions of the conflict recorded in letters and published in the British press. When soldiers do appear, it is either in posed scenes of camp life, group portraits, or more rarely, engaged in military maneuvers. Despite these limitations, photographers sought ways to convey the human toll of battle. Some, like Fenton, borrowed from the metaphoric evocations of poetry, and others, like Matthew Brady and Alexander Gardner or Felice Beato, relocated and even exhumed corpses to recreate the horrors of the front. This “directorial mode” to composing


war reportage both challenged assumptions about photography’s role as an analog and document of reality, and underscored the limitations of all representational media at conveying the psychological and physical experience of war to an audience that had never experienced it firsthand.308

Although Lecchi’s photographs did not circulate on a mass level, they were pirated to serve as the basis for a series of lithographs produced shortly after the Roman Republic’s defeat and distributed by the publisher Charles Soleil, who was connected to the Vatican.309 Most likely released without Lecchi’s consent or compensation (Lecchi is nowhere mentioned on the prints), the artists of Soleil’s Rovine della Guerra di Roma del 1849, tratte dal daguerreotipo (Ruins of the Roman War of 1849, traced from the daguerreotype) drew on the documentary nature of Lecchi’s photographs to produce accurate depictions of the damage to architecture and battlements on the Janiculum, but also embellished those records, most notably by populating some of the scenes with figures that did not appear in Lecchi’s photographs. In a lithograph view of the Porta San Pancrazio (Figure 3.22), for example, the artist has depicted the crumbling arch, masonry, and rubble in the painstakingly detailed manner typical of both topographical military drawings and souvenir architectural views. Here, the draughtsman’s detail perhaps even exceeds

308 The phrase “directorial mode” was first used by A. D. Coleman, in “The Directorial Mode: Notes Toward a Definition,” Artforum 15, no. 1 (September 1976): 55-61.
that of Lecchi’s photograph (Figure 3.23), which is characterized by the subtle tones and textured surfaces of his paper negative.

The most striking discrepancy between this photographic “original” and the printed copy, however, is the addition of several figures: a group of French soldiers converses casually in front of the arch, a corpse splayed at their feet. Whereas Lecchi’s photograph frames traces of artillery fire, the bullet holes only hint at the loss of human life, which is otherwise notably absent. The print on the other hand, revivifies the scene through the addition of uniformed (though anonymous) soldiers. In fact, Soleil’s prints, comprised of several framed views on a single page, incorporate portraits of military types from French, Papal, and Republican forces in the margins, emphasizing the identifying features of their uniforms and weaponry (Figure 3.24). These figural additions literally frame the battle scenes, reinserting the soldiers into the emptied battle ruins, and stressing the oppositional forces involved in the conflict.

Another print in the series (Figure 3.25), based on Lecchi’s panorama (Figure 3.26), spans the battle-scarred fields of the Janiculum from the Villa Quattro Venti to the Villa Vascello. The buildings, identified by captions in the print’s margins, represent strategic sites and help the viewer contextualize within the theater of battle several isolated monuments that are otherwise recorded in other individual prints. Lecchi had taken this approach in his series, making three panoramas, which allow the viewer to retrace the progressive military maneuvers across the landscape. In the printed panorama, however, the foreground is populated by a group of battlefield tourists, surrogates for viewers of the print. A gentleman in a top hat discourses over the ruins with two well-dressed women at the lower left, while another with a spyglass surveys the scene. His optical device, an emblem of looking closer, provides a witty shorthand for the
same activity occupying a viewer of the print. Alongside these staffage figures is a solitary man with a shovel, delicately hinting at the grim work of digging a soldier’s grave.

Multiple corpses dramatize another view representing the Italian fortifications at the bastion near Villa Spada (Figure 3.27). A comparison of this print to its photographic matrix is telling, for although Lecchi’s photographs do not capture the action of battle or the war dead, they are not entirely absent of human life (Figure 3.28). Solitary figures can be spied throughout the series: men in top hats casually leaning against walls pockmarked by cannon fire and lone soldiers guarding bastions practically still smoldering. Not all of the figures appear to be mere battlefield tourists. In one scene from the series (not included in the *Fotografi di Roma* album) a seated man poses with a bayonet, light gleaming off of its reflective surface (Figure 3.29). In another, a figure occupying a shaded arch in the Villa Valentini has a map splayed across his lap, possibly demonstrating the work of surveying and recording the aftermath of battle for strategic use in future wars (Figure 3.30). Amidst the battle ruins, the presence of soldiers is a reminder of the recent French victory and occupation of Rome, which would not end until 1870.

In translating Lecchi’s photographs into prints, the artists of Soleil’s series embellished his compositions to compensate for photography’s limitations and to produce souvenir views. Indeed, Critelli has demonstrated that the prints were aimed at a wide audience comprised of Roman citizens, tourists, and the French soldiers occupying the city. The use of Lecchi’s images in the production of souvenir views reveals that contemporary audiences desired images of war that enabled them to establish a personal connection with the event, and to preserve the memory. Lecchi’s photographs were not sought primarily for their utility in reportage (an

---

objective account of an event), but foremost for their ability to transform the viewer himself into an eyewitness of history (a subjective experience.)

In many of Lecchi’s photographs in the album three small children take turns posing next to battered villas and unoccupied trenches (See, for example 3.10 and 3.29). Significantly, these same humbly dressed children along with a horse-drawn carriage used to help transport photographic equipment appear in both the Roman Republic photographs and in a series depicting the Villa Borghese gardens. Three of the Villa Borghese photographs (Figures 3.31-3.33) have been inserted within the narrative album Fotografi di Roma. Lecchi had four children including three boys, Achille, Mario, and Antonio, likely the same children who appear repeatedly in his photographs, and apparently he brought his children with him on his photographic excursions, perhaps to serve as assistants.311 The children pose dutifully, but one can imagine their wonder and excitement at being allowed to wander amongst soldiers on a recent battlefield. In Lecchi’s photograph of the fortifications (Figure 3.28), the two boys pose, forming a group with the soldiers, and one sits atop a canon. (Ironically, this figure was the basis for a decapitated body in the lithograph version of the image.) The presence of Lecchi’s children serves as visual evidence of his authorship of the photographs, and underscores the personal nature of his project. Not working on commission for any government or publisher, Lecchi’s series derived from his own ingenuity and interest.

Although the revolutions of 1848-49 ended in failure, they left an indelible impression on those that lived through them. Scholars of the Risorgimento have noted the importance of the dramatic battles to defend the Roman Republic in particular for inspiring a younger generation to

311 Miraglia, “Come Simonide di Ceo,” 18 comments on the autobiographical nature of these images.
political consciousness and action, and Lecchi’s use of this trope further supports this idea.\textsuperscript{312} Their youth is a reminder not only of the fragility of life within a landscape marred by death, but more specifically, of the Risorgimento’s youthful image.\textsuperscript{313} Mazzini’s “Giovane Italia” had signaled a movement characterized by its youthful vigor, a generation oedipally rejecting their fathers’ politics in favor of radicalism. Many young men, like Augusto and Alessandro Castellani, fought on these very battlefields on which the Lecchi children stood. Lecchi’s children were themselves too young to fight, and their presence therefore suggests a future generation that would bear witness to the sacrifices of heroes and also inherit their cause. The unexpected presence of children in Lecchi’s photographs adds a personal dimension to the series, embodying the significance of commemorative acts of bearing witness to Risorgimento mythologies. Furthermore, by including his family in the photographs, Lecchi not only inserted himself (and them) into a dramatic moment in current events, but also seized them as witnesses to a new national history, a history that would be forged precisely by patriotic acts of commemoration. Photography as a medium was particularly suited to this purpose, acting powerfully as both testimony and memorial, and capable of circulating in multiple.

**Casualties of War**

Lecchi’s itinerary in *Fotografi di Roma* represents a pilgrimage route marked by the sacrifices of nineteenth-century soldiers. Those fighting in the conflict came from all over Italy, and on the Papal side, from France. During the Risorgimento, the cult surrounding the Italian heroes became almost more important than specific defeats in battle, due to the quasi-religious fervor they inspired. As Lucy Riall has articulated, for example, how Garibaldi became among

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{312} Lucy Riall, *Garibaldi: Invention of a Hero*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), 93-97.
\item \textsuperscript{313} Alberto Mario Banti, *La Nazione del Risorgimento* (Turin: Einaudi, 2000), 33.
\end{itemize}
the most potent icons around which the development of Italian national identity took shape; after the events of 1849, his image began to circulate at a mass level through prints, paintings, literary accounts, and photographs. Drawing on the Romantic emphasis on individual heroism, texts and images emphasized Garibaldi’s status as a folk hero and his suffering at the loss of his beloved wife Anita (herself a martyr of war), even likening him to Christ. Recent scholarship on the careful cultivation of Risorgimento political celebrity has shown just how important these public faces of the movement were for rousing patriotism in Italy, and also for garnering international support for Italian independence. For example, portraits of the virile Garibaldi and intellectual Mazzini circulated internationally as cartes-de-visite and inspired legions of female supporters, who in turn became instrumental in educating a global audience about the political situation in Italy. During the decade that followed the 1848-9 uprisings, images of celebrated heroes and patriotic martyrs inspired devotion to the Italian cause and generated a pantheon of local and national heroes comprised of Garibaldi’s followers, molded in his heroic image.

The “sites of memory” Lecchi depicted in his photographs, which included the shelled villas that sheltered Republican forces, thus became associated with the specific heroes and martyrs who fought and died there, and were familiar to viewers through published accounts. Lecchi’s photograph of an 1851 painting by Filippo Vittori depicting the death of Luciano Manara (Figure 3.34) illustrates this point. Although not part of the Fotografi di Roma album, this example proves that Lecchi was engaged with the popular interest in martyrdom
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314 Riall, Garibaldi: Invention of a Hero, 128-131.
315 The impact of Riall’s study of Garibaldi’s fame can also be seen in more recent scholarship, for example: Gian Luca Fruci, “The two faces of Daniele Manin. French Republican Celebrity and Italian Monarchic Icon (1848-1880),” Modern Italy 18, no. 2 (March 2013): 157-171.
316 Riall, “Hero Saint or Revolutionary?” 197.
narratives. The painting illustrates an episode that occurred on June 30, 1849, when the twenty-four year old Milanese general was shot during intense fighting at the Villa Spada. His comrades carried his gravely wounded body from the battlefield and into the church of Santa Maria della Scala in Trastevere, where he later died surrounded by his friends, including the physician Agostino Bertani (who was the owner of another group of Lecchi’s photographs, as indicated earlier). Manara had distinguished himself during the Cinque Giornate and gone on to lead Lombard volunteers in Trentino before joining Garibaldi in the defense of Rome in April of 1849. A fellow Milanese patriot, Emilio Dandolo, commemorated his bravery in battle and his heroic death in a memoir published in 1849 that circulated widely in Italian and English translations during the following decade. According to Dandolo’s account, Manara was shot through an open window during the siege on the Villa Spada, and carried in a handcart to the nearby church, which had become a makeshift hospital.

In Vittori’s painting (Figure 3.35), Manara’s limp body is supported on the shoulders of his comrades, who gather with concern and grief around the fallen hero. This compact group of figures is surrounded by a rushing brigade of Garibaldi’s Red Shirts on horseback, carrying lances and a tricolor flag emblazoned with the words “ROMA // 1849.” Behind them are the remains of the Villa Vascello and Quattro Venti, and around them lie corpses and smoldering debris. The composition closely resembles that of a deposition from the cross, appropriating codified elements such as the blood trickling down Manara’s side, staining the white shroud underneath his limp body. Like many history paintings of war during the neoclassical and

318 Critelli, Le ‘Nuove Rovine’ di Roma,” 35.
319 Emilio Dandolo, I volontari ed i bersaglieri lombardi: annotazioni storiche (Turin: Tipografia Ferrero e Franco, 1849); Emilio Dandolo, The Italian Volunteers and Lombard Rifle Brigade, Being an Authentic Narrative of the Organization, Adventures, and Final Disbanding of These Corps in 1848-49 ... (London: Longman, Brown, Green, & Longmans, 1851).
Romantic periods, Vittori’s draws pathos from its reference to the traditional iconography of Christian martyrdom, and this continued to be an important element of Risorgimento canvases into the late-nineteenth century.\(^{320}\)

Curiously, Lecchi’s photograph of the painting crops the landscape surrounding this central grouping from the frame, transforming the horizontally oriented canvas into a vertical composition. Possibly a practical choice, Lecchi’s detail of the original nonetheless places all the focus on the human drama of Manara’s death, the emotional center of the artwork. Vittori exhibited his painting publically in the Piazza del Popolo in 1851, drawing such crowds that the papal government ordered that it be removed. The monumental size of the canvas and the heroic depiction of the subject matter must have been responsible for “lead[ing] the masses of demagogues to worship it,” according to one biting account from a papal official.\(^{321}\) The government’s censorship of the painting underscores its potency as political propaganda, rousing an emotional response and patriotic fervor among Rome’s citizens for whom the Siege of Rome was a recent memory. Its controversial popularity provides context for Lecchi’s photographic reproduction, which enabled a clandestine circulation after it was withdrawn from public view.

Whereas the mural-sized history painting bore an emotional impact on those who viewed it through its striking portrayal of contemporary events rendered on a grand scale in bold colorito, the photograph translated the original to a format that could be distributed among an audience of

\(^{320}\) A classic example of this Christian symbolism is found in the death of the eponymous general in Benjamin West’s *The Death of General Wolfe*, 1770, oil on canvas, The National Gallery of Canada, Ottawa. A relevant example from Risorgimento history painting is Eleuterio Pagliano’s realist canvas from 1884, *Il corpo di Luciano Manara a Santa Maria della Scala a Roma (The Body of Luciano Manara at S. Maria della Scala in Rome)*, oil on canvas, Galleria Nazionale d’arte Moderna, Rome. This painting depicts the dying Manara lying enshrouded under a cross, thus evoking earlier Renaissance paintings of the Lamentation of Christ.

patriots, still retaining its emotional impact through the careful cropping and intimate format of a paper print.

The photographic pilgrimage recorded in Lecchi’s *Fotografi di Roma* evoked in its contemporary viewers the heroes and martyrs, victories and defeats of the Roman Republic as one part of a larger field of images and texts associated with the historic event, such as prints published by Soleil, history paintings like Vittori’s, and personal accounts like Dandolo’s. Certainly, the international and multi-media nature of the Risorgimento characterized a new understanding of war, its leaders – and those of the opposition -- relying upon increasingly rapid modes of disseminating news and propaganda for the movement’s support in Italy and abroad. In this context, Lecchi’s photographs saw relatively limited distribution, since they circulated privately. This examination of the album *Fotografi di Roma* thus reveals that Lecchi’s series was most significant not only for its prescient use of photography to depict the aftermath of war, but especially for inspiring personal commemoration of the war dead among a circle of patrons dedicated to the national cause, including moderates and Republicans alike. The transnational network of individuals involved in this album’s production and use, namely, Caetani, Cheney, and Castellani, reveals the cosmopolitan nature of Risorgimento politics. By articulating Lecchi’s connection to this group and to other protagonists of photography’s early period from Great Britain and France, this chapter has also proved Lecchi’s pioneering role in the spread of paper photography to Italy.
CHAPTER FOUR

Giacomo Caneva: A “Painter-Photographer” in Rome

The Career of Giacomo Caneva

Giacomo Caneva was an important member of an international group of photographers active in Rome between 1847 and 1853 who became known as the Roman School of Photography.\(^{322}\) Not a school per se, this group collaborated and shared knowledge about new developments to the medium originating in France, Great Britain, and Italy. Rome’s position as a major destination for tourists and artists made it an important meeting place for early practitioners of the paper negative in particular, and the Roman School thus contributed greatly not only to the growth of that process within Italy, but throughout Europe, and even the United States.\(^{323}\) Significantly, Caneva was the only Italian member of the Roman School, and the only photographer among the group to make photographs of the Roman Campagna and peasants a particular focus of his work. This chapter argues that Caneva’s images of these subjects articulate a distinct Italian identity within his international milieu, and in response to the cultural and political circumstances of Risorgimento Rome. Producing the majority of his work in the years after the fall of the Roman Republic in 1849, Caneva’s photographs resonated with and


contributed to the creation of a nationalist imagery in Italian painting that centered on a homegrown image based on the tropes of the landscape and the peasants bound to it.

Caneva is one of few Italian practitioners of the nineteenth century to have garnered any critical attention in English-language histories of photography.324 When he listed himself in the register of Rome’s Caffè Greco as “pittore-fotografo” (painter-photographer) in 1845, he established a dual identity that characterized his work in his own time and through subsequent historiography.325 Such an identity conferred upon his photographs an artistic imprimatur, and declared a professional status. While scholars have traced the outlines of his early career as a painter, this chapter draws on newly discovered evidence in order to explicate the importance that Caneva’s early career as an academy-trained artist held for his professional success as a photographer.326 In particular, Caneva used personal and professional networks that he had established as a painter to build a niche supplying photographs to Rome’s artistic community, of which he was part.327 Caneva’s peasant studies and a handful of staged figural tableaux were

327 On Caneva’s links to Rome’s artistic community, see: Lucia Cavazzi, Anita Margiotta, and Simonetta Tozzi, Pittori Fotografi a Roma 1845-1870: Immagini dalla raccolta fotografica comunale (Rome: Palazzo Braschi, 1987); Laura Gasparini, “La raccolta delle carte salate della Scuola Romana di Fotografia dell’Istituto Statale d’Arte G. Chierici di Reggio Emilia,” in Un Museo ritrovato. Il patrimonio dell’Istituto d’Arte Chierici restituito alla città (Reggio Emilia: Musei civici di Reggio Emilia, 2005), 81-89; Maria Francesca Bonetti, Chiara Dall’Olio, and
some of the first of their kind anywhere in the history of the medium, and his sceneries of the Roman Campagna initiated the landscape genre in Italian photography. The sheer number of surviving paper negatives and prints made by Caneva attests to the wide circulation and popularity of his images, and the distribution of his photographs to artists active in Rome confirms his impact on the development of a national identity through painting and photography.\textsuperscript{328} This chapter reveals how Caneva adapted the landscape and peasant genres through myth-making strategies that aligned his work with the nationalist content of Italian Romanticism during the Risorgimento.

\textbf{“Painter-Photographer”}

As the last chapter discussed with regard to the career of Stefano Lecchi, photography as a medium emerged during a shift in art’s production and reception that mirrored concurrent transformations of social hierarchies and of traditional avenues of patronage within the mid-nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{329} Surviving as an artist required an ability to adapt to these changes, which for Caneva meant pursuing photography as his primary artistic medium. Before embarking on his photographic career in Rome, however, Caneva received artistic training in his native Veneto. He

\textsuperscript{329} Photography’s relationship to these transformations of the academy system and commerce are insightfully handled in Stephen Pinson, \textit{Speculating Daguerre: Art and Enterprise in the Work of L. J. M. Daguerre} (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012).}
remained connected to the region throughout his life, not only through his work in the *vedute* tradition (a specialty of Venetian artists) but also through his relationships with patrons and friends. Giacomo Giuseppe Caneva was born in Padua on July 4, 1813 to Anna Pavan and Giuseppe Caneva. His father was proprietor of the Albergo al Principe Carlo, a hotel located in the Prato delle Valle (Figure 4.1). Little is known of Caneva’s artistic training before 1834, when he matriculated in the schools of perspective, decoration, and ornament of the Imperiale Regia Accademia di Belle Arti di Venezia. Living in the Campiello Squellini, he was one of seven students instructed by Tranquillo Orsi (1771-1845) a painter, scenographer, and architect. There are no further records attesting to his presence at the Venetian Academy, although Maria Rampin has proposed that Caneva likely attended courses for several years until relocating to Rome around 1838.

The history of the Venetian Academy provides insight into the artistic traditions and political climate that shaped Caneva’s early career. Like other Italian art academies during the long nineteenth century, its history reflects Enlightenment ideals in connection to the period’s political upheaval. Established in 1750 as the Veneta Accademia di Pittura, Scultura, ed Architettura, Napoleon transformed the institution’s structure through reforms enacted in 1808,

---

330 Incidentally, the artist of this advertisement is Giovanni Battista Cecchini, a *vedutista* whose work is discussed alongside Caneva’s in A. Meneghelli, “Il Tempio di Vesta di Jacopo Caneva – un paesaggio nei dintorni di Gratz di Giambatista Cecchini,” in *Giornale Euganeo di Scienze, Lettere, Arti e Varietà*, vol. 2 (Padua: Tipografia Crescini, 1844), 311-313.
332 Rampin, “Note sul pittore-fotografo,” 114 suggests that he may have won the academy’s annual prize for travel to Rome, but this is speculation.
which aimed at standardizing artistic practice across the Kingdom of Italy. Under the new regulations, Napoleon’s governors in Italy oversaw the academies in Venice, Milan, and Bologna and nominated those institutions’ presidents and professors. Significantly, this period also saw the academies’ galleries fill with art works removed from churches, suppressed religious orders, and scuole. Thus, the renamed Accademia Reale di Belle Arti di Venezia took on increased importance in the preservation of cultural patrimony and architectural restoration in the Veneto. Photography’s relationship to these functions of Italian academies will be discussed at greater length in the following chapter, nonetheless, the close relationship between artistic training and patrimony helped to shape Caneva’s artistic vision.

Caneva’s education in perspective painting overlapped with the fields of architecture and scenography, and indeed many vedutisti also worked in theater or architectural decoration over the course of their careers. His training would have included en plein air study, the use of optical devices, and a rigorous knowledge of the mathematical and geometric rules for depicting complex three-dimensional space on a two-dimensional surface. Two of Caneva’s earliest surviving painted vedute represent scenes from his native Veneto. One depicts Padua’s outdoor park and sculpture garden, the Prato delle Valle, from the perspective of his father’s hotel, with much attention paid to the bustling activity in the public space (Figure 4.2). The other, a Venetian winter scene (Figure 4.3), reveals the influence of other prominent vedutisti including Ippolito Caffi (1814-1866) and Giuseppe Borsato (1770-1849), who had previously painted the lagoon city in the snow. Both paintings reveal elements of vedute prized by collectors and critics, including accuracy of detail, wittily rendered picturesque figures, and an attention to atmospheric effects. These canvases possibly date from Caneva’s student years, or they might

---

334 Plant, Venice Fragile City, 119.
have been painted later in his Rome studio from sketches made *en plein air* during his early artistic education, a standard practice that eventually also integrated photography. Caffi and Caneva’s artistic trajectories were closely linked; both studied perspective at the Venetian academy and belonged to the same social and professional networks in Rome. Whether Caffi used Caneva’s photographs during the preparatory stages of his paintings is unverifiable, but as the leading view painter of his era and an “artist-soldier,” his career is instructive for understanding Caneva’s aesthetic point of view and the intended audience for his photographs, which was comprised not only of tourists but also of fellow artists.

Born in Belluno in 1809, Caffi learned to paint in Caneva’s native Padua under the tutelage of his cousin Pietro Paoletti and the history painter Antonio Tessari. He preceded Caneva in the school of perspective painting at the Accademia di Belle Arti di Venezia, and in numerous other pursuits. Caffi initially arrived in Rome in 1832, though he traveled constantly throughout his career to locations as far afield as Asia Minor, where he produced evocative Orientalist *vedute*. He painted four canvases to decorate Rome’s Caffè Greco, and completed murals for a room in Padua’s Caffè Pedrocchi that depicts Rome and its environs. The Caffè Pedrocchi was a noted center of political engagement, and Caffi’s contributions to the décor thus link him to a social milieu characterized by its revolutionary idealism. For this commission, Caffi worked with the architect Giuseppe Jappelli, the same figure who first employed Caneva in Rome (as will be discussed below.) It is likely that Caffi and Caneva knew each other well by the time they both arrived in Rome, and although no epistolary evidence survives to directly link them, their lives remain closely intertwined during these years.

---

336 Pirani, “Amici e rivali,” 43.
The most intriguing episode of these two artists’ connection occurred in Rome in 1847 during a highly publicized visit by a French aeronaut named Francois Arban. Both artists accompanied the aerialist on hot air balloon rides, ascending from the Baths of Diocletian and landing in the town of Porcigliano in the Campagna. A commemorative lithograph features portraits of Caffi and Arban alongside a third companion, G. Seiffard (Figure 4.4), attesting to the publicity surrounding the occasion. In a letter to a friend a few days after his balloon flight, Caffi wrote, “My aerial voyage left in my mind the most beautiful and poetic impressions: all of Rome envied my courage and my happy journey. With gratitude to the aeronaut who conducted me, I immediately made a little canvas that represented the spectacle where we are untied from the ground with all the people whom I found there as spectators.” In fact, Caffi produced two oil paintings of the experience. Although executed after the flight, their small format and facture suggests the manner of a _plein air_ study. Painted in oil on paper with loose brushstrokes (Figure 4.5), the small balloon floats above a glistening lake that mirrors the twilight sky, while in the second a hazy yellow sunset dissolves into the violet and green earth of the Roman Campagna below. Caffi scratched an inscription into the paint along the bottom edge of each reading “the author Caffi flight in Rome, April 5, 1847.”

Newspapers and period accounts reported on the exciting spectacle of the two artists’ balloon rides, and Caneva’s letter to a friend about his own ascent even appeared in a French

---

338 “Il mio viaggio aero mi lasciò nella memoria le più belle e poetiche impressioni: tutta Roma invidiò il mio coraggio e il mio felice viaggio. Per graditudine all’Aeronauta che seco mi condusse gli feci subito un quadretto che rappresentava lo spettacolo ove noi ci siamo staccato dalla terra con tutto il popolo che ivi si trovò spettatore.” Quoted in _Lettere inedite d’Ippolito Caffi Pittore Bellunese_ (Belluno: Tipografia Editrice “La Cartolibraria,” 1927).
339 Pirani, “Amici e rivali,” 44.
physics textbook some years later. In his account, Caneva marveled at the new perspective the aerial view offered, noting the way this visual experience challenged the characteristic tropes of topographical renderings:

Indeed to strengthen my argument in this particular observation I can say that I saw the great Rome with this difference from the common topographic engravings: I saw the houses of the eternal city tinted a light-colored hue, and dark streets. Then, to better see, I took up the telescope and pressed it to my eye; but almost immediately I removed it and abandoned it as useless; here is why: the lens of the optical instrument features a small circle, so tiny in comparison to the amplitude that embraces the naked eye, that although the objects are partially more distinct, it does not compensate for the immense spectacle that the natural view offers.\(^{340}\)

Caneva, like Caffi, preferred the overall impression that the spectacle offered to his eye to the detailed renderings of traditional prints or the “unnatural” vision of optical aides. The two vedutisti, therefore, valued an impression of a scene over exactitude, and effects of light and dark over contour. These preferences underscore a Romantic conception of nature that diverged from the vedute tradition’s presumed verisimilitude. For Caneva, this sensibility shaped his exploration of photography not as a mere analog for reality, but rather, as an artistic medium capable of depicting painterly subject matter.

