
THE NELSON

Richard L. Nelson Gallery & Fine Arts Collection, UC Davis

The Role of Photography in the Transformation and Preservation of Venice

by Kamal Zargar

Captured in an undisturbed state, the photograph by the Fratelli Alinari of the *Doge's Palace* (Fig. 1) in St. Mark's Square Venice appears to be preserved in time. Not a single passing visitor is present, nor have the effects of hundreds of years caused considerable injury to the façade. The Doge's Palace was once the headquarters of the great Republic of Venice, but in the nineteenth century, the palace had been reduced to only a symbol of the Republic and the glory it once inhabited. When Mark Twain visited Venice in 1867, he wrote about the Venice that once was, "haughty, invincible, magnificent." But he also wrote of the destitute state that Venice had fallen into. "Her glory is departed," Twain solemnly wrote, "she sits among her stagnate lagoons, forlorn and beggared, forgotten of the world."¹

As early as the eighteenth century, Venice was in a state of decline from its heyday in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. This decline was accelerated in the nineteenth century with Napoleon's 1797 invasion into Venice, and the subsequent exchange of the city between French and Austrian control. Her reputation of an efficient government, worldly commercial success, and as a producer of the world's greatest artists was quickly dissolving. This decline occurred amidst the peninsula's struggle for national unification. But with the advent and the rapid development of photography in the mid nineteenth century, and the potential wealth that a growing tourism industry provided, Venice had an opportunity to transform itself and regain the glory she once had.

Foreign Occupation and the Struggle for National Unification

Prior to Napoleon's invasion in 1797, Venice had long established a very successful, economically minded republican government that allowed a commercial economy to flourish, while creating a worldly center for arts and culture. The earliest Venetians installed their first doge as the leader of their young autonomous state in 697. At its height, the Republic of Venice, which would become known as the Serenissima, meaning "the most serene," divided its power amongst members of the Inner Circle, which included the Doge and his six Ducal Councilors, three Inquisitors who commanded a secret police that oppressed any movement toward radical political change, the Council of Ten which stemmed from the larger body of the Great Council – consisting of 2000 members in the sixteenth century – and finally, six Savvi Grandi who were responsible for foreign and commercial affairs. In reality, the doge was mostly a symbolic



Figure 1: Fratelli Alinari, *Palazzo Ducale, Venice*, Albumen print, c. 1865-1885, (Nelson Gallery Collection, U.C. Davis)

position, and the six Savvi Grandi as well as the three Inquisitors held most of the power of the Inner Circle, and thus the government at large. Even though high government positions technically held temporal power, positions were simply transferred and exchanged between a limited number of Venetian nobility, thus explaining how one family could produce a legacy of doges. It may not have been an ideal representative government, but it was efficient nevertheless and it garnered great commercial wealth for over a millennium.²

Such commercial wealth in Venice was amassed primarily from local industry and maritime trade. Main industries included textiles, agriculture, and shipbuilding amongst others. Shipbuilding not only provided vessels of trade insuring commercial success, but it built a strong naval fleet necessary to control and secure important seaways and territories from nearby rivals, such as Turkey. Trade allowed for the successful exportation of Venice's own goods, in addition to the importing of luxurious, novelty items from the East sought after by Europe's elite.

In addition to an efficient government and maritime commercial success, Venice was a center for arts and culture. From Titian to Tintoretto, Venice was home to some of Italy's most renowned Renaissance painters. In a city highly renowned for her architecture, Venice laid claim to the celebrated Renaissance architects, Jacopo

Richard L. Nelson Gallery & Fine Arts Collection, UC Davis

Sansovino and Andrea Palladio. In short, Venice had created for herself a reputation of effective governing, a successful of economy, and high culture that would project a prevailing view of the city deep into the eyes of her own people, as well as those who feared her and loved her from afar. But in rising to such high points, the threat of a deep fall loomed over Venice.

