

Araújo Porto-Alegre and the praise of baroque

Leticia Squeff

Professor at Art History Department – Federal University of São Paulo – UNIFESP

ABSTRACT The opposition between styles has had a great importance in the historiography of arts in Europe. This article argues that the term school of painting was adopted by Brazilian painter and art critic Manoel de Araújo Porto-Alegre (1806-79) for writing the history of 19th century art in Rio de Janeiro. By defining a “Fluminense School” and later a “Brazilian School”, the critic conceived an interpretation of Brazilian past that praised baroque artworks and the peculiarities of the artistic past of Rio de Janeiro. This article claims, on the contrary to what has been stated, Porto-Alegre appreciated Baroque art as an important step to the creation of what he thought to be the History of art in Brazil.

KEYWORDS Araújo Porto-Alegre (1806-79); art history in Brazil; baroque; Brazilian School; Fluminense School of Painting.

Manoel de Araújo Porto-Alegre (1806-1879) is known as the first critic to use the term “baroque” in Brazil. As an artist faithful to the tenets of Neoclassicism, it is believed Porto Alegre deplored the colonial origins of Brazilian art. Baroque being labeled as the origins of Brazilian art was a disturbing factor to Brazilian culture, a problem that would later be challenged by critic Mario de Andrade. Even though they regarded baroque origin as a problem, both critics wanted to create a new future for the arts in Brazil.¹ This future should be built on a rational basis, according to what was going on in the international art circles, particularly in France. This paper intends to present a new interpretation of Porto-Alegre ideas about the history of art in Imperial Brazil. I shall discuss how the term “school of painting” was adopted by Porto Alegre for writing the history of art in Rio de Janeiro. Due to this concept, the critic changed his approach about the Baroque artists of the colonial period. Furthermore, by using the term “school of art”, he and other thinkers of nineteenth century Brazil were able to formulate a global overview of the art produced in Brazil. “School of painting” and “School of art” were employed by several nineteenth century critics and historians.

¹ GOMES JR, Guilherme Simões. *Palavra peregrina: o barroco e o pensamento sobre artes e letras no Brasil*. São Paulo: Edusp/Educ/Fapesp, 1998.

Porto-Alegre and the ideas about art at the time

Araújo Porto Alegre laid the foundations of art history in Brazil. He was believed to be one of the most educated men of his time. For this reason, apart from being a painter and architect, he also worked as an art critic and a journalist in Rio de Janeiro. His writings are spread in newspapers and cultural magazines. Nevertheless, I argue that in some articles he achieved a comprehensive view of art history, in which differences among local artists were organized in to a coherent historical complex.²

Porto-Alegre writes about artists biographies or works of art and architecture in Rio de Janeiro, by using concepts of European history of art such as schools of painting and styles. In his texts, he quotes authors such as Johann Joachim Winckelmann, Alexander Lenoir, F. Schlegel, among others. There are in truth a long list of names and references in each of his texts. For this reason, his role in what could be called the history of ideas about art in Brazil have inspired different interpretations. Some scholars would associate Porto-Alegre's relations with a myriad of authors and personalities of the nineteenth century. Relying on nominal references made by the critic himself, these works lacked in-depth analyzes. However, the question must be carefully examined, because quoting was part of the rhetoric of the intellectuals of that time. Specific rhetoric, heightened level of vocabulary and usage of quotes were all hallmarks of such authors of the time period. Thus, Porto-Alegre was not uncomfortable with this trend. For this reason, a history of ideas about art in nineteenth-century Brazil should rather discuss the methods and concepts used by the critic as opposed to referencing his sources.

Porto-Alegre used the term “school” in several writings, dealing not only with the past of the empire but also with respect to contemporary artists. The critic even mentioned Luigi Lanzi in at least one of his articles.³ At that time, “school” had a long tradition in art appraisal in Europe. The term had enormous popularity among antiquarians and art collectors at the recently founded museums at the end of century XVIII, thanks to the diffusion of the ideas of the antiquarian and scholar Luigi Lanzi (1732-1810). Let us shed light on Lanzi's role in debates on the history of art of his time.

