The world that shaped Europe’s first national sculptor-celebrities, from Schadow to David d’Angers, from Flaxman to Gibson, from Canova to Thorvaldsen, was the city of Rome. Until around 1800, the Holy See effectively served as Europe’s cultural capital, and Roman sculptors found themselves at the intersection of the Italian marble trade, Grand Tour expenditure, the cult of the classical male nude, and the Enlightenment republic of letters. Two sets of visitors to Rome, the David circle and the British traveler, have tended to dominate Rome’s image as an open artistic hub, while the lively community of sculptors of mixed origins has not been awarded similar attention.

Rome, Travel and the Sculpture Capital, c.1770–1825 is the first study to piece together the labyrinthine sculptors’ world of Rome between 1770 and 1825. The volume sheds new light on the links connecting Neo-classicism, sculpture collecting, Enlightenment aesthetics, studio culture, and queer studies. The collection offers ideal introductory reading on sculpture and Rome around 1800, but its combination of provocative perspectives is sure to appeal to a readership interested in understanding a modernized Europe’s overwhelmingly transnational desire for Neo-classical, Roman sculpture.

Tomas Macsotay has held postdoctoral grants from the Henry Moore Foundation and the Marie Curie Co-fund Programme M4 Human, Gerda Henkel Foundation. He is a Ramón y Cajal Research Fellow at the Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona.

‘This important collection of essays by an international team of scholars sheds new light on Rome’s emergence as an international center of sculptural production and consumption at the period spanning the end of the eighteenth-century through the defeat of Napoleon. Their research takes us inside the studios of artistic giants like Canova and Thorvaldsen as well as a host of lesser-known
figures who made Rome Europe’s sculpture capital *par excellence.* Together, the authors reveal the Eternal City as a cosmopolitan community of patrons and practitioners whose interactions led to technical breakthroughs, stylistic innovations, and lofty claims for the centrality of sculpture to modern life.’

Jeffrey Collins, Bard Graduate Center, USA

‘Comprised of archivally rich analyses, this volume traces the myriad forces that ensured Rome’s ascendance as the capital of European sculpture in the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries. Essays chart an expanded topography of sculptural networks, drawing together luminaries like Canova, Cavaceppi, and Flaxman; the specialized tradesmen and assistants whose work was integral to the business of sculpture; and aesthetic interlocutors in the guise of patrons, scholars, and museum personnel. Bringing new life to the material and theoretical lives of sculpture, its makers and audiences, the volume significantly expands our appreciation of the interlinked histories of sculptural restoration, production, and consumption that underwrote a Roman dialectic of ancient and modern.’

Sarah Betzer, University of Virginia, USA
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This book started as a bulk of six papers presented at a busily attended symposium hosted on 19 January 2011, by the Henry Moore Foundation, Leeds. At first, *Antiquity Multiplied. Artistic Itineracy and Sculpture-making in Rome (ca.1750–1850)* was to address themes of itineracy in two distinctive but overlapping levels: in a more direct manner, it was to address the effect of a travelling costumer culture and of migrant sculptors on the production and appreciation of sculpture of neoclassicism. On a more speculative level, *Antiquity Multiplied* was also looking to explore the possibility of international dialogue, asking how far developments in art history in the UK, France and the German-speaking world had resonance for communities of scholars across national borders. Predictably enough, we soon found it would be necessary to debate the difficulty of having a proper debate. There appeared to be consensus on the notion that art historians needed to apprehend Rome as a local and politico-economic environment, and also of the importance of going beyond Canova and Thorvaldsen to understand the cultural framework of neo-classical sculpture. But our speakers wove together a tissue of six divergent ways of correcting the monographic mould that had long taken hold of art histories of Rome and sculpture around 1800.

For some, the way forward consisted of close inspection of style in sculpture, including phenomena of replication and clandestine “trading” in new ideas between rival or subaltern sculptors, while for others, what demanded attention was the use made of sculpture by consumers as part of a wider effort to appropriate the classical past. For some, what mattered was to bring into focus a number of strategic choices confronting sculptors within a primarily economic set of constraints, while others believed more attention was to be paid to the archives of antiquarians and collectors, to find the deeper sediment of what was once awakened by the sculptures, triggering aesthetic responses both complex and compromised (by emotion, by the economic, by sex and gender). Some protested that one might never truly be able to reconstruct such feelings. As this book was prepared,
and new authors were invited to write for it, the driving force remained the reminiscence of a debate at Leeds about the need to allow for the many voices to be heard in a way that must nevertheless incite the reader to savour gaps and points of fracture. The result hopefully relays a reading askance from the comforts of a tightly knit narrative. Perhaps a deliberately terraced architecture of methods and approaches is bound to produce a cross-referential, inviting and thought-provoking overall picture of why Rome’s neo-classical sculpture continues and should continue to occupy art historians, particularly those who lay at its steps a series of questions that are increasingly social and cultural.
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Introduction
‘Close up and Far Away’

Tomas Macsotay

Create Greek beauty under the Cimbrian sky, where it has never been seen, and if possible raise it above all sensation that might soil the traits of beauty.

Winckelmann to the Danish Sculptor Wiedewelt (1761)

This volume examines sculpture made at the time of Rome’s emergence as a transnational capital of neoclassical taste, from approximately 1770 to shortly after Canova’s death in 1822. The contributions to this book engage with Roman neoclassical sculpture’s immediate spaces and historical agents of production and reception. They explore Rome’s modernizing cultural institutions, the ‘studio’ system, and the unique circumstances generated by travel for commissioning, commercializing, and framing an interest in modern sculpture of that city. They also pursue new insights into sculpture’s international audiences, showing that the collecting and encouraging of sculptors from abroad contributed a series of aesthetic conditions that both stimulated and impinged upon sculptural production in the city.

In Rome, a time-honoured destination for Europe’s cultivated elites, Greco-Roman sculpture had long been part of the city’s educational sights. Since the late seventeenth century, a series of aristocratic galleries closed their doors to offer their antiques to the highest bidder, and so a tenacious hunt for marble figural statuary began among Europe’s nobility, infecting even minor travellers. Between 1750 and 1780, agents and travellers obtained vast amounts of antiquities (including many forgeries) from dealers such as Thomas Jenkins or sculptor-restorers such as Bartolomeo Cavaceppi, who, as Daniella Gallo tells us, led a princely studio (Figures 0.1 and 0.2). Roman sculptural enterprises adapted to the new clientele, although it was not until the late 1780s that the traveller began to truly affect the city’s system of marble statue production. As the demand for new sculpture increased, and as foreigners dominated a market long dependent on noble families and their religiously and
aristocratically framed patronage, some of the most direct attempts at recreating antique grandeur occurred among Rome’s outsiders; sculptors who travelled and migrated south.⁴
Rome’s elite sculptors – Antonio Canova (a Venetian), Johann Tobias Sergel, Alexander Trippel, John Flaxman and Bertel Thorvaldsen – secured private commissions that gave their careers momentum and enabled them to focus on the classical style. For an array of transalpine locations, they prepared carefully worked gallery statues, innovative tomb projects or intrepid public monuments. Similarly, Christopher Hewetson and other less well-known sculptors specialized in more affordable genres, from busts to adaptable bas-relief formats. A mixed itinerant clientele of casual visitors, private collectors and cultural ambassadors went on the sculptors’ studio tour and, after 1790, regular visitors included a cohort of art-loving queens and princes – among them the Hannover Prince Augustus Frederick, later Duke of Sussex (1793), the Princess-Abbess Sofia Albertina of Sweden (1793) and Bavaria’s Ludwig I (who first visited in 1815). They appear to have looked for studios of exalted beauty, peopled by sculptors of advanced skills with perhaps some verbal flair and an air of reliability.