At the end of the seventeenth century Venice was involved in several wars with nearby Turkey. Although quick recoveries were able restore parts of the economy, major industries such as shipbuilding and textiles were in decline, causing outposts in the Mediterranean and the Near East to close due to lack of business.³ But Venice was not yet in a state of destitution, at least not in public perception. Notable Venetian families, as well as foreign visitors, pursued a life of luxury and decadence in Venice. This life style of excess and the inability – or the unwillingness – to adapt to the changing times inevitably caused Venice to have a decline that essentially seemed “luxurious.” Lavish parties, gambling, fine dress, and expensive jewelry were being purchased while investments into industry were avoided. Economic troubles and the increase of public debt were such a widespread problem, that in the beginning years of the eighteenth century, the Venetian Republic decided to devalue its currency by a quarter. To make matters worse, from 1714-1718, Venice fought another war with Turkey that increased her economic troubles. Yet the nobility continued to live a life of unnecessary luxury while ignoring the task of governing and maintaining the city that was home to 140,000 lower class Venetians in the middle of the eighteenth century.⁴

Furthermore, prior to Napoleon’s invasion in 1797, Venice was largely defenseless in terms of a standing army. Morality was low as many officers were corrupt, “troops were dressed in rags, and musketry practice was actually forbidden in order to save powder.” The glory that was once Venice was quickly becoming a memory, as Paolo Renier, the second to last doge stated, “we live by luck...We depend entirely on the idea of Venetian prudence which other people have of us.”⁵

In February 1789, Doge Paolo Renier died and Lodovico Manin took up the position as doge. He was the one hundred and eighteenth man to be elected to the office; he was also the last to hold the post. To a certain degree, Manin was a ‘foreigner’ and of ‘new money,’ in the sense that he and his family were not actually from the island and only recently had they bought their way into the Golden Book – the historic directory of Venetian nobility. Regarded as being “weak-willed and hesitant,” Manin was the exact opposite of what Venice needed in its eighteenth century decline, and unworthy of the threat that would soon come from the French.

The same year that Manin was elected, 1789, violent revolution had hit Paris. Even though diplomatic relations were retained after the death of the French monarchy, the Venetian Republic was reluctant to involve itself in the problems that the French Revolution created. By 1796 Napoleon Bonaparte was commanding an army in northern Italy, creating peace with Piedmont while absorbing Savoy and Nice for France.⁶ Without a substantial standing army to defend it, the Venetian Republic submissively agreed to terms set by Napoleon, despite the local

cries of ‘*Viva San Marco!*’ by Venetian commoners. On May 12, 1797, from the Hall of the Great Council in the Doge’s Palace, the Great Council held its last meeting and agreed to dissolve the Republic.⁷ Four days later on May 16, 1797, four thousand French troops rowed into the city, marking the day that a thousand year old government had now become a memory.⁸

French occupation of Venice would last only a few months. On October 17, 1797, the signing of the Treaty of Campo Formio transferred Venice into Austrian hands. Although Napoleon’s sojourn, albeit only a few months, was busy to say the least. He robbed Venice of her many artistic treasures – from panel pieces by Veronese inside the Doge’s Palace, to the infamous four bronze horses from antiquity that had crowned the Basilica of St. Mark’s since the thirteenth century. By disassembling her remaining naval fleet, Napoleon also left Venice even more defenseless than she already was.⁹ After several future exchanges of the city’s holding between the Austrians and the French, the Congress of Vienna in 1815 decreed Venice to Austrian control, where she would remain until she was unified with the rest of the Italian peninsula.

By 1815 Venice and its people were in a state of serious decline and the situation would continue to deteriorate. The population was reduced from 138,000 in 1797 to 114,000 in 1824. The once productive shipbuilding area of the Arsenal that used to employ sixteen thousand workers could now provide work for less than a thousand men. Venice’s trade and industry had been depleted, as Trieste to the north became a more prevalent port.¹⁰ Furthermore, Venice along with Lombardy – which was also controlled by the Austrians – were both being heavily taxed. These two territories provided a quarter of the tax income for the Austrian Empire, despite making up only an eighth of its total population.¹¹

In the mid 1840’s, anti-Austrian sentiment in Venice was brewing itself into a revolution, even though the city saw moments of economic progress. For example, the first bridge that linked Venice with the mainland was built in 1846, requiring the hands of a thousand workers and providing a much-needed stimulus to the economy. But in spite of a partial economic recovery, middle class Venetians resented their occupiers and desired a more liberal and democratic society.¹² As nationalistic political movements began to aspire around Europe in 1848, Italy was no exception. Although the idea of an Italian nation largely meant nothing – it was simply a geographic expression, especially to the uneducated classes. Therefore, allegiance was localized to cities and regions, rather than to a larger unified Italy. In Venice, such liberal aspirations were lead by Daniele Manin, who despite his last name, had no connection to the last doge of Venice, Lodovico Manin.