The school of painting and the new display of art collection

Father Lanzi, a respected Etruscologist, published several treatises on ancient archeology, literature and poetry.⁴ His *Storia Pittorica dell'Italia* (1792) was a great success, being read and widely used during the nineteenth century. The book was quickly translated into English and French, being

² GOMES JR, Guilherme Simões. *Op. Cit.*

³ Porto-Alegre mentions Lanzi in the essay “Exposição de 1843”, in *Minerva Brasiliense*, vol. 1, nº 5, 1844, *apud* KOVENSKEY & SQUEFF (orgs). *Manuel de Araújo Porto Alegre: singular e plural*. São Paulo: IMS, 2014, p. 275.

⁴ BAZIN, G. *Histoire de l'Histoire de l'Art*. Paris, Éditions Albin Michel, 1986.

reworked for the first time in 1795-96, when it was edited into two volumes. In 1809 the book received the definitive edition, revised by the author and published into five volumes plus an index.

At the beginning Lanzi divides Italian painting into four schools: Florentine, Bolognese, Roman and Neapolitan.⁵ This structure would increase up to fourteen schools in the next three editions.⁶ Each school was defined by relatively elastic criteria: the region of the peninsula, the relation between masters and disciples, admitting in some cases the inclusion of foreign artists, among others, to simultaneously create a coherent and varied system.⁷

“What do we learn by exploring the jealousies of the Florentine artists, the Roman quarrels, or the boasts of the Bolognian schools?”⁸ Lanzi asked, ironically, in the foreword, demonstrating his intention to overcome the Vasarian model, organized by artists biographies. Lanzi’s approach was to discuss the artworks, not artists’ lives. In addition, the concept of school of painting allowed Lanzi to avoid what he considered to be another problem in Vasari’s treatise: Florentine artistic primacy over other artistic centers. Lanzi recognized the importance of each school, seeking to rank it in relation to the others. The term of school was also adopted in order to understand the history of painting in Italy based on artistic styles or “manners”, following the method already used by Johann Joachim Winckelmann (1717-1768).⁹

The German scholar had transformed the approach to antiquity. His method gave prominence to the examination and interpretation of objects, contributing to consolidate a discipline that was emerging as a specific field of knowledge -the history of art. Winckelmann had set periods in the history of Antiquity, pointing eras of progress, apex and decadence, as well as differentiate the styles of each civilization. The scholar created a complex historical scheme, in which time periods were articulated to certain artworks and societies.¹⁰ Under Winckelmann’s influence, Lanzi establishes an interpretation of the history of painting in Italy in which styles, related to the schools of painting, have

⁵ GRASSI, Luigi & PEPE, Mario. *Dizionario dei termini artistici*. Torino: UTET, 1994, p. 850. The idea of school was used by authors such as Giovanni b. Agucchi, Mancini, b. Cellini, among others. “The novelty brought by Lanzi consisted in having larger schools included a rich constellation of smaller schools: (...)”. Lanzi states that Agucchi “was the first to divide Italian art into the schools of Lombardy, Venice, Tuscany, and Rome.” LANZI, Luigi. *Luigi Lanzi Works*. The Perfect Library, 2013. E-book, position 5669. GUINZBURG, Carlo. “História da arte italiana”, in *A micro-história e outros ensaios*. LISBOA: Difel, 1989, p. 10. Cf. também VENTURI, L. *Il gusto dei primitivi* (1936); ZERI, Federico, *Storia dell’arte italiana* (1983). I thank my colleague Cassio Fernandes is suggesting this reading.

⁶ *Apud*. BAZIN, *A história da história da arte*. Rio de Janeiro: Martins Fontes, 1989, p. 70.

⁷ Venturi compares Lanzi to a botanist, because he sorts and gathers artists according to regional schools (Florence, Siena, and so on), individual (teachers and disciples) and according to the genre. Cf. VENTURI, Lionello. *Historia de la critica de arte*. Buenos Aires: Poseidon, 1949 (1936), p. 162.

⁸ LANZI, Luigi. *Luigi Lanzi Works*. The Perfect Library, 2013. E-book.