While neoclassicism presents itself to us as an international phenomenon, much of the sculpture from the neoclassical era depended on Rome as an urban centre. Rome was a site where two types of ‘goods’ were exchanged: aristocratic and tourist taste and the lustre and classical form of Carrara marble. Tourism animated excavations at Hadrian’s Villa, the Via Appia, the Naples area and elsewhere in the peninsula, causing modern sculptors to take a direct interest in the mastery of ancient sculptural styles. In Carrara, the quarries prepared and shipped marble to Rome, where the tourist clientele ordered sculpture in the studios to be sent home via Leghorn. For decades little changed in this commercial network, though some sculptors moved directly to Carrara. In 1769, Maria Teresa d’Este established an Academy in Carrara with a view to improving relations with architects and retailers in other towns. Its geographically and economically favourable position goes some way to explaining a by now familiar protocol of sculptural trade (marble is exported; skill gravitates to the hub; and sculptors’ reputation and branding are enhanced as a result). This system of marble sculpture production reached its full potential during the heyday of Rome’s status as the Western cultural capital, ‘exporting culture’ (to employ Orietta Rossi Pinelli’s recent characterization) to traditionally active cultural capitals such as London and Paris, or cultural construction sites such as Edinburgh, Munich, St Petersburg and Barcelona.

The fact that, after 1750, the Roman art world was no longer a local, impermeable, self-contained universe suggests that Baroque Rome had become a successful cultural hub in Europe by this time. The notion of a ‘sculpture capital’ is employed here to convey Rome’s position as a capital city of Europeans (joined later by a host of North Americans), who made and purchased sculpture. Rome’s unique possibilities and limitations as a social and economic hub enable us to analyse its sculpture trade in terms
of porous borders and cross-national encounters, and also suggests how its unique vibrancy depended on the constant assembling and disassembling of artistic and national communities and supervisory institutions.
To be sure, by 1750 sculpture thrived in almost every capital of Western Europe. For much of the eighteenth century London was the home of an active sculpture industry that was rich in skilled Italian and Flemish carvers; however, its clients were all local. The academic sculptors and religious decorators of late eighteenth-century Paris were similarly busy. Like Rome, Paris attracted a significant number of genteel travellers, while *philosophes* such as Denis Diderot and Melchior Grimm promoted the benefits of foreign employment for French sculptors such as Laurent Guiard, Etienne-Maurice Falconet and Antoine Houdon. In terms of its sculptural economy, Paris had nothing to compare to the combination of local stone-cutting and foreign acquisitiveness seen in Rome; for its marble supplies, Paris depended entirely on imports. Moreover, sculptors who left Paris came under the strict control of a specific court, which prevented the development of anything resembling a free ‘marketplace’ for their work. Rome’s sculpture studios, by contrast, are best described as international settlements that filled niches in the market. The alleyways where sculptors set up their shops provided the natural décor for the international network and cultural élan of this cosmopolitan pilgrimage. This synergy, where the travelling aristocrat met the emigrated sculptor, is the baseline for the advent of neoclassical sculpture in Rome, and it explains why the ‘sculpture capital’ was such a successful concept: the aura of modern sculpture became part of the very fabric of the city’s mythical aura, not to mention its commercial strategy as a cultural treasure house.

Throughout the book, two interdependent theories are proposed: one theory concerns the opening of national boundaries for modern Roman sculpture, and the other theory describes the apparent effects on sculpture caused by the flux of travellers and migrant sculptors. The first hypothetical strand traces the wider repercussions of sculpture as the object of a set of cosmopolitan projections. Johann Joachim Winckelmann, as quoted at the beginning of this introduction, describes this larger cultural concern as the desire to compensate for the geographical distance separating southern ‘skies’ from other corners and outposts of Europe. This work of un-siting and re-siting, this cancellation of the natural topography of the ideal, turned the traveller-sculptor into a public teacher of ancient beauty. It was not just a matter of producing sculpture, and lots of it, at the fundamental site of antiquarian discovery and recovery, but also of recreating outside Rome (and in real flesh) the beholder’s transformative, salubrious encounter with classical beauty.

If the trade in Roman marble statuary can be characterized as international simply by noting how far afield modern statues travelled, the layered and composite nature of sculpture production – its dependence on ephemeral communities of manufacturers and traveller-clients – demands a more detailed and historically thought-out concept. Mid- to late eighteenth-century Rome is habitually framed as a cosmopolitan art centre with a large British
presence. During the 1790s, Rome takes this modernity to a fever-pitch, as the city stages ‘the true climax of international neoclassicism’; by the early Restoration, as Christina Fernado suggests, Rome’s international image functions above all as a clever trademark.

This problem of commercial openness and social heterogeneity underlines the second proposition of this book, which asks how the presence and interactions of travellers and artist-migrants, as historical agents behind the trade, shaped sculpture in new and unexpected ways. Here, we must move away from the habit of over-identifying with the patron-traveller, and also avoid the prevailing myopic interest in single artists and oeuvres. The too-frequent amalgamation of neoclassicism with didactic public art, (for example, the famous David school) has done a disservice to realities on the ground: in the case of Roman sculpture, scholars have recently tracked its arbitrary evolution, its artistic fragmentation, and even its aesthetic ambiguity, polysemy and ‘queerness’, which left many traces both in the making of sculpture and the forms of its enjoyment. This picture suggests that the openness of Rome should not be interpreted solely in terms of its contribution to the internationalization of a specific school of art making. A closer look at the colonies of sculptors in Rome allows us to focus on the informal and erratic, even volatile, nature of itinerant patronage and encouragement of sculpture. In the years 1770–1820, no city offers so much international visibility. Yet it may be time to challenge the hermetic idea of neoclassicism as a tightly run enactment of Winckelmann’s ideas.