Caffi wrote candidly of the new medium in a letter to his painting instructor after viewing a daguerreotype in Trieste, and these observations shed further light on the relationship between view painting and photography in this period:

\(^{340}\) “Anzi a rafforzare il mio argomento in questa particolare osservazione posso accennare che vedeva io la gran Roma, con questa differenza dalle comuni incisioni topografiche: vedeva le case dell’eterna Città tinte di un color incarnato chiaro, e le vie oscure. Allora ip per meglio vedere, impugnato il cannocchiale, me lo appressai all’occhio; ma quasi subito ve lo tolsi e lo abbandonai come inutile: ecco il perchè. La lente dello strumento ottico presenta un piccolo circolo e tanto breve in confront dell’ampiezza che abbracciasi ad occhio nudo, che sebbene siano parzialmente più distinti gli oggetti, non compensa ciò lo spettacolo immense che dalla vista naturale si offre.” Giacomo Caneva, quoted in, Adolphe Ganot, *Lezione di fisica sperimentale* (Rome: Presso Alessandro Foli, 1864), 211. This reference is also cited in: Becchetti, *Giacomo Caneva e la scuola fotografica romana*, 15.
On my trip to Trieste, I had various commissions and sold three of my paintings; I was able to examine the Daguerreotype camera, that is to say, the discovery that was made in Paris, by means of tracing every view from reality with maximum diligence and concern. Much fuss has been made from the mouths of fools about this invention, which determines absolutely that view painters will die of starvation.... How is it possible that with a machine one can make that which the rarest minds can conceive? If it is true that the great difficulty in art is that of training the hand to be obedient to the intellect, if it is true that the spirit of a work of art cannot be created but with rare force of intelligence and with experience; how is it possible that a mechanism can supply all this beauty and difficulty of imitating nature? I saw the work of Parisian genius, I saw it in action, I saw the traced view. Here, the inconveniences: With the aforementioned machine, one cannot operate it three months of the year; not all climates are good; every little draft is harmful of anything mobile, which for the same reason not only is not recorded but leaves an unerasable mark where it is found in the view; no one can operate it who is not a chemist; no object can be made if there are figures stopped or passing because merely their breath tickles the contours of the figure; all the masses of shadow are not designated because one finds no indication of details within the interior. Trees and water one cannot make, and thousands and thousands of these inconveniences. This is well true and it is necessary to have much experience with chemistry and physics, not least botany and many other things besides. So we can rejoice. I have begun a canvas depicting the sunrise with mist that comes to the front of the painting distinguished by the rays of the sun.341

341 “Nel mio viaggio a Trieste ho avuto varie commissioni e venduti tre miei quadri; ebbi campo di esaminare quella Machina del Daguerotippo cioè a dire la scoperta che si fece a Parigi sul modo di ritrarre ogni veduta dal vero colla massima diligenza e sollecitudine. Tanto ne fece chiazzo, per bocca di sciocchi questa invenzione, che si determine assolutamente che i pittore vedutisti sarebbero morti di fame [...]. Come è possibile che con una macchina si possa fare ciò che rarissimi ingegni possono concepire? Se è vero che la grande difficoltà nell’arte è quella di abituarela mano ubbidiente all’intelletto, se è vero che l’anima ha dell’opera di belle arti non si può mettere che e con rara forza di ingegno o colla esperienza; come è possibile che un meccanismo possa supplier tutta questa bellezza e difficoltà d’imitare la natura? Io vidi l’opera dell’ingegno parigino, la vidi in azione, ne vidi la veduta ritratta. Ecco gli inconvenienti. Con detta macchina non si può operare che tre mesi dell’anno, non tutti i climi son buoni; ogni piccolo-a? ventilazione è nociva di qualunque cosa movibile da per se stessa non solamente non viene riportata ma lascia una macchia incancellabile ov’ella si trova sulla veduta, nessuno può operare se non è chimico, nessun oggetto si può fare se vi sono figure ferme o che passeggiano poché solo la loro respirazione rappiano (sic) I contorni di po?gni figura, tutte le masse d’ombra non sono segnate che per l’intero senza indicare nessun dettaglio che in esse si trovano. Alberi ed acqua non si può farne, e mille e mille e di questi inconvenienti. E ben vero di essa e’ necessaria via a molte esperienze chimiche e fisiche, non meno però le botaniche e molte altre cose dunque? Dunque evviva noi. Ho incominciato un quadro rappresentante una aurora con la nebbia che viene nel davanti del quadro distinta da raggio del sole.” Ippolito Caffi to Antonio Tessari, Venice, January 23, 1840. Biblioteca Comunale, Belluno, ms. 740, n. 72, repr. Pirani, “Scatti di pennello,” 81.
Here, Caffi dispatched with the cliché that photography would replace painting by pointing out its shortcomings: it fails at recording human life, movement, and, above all, fluctuating atmospheric conditions. Caffi emphasized this final point by quickly changing the subject from the daguerreotype to his own painting of a sunrise, a meteorological event that the camera could not yet capture. Of all artists working in Italy during the nineteenth century, vedutisti had perhaps the most to fear from photography. In one respect, Caffi’s letter confirms the notion that photography supplanted the genre of the topographical view, but it also indicates the way that artists responded to this new challenge. He reacted by emphasizing atmospheric effects and filling his canvases of Risorgimento events with innumerable active figures and dramatic lighting, such as the patriotic red, white, and green illuminations of Pius IX’s benediction on the Quirinal hill (Figure 4.6). For Caneva, although photography did eclipse his work in painting, his response to the new medium was to challenge its capabilities by depicting landscapes and composing figure studies, genres as yet unprecedented in Italian photography.

Caneva’s earliest activities as a professional artist took place outside of his native region, mirroring the career trajectory of other Venetian artists like Piranesi and Canova who traveled to Rome to pursue fame and financial support. Abbot Antonio Meneghelli, a collector and university professor known for his support of young Paduan artists, purchased Caneva’s paintings for his collection and aided in promoting the artist’s work within the Veneto. Meneghelli helped secure Caneva commissions from the Venetian entrepreneur Count Giacomo Treves, who owned his Temple of Vesta (Figure 4.7) and Pantheon (Figure 4.8). Meneghelli published a short article on the former canvas in 1844, remarking on Caneva’s strengths in

accurate perspective and proportion. He commented especially on the lively characterization of the figures populating the piazza, which includes the omnibus of S. Paolo, a public street car that ran from Piazza Venezia past the Temple of Vesta to the church of San Paolo fuori le mura. The omnibus, a precursor to the tram system, was Rome’s first public transportation, and it is interesting that Caneva was able to capture the coexistence of ancient and modern Rome, a contrast largely absent from early photographs of the city, including his own. In photography, as will be discussed, Caneva found another way to comment upon contemporary life, through allegory.

Treves’s Pantheon is likely the same painting mentioned in an 1843 review of the annual exposition of the Venetian Academy. The existence of a copy of the painting along with the content of his letters to Meneghelli demonstrates that Caneva, like other vedutisti, produced variants of his most popular subjects for sale, thus treating painting as a reproducible medium, though not a mechanical one. This was common practice among nineteenth-century artists, who capitalized on the success of noteworthy commissions and works that had been singled out for praise in the press in order to made additional sales. Caneva discussed these repetitions in his letters to Meneghelli, writing, “I am executing small commercial canvases, which this year await the distraction of the races held in the Campagna by the Roman and foreign Princes, little

---

343 Meneghelli was a teacher at the University of Padua and president of the Accademia patavina. He wrote on Petrarch, Canova, and other Venetian artists. He was also a collector, and supported young artistic talent from the region. Vanzella, “Sei lettere inedite,” 39.
344 “Quadri più notevoli dell’esposizione veneta. Prospettive e Paesaggi,” La Favilla Giornale Triestino 8, no. 17 (September 15, 1843): 263-264. The same painting sold at Drouot Richelieu, Paris, October 24, 1997 (lot 12) and Sotheby’s, Paris, June 25, 2008 (lot 9), where it was attributed to the vedutista Giuseppe Canella. It bears a distinctive signature used by Caneva, a rebus formed by a dog (in Italian, “cane”) next to the letters “va” (hence, Cane-va). Federica Pirani, “Amici e rivali,” 42 indicates that the same canvas also sold at Galleria Antonacci in Rome in 2000.
sells...”346 and, “Now I am occupied with dealing in commerce in order to overcome the starvation that this year seemed to invade the artists, that poor brood condemned by enjoying themselves with the greatest shamelessness...”347 These statements reveal that while Caneva was not exactly thrilled to ply this commercial trade in paintings, preferring the security of patronage, he was also critical of artists who seemed inured to starvation in pursuit of a fashionable bohemian lifestyle rather than work. Previous scholarship has minimized the commercial dimension of Caneva’s career both as a painter and as a photographer. During his lifetime, photography as a medium was not recognized as an art form in and of itself. Likewise, painting (particularly within the genre of the *veduta*) was still a craft as much as an art, and artists were subject to the economic realities of earning a living. Caneva’s recognition of the lucrative market for copies and his willingness to engage in multiple pursuits to remain financially secure illuminate his shift to a career in photography.

In Rome, Caneva relied on public exhibitions to promote the sale of his paintings. He produced a variation on his Pantheon theme in the dimensions of seven by five “palmi romani,” which he showed in the annual exhibition of the Società degli Amatori e Cultori di Belle Arti di Roma in 1844.348 This society, begun in 1829 by the painter Tommaso Minardi, supported annual exhibitions by an international group of artists, some of whom had affiliations to government sponsored academies like Rome’s Accademia di San Luca and the French Academy

at the Villa Medici. These *promotrice* (promotional societies) provided a means for contemporary artists of all nationalities to exhibit their work publicly, thus gaining increased exposure with minor collectors and sometime buyers, including tourists in addition to traditional art patrons.\(^{349}\) The *promotrice*, therefore, served both an economic and cultural function, and was a particular boon to artists working with subjects lower on the academic hierarchy, in particular *vedute*, landscape, and genre painting. The Società degli Amatori e Cultori di Roma was the first of many similar organizations to develop in cities across Italy in the nineteenth century, and created a potential space for artistic innovation and success outside the rigid confines of the academic structure. Caneva’s involvement with the group expanded his commercial potential and provided a network of colleagues, putting him into contact with a number of painters who, like him, would later become professional photographers. They included James Anderson and Carlo Baldassare Simelli, as well as the painter Isidore Flachéron (brother of the photographer Frédéric Flachéron), all of whom Caneva continued to have social and professional relationships with throughout the course of his career.\(^{350}\) The society’s annual exhibitions thus garnered exposure for Caneva and his work among tourists, and introduced him to professional colleagues. His

\(^{349}\) Silvia Bordini, “Il Sistema dell’arte: dall’Accademia al mercato privato,” in *L’Ottocento, 1815-1880* (Rome: Carocci Editore, 2002), 25-25 and 112-114. The original 1830 statutes of Rome’s Società degli Amatori e Cultori were reformed in 1840. The basic organization was broken down into artists and patrons with both groups paying dues to participate in the society’s annual exhibitions. The patrons were guaranteed acquisition of works drawn by lot from the artists, and the artists were guaranteed exhibition space. Artists had to be recommended to the president of the society by a member and voted into the group. The annual exhibition took place beginning November 1 of every year in a space off the Piazza del Popolo and closed in April.

involvement with the *promotrice* placed him squarely in the heart of the international group of artists living and working in 1840s Rome.

**Caneva’s Early Career in Rome**

Caneva’s extant painted *vedute* of Rome can be traced to the years immediately following his arrival in the city in 1841, but his first artistic endeavor there was working under the Paduan architect Giuseppe Jappelli (1783-1852) on the garden decoration of the Villa Torlonia.\(^3\) Prince Alessandro Torlonia had hired Jappelli to systematize the plan for his grounds based on the model of British picturesque garden design, a vogue that this architect had popularized in Italy. The design included a number of architectural follies such as a Gothic ruin, a sylvan grotto, and a medieval jousting arena. Fortuitously for Caneva, Jappelli had an antagonistic relationship with the Prince, and resigned his position in 1840, leaving the unfinished work in his younger associate’s hands.\(^4\)

A guide to the gardens published by the prominent art critic and journalist Giuseppe Checchetelli (1823-1879) recorded Caneva’s contributions to the project. He was responsible for the decoration of the Capanna Svizzera (Swiss chalet), the Serra Moresca (Moorish Pavilion), and the Campo Chiuso (an outdoor jousting theater), as well as paintings adorning the portico of

---

\(^3\) Rampin, “Note sul pittore-fotografo Giacomo Caneva,” 115-116; Giuseppe Checchetelli, *Una Giornata di osservazione nel palazzo e nella villa di S. E. il Sig. Principe D. Alessandro Torlonia* (Rome: Tipografia di Crispino Puccinelli, 1842), 90-99 and 105. Checchetelli’s text notes Caneva’s address at the time as via di S. Basilio n. 73.

\(^4\) Terry Kirk, *The Architecture of Modern Italy. Volume I: The Challenge of Tradition, 1750-1900* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2005), 138-142; Rampin, “Note sul pittore-fotografo Giacomo Caneva,” 115. Caneva and an S. Bonvicini were left in charge of the project. I was unable to identify the latter’s biography.
a temple dedicated to Sant’Alessandro. These latter decorations included frescoes of biblical figures in the style of Trecento religious painting, which were distressed to appear authentically aged. Unfortunately, these spectacular buildings have either been destroyed or heavily rebuilt so that Caneva’s decorative work cannot be fully assessed, but Checchetelli’s favorable descriptions suggest that the young artist had found success as a decorative painter, utilizing his academic training in that field. Recent restorations to the Villa Torlonia gardens, which follow the original designs preserved in archival and photographic evidence, help to reconstruct Caneva’s work for the project (Figure 4.9).

Caneva illustrated the Serra Moresca in an engraving within Checchetelli’s publication, providing evidence that he worked in another medium of multiple reproduction besides photography. In this print (Figure 4.10), simple contours comprise the building, with the landscape cursorily inserted by a loose hand. Caneva expended the most effort detailing the elaborate arabesques of the Serra Moresca’s orientalist fantasy structure for which Jappelli had directed him to copy designs found in J. C. Murphy’s The Arabian Antiquities of Spain. The engraving also depicts the tower of the Moorish pavilion, which was outfitted with an ingenious mechanism by which a decorative puff at the center of a seating area automatically lifted to form a canopy, and revealed a set table arisen from a hidden kitchen below. Caneva’s involvement with this project demonstrates his engagement with the decorative, scenographic, and

---

354 A second print depicting the Capanna Svizzera within the publication may also be by Caneva. It is not signed, however, and although it bears some similarities in draftsmanship to Caneva’s Serra Moresco, it cannot be attributed to him without some reservation.
illusionistic aspects of his training as a vedutista, which he later employed as a photographer directing carefully staged tableaux. Furthermore, it highlights the Romantic taste for exoticism, which certainly figured into his costume studies of peasants.

Checchetelli’s text, illustrated by Caneva’s engraving of the Serra Moresca, is filled with effusive praise. The entire book reads as a public relations campaign for the project, celebrating the achievements of two generations of Roman artists who worked on the villa under the princely patronage of Alessandro Torlonia, and whisking the reader on an imaginative journey through the gardens’ delights. The publication’s index of contributing artists is a who’s who of noteworthy figures, including the likes of the sculptors Antonio Canova, Berthel Thorvaldsen, and John Gibson, and the painters Vincenzo Camuccini and Pelagio Palagi, among others.357 Caneva’s role within this well-publicized project put him into contact with many of Rome’s most important artists, and his work on such a celebrated commission, promoted within the pages of Checchetelli’s guidebook, must have significantly elevated his profile as a relative newcomer to Rome’s artistic community.

Caneva’s experience at the Villa Torlonia also introduced him to a number of artists who, like himself, would also begin working with photography. For example, Caneva collaborated on the Campo Chiuso with the Fratelli Luswergh, who produced ironwork decorations for the theater. The brothers Angelo (1793-1858) and Giacomo (1819-1891) came from a family of opticians and metalworkers, and experimented with daguerreotypes and paper negatives before opening a photography studio in Rome following their visit to the 1851 Great Exhibition in London.358 Caneva’s engravings of the Villa Torlonia also provide early evidence of his

---

357 Checchetelli, Una Giornata di osservazione, 105-107.
358 On the Fratelli Luswergh, see: Becchetti, La Fotografia a Roma, 318-319. Coincidentally, a series of photographs of Vatican Sculptures in the Harrison Horblit Collection, Houghton
involvement with Tommaso Cuccioni (1790-1864), an engraver and print dealer through whose shop Caneva later distributed his photographs. Cuccioni also began making photographs in the 1850s, and the two must have been very close since Caneva produced an inventory of Cuccioni’s estate after the publisher’s death.\(^{359}\) Caneva’s involvement with printmaking, which has previously been unexplored in relationship to his photographs, as well as his work in painting and architectural design, provides evidence of his early connection to a network of artists with whom he remained affiliated throughout his career.

Caneva’s prominence within Rome’s artistic community also led him to participate in public life within the city. As discussed in the previous chapter, Pius IX’s ascendency to the Holy See in 1846 was greeted with popular approval, particularly after the new Pope granted a general pardon and amnesty to political prisoners. This support for the national cause seemed an important step in the fulfillment of liberals’ hopes, and celebrations of the proclamation took place throughout the Papal States. From July 17 to 19, 1846 Rome’s Piazza del Popolo hosted a variety of festivities, which included poems offered up as encomia to the new leader, and the erection of a triumphal arch embellished with religious scenes and the papal stemma. According to several publications produced in honor of the event, Caneva contributed gesso and plaster decorations for the ephemeral arch, depicted in an 1846 lithograph based on a daguerreotype by Lorenzo Suscipj (Figure 4.11).\(^{360}\) These decorations included figures of genii, columns, and

---

Library, Harvard, currently attributed to Caneva are likely instead the work of the Luswergh studio. A photograph from the series in the collection of the Metropolitan Museum of Art (2005.100.1314) bears the same German inscriptions, as well as a Luswergh blindstamp.\(^{359}\) Becchetti, *Giacomo Caneva e la scuola fotografica romana*, 19-21.

vegetal swags framing relief sculptures. For the project, Caneva worked with the sculptor Angelo Bezzi, a fellow member of the Società degli Amatori e Cultori. Significantly, Bezzi was a revolutionary who, after the revolutions of 1848-49, fled to Great Britain as a political exile in the circle of Giuseppe Mazzini. Bezzi’s turn from his public support of Pius IX to fighting against Papal forces is a story common to other cultural figures of this period as the hopefulness surrounding Pius IX’s election gave way to dissatisfaction with his unwillingness for significant political reform.

Caneva’s participation in the event went beyond his decorative propaganda, involving him directly in the Pope’s procession. A period account of the festivities relates a bizarre incident; while the Pope attempted to make his way through the Piazza, his horses broke away from his carriage, and crowds gathered around the immobile vehicle. The Pope feared being trapped by the exuberant throngs, and it was Giacomo Caneva, standing nearby, who calmed him. Caneva’s very public participation in the celebrations surrounding Pius IX’s pardon of political prisoners reflects his spiritual leanings. The two known portraits of him suggest a man of strong religious conviction. The Neapolitan artist Giuseppe Mancinelli (Figure 4.12) included Caneva’s portrait as the figure of a monk assisting San Carlo Borromeo giving aid to plague victims. He

---

Ajani, 1846), 17; Roma nel giorno 8 settembre 1846; lettera di un curato di campagna al proprio vescovo. Con note e documenti diversi (Livorno: Vannini, 1846), 16; Giuseppe Checchetelli, “La Festa degli otto settembre 1846 in Roma descritta da Giuseppe Checchetelli,” Estratto dal Giornale Romano la Pallade 1, no. 24 (1846), 3-4; On Suscipj’s print, see: Becchetti, Giacomo Caneva e la scuola fotografica romana, 15; Piero Becchetti, Roma in Dagherrotipia (Roma: Edizioni Quasar, 1979), 34.

361 Giuseppe Mazzini, et al. Dear Kate: lettere inedito di G. Mazzini a Katherine Hill, Angelo Bezzi, e altri Italiani a Londra (1841-1871) (Soveria Mannelli, Catanzaro: Rubbettino, 2011). Bezzi also worked as stonecutter on the bases for sculptures of Peter and Paul at the Vatican in 1849.

362 Becchetti, Giacomo Caneva e la scuola fotografica romana, 15.

363 I thank Maria Francesca Bonetti for alerting me to this painting and the following source. The artist Bernardo Celentano mentions Mancinelli’s portrait of Caneva in a letter to his father and
also posed for a group portrait made on the occasion of his final meeting with a group of Spanish artists, shortly before they fled Rome for Bourbon protection in Naples on the heels of Pius IX’s escape to Gaeta (figure 4.13). Whether Caneva’s papal sympathies amounted to an anti-Republican stance remains ambiguous, since many of his professional colleagues and friends, such as Bezzi and Caffi, were active participants in the defense of Rome. Caneva produced only one photograph of that conflict, which records the remnants of battle on the Janiculum hill (Figure 4.14). In the foreground, tall grasses surround a splinter-proof cage, a shield that would have been used to protect soldiers against bullets and shrapnel. In the background, the dome of St. Peter’s rises beyond the city walls, providing a commentary on Rome’s political disunity. The uncertainty of Caneva’s precise politics reveals, once again, the complex circumstances of the Risorgimento, which pitted Italians against not only foreigners, but also against each other, and against God’s representative on Earth, the Pope. Regardless of his motivations, Caneva’s involvement in the events surrounding Pius IX’s pardon provides further evidence of his prominence within Rome’s international artistic community and the cultural life of the city.

brother. Celentano writes, “I knew Caneva, another race of man; we will speak of him. His portrait can be admired as the monk holding the missal in the stupendous painting of San Carlo Borromeo by the great Mancinelli, my teacher.” (‘Ho conosciuto Caneva, un’altra razza d’uomo; discorreremo a voce di costui. Il suo ritratto lo puoi ammirare nel monaco che tiene il messale nella stupenda pittura di San Carlo Borromeo del grandissimo mio maestro Mancinelli.’) Bernardo Celentano to Luigi Celentano, Rome, July 31, 1854, in Bernardo Celentano due settenni della pittura. Notizie e lettere intime pubblicate nel ventesimo anniversario della sua morte dal fratello Luigi (Rome, Tip. Bodoniana, 1883), 81.

The Roman School of Photography

As an artistic and travel destination, Rome became a significant locus of experimentation with photography. Although in this period other cities, such as London, Paris, Edinburgh, and Philadelphia, also had strong photographic communities, Rome was unique for its international character. First-hand encounters with visiting practitioners as well as personal connections abroad exposed those working in Rome to advancements to the medium happening elsewhere in Europe. In particular, the so-called Roman School of Photography became known internationally for its success with paper negatives, and for spreading information about the process to artists and amateur photographers passing through Italy. Active from around 1847 to 1853, this group included Caneva, the French sculptor and medalist Frédéric Flachéron, the painter Eugène Constant, the architect Alfred-Nicolas Normand, and the British painter James Anderson. Their recognition as a school lies not only in the fact that they generally used the same photographic techniques (with minor variation) and often traveled together to record monuments, but also because their contemporaries recognized them as a cohesive unit. For example, after

---


visiting Rome in 1850, the British amateur Richard W. Thomas referred to them as “the photographic clique,” and praised the high quality of their work at a time when the medium’s various processes remained obscure and often unsuccessful. The Roman School thus presents an exemplary case study of how transnational exchange contributed to the development of early photography.

In Rome, the Caffè Greco served as an important center of exchange for early photographers, since it brought together artists and travelers of different nationalities who may not have otherwise met. Still in existence, this café was already a famous meeting place for artists and intellectuals by the end of the eighteenth century, and became a favorite haunt for protagonists of the Roman School of Photography. The German painter Ludwig Passini recorded the lively atmosphere comprised of groups of artists populating the café in a watercolor of 1856 (figure 4.15), and the establishment’s register records the signatures of several key figures of early photography in addition to Caneva. Filled with artists, writers, young bohemians, and intellectuals, the Caffè Greco also provided a public space for discussing political ideas, and it

---

367 Thomas, “Photography in Rome,” 159. Abigail Solomon-Godeau has criticized labeling groups of photographers schools because the term signifies a shared aesthetic, and thus anachronistically valorizes the calotype as an artistic medium on par with painting. In the case of the Roman School, not only was the term contemporaneously applied, but it proves useful for identifying a specific network of photographers whose training and experimentation with the medium occurred collaboratively. Abigail Solomon-Godeau, “Calotypomania: the gourment guide to nineteenth-century photography,” Photography at the Dock: Essays on Photographic History, Institutions, and Practices (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1991), 4-27.  
368 These artists’ names were listed in the register of the café, with Caneva’s address recorded as “G. Caneva, Pittore—Fotografo, via Sistina n. 100, 3rd floor,” and amended with a later change in address to via del Corso, presso S. Carlo, n. 446, 4th floor.” Margiotta, “La Scuola Romana di Fotografia,” 30; Tittoni, “Il Caffè Greco: ’le petit café le plus plaisant du monde,’” 13; On the history of the Caffè Greco, see: Diego Angeli, Le Cronache del Caffè Greco, ed. Stefano Stringini (Rome: Bulzoni, 2001).
became known as a bastion of liberal thought. Many of its patrons became actively involved in the revolutions of 1848-1849.\textsuperscript{369}

The Caffè Greco was situated just off the Piazza di Spagna, which formed the nucleus of artistic life in nineteenth-century Rome, especially because of its location nearby the French Academy at the Villa Medici. The French Academy in Rome was founded by Louis XIV in 1666 with the purpose of supplying the French state with copies of Italy’s masterpieces.\textsuperscript{370} In 1798, Napoleon reestablished it as the School of Rome, and its home has been the Villa Medici since 1803. During the nineteenth century, up to fifteen pensionnaires, recipients of the prestigious \textit{Prix de Rome}, lived at the Villa. Their time there provided them crucial exposure to the works of antiquity, which constituted the \textit{beau ideale} of Neoclassicism. In exchange for room and board, pensionnaires produced copies of famous classical and Renaissance masterpieces and sent to Paris \textit{envois}, annual works that demonstrated their abilities. Beyond these institutional demands, and perhaps surpassing them in importance, the experience in Rome signified artistic and social freedom for a young artist, a time of experimentation and exchange. For early photographers, the French Academy served a similar function, providing an artistic community that encouraged new technical and aesthetic developments, and a ready clientele for artists’ studies and souvenirs of Roman views.