⁹ *Id. Ibid.*

¹⁰ SÜSSEKIND, Pedro. “A Grécia de Winckelmann”, in *KRITERION*, Belo Horizonte, nº 117, Jun/2008, pp. 67-77.

a central role. In addition, the *Storia* of Lanzi plays a part in the renewal of art understanding, archaeology and debates about cultural heritage.¹¹

Father Lanzi had also been responsible for reorganizing the collection of the *Galleria degli Uffizi*, which inspired his *Guida alla Galleria di Firenze* (1782). The book had an enormous impact among princely galleries and recently founded art museums that arose around Europe. Lanzi organized the artworks as “Galleria Progressiva” (progressive collection), display by regional or national schools, chronologically aligned. The *Galleria Progressiva* offered a historical and geographical view of the Uffizi Collection.¹²

Men like Francesco Algarotti, Louis Petit de Bachaumont, Chrétien de Mechel, Nicolas de Pigage, J.J. Winckelmann, among others, formed an international network of scholars who shared this approach to the display of art as *Galleria Progressiva*.¹³ Along with Lanzi, they set a standard no enlightened collector could ignore. In 1780, Chrétien de Mechel transformed Vienna into what was “the first art historical survey museum”. In the beginning of the following century, the Louvre museum followed in suit.¹⁴

The same principle of “progressive collection” was used by Joachim Lebreton in the Academy of Fine Arts of Rio de Janeiro. In the following years, Academy’s gallery would be enlarged and reformulated by different managers. But school remained a key-category to classify paintings and artists of the collection. Later, the idea of “Brazilian school” would be adopted for the display of the paintings at least three times: in 1859 and later, as “National Paintings collection forming the Brazilian School” in 1879 and 1884.¹⁵

“Our primitives” and the praise of the baroque

From this broader perspective, Porto Alegre’s adoption of the concept of school seems almost obvious. He was a former student of Rio de Janeiro academy and also knew the writings of Winckelmann, Mengs and Lanzi. However, the issue needs closer examination.

¹¹ On the spreadings of this new way of relating to antiquity in the debate on heritage cf. CHOAY, Françoise, *Alegoria do Patrimônio*, São Paulo: Edusp/Liberdade, 2001, p. 65 *passim*.

¹² Lanzi “(...) donnera un exposé théorique dans sa *Storia pittorica dell’Italia dal Risorgimento delle belle arti fin presso al fino del XVIII secolo*, ou il créera ce cadre des écoles de peinture qui allait régir les pinacothèques européennes jusqu’à nos jours.” Bazin, *Les temps de musées*. Liège: Desoer S.A., s/d, p. 162. Sobre o tema, ver também McCLELLAN, Andrew. “Rapports entre la théorie de l’art et la dispositions des tableaux au XVIIIe siècle”. In : *Les Musées en Europe à la veille de l’Ouverture du Louvre. Actes du colloque la commémoration du bicentenaire de l’ouverture du Louvre*, les 3, 4 et 5 juin 1993, sous la direction scientifique d’Edouard Pommier. Paris: Klincksieck et musée du Louvre, 1995.

¹³ McClellan, *Inventing the Louvre*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999, p. 4.

¹⁴ *Idem*, *ibidem*, p. 4.

¹⁵ I discuss this issue in *Uma Galeria para o Império: a coleção de quadros nacionais formando a escola brasileira* (1879). São Paulo: Edusp, 2013, chapter 3.

The first time he approaches art history in Brazil, Porto Alegre talks to the members of the Historical Institute of Paris about some of the artists he would later deal with, such as the sculptor and architect Mestre Valentim and the painter José Leandro de Carvalho, among others. In the short speech, later published in one of the volumes of Debret's *Voyage Pittoresque et historique au Brésil* (1834-39), the young Porto Alegre already uses the term of school of painting. As his main concern is to emphasize the relationship between the new academy, inaugurated in Rio de Janeiro in 1826, and the tradition of French art education, he states that the "Rio de Janeiro school" is an "authentic pupil of the Paris school". He goes on to add that "the school of Grandjean [de Montigny] was not less prosperous than that of Mr. Debret."¹⁶ In making this statement, the author admits that "school" refers to something broader than artistic teaching. It implies the specific manner of each teacher, which is learned and developed by his pupils.

After his return to Brazil in 1837, Porto-Alegre made more in-depth research, examining ecclesiastical documents and churches. The "Memory of the Fluminense School of Painting" narrates the history of seven painters active in Rio de Janeiro between the beginning of the eighteenth century and the 1830s. In this article, published in the *Quarterly Review* of the Brazilian Historical and Geographical Institute, he made a survey of the works and biographies of those artists, joining, in some cases, all the available information about them.¹⁷

The concept of school was used not only as a geographical reference – "Fluminense School of Painting" – but also conveyed each artist's individual creation. Porto-Alegre inserts the artists of the colony under a double symbolic title. First, he sheds light on the region where these artists worked: the adjective "fluminense" relates to the climatic-geographical surroundings of Rio de Janeiro. Porto-Alegre adopts Lanzi's ideas, which also divided Italian schools according to their geographical locations. Furthermore, he mentions the "school" of Manoel Dias as equally as he refers to the "school" of Montigny or Debret.