1770–1825

This book does not intend to offer an overview of Rome’s rise and fall as a sculpture capital, but rather focuses on the city’s initial growth and moments of crisis. It presents a series of interconnected approaches to the consolidation of a strong sculptural economy in Rome. The years 1770–1825 exclude much of the nineteenth century, and even if they include practically all of Canova’s activity and part of Thorvaldsen’s, they are not premised on these sculptors’ working lives. The aim has been less to compose a Whig history of neoclassicism than to ask what circumstances contributed to the rise of Rome as a city of sculptural entrepreneurship in the modern sense. Aside from quarries and ancient sculpture, this ‘fertile soil’ included galleries, papal cultural politics, and of course travel and expatriate life.

Rome’s papal collections have often been regarded as the forerunners of the modern state museum. Decades of expensive building and restoration under the supervision of the pontificate stimulated a fascination for antique sculpture shared by artists and travellers alike, but it also redirected their attention in new ways. Starting with the creation of the
Capitoline Museum in 1734, the administration of the Papal States reunited works that had been split up, and housed them in accessible collections. During this development, and notably under Pope Benedict XIV (1740–1758), the canon was expanded and new galleries devoted to early Christian and medieval art were created. This was another key transition that promoted among dilettanti and artists alike the survey of art forms previously considered to be primitive and now viewed as major historical curiosities, if not imitable models. As Jeffrey Collins noted in a recent study, the investment in archaeological knowledge by the last Ancien Régime pope, Pius VI, was a means of counterbalancing the widespread atheist and materialist currents of Enlightenment thought dominating the city.9 If the Vatican could not block out secularist thinking and politics, galleries of art and antiquities could at least offer a historicist plea for the continuation of a Christian legacy. Opening up the European treasure house of Papal Rome to antiquaries, scholars and artists was, in effect, a strategy of elite appeasement.

Christian monuments and works of art suffered greatly from looting and iconoclasm at the hands of French and Italian radicals during the French take-over (from 1796) and the short-lived Roman republic (1798–1799). The debasing of Catholic landmarks and the transportation of large amounts of monuments from the Vatican to the Musée Napoléon was accompanied by assaults on artists in Rome. A notable example of this was the Canova studio, which was charged and occupied during the self-imposed exile of the sculptor in 1798.10 A strongly politicized atmosphere had built up over time. Before the French incursion, it had been Italian ‘mobs’ that disrupted the convivial atmosphere governing foreign artists’ circles in Rome – many were sympathetic to the republican counter-culture. Rome’s police fought against these popular revolts, but not with all their might.11 Two events in the winter of 1793: the riots that devastated the French Academy on the Via del Corso and France’s declaration of war on Britain, fanned young artists’ fears of a crisis. Thus a young painter, Theed, describes in a letter his belief that ‘the Roman populace are brutal enough to massacre all the French here, should they get the better of the military’ and he goes on to point out, ‘the horrid barbarity of the Italian disposition and the feebleness of the government to oppose any outrage of the people’.12 By 1798, practically every British and German artist had evacuated the city and it was only after the Catholic compromise of the Concordat in 1801, in conjunction with Prussian neutrality in the French and Napoleonic wars (Prussia was forced to resume war in 1806), that a somewhat interlinked community of Danes and Germans gained a foothold. Archaeologists Jørgen Zoëga and Friederike Brun, Prussian statesman Wilhelm von Humboldt, Danish ambassador Herman Schubart and his wife, Jacqueline Elisabeth Schubart-Wieling (Figure 0.3), guided and patronized the newly arrived Thorvaldsen. Meanwhile, Prussian state-backed sculptors Christian Friedrich Tieck and Christian Daniel Rauch ventured to
Rome and Carrara, producing there a cohort of Prussian commissions which included the sarcophagus of the deceased queen of Prussia and a portrait-bust series for the Walhalla memorial. Next to Canova’s portraits of the Napoleons,
such works seem to be designed to mourn the destruction of a Christian and German cultural identity, besieged by a French militarized machine. The Nazarene movement sealed this wilfully fölkish and introverted German contribution to Rome’s evolution as fertile soil for young artist-settlers.

Between 1796 (the year of the French incursion) and 1814, Rome’s population decreased by a third.14 The contested presence of the French in the city, coupled with the dearth of British travellers, aggravated the crisis for sculptors’ studios and damaged the city’s reputation for openness in the 1780s and 1790s. This was the tense climate facing the small band of northern expatriates that greeted Thorvaldsen’s Jason (plaster version 1803) as heralding the dawn of a new era of heroic, soul-cleansing beauty (Figure 0.4).15 Coupling a deep awareness of the best of German aesthetic debate (Winckelmann, Schiller and Kant) with an effective anti-Canovian posture, and rampant patriotic sentiment, their writings have left art history with an excessive sense of disruption around 1800. I will return to this important point, as it has affected the art historian’s image of Rome.

The return of a strong British influence after 1815 must have been partly due to the collaboration between the Duke of Wellington and Canova. The sculptor launched a successful diplomatic campaign to restore works of art taken by the French from Rome to Paris after 1796. This new order was again beneficial for the growth of what might be called, albeit hesitantly, a cosmopolitan circle of sculptors. Northern travellers of all sorts flocked back to the city, resulting in the rapid development of a customer-friendly sculpture industry. During her travels in Florence and Rome between 1816 and 1836, Lady Murray visited some fifty-five independent sculptors established in these urban hubs, meeting locals as well as Germans, Britons, Frenchmen, Scandinavians and Belgians. Like other contemporary observers, she described what we might now call a showroom approach to the sculptor’s studio: busts of travellers and contemporaries shared the limelight with plaster casts (from which replicas could be ordered) and models of works waiting for the generosity of passers-by. By the time of Antonio Canova’s death, the transformation of sculpture audiences and the expansion of sculptural genres to include new memorial, representative and decorative types, looked irreversible.16

The last decade covered by this book shows a situation similar to that before 1793. British patronage was still important but the city was less rebellious, less unpredictable. As before, the studios retained their typically Roman semi-public presence, attracting visitors who had no other outlet for viewing contemporary art. Sculpture studios retained their dominance of art exhibition, losing it only in 1830 with the first exhibition of modern art hosted at the Capitol on behalf of an artist’s corporation, the Società degli Amatori e Cultori di Belle Arti.17
0.4 Bertel Thorvaldsen, *Jason with the Golden Fleece*, 1802–1803. Plaster, Copenhagen, Thorvaldsens Museum © Photo Conway Library, courtesy Courtauld Institute of Art.
Antiquities, Learning and Marblemania

Given the large British share in the trade of antiquities and new sculpture, it goes without saying that trade via Leghorn exerted a direct impact on the lives of sculptors and other agents. Whenever European states were at war, naval conflict compromised trade through the strait of Gibraltar. The capture of the Westmoreland, a ship carrying tourist exports (including a handful of portrait-busts, reduced antique copies and small marble compositions), beautifully illustrates how sculptors in Rome had a direct stake in naval trading routes.18

Busy artisan migration routes had existed since the fourteenth century, but they seldom gave rise to such prestigious and lively conglomerates of artists and dilettanti. Rome’s relevance to the study of sculpture is not limited to historical instances of recreational tourism and happenstance ‘marblemania’. The city, recently described as ‘a place where the cross-pollination of the modern with the ancient allowed the culture of Europe to flower in new and unexpected ways’, was an epitome of artistic and intellectual effervescence that was ideally suited for the creation of informal circles of art-lovers and artist-masters. Goethe joined some of these groups when visiting Rome in 1786 and 1787.19 A consummate centre for scholarship and the artistic study of antiquity, the city’s sculptors and travellers joined a uniquely local cultural (yet disconcerting) arena that was shaped by the fragility of transnational contacts and episodes of anguish and confusion caused by political crises and warfare.