Daniele Manin came from a middle class family, was a bright student of philosophy and law, and was well versed in both ancient and modern European languages. In 1831, Manin had made his first attempt at inspiring revolt against Austrian occupation, but ultimately failed. As drastic food shortages fueled discontent and liberal ideas were passed around Europe leading up to 1848, Manin and his followers saw a new opportunity to fight for their independence. Manin’s movement began with

Richard L. Nelson Gallery & Fine Arts Collection, UC Davis

having public debates for economic and social reforms, and demanded that the Austrians accede to them. After hearing about the successful toppling of monarchs in Sicily, Paris, and Vienna, Manin and his followers saw a definitive chance. On March 16, 1848, Venetians marched towards St. Mark's Square in protest.¹³ By March 22, the Arsenal had been seized without any confrontation from the Austrian troops who were ill prepared and outnumbered.¹⁴ Chants of 'Viva la Repubblica! Viva la liberta! Viva San Marco!' projected out from the Venetian crowds. The Austrians had no choice but to submit, and for the first time since 1797, Venice once again an independent state and Manin was to lead it.¹⁵

In 1848, the new Venetian Republic of St. Mark was proclaimed and Manin was its President. But the new government was failed from the beginning and ultimately lasted little more than a year. Although enthusiastic with Venetian localism, the new government was filled with middle-aged to elderly men who had little to no experience in governance. The working class, who had long been suffering in Venice, did not see their situation improve with the new republic; wages did not rise and poor conditions in factories were not ameliorated. The bourgeoisie and the Venetian nobility quickly called for alliance with the Kingdom of Piedmont in an effort towards Italian unification, but Manin and his supporters were largely against this. The decision was ultimately placed on the Republic's assembly, and on July 4, 1848, they voted overwhelming in a union with Piedmont.¹⁶

In 1849 the Austrian forces returned to claim what they had lost, and the alliance with Piedmont did not provide the necessary military defense Venice needed. In desperation, the Venetians looked again to Manin. A local assembly met in February 1849 and decided for the return of a republic with Manin once again as its president. But Manin could not defend against the Austrian forces that were better prepared and strategically planted around the lagoon. The Austrian navy bombarded Venice and whole neighborhoods prone to destruction were abandoned. Eventually on August 19, 1849, ships with white flags headed toward the Austrians in admittance to defeat. By August 30, the Austrians were back in Venice parading their victory on the Grand Canal.¹⁷ In the aftermath of all the 1848 liberal political movements in Venice and the rest of Italy, very little changed in terms of geo-politics, with the exception of Piedmont, which held its constitution and certain social freedoms.¹⁸

Piedmont would eventually come to provide the umbrella for Italian unification in 1861. The process was led in the north by the politics of Piedmont's Prime Minister, Camillo di Cavour, with the additional militaristic help of Giuseppe Garibaldi and his band of Redshirts who worked upward from Sicily in the south. By March of 1860, most of northern Italy was unified, with the exception of Venice and the surrounding region of Veneto. An undeniably complicated political process, unification included the usual major players, France, Austria, as well as Prussia. The Kingdom of Italy was eventually proclaimed in March 1861 excluding Rome and Venice. Although, Italian unification was not the result of a relentless nationalistic fever, rather, it was the consequence of compromises and exchanges of

territories by Italian and foreign monarchs, orchestrated by the political genius of Cavour. In short, Italy was created by politics not nationalism.¹⁹

This is not to say Italian nationalism was largely absent in Venice and the rest of the Italian peninsula during the nineteenth century. For example, nationalists would shout 'Viva Verdi!' at the end of productions in theatres such as the Fenice in Venice. The loud outcry was in praise of the great opera composer, Giuseppe Verdi, but it was code as well. The acronym V-E-R-D-I stood for Vittorio Emmanuele Re d'Italia – Victor Emmanuel King of Italy.²⁰

There were also active revolutionaries like Genese Giuseppe Mazzini and his Young Italy movement. They had long fought for and advocated for Italian unification, but wished it through insurrection and guerrilla bands, rather than bureaucratic politics. Nevertheless, unification was achieved, and having lead the undertaking, the Piedmont constitution, legal system, bureaucracy, and its king were transferred into law for the new kingdom. As for Venice and Rome, they would join respectively in 1866 and 1870. These two additions were consequences of international crises that existed beyond the borders of the peninsula, primarily the Austro-Prussian War in 1866. The dream of Italian unification was far overdue, a dream that Niccolò Machiavelli once had four hundred ears earlier. Crudely commenting on the topic, Massimo D'Azeglio – a Piedmont born statesman and all-around Renaissance man of the nineteenth century – stated, "to make an Italy out of Italians one must not be in a hurry."²¹