The artistic community of the French Academy in Rome had been aware of photography from as early as 1836, when the pensionnaire Eugène Viollet-le-Duc wrote home to his father

\textsuperscript{369} Angeli, \textit{Le Cronache del Caffè Greco}, 94-95.
requesting information from Paris about Daguerre’s experiments. Academicians including Paul Delaroche, Horace Vernet, and Jean-Auguste-Dominique Ingres, important figures in the life of the Villa Medici, also participated in discussions around the new invention, and thus served as intermediaries transmitting information on photography between Paris and Rome. For example, in 1851, the photographer Maxime Du Camp and the writer Gustave Flaubert passed through on their return trip from Egypt, and it was on this occasion that Du Camp inspired the Prix de Rome winner Normand to take up “daguerreotypes on paper.” The young architect integrated his photographs into his drawing practice, for which they served as analogues to his studies for building projects.

In the artistic crossroads of Rome, photographers quickly adopted both British and French advancements upon Talbot’s calotype, though the harsh Mediterranean sunlight demanded further modifications to the process. The year 1846 marked a decisive moment in the use of paper negatives among photographers in Rome, in which both Calvert Jones and the

---

373 An article by Richard W. Thomas reprinted by Henry Hunt Snelling in 1854 described the Roman process, which was in essence Blanquart-Evrard’s improvement of Talbot’s process as simplified by the husband and wife photographers Guillot and Saguez. The method was to expose the paper negatives to light while still wet from an immersion in a solution of acid nitrate of silver. It also eliminated the first bath of silver nitrate in preparation of the paper, and added potassium bromide to the iodide. Richard W. Thomas says that the strength of the Mediterranean sun required this change; the potassium bromide made the paper less light sensitive. After exposure, the paper was then developed with gallic acid, stabilized with potassium bromide, and fixed with hyposulphite of soda. On the technical details of the method, see: Anne Cartier-Bresson, “Il metodo Romano: tra ricerca e adattamento,” Roma 1850: Il Circolo dei pittoi fotografi del Caffè Greco, Anita Margiotta and Anne Cartier-Bresson, eds. (Milano: Electa, 2003), 23.
husband and wife photographers Jacques-Michel Guillot (1807-1866) and Amélie Saguez (1810-1864) were present in the city, introducing both Talbot’s process and a French variation of it. It is documented that Jones showed examples of his photographs to artists in Rome, and it is quite likely that he also encountered Guillot and Saguez during this visit. Guillot, a doctor, and Saguez, a painter, traveled to both Rome and Naples between 1845 and 1847, and were connected to the circle of French artists affiliated with the Villa Medici. A salted paper print depicting a *pifferaro*, a peasant musician who played in front of shrines of the Madonna at Christmas time, (Figure 4.16) signed “A. Guillot-Saguez, photographe” is conserved in an album compiled by Victor Régnault, one of the founding members of the Société héliographique. The presence of this photograph in the Régnault album confirms the couple’s affiliation with a wider network of photographers in France, and verifies the impact of that network on the development of photography within Italy. It is also remarkable evidence of the contribution of women to the early history of photography; Amélie composed the photographs and operated the camera, while Jacques-Michel likely lent his knowledge of chemistry to printing the negatives. After their

---

375 Calvert Jones to W. H. F. Talbot, Rome, May 11, 1846, Document number: 5647, *The Correspondence of William Henry Fox Talbot*, http://foxtalbot.dmu.ac.uk/. Jones writes, “There is a man here who does Talbotype portraits, which are pretty good, but all touched, he is a Frenchman, and tells me that he does the large Camera specimens in 15 seconds but of course makes a secret of his acceleration. I only wish that you wd manage the same time, as the additional period which I now leave it in the Camera is very inconvenient.” Of the French calotypists known to have worked in Rome at this early date, Guillot seems a likely candidate, since at least one extant portrait made by him at this time has been traced.
376 At the time of this writing, an album containing 37 salted paper prints from paper negatives made by Guillot and Saguez during this Italian stay has resurfaced, and is scheduled for auction at Christies Paris in November 2016. The album will undoubtedly serve to better understanding of these figures. Previously, only five prints had been attributed to the collaborators.
Roman sojourn, Guillot and Saguez returned to France, where they published their process and exhibited several photographs at the 1849 *Exposition des produits de l’Industrie* in Paris, winning a bronze medal for their image of Michelangelo’s *Moses*.  

Caneva’s earliest extant photographs can be traced to 1847, the year after Jones and Guillot and Saguez visited the city. This timing suggests that the presence of travelers galvanized the activities of the Roman School by exposing the nascent group to advancements in paper photography occurring elsewhere. Caneva’s work from this period includes a view of the *Temple of Vesta* (Figure 4.17), in which the artist repeated a subject that he had successfully tackled as a painter. Dating from the same year, Caneva’s portrait of a peasant couple (Figure 4.18) introduces his engagement with the genre, and may owe a debt to Guillot and Saguez’s output while in Rome. Both examples reveal that his training as a painter proved key to his selection of subjects for the camera. His work as a *vedutista* gave him an understanding of the compositions that would most appeal to travelers, and his sensitive depiction of peasants reflected an important subject for painters, both foreign and Italian, working in Rome, but one that had (with the exception of Guillot and Saguez’s single image) not been explored by local photographers. These two examples, therefore, exemplify his camera work, which I argue, can be divided into two major categories: on the one hand, his views of the city’s monuments, and on

---


379 The importance of the process of Guillot and Saguez to the development of the so-called “Roman Method” of photography is confirmed by period sources, such as Augusto Castellani in his 1849 *Manuale Di Fotografia sulla Carta*. See: Alberto Prandi, “The Roman Process.” Con un repetorio della letteratura fotografica 1849-1863 relativa all’esperienza romana,” in “Fotografi e collezionisti: il caso romano,” in *Roma 1840-1870: La Fotografia, il collezionista e lo storico*, eds. Maria Francesca Bonetti, Chiara Dall’Olio and Alberto Prandi (Rome: Peliti Associati, 2008), 17-19.
the other, his peasant studies and landscapes in the Campagna, which distinguish him from the other members of the Roman School who concentrated primarily on architectural views.

One of the most important figures linking the Roman School to artists working in the city was the painter and medalist Flachéron, who had moved there after winning the Prix de Rome in 1839. Soon after, he married Caroline Hayard and took over her father’s art supply store near the Piazza di Spagna.\textsuperscript{380} The shop sold photographic equipment imported from France and posted notices on the latest technological advancements to the medium. Flachéron also marketed his Roman views to artists and travelers through the shop. His wider artistic and professional network enabled him to distribute his photographs in France and Great Britain. For example, they were displayed at the Photographic Institution in London, a commercial and exhibition space established in 1853 by Joseph Cundall and Phillip Delamotte to promote photography.\textsuperscript{381} Caneva distributed his photographs among the same networks, capitalizing on the presence of foreign visitors to Rome, such as Richard W. Thomas, Thomas Sutton, and a Mr. Anthony, who served as intermediaries for distributing work by the Roman School abroad.\textsuperscript{382} For example,

\begin{itemize}
  \item[381] Daffner, “‘A Transparent Atmosphere,’” 428.
  \item[382] Cartier-Bresson, “Il metodo Romano, 23. Cartier-Bresson posits that Flachéron’s participation in the Great Exhibition of 1851 was possibly through Thomas Sutton. Caneva’s photographs as well as those of Flachéron and Constant were exhibited at the 1852 Society of Arts exhibition in London by a Mr. Anthony. Additional photographs by Flachéron were exhibited by a Mr. Baillère and by Antoine Claudet. Caneva and Flachéron both participated in the 1853 exhibition of the Photographic Institution, London, and Caneva’s works were shown in 1856 at the Photographic Society of Scotland in Edinburgh. See: “L’Arc de Triomphe a Rome, par M. Constant, et le colisée de M. Flachéron…” in “Angleterre: exposition d’epreuves photographiques a la societe des Arts,” \textit{La Lumière} 4 (January 22, 1853), 15; Roger Taylor,
Caneva exhibited his photographs in Paris, London, and Edinburgh in the early 1850s thanks to this international professional network.\(^{383}\) Between 1852 and 1856, he sent ten photographs to exhibitions in London at the Society of Arts and Photographic Institution, and in Edinburgh at the Photographic Society of Scotland. The subjects included five views of the Roman Forum and other ancient sites, and five images of animals and landscapes around Tivoli. This exhibition record can thus be compared to those of Caneva’s Roman colleagues Flachéron, Constant, and Anderson, who also presented their work at the same institutions during this period. Their entries only included architectural subjects, further confirming that Caneva’s breadth of subject matter was unique among his circle.\(^{384}\) His engagement with subjects drawn from the land and people of Rome and the surrounding Campagna thus attest to his particularly Italian identity within an international milieu.

Flachéron’s connections to the French Academy also put him and his fellow photographers in contact with influential collectors like Courbet’s patron, Alfred Bruyas, whose catalogues indicate that he owned an early group of photographs by Flachéron and Constant, with whom he had corresponded.\(^{385}\) Among the Roman School, Constant was the only

\(^{385}\) Bruyas was in Rome from 1846-48, letters from the painter Alexandre Cabanel to Bruyas in 1849 mention three prints by Flachéron of the Colosseum, Arch of Titus, and Arch of Constantine, and two photographs by Flachéron were listed in Bruyas’s 1852 catalogue. Flachéron’s photographs were also collected by Jean Hippolyte Flandrin, and he maintained a correspondence with Charles Chevalier, who published a letter from Flachéron in his \textit{Guide du...}
photographer to adopt the method of albumen glass plate negatives devised by Niépce de Saint-Victor in 1847. A member of the Société Héliographique, Constant also maintained a relationship with the French photographer Humbert de Molard and published a biographical account of the daguerreotypist Philibert Perraud whom he must have known personally in Rome. Constant sold his views through the bookshop of Edouard Mauche.\footnote{Bouillon, “Eugène Constant,” in \textit{Roma 1850: Il Circolo dei Pittori Fotografi del Caffè Greco} (Milan: Electa, 2003); 177.} This was common practice; for example, James Anderson sold prints through the book dealer Joseph Spithöver before establishing his own firm, and, as previously mentioned, Caneva initially marketed his photographs through Cuccioni’s print shop.\footnote{Anderson’s commercial catalogue listing 450 photographs is at the Archivio Fotografico Comunale in Rome. See: Bouillon, “James Anderson,” in \textit{Roma 1850}, 176; Anita Margiotta, “La Scuola Romana di Fotografia,” 29; Piero Becchetti, “Una dinastia di fotografi romani: gli Anderson,” \textit{AFT} 2, n. 4 (1986), 56-67.} This dual distribution, which capitalized on commercial affiliations as well as artistic networks, reveals the significant engagement of the Roman School with photography as both an adjunct to previous artistic experiments and as a professional pursuit.

Just as photographers of the Roman School distributed their work through the same channels, so did they convene at the same sites with their photographic equipment. It was already characteristic of artistic communities in Rome to sketch together \textit{in situ}, and photographers had an added practical need for assistance. Since they were using the wet method of the calotype, the paper had to be dipped into the chemical solution and exposed in the camera while it was still damp. This complicated technology required more than one operator; arguably, the carefully posed figures that often appear for scale in their photographs, and evoke Romantic reverie

among the ruins, indicate this kind of collaboration. For example, the same suntanned and
bearded figure dressed in workers’ clothes appearing in a number of Caneva’s photographs,
suggests that he employed at least one assistant. This figure can be seen leaning next to a
monumental sculptural head of Constantine (Figure 4.19) and posing by the fountain in front of
the French Academy, providing further evidence of Caneva’s connection to the institution
(Figure 4.20). Another image by Caneva shows a man posing below one of the Capitoline
Dioscuri, providing scale within this monumental site (Figure 4.21). In the foreground, a modern
gas lamp hangs above a camera on a tripod. The complex composition, which places the camera
at an oblique angle above the stairs of the Capitoline piazza, captures the vertical layering of
architecture and history characteristic of the hilly site. The gas lamp and camera tripod suggest
the intrusion of modernity within a scene that otherwise attests to historical continuity. Likewise,
the figures that Caneva included within the frame of many of his compositions enliven those
spaces.

An important album of Roman views in the collection of the Archivio Fotografico
Comunale in Rome testifies to the close association of the Roman School, because it includes
photographs produced by many key figures like Constant, Caneva, Anderson, and Flachéron.388
This album, compiled in 1857 with prints from negatives dating from at least four years earlier,
indicates the continued prominence of this group in the Roman market well into the 1850s. Two

388 Maria Francesca Bonetti, “Fotografi e collezionisti: il caso romano,” 14; Anita Margiotta,
“Rome 1857: un album di antiche vedute fotografiche romane,” Bollettino dei musei comunali di
Scuola Romana di Fotografia,” 30. This album of 54 salt prints by photographers of the Roman
School was compiled by a French traveler. It also includes two signed and dated prints by
Domenico Castracane and F. Borioni, lesser-known figures associated with the Roman School.
The inscriptions following those photographers’ names on the mount below each print read “d’A,”
perhaps suggesting that these photographers were camera operators employed by the firm
established by Antonio d’Alessandri. Additional photographs by Borioni and Castracane are
located in the Fondo Ceccarius of the Biblioteca Nazionale di Roma.
prints from the album bear the inscription “1 8ber 1853 / Publicatur / F. D. Buttaoni / S. P. A. M.,” signifying that they were deposited with Rome’s official censor on October 1, 1853.389 All graphic and literary works destined for publication or distribution in Rome had to be approved by Domenico Buttaoni, the censor appointed by Pius IX. 390 This evidence, along with the signatures and blind stamps on many of the prints and the luxury size and binding of the album, underscore that the Roman School sought a commercial distribution for their photographs.

As Maria Francesca Bonetti has observed, photographic publishing firms like those of Blanquart-Evrard’s in Lille or Talbot’s in Reading had yet to be established in Italy.391 Rather, the 1857 album demonstrates how photographs circulated through formats determined by the print trade. Customers could purchase individual photographs or portfolios, selecting preferred subjects from catalogue listings. For this album, the blind stamps indicate that the photographs came from various sources and print-sellers, and were compiled and bound under the direction of the album’s owner. Caneva also distributed his prints in this way, offering a discounted price for a selection of photographs in folio sold from his shop on via del Babuino. Extant portfolios from this period bear the carefully hand-written title “Roma in Fotografia,” with a tipped in salted paper print as a cover image (Figure 4.22).392 By 1855, Caneva listed his shop in several

---

389 Tozzi, Pittori Fotografi, 33.
390 Tozzi, Pittori Fotografi, 33.
392 Examples of these portfolios can be found in the collections of the Getty Research Institute, AGFA Foto-Historama Cologne, and a Private Collection in Connecticut. See: Bodo von Dewitz, Dietmar Siegert, and Karin Schuller-Procopovici, Italien Sehen und Sterben: Photographien der Zeit des Risorgimento (1845-1870) (Cologne: Stadt, 1994), 88-93, 176-181, and 265-266. Receipts from Caneva’s dealings with Cuccioni indicate payments for thirty-two photographs over less than a year from 1849 to 1850: “17 ottobre 1849, a Caneva per 4 dagherrotipi venduti, scudi 2,40; 25 ottobre 1849, a Caneva per 4 dagerrotipi (sic), scudi 2,40; 16 maggio 1850, a Caneva per 20 dagerrotipi (sic) e residuo di altri Quattro, scudi 12,34.” Quoted in Piero Becchetti, Giacomo Caneva e la scuola fotografica romana, 19. I could not obtain access to the original receipts, though they are allegedly preserved in the Fondo Cuccioni of the ICCD, Rome.
guidebooks, which provided a form of advertising for vendors and artisans.\textsuperscript{393} That year, he also published an album called \textit{Vedute di Roma e dei contorni in fotografia}.\textsuperscript{394} In 1858, Caneva listed himself in one such guide as a seller of “galvanoplastics,” small copper statuettes produced mechanically through the process of electrotyping, a process which was also used to produce prints from daguerreotype plates.\textsuperscript{395} Other print dealers and photographers of the period sold these miniature copies of Italy’s famous classical and Renaissance sculptures, which, like photographs, served as inexpensive souvenirs for the artist’s studio or tourist’s collection. Rome’s steady flow of travelers supplied the Roman School with an inexhaustible clientele, who

---

Although the receipts are for daguerreotypes, these were most likely salt prints. The camera used by Caneva at this time was a daguerreotype camera, but only paper negatives from this period survive, and it was common for all photographs to be referred to as daguerreotypes in this early period (see the previous chapter for examples of this.) Caneva’s photographs were priced at 2.40 scudi. The “Roma in Fotografia” portfolios indicate that by the 1850s, the price of his photographs had dropped to twelve prints for 8.00 scudi or individual prints for 8.00 paoli (a little less than one scudo.) At mid-century, the cost of one of Caneva’s photographs was roughly equivalent to a day’s wages for a skilled laborer or artisan in Rome. The price put them outside the hands of such workers, but tourists considered the expense much lower than in Northern Europe. For example, in 1877 the Danish zoologist Vilhelm Bersøe wrote that a photograph costing the equivalent of two or three Danish marks in Rome would be 4 or 5 times more in Denmark, and noted that for only three scudi, you could get a view of the Forum over three feet wide. Helsted, \textit{Rome in Early Photographs}, 8 and Becchetti, \textit{La Fotografia a Roma}, 41.


\textsuperscript{394} No extant copies of this volume have been located. It is mentioned in A. Gugliemotti, \textit{La Guerra dei pirati e la Marina Pontificia}, Vol. 2. (Florence: Successori Le Monnier, 1876), 309.

\textsuperscript{395} “Caneva, Giacomo, v. del Babuino num. 69,” listed under Galvano-Plastica (Oggetti di) in \textit{Almanacco romano ossia, raccolta dei primari dignitari e funzionari della citta’ di Roma} (Rome: Tipographia Sinimberghi, 1858), 135.
aided in publicizing their work abroad. Photographers built upon relationships that had already formed through shared institutional affiliations, including the promotrice and the French Academy as well as informal meetings in cafés, to exchange practical information and promote each other’s work.

Scholars of the early history of photography have criticized the historic valorization of the paper negative as an artistic medium, and the way in which its practitioners have been lauded as masters despite the fact that many never pursued photography as a profession or gave up the medium altogether with the advent of glass negatives. The destiny of the Roman School’s photographers indeed offers a variety of such outcomes. Flachéron and Constant abandoned photography in 1853, and eventually relocated to Paris. Normand continued to reprint his Roman negatives throughout his life, and used the resulting prints as aids to his professional work as an architect, eventually becoming Vice President of the Société Française de Photographie. Anderson took up glass negatives, and operated a successful studio documenting Italy’s monuments and art that passed to his son Domenico after his death. Critically, each of the photographers associated with the Roman School pursued photography professionally, thus, the collaborative nature of these photographers’ work and the specificity of their Roman context compels a reevaluation of historiographical distinctions between amateur and professional.

Caneva continued to work as a professional photographer until his death in 1865, never waverering from his preference for paper negatives despite the widespread shift to a more industrialized technique of collodion on albumen negatives and albumen prints. This seemingly

396 Solomon-Godeau, “Calotypomania,” 4-27.
397 Cartier-Bresson, “Il metodo Romano,” 25.
399 Bouillon, “James Anderson,” 176.
anachronistic predilection distinguished Caneva from his contemporaries in Rome, and he articulated his *modus operandi* in his 1855 photographic manual *Della fotografia: trattato pratico* (*On Photography, A Practical Treatise.*).\(^{400}\) The first of its kind in Italy, Caneva’s treatise offered readers a brief account of photography’s history followed by detailed instructions for every photographic process available at the time. Throughout the text, he credited individual photographers for their various improvements to the processes under discussion, demonstrating his awareness of the field. Perhaps most telling of his own views, however, he observed that certain methods of photography were best suited to particular subjects. Ultimately, he argued, “For every occasion, the paper negative offers an advantage, and for handling they can be conserved in a portfolio, they give no added weight to the assembly of the camera, and they do not puzzle in the laboratory.”\(^{401}\) He considered the glass negative “a bit crude” in its detail, causing ancient ruins to appear as modern reconstructions, while paper negatives captured aerial perspective and tonal variety appropriate for monuments, ruins, and landscapes.\(^{402}\) Caneva’s statement reflects a perception of photography inflected by his artistic training and milieu, which informed his preference for the calotype. His decision to continue producing paper negatives after his contemporaries had switched to glass perhaps indicates a desire to make photographs that consciously appealed to artists, and thus distinguish his output from the growing number of professional rivals setting up shop in Rome during the 1850s. Caneva’s association with the Roman School demonstrates the importance of Rome’s international artistic community for his

\(^{400}\) Giacomo Caneva, *Trattato Pratico* (Rome: Tipografia Tiberina, 1855), facsimile, (Florence: Alinari, 1985.)

\(^{401}\) “Ad ogni evento, le negative in carta offrono un vantaggio, e per la manipolazione potendole conservare entro un portafoglio, e per non dar alcun peso all’assieme dell’apparecchio, e per non esser d’imbarazzo nel laboratorio.” Caneva, *Della Fotografia*, 11.

\(^{402}\) Caneva, *Della Fotografia*, 11.
technical and professional development as a photographer, and reveals his unique position as the only Italian within that group.

**Caneva’s Photographs of the Roman Campagna**

Caneva’s artistic aspirations for his photography and his connections to other artists in Rome are key to understanding the nationalist content of his works. His images of the landscape outside of Rome set him apart from foreign photographers who were mainly concerned with the representation of architectural monuments. Caneva’s artistic vision was thus more closely aligned with the pursuits of Italian painters active in Rome, many of whom collected his photographs, who focused on Italy’s landscape and had been inspired to this subject as an expression of nationalism after participating in the defense of the Roman Republic. For these painters and, I argue, for Caneva, the depiction of the landscape and peasantry was a means of challenging foreign representations and asserting the existence of a shared indigenous culture that was bound to the land. His photographs of the Romagna Campagna thus took their place alongside artist’s sketches and studies as compositional aids for this group of patriotic landscape painters, bolstering the authority of their symbolic constructions of national identity through photography’s direct relationship to reality.

Caneva’s home and studio were located a short distance from the Caffè Greco on via del Babuino. Just as that establishment had served as an important meeting place for the Roman School of Photography, it had also become a regular haunt for young Italian artists. As discussed, the café was a social space in which patrons could freely discuss artistic as well as political ideas. It was, therefore, exemplary of the type of space that was crucial to the development of a public
sphere within Italy during the Risorgimento. Notably, many Italian artists known for their participation in the defense of the Roman Republic were frequent patrons of the Caffè Greco, including, for example, the landscape painter Nino Costa (1826-1903), who fought in the defense of the Roman Republic and the battles of Colta, Palazzolo, and Governolo, as well as Caffi, Alessandro Prampolini (1823-1865), Eleuterio Pagliano (1826-1903), Alfonso Chierici (1816-1863), and Gerolamo Induno (1827-1890). Caneva’s relationship to Caffi has already been addressed, and further evidence demonstrates his connection to a number of these artists; for example, his photographs of monuments, landscapes, and peasants were collected by Costa, Prampolini, Pagliano, and Chierici as well as other important Italian artists not associated with the café. Significantly, Caneva’s photographs continued to circulate among the artistic community in Rome even after his death in 1865 through the photographers Carlo Baldassare Simelli and Ludovico Tuminello, both of whom had acquired some of Caneva’s negatives (whether by direct sale or through an intermediary is unknown). A participant in the defense of the Roman Republic, Tuminello had returned to Rome around 1868 after many years of exile in Turin. He persisted in printing and distributing Caneva’s images during the 1860s and 1870s,

and is recorded as selling them to artists he met at the Caffè Greco, thus, that establishment served as an important platform for the sale of Caneva’s photographs to artists well after his death.407

Another important meeting place for artists working in Rome during this period was the Campagna itself, since sketching from direct observation in the landscape was foundational to their training.408 This was true of foreign and Italian artists alike, and the significance of the Roman Campagna to this transnational community manifested most clearly in the Festa degli Artisti at Cervara. This festival emerged in the early-nineteenth century out of a processional and bacchanalia first performed by a group of German artists in Rome annually on May 1, signaling the seasonal return to the countryside to sketch. Originally meeting in various locations, like the tomb of Cecilia Metella or Tivoli, by the 1830s the Festa expanded to include artists of diverse nationalities, and relocated to the tufo grotto of Cervara. Artists gathered at the church of Santa Maria Maggiore, where they mounted donkeys in a mockery of military processions.

Progressing out of the city via the Porta Maggiore, they picnicked while donning carnival costumes, and then continued to the Tor de’ Schiavi, where they performed pageants and

407 Angeli, Le Cronache del Caffè Greco, 95 explains Tuminello’s distribution of earlier photographs at the café, but does not mention Caneva by name, however, a corpus of Caneva’s negatives has been preserved at the Istituto Centrale per Catologo e Documentazione in Rome since 1903, when Tuminello’s archive sold at auction. It seems likely that many of the earlier photographs to which Angeli refers were part of the group by Caneva that Tuminello probably acquired when Caneva died. Piero Becchetti, Giacomo Caneva e la scuola fotografica romana (1847-1855), 11-12; Serena Romano, ed., L’immagine di Roma 1848-1895. La città, l’archeologia, il medioevo nei calotipi del fondo Tuminello (Naples: Electa, 1994); 11-12; Marina Miraglia, “Simelli and Landscape,” 20.