The most dramatic moment of institutional collapse came with the French revolutionary incursions to Italy, between the violent storming of the French Academy in 1793 (when all French fine art students fled Rome) and the failure of the republican experiment in Rome in 1798. The Napoleonic occupation affected sculptors like François Marie Poncet from Lyon (d. 1797) and Liverpool-born John Deare, who died in 1798 in dubious circumstances.20 Deare and Poncet were celebrated for their copies of classical masterpieces and Poncet, in particular, made independent sculpture so convincingly antique in appearance, that it was traded as freshly excavated and original. Clearly, national schools had a much smaller part in more ‘serious’ work than that of playing footman to a dishonest trade in antiquities, but the many questions this gives rise to have hardly been answered by current literature on neoclassical Rome.21 A different situation held for young sculptors arriving in Rome after 1798. They entered national circles that scorned republican violence and the Napoleonic spoliation of Roman collections. Rauch, David D’Angers and Francis Chantrey were placed under the protection of rebuilt national academies or made to secure training with Canova or Thorvaldsen, where production revolved around large, nude gallery-statues – ‘new classics’ no longer easily mistaken for antiquities or sold at random.
Academism registers alongside tourism as the most influential factor in giving neoclassical sculpture its identity. Academies saw themselves as anterior to the whims of patronage – they placed elite collective approval on artistic excellence, seeing their apparatus of training and judging as a defence of art’s autonomy against private ownership. In 1767, a visitor from the freshly installed Royal Academy in Stockholm, the Swede Johann Tobias Sergel, arrived in Rome on a pension extended to him by the Swedish king. Like many before and after him, he kept close relations with a selection of state-funded students in the French residential facility, the school for life drawing and gallery of plaster casts on the Via del Corso, the famous Palazzo Mancini. Forging friendships with, among others, Thomas Banks and Henry Fuseli, Sergel worked his marble for a clientele consisting mostly of foreign nobility. Baron de Breteuil, the French ambassador to Naples, purchased a marble version of Sergel’s *Drunk Faun*, while Richard Payne Knight commissioned a marble *Mars and Venus* that could not be completed before the sculptor returned to Stockholm in 1777 (Figure 6.1).22

Some Historiographical Remarks

While personal relationships forged between sculptors and patrons over commissions have been the object of detained scholarly interest, this book attempts to describe these exchanges as expressions of a comprehensive system of association that was economic, but also psycho-cultural in nature. The book addresses the reality of a sculpture capital that was attractive to producers and audiences, in part because of its cosmopolitan atmosphere. In recent years, an awareness of the transformative nature of cosmopolitan culture has animated greater interdisciplinary collaboration, producing studies where Rome’s medicine, literature, natural science and fine art are seen to enter into dialogue or embark on combined cultural ventures.23 What triggers curiosity about neoclassical sculpture must not simply be the sheer quantity of cross-national commissioning that went on in Rome, but indeed (given these cosmopolitan and local conditions) evidence of communication between sculptors and their clientele that affected the city’s emergence as a sculptural milieu. Helped along in some cases by a shared mother tongue, acts of patronage in Rome can be read as the protracted negotiation, if you will, of an aesthetic common ground that is lined with the concerns of patriotic-aristocratic representation, commodity culture and the prestige of Italian travel. Hugh Hamilton’s well-known rendition of Canova posing next to a model of his Cupid and Psyche group and depicting Henry Tresham’s physical proximity both to the sculptor and the plaster, as he ponders over the work’s virtues (Figure 0.5), is perhaps the most fascinating example of this phenomenon.
The chapters in this book focus on this combination of consumers and producers by bringing greater subtlety to dominant art-historical accounts of the sculpture that best exemplifies the neoclassical movement. They disinvest in genius-artists and if attention is claimed for the era’s great patron-collectors, the narrative that glorifies their ‘singular vision’ is always undermined. These contributions also move away from the simple model of causation: the artist’s laboratory as the engine of innovation and artistic success. What appears in lieu of this history of pristine progress and novelty is an image of sculpture flourishing amidst intra-individual dynamics; of compromise and making-do, where ideas travel uncharted among viewers and sculptors, and where aesthetic notions of sculptural form are neither exclusively of Rome or of the cultural outposts that commission its sculpture, but somewhere in between. Finally, they make the case that such in-betweenness is encrypted in the language of administrative reports, private letters, memoirs and the first (expatriate) art histories.

The inadequacy of the notion that the consecrated artistic ‘movement’ represents the ‘open’, transnational nature of Rome’s sculptural field is not the only theory offered in this book. Similarly, the subject of sculptural enjoyment, the spectator – addressed in the third part of the book – moves in to replace more individualist approaches hailing patrons and artists. The spectator covers a wider range than the patron circle, and overlaps the artistic undertaking of work, becoming a participant as much as a witness to the process of sculpture’s production. After all, Rome’s studio system, as Susanna Adina Meyer demonstrates, was defined by the degree to which the influx of travellers and local patricians navigated this particular branch of the Roman economy. As Chiara Piva points out, even intimately technical activities, such as restoring a statue, necessitated that Roman collectors and scholars evaluated models and counselled restorers. The neoclassical laboratory involved the activities of viewing, comparing and serial development. At the same time, the Roman studios were more than simple shops dependent on client relations. They were also sites of artistic freedom, in the sense that the visibility of sculpture in a Roman studio could fuel pan-European fame. In this book, Roberto C. Ferrari tells of John Gibson’s anguish over the fact that after being shipped off to Chatsworth, his Mars and Cupid would no longer be able to spark a public response.