In his article on the Candelária church, Porto-Alegre affirmed: "Our best temples were started when borrominesque art triumphed in the metropolis of Portuguese America, that is the reason why we see this similar style in abundance here."¹⁸

In fact, Rio de Janeiro city's main landmarks - the Passeio Público (Public Promenade), the Carioca arches, the fountains, and all the main churches of the city- were built in the previous century.

¹⁶ PORTO-ALEGRE, Manuel de Araújo. "As artes", in "Resumo da história da literatura, das ciências e das artes no Brasil", in *Viagem Pitoresca e Histórica ao Brasil*, apud KOVENSKY & SQUEFF (orgs). *Op. Cit.*, pp. 260-261.

¹⁷ PORTO-ALEGRE, Manuel de Araújo. "Memória sobre a antiga Escola de Pintura Fluminense", *R.I.H.G.B.*, 1841, III, 33, Suplemento, pp. 547-557 apud KOVENSKY & SQUEFF, *Op. Cit.*, pp. 262-266.

¹⁸ Porto-Alegre. "Iconografia Brasileira". *RIHGB*, 1856, p. 370.

Porto-Alegre gave these buildings various praises.¹⁹ In his speech at the Historical Institute of Paris, the critic recounts the history of the Public Promenade, admiring the crocodiles that adorned one of the fountains, “ingenious in its colossal form”. He celebrates the booths for their “harmonious integration with sea and rocks around” concluding that “These works and many other works gave impulse to the national genius; (...)”.²⁰ In another article, he pays tribute to the Carmo Church, commenting that “These two ports would be considered as two perfect borrominesque art monuments in all of its fancy in any city of Europe.”

He also praises the “grand manner” of the “arts in the time of the colony”.²¹ Master Valentim would be acclaimed in several articles for the “luxury” of his works. Porto-Alegre would go so far as to say: “Valentim has elevated the borrominesque art to such an extent that it challenges the wonders of Versailles and the Royal Chapel of Dresden.” The Baroque, as a style, is part of an artistic repertoire of the school of Rio de Janeiro. Therefore, it must be exalted and inserted in the general art history. However, Porto-Alegre criticizes baroque aspects in artworks of contemporary artists displaying in academy exhibitions.²²

The idea of school suited to problems faced by the historian. The history of art in colonial Brazil has always closely followed what occurred in the Italian and French Art Centers. “(...) We always walk a century behind the European movement”, wrote Porto-Alegre.²³ Furthermore, the artists of the colony were usually simple craftsmen with practical background. Porto-Alegre observes that painter Raimundo was “son of his own enthusiasm”, or that “not one painter from the school of Manoel Dias deserves such a name.” The critic does not deny the technical limits of the first artists from Rio de Janeiro.

In his article about the Fluminense School, the critic compares the “oldest historical painter” he discovered in the archives of Rio de Janeiro, Frei Ricardo do Pilar, to artists such as Cimabue and Giotto. Later, in “Iconografia Brasiliense” (1856), Porto-Alegre observes that the works made by Leandro Joaquim “will one day be what today are the paintings of Giotto, Masaccio and other masters that preceded the Renaissance.”²⁴

¹⁹ The same was true in other former colonies, where the adaptation of classicism was shaped by local factors. Cf. NIELL, Paul B. and WIDDIFIELD, Stacie G. *Buen gusto and classicism in the visual cultures of Latin America, 1780-1910*.

²⁰ PORTO-ALEGRE, Manuel de Araújo. “As artes”, *apud* KOVENSKY & SQUEFF (orgs). *Op. Cit.*, p. 259.

²¹ Cf. PORTO-ALEGRE, Manuel de Araújo. “A igreja Santa Cruz dos Militares” *Ostensor Brasileiro*, nº 31, vol. 1, 1845, pp. 241-245, p. 242.