Olympic-style games—including lancing the paper effigy of an art critic. Finally, they made their way to Cervara where the day ended in drunken revelry. Photographs of masked artists by Gioacchino Altobelli and Giuseppe Primoli from later in the century make palpable the spectacle of the entourage (Figures 4.23-4.24). By comparison, Caneva depicted numerous sites associated with these events including the distinctive silhouette of the Tor de’ Schiavi (Figure 4.25), which contrasts the lively atmosphere of those later examples by its striking solitude and symbolic power.

Painter-patriots such as Caffi, Prampolini, Costa, Induno, and Vittorio Avondo, all contemporaries of Caneva and patrons of the Caffè Greco, participated in the Festa in the period before 1849, when it was interrupted until 1853 because of opposition from the Papal government. For example, Caffi documented the 1844 festival in a lively painting (Figure 4.26). In his autobiography, Costa fondly remembered the sense of freedom and liberty – resonant within Caffi’s canvas -- that characterized the event, and specifically linked his formative artistic experiences in Rome to his patriotic engagement. His memoir is filled with anecdotes about his friendships, artistic training and military exploits, and perhaps best capturing the bombastic tone of these reminiscences is his quip, “In the day we marched, in the night we danced.” Furthermore, as the historian Paolo Grassi has noted, between 1844 and 1848, the Festa began to take on a new significance, serving as an antidote to the static academic climate of the Restoration. The Festa of 1848 also bore signs of the political transformations occurring across Italy, and some of the carnival masks alluded to the revolutionary insurrections beginning

---

411 “Durante il giorno si marciava, la notte si ballava.”Nino Costa, Quel che vidi e quel che intesi a cura di Giorgia Guerrazzi Costa (Milan: Treves, 1927), 30.
to break out that year.\textsuperscript{412} Tellingly, Caffi, a dedicated annual participant, did not attend the 1848 festival because he had left Rome to fight in the Venetian War of Independence.\textsuperscript{413}

As a site strongly associated with youthful sentiment and an overall sense of freedom, the Campagna also became a symbolic touchstone for Italian artists’ personal and political awakenings. The writer, painter, and politician Massimo D’Azeglio’s memoir recounted his formative experience as a landscape painter in Rome and its natural surrounding in the 1820s and 1830s, and then as an artist and writer in Milan in the 1840s. Critical of the young patriots he encountered within these artistic circles, and in particular of the secret societies like \textit{Giovane Italia}, D’Azeglio nevertheless championed the creation of a nationalistic artistic culture expressed through literature and painting, one that by the time he wrote his memoir in 1866 already seemed compromised.

The historian Paul Ginsborg has emphasized the importance of Romanticism for understanding how the individual’s personal experience led to political action during the Risorgimento. This is epitomized in the vast number of autobiographies, letters, and recollections, like D’Azeglio’s, that were generated and circulated during this period. For Ginsborg, these memoirs articulate the generational nature of the Risorgimento, as well as its difficult-to-quantify emotional dimension.\textsuperscript{414} Written primarily after unification, such memoirs as D’Azeglio’s drew a direct association between their authors’ youth and patriotic sentiment, and provide evidence of the way strong feelings such as first love or parental rebellion were channeled into support for the national cause. For D’Azeglio and many artists of the time, the Italian landscape became a

\textsuperscript{412} Grassi, “La ‘festa,’” 17.
\textsuperscript{413} Pirani, “Amici e rivali,” 43.
viable subject for evoking these strong patriotic emotions. In his memoir, D’Azeglio complained that although Italian artists painted subjects from nature, they were not relying on observation, but rather imitation of French schools of landscape painting including Barbizon and the Impressionists. Nostalgic for his youth painting in the Campagna, he wrote:

Independence, nationality, united Italy, are our idols; and, indeed, landscape-painters are generally tuned to the cry of “Rome or Death;” yet when they take up a brush the only thing they do not copy is Italy! The glorious Italian scenery, the spending light, the rich hues of her skies, are deemed unworthy of being represented! … It is not enough to have independence on our lips, if it is not also in our hearts, and in everything—even in art. Let us be a nation—Italians—ourselves at last in everything, in every shape, and in every way; or if we will not act more, let us brag less loudly.415

As D’Azeglio’s quotation makes evident, foreign painters influenced the development of landscape painting within Italy. For local artists working in the Campagna, the task of developing an expression of nationalist ideals through this genre was carried out in direct response to the presence of this international artistic community, nonetheless, D’Azeglio argued that it was only through close observation and representation of the particular characteristics of the Italian landscape that painters would succeed in the creation of a national art.416 As a tool of direct observation, photography offered a visual model whose facticity would guide Italian artists in this patriotic endeavor.

Caneva’s photographs in the Campagna can loosely be grouped into two types: those that echoed the traditional compositional structure of landscape paintings, and studies that focused on particular motifs or topographical features isolated from the landscape. His photographs in the Campagna featured many sites that were popular among artists and travelers. For example, the Promenade of Poussin (Figure 4.27) led artists to produce sketches of the same area, following in

the footsteps of the master of the classical landscape, and thus attracting Caneva as well. In this photograph, Caneva’s composition draws the eye toward an arcing bridge through a succession overlapping planes. Whereas such a view would have been appealing to tourists and artists alike, Caneva’s studies formed typologies that resonated with a deeply rooted understanding of the connection between the land and Italian identity, such as characteristic flora, topographical formations, peasant dwellings, and vestiges of agricultural labor.\footnote{Maria Francesca Bonetti, “La Campagna romana: il paesaggio e gli studi per gli artisti,” in Roma 1840-1870: La Fotografia, il collezionista e lo storico, eds. Maria Francesca Bonetti, Chiara Dall’Olio and Alberto Prandi (Rome: Peliti Associati, 2008), 108.} For instance, Caneva made photographs depicting tufo rocks (Figure 4.28), agave plants (Figure 4.29), and umbrella pines (Figure 4.30), and olive trees (Figure 4.31). These trees represented distinctive flora that became symbolic of the Roman landscape. Furthermore, his images of roadside shrines (Figure 4.32), and thatched huts (Figure 4.33-34) recorded traces of the activities of peasants who lived and worked in the Campagna, thus linking that particular landscape to an indigenous Italian culture. These examples demonstrate photography’s capacity to extract fragmentary glimpses of the landscape and reconfigure them as a series of ideal (but real) elements and views, which in turn served as a powerful means of constructing national identity.

Nino Costa’s 1850-1852 canvas Le donne che imbarcano legna a porto di Anzio (Women carrying wood at the Port of Anzio) (Figure 4.35) is a key example of the emphasis on direct observation of nature that became critical to Italian landscape painters in this period, as well as the integral relationship of the peasant to the land in these works. It depicts two peasant women carrying branches to be loaded onto boats waiting along the coast. Costa produced the painting by quickly sketching an impression of the scene \textit{en plein air} and then making a drawing focused on particular details. The canvas itself was completed in the studio, using the sketches he
produced as reference material. Artists used Caneva’s photographs in the same way as sketches and studies made en plein air to reinforce the naturalism of such scenes. This approach was certainly indebted to methods employed by other artists working in Rome, both Italian and foreign, but in the case of Costa’s canvas, the resulting composition presents a realistic scene of peasant life tied to a particular landscape and raised to monumental status, thus creating a new national iconography rooted in its indigenous culture. Incidentally, Caneva made a number of photographs of Rome’s coastal landscape, including one of Anzio, sometime between 1852 and 1855 (Figure 4.36), which demonstrates that he explored the full territory of the Campagna with his camera in a manner analogous to Costa’s own search for homegrown subjects.

During the 1850s, Italian painters began to portray the territory naturalistically through direct observation. These paintings established the indigenous origins of a shared culture based on a relationship to the land, and thus proposed an image of the Italian nation. Caneva’s photographs of the Roman Campagna offered a powerful tool for this task not only because of their facticity, but also because this “painter-photographer” selected specific subjects that reflected the development of Italian painting at this time. As the only Italian member of the Roman School of photography, and the only one to make the Campagna a major focus of his work, Caneva stood apart from that group. His landscape photographs circulated among a network of Italian artists who were engaged with the representation of a shared national identity, and thus contributed to these aims.

418 Stefania Frezzotti, Nino Costa e il paesaggio dell’anima (Milan: Skira, 2009), 118-119.
Caneva’s Peasant Photographs

In addition to his early engagement with landscape, one of Caneva’s lasting contributions to photography in Italy was the creation of the peasant genre. With only a few exceptions, such as Guillot and Saguez’s photograph of a pifferaro discussed earlier, members of the Roman School of Photography were not known for this genre and Caneva thus distinguished himself for by this pictorial choice. Between 1848 and 1852, Caneva produced some thirty photographs of peasants, posed either on his terrace studio or in makeshift studio settings on the streets of Rome.419 These photographs encompass a set of typologies, including pifferari, ciociare (women and girls wearing the distinctive bark sandals called ciocie), nursing mothers, spinners, fishermen, shepherds, humble priests, and monks (Figures 4.37-4.39.) These images emphasize the distinctive costumes and objects associated with peasant life, such as the ciocie, as well as a variety of musical instruments, jugs, and spinning needles. Caneva also produced a series of related studies of livestock including sheep and oxen (Figure 4.40), and exceptionally, he created at least four multi-figure narrative tableaux that are some of the earliest staged photographs in the medium’s history, roughly contemporaneous with those of Talbot, D. O. Hill and Robert Adamson, Hippolyte Bayard, Humbert de Molard, and Charles Négre. Caneva sold his peasant

419 The number of peasant photographs made by Caneva is difficult to determine with precision. His peasant photographs are dispersed across a number of different collections, and there has been a tendency within the art market to attribute any early unsigned salted paper print depicting a Roman peasant to him. I believe that there are at least thirty images reasonably attributable to him based on the size, visibility of his studio’s distinctive terrace wall, repetition of models, and the presence of his signature on the print verso or other distinctive markings. For example, I have observed that a number of Caneva’s peasant studies have strike marks in black or colored crayon on the print verso that matches the same marks on autograph works, including examples in the Maggi Collection at the Biblioteca Panini, Modena and in the Ortolani Collection in the Alinari Archive, Florence.
photographs to Rome’s international artistic community as studies for paintings, however, no individual canvases can be said to directly copy one of his photographs.⁴²⁰

Artists would have treated Caneva’s peasant images much like sketches, offering a visually accurate depiction of costumes and props that could be incorporated into finished paintings within the artist’s studio. While Caneva made these photographs with painters in mind, and perhaps even in collaboration with other artists, they stand out as his own original compositions. These peasant photographs certainly appealed to the international community of artists working in Rome; however, I argue that they also held particular resonance with a new branch of Italian genre painting that emerged in the late 1840s and early 1850s as a patriotic art form. In these works, the peasants who were so closely bound to Italian soil became symbols of a nation violated by foreign occupation. Caneva’s photographs were also part of a more widespread shift in the iconography of peasants within European art from picturesque to Romantic and Realist modes, which occurred in tandem with the social and political upheaval of nineteenth-century politics. Responding to the events of the Roman Republic, Caneva adopted the peasant genre as a myth-making strategy that aligns his work with the nationalist content of Italian Romanticism more broadly.

⁴²⁰ Beginning in the late 1850s, Caneva’s peasant photographs were also reprinted and distributed by his fellow photographer Simelli, thus confirming their popularity. Among the artists known to have used or collected Caneva’s landscape and peasant photographs are Vittorio Avondo, Bernardo Celentano, Cristiano Banti, Alessandro Prampolini, Scipione Vannutelli, Michele Cammarano, Achille Vertunni, Nino Costa, Odoardo Borrani, Edmond Lebel, Théophile Chauvier, the Flandrin brothers, Jean-Baptiste Daniel-Dupuis, Bernardino Montañes, William Bougereau, and Charles Garnier. See, for example: Cinzia Virno, Scipione Vannutelli (1834-1894): il fondo di opere dalla Villa Clementi a Cave (Rome: De Luca, 2004), 28-37; Pierangelo Cavanna, Vittorio Avondo e la fotografia (Turin: Fondazione Torino musei, 2005); Monica Maffioli, Silvio Balloni, and Nadia Marchioni, I macchiaioli e la fotografia (Florence: Fratelli Alinari, 2008); Gasparini, “La raccolta delle carte salate della Scuola Romana di Fotografia dell’Istituto Statale d’Arte G. Chierici di Reggio Emilia,” 82; Bonetti, “‘Allora non d’altro si consigliava che della fotografia.’ Artisti e accademie alla prova della fotografia (1850-1880),” 99.
By the time Caneva began making his peasant photographs, the subject had already become a predominant artistic genre through which quotidian scenes of peasant life were combined with the moralistic narratives of genre painting to produce popular works aimed at an expanding middle class. The Roman engraver Bartolomeo Pinelli (1771-1835) and the Swiss genre painter Léopold Robert (1794-1835) best represent this picturesque turn, and it is from this tradition that Caneva’s photographs find their historical antecedents. By the 1840s, due to Robert’s success, peasant subjects were a firmly entrenched genre at the French Academy in Rome, promoted under the directorship of Ingres and popularized by his successor, another proponent of the genre, Victor Schnetz. Robert’s peasant scenes were some of the most widely popular paintings of their day. They were a sensation at the Salon of 1831, where Robert’s *Arrival of Harvesters in the Pontine Marshes* (Figure 4.41) elevated a peasant scene to the scale of history painting, and the image, widely distributed via engravings, became one of the most ubiquitous of the nineteenth century. During the Risorgimento, Italian artists transformed the figure of the peasant into a symbol of a martyred Italy, and many painters who had participated in the 1849 revolutions took up patriotic themes in their art as a means of demonstrating their continued political commitment during the 1850s.

---

422 Petrusa, “Iconografia del Costume Popolare,” 53.
424 *L’Artiste* commissioned a print reproduction from the engraver Paul Mercuri which was exhibited at the Salon of 1834, garnering him a second place medal for engraving and establishing his fame while bolstering Robert’s. The print went on to sell over one million copies. Ambrosini, “Peasants in French Painting, 1815-1848: The Romantic Roots of the Realist Mode,” 364-368.
The Milanese brothers Domenico and Gerolamo Induno became leading figures in the development of patriotic genre painting, which transformed scenes of everyday life into political allegories.\(^{425}\) For example, Gerolamo Induno’s *Trasteverina Killed by a Bomb* (Figure 4.42) transforms the familiar image of a costumed peasant girl into a scene of patriotic martyrdom and pathos.\(^{426}\) The painting depicts the lifeless body of a young girl who has been killed by a bomb fired by French forces during the siege of the Roman Republic. This subject was based on an actual event, the death of a young girl named Nella in her home in Rome’s Trastevere quarter on June 16, 1849.\(^{427}\) Significantly, critics contemporary to Induno identified the subject of this painting not as a Trasteverina, but instead as a *ciociara*, a designation used to describe the inhabitants of Ciociara, a region of the Campagna where the local population wore the characteristic *ciocie* (visible on the subject’s feet).\(^{428}\) By depicting the young girl in a traditional peasant costume, Induno transformed this specific girl into a figure who symbolized the nation itself, and thus the canvas allegorized Italy’s victimization due to foreign occupation and violence beyond the single incident it depicted. As the art historian Silvia Regonelli has argued, this symbolic valence elevated Induno’s dramatic canvas into a modern form of history painting. As this example demonstrates, during the Risorgimento, the emergence of a socially engaged art


\(^{428}\) Regonelli, *1861*, 114.
form based in real life enabled artists to pursue political themes while escaping censorship. This new type of genre painting was also promoted by leading critics and academicians such as Carlo Tenca in Milan and Pietro Selvatico in Venice as a moral art that would provide a civic example through its representation of familial relationships and piety.\footnote{Bordini, L’Ottocento, 75.} Caneva’s peasant photographs reinforced these themes, and thus contributed to the morphology by which the peasant was transformed into a national symbol of Italy.

In Caneva’s time, the majority of peasants were \textit{braccianti}, rural poor who worked for food rather than wages, who eked out a living through herding or plowing, taking jobs on railroad construction projects or migrating to Rome as day laborers. The peasants that he employed were most likely drawn from the groups of day laborers who congregated on the Spanish Steps looking for work as models.\footnote{Paul Ginsborg, “Peasants and Revolutionaries in Venice and the Veneto, 1848,” \textit{The Historical Journal} 17, no. 3 (1974): 503-550; Dora M. Dumont, “Rural Society and Crowd Action in Bologna, c. 1796-c.1831,” \textit{The Historical Journal} 48, no. 4 (2005): 977-997. There is relatively little information on the lives of peasants in Italy in the nineteenth century. Although focused on the Veneto and Bologna, these sources provide some general background and useful comparative information.} Caneva staged many of his peasant photographs on his terrace, and a photograph of his balcony (Figure 4.43) demonstrates how the outdoor space offered a light-filled makeshift studio for his compositions. His photograph of a reclining \textit{ciociarella} (Figure 4.44) bathed in light demonstrates how carefully he composed these peasant pictures. The use of a neutral background, which Caneva accomplished by posing his models against his terrace wall or in front of drapery, had already been adopted in studio portraits to heighten contrast and emphasize details of sitters’ physiognomy, clothing, and props. Most noteworthy, however, is the harmony of the composition, balanced between the young girl’s dreamy pose -- her arms and feet are delicately crossed -- and the pattern of shadows cast on the
It is a scene both still and transitory. Caneva has sensitively positioned his camera at the level of the young girl rather than from above, heightening the sense of intimacy.

The same models appeared repeatedly in Caneva’s photographs, sometimes with different props or in the company of others, suggesting that, like any artist, he developed relationships with his favorite sitters. In the case of the *ciociarella*, the photograph’s mount bears the pencil inscription “Carlotta Cortudino,” identifying the young girl by name rather than as an anonymous peasant type. This is also the case of another photograph depicting a *pifferaro*, who, the inscription reveals, is a man named Tullio (Figure 4.45). The insistence on the particularity of these peasants as individuals makes Caneva’s practice distinct from later nineteenth-century photographs of peasants made for ethnographic or documentary purposes. In both of these examples, Caneva’s inscriptions underscore the facticity of the photographs by ascribing individuality to their subjects, demonstrating how photography offered to the peasant genre specificity and authenticity that other media could not equal.

Caneva produced several photographs that feature breastfeeding young women or peasant families. Whereas the single figure studies, such as the *pifferaro* Tullio or a young woman spinning, suggest common activities associated with peasant life, these multi-figure compositions convey the characteristics that nineteenth-century viewers, in particular the artists for whom such photographs were intended, ascribed to peasants. Caneva’s breastfeeding mothers are modestly posed, with lace garments and their babies’ heads covering their bodies (Figure 4.46-4.47). For these compositions, the women are seated in natural settings or makeshift studios, sometimes with additional props such as a bassinet. By depicting peasant women breastfeeding, these photographs suggest a natural order in which the mother nourishes and provides for her children. These everyday scenes of familial harmony accord with Caneva’s representations of peasant
couples and families, one of which is particularly notable for the presence of a father figure looking on tenderly (Figure 4.48).\textsuperscript{431} In this period, the Milanese art critic Tenca championed genre scenes as a replacement for the defunct category of religious painting.\textsuperscript{432} Indeed, Caneva’s photographs of peasant families evoke traditional compositions of the Madonna and Child or the Holy Family, but focus on everyday life. These multi-figure studies can thus be seen as conveying a simple moral message about the importance of traditional familial roles. Significantly, during the Risorgimento kinship bonds became the basis for exploring themes of religious piety and personal sacrifice, values that shaped the construction of Italian national identity.

Alberto Mario Banti has pointed to the prevalence of “a common form of national allegory,” during the Risorgimento, in which “a young woman with a bared breast symbolizes the capacity of the mother-fatherland to feed its sons the values of liberty.”\textsuperscript{433} This iconography had immediate roots in the French Revolution, and became popular in Italy during the Napoleonic and Restoration periods. At that time, women in particular were often depicted as personifications of the state or as allegories of liberty.\textsuperscript{434} For example, the most famous image associated with revolution in the nineteenth century, Delacroix’s \textit{Liberty Leading the People} (Figure 4.49), depicts the figure of Marianne, symbol of the Republic, as a potent combination of realistic and ideal traits. Her robust, barefoot figure advances over a mass of bodies, her dress

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{431} On these themes, see: Carol Duncan, “Happy Mothers and Other New Ideas in French Art,” \textit{Art Bulletin} 55 (1973): 570-583.
\end{flushright}
falling to expose her breasts while she lifts her arm to grasp the tricolour. The realism of Delacroix’s painting troubled some contemporaries who feared the threat that freedom might pose to the status quo when applied to women.435

In Italy, on the other hand, the figure of a crowned Italia baring her breast and nurturing her citizens was informed by a much longer allegorical representation of the Virgin Mary nurturing the Christ child, which was itself a potent metaphor for the Roman Catholic Church’s relationship to its devoted.436 During the Risorgimento, however, women were more likely to be depicted as maternal figures or as victims of sexual violence.437 Instead of leading her people, the allegorical Italy urged her male kin to restore her honor, defiled by foreign domination, through retribution. The motif can be observed in Hayez’s 1851 painting Meditation, which depicts a bare-breasted woman staring accusingly out at the viewer, while grasping a crucifix and a book titled Storia d’Italia (Figure 4.50). Similarly, his Sicilian Vespers, based on a popular historical novel of the period, depicts a scene from a Sicilian insurrection against French troops initiated when a French soldier violated a young woman during early evening mass (Figure 4.51). The young woman swoons, her dress torn to reveal her breast, as her husband avenges this act of sexual violence by murdering the French soldier.438 Marina Warner has argued that the bare-breasted allegorical female figure “proclaims its virtues by abandoning protective coverings, to announce it has no need of them. By exposing vulnerable flesh as if it were not so, and especially by uncovering the breast, softest and most womanly part of woman, as if it were invulnerable, to

the semi-clad female figure expresses strength and freedom. “Significantly, the female allegorical representations that emerged in Risorgimento Italy were founded less in idealism than in realism. Whereas French critics may have been unnerved by the raw power of Delacroix’s Marianne, Italian representations of the nation as an allegorical female figure were firmly rooted in reality; she was a daughter, sister, mother, and wife, and her symbolic power came from her relationship to the Italian soil and her religious faith.

Caneva created four staged narrative tableaux that demonstrate, in various ways, his engagement with these myth-making strategies based on themes of family, piety, and/or personal sacrifice, and rooted in the explorations of his peasant studies. Two of these staged allegorical photographs overtly explored the classical iconography of the breastfeeding woman through the mythological story of the Roman Charity. In this legend, recorded by Pliny the Elder (VIII, 36, 121-122) and depicted in wall paintings at Pompeii, a young woman named Pero visits her imprisoned father, who has been sentenced to death by starvation, and breastfeeds him. She is caught, but her selfless act secures her father’s release. The classical subject was revived during the Renaissance, but grew to prominence during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, popularized through representations ranging from Caravaggio’s realism to Greuze’s moralism. In the latter period, emphasis shifted from Pero’s filial loyalty to revolutionary sacrifice, with Pero serving as exemplum virtutis and political allegory during both the French and American Revolutions.

---

Certainly, the Roman Charity—a story about the daughter’s bearing her breast to nourish her father, an act which leads to his liberation from jail—demonstrates the continued potency of this allegorical motif in Revolutionary Rome. In one photograph (Figure 4.52), a male model slouches against an upturned basket, his face tilted toward a female model fully clothed in classical garb, who bends to feed him from a small bowl. In the variant image, however, the female model is seated, offering her breast to the man whose body is draped across her lap while turning her head away in an act of humility (Figure 4.53). In this second version, there are no props, and the makeshift nature of the setting is more fully revealed: the edge of the backdrop hanging behind the figures remains within the frame and an extraneous bucket and planter intrude, piercing the illusion of the scene. Whereas previous depictions of the Roman Charity concealed their erotic charge through the artifice of their painted surfaces, this photograph’s direct relationship to reality ensures that the scene depicted actually occurred in front of the camera, even if it was staged. In Caneva’s Roman Charity, the sublimation of the potentially salacious image of the exposed breast heightens the physicality of Pero’s act of filial loyalty. Photography thus breathed new life into a familiar iconography, wresting it from the realm of pure allegory heightening the story’s contemporary relevance to Risorgimento Rome.

Another of Caneva’s staged tableaux, The Last Rites (Figure 4.54), takes place in the present-day of nineteenth-century Italy. In this genre scene, a priest gives a dying adolescent peasant girl final communion, while her family solemnly watches from her side. The most carefully composed of Caneva’s tableaux, the scene is comprised of numerous props and reveals few traces of the staging that were so evident in the Roman Charity photographs. Here, a backdrop of curtains delineates the space of a humble peasant home filled with domestic objects.

such as blankets, a jug, and a candlestick. A framed print of the Virgin Mary looking down from above hangs just behind the figure of the priest. This tableau shares its subject with Henry Peach Robinson’s famous photograph *Fading Away* (Figure 4.55), which was not only staged, but, unlike Caneva’s image, also produced from a combination print of five negatives. The highly constructed nature of both images reflects their respective photographer’s artistic aspirations. Whereas Robinson focused on the pathos of a young woman who died before her time, Caneva’s photograph places religious faith at the core of the narrative by depicting the Catholic rite of extreme unction. Through its specificity and detail, Caneva’s *The Last Rites* is a contemporary genre scene that conveys the intertwined bonds of family and church that were central to the construction of a shared Italian culture during the Risorgimento.

The scene of a fatally wounded peasant surrounded by his family brings together the themes of family, piety, and martyrdom that were fundamental to Risorgimento iconography (Figure 4.56). The Christological imagery evoked in the deposition-like staging of this photograph elevates this genre scene to the level of allegory. Deriving its impact from religious iconography, this image makes visible the process by which kinship bonds were symbolically tied to those of a wider Catholic family within Italy, thus forming the basis of a shared national identity. The photograph depicts four figures arranged symmetrically around a cross, evoking the iconography of the deposition of Christ, a common motif that was also the basis for the composition of Filippo Vittori’s *Death of Lucio Manara*, discussed in the previous chapter. In Caneva’s theatrical image, a young man takes center stage in the place of the crucified Christ, while around him kneel two women and an older man dressed as a priest. The gesture of the
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442 As mentioned in the previous chapter, a classic example of this Christian symbolism is found in the death of the eponymous general in Benjamin West’s *The Death of General Wolfe*, 1770, oil on canvas, The National Gallery of Canada, Ottawa. The photograph of Filippo Vittori’s painting of Luciano Manara exhibits a similar composition and motif.
woman kneeling by his head (in the spot typically reserved for Mary) is one of verification; she gently turns his face to reveal to the viewer that, indeed, he is dead. Acknowledging this, the priest raises his hand in benediction, letting his rosary fall delicately across the stark white breeches of the dead youth, while at his feet a young woman clasps her folded hands and tilts her chin in mourning. This dramatic scene of martyrdom and sacrifice does not unfold on the forbidding hill of Golgotha, however, but in the here and now of 1850s Rome. The figures wear simple peasant clothes rather than the classical robes characteristic of timeless religious paintings, and terra cotta jugs and potted plants replace the skulls, snakes, and other accouterments of the crucifixion. This brief iconographic analysis suggests a basic narrative: somewhere in Rome or the Campagna in the nineteenth century, a young man has been killed, his own gun fallen by his side. His family—maybe his mother, sister, or young widow—gather to mourn his death. Made in the years following the defense of the Roman Republic, Caneva’s photograph can be interpreted as a political allegory in which the young peasant soldier symbolizes a martyred Italy. Furthermore, the emphasis within the composition on the women who mourn him conveys the moral lesson that each individual (and each gender) has a contribution to make in this national struggle.