If this book’s contributors articulate a new structuring of the field, then it seems appropriate to underline here which ideas are left behind. The Roman artists’ world has been portrayed before. After the renewed interest in neoclassicism in the 1970s, a series of books on Thorvaldsen and Canova – and their Roman context – have addressed the ramified circles of patronage, encouragement and friendship that catered to these two sculptors’ success. They have exposed the importance of transnational contacts, in particular the interventions of British collectors, Italian, German and Scandinavian antiquarians and writers, and migrant artists.24
In spite of their deep digging into social contexts, the Canova–Thorvaldsen monographs may have unwittingly created a vacuum around them, taking away momentum from the study of other representatives of Rome’s neoclassical community of sculptors at large. One possible reason for this is the frequent depiction of Thorvaldsen’s context as ‘northern’, and the analysis of Thorvaldsen’s statues as expressions of a ‘northern tradition’. His ‘radici nordiche’ concern much more than his ‘Cimbrian’ place of birth: they answer to an art-historical paradigm where German luminaries are portrayed as guards of artistic reform, while Italy and France embody the Ancien Régime, slacking in aristocratic decay. Accounts of this transalpine affinity open up to a teleological reading where Franco-Italian academicism is dislodged by an austere, idealistic, interiorized classicism; even the ‘neo’ prefix, with its promise of rebirth, shares in this narrative. Thus Thorvaldsen’s self-conscious reinvigoration of absolute Greek beauty, and his inception of a new northern classical, seems to re-enact the transformative cultural reform wrought by 1790s Weimarklassizismus.

After the development in the last twenty years of a body of scholarship on eighteenth-century material culture, this idealistic, northern solipsism stands in need of correction. Indeed, the facts of trade, fashion and commodity cultures, genteel sociability and the aesthetic of acquisitiveness de-stabilize and complicate art history’s propensity to premise the neoclassical movement upon values expressed by Winckelmann and German artists in their letters. I refer to the ideal Rome, conjoining the classical monuments with the idea of the city as still, somehow, a virgin territory of human experience. Recently, Richard Wrigley has shown the extent to which suppositions about the uniqueness of the climate and the dangers of the air in and around Rome were key elements in the articulation both of travellers’ experiences of the city and the very sense of its historical links to antiquity. Travelling to Rome was about breathing its airs, which could result in states of physical and emotive disarray, both the patent ones of infection by malaria and the metaphorical ones of anticipation, disenchantment, epiphany and ‘painful self-renewal’.

The pathological language of visiting Rome thus came to encapsulate a Burkean preoccupation with personal rebirth through sublime self-exposure. Exalted hopes that enjoyment of the beauty of the best Greek sculpture brought about a free subjectivity that was unavailable elsewhere was central to the Italian experience – certainly one which could at least in part be re-enacted by reading Winckelmann. More to the point, Winckelmann’s recovery of Greek ‘beautiful’ and ‘heroic’ sculpture was, from this point on, typically described as plotting a path towards the accomplishments of Canova and Thorvaldsen, who became revered as geniuses making up for ‘our’ lost connection with the Greco-Roman past. But if utopian art made its debut in neoclassical Rome, nurtured by those who, like Carstens, embraced their foreignness as a necessary
escape into self-possession and subjective interiority, it was not an unambiguous new beginning. The popular claim that Thorvaldsen’s *Jason* signified a break with tradition is unfair and simplistic; it makes little of the complexities of Canova and the other sculptors who visited Rome in these decades. Moreover, what reception of *Jason* tends to distract us from is the less ‘authorial’ soil out of which Rome’s neoclassical revolution unfolded: the fellow-travelling between gentry and sculptors, the fine assimilation of ideas and expectations of sculptural beauty, the taste for splendid, marble nude figures, with ever greater attention directed at display settings and the surface treatment of marble both newly carved and restored.

The tragedies of remigration and dispersion around 1798 preceded and accompanied the arrival in Rome of German Kantian aesthetics, the philosophical revolution that became invested, via Berlin, in the idea of a Thorvaldsen ‘break’. But should we speak here of a stylistic–aesthetic momentum, a sudden onset of free thinking that was to elevate the sculptural heroic nude into new secular ideals? This seems doubtful. The challenge for modern scholars is to acknowledge the powerful legacy of neoclassical fictions of Rome, without thereby subscribing to the idea that such narratives are historically descriptive. Understanding neoclassicism as a transitional moment in the emergence of modern art also entails the recognition of commerce, of Rome’s ideal position in international trade and of the fact that sculpture was not by any means an art form practiced above all else by artists seeking unfettered creative licence. This approach risks downplaying the commercial, political and local pressures of the sculpture market. In the eyes of Trippel and Flaxman, Rome was not the paradise that art history has depicted. Their aim was to achieve dramatic success before the eyes of their countrymen, with a dim promise (often betrayed) of high offices in Academies once back in the north. The notion of freedom that appears in German circles was utopian, and although such utopianism was politically resounding, it provides no final answer to questions about Rome, sculpture and their possible dependence on Kantian debates. Nevertheless, emancipative practices and the idealist strain of neoclassicism have to be integrated into our picture, resulting in an artistic sphere that looks like an amalgam of the commercial and the utopian.

The earlier era of sculptural effervescence, before 1793, is perhaps the hardest to reimagine. Pre-Napoleonic Rome was a laboratory of ideas that united many strands of European Enlightenment culture. Some notable art historians, including Stefano Susinno, Wendy Wassyng Roworth, Ilaria Bignamini, Jeffrey Collins, Carole Paul, Christopher M.S. Johns and Edward Bowron, alongside some of the authors represented in this book, have pursued a model of cultural history that tempers art-historical plots of stylistic evolution with cultural ones. As this happens, material culture is changing the direction of Grand Tour studies, as can be observed in the work of Alison Yarrington and Viccy Coltman. Gilles Bertrand, Richard Wrigley, Chloe Chard, Edward Chaney,
Claudia Sedlarz and others have reinserted aesthetic responses recorded in Tour memoirs and travel accounts to received languages of subjectivity. Such prodigious work on the Tour permits us to reassess the cultural politics of Pope Pius VI (1775–1799) and artistic life unfolding as an integral part of Roman elite sociability and the art market; of antiquarian expertise and the Museo Pio-Clementino; and of support to scholars and opposition to the irresponsible antiquities trade (which emblazoned the popularity of new sculpture). The bifurcated treatment of Rome as a city in transition from a baroque-religious to a neoclassical-civic art nowadays seems to run behind the facts of a secularity inspired by Vatican interests; of classical revival and reformist aesthetics as gambits of conservative, not just modern, pursuits and convictions. The Rome of Italian antiquarians, travelling British gentry and French pensionnaires is sporadically documented and published, each in isolation, as patrimony that concerns primarily the Italian, British and French contributions to art history. A synthetic account of so many strands of cultural activity is difficult to give, but the chapters below accept this challenge by pursuing a transnational survey, offering new insights into the dynamics of economic, socio-artistic and cultural life in and around the Roman sculptor’s studios.