²² See for instance Porto-Alegre critiques in *Minerva Brasiliense* (1843-45) e *Guanabara* (1849-1855). He criticizes baroque art in his essay on the 1843 exhibition. “Exposição de 1843”, in *Minerva Brasiliense*, RJ, nº 5, vol. I, 1º de janeiro de 1844, in Kovensky & Squeff, *Op. Cit.*, p. 275.

²³ Cf. PORTO-ALEGRE, Manuel de Araújo. “A igreja Paroquial de Nossa Senhora da Candelária”, *apud* KOVENSKY & SQUEFF (orgs). *Op. Cit.*, p. 281.

²⁴ PORTO-ALEGRE, Manuel de Araújo. “Iconografia Brasileira”, in *Revista do Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro*, Rio de Janeiro, tomo XIX, n.23, 1856, KOVENSKY & SQUEFF, *Op. Cit.*, p. 338.

These comparisons should not be understood simply as pieces of rhetoric, or an excess of a scholar influenced by Italian art history. As the critic himself states in several writings, the artists of the colonial period were enslaved and/or former enslaved. In a time of racial theories, Porto Alegre made a break through by including those men in a history of art.²⁵ To compare those men to consecrated European artists can thus be understood as part of a convincing strategy. Porto Alegre was once again inspired by Lanzi.

Facing the lack of a historical narrative about art in the Brazilian empire, as well as the absence of internal parameters to qualify those artists, Porto Alegre borrows the “primitives”, valued in Lanzi’s narrative on Italian painting, as a means of evaluating local artists.²⁶

“When Brazil has its Vasari, these short stories will serve as the basis for a more complete work, and inspire new research on our primitive artists.”²⁷

Porto-Alegre knows that it is up to him to start an initial narrative about those men. Thus he presents himself as the author of the first draft of a story that later can be properly written by other historians. In comparison with Italian primitives, “our primitive artists” can be put in perspective. They are the forerunners of the Brazilian school. The artists of the School of Rio de Janeiro had prepared the way for the more refined artists that would come later. The belief in transformation of styles and schools through time allows Porto-Alegre to accept and praise Baroque style.

The Fluminense school and the Brazilian school

In a speech at the historical Institute, Porto-Alegre summarizes a periodization of the history of art of Brazil: each period in the history – colonial, the Portuguese Kingdom and Independent Empire –, corresponded to a school.

Lanzi divided the Florentine school into five eras, from the earlier Tuscan artists to Cimabue and Giotto up to Pietro da Cortona and his followers.²⁸ Porto-Alegre asserts that each of the phases of Brazilian history – colonial, kingdom and empire – corresponded with a stage in the history of art. In addition, the critic would use the same time category used by Lanzi:

²⁵ I discussed this aspect in SQUEFF, L. “Quando a história reinventa a arte: a Escola de Pintura Fluminense”, *Rotunda*, nº 1, 2003. Disponível em <http://www.iar.unicamp.br/rotunda/rotunda01.pdf> (acesso em 3 de setembro de 2016).

²⁶ On the appreciation of Italian primitives by Lanzi cf. BAZIN, *Op. Cit.*, p. 70; Lanzi starts his book by refuting Vasari’s statement that the painting before Cimabue was lost. *Apud*. SORENSSEN, Lee. “Luigi Lanzi”, *Dictionary of Art Historians* (website), <https://dictionaryofarthistorians.org/lanzil.htm>.

²⁷ PORTO-ALEGRE, Manuel de Araújo. “Manoel Dias: O Romano”, in *Revista do Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro*, Rio de Janeiro, tomo XIX, nº 23, 1856 *apud*. KOVENSKY & SQUEFF, *Op. Cit.*, p. 284.

²⁸ LANZI, Luigi. *The history of painting in Italy*, book 1. In *Luigi Lanzi Works*, The Perfect Library, edições Kindle.