As this chapter demonstrates, Caneva’s landscape and peasant photographs, the first of their kind in Italy, formed a set of visual typologies of the Italian nation rooted in its land and people that established a shared cultural, and thus, national identity. By using the medium of photography, his studies of the characteristic flora, topography, and peasant dwellings in the Campagna, as well as those of peasant musicians, children, and families, brought an unprecedented level of realism to these depictions. His four allegorical photographs represent a small fraction of his larger output as a photographer, but they are remarkable, at this early age,
for their complex engagement with themes contemporary to political life in Rome and apparent in the work of other artists within his milieu. His choice of subject and compositional style was shaped both by his own artistic training and also by the international community of artists working in Rome for whom they were made, notably, painters like Avondo, Celentano, Morelli, Costa, and Induno. His photographs were thus informed not only by international aesthetic trends, but also, and more specifically, by a critical imperative from within Italy to produce works that realistically recorded the experience of everyday life, and which thus contributed to the development of a shared national identity.
CHAPTER FIVE

“Mutual Illumination”: The Printmaking and Photography of Luigi Sacchi

The Career of Luigi Sacchi

In 1851, Luigi Sacchi set out from his native Milan on a pilgrimage to document on paper negatives the most important historic sites from throughout Italy with the intention of issuing the images as a commercial series of salt prints. The resulting publication, *Monumenti, Vedute e Costumi d’Italia* (1852-1855), which featured locales from as far north as Como in Lombardy to as far south as Palermo in Sicily, presented a coherent vision of a culturally unified country during the Risorgimento. This chapter examines Sacchi’s early career as an academy-trained painter, printmaker, and editor in Milan in order to demonstrate how his involvement with the city’s artistic and publishing communities impacted his development as a photographer. Milan’s art academy, the Accademia di Belle Arti di Brera (hereafter, Brera Academy), and the city’s vibrant publishing industry were led by an elite group of powerful liberal intellectuals who played a critical role in disseminating a nationalist discourse to an urban bourgeois public sphere before Unification.443 I argue that Sacchi’s photographs contributed to this nation-building project by depicting sites that resonated with a shared Italian history. The series thus presented a visual typology of the monuments, views, and costumes that comprised the Italian nation. Significantly, the photographs included in *Monumenti, Vedute e Costumi d’Italia* provided a visually accurate counterpart to other works of artistic and literary Romanticism produced in Milan during this period, which also communicated a patriotic message.

Sacchi trained as a painter at the Brera Academy under the artist Francesco Hayez, a key figure in the creation of a new genre of Romantic history painting in Italy that depicted subjects drawn from Milan’s late medieval and early Renaissance periods. The twelfth to sixteenth centuries in particular represented a golden age of self-governance in which northern cities united to form a single political and military force known as the Lombard League that expelled the Holy Roman Emperor Frederick I Barbarossa from Italy. This episode provided a model for the contemporary political situation of Risorgimento Milan, which was also under Austrian rule, by suggesting that Italy unify to expel this foreign regime. Sacchi’s engagement with subjects related to this history remained central to all of his artistic endeavors, and his adoption of the reproducible mediums of prints and photographs demonstrates his desire to communicate this patriotic message to a wider public.

Sacchi began photography around 1845 after successfully working as an editor and illustrator in collaboration with Giuseppe and Defendente Sacchi (his brother and cousin, respectively) who were influential journalists and statisticians. His experience as the pictorial editor and engraver for their illustrated weekly magazine, *Cosmorama Pittorico*, and as editor for the illustrated edition of Alessandro Manzoni’s historical romance novel, *I Promessi sposi* (*The Betrothed*, 1840) put Sacchi into close contact with Milan’s literary elite. The latter text played an important role in the development of national identity during the Risorgimento, and Sacchi’s involvement with this project stands as proof of his patriotism. This chapter explores how the specificity of the Milanese context inflected Sacchi’s thinking and his art, and propelled him to create *Monumenti, Vedute e Costumi d’Italia*, a remarkable body of work aimed at not only representing Italy as a coherent cultural and historically entity, but also at educating his audience
about that shared history and promoting it as relevant to the contemporary political situation of
the Risorgimento.

**Journalism in Restoration Milan**

The deeply intertwined nature of Milan’s literary and artistic networks is key to
understanding Luigi Sacchi’s development as an artist and thinker. He was born in 1805 to
Giuseppe Sacchi and Teresa Sommariva, and maintained a close working relationship with his
older brother Giuseppe (1804-1891) and cousin Defendente (1796-1840) throughout his life.
The family was part of a wider liberal intellectual community centered around the jurist,
philosopher, and economic historian Gian Domenico Romagnosi (1761-1835), who briefly
served as editor of the influential journal *Biblioteca Italiana* before his arrest and imprisonment
in Venice for alleged participation in a plot organized by a group of Carbonari against the
Austrian government. Romagnosi’s most important role, however, was that of teacher to a
younger generation of bourgeois professionals who championed his concept of *incivilimento*
(civilization), which held that civic improvement required the practical application of legal and
social policies, and that this progress could be measured through statistics.444 Romagnosi’s
teachings significantly influenced not only the Sacchi family, but also other key figures within
the intellectual life of Restoration Milan, such as Carlo Cattaneo (1801-1869), who used
journalism as a means of disseminating these political philosophies to the public sphere. Luigi
Sacchi adopted the reproducible mediums of lithography, wood engraving, and eventually,
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444 Silvana Patriarca, *Numbers and Nationhood: Writing Statistics in Nineteenth-Century Italy*
and liberalism in the Risorgimento: A Study of Nationalism in Lombardy, 1814-1848*, Revised
photography as a visual counterpart to the political and didactic content produced by this network of journalists.

The Austrian government established the literary journal *Biblioteca Italiana* in 1816 in an attempt to attract the Milanese intellectual community to support imperial policies. Although the project was ultimately unsuccessful, the importance of literature within public debate made Milan fertile ground for the development of literary Romanticism in Italy during the years between 1816 and 1821, which in turn inspired artists at the Brera Academy to engage with historical themes. In the pages of *Biblioteca Italiana*, Milan’s leading intellectual figures debated the state of Italian literature by responding to Madame de Staël’s criticism (published in the journal) that Italian culture had stagnated. She argued that Italians should look over the Alps for inspiration, and in reaction, Italian intellectuals championed the “consciousness of history as a method and as a theme” that would reinvigorate their national literature.\(^{445}\) Furthermore, many writers began to argue for the popularization of culture in the form of newspapers, poetry, novellas, and especially the theater, where historical themes might inspire larger audiences.\(^{446}\)

In fact, the Restoration represented a publishing boom in Milan despite the government’s close control and censorship of the press. The Northern territory of Lombardy-Veneto produced twice as many books as the rest of Italy, and in Milan numerous journals arose catering to the growing bourgeoisie.\(^{447}\) The Sacchi brothers were active participants in the broader shift from the erudite debates of literary journals like *Biblioteca Italiana* to the encyclopedic and practical topics that characterized new publications of the 1820s and 1830s, especially those released by the Società degli Annali, a corporation formed of editors and publishers working in the same

---

\(^{446}\) Caesar, *Modern Italian Literature*, 92-94.  
ideological and commercial framework.⁴⁴⁸ Their weekly and daily publications, most notably the *Annali universali di statistica*, offered an all-encompassing representation of civic and industrial progress in Italy and abroad, reporting on subjects as diverse as new scientific discoveries, the building of railroads, art exhibitions, and economic development. In the early 1830s, Defendente and Giuseppe wrote a majority of the publication’s articles, and Luigi produced the graphic tables.⁴⁴⁹

Silvana Patriarca has argued that *Annali universali di statistica* promoted a nationalist discourse through its use of a particularly Italian brand of statistics that emerged during the 1820s. She writes, “These works constituted the kind of literature that most distinctively illustrates what the promoters of statistics in the Italian states meant when they used the word ‘statistics’: a mainly descriptive endeavor aimed at constructing a comprehensive picture of a country, or of any of its subdivisions, with numbers, in order to evaluate its overall condition, and most importantly, its degree of ‘civilization.’”⁴⁵⁰ As the title suggests, *Annali universali di statistica* assumed a detached, quantitative tone, often presenting its findings as statistical tables or a “taking stock” of the economic and social state of Milan, Italy, and Europe. This was a means of avoiding censorship while promoting a particular moderate liberal viewpoint, since it offered a comparative perspective by which readers could judge Italy’s relative socio-economic and cultural progress.⁴⁵¹ Romagnosi’s influence on the Sacchis’ intellectual development is

---


⁴⁴⁹ Giuseppe became its director in 1852 until the publication ceased in 1871. Patriarca, *Numbers and Nationhood*, 39; Mazzocca, *Quale Manzoni?*, 126.


especially pertinent to the popularization of this brand of “descriptive statistics,” because his approach cautioned against a reliance on numbers alone to account for the achievements of civilization.

The Sacchis’ contributions to these journalistic endeavors demonstrate their broader view of statistics as but one form of representing the current political and economic state of affairs in Italy. Patriarca discusses the approach to statistics in this period as, “a sort of statistical panopticon: the desire to know everything in order to control everything, and the desire to control everything in order to make the body social more productive and useful.” This concept finds a perfect analogue in the medium of photography; each might be considered “an art of describing,” their ostensibly scientific and un-interpretive natures thus made them ideal tools of knowledge and social control. Just as the dry actuarial tables of the *Annuali universali di statistica* offered both a straightforward statistical accounting and a means of comparison and analysis between Italian states and Europe, so would photography offer the illusion of a transparent window through which to assess what constituted Italy. For Luigi Sacchi, photography’s facticity and reproducibility would offer a visual counterpart to the politically motivated journalistic efforts of his intellectual community that surpassed the persuasive power of traditional printed media.

The Sacchis’ first artistic collaboration was a two-volume book on the history of medieval architecture, *Antichità Romantiche d’Italia* (1828), written by Defendente and
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452 Patriarca notes that French statisticians used the term “descriptive statistics” pejoratively, but she recuperates it as a means of demonstrating how statistics were used practically in Italy. Patriarca, *Numbers and Nationhood*, 24-25.
Giuseppe. The text was to be accompanied by lithographs in a large folio produced by Luigi, and although he apparently prepared drawings for these illustrations, the prints were likely never realized and the originals have been lost. It is probable that the lithographs were to be made upon subscription, but due to their high price, they were never produced. The published text, and the impetus behind the joint project, which is recorded in the introduction to the book, nevertheless provides evidence of the way that the Sacchis used history as a model to instruct contemporary audiences in civic-mindedness. In particular, Antichità Romantiche d’Italia re-evaluates the Middle Ages in Italy, from the fifth to the sixteenth century, through the lens of its architecture. The authors purport to cover the entirety of Italy, nonetheless, the book focuses primarily on the Sacchis’ native Lombardy, and includes a few sections devoted to monuments in Tuscany and Naples.

Written chiefly by Defendente, the text argues that the self-governance of Italy’s city-states during the twelfth to sixteenth centuries achieved a cultural and political golden age that could be looked to for inspiration in the contemporary time. This opinion was one shared by other scholars in Italy, who used the past as a coded means of critiquing foreign rule, leading to a revival of interest in medieval and early Renaissance history within cultural forms during the Risorgimento. Defendente maintained that the thousand years between the fall of the Roman Empire and the sixteenth century should be viewed as two distinct periods: one of decline precipitated by barbarian invasion and rule, and the other of regeneration and “risurgimento”

[sic] characterized by the thriving of municipal governments. This interpretation of the medieval period within Italy, and especially Lombardy, proposed a historical narrative that directly linked cultural production to the political situation both in the past and during the nineteenth century. In essence, the text argued that the relative civic and moral health of a society could be diagnosed through the forms of its architecture and the extent to which they fulfilled the needs of the community. Through this lens, Defendente judged periods of foreign occupation harshly against the achievements of homegrown rule. The twelfth-century Lombard League and the Duchy of Milan, which thrived under the Visconti and Sforza families until the sixteenth-century, thus became exemplary historical models used to propel political action against foreign rule during the Risorgimento.

Despite the lack of surviving visual evidence, this publication marks Sacchi’s first known involvement with printmaking. That images were to be an important element of the book’s overall conception is made clear in an introductory notice to readers published in the first volume:

"It therefore remains to be said that to the text sent to Brescia [where the book was published] were joined nine large plates in folio, which we will list. They were all Italian monuments of the Lombard period, surveyed and measured on site, and drawn by the painter Luigi Sacchi. Some of these monuments were previously unpublished, and others outlined upon a scale not previously offered at such great size, all were then verified from life, and their primitive forms reproduced correctly. In this way, the series of plates constitutes an atlas illustrating the text, and by ordering it in this way forms a work of art that can be detached. We discussed this necessity with the aforementioned artist who wished to make public his work on its own account, while the publication of analogous illustrations might give mutual illumination to our respective research."
The “mutual illumination” of images and text, although apparently a failed enterprise in this case, would later become critical for the Sacchis’ editorial approach to their illustrated magazine *Cosmorama Pittorico*. Whereas Artaria’s publication, discussed in Chapter Two, highlighted recent constructions and public gathering spaces as a means of declaring Italian modernity, the Sacchis’ intellectual reappraisal of medieval architecture via Defendente’s text provided an idealized model of civic-mindedness for contemporary audiences to follow. Furthermore, by identifying and illustrating monuments that had previously not been acknowledged as historically significant, they validated them as important examples of cultural patrimony, and thus established a new taxonomy of key architectural sites deserving of preservation. The Sacchi’s intellectual development, and in particular their commitment to publishing as a means of educating the bourgeois public sphere in Milan about its own history underlay Luigi Sacchi’s engagement with reproducible media, and especially his turn to photography.

“*Mutual Illumination*”: Luigi Sacchi and *Cosmorama Pittorico*

The Sacchis launched the weekly magazine *Cosmorama Pittorico* in Milan in 1835, making it the first illustrated periodical in Italy.\(^{459}\) Defendente Sacchi founded *Cosmorama Pittorico* under the umbrella of the Società degli Annali, and based its format on the model of Great Britain’s *Penny Magazine* and France’s *Magasin pittoresque*. Whereas the *Annali Universali di Statistica* focused on political economy, *Cosmorama Pittorico* was a “variety” magazine that discussed geography, art, literature, and travel, and also featured lengthy historical
and biographical articles. The first issue appeared in January 1835 and it was published weekly until 1848, when production ceased.\textsuperscript{460} During the first year of publication, Defendente and Giuseppe wrote the majority of its articles, while Luigi produced numerous lithograph illustrations and coordinated an archive of stock images by other artists that could be incorporated into relevant articles.\textsuperscript{461} Defendente continued as editor until his death in 1840, and Giuseppe and Luigi seem to have ceased their work on the magazine at the same time. During the short period of the Sacchis’ activity with this journal, \textit{Cosmorama Pittorico} expressed many of the ideas they had also explored in the \textit{Annali}, while aiming for a broader audience. Specifically, it combined the big picture view of the state of Italy promoted in their statistical endeavors with an emphasis on Italy’s great achievements through articles chronicling key monuments and art works, both old and new. Significantly, despite government censorship and regulation, this publication was available outside of Lombardy, thus communicating their message across Italy’s regions.\textsuperscript{462}

Although scholars have acknowledged the ideological influence of Luigi Sacchi’s work for \textit{Cosmorama Pittorico} on his later photographic publication \textit{Monumenti, Vedute e Costumi}

\textsuperscript{460} A second series started in 1851, when it became a daily journal. Miraglia “Luigi Sacchi artista e fotografo,” 13; Marino Berengo, \textit{Intellettuali e librai}, 234-235.
\textsuperscript{461} Sacchi produced at least one illustration for thirty-three out of the initial fifty-two issues. In the earliest issues of the magazine, illustrations were only sporadically signed, and there were relatively few autograph images by Sacchi, though others can be identified as his by their formal characteristics. His work as an illustrator seems to have accelerated around the twentieth issue, and continued steadily into 1840. Each issue was composed of eight pages, with over half of the space occupied by lithographic illustrations. Typically, a single artist provided the majority of illustrations for an issue, which consisted of a large signed cover, and around three to five additional images of either half-page or quarter page vignettes, usually unsigned. Artists for the journal during Sacchi’s tenure included: B. Pampari, E. Parker, L. Elena, G. Ferrari, G. Fiorentini; additional writers included Cristoforo Cattaneo, Luigi Cibrario, Ignazio Cantù, Carlo Cattaneo, among others.
\textsuperscript{462} Silvana Patriarca, \textit{Numbers and Nationhood}, 44. \textit{Cosmorama Pittorico} boasted thousands of copies in circulation, but the average printing per issue was more likely around 300-500 per issue.
d’Italia, the images he contributed to the periodical have not been examined.\textsuperscript{463} As the magazine’s pictorial editor during its first years, Luigi established the visual strategies that defined not only this particular publication, but his future printed and photographic endeavors as well. The magazine’s repertoire of subjects and themes reflected the popularity within Milan of Romanticism as an artistic and literary genre. Above all, his involvement with \textit{Cosmorama Pittorico} proves his engagement with the intertwined themes of reproduction, cultural patrimony, and history that have been central to this dissertation, and reveals his expertise in a variety of artistic mediums and genres.

Sacchi’s perspectival view of Pisa’s Campo Santo (Figure 5.1) in an early issue represents the magazine’s visual approach and the way images enhanced the content of the text. The lithograph accompanies Giuseppe’s report on his travel to Tuscany, blending historical fact with an eyewitness account that frequently relies on the first person (i.e., “When I visited…”). The article focuses on the Campo Santo’s architectural and artistic features, praising the “Italian gracefulness” (\textit{leggiadria italiana}) of the portico’s gothic tracery, calling its sculptures a “true museum of antiquity” (\textit{un vero museo di antichità}) and the frescoes by Benozzo Gozzoli, Antonio Veneziano, and others, “a precious gallery” (\textit{preziosa galleria}) that “present[s] a faithful history of the resurgence of this art in the Middle Ages.”\textsuperscript{464} Notably, Giuseppe’s account emphasizes the significance of the Campo Santo as a specifically Italian medieval structure, and gives special importance to the monument as the source of the Renaissance “rebirth” of Italian culture. By singling out this particular site for praise, the article contributed to the creation of a

\textsuperscript{463} The exception is Moe, whose argument centers on Northern Italian depictions of Southern Italy, though he does not discuss Sacchi’s photographic work. Nelson Moe, \textit{The View from Vesuvius} (Berekley: University of California Press, 2002), 100.

new typology of key examples of architectural patrimony that symbolized a shared Italian heritage.

The final paragraph of the text refers directly to the nearly full-page illustration above it, which, Giuseppe notes, has been “traced” from a recent publication focused on the Campo Santo’s portico frescoes. The illustration has an imposing presence and the reader must turn the magazine to view it at its correct horizontal orientation. Although Giuseppe does not name the image from which the lithograph was copied, it is most likely Giovanni Paolo Lasinio’s *Raccolta di Sarcofagi, Urne, e altri Monumenti di Scultura del Campo Santo di Pisa* (1814), and a comparison of the two prints shows that Sacchi’s illustration replicates the point of view of Lasinio’s (Figure 5.2), even including the same pair of figures admiring the frescoes. Sacchi rendered the frescoes with a thinly weighted line, emphasizing their contours such that the subjects of individual panels are legible. The illustration thus reinforces the text’s emphasis on the frescoes, and lends authority to Giuseppe’s eyewitness account. The fact that Sacchi’s illustration derived directly from Lasinio’s print underscores this “firsthand” approach; although the lithograph is a copy, it is one traced directly to the source. Sacchi’s turn to photography for his subsequent *Monumenti, Vedute e Costumi d’Italia* demonstrates clearly the impetus to get even closer to the historic monument, and to be the first to represent it in this new, more factual, medium.

In addition to providing illustrations for his collaborators’ articles, Sacchi also wrote about his own trip to France for the magazine, offering a much lighter, anecdotal tone than Defendente and Giuseppe’s historical travel accounts. For example, one of these features
recounts his visit to the zoo in the gardens of the Museum of Natural History in Paris, where Sacchi joyfully relates watching an elephant dip its trunk in a pool of water to spray onlookers who have paid for the privilege. The article notes that the accompanying illustration reproduces a drawing from his sketchbook made on the site, and features an elephant poised on the edge of a pond, with a loosely outlined giraffe in the background (Figure 5.3).

In another example, Sacchi presents a two-page panorama of Paris from Montmartre (Figure 5.4). The accompanying text again testifies that the illustration is from a drawing produced on the spot, and recounts the author’s attempts to find a suitable vantage point from which to take in the whole city. Sacchi explains that climbing the Panthéon and the Vendôme Column left him unsatisfied, while a small piazza in Montmartre offered the ideal position from which to view Paris’s most important landmarks, which he recorded in captions and identified in the text. In both of these examples, the eyewitness account is central. In “mutual illumination,” the text and images drawn from reality offered the reader of Cosmorama Pittorico an immediate experience of a foreign place, and involved him or her as active participant in the story.

The informational quality of the magazine could also be tempered by the sometimes fantastical quality of its illustrations. In a biting review of the Sacchis’ efforts with Cosmorama Pittorico, Carlo Cattaneo (a former collaborator on the Annali universali di statistica) wrote that they “have set themselves up with Cosmorama to explain little pictures to children.” Although clearly meant as a slight toward what he viewed as frivolous entertainment rather than serious journalism, the rhetoric is telling of the Sacchis’ larger aims: the moral and civic education of an

467 Quoted in Moe, The View from Vesuvius, 93.
ever broadening public. Illustrations provided a means of communicating to as wide an audience as possible, even – potentially – an illiterate one. By Unification in 1861, only about twenty-five percent of Italy’s population of 25 million were literate, although significantly, Lombardy’s literacy rates were higher than the rest of the country.\textsuperscript{468} Ultimately, the popularity of illustrated periodicals hinged upon their capacity to entertain, and thus to convey information via a pleasurable and novel format. Through their combination of text and image, as well as strategies such as serial articles and the repetition of images across issues, the magazines created an “imagined community” of knowing readers, and supplied them with edifying lessons about Italian history and culture.\textsuperscript{469}

In this regard, the Sacchis’ work on \textit{Cosmorama Pittorico} was perfectly in keeping with similar efforts by leading literary figures and thinkers in their social and professional milieu, and typified by another new type of publication that combined word and image: \textit{strenne}, or keepsakes. Particular to Milan, these small cards, calendars, and other printed items were published and sold towards the end of the year as Christmas and New Year’s gifts.\textsuperscript{470} An illustration from \textit{Cosmorama Pittorico} depicts a group of fashionable Milanese exchanging these

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{468} Several Italian illustrated magazines provide information on their cost and circulation. \textit{Teatro universale} figured its readership at ten thousand and \textit{Poliorama Pittoresco} boasted “thousands.” One magazine estimated the total number of illustrated magazines in circulation in the Italian peninsula at 300,000. Giordano, \textit{La Stampa Illustrata}, 21. On the use of the Italian language in nineteenth-century Italy, see also: Michele Colombo and John J. Kinder, “Italian as a Language of Communication in Nineteenth Century Italy and Abroad,” \textit{Italica} 89, no. 1 (Spring 2012): 109-121; Lucy Riall, \textit{Garibaldi Invention of a Hero} (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), 135.
\item \textsuperscript{469} Benedict Anderson, \textit{Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism} (London: Verso, 1983) argues that during the nineteenth century, shared language and media, especially newspapers, constructed a sense of belonging to an “imagined community,” and that nationalism developed out of these social formations.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
small books and leaflets (Figure 5.5). In the 1830s, the publisher Vallardi expanded on the tradition by issuing new forms of *strenne* that incorporated poems and literary texts by leading writers. Two types of this “high-brow” iteration emerged: almanacs and the *Non ti scordar di me* (“Forget me not”), which were typically four to nine pages long and featured poems and novellas illustrated by lithographs or wood engravings. Giuseppe and Defendente Sacchi frequently contributed to the *strenne*, and later on, Giuseppe reissued his work in this genre, along with other popular writing, in the anthology *Racconti Morali e Storici (Moral and Historic Tales)*, accompanied by 66 illustrations by Luigi Sacchi.471 For this publication, Sacchi used the new technique of polytype, a form of producing quick facsimiles of wood engravings using casts made via metal molds pulled directly from the original woodblocks. Polytypy allowed for more illustrations, vignettes, and decorative material in relation to the text than previous methods allowed. Sacchi invented his own improvement to the process, and opened a printing establishment using the new technology in 1839. The volume *Milano e il suo territorio*, discussed in Chapter Two, was also produced by this method, and Sacchi, who is mentioned in that text, may have served as its editor, providing further evidence of his prominent position within progressive intellectual circles in Milan.472

In his illustrations for *Racconti Morali e Storici*, Sacchi drew on his experiences with *Cosmorama Pittorico* to produce portraits, *vedute*, and decorative vignettes, some borrowed directly from the pages of the magazine. This reuse of images from the illustrated periodical provides further evidence of the development of a knowing readership among which these new literary genres circulated. One of Giuseppe Sacchi’s stories in fact thematized the innovative

relationship of text to image by using the conceit of a mother teaching her young children about
the history of printmaking with a particular emphasis on the history of the alphabet and literacy.
The accompanying illustrations include a page from a “pauper’s bible” in which an image of
Christ the Redeemer encapsulates a text from the gospel of Saint Mark (Figure 5.6). Giuseppe
writes, “These bibles served those who did not know how to read, it being enough to see the
images placed in the middle of a page for them to understand what is represented.”473 In this self-
referential passage, Giuseppe explains how text and image work together in “mutual illumination”
to create meaning. Thus, the combination of word and image was critical not only for reaching
the bourgeois public sphere in Milan, but also, potentially, to spreading ideas to a wider illiterate
public as well.