****

Part I: A Space for Encounters

In the second half of the eighteenth century, Rome developed an elaborate system for the promotion of contemporary art, which was set in motion by a decline in traditional aristocratic and public patronage. Neighbourhoods by the Trinità dei Monti and the Corso traditionally accommodated many sculptors’ workshops and with the arrival of émigré settlers, these travellers, collectors and their agents, the quarters acquired a new vibrancy. Understanding how contacts between producers and purchasers were established entails reading memoirs, journals, diaries and letters exchanged between the travellers and artists, or collectors and their agents. Part I of the book pieces together a socio-economic image of life for sculptors in Rome in the second half of the century. It analyses documentation that leads to a more reliable understanding of how Roman workshops functioned in practice and the role of markets in connecting Rome to the growing number of European costumers of Carrara sculpture. The creation of transalpine sculpture galleries belongs to the history of collecting as much as it does to the nature of Roman expenditures, and so it too receives attention here.

Chiara Piva offers an analysis of the economic conditions that pertain to the work of sculptors and their collaborators with polishers, stonemasons, stonecutters and moulders. Her representation of the sculptors’ businesses is
based on careful work in public and private archives in Rome. This primary source material contains papers on salaries, payments, costs of materials, the antiquities market and transportation costs. The data arising from these papers reveal that the Roman system of sculptural production was favourable to sub-contracting and collaboration between specialized labourers. Unexpected economic and social constraints emerge as well: the cost of living in late eighteenth-century Rome is one important example. Combined, these findings reveal the topography of ateliers in the city of Rome; a living body, where competition also entailed many forms of dependency and where the exchange of goods and services was a necessary means of accommodating the demands of an increasingly mixed market.

Rather than thinking of production and consumption as two separate spheres, it can be helpful to think of Rome as providing fertile soil for financial ventures involving marble sculpture. Newcomers to Rome operated on the elaborate foundations of a marble-transporting and marble-working trade that was put in place and financed by the prestigious enterprises of Roman rebuilding (for example, the Museo Pio-Clementino and the Villa Borghese). The fact that these Roman operations involved, almost exclusively, fellow-Italians may be attributed not to a budding national sentiment, but to the simple fact that the co-ordination of tasks requires a lingua franca that puts other foreigners at a disadvantage. By contrast, foreign sculptors who spoke Swedish, French, English and German were central to the rise of the large, ambitious nudes in direct emulation of antiquity, as Susanne Adina Meyer shows in the next chapter. Meyer presents a rare account combining different strands of evidence: studio visits, special exhibitions of new art works, art criticism in journals, the role of art agents and ‘ciceroni’ and the function of art academies. As instruments developed with the aim of amassing a Roman audience that included many foreign travellers, these were all-important factors for professional success in a sculptural enterprise in Rome. In the 1780s, sculptors like Poncet, Trippel and Johann Heinrich Dannecker all took advantage of available platforms and strategies of artistic promotion. This took them to exhibit at the Accademia di San Luca and Académie de France, but also to make inventive use of their own studios by singling out noteworthy sculptural projects for public attention. Here lie the origins of a form that Canova, Thorvaldsen and the Restoration sculptors would develop further: the tall, nude marble statue, the ‘new classic’ that advertises itself as an exquisite sculpture gallery item.

Meyers registers the unique identity of Rome as a site for viewing and purchasing modern sculpture, forging a more nuanced understanding of communities in the field of production and the divisions and internal boundaries that gave them their identity inside the sculpture hub. Less well-connected transalpine sculptors might have been pivotal in developing the ‘studio’ strategy, looking at the ever-larger, self-standing projects as venture investments offered to the visitor, but packaged as ‘free’ artistic creations. Meanwhile,
smaller numbers of sculptors with peninsular origins, Italian-speaking and thereby better assimilated into city rebuilding, moved into the production of gallery statues, achieving international success in that genre only in the early–mid nineteenth century.

As an example of how the competitive sculpture business in Rome was nourished by the creation of a sculpture gallery at a marginal outpost of the European sculpture trade, Alison Yarrington considers the 6th Duke of Devonshire’s sculpture collection at Chatsworth. Yarrington conveys the means by which, in the years following the Napoleonic Wars, the 6th Duke realized his ambition to form a collection of contemporary sculpture, predominantly sourced from Roman studios, to be housed in his new gallery at Chatsworth. His campaign resulted in the acquisition of works by Canova and Thorvaldsen as well as by Carlo Albacini, Carl Finelli, Matthias Kessels, John Gibson, Joseph Gott, Johann Gottfried Schadow, Lorenzo Bartolini and others. At the outset, Canova was central to his enterprise and the sculptor’s unexpected death was to impact upon his plans in a variety of ways. Although the sixth Duke called those from whom he commissioned work ‘my sculptors’, a pivotal role in realizing his vision for the Chatsworth sculpture gallery was played by Gaspare Gabrielli, his Rome-based agent who was employed variously as artist, dealer, designer and artistic intermediary. The letters and writings documenting the genesis of Chatsworth’s famed sculpture gallery suggest an organic approach to the collection, one where the activity of trendspotting by the Roman agent (Gabrielli in the case of Chatsworth) claims special attention, and where decisions taken in Rome and in Chatsworth over the years interact in unexpected ways. A fascinating example of *ars combinatoria* at Chatsworth is the ornamental effect that the Duke achieved by choosing coloured pedestals and statues that set themselves off from the whiteness of Carrara marble. The Duke’s interest in the marble trade included the employment of marble workers to create copies of antique works from marbles extracted from the Devonshire-owned quarries. This meant a double-lane shipping of stone, from Derbyshire to Rome – to bring it under the hands of superior craftsmen – and then back to Chatsworth. The implications of this are many. As Rome’s association to Carrara marble no longer made up the monopoly in the employment of the city’s skilled carvers, audiences also began to use their acquired classical ‘lens’ in imaginative ways to support local industry.

At Chatsworth, we face an important side-effect of the system of ‘sculpture-exporting’ for which Rome became famous: if this sculpture collection documents the somewhat straying studio visits in Rome, the penchant for discovering modern sculptors’ talents, for making informed stone choices, and taking advantage of Roman stoneworker’s skill sets, then perhaps this means that a subordinate role was given to the symbolism of permanent display, including the potential for using the display as a means to broadcast the proprietor’s self-image. Indeed, the fact that after a long period where the
collection had no final arrangement (lasting until 1834) the sculptures were finally set up to suggest a memorial (a homage to Canova), thereby improvising new meaning from the existing pieces, seems to suggest that a constant fine-tuning took place charting the hidden possibilities of the collection, with the emotive nature of the dilettanti’s discernments outweighing the purposes of programmatic decoration. Thus, ‘romantic’ collecting and entrepreneurial Rome habilitate one another.