J.B. Debret is the head of the third period of the Fluminense school, which began in colonial times with Frei Ricardo do Pilar and ended with Raimundo, to begin again with Leandro Joaquim and end in 1816 with Manoel Dias and José Leandro. Debret taught Simplício Rodrigues de Sá, Francisco Pedro do Amaral, José Cristo Moreira, José da Silva Arruda, history painting, ornamentation, landscape, and scenography; (...) ²⁹

The division by periods corresponds to the variations of style. Porto Alegre follows the principle established by Lanzi of defining each epoch according to its masters. As shown by Lanzi, Fluminense school had three periods: the first one started with Frei Ricardo do Pilar, the next one was led by Leandro Joaquim, and then the art found a better style under the direction of Debret, in the fine arts academy. Like the ones previous, the artistic current led by Debret also intertwines with political history: it corresponds to the independent nation. Hence, Porto-Alegre inserts French artists in Brazilian history. Debret is also associated with the school of Rio de Janeiro – a critical component in Porto-Alegre’s thinking. In doing so, the author includes himself in the Fluminense school. After all, Porto-Alegre had been one of Debret’s first disciples at the Rio academy. However, he points out Francisco Pedro do Amaral as the most important pupil under Debret. ³⁰

Porto-Alegre creates a continuity between masters and disciples, and sets the transformation of artistic styles in a coherent historical development. Using the classification of schools, Porto-Alegre recognizes the Baroque as “the beginning” of the “Brazilian school”. The local school developed with the arrival of Debret and the opening of the carioca Academy. For Porto-Alegre, under the independent empire, fluminense school turns into Brazilian school. So, he would use the school term in essays on contemporary artists, in articles about the General exhibitions, or even as director of the Academy of fine arts, a position he held between 1854 and 1857.

Porto Alegre attentively argues that Brazilian school arises with political emancipation. Brazilian School of painting feeds from the classical French traditions, but it is not merely repetition of French classicism. Their masters and pupils not only borrowed from foreign models but also developed their own styles. Thus, “Brazilian school” is a work-in-progress that develops slowly, as its style undergoes changes with the variation of taste, thanks to the Rio de Janeiro Academy of Fine Arts, the artistic practice of local masters, and the conscious action of people like Porto-Alegre himself, among others. Moreover, for Porto-Alegre, it’s up to the contemporaries, especially the younger ones, to organize and promote the “Brazilian school”, which soon should be classic and Brazilian, and no longer “Fluminense” and “Baroque”.

²⁹ PORTO-ALEGRE. “Discurso pronunciado na sessão pública aniversária do Instituto, em 15 de dezembro de 1852”, *RIHGB*, p. 548.

³⁰ PORTO-ALEGRE, “Iconografia brasileira”, 1856, *apud*. KOVENSKY & SQUEFF (orgs). *Op. Cit.*

School of painting and the art of the periphery

As pointed out by Carlo Guinzburg, the history of Italian painting written by Lanzi avoids the idea of center successfully. Moreover, in accordance to the idea of school, regional differences and local identities are valued in and of themselves. I.e. “school” softens the traditional scheme proposed by Vasari, organized according to the idea of Center-periphery.³¹ If Lanzi sought to handle the polycentrism of Italy, the case of Portuguese America does not seem to have been different, with several centers and different vectors of artist circulation and artworks. This is the reason the idea of school was also adopted throughout Brazil by later historians, who mentioned a “Bahia school of painting”, a “Minas Gerais school”, the “Recife school” and so on.

Porto-Alegre’s narrative about art history is inspired by authors such as Lanzi and Winckelmann. However, he properly manipulates the term of school to compare the artists of the past to international masters of European art.

Porto-Alegre’s case allows us to retrace not only how the narrative of Brazilian art history arises from the reading of works by authors such as Lanzi and Winckelmann. He celebrates artists like Mestre Valentim and others, and formulates the idea of “primitive school of Rio de Janeiro”. In addition, the author, normally inspired by neoclassicism and by antiquity, not only studies but also appreciates artists who were less inspired by the classical traditions. On the contrary, the artists studied by Porto-Alegre were aligned to the “Borrominian” or Baroque taste, as he himself affirms so many times. But by virtue of the idea of school, these simple men, with their workshops and baroque tendencies, can be incorporated into the history of art that Porto Alegre writes. Baroque is the style of the Fluminense school, which later will be expanded and transformed into Brazilian school. From the Rio de Janeiro school to the Brazilian school, the baroque is the path and source from which, for Porto-Alegre, the (possible) history of Brazilian art emerges.

³¹ However, the author shows that Lanzi’s book maintains an unequal approach from arts and culture in Italy. The tension between centre and periphery in Lanzi “reflects that distortion that characterizes the story (not just pictorial) of Italy” GUINZBURG, *Op. Cit.*, p. 25.