If Cattaneo criticized the Sacchis for explaining pictures to children, he was not entirely
wrong, and his comment ought not to be intended as diminishing. Giuseppe was a major
proponent of literacy as inspector of elementary schools in Lombardy and, eventually, in the
Kingdom of Italy.474 His Racconti morali e storici epitomizes the type of entertaining and
educational text promoted by the Sacchis, which took advantage of new printmaking
technologies to teach citizens, even those who could not read, about Italy’s past, and train them
in a new visual language. Luigi Sacchi’s contribution to these earlier projects demonstrates that
his engagement with reproducible media was motivated by an interest in instructing the public
sphere about its shared history, and foreshadows his interest in photography. The above
quotation from Racconti Morali e Storici might also be viewed as the credo for Cosmorama
Pittorico; whereas language might fail to reach some audiences, images would succeed.

473 “Queste bibbie servivano per coloro che non sapevano leggere, bastando ad essi di veder
l’immagine posta in mezzo della tavola per comprendere che cosa rappresentasse.” Sacchi,
Racconti morali e storici, 208.
474 Patriarca, Numbers and Nationhood, 39 cf. 56.
“What need is there for myth when you have history?”

On the merit of his images for Cosmorama Pittorico, Sacchi received the prestigious commission from Alessandro Manzoni to edit the illustrated edition of the author’s I Promessi sposi (1840). This novel recounts the tale of Renzo and Lucia, two star-crossed lovers from Lombardy’s peasantry, in their attempts to wed despite seemingly insurmountable obstacles. The drama is set against the backdrop of the seventeenth-century Spanish occupation, and Manzoni blends his fictional tale with meticulous historical fact, thus creating the new literary genre of romanzo storico (historical romance), which used real historical events as the basis for exploring the contemporary political situation, and therefore, nationalistic themes. Manzoni’s novel was hugely successful, and inspired numerous other works of historical fiction that comprise the canon of literature that Alberto Mario Banti has identified as key texts that incited political action and nation-building. Significantly, Banti does not include I Promessi sposi as part of this canon, following Mazzini’s own view that the novel was not explicitly patriotic, however, Manzoni’s text is widely regarded as a touchstone for pre-Unification Romanticism and a major contribution to Italy’s national literature during the Risorgimento.

Manzoni was particularly concerned with his novel’s capacity to reach a broad audience, which led him to write the first edition in Lombard dialect. In subsequent versions, however, he

---

476 I Promessi sposi was unequivocally a popular success. Between 1825 and 1840, sixty-eight editions were published in Italy and abroad with over 60,000 copies in circulation. Alessandro Manzoni, I Promessi Sposi (Milan: Guglielmini e Raedalli, 1840-1843); Remigio U. Pane, “The One Hundredth Anniversary of Alessandro Manzoni’s I Promessi Sposi,” Italica 17, no. 4 (December 1940), 167.
477 Caesar, Modern Italian Literature, 97-98.
478 Alberto M. Banti, La nazione del Risorgimento: Parentela, santità e onore alle origini dell’Italia unita (Turin: Biblioteca Einaudi, 2000), 46-49.
479 Caesar, Modern Italian Literature, 97-98.
used the “universal” Tuscan, which had been adopted as the national language of Italian literature.\textsuperscript{480} Manzoni wanted a visual idiom that would complement the modernity of its literary form, and thus sought to produce a version that would echo the presentation of illustrated foreign novels, periodicals, encyclopedias and dictionaries produced at that time.\textsuperscript{481} Manzoni thus chose the technique of wood engraving, since it was the most modern reproductive method, and would, therefore, enliven the novel by its visual similarity to the look of illustrated magazines.\textsuperscript{482} His desire to mimic those popular literary genres that combined word and image was a means of making the story legible for as wide an audience as possible. Although ultimately the high production costs of this illustrated version of \textit{I Promessi Sposi} made it a financial disaster, it remains an opus of Italian Romanticism, and reveals the patriotic spirit guiding Milan’s leading intellectuals in their artistic pursuits.\textsuperscript{483}

The illustrated edition of \textit{I Promessi Sposi} also represents a significant monument to Milan’s advanced publishing industry, through which Sacchi also achieved renown because of his critical role as editor. Through his prior involvement with \textit{Cosmorama Pittorico}, Sacchi had proven expertise managing artists and producing a wide variety of visual content ranging from

\textsuperscript{480} Mark I. Choate, \textit{Emigrant Nation: The Making of Italy Abroad} (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008), 106; Caesar, \textit{Modern Italian Literature}, 92-94. Manzoni would later champion the Tuscan dialect as Italy’s national language.

\textsuperscript{481} Mazzocca, \textit{Quale Manzoni?}, 109-114.

\textsuperscript{482} Mazzocca, \textit{Quale Manzoni?}, 127. Sacchi’s contract stipulated there be no less than 400 illustrations.

\textsuperscript{483} Pane, “The One Hundredth Anniversary of Alessandro Manzoni’s \textit{I Promessi Sposi},” 168 records a loss of 80,000 lire on the venture. Manzoni was also frequently late in paying Sacchi, and their relationship was all but destroyed by the end of the project. Mazzocca, \textit{Quale Manzoni?}, 129. For correspondence between Sacchi and Manzoni, see: Marino Parenti, \textit{Manzoni editore, storia di una celebre impresa manzoniana, illustrata su documenti inediti o poco noti} (Bergamo: Istituto italiano d'arti grafiche, 1946.)
landscapes to portraits and narrative scenes. For Manzoni’s project, he even employed many of the same artists with whom he had worked on the earlier publication, including Paolo Riccardi, Giuseppe Sogni, Luigi Riccardi, Luigi Bisi, Federico Moja, and three vignettes by the artist and politician Massimo D’Azeglio. The majority of images in *I Promessi sposi*, however, were the work of Francesco Gonin (1808-1889), a painter from Turin who specialized in miniatures and historical themes, such as his *Lodovico il Moro and Beatrice d’Este Visiting Leonardo Da Vinci’s Last Supper* (Figure 5.7). In his selection of Gonin as leading artist for the project, Sacchi was inspired by the prevalence of *romanzo storico* painting in Milan, shaped by his own training at the Brera Academy under Francesco Hayez, the leading protagonist of the genre.

Scholars of nineteenth-century Italian painting have long considered the development of *romanzo storico* a manifestation of Italian nationalism, and Hayez’s art has been associated with the Risorgimento perhaps more than any painter of his time. The *romanzo storico* genre was strongly influenced by the Troubadour paintings of Jean-August-Dominique Ingres and Paul Delaroche, and featured historical subjects depicted naturalistically with a high level of visual detail and period accuracy in costumes, settings, and objects. Given that some of those French

---


artists’ most celebrated canvases derived from Italian sources, such as Ingres’s Dante-inspired *Paolo and Francesca* (1814 and 1819) or his *Raphael and La Fornarina* (1819), Italian artists were even more likely to recuperate their cultural heritage in artworks that celebrated Italy’s past. One of Hayez’s earliest paintings in the genre, *Pietro Rossi* (Figure 5.8), is considered the origin of historical Romantic painting in Italy, and its subject of a father giving his life for his country—a scene of patriotic martyrdom—derives from the history of Republican Venice.\(^{487}\) Hayez used a specific literary source, *Histoire de la République de Venise by Laugier* (1758), and painted the scene in a style that through its vibrant coloration consciously evoked that of fifteenth-century Venetian painting. Many of the patrons who collected and commissioned works by Hayez were committed patriots, including the owner of *Pietro Rossi*, Count Pallavicino Trivulzio, who had been involved in a Carbonari uprising against the Austrians in 1821.\(^{488}\) Hayez’s approach to painting, which included using literary and historical sources as the basis for his compositions was closely related to Manzoni’s own emphasis on historical verisimilitude in his writing.\(^{489}\) The influence of Hayez on Sacchi and the artists that he employed thus made the images for the illustrated edition of *I Promessi sposi* the perfect visual counterpart to Manzoni’s text. Sacchi had himself produced paintings within the *romanzo storico* genre, and although none of his canvases survive, their subjects are known through his participation in Brera’s annual exhibitions. Two of these paintings depicted themes related to historical novels.


\(^{489}\) The correlation between *romanzo storico* in literature and painting was the subject of an important exhibition and catalogue by Sandra Pinto, Paola Barocchi, Fianna Nicolodi, *Romantico Storico* (Florence: Meridiana di Palazzo Pitti, 1974), which invigorated scholarship on the genre.
published by his cousin Defendente: *Imelda de Lambertazzi nelle braccia dell’amante Geremeo* and *Filippo Lippi e Lucrezia Buti*.\(^{490}\)

The rise of Romantic painting in Italy was tied to the peninsula’s political situation, and was a topic of debate among artists and intellectuals. In a series of essays from the period, the politician Giuseppe Mazzini called for a socially engaged art that would educate the public toward pursuing an ideal society. For Mazzini, contemporary artists merely reflected reality in “a broken mirror.”\(^{491}\) In his writings, he incited artists to pursue ideal forms, and thus express ideal social and political goals. He observed,

> The flower that these men cultivate cannot blossom fully unless they are in a transformed ‘environment.’ For the Art of the People, of the Italian nation to exist, the Nation must exist. Today there are only artists, as there are only martyrs: how can they be more, until the hour of triumph comes? But these men are the precursors of the National Painting, like those martyrs are the precursors of the Nation. It seems to me that they are worth being studied. The characteristic of the school that follows is to be eminently 'historic': it is through the continuity of the historical translation that Italy must access the inspirations and the forces for establishing its nationality; but it is the ‘truth’, not the simple and poor reality, that constitutes the story for them. Through the facts, they pursue the ideal.\(^{492}\)

---

\(^{490}\) Beatrice Tenda conditta al supplizio, L’ultimo addio di Foscari alla sua famiglia, Leonardo in atto di ritrarre Monna Lisa, Maria Stuarda ascolta la sentenza, Convito dato da Gian Galeazzo Visconti per le nozze di sua figlia con Lionello d’Inghilterra, *Imelda de Lambertazzi nelle braccia dell’amante Geremeo*, Filippo Lippi e Lucrezia Buti, Gualdrada, Bianca Capello (These last two are previously un-cited, and are reviewed by Defendente and Giuseppe Sacchi in, *Le Belle Arti in Milano* nel 1832 vol. 7 (Milan: Ant. Fort. Stella & Figli, 1832): 33-34.


For Mazzini, seeking inspiration in Italy’s past would lead Italians to recognize a shared heritage that would in turn contribute to nation building, and in this regard, he identified Hayez as the artist who most clearly imbued his work with historical and national resonance. Echoing this idea, the writer Niccolò Tommaseo asked, “What need is there for myth, when you have history?,” and thus championed a codified iconography of Italy’s history, including its monuments, that would function to symbolically represent events in the present, aimed at a greater civic good.\footnote{Niccolò Tommaseo, “Bellezza e civiltà o delle arti del bello sensibile,” (1838) in \textit{L'Ottocento: 1815-1880}, ed. Silvia Bordini, (Roma: Carocci, 2002), 412-413.}

The idea that period details and historic facts were a means of representing moral and civic truths to the public was central for these influential thinkers and to Luigi Sacchi, whose own education and formative experiences were steeped in these philosophies. Photography’s accurate transcription of reality -- not a broken mirror, but a “mirror with a memory” -- provided artists with a powerful means of accomplishing these goals.\footnote{Oliver Wendell Holmes coined the phrase “mirror with a memory” in Oliver Wendell Holmes, “The Stereoscope and the Stereograph,” (1859), in \textit{Photography: Essays and Images}, ed. Beaumont Newhall (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1980), 54.}

\textbf{“A sister in the education of the artist”: Photography at Brera}

The Brera Academy took an interested position in photography from an early date. In January 1840 the Academy’s council approved the acquisition of a daguerreotype camera, which was kept under the care of Francesco Durelli and Luigi Bisi, the school’s perspective professors.\footnote{Initially, the academy declined purchase of a camera from the local optician Luigi Brenta, who had acquired it from Alphonse Giroux, seeing to buy one through a professor Carl August von Steinheil (1801-1870) of Munich. In the end, they acquired a camera directly from Daguerre through the Austrian ambassador in Paris. Miraglia, “Luigi Sacchi artista e fotografo,” 23-24.} It was a fitting choice, since the instructors likely already incorporated optical aids into their teaching methods, and it demonstrates the primary pedagogical function of
photography within the context of artistic education at this time. In particular, photography’s utility in reproducing artworks and architectural monuments led Pietro Selvatico (1803-1880), professor of aesthetics, secretary, and eventually president of the Accademia di Venezia, to endorse its educational value. Selvatico wrote extensively on academic pedagogy and art theory, promoting observation of reality—both through attention to historical details and quotidian subjects observed from life—as a means of producing art with moral and civic resonance. Milan’s and Venice’s academies were closely linked in this period since both were under Austrian rule, and consequently, Selvatico was an important influence on academic theory at Brera as well.

A leading voice in Italian Romanticism, Selvatico contributed to the growing discourse on photography within Italian academic circles, arguing:

How much the public will learn, and how much more won’t the artists learn, when they take photography as a guide in their studies? Then they will realize how the heliographic image, traced by the instant action of a man, can give lessons altogether more useful than those taken from statues, from anatomic training, and from the slavish copies of a model forced into impossible immobility.

According to Selvatico, photographs of Italy’s artistic and architectural masterpieces could provide invaluable lessons in modeling, proportion, and perspective that otherwise eluded or challenged the assumptions of the naked eye. “In this way,” he noted, “this dreaded rival of art will become a sister in the education of the artist: she will be the rescuer of coordinated

---


497 Bordini, L’Ottocento: 1815-1880, 75.

Academic training; she will aid in reaffirming the diligent observation of truth."499 His emphasis on truth over the ideal was a direct challenge to the neoclassical tradition, and he became one of the period’s foremost scholars of Italy’s medieval architecture and proponents of its preservation. While not overtly political himself, Selvatico’s writings were central to a generation of academically-trained artists like Sacchi, who would take up the theorist’s call to arms by producing works that were resonant with Italy’s past as a means of commenting on the political situation during the Risorgimento.

Although Sacchi maintained close ties to the Brera Academy, he probably first encountered photography while in Paris working on I Promessi sposi. There is, however, no evidence that he experimented with the daguerreotype, but it is certain that he would have been familiar with the technology.500 According to the earliest account of Sacchi’s photographic career, he first adopted paper negatives in 1845, exhibiting his efforts a year later at the Esposizione dell’Industria Lombarda.501 Sacchi’s affiliation with Brera supplied the emerging

500 For example, Alessandro Duroni exhibited examples in his shop in the Galleria de Cristoforis, which was the same location of the Cosmorama Pittorico offices. Miraglia, “Luigi Sacchi artista e fotografo,” 15, suggests that Sacchi was interested in photography from 1839, citing documents owned by Sacchi’s descendants and in the collection of Marino Parenti, which were in turn cited in Negro’s Nuovo Album Romano. I have been unable to verify this claim. On Duroni, see: Alfonso Frisiani, “Esperimenti fatti col daguerrotipo a Milano,” Gazzetta privilegiata di Milano n. 337, December 3, 1839, in Italo Zannier and Paolo Costantini, Cultura Fotografica in Italia: Antologia di testi sulla fotografia (1839-1949) (Milan: Franco Angeli, 1985), 81.
501 Miraglia, “Luigi Sacchi artista e fotografo,” 28-29. On the development of photography in Milan, see also: Silvia Paoli, Lo sguardo della fotografia sulla città ottocentesca: Milano 1839-1899 (Turin: Allemandi, 2010.) As the previous chapters outlined, the calotype was not widely used in Italy until 1845, when Carlo Jest translated Marc-Antoine Gaudin’s treatise, and Sacchi was among the earliest practitioners of the medium in Lombardy. It is also worth noting that Calvert Jones had traveled through Milan briefly as part of his photographic Grand Tour in 1846, producing the earliest extant paper photograph of the Duomo. On Calvert Jones in Italy, see Chapter Three of this thesis, and: Robert E. Lassam and Michael Gray, The Romantic Era: La Calotipia in Italia 1845-1860 (Florence: Alinari, 1988); Maria Francesca Bonetti, “Talbot et l’introduction du calotype en Italie,” in Éloge du négatif: Les débuts de la photographie sur
photographer with a potential audience for his images, and Durelli and Bisi soon became allies in his attempts to market his photographs as aids for artistic instruction. His earliest photographs depicted Lombardy’s architectural patrimony, and served as a visual statement of the architectural theories predominant at the time, including those expressed by his cousins Giuseppe and Defendente in the pages of Cosmorama Pittorico.

Just as Giuseppe and Defendente had promoted Sacchi’s printing and artistic endeavors through collaborations and glowing reviews, they also endorsed his burgeoning photographic career. This was the case at the Ninth Congress of Italian Scientists held in Venice in 1847, where Giuseppe was Secretary of the Agronomy and Technology section. He invited his brother to demonstrate the calotype process at that meeting, an occasion particularly memorable for the fortuitous coincidence of a pigeon taking flight during exposure, the movement captured by Sacchi’s camera.502 In addition to this demonstration, new evidence discovered by this author verifies that he also offered his photographs to Luigi Magrini, President of the Physics and Math session of the Congress.503 Unquestionably, Sacchi exploited his professional networks in the
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502 Miraglia, “Luigi Sacchi artista e fotografo,” 29-31; His participation in the conference was first recorded in the “Storia e progresso dell’arte fotografica,” in Varietà Scientifiche, Annali Universali di statistica (November-December 1850), 314-316.
503 The ninth Congress was the last of the pre-Unification meetings, since revolution interrupted the 1848 meeting. In the post-war climate, the organizers of the Ninth Congress did not publish official acts as in previous meetings; however, documents compiled for the planned publication remain. Among them is a letter from Guido Susani, a delegate along with Giuseppe Sacchi from the Società d’Incoraggiamento di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti di Milano (Society for the Encouragement of the Sciences, Letters, and Arts of Milan), which generously promoted Sacchi’s photographs, encouraging Magrini to include Sacchi in the official documentation of the Physics and Math Section. Susani’s plea seems to have had little effect, however, since the abbreviated “Diary” of the Congress that was eventually published does not record Sacchi’s
scientific and publishing communities to promote the practical potential of his photographic work, and kept this approach throughout his career.

Sacchi’s earliest extant photographs depict the architecture of his native city. His view of the courtyard of the Romanesque Church of Sant’Ambrogio (Figure 5.9), for example, highlights a gem of Milan’s medieval period. Sacchi’s exposure has captured the monument with the sunlight directly overhead, so that shadows emphasize the rounded arches of the church’s façade. The building fills the frame; the perspectival recession of the arches at left contrasts the flatness of the cropped façade with its planes of light and dark. The church becomes at once an abstraction—individual bricks, carved capitals, and single windowpanes provide an excess of detail—and a proscenium for the figures in front, including a pair of ladies beneath their parasols and a family group looking at the camera.

Sacchi had depicted Sant’Ambrogio previously with the medium of lithography in a perspectival interior view for an article in *Cosmorama Pittorico* written by Giuseppe (Figure 5.10).504 In the text accompanying this image of worshippers attending mass, Giuseppe gives a detailed description of the cathedral’s architecture, hailing it as the first, and thus, prototypical Christian building in Milan. He compares its historical significance to the Colonnade of San Lorenzo, which had been discussed in a previous issue of the journal as the most important remnant of Milan’s Roman past.505 For Giuseppe, Sant’Ambrogio’s art and architecture reflected

---

the ethos of the Christian faith that inspired its creation, and represented an important center of
civic life for the city in the medieval period. Initially built during the fourth century, it was
renovated in the Romanesque style during the twelfth century. Viewed in the context of the
Sacchis’ previous writing on architecture in medieval Lombardy, the building was, therefore,
emblematic of the period’s resurgence of local culture after the “dark ages” of foreign rule. This
comparison confirms that Sacchi’s selection of subjects for his photographs was inspired by a
contemporary revival of interest in the late medieval and early Renaissance among his
intellectual and artistic circles. His photographs brought the past to life by revealing the histories
embedded in Lombardy’s monuments.

Whereas Sacchi included the figures in his Sant’Ambrogio primarily for scale, in other
compositions they activate the scenes with a secondary drama. His view of the Sanctuary of
Santa Maria in San Celso (Figure 5.11), for example, uses a similar strategy in documenting the
architecture as that of Sant’Ambrogio, but includes a lively grouping of carefully arranged
figures in the foreground. As Roberto Cassanelli has noted, this photograph bears a striking
similarity to printed vedute of the period, which were animated by staffage figures, such as those
included in Ferdinando Artaria’s views discussed in Chapter Two, or those Sacchi produced for
Cosmorama Pistorico.506 His Arco della Pace (Figure 5.12), for example, provides a visual
precedent in which top hatted men traipse beneath the arch on jaunty horses, dodging ladies out
for a stroll. Significantly, the figures in Sacchi’s photographs would have had to pose and remain
still for the duration of his exposure. The lack of blurred movement and punctuated clusters of
figures in his photograph of San Celso suggests that each participant in this scene was a willing
model. The figures include a variety of costumes including ecclesiastical robes and an

506 Cassanelli, cat. no. 4, Luigi Sacchi: Lucigrafo a Milano, 134.
anachronistic male figure in stockings, breeches, and a tricorn hat. Sacchi’s interest in the relationship of people to their architectural setting suggests a living urban fabric in which the individual monument continues to shape contemporary life.

A photograph of the Trofeo di Fuentes (Figure 5.13), a carved marble monument erected in 1600 by the Spanish governor of Milan, makes this notion even more explicit. A single figure reclines against the carved structure, while two companions lean on the edge of a railing. In the distance is the neoclassical Porta Ticinese, one of the tollgates erected in the Napoleonic period to replace those built during the sixteenth century Spanish occupation. The monument (since destroyed) marked the meeting point of several bodies of water joined by Milan’s extensive system of canals, and bore an epitaph celebrating King Philip III of Spain, whose rule, it suggested, brought fertility and rejuvenation to the city of Milan. In an autograph inscription accompanying the photograph, Sacchi refers to the Trofeo di Fuentes as the “deceitful monument on the Naviglio outside Porta Ticinese.”507 Thus, what at first glance appeared to be a Romantic evocation of the site (that bears a striking visual resonance with Hill and Adamson’s photographs in Greyfriars’s Churchyard [Figure 5.14] – patriotic images resonant with Scotland’s past) is revealed instead to be a picture about Milan’s history of occupation told through the city’s monuments. This is confirmed by a similar view in Cosmorama Pittorico (Figure 5.15), which accompanied an article by Defendente, titled, “The deceitful monument outside Porta Ticinese in Milan.” In this text, the author described the true history of the monument, which was erected in the seventeenth century at the initiation of a project to construct a navigable canal between Milan and Pavia.508 The project was still unfinished by 1819, and thus represented the failure of foreign

507 Cassanelli, cat. no. 5, *Luigi Sacchi: Lucigrafo a Milano*, 135.
governments to undertake meaningful public works projects or encourage economic
development. The connection between Sacchi’s photograph and the earlier article in *Cosmorama Pittorico*, underscored by the pejorative inscription, brings his photographic and earlier
publishing work into “mutual illumination,” demonstrating the patriotism that underlay both projects, and enriching the meaning of the Romantic group of local bourgeois sitting by this contested site within the image.

Sacchi’s work for *Cosmorama Pittorico* and the ideology of architectural historicism promoted by Giuseppe and Defendente inflected his earliest photographs of Milan. Sacchi promoted his photographs as potential tools for artistic training at Brera, offering them for purchase to the Academic Council in 1851.\textsuperscript{509} The president approved a selection of only six, since the academy already had a large study collection of prints.\textsuperscript{510} The perspective professors Durelli and Bisi, who had previously been placed in charge of the institution’s daguerreotype camera, met with Sacchi some weeks later to select the group. Their subjects represented key monuments of Lombardy and the Veneto, a selection that accorded closely with contemporary academic thinking about what constituted exemplary architectural styles.\textsuperscript{511} The idea that the city’s past could be read through its monuments, and thus used as a template for constructing a modern civil society became an important element of academic pedagogy in this period.

\textsuperscript{511} They include the 9\textsuperscript{th} century baptistery of Gravedona of Como, the 14\textsuperscript{th} century Exterior of Santa Anastasia in Verona, the façade of Como’s Duomo, the Byzantine façade of the basilica of San Marco in Venice, the 16\textsuperscript{th} century classical Amphitheater in Verona, and the façade and cortile of the sanctuary of S. Maria presso S. Celso in Milan. Purchased at a cost of 30 lire, these photographs have not been located. Cassanelli, “La fotografia nell’Accademia di Brera. Le prime acquisizioni, 1850-1860,” 31.
Photography, because of its ability to document these historic monuments with unprecedented veracity contributed greatly to this project.