Part II: Close to Canova

The Canova studio had a magnetic appeal to the Tourist, the antiquarian and the foreign artist alike. When considering foreign sculptors in Rome, one never wanders far from Canova’s seminal work from the 1780s and 1790s. Canova’s exemplarity fed into a widely professed image of the sculptor’s personality as inclusive with regard to foreign artists and amicable with regard to foreign art lovers. All of this stood in stark contrast to the old studio and guild systems, reviled by Diderot in his craft articles for the Encyclopédie because, in the philosophe’s view, so much of what they achieved depended on servility, exclusion, mercenary rivalry, the despotism of studio masters and the secrecy imposed on students. In this way, Canova has become the centrepiece of an argument for regarding Rome as artistically modern: a place where sculptors cherished their freedom and exercised their genius as artists. However, taking a closer look at openness in Rome seems to undermine the idea of the primacy of Canova’s personality to artistic modernization. In fact, other potential sources of artistic modernization demand our attention: the city’s imbrication of beholders in the work of sculptors, a result of accessible studios’ ‘venture investment’ statues, is certainly one of them. Johannes Myssok, Daniella Gallo and Christina Ferando chart ways in which Canova’s apparent artistic magnanimity and self-confidence can be attributed to external (his acute understanding of the open studio system) and internal factors (Canova’s hiring of skilled carvers, and his cultivating young artists for technical and stylistic fermentation).

The first chapter in this part constitutes a reflection on the history of late-neoclassical Rome as a city whose ‘open’ artistic physiognomy increasingly came to rest on subsequent ideological manoeuvring. Christina Ferando argues that nuanced understandings of post-Restoration politics explain and hollow out inherited notions of the ‘open’ nature of the Papal States at that time and of Canova’s studio, both famed in similar terms as all-admissive, cosmopolitan venues. Canova’s nineteenth-century panegyrics in particular tend to obfuscate the realities on the studio floor, proving to be a stubborn influence on the image of Rome, especially in art histories of the neoclassical era. Thus, Fernando shows that the flattering portrayal of Canova as a great
inventor and autonomous creator in fact answered to the Risorgimento nationalist mobilization of a heroic ideal of the Italian past, making much more of Canova’s proud resourcefulness and non-committal outlook than we can tell by examining the collaborative realities of his studio or its ties to official circles. Similarly, the inherited idea of Canova’s European identity, which portrays his studio as a node of international networks of patronage and diplomacy, tends to overshadow Canova’s dedication to conservative causes at the heart of the cultural politics of the Papal States in the post-Napoleonic years.

The traffic of ideas and genres, the shared choice of technical devices and the borrowing of styles that connect Canova to the likes of Dannecker and Schadow are the themes in Part II. Since co-operative work and mutual dependence were features of the Roman sculptors’ trade, these chapters embark on problems of genres, themes and styles in flux. Rather than strive for a settled view of influences between Canova and the foreign sculptors, Gallo and Myssok contribute two divergent perspectives for discussing artistic exchanges around Canova. This part will chart the historical and visual evidence of influence and proximity, and the mix of formal and economic arrangements between studios that such influence entailed.

In the second contribution, Daniella Gallo explores the meaning of being a Canovite sculptor, i.e. working in Canova’s shadow, without having much space for competing with him. As her chapter indicates, the distribution of commissions among major and minor workshops depended on biases towards the value of different genres of sculptural labour. At the same time this capacity to discriminate between upper-tier commissions (such as ecclesiastical employment), and lower tasks (such as the final polish) was in itself changing under the weight of Canova’s achievements. Gallo, like Johannes Myssok in his own take on the Canovian influence, seeks to qualify the nature of Canova’s pre-eminence by arguing that it was not shy of opportunism and good luck. Unlike more biographical assessments of this period, Gallo opts for a rationale of place and economic competition. Indeed, her chapter exposes the darker shadings of the sculptors’ neighbourhood (the condensation of Rome’s studios) they made for restricting conditions affecting sculptors relegated to a peripheral role beneath Canova’s star. Yet since Canova was a magnet for employment from which other sculptors benefitted, we see the beginnings of a conflicted Canovianism: it was good to be like Canova, but it was also Canova’s prerogative to ‘borrow’ from his neighbours. By contrast, in the final chapter of this part Myssok argues that Canova deserved his prerogative treatment, given his technical and stylistic accomplishments.

German-speaking sculptors arriving in Rome, and sheltered by foreign courts rather than Academies or travelling costumers, played into the hands of the exemplary status of the Canova workshop. Johannes Myssok’s contribution traces the impact of Canova’s œuvre on his German friends, Johann Gottfried Schadow and Johann Heinrich Dannecker. Both sculptors took
residence in Rome in the closing years of the 1780s, meeting Canova just as he enjoyed the fame earned by his group of *Theseus*. Myssok shows that the young Schadow and Dannecker were marked by their friendly admiration and academic ‘study’ of Canova. The German sculptors, mostly preoccupied by the Venetian’s funerary monument for Clement XIV, were keen students of antique borrowings, stylistic precepts and technical advances lending splendour to Canova’s work. Indeed, these accomplishments were at the centre of a neoclassical vocabulary they set out to develop upon their return to Germany. Schadow’s cenotaph for Count Alexander von der Mark exemplifies this internationalization of Canovian practices, as do works by Dannecker. Myssok points to ways in which technical and stylistic novelty, as well as a shared concern over the commemorative function of sculpture, produced new versions – Prussian, Swabian – of the classical. In Myssok’s account of the Swiss and German protagonists of the 1780s and 1790s, the Roman artists’ world worked in part on the model of Canova’s studio. While young sculptors allowed Canova to stand as a model for antique renewal, the latter’s powerful position would have been co-opted.

**Part III: Distance and Difference**

The personal encounter with classical remains, the focus of a well-rehearsed early modern rite de passage, was a highly framed ‘transformative’ experience, available to the educated traveller and to the man of virtue. The formula of empirical, intellectual and sentimental transportation to ancient Rome is of interest here for its similarity with a desire, as it emerges everywhere among British, French and German foreigners, to promote sculptural life in modern Rome as a vehicle of deeper truths and lost imaginaries of Greek art making. Part III of this collection focuses on the neoclassical beholder: how was he or she mentally and physically addressed by neoclassical sculpture, and how did sculptors pre-empt this aesthetic encounter by means of subject-matter, the heroic ‘new classic’ or nude, and the object’s materials and textures? Elaborating on the close encounters between migrant artists and patrician travellers, the chapters in this part craft a psycho-cultural outlook on neoclassical sculpture that underlines the mutual dependence of making and viewing, of design and spectatorship, of workshop venture and audience self-discovery. These chapters explore different aspects of the idea that the Rome in travellers’ imaginations represents a useful point of departure for carrying out an analysis of neoclassicism as a cultural current.