The Role of Photography in Nineteenth Century Venice

The question to be asked, for the purpose of this article, is what role did photographs like the *Doge's Palace* by the Fratelli Alinari have amongst the turmoil of nineteenth century Venice? How did photography help Venice venture out of a state of economic decline, while the city remained under the cloud of foreign occupation, and tension existed between ties to local heritage versus the struggle for national unification/identity? An answer for these questions can begin with photography's two main universal qualities: the ability to freeze a moment in time, thus preserving it, and its accessibility as an aesthetic commodity that is easily distributable to the masses.²² Consequently, the photograph had a profound effect on nineteenth century Venetian economics and politics, taking into account that the city was an early and frequent subject of the very first photographers. Therefore, we can also trace the advent and the development of photography through photographs of Venice from the nineteenth century, in addition to having a visual record of the transformation and preservation of the historic city.

Prior to the advent of photography in the mid nineteenth century, Venice already had a tradition of using cameras and lenses as tools for artistic production. *Vedute* painters such as Canaletto and Francesco Guardi were prolific users of the camera obscura, which allowed them to create "photographic drawings" in assistance to their realistic paintings of Venice.²³ But when Louis Jacques Mande Dageurre introduced the da-

Richard L. Nelson Gallery & Fine Arts Collection, UC Davis

guerreotype in Paris on January 7, 1839, it was a transformative moment, as the daguerreotype became the first realistic image that was comparable to what the human eye could see. The phenomenological experience that daguerreotypes created likened photographers to magicians who could make an image appear seemingly out of nowhere.

The first known daguerreotype taken in Venice was by the English philologist, Alexander John Ellis in 1841. Ellis was commissioned to produce a commercial publication titled *Italy Daguerreotyped*.²⁵ His image was a novel, mechanical rendering of the docking area called the Bacino of St. Mark's, which shows the entrance of Grand Canal, the old customs house, and the towering multiplicity of domes of the Santa Maria della Salute Church.²⁵

Alexander John Ellis may have been the first to use the daguerreotype in Venice, but it is John Ruskin who is probably the most famous user and collector of Venetian daguerreotypes. Ruskin was an English historian and art critic, who had a love for Venice and its gothic architecture that went far deeper than a commercial venture in photography. His collection of daguerreotypes from 1845-1852 was part of an effort, or rather a duty as he saw it, to save Venice in its proper form. Ruskin's numerous daguerreotypes did not provide the most appealing views of the city, rather, they were close-ups of buildings and artworks that were to be used later for detailed studies. In his famous treatise, *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*, Ruskin advocated that buildings of architectural importance should be carefully taken care of, but left alone and never restored. Ruskin wrote, "it is impossible, as impossible as to raise the dead, to restore anything that has ever been great or beautiful in architecture."²⁷ After the publication of *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*, Ruskin and his wife Effie went to Venice in 1849, one year after Manin's rebellion of 1848. He began an extensive study on Venetian art and architecture that was realized in his book *The Stones of Venice*. The daguerreotypes helped Ruskin with his finely detailed drawings of sculptures and gothic facades, which in turn assisted in the writing of *The Stones of Venice*.

As soon as the daguerreotype was introduced in 1839, those captured by its novelty began experimenting with its process. The main disadvantage of the daguerreotype was its inability to be reproduced. This issue was resolved with the development of the calotype by Henry Fox Talbot in 1841. It allowed photographers to use a negative to create countless positive prints, but the quality of the image diminished with each new print. Ten years later in 1851, the collodion process was introduced by Frederick Scott Archer and was the dividing line. It provided the high amount of detail of the daguerreotype and was reproducible like the calotype. In addition, exposure times were greatly reduced from several minutes to only a few seconds.²⁸ With these developments in the photographic process, and the simplification of cameras and lenses, Italy saw a rise in amateur photographers during the 1850's. Some were able to grow themselves into full-fledged studios with high outputs of this new aesthetic commodity, which was popular with a growing mass tourism industry.