**Politics and Portraiture at Brera**

An 1851 portrait by Luigi Sacchi elucidates the close artistic and ideological bonds that he shared with a group of “painter-soldiers,” who had, like him, trained at Milan’s Brera Academy (Figure 5.16), providing further evidence of the importance of artistic networks for the development of photography and nationalism within Italy.\(^5\text{12}\) Posed in the courtyard of that institution, figures such as Giuseppe Bertini and Eleuterio Pagliano convey an attitude of gravity as well as camaraderie. Their facial expressions and gestures demonstrate self-awareness, confidence, deliberation, and a shared identity. Several of the artists discussed in Chapter Four who fought in the Roman Republic—including Domenico and Gerolamo Induno, who also appear in this group portrait—did so after participating in the January 1848 Milanese uprising against the Austrian regime, known as the *Cinque giornate*. This period of five days of urban
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\(^{5\text{12}}\) Francesca Valli, “1851, foto di gruppo con artisti milanesi,” in *Luigi Sacchi, lucigrafo a Milano 1805-1861*, ed. Marina Miraglia (Milan: Federico Motta Editore, 1996), 39-42. Ferdinando Galli fought in the 1848 Roman Republic with Nino Costa; Gottardo Valentini, Pietro Magni, and Eleuterio Pagliano participated in the *Cinque giornate* and fought alongside Luciano Manara in Rome; Pagliano would go on to fight with the Cacciaitori delle Alpi in 1859, for which he received a medal of military valor; Domenico and Gerolamo Induno also fought in Milan and Rome, before going into exile in Tuscany. There is no evidence that Sacchi fought in the war, but his close ties to this circle of artist-patriots, as well as his family’s liberal politics, suggests his sympathies. During the period of Lombardy’s provisional government, his brother Giuseppe was co-founder and secretary of the Società Patriotica, and wrote numerous articles and reports on the provisional governments in Lombardy and Venetia for the *Annali di statistica*. Remarkably, the journal’s frontispiece bore the words “italia libera.” He even directed the publication for its editor Giuseppe Lampato, who had left the journal to take on the role of Minister of War for the provisional government. After the Austrian return to power in 1849, the government severely restricted these associations and political societies. *Bibliografia dei periodici economici Lombardi: 1815-1914* vol. 1, ed. Franco Della Peruta and Elvira Cantarella (Milan: Franco Angeli, 2005), 88-89.
warfare was inspired by revolutions taking place at the same time in Vienna, and resulted in civilians pushing Austrian troops out of Milan, spiking war between Lombardy, backed by the Piedmontese King Carlo Alberto, and Austria, led by General Josef Radetzky. While Hapsburg rule was restored in 1849, the seeds were planted for the definitive independence of Italy a decade later, and many of these artists demonstrated continued commitment to the cause by depicting patriotic themes in their art and by fighting in the Second War of Independence in 1859.

Sacchi’s group portrait thus captured a significant moment in the life of Brera’s community, in which this group of artists and friends reunited after the rupture of war. This portrait of his contemporaries demonstrates Sacchi’s own close ties to Brera, but also his affiliation with a circle of artists and intellectuals who looked to the values of Lombardy’s late medieval and early Renaissance periods as a model for a patriotic art. In particular, the painter

and stained-glass maker Giuseppe Bertini (1825-1898) served as an artistic and ideological mentor for this generation of artists disillusioned after their participation in the failed revolutions of 1848. That year, as a protest against the Austrian regime, Bertini famously returned the gold medal he had won in 1845 for his painting *Dante and Frate Ilario.*\(^{515}\) The historian Felice Calvi wrote in commemoration of Bertini, “Milan seemed dead, but Bertini, with his inexpressible intellectual delight in wandering in the fantasies of the ideal, brought refreshment to our pains; he comforted us to be patient; he persuaded us with his superb works that our city was not dead.”\(^{516}\) Bertini thus became a rallying figure for this artistic community, and Sacchi’s portraits of him provide further evidence of the photographer’s own political engagement.

In 1848, Bertini took over his family’s stained glass workshop, which became synonymous with the renewed interest in Lombardy’s *Quattrocento.* In 1851, Bertini produced a stained glass window depicting Dante for Como’s cathedral that became emblematic of the rejuvenation of Milan’s artistic community and a symbol of civic pride. Prior to the installation, Bertini displayed the window publicly in his atelier for three days, garnering much acclaim, and he traveled with the painter Eleuterio Pagliano to London to exhibit it at the Crystal Palace.\(^{517}\) Whereas *romanzo storico* paintings in the style of Hayez had become the dominant mode at the Brera Academy, after the 1848 revolution, many young artists for whom


\(^{516}\) “Milano pareva deserta -- scriveva rammentandone la giovinezza nella città di metà secolo -- ma il Bertini, col procurarci l’indicibile godimento dell’intelletto vagante nelle fantasie dell’ideale, portava refrigero alle nostre pene; ci confortava a pazientare, persuadendoci co’ suoi superbi lavori che la nostra città non era la terra dei morti.” Quoted in Pini, “Milano -Londra 1851,” 131.

\(^{517}\) Pini, “Milano-Londra 1851,” 132-137.
verisimilitude and the legacy of Milan’s artistic heritage were paramount sought the experimental environment of Bertini’s glasswork studio over the increasingly restrictive atmosphere of the Brera Academy, which was controlled by the Austrian government.

Bertini’s emphasis on medieval handcraft embodied the notion that art conveys the moral ideals of a society, and Sacchi’s photograph of Bertini’s studio (Figure 5.17) has much symbolic resonance with this idea. Here, Sacchi has positioned the camera far from Bertini’s seated figure, seen lost in contemplation of a book, and because of his physical and psychological remove from the viewer, the composition suggests an unmediated view into the artist’s private world. In the nineteenth century, paintings of artists’ studios provided a window into their minds and creative processes, and the objects filling these spaces served as emblems of both artistic inspiration and ideological allegiance. Bertini’s studio, furnished with carved wood and inlaid cabinets, is filled with Chinese vases and porcelain figures, a suit of armor, fresco-like wall hangings, and numerous unframed canvases propped along the walls. In Figure 5.18, many of these same objects take center-stage in a still life arrangement. A study for a stained glass window depicting the Madonna and Child sits amongst Chinese porcelain, delicate glass, and metalwork. In these photographs, Sacchi depicts Bertini’s sanctum in the manner of a Renaissance studiolo, each object a reflection of the collector’s taste and beliefs. The staging of these images, including the directional lighting, the lone figure in a domestic space, and the still life arrangements, also suggests the renewed interest in Dutch genre painting in this period, which was championed by
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the Induno brothers. These photographs thus reinforce Sacchi’s artistic allegiance to this important circle of Risorgimento artists.

Sacchi also produced a series of portraits that depict Bertini, the Induno brothers, and Pagliano posing alone or in casual pairs or groupings. These photographs reveal Sacchi’s abilities at constructing compositions through tonality. In his portrait of Bertini (Figure 5.19), for example, a sweeping shadow cuts a diagonal swath across the standing figure’s torso, leaving his bust fully illuminated in order to accentuate his features. Light plays across the textures of wood grain, stone, and brush surrounding Bertini, integrating him into the outdoor setting. Likewise, in his portrait of Bertini, Pagliano, and Domenico Induno (Figure 5.20), the three figures pose in conversation as if Sacchi has spontaneously happened upon the group. Bertini’s hands gesticulate to emphasize a point of argument, while dappled light flickers across the garden wall behind them. Just as Sacchi had done in his staging of figures outside the church of Sant’Ambrogio, here he directs his friends in a dynamic composition in which the outdoor setting connotes a friendship that extends beyond the walls of academy or studio.

These portraits convey the intellectual connection among this group of Milan’s leading artistic figures of the 1850s, who were also dedicated patriots. Sacchi continued to make portraits of these same artists and friends throughout the decade, adopting glass plate negatives to produce large-format prints. It seems that Sacchi created many of his later photographic portraits as studies for paintings by artists in his circle, confirming the important role that photography had assumed as an aid to artistic education and practice. One such example is a portrait of Sacchi by Domenico Induno (Figure 5.21) rediscovered by this author, which was based on a previously

---

519 Sacchi exhibited several portraits at the Esposizione dei prodotti dell’industria in Milan in 1857. The art critic Carlo Tenca criticized Sacchi’s portraits as lacking detail and inferior to those of the studio photographer Alessandro Duroni’s.
unidentified self-portrait (Figure 5.22). Here Sacchi appears as a modestly dignified middle-aged man, his aged features and beard perhaps betraying his premature death in 1861. Although Sacchi did not live long enough to bear witness to the changes brought about by Italian nationhood, he contributed to its construction, and his friends and family, with whom he exchanged portraits and offered gifts of his photographs, were leading figures of Milan’s national movement.

Several scholars have seen in Sacchi’s portraits an affinity with the ideals of the Pre-Raphaelites, noting the link between medieval revivals taking place in both Northern Italy and England during this period. Indeed, these photographs might be considered in terms of the genre of Freundschaftsbilder, or friendship portraits, that embody a shared artistic identity. The tradition of the Freundschaftsbild has especially strong resonance with the medieval and early Renaissance periods, since the concept was generated among the Nazarenes, a group of primarily German artists living and working communally in Rome during the early nineteenth century, who looked to that era as a model for a moral art. A similar idealism is reflected in Bertini and his circle, for whom Lombardy’s medieval period represented an indigenous craft tradition that would inspire and reinvigorate art in their own time. For example, in addition to his
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520 A footnote in Carotti, Emporium, 164 indicates, “Of Luigi Sacchi, Domenico Induno left a magnificent portrait, which today is in the Galleria di Arte Nazionale in Rome.” (“Di Luigi Sacchi, Domenico Induno lasciò un magnifico ritratto, che oggi è nella Galleria di arte nazionale di roma.”) The acquisition paperwork in the archives of GNAM indicates that the painting came into the collection with its current title “Ritratto di uomo.” Protocollo no. 817, “D. Induno” (October 13, 1891). The visual evidence of the photograph along with the notation in Carotti, Emporium, 164 informs my attribution. I thank Maria Francesca Bonetti for her assistance with access to the paintings and documents at GNAM and for her thoughts on the subject.


522 On Freundschaftsbilder, see: Klaus Lankheit, Das Freundschaftsbild der Romantik (Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1952) and Cordula Grewe, Painting the Sacred in the Age of Romanticism (Farnham, England: Ashgate, 2009), 61-98.
visit to the Crystal Palace, Bertini displayed tapestries in his Milan studio to Otto Mündler, Charles Eastlake’s agent, and also during this period, England’s Arundel Society commissioned copies of paintings by Bernardino Luini and other artists of the Lombard Renaissance from Brera’s artists. Notably, John Ruskin traveled to Italy in 1845 and 1849, where his ideas for *The Seven Lamps of Architecture* (1845) and *The Stones of Venice* (1851-1853) were formed. Although Ruskin’s promotion of Italian Gothic art contributed to its popularity in England, Selvatico and other Italian intellectuals had already begun to look to the medieval period as a source for contemporary artists and architects, as suggested by the prominence of articles featuring Lombardy’s medieval monuments in the pages of *Cosmorama Pittorico* in the 1830s.

Of greater relevance to the particular circumstances of Risorgimento Milan is the connection between these artists’ aesthetic and political views, and their involvement in the Società degli Artisti di Milano, a promotional society like those discussed in the previous chapter, instituted in 1848 as an alternative to the Brera Academy. Significantly, Sacchi published a short book titled *Studi intorno alla storia civile delle Arti Belle in Italia* (*Studies into the social history of the fine arts in Italy*) for the organization to coincide with the 1855 Universal Exposition in Paris. In this text, he considered the progress of the arts in Italy as a matter of public economy, and argued for the necessity of liberty and national prosperity for art to flourish,

---

523 Cassanelli, “La fotografia nell’ Accademia di Brera,” 34-35
525 The Società degli Artisti di Milano began activity in 1848, but was shut down for a few months in 1852 by Austrian military command with the ban on social societies and gatherings. Valli, “1851, foto di gruppo con artisti milanesi,” 39-40.
tracing these themes historically to the Quattrocento. Furthermore, Sacchi indicted Italy’s artistic institutions in the nineteenth century, and criticized the academic system in particular. He argued that the institution was anachronistic to the artist’s role in contemporary society, because sequestered artists from the very public that granted art its civic function. He proclaimed art a “bene comune” – a common good – closely tied to the freedom of the society that produced it.\footnote{527 Luigi Sacchi, Studii intorno alla storia civile delle arti belle in Italia, 55.}

This text is a prime example of what D’Azeglio referred to as “a conspiracy in open daylight” that publically critiqued both the Austrian government that controlled Milan’s academies and museums, and the lack of freedom in Italian society that brought a decline in an otherwise illustrious artistic history.\footnote{528 Quoted in Greenfield, Economics and liberalism in the Risorgimento, 149. D’Azeglio was speaking of the Lombard press, of which Sacchi was certainly part.}

Sacchi’s appeal to the Quattrocento as a period in which art reflected the freedom and prosperity of society demonstrates the idealism behind the medieval revival taking place within this artistic circle, and reveals the values underpinning his art and that of the revolutionary colleagues portrayed by his camera.

**Monumenti, Vedute e Costumi d’Italia and Photographic Publishing**

When Sacchi embarked on his photographic Grand Tour of the Italian peninsula in 1851, he did so in a cultural and political climate still reeling from the revolutions of 1848-1849. Many of the artists in his circle spent at least some of this period in exile, and his travel was certainly inspired by political exigencies. An article titled, “History and Progress of the Photographic Art,” likely penned by Sacchi himself and published in the _Annali universali di statistica_, announced his ambitions:

> It is our wish that a skillful and hard-working artist will walk through a hundred Italian cities and will reproduce a thousand monuments and costumes as if they were in a gallery.
Wealthy art lovers, scholars of historical studies, archeologists, directors of museums and of Academies of Fine Arts could contribute towards such a goal in order to create a monumental illustration of the whole of Italy and thus disseminate the image of the most splendid memories of our history.529

This statement outlined Sacchi’s intentions for this project, and identified as his audience not the general public, but an educated elite, the same artists and scholars that constituted his social and political circle. Sacchi thus conceived of Monumenti, Vedute e Costumi d’Italia as an aid to the endeavors of those with influential roles in Milan’s academies and other institutions, who were also key figures of Italian nation-building and spread patriotic ideas to a broader public sphere. In this regard, it is important to note that in selecting the subjects for Monumenti, Vedute e Costumi d’Italia he drew upon his previous experience with Cosmorama Pittorico just as he had for his earlier photographs of Milan. Significantly, in the above quotation, Sacchi describes monuments as “the most splendid memories of our history,” and thus conveys the idea that Italy’s architecture bears tangible traces of an illustrious past that photography makes legible in the present. Monumenti, Vedute e Costumi d’Italia departed from the local Milanese context to produce an unprecedented all-encompassing vision of Italy’s historically significant sites, covering an impressive geography from throughout the peninsula.

Sacchi’s “History and Progress of the Photographic Art” recounted the simultaneous invention of photography by Daguerre and Talbot, and provided an analysis of the relative merits of each process, with a brief notice on Louis Désiré Blanquart-Evrard’s improvement to Talbot’s
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529 Quoted in Maria Antonella Pelizzari, Photography and Italy (London: Reaktion Books, 2011), 30. This text originally appeared in “Varietà Scientifiche. Storia e progresso dell’arte fotografica,” in Annali Universali di statistica (November-December 1850), 316. There is a strong possibility that Sacchi wrote the article himself. He had published a shorter article in the same journal earlier in the year. The two articles are closely related rhetorically, both in terms of language and key arguments. The second reads like an elaboration on the first. For the earlier article, see: Luigi Sacchi, “Varietà Scientifiche. Brevi cenni sulla fotografia,” Annali Universali di Statistica, economia pubblica, geografia, storia, viaggi e commercio. Compilato da Francesco Lampato series 2, vol. 24 (April-June 1850), 108-109.
method. According to Sacchi, photography on paper “presents a much more picturesque effect,” and “offers other important advantages, among which must be reported that of being able to reproduce many examples of the same design.”\footnote{La fotografia sulla carta, in confronto al metodo Daguerre, presenta un effetto molto più pittoresco: l’immagine è resa visibile sotto ogni raggio di luce, ed offre altresì altri vantaggi importanti, fra i quali va riferito quello di poter moltiplicare tanti esemplari dell’istesso disegno che riescono come altrettanti originali senza il bisogno di ripetere le sedute, quando siano ritratti, o di ritornare più volte sul luogo quando vedute prospettiche.” Sacchi, “Brevi cenni sulla fotografia,” 108.} Furthermore, he notes that paper prints “easily permit coloring or retouching of the images as one does with lithograph copies.”\footnote{Il metodo Talbot oltre al suaccennato vantaggio presenta anche quello di permettere facilmente la coloratura o il ritocco dell’immagine ottenuta colle incisioni di litografie.” Sacchi, “Brevi cenni sulla fotografia,” 109.} While the rhetorical comparison of early photography to printmaking processes has been well established in this thesis and elsewhere, in Sacchi’s case, it is of particular significance because of his longstanding interest in reproducible media. A second article, an expanded version of the first, which, if not written by Sacchi can be understood as articulating his views on the subject, gives a lengthier description of the negative-positive process, further highlighting its importance with respect to earlier printmaking techniques. He notes, “The invention of Talbot is to the daguerreotype as wood engraving is to that of movable type.”\footnote{La scoperta di Talbot sta dunque al daguerrotipo, come l’antica scultura xilografica in legno sta alla tipografia a caratteri mobile.” Sacchi, “Storia e progresso dell’arte fotografica,” 315.} In other words, while he recognized Daguerre as photography’s inventor, he viewed Talbot as the one to discover its more important, practical use. The analogy also conveys the idea that for Sacchi, Talbot’s process represented an innovation in printmaking that held practical value as a new form of visual communication.

Sacchi’s production for Monuments, Vedute e Costumi d’Italia was distinct from the division of labor that he oversaw in his editorial roles at Cosmorama Pittorico and I Promessi
sposi, and was a closely controlled artistic endeavor. He intended to issue his publication over four years (1852-55) with twenty-five prints to be published each year, in six parts. His method employed Blanquart-Evrard and Gustave Le Gray’s improvements to the calotype, and he acquired a camera from Chevalier in Paris in 1851 in order to produce the “monumental” negatives that his subject required (35 x 27 cm). The series was comprised of large-format salt prints from paper negatives mounted to paper, with a lithographic border and caption including the city and a descriptive note about each scene below each photograph, similar to the format of traditional engraved vedute. He executed every aspect of production, from photographing and printing the views to producing the lithograph labels for the plates.

Sacchi’s self-directed approach to the serial publication of photographic prints distinguishes it from roughly contemporaneous endeavors in England and France. Talbot’s The Pencil of Nature (1844-1846) and Sun Pictures in Scotland (1845), which depicted scenes made famous by Sir Walter Scott, demonstrated his attempts at disseminating his new invention and showing its capacity for illustration. Talbot issued each part of The Pencil of Nature in increasingly limited editions, and was unable to interest publishers in funding large-scale print runs. Nonetheless, Talbot’s Reading Establishment, a firm overseen by his assistant, Nicolaas Henneman, produced the multiple prints necessary for these publications, which were sold by
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533 At the same time, Sacchi also published a smaller folio called Paese Lombardo, which depicted landscapes north of Milan. The series has not been located, though two forest scenes attributed to Sacchi were published in Éloge du negatif, 132-133. See also, Cassanelli, Luigi Sacchi Un Artista dell’Ottocento, 35.

534 He sold the series at a cost of 20 francs per fascicle through the print shop of Pompeo Pozzi in the Galleria de Cristoforis. No complete set of the series is known. Miraglia, “Luigi Sacchi artista e fotografo,” 18-19.


The division of labor employed at the establishment is the subject of a two-part photograph in which camera operators and printers can be seen going about the photographic business of making copies of artworks and portraits, and producing multiple prints (Figure 5.23). This composition emphasized photography’s commercial potential in order to promote Talbot’s process within the context of industrialized England. Unlike Talbot’s organization at Reading, Sacchi’s artisanal operation accorded with the valorization of medieval handcraft in this period, but more pointedly exposed the fact that Italy lacked the subsidiary industries required for a more mechanized and efficient photographic production.

By the time Sacchi began working on his series in 1852, Blanquart-Evrard had perfected his own method of printing from paper negatives, making larger print runs possible through the employment of industrial processes. At least forty people worked at the Lille printing firm, issuing some 200 to 300 prints per day. Some estimates suggest that the firm produced around 100,000 prints using assembly-line techniques. Blanquart-Evrard began sales of his first photographic publication in September 1851. The Album photographique de l’artiste et de l’amateur included five photographs of art and architecture by a variety of photographers, and was the first installment of an ongoing series available by subscription, in which views of Italy’s monuments appeared with some frequency. Other notable series published by Blanquart-Evrard include Maxime Du Camp’s Égypte, Nubie, Palestine et Syrie (1852) and Auguste
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Salzmann’s *Jerusalem* (1856.) In comparison to Talbot and Blanquart-Evrard’s endeavors, Sacchi’s production differed drastically in its scale, resources, and even quality, but it nonetheless represented a remarkable individual achievement within the history of photography.

Comparing Sacchi’s series to foreign examples is not without justification, since he had traveled to France in his role as printmaker and editor at least as early as 1835 while working for *Cosmorama Pittorico*. In addition, Sacchi probably read *La Lumièrè*, in which his own name was recorded several times on the occasion of his participation in juried photography exhibitions in Belgium and France. Critically, Sacchi’s entries at these foreign exhibitions included reproductions of recently restored Lombard Renaissance artworks, such as Leonardo’s *Last Supper*, and frescoes by Bernardino Luini. These articles further demonstrate the transnational context in which early photography developed throughout Europe.

The most important precedent for *Monumenti, Vedute e Costumi d’Italia*, however, was the French art collector Eugène Piot’s self-directed publication *L’Italie Monumentale*. Piot published the first and only fascicle of the series in 1851 and it predated the opening of Blanquart-Evrard’s Lille Establishment. In *La Lumièrè*, the art critic Francis Wey wrote of Piot’s publication, “Thus begins the series of art travel books illustrated by photography: Mr.

---


Piot has created a new commercial field.” 544 The scholar and antiquarian Piot arrived in Italy in 1849, accompanied by the French writer Théophile Gautier (1811-1872), who had received a commission from the French journal La Presse to produce a series of articles inspired by his travels. This affiliation helps contextualize Piot’s point of view as a wealthy French traveler with antiquarian interests in Italy’s patrimony. Indeed, another impetus for Piot’s travel was the acquisition of Etruscan artifacts for his collection. 545 Piot produced some 100 large-format paper negatives between 1850 and 1853. 546 In Rome, he encountered Frédéric Flachéron and other members of the Roman School, and in Florence he received permission to document the Academy’s sculptural masterpieces, exhibiting some of his Italian photographs at the Great Exhibition in 1851. 547 In that year, Piot traveled through Venice producing the largest number of his Italian images. Sacchi may have encountered Piot during those travels, and owned at least one of his Venetian photographs, depicting the staircase of the Ducal Palace (Figure 5.24). 548

A comparison of Piot’s format to Sacchi’s demonstrates similarities between the two photographers’ approach to presentation. Both Sacchi and Piot developed strategies from printmaking traditions, such as those employed in Lerebours’s Excursions Daguerriennes and Artaria’s Vues d’Italie, discussed in Chapter Two. Piot mounted his salt print of the lateral portal of the Florence Cathedral to a support bearing a lithographic title and caption information (Figure 5.25). Following the format common to printed views, the series title “L’Italie Monumentale” appears above the image, while the caption below briefly identifies the subject

544 Quoted in Renié, “Eugène Piot (1812-1890),” 1132.
547 Paoli, “Culture Artistique et Photographie,” 49.
548 This photograph is now in the private collection of Emilio Sioli Legnani. It is reproduced in Cassanelli, Luigi Sacchi: Un artista dell’Ottocento, 15.
depicted in the photograph. The photographer’s name and the date appear directly below the photograph at left and right respectively. Sacchi also captioned his view with a brief description below each image, but rather than printing the series title above the frame, he identified the city in which the monument depicted can be found (Figure 5.26). Exceptionally, an album of views from Sacchi’s series at the Museo Fortuny in Venice includes a number of plates in which the caption and title are printed on separate slips of paper and pasted to the mounts. Cassanelli has hypothesized that this album might have been compiled as a record of Sacchi’s artistic process and experimentation with different topographic and print formats.\textsuperscript{549} In general, only some of Sacchi’s prints include his name on the mount underneath the photograph, while others bear a blind stamp.

Sacchi’s series can in some respects be viewed as a local response to the foreign vision typified by Piot’s \textit{L’Italie Monumentale}. For example, a comparison of the locations recorded by the two photographers reveals the broader scope of Sacchi’s project with regard to Piot’s. Whereas the Frenchman traveled primarily through Northern Italy, spending the greatest amount of time in Venice, Sacchi ventured from his native region to locations throughout the peninsula, exploring sites as far south as Palermo, Agrigento, and Paestum, and as far north as Trento and Brescia that were typically not included on a tourists’ itinerary.

Another major distinction between Sacchi’s project and French examples lies in the necessarily self-sufficient and artisanal nature of his production, carried out in the absence of a centralized government that might commission such a project, or the commercial context of

\textsuperscript{549} The recently rediscovered album was first published in Silvia Carminati, “Saggi Fotografici - Vedute d'Italia: un album di fotografie di Luigi Sacchi nel museo Fortuny a Venezia,” in \textit{Lo Sguardo della fotografia}, cat. no. 210, 267-270; Roberto Cassanelli, “Risorgimento e fotografia d'architettura a proposito dei “Monumenti, vedute e costume d'Italia” di Luigi Sacchi (1852-1854),” unpublished paper delivered at Association for the Study of Modern Italy Annual Conference. University of London, November 22, 2014.
Blanquart-Evrard’s industrial enterprise. For Milan’s leading intellectuals, the lack of such infrastructure was viewed as a product of Italy’s disunity, and a halt to its economic and social growth. Cassanelli has justly argued that Sacchi’s project represents an attempt to overcome those obstacles, “a return to the roots of the Italian civilization and culture, without the political barriers, customs, and above all imposed ideas of foreign domination, in the search of lost unity and future redemption.” Sacchi ultimately created a visual record that spanned all of Italy’s regional divisions, and for which, it should be remembered, he would have needed to produce a passport at each border. The final publication did not echo that political fragmentation, but instead each fascicle mixed sites from different cities and monuments from a variety of historical periods. Sacchi’s ambition is evident, even if it surpassed his capability. In common with other photographic publishing efforts outlined above, this project seems to have fallen short of his intentions, with only the first two series produced for publication and commercial distribution.