Part III starts by suggesting that neoclassical sculpture shaped a fictional beholder. How this was done, is the subject of Roland Kanz’s ‘Multiple Views, Contours and Sculptural Narration’. As Kanz shows, neoclassical sculpture struggled with an awareness of its own potential for embodied experience. Renaissance sculptors opened the figural statue up to a mobile beholder,
developing techniques of narration that depended on this possibility of changing views. Canova’s *Three Graces* at Woburn Abbey, discussed by Kanz along with other neoclassical architectural settings for single sculptures, illustrates how these increasingly located the beholder on a fixed point facing the statue. Such tightly controlled presentation forced sculptors and their audience to reconsider viewpoints and narratives before the sculpted body. On the side of sculptural practice, Kanz registers a bent for experimentation, as antique examples are rediscovered in their formal coherence. The chapter then turns to the meaning of contour, and the aesthetic status attributed to it by authors from Winckelmann to Cicognara. Kanz pursues these findings to a surprising conclusion: narration is central to neoclassical spectatorship, even if it is achieved by the contradictory means of fixed viewpoints and linear abstraction. The pure outline, fixing the distinctive shapes of sculpture by its representation in prints and drawings, opens possibilities for new types of narrative schematization. The same is true on the level of figural sculpture, as long as it is considered as a complex interaction between contour and movement in its spatial setting.

In some fortunate instances, the audience for sculpture and the practicing hand occur in a single persona. From 1787 to 1794, the English sculptor John Flaxman went to Italy to study the sculptures of ancient Rome and Greece. Eckart Marchand has studied Flaxman’s surviving journals and sketchbooks. The sketchbooks depict a strikingly wide range of object types from antiquity, the Middle Ages, early and high Renaissance and even the Baroque era, while the journals show the wide horizon, characteristic for contemporary Grand Tour travel books, of contents. Despite Flaxman’s relatively humble origins, he received a considerable classical education – in his time a sign of social distinction. Although he reacted to typical professional requirements when travelling to Rome, Marchand shows us that Flaxman undertook his journey in the spirit of a gentleman Grand Tourist, choosing the typical overland route and collecting information about the places he visited according to patterns set by the published travel literature. The interests of tourist and sculptor illuminate the choice of motifs in the sketchbooks as well as the narrative of the journals. This reminds us that sculptors, too, were beholders.

It has been correctly observed, most recently by Martin Dönike, that Roman archaeology and art in the 1790s turn overwhelmingly towards problems of representing the violent and vitriolic. A chapter on John Deare’s *Caesar Invading Britain* takes a closer look at a remarkable example of country house decoration, contextualizing it by considering the migratory life and stage writing of John Penn, the *Caesar’s* commissioner. Penn’s writing is of interest here for the way it shows an incidental sculpture commissioner working through some of the difficulties posed by the memorial genre in the early 1790s. Deare’s *Caesar* is at the same time defined by the formal experimentation that characterized 1790s Rome. By closely reconstructing the poetic share
of the commissioner and the stylistic one of Rome’s bas-reliefs, we regain a sense of the deeper implications of John Deare’s *Caesar Invading Britain* for the evolution of the memorial genre.

In the art-historical literature on British Neoclassical sculptors, a surprising gap exists when it comes to the study of the sculpted nude male body as an object of homoerotic desire. In contrast, an established corps of literature has examined this very issue in French painting of the same period. Roberto C. Ferrari closes the book with a contribution that considers the early career of the sculptor Gibson. Ferrari argues that as a pupil of Antonio Canova in the carving of sensual sculpture, and as a follower of Winckelmann’s aesthetic theories on the *beau idéal*, Gibson crafted a *Mars Restrained by Cupid* that can be seen as celebrating homoeroticism and the subject of Greek love. Focusing on his representation of the homoerotic classical body, the chapter switches between the perspectives of artist, patron and (potential) viewer. As in the previous contributions, Ferrari carries his analysis to bear on correspondences and tensions between two modalities of loving art in Rome: the sculpture student embracing classical form and the presence and imaginaries of the visitor public. Works that, for all their academic and technical credentials, we might now still see as elliptic in their meaning, are seen to be the result of a complicity of beholders.

Notes


4 An ever-expanding scholarship on the travellers, and the networks of collectors and agents responsible for commissioning modern sculpture in Rome, means that some interesting findings on the market for Roman sculpture occur in studies devoted to antiques collecting or British country house culture. Scholars will profit for decades to come from the vast documentation in John Ingamells, *A Dictionary of British and Irish Travellers in Italy, 1701–1800* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1997).

5 On Carrara and the traffic of Roman art from Leghorn to London see Cinzia Sicca and Alison Yarrington, *The Lustrous Trade: Material Culture and the*


11 Johns, Antonio Canova, p. 70.


14 Johns, Antonio Canova, p. 76.

15 I am indebted to Margreet Boomkamp for allowing me to read some of her work on the immediate context of Thorvaldsen’s breakthrough, and look forward to her published account. Chapters of the Thorvaldsen monographs quoted below will mention the Roman supporters of Thorvaldsen – Zoëga, Friederike Brun and Wilhem von Humboldt – but fall short of redressing some of the rhetorics of these diatribes against ‘what went before’ the Dane.

16 It must have appeared even more so in the sculptural trade of Florence, where tourism left an even more profound mark.


20 There are at least three versions on the cause of Deare’s death, including the rumour that he was murdered by a French soldier who had assaulted the sculptor’s wife.


27 By now, the study of German circles in Rome has been turning to narrativity and aesthetics rather than the ‘history of ideas’, paying greater attention to embodied conditions of exploring Rome and its monuments. See for instance Claudia Sedlarz,
Rom sehen und darüber reden. Karl Philipp Moritz' Italienreise und die literarische Darstellung eines neuen Kunstdiskurses (Hannover-Laatzen: Wehrhahn Verlag, 2010).

29 For the image of Rome as a locus where a classical spirit comes to be reinterpreted as a modern emancipative drive, see Alexander Potts' analysis of Winckelmann's letters: Alex Potts, Flesh and the Ideal: Winckelmann and the Origins of Art History, paperback edn (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), p. 182.

30 In British historiography, the idea of Canova and neoclassical sculpture as the overture of a modern condition of embodied viewing has been argued by Alex Potts, The Sculptural Imagination: Figurative, Modernist, Minimalist (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2000), p. 36. A crucial contribution to these debates is David Bindman’s account of Canova and Thorvaldsen’s exposure to post-Kantian aesthetics, published as this book was being completed. See David Bindman, Warm Flesh, Cold Marble. Canova, Thorvaldsen, and Their Critics (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2015).


33 The exploration of archaeological, philological and aesthetic writing that circulated in the circles of Canova should be noted here. See Johannes Myssok, Antonio Canova. Die Erneuerung der klassischen Mythen in der Kunst um 1800 (Petersberg: Imhof, 2007).


36 Some of his findings were presented in the recently published critical edition for the Walpole Society. See Hugh Brigstocke, Eckart Marchand and Alison E. Wright (eds), John Flaxman and William Young Ottley in Italy, thematic issue in Annual Volume of the Walpole Society 72 (2010).
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