The emergence of mass tourism in the nineteenth

century came from an older tradition of upper-class Englishmen visiting Venice and other European cities on the account of cultural and artistic enlightenment. Since the seventeenth century, it was customary for young, prevalent Elizabethan English gentleman to partake in a Grand Tour through Europe. It was an opportunity to educate oneself by measuring "ones own identity against that of the other." Venice was just one of many stops on the tour, particularly important for those aspiring to managerial roles in business or the state, as the Republic of the Venice was seen as a "model for efficiency." In the eighteenth century, the institution of the Grand Tour grew beyond England to the rest of Europe and America, although the high cost of travel by sea and accommodation expenses still left the trip to the more affluent. With the increase of foreigners traveling through sites in Italy and beyond, publication of travel literature and itineraries were needed. Consequently, such publications can be attributed to the growing identity of an Italian nation, as foreigners lumped the different cities and regions together despite their many differences in language, history and culture.²⁹

The tourist industry would become increasingly democratized as technological innovation during the nineteenth century allowed for cheaper and faster travel. We can look to 1839, the same year that the daguerreotype was introduced in Paris, as a decisive year for the increased accessibility for touristic travel as the first segment of railroad was laid in Italy. The seven-kilometer stretch of railroad traveled from Naples to Portici, which is considered relatively short by today's standards, but it nevertheless marked the beginning of a new, faster, and cheaper form of travel. In 1846, the railway had reached Venice as the railway bridge connecting the island to the mainland was built. In addition, travel was also made more accessible by advances in sea travel, as the first propeller was attached to a yacht in 1840.³⁰ Such travel innovations prefigured the accessibility of Venice in today's age, were thousands of visitors arrive at Venice's doorstep by rail, car, boat, and plane.

On the account of the rise of tourism to Venice because of easier travel, and advances in the photographic process, the opportunity for commercial success presented itself through these two modern institutions. The Alinari family was not the only one aware of the commercial opportunity in photography paired with tourism, but they certainly would become one of the most successful photographic studios in the business. Based in Florence, Leopoldo Alinari first opened a small photographic studio in 1852. Two years later, his brothers Romauldo and Giuseppe joined his business and effectively created the Fratelli Alinari Company – *fratelli* meaning "brothers." Their popularity and reputation grew quickly as they opened shops and studios in major Italian cities. Subjects included art and architecture, landscapes, cityscapes and townscapes, group portraiture and single portraiture of both the affluent and the working class.³¹ Prominent in their production and varied in their subject matter of Italy during the 1850's and 1860's, the Fratelli Alinari were the un-official photographers of a diverse yet an emerging Italian nation.

Although prolific in their work and financially successful, the Fratelli Alinari were not alone. In Venice, the Alinari had

Richard L. Nelson Gallery & Fine Arts Collection, UC Davis

to compete with Carlo Ponti, who had opened the first commercial studio in Venice. In addition, competition came from Carlo Naya, the most famous architectural photographer of Venice.³² Collectively, the Alinari, Ponti, Naya, and many other prolific studios and photographers, adhered to the demand of a growing tourist industry traveling to Venice and the rest of Italy. Single post-card photographs to complete albums were popular souvenirs purchased by tourists, who could now take the memory of their travels home and enjoy them as a fledgling version of today's 'arm-chair tourist.'

When it came to photographing large, monumental buildings such as the Doge's Palace, specific compositional elements and formal devices were used. Photographers borrowed the composition from the *vedute* painters. Facades were domineering and depicted at angles rather than from a frontal vantage point, therefore heightening the building's monumentality. Many photographers included figures to show scale; often they were tourists playing with pigeons in St. Mark's Square – an aspect that is notably absent in the photograph by the Fratelli Alinari. Photographing the Doge's Palace in this undisturbed, almost ghostly state, the building – and the old Republic of Venice that it symbolizes – virtually become preserved in time. By definition, the Doge's Palace becomes a monument: an object that has both historical value and art-value that are designated to a specific time and a specific group of people.³³

If you travel to Venice today, and manage to photograph the building from the same position without any figures, you will produce nearly the exact same scene. Although the stones of the building have been noticeably cleaned, much to Ruskin's anticipated disapproval. The significant point to understand is that even though the institution of the Republic of Venice has been dissolved, the memory of it is far from departed. To the contrary, because of photography and its mass distribution stimulated by industries like tourism, the memory and the glory of the Republic of Venice become preserved.

The nineteenth century also saw the physical preservation of important Venetian buildings by the practice of architectural restoration. Many *palazzi* in Venice were purchased and turned into museums or hotels. For example, Palazzo Nani-Mocenigo, which is adjacent to the Doge's Palace, became the Hotel Danieli in 1847.³⁴ Restored several times over, the Danieli has been the pinnacle of Venetian luxury, hosting Europe's elite including Ruskin and his wife Effie on their 1849 trip.

In addition, development of Venice's infrastructure was necessary in order to adhere to the demand of a growing tourist industry. With the influx of visitors to the city, a cheaper and faster form of transportation was needed for travel around the lagoon and on the Grand Canal. The *vaporetti* – steam-powered waterbuses – were introduced to the city in 1874. By 1881, the *vaporetti* were providing regular service to Venetians and tourists, which subsequently put the *gondolieri* at odds as they feared for their loss of income.³⁵ Also, numerous bridges were created to link the city together, while many streets were widened and canals filled.³⁶

Changes to Venice's architecture and infrastructure have long been controversial issues. On the one hand, historic

buildings such as the Doge's Palace have been preserved so that they can be enjoyed by future generations. On the other hand, some buildings were destroyed in order to meet new demands of modernity. For example, the new railway bridge constructed in 1846 needed a sufficient station. Subsequently, the church of Santa Lucia at the northern end of the island was destroyed in order to make space available.³⁷ Even though the destruction of the church may not have been popular, it nevertheless showed a willingness to adapt and meet the new demands stipulated by the changing times, in order to insure the city's long-term vitality – a crucial outlook that was missing in Venice's eighteenth century decline.

The accessibility that modernization provided to Venice attracted regular tourists as well as artisan visitors who not only wanted to experience the city's artistic grandeur, but those who wanted to add to the memory and myths of Venice, and others who wanted to capture the reality of its modernization. In the first half of the nineteenth century, J.M.W. Turner made several trips from 1819 to 1840, capturing the sublimity of the Venetian light. Charles Dickens visited Venice in 1844, and later published *Pictures of Italy* about his travels around the peninsula. In the second half of the nineteenth century, James Abbott McNeill Whistler and John Singer Sargent both had their opportunity in depicting the Venice they saw and felt. At the very end of the nineteenth century, Maurice Prendergast visited Venice where he created watercolor paintings in which he depicts the overwhelming influx of tourists into Venice's major squares and promenades. Literary writers also continued to write about the allure of Venice during the second half of the nineteenth-century, notably Henry James in *Italian Hours* and of course Mark Twain in *The Innocence Abroad*. These artisans, equally but separately, added and sometimes altered an already existing imagined community that engulfed Venice in the nineteenth century.

At the turn of the twentieth century, artistic pilgrimage to Venice did not subside as the city continued to value its artistic heritage while embracing the avant-garde. Since 1895, the most exciting contemporary art comes to Venice every two years in the forum of the Venice Biennale. Chosen artists representing countries from all over the world now occupy the former shipbuilding Arsenal and the public gardens in the southeast corner of the city. Furthermore, the likes of Picasso and Pollock are now hung in appropriated *palazzi* that have become modern art museums, such as Ca' Pesaro and the Peggy Guggenheim Collection, which is housed in the unfinished Palazzo Venier dei Leoni. More contemporary works occupy the Palazzo Grassi on the Grand Canal and the Punta della Dogana, the old customs house across from the Bacino of St. Mark's; both museums house the collection of prominent French businessman Francois Pinault. With an artistic legacy that stretches from the Byzantium to the contemporary, Venice continues to hold its authority as a leading center for the arts, more so by attracting the world's leading artists, rather than being a producer of the best talent. The city today not only attracts the best artists in the fine arts, but also those in film, dance, theatre and architecture, all of which have their respective annual and biannual festivals.

To conclude, we can return to Mark Twain's dualistic

Richard L. Nelson Gallery & Fine Arts Collection, UC Davis

description of Venice as both “magnificent” and as “forlorn,” and understand why he described the city in such a way. It was magnificent because of its great history, but it was forlorn because of the poverty and the urban decay. As photography quickly developed in the nineteenth century, it played a significant role in helping Venice revive its economy, all while preserving the city’s historic legacy. The photograph of the *Doge’s Palace* by the Fratelli Alinari – which was taken during the same period Twain had visited Venice – thus became a symbol of Venice’s transformation: even though Venice would never fully gain back her independent self-governance after Napoleon’s invasion, its memory was cemented in the photographs as well as the actual preservation of its historic buildings; the primary source of the city’s wealth was no longer beholden to merchants entering the lagoon looking to transact their goods, rather, wealth was generated through visitors who came to Venice for the memory and experience of a different time, a memory that was taken home in the form of photographs; and even though Venice no longer produced the likes of Titian and Sansovino, the abundant distribution of photographs promoted and maintained Venice’s artistic allure, consequently attracting the best artists from abroad to come and create as well as show leading contemporary art. In short, photography of Venice was a moderm of both the preservation and the transformation of this great city that had fallen ill in the nineteenth century.

Furthermore, the photographic commodity sought after by tourists helped to create an Italian national identity that up until the nineteenth century was largely absent, especially to the lower, uneducated classes. Photography also helped revive a local Venetian swagger based on culture and wealth, which continues to this day in its relentless march through history.

Kamal Zargar is an M.A. candidate in Art History at U.C. Davis. Within the framework of the interconnections between Europe/U.S. and the Middle East, Kamal studies modern and contemporary issues of politics and economics in art. (kzargar@ucdavis.edu)

Notes

¹ Twain, Mark, and Guy Cardwell. *The Innocents Abroad; Roughing It*. New York, N.Y.: Literary Classics of the U.S.: Viking Press, 1984: 170. For more on Twain’s visit to Venice see Chapters 22 and 23 of *The Innocence Abroad*.

² Lane, Frederic Chapin. *Venice, a Maritime Republic*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973: 428. See page 429 for a diagram of the hierarchy within the power structure of the Republic of Venice.

³ Longworth, Philip. *The Rise and Fall of Venice*. London: Constable, 1974: 270.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 276.

⁵ *Ibid.*, as quoted on page 286.

⁶ Hibbert, Christopher. *Venice, the Biography of a City*. London: Grafton Books, 1988: 185, 188.

⁷ Lane, Frederic Chapin. *Venice, a Maritime Republic*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973: 436.

⁸ Hibbert, Christopher. *Venice, the Biography of a City*. London: Grafton Books, 1988: 194.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 194-195.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 199.

¹¹ Longworth, Philip. *The Rise and Fall of Venice*. London: Constable, 1974: 295. In his Epilogue, Longworth provides a summary of the conditions in Venice under French and Austrian occupation, as well as the nineteenth century liberal political movement of Manin.

¹² *Ibid.*, 296-297.

¹³ Hibbert, Christopher. *Venice, the Biography of a City*. London: Grafton Books, 1988: 219, 226-230. See Chapter 14 “Daniele Manin and the New Republic 1820-1840” for further information on the revolutionary events that lead to Manin’s successful 1848 rebellion against the Austrian occupiers.

¹⁴ Longworth, Philip. *The Rise and Fall of Venice*. London: Constable, 1974: 298.

¹⁵ Hibbert, Christopher. *Venice, the Biography of a City*. London: Grafton Books, 1988: 233.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 240-241.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 246-254.

¹⁸ Beales, Derek. *The Risorgimento and the Unification of Italy*. London; New York: Allen and Unwin; Barnes and Noble, 1971: 66.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 77-92. For a more detailed account of Cavour’s politics leading to the 1861 unification, see Introduction 7 “Cavour’s Foreign Policy and Unification 1852-1861.”

²⁰ Arblaster, Anthony. *Viva La Libertà!: Politics in Opera*. New York: Verso, 1992: 93.

²¹ As quoted in Beales, Derek. *The Risorgimento and the Unification of Italy*. London; New York: Allen and Unwin; Barnes and Noble, 1971: 93-94.

²² Stimson, Blake. “Photography and Ontology.” *Philosophy of Photography* 1, no. 1, 2010: 41.

²³ Zannier, Italo. *Veneto: Fotografie Tra ‘800 E ‘900 Nelle Collezioni Alinari = Photographs: Mid 19th to Early 20th Century*. Firenze: Alinari 24 ore, 2010: 9.

²⁴ Ritter, Dorothea. *Venice in Old Photographs, 1841-1920*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1994: 24.

²⁵ Zannier, Italo. *Le Grand Tour : In the Photographs of Travelers of 19th Century = Dans Les Photographies Des Voyageurs Du Xixe Siècle = Nelle Fotografie Dei Viaggiatori Del Xix Secolo*. Venezia; Paris: Canal & Stamperia ; Canal Editions, 1997: 24. Ellis’ publication, *Italy*



Richard L. Nelson Gallery & Fine