In 1886, however, Sacchi’s series was still remembered in a commemoration of the life and work of his son Archimede Sacchi, who at the age of fourteen traveled with his father on his photographic journey:

“It was a tour made under exceptional conditions. It was not a visit to one Italian city after another for fun, as tourists, nor was it travel with limited scope or predetermined studies. Archimede’s father, an artist by spirit and by profession, intended to illustrate with photography our principle monuments. Many of us certainly remember Sacchi’s photographs: they always presented an interest, a special attraction. Although they did not

550 “…un ritorno alle radici della civiltà e della cultura italiana senza più le barriere politiche, dogonali e soprattutto mentali imposte da dominazioni straniere, nella ricerca della perduta unità e nella prefigurazione del futuro riscatto.” Cassanelli, “Luigi Sacchi Fotografo,” 34.
551 Miraglia, “Luigi Sacchi artista e fotografo,” 18 suggests that Sacchi’s travel was funded by subscription, a common practice at the time. Sacchi’s published lists for the first two series (1852-1853) are part of the Brera Fototeca’s Fondo Hayez, now stored at Rome’s Istituto Nazionale per la Grafica. They are reproduced in Cassanelli, Luigi Sacchi: Un artista dell’Ottocento, 158-159. The Fondo Hayez includes fifty photographs from the series, and the Fortuny album an additional 19 mounted prints not included on those lists, which may have been intended for the third, possibly unfinished, series.
have the minutiae of detail, which we find in recent photographs, or perhaps because of that, the reproductions retained that grandiosity of effect that characterizes the impressions of truth.552

The passage continues by lauding the hands-on artistic education that Sacchi gave to his son, crediting the selection of fragments and vantage points required for the photographic documentation of buildings as the basis of his progeny’s expertise as an architect. It also suggests that Sacchi passed to Archimede his own “artistic spirit” and consciousness of the historical and patriotic value of the sites. In many of Sacchi’s photographs, his son Archimede can be seen posing next to monuments, but his presence is generally subsidiary to the architectural detail.

This legacy is also connected to the discussion in Chapter Three of Stefano Lecchi’s reportage of the Roman Republic, in which the photographer also inserted his children into sites of historical significance, and the generational impact of national myths in this context. This passage reinforces those points and highlights the important role of Sacchi’s photographs as pedagogical aids and as symbols of patriotism within the context of the Brera Academy.

In addition to revealing a more personal aspect of the project, the above passage articulates the contemporary reception of the series. Sacchi’s colleagues understood that Monumenti, Vedute e Costumi d’Italia was not exclusively a commercial endeavor undertaken with tourists in mind, but rather, it was inspired by ideals of artistic exploration and patriotism. Significantly, the author identifies Sacchi’s use of paper negatives as a critical element of their success. Not overburdened with detail, his photographs “conserved” the “grandiosity” of the

552 …fu un giro compiuto in condizioni eccezionali; non era il visitare una dopo l’altra le città d’Italia per divertimento, en touriste, e neppure il viaggiare con scopi limitati, o studi prefissi. Il padre di Archimede, artista d’animo e di professione, si era proposto d’illustrare colla fotografia i principali nostri monumenti. Molti di noi certo ricordano le fotografie di Sacchi: presentano sempre un’interesse, un’attrattiva speciale. Benchè non abbiano quelle minuzie di dettaglio che troviamo nelle recenti fotografie, anzi forse per ciò, le riproduzioni conservano quella grandiosità di effetto che caratterizza le impressioni del vero. Luca Beltrami, “Commemorazione della vita e delle opera di Archimede Sacchi,” 182.
monuments they depicted, and revealed a deeper “impression of truth.” Rather than merely reproducing Italy’s monuments, this text suggests, Sacchi’s photographs conveyed something of their symbolic significance.

**Monumenti, Vedute e Costumi d’Italia and Collective Memory**

Scholars such as Marina Miraglia have noted that Sacchi’s *Monumenti, Vedute e Costumi d’Italia* visualized many of the same themes from *Cosmorama Pittorico*, aiming to present a patriotic and totalizing image of Italy’s regions and people to a Milan’s bourgeois public sphere.553 Despite this acknowledgement, there has been no analysis of the visual relationship or content shared between these two endeavors. Such a comparison demonstrates Sacchi’s ongoing view that art and architecture represented an embodiment of civic and moral values, as well as his enduring commitment to disseminating those ideas through illustrated publishing. Sacchi’s series of primarily architectural views is also related to a contemporaneous project carried out by photographers employed by France’s Commission on Historic Monuments, the *Mission Héliographique*. Christine Boyer has argued that the photographs produced by this commission, most of them documenting France’s medieval architecture, were a means not only of preserving French history, but of creating a new itinerary of significant sites and monuments that would generate a collective memory of the nation after the tumultuous years following the French Revolution.554 Similarly, *Monumenti, Vedute e Costumi d’Italia* aimed to generate a collective memory and thus collective identity through images and stories not only of Lombardy’s

medieval period, but also of monuments from other regions that, when viewed as a whole, represented a common past for all Italians. Significantly, however, Sacchi’s project was entirely self-directed in contrast to the government commissioned *Mission Héliographique*.

Many of his photographs depicted monuments that he had illustrated in *Cosmorama Pittorico*, and he placed particular emphasis on the local architectural idioms of each city. Among them were his photographs of Ancona’s Arch of Trajan, Modena’s Cathedral, and Florence’s Cathedral. A comparison of his photograph of Ancona’s Arch of Trajan (Figure 5.27) to the earlier lithograph (Figure 5.28) shows that Sacchi positioned his camera to repeat the vantage point of the earlier illustration. Sacchi’s own pilgrimage to capture these monuments first-hand in photographs enacts precisely what the series suggests viewers do: it traces an itinerary of Italy’s most prominent sites with their historic importance in mind. *Monumenti, Vedute e Costumi d’Italia* thus demonstrates the importance of the medium of photography for constructing a visual typology of key monuments, which contributed to nation-building by representing Italy as a cohesive entity.

The Certosa di Pavia was the subject of four plates in Sacchi’s *Monumenti, Vedute e Costumi d’Italia* (Fig. 5.29-5.32), and therefore confirms the continued importance of local Lombard history for this project. The convent had become a popular subject for *vedute* in the 1820s, following its restoration during the previous decade. Considered a prime example of the architectural transition between Lombardy’s Gothic and Renaissance periods, it served throughout the nineteenth century as a veritable pattern book for Brera’s architects and artists.
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Figure 5.29, for example, is a closely framed view of an elaborately decorated window by Giovanni Antonio Amadeo that combines the elongated figures of prophets with decorative swags, cherubs, and other classical motifs, emphasizing the structure’s characteristically Lombard sculptural ornamentation. Additional views also highlight its distinctive blend of classical forms within a decorative Gothic tradition. In particular, his framing of one corner of the small cloister presents a layered elevation of rounded arches on delicate columns capped by pointed towers and punctuated by a startlingly classical oculus (Figure 5.30). Sacchi’s careful handling of light and shadow gives attention to each sculptural detail without sacrificing the structure’s overall design. The apsidal view (Figure 5.31) highlights the Church’s Latin cross plan and its elegantly elongated windows and pointed towers. Significantly, Sacchi does not include in his series any views of the Church’s Bramantesque façade, instead favoring elements that demonstrate the combination of Renaissance and Gothic forms. By photographing the monument from multiple perspectives and details, Sacchi’s photographs bear their practical potential as didactic aids. This approach also distinguishes Sacchi’s photographs from more traditional tourist views, which tend to use a single characteristic vantage point to represent the monument as a whole.

Pavia held a privileged position within Cosmorama Pittorico, because the Sacchi family traced its roots to the city, and Defendente had attended university there.557 During the Restoration, Pavia was also the terminus of a construction project linking the city to Milan by a new navigable canal, which contributed to public interest in its history and monuments.558 The project was the subject of an article illustrated by Sacchi (Figure 5.33) in which Defendente outlined the long history of the canal, which was first conceived in the fifteenth century, and

gave a statistical accounting of its length, cost, and economic productivity.\(^{559}\) The article was a prime example of how liberal Milanese journalists like the Sacchis used statistics to educate the public about the state of Italy’s infrastructure. It offered tacit praise to the Austrian government for their completion of the long unfinished project, while implicitly raising the larger issue that roads, canals, and railroads joining Milan to wider economic trade within Italy was still lacking.\(^{560}\)

Another article published in *Cosmorama Pittorico* delved deeper into Pavia’s storied past as a Ducal stronghold during the fifteenth century.\(^{561}\) Sacchi illustrated this two-part “historical scene” by focusing on Pavia’s Castello, and thus transported the viewer back in time to the reign of Gian Galeazzo Sforza. The illustrations included a view of the castle and an interior of its courtyard, populated by figures in Renaissance garb (5.34-5.35). This Troubadour fantasy, clearly inspired by the *romanzo storico* genre, also employed first-person narration in the accompanying text. Similarly, Sacchi’s photography transported the viewer (or more accurately the subject) through time. Addressing these dynamics in his discussion of Hill and Adamson’s photographs of Scotland’s great nationalist writer, Sir Walter Scott’s, *The Antiquary*, Jordan Bear has suggested that the staged nature of those images, which include costumed figures posed in a real architectural ruin, undermines the photograph’s supposed relationship to visual truth. He has argued that the “directoril mode” points to the presence of an authorial voice that in turn

---

\(^{559}\) Defendente Sacchi, “Canale Navigabile tra Milano e Pavia,” *Cosmorama Pittorico* 1, no. 46 (1835): 367.  
\(^{560}\) Greenfield, *Economics and liberalism in the Risorgimento*, 204-205. Greenfield points out that the combination of praise toward the Austrian government and critique of the speed of Italy-wide progress was a consistent tactic used in the *Annali*.  
\(^{561}\) “Il Castello di Pavia,” *Cosmorama Pittorico* 2, no. 3 (1836): 17-19.
bars the viewer’s access to the history it is trying to represent. Bear’s assertion brings to mind Caneva’s staged *tableaux* discussed in the previous chapter, however, rather than attempting to represent historical moments, Caneva’s photographs functioned as allegories, so that their artificial nature did not conflict with, but rather bolstered, their symbolic valence. Sacchi’s photographs, on the other hand, were created as an attempt to represent history, but they avoid the temporal rupture to which Bear refers by focusing on monuments that already bore strong associations supplied by the viewer’s familiarity with their appearance in literary and other artistic works. Specifically, in depicting in photographs monuments and locales that Sacchi had previously rendered as illustrations for *Cosmorama Pittorico*, he relied upon the knowing readership of Milan’s bourgeois public sphere to illuminate those images with historical and cultural significance.

Outside his native Lombardy, Sacchi also sought architectural monuments that held particular importance to their respective cities, many of which had also appeared in the pages of *Cosmorama Pittorico*. Another suite of plates depicts Pisa’s cathedral complex, highlighting the site’s characteristic Tuscan Gothic architecture. A photograph depicting the Campo Santo (Figure 5.36), for example, brought Sacchi to a monument he had previously illustrated based on a printed view. Rather than an interior scene (which would have been very difficult to capture in this period), the photograph focuses on the play of light and shadow on the Gothic façade of the famous structure. Labeled “Campo Santo,” this plate notes the building’s architect, Giovanni di Pisa, and its XIII century date. The focus is on the historical period and the style of the monument, which is revealed in the details of Gothic tracery, and emphasized through light and dark contrast. In this photograph, the figures standing at the portal of the Campo Santo are

---

prominent features of the composition, and continue Sacchi’s investigations of the human relationship to monuments carried out in his earliest photographs of Milan, as discussed earlier. Further proof of this is another plate from the Pisa series, in which the portal of the Cathedral works like a stage for groups perched on the building’s masonry (Figure 5.37). In this masterful composition, a dark shadow makes legible the portal’s carving, and casts two standing figures into relief. In the foreground, the repeated diagonals of the stairs recede dramatically, both pointing to and echoing the row of seated men and women. Almost everyone gazes back at Sacchi’s camera, arresting the viewer’s attention from the architecture. The “pilgrims” depicted here range from men in top hats and tails to women in humble dresses, suggesting religion’s function as a leveler of class distinction. This photograph is an example of the Costumi in Sacchi’s series. Rather than artfully staged peasant scenes in the manner of Caneva, Sacchi incorporated figures into their environment, often posed as if captured spontaneously in situ, thus attesting to the life of these monuments in the present.

The Costumi are by far the least representative plates in the series, with only one explicitly labeled as such. Genova. Costumi popolari presi nel borgo di S. Piero d’Arena (Figure 5.38) depicts a group of dockworkers posed in front of a row of boats in Genoa’s harbor, nevertheless, this photograph shares little with the picturesque and stereotypical images of Venetian and Neapolitan fisherman characteristic of the vedute tradition, because it reveals elements of class and labor that those images typically conceal. In the larger context of the series, this photograph does function to add “local color” to the scene, but it also—and especially for its Milanese audience—provided information about the state of economic progress in other
regions. Genoa, otherwise represented in the series by the Palazzo Doria and its Gothic Cathedral, was singled out for its active port, and thus its larger economic importance in international commerce. Milanese industrialists were particularly interested in gaining access to Genoa’s port, but were restricted from conducting trade through Piedmont by the Austrian regime. Like the monuments associated with modern life in Milan in Artaria’s series, this view focuses on sites relevant to contemporary viewers rather than evoking historical association or composing picturesque vignettes of local costumes.

As the above examples suggest, Sacchi’s compositional strategies articulate a distinct point of view influenced by his conception of the historical and contemporary significance of his subjects. This idea was central to the discourse on photography led by the art critic Francis Wey in the pages of La Lumière, which Sacchi would likely have followed. As art historian Margaret Denton has argued, “Monuments, statues, and sites were, for Wey, both art and history and their significance lay in this juncture. […] In Wey’s aesthetic, photographs of monuments presumably signify because they stimulate a complex of associations and allow for the role of memory demanded of art.” Within this framework, strategically emphasized details served as entry points through which viewers accessed the past. Sacchi’s photographs also functioned in this way. He selected monuments that signified specific historical moments and emphasized their historicity through his framing, which was then reinforced by his captions. Thus, the photographer directed the viewer’s attention to the significant detail from which numerous

563 Maria Grazia Lolla, “Local Colour and the Grey Aura of Modernity: Photography, Literature, and the Social Sciences in Fin-de-siècle Italy,” Stillness in Motion: Italy, Photography, and the Meanings of Modernity, eds. Giuliana Minghelli and Sarah Patricia Hill (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014), 78. Lolla uses the term with regard to Sacchi in her account of the evolution of stereotypes in Italian photography as part of an early picturesque representation.
564 Margaret Denton, “Francis Wey and the Discourse of Photography as Art in France in the Early 1850s: ‘Rien n’est beau que le vrai; mais il faut le choisir,’” Art History 25, no. 5 (November 2002): 642.
historical and literary connotations flowed, which in turn validated the photograph’s status as an object of study. This idea might be compared to the concept of “mutual illumination” explored by the Sacchis in their earliest explorations of image and text relationships.

Like Wey, art critics in Italy including Selvatico and Brera’s Giuseppe Mongeri (1812-1888), wrote about photography’s role in artistic study and architectural preservation. Significantly, Selvatico saw photography as a mechanical art, the value of which lay in its use in artistic training, whereas Mongeri – Sacchi’s most important promoter – held a similar view to Wey, perceiving the medium’s potential to eventually achieve the status of art.\(^{565}\) Sacchi’s own writing and his commitment to the medium indicates that he shared, if not influenced, Mongeri’s opinions on the subject.

Notably, by the mid-1850s, photography began to take on an increasingly important role in the preservation of monuments in Italy. In 1856, the Austrian government initiated two centers for the restoration of monuments at Brera and the Venetian Academy, with Mongeri and Selvatico as the respective heads of these commissions.\(^{566}\) Milan’s first official project was the restoration of the Roman city gate, the Porta Nuova, and photography was included in the portfolio presentation put together by Mongeri for his official report to the Austrian government. He accompanied his proposal with two drawings, a publication on the monument written by Giuseppe Sacchi, and Sacchi’s photograph of the structure (Figure 5.39). The endurance of this Roman monument, as Cassanelli has explained, was a potent symbol of Milanese resistance to foreign invasion, including that of Frederick I Barbarossa and contemporary Austrian rule during the Cinque Giornate. It is quite likely that Mongeri’s involvement was not only for the sake of

\(^{565}\) Miraglia “Luigi Sacchi artista e fotografo,” 21-22.

preservation of a rare piece of Milan’s Roman history, but also, and perhaps most importantly, due to a sense of civic pride.567

Sacchi’s patriotic interest in medieval sites also proved key to his critical fortune in the twentieth century, when the art historian Lamberto Vitali deemed him one of the primitivi of Italian photography, borrowing the term in part from Nadar’s description of the French calotypists in his 1900 memoir When I Was a Photographer.568 More recently, the collector André Jammes and photohistorian Eugenia Parry Janis adopted this designation in arguing for a distinctive calotype aesthetic shared among early French photographers. Thus, within the history of photography, the term “primitive” has long been associated particularly with French claims to artistic mastery of the medium. The term “primitivi,” however, also had a distinctly Italian significance, since during the mid-1920s it came into use during a revival of interest in art of the Quattrocento.569 Vitali’s deployment of the word therefore not only positioned Sacchi within the

---

569 Abigail Solomon-Godeau famously critiqued Parry Janis and Jammes’s use of the term as ahistorical and market-driven led to a reevaluation of its use. More recent scholarship has appropriated “primitive” in productive ways, such as Michel Frizot’s exploration of early photography as a non-verbal (i.e. primitive) form of communication, or Lindsay Harris’s discussion of the image of the peasant in the construction of modernism in Italian photography. The term “primitive” was used with regard to the early Renaissance beginning in Sacchi’s own time, though it too became disused by twentieth-century scholars, due to the comparative value judgment it places on artistic periods. See: André Jammes and Eugenia Parry Janis, The Art of French Calotype: With a Critical Dictionary of Photographers, 1845-1870 (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1983); Abigail Solomon-Godeau, “Calotypomania” (1983), Photography at the Dock: Essays on Photographic History, Institutions, and Practices (University of Minnesota Press, 1991), 4-27; Michel Frizot, “The Parole of the Primitives:
same echelon as established French masters of photography, but also linked him to a longer Milanese artistic lineage, namely the Lombard “primitives,” or painters of the late medieval and early Renaissance, including Leonardo Da Vinci and Bernardino Luini, the same artists whose work Sacchi recorded in his photographs. Vitali’s narrative demonstrates the endurance into the twentieth century of a national mythology within photography that was centered on the past and fashioned during the Risorgimento.

Arguably, Sacchi exploited the potential of the new medium as an artistic and political tool with more self-awareness and purpose than any photographer working in Italy during this period. He intended his photographs to educate a Milanese audience about the history of that city—and Italy more generally—and to build a foundation for civic engagement through Italian cultural patrimony, drawing his ideas from the past and moving across media and printed matter. During a period in which the Italian nation seemed irreconcilably elusive yet imminent, Sacchi made it tangible, and through his photographs, taught viewers how to be Italian.

Epilogue and Conclusion

On June 4, 1859 French and Piedmontese forces won a decisive victory against Austrian troops at the Battle of Magenta. Echoing Stefano Lecchi’s documentation of the aftermath of the Roman Republic, Sacchi captured the artillery-damaged bridge at Magenta extending over the Ticino River (Figure 5.40). The bridge had been a strategic element in the battle; French forces crossed the river to outflank the Austrians who had failed to destroy the structure in time.570

There is no evidence that Sacchi participated in the battle, but the inscribed caption under the photograph suggests that it was made on the same day. Magenta is a mere twelve miles outside of Milan and accessible by canal; thus Sacchi could easily have rushed to document the scene. The existence of an album page (Figure 5.41) bearing this image alongside portraits of war heroes attests that Sacchi’s photograph, like Lecchi’s, circulated among patriots as a memento of their support for the Italian cause and participation in a moment of historical significance.571

The Battle of Magenta marked the beginning of the Second War of Independence, which culminated in the establishment of the Kingdom of Italy in 1861. During this period of war, and especially in the earliest years of Italian nationhood, the single most potent symbol of Italian nationalism was Giuseppe Garibaldi. Already established as an international celebrity after the Roman Republic, he became savior of the nation after his daring 1860 campaign through southern Italy. Setting sail from Genoa to Sicily with the “Mille,” a troop of one thousand red-shirted supporters, Garibaldi arrived in Marsala and launched a swift and decisive campaign against Bourbon troops, who were forced to retreat to the mainland.572 Famously, Gustave Le Gray and Alexandre Dumas followed this “Expedition of the Mille,” and Le Gray produced photographs of the barricades and shelled buildings in Palermo following fighting in the city (Figure 5.42).573 Le Gray also made a widely circulated portrait of Garibaldi that was subsequently re-photographed and reproduced in a variety of media in Italy and abroad (Figure 5.43).574 After leading a successful revolution against the Bourbon monarchy in Palermo and

571 This detached album page is part of the collection of the Alinari Archives Fototeca; I have been unable to trace its provenance.
573 Pelizzari, Photography and Italy, 35-38.
574 Miraglia has suggested that Luigi Sacchi also documented the aftermath of fighting in Palermo. Her assessment is based on photographs formerly in the private collection of Dietmar
Naples, Garibaldi intended to march north to liberate Rome from Papal authority and unite Northern and Southern Italy. Due to behind the scenes political maneuvering, however, Garibaldi ceded his leadership role to Vittorio Emmanuele II, and returned to retirement at his home on the Sardinian island of Caprera.\(^{575}\) Despite the disappointment that some felt at this eclipse of Garibaldi’s political position, the Expedition of the Mille took on mythic status in the imaginations of Italians. Publications featuring the names and biographies of the “Mille” and photographic albums commemorating these new national heroes came quickly to the market to fulfill desires for a tangible piece of this historical moment.\(^{576}\)

Embarking once again on a photographic “Grand Tour” of Italy, Sacchi too followed in Garibaldi’s footsteps, setting sail from Genoa in November 1860 and embarking on a self-imposed pilgrimage to photograph the hero’s house on Caprera. Upon returning to Milan from this expedition, Sacchi published a small pamphlet recounting his journey, which served as a companion to the photographs.\(^{577}\) The text follows Sacchi aboard a steam ship from Genoa as he traveled from Sardinia’s Isola Maddalena to Caprera, and finally to Garibaldi’s humble home. The photographs record the island and the house from multiple vantage points, taking a telescoping perspective that brings the viewer closer to the man himself through sequential views.

One photograph captioned, “View of Caprera toward the House of General Garibaldi,” depicts the structure from a distance, a stone wall cutting a diagonal across the rocky landscape.

---

\(^{575}\) Riall, *Garibaldi*, 222-224.  
toward the small white house nestled in rolling hills beyond (Figure 5.44). Another image in the series shows the house from a close angle, guarded by the same low stone wall (Figure 5.45), and in the third photograph of the series, the camera faces a large group of male figures standing in front of the humble structure (Figure 5.46). Sacchi’s narration enlivens the photographs:

The various photographic views made by me or made public present to all a portrait of his pitiful house. It is a square building that covers a short area of 140 to 150 meters at most. [...] I approached Garibaldi to deliver a letter from his friend, and such was my joy in seeing the great man in good health, and with an appearance so serene and so happy as to take from him the most auspicious predictions.578

On their own, the images of the small home set against barren and desolate scenery provide mere traces of the mythical encounter, but the text adds an additional authority to his photographs by giving concrete meaning to these rather abstract scenes. Garibaldi, whose wellbeing, Sacchi suggests, augurs the fortune of the fledgling Italian nation, remains an absent presence. This memorial pilgrimage resonates with Lecchi’s earlier tour in the somber aftermath of the Roman Republic, guiding the viewer through the space and time of a heroic battle and the meaningful abode of a protagonist of historical events. In both cases, the photographic evidence produced by these patriotic pilgrimages highlights the tenuousness of making visible something so intangible as nationalist belief, yet their efforts testify to photography’s central role in constructing symbols of political struggle. Sacchi carried out this final series at a key turning point in Italy’s history, but one in which the battle for the nation was far from over. He bore witness to the end of an earlier era of photography in which the fragile traces of Italian identity (that he recorded in Monumenti, Vedute e Costumi d’Italia) gave way to a memorializing industry aimed at shoring

578 “Le varie vedute fotografiche da me o fatte di pubblica ragione presentano a tutta evidenza anche il ritratto della sua povera casa. È un edificio quadrato che copre una breve superficie di 140 a 150 metri al più. [...] Io mi accostai a Garibaldi per consegnargli una lettera di un suo amico, e quale non fu la mia gioia nel vedere il grand’uomo in ottimo stato di salute, e con apparenze così serene e così liete da dover fare di lui e del suo imminente avvenire i più fausti pronostici.” Sacchi, Una visita all’isola di Caprera, 14-15.
up that unity by teaching Italians a new pantheon of national heroes, martyrs, and historically significant sites. After Unification, the cities depicted in that earlier series were transformed as streets were renamed for the Risorgimento’s protagonists and politicians, and monuments were erected to local men who had taken up arms to fight with Garibaldi.

The title and content of this dissertation, “Developing Italy,” suggests that the early history of photography within the peninsula was inextricably linked to the very development of the nation during the Risorgimento. This dissertation has identified several key figures of early photography from the fields of science, art, and publishing, including Macedonio Melloni, Gaetano Fazzini, Antonio Bertoloni, Giovanni Battista Amici, Ferdinando Artaria, Stefano Lecchi, Giacomo Caneva, and Luigi Sacchi, who made a significant contribution to the development of the medium and of a national discourse. These figures played a significant role in nation-building by producing and disseminating among the public sphere a new type of image, resonant with the idea of Italy, which portrayed a distinct identity and inspired patriotism. The significance of their early endeavor can be measured, among other criteria, by the endurance within Italian photography well into the twentieth century of the subjects that they depicted with their cameras, including key monuments, peasant studies, and sites associated with Risorgimento battles. The processes, formats, and iconography established by these early photographers thus formed the basis for a commercial photographic practice in Italy, which reached a mass distribution after Unification (1861).

The case studies explored within this dissertation have shown that these early efforts, and the overarching development of photography within Italy, closely followed experiments with the medium occurring elsewhere in Europe. My discussion, therefore, reveals how quickly Italian practitioners adopted new processes, and how closely connected they were to well-known
protagonists of photography’s history, such as Daguerre, Talbot, Lerebours, and Arago. The lack of national unity, and thus lack of governmental backing in the form of commissions, competitions, exhibitions, and infrastructure distinguished the efforts of photographers within Italy from their foreign counterparts, and, remarkably, led them to seek alternative means of financial support and routes of distribution for their images. In doing so, they exploited their own personal and professional connections to scientific, publishing, and artistic communities, and thus, they and their photographs traversed local, regional, and national boundaries. Tracing these networks necessarily led this research outward from localized and individual bodies of work to a wider transregional and transnational perspective. The scope of this discussion has, therefore, aimed to go beyond photography’s contribution to the discourse that shaped the emerging nation by also arguing that Italian photographers played a significant role in the early development of photography as a medium, both locally and – significantly – internationally.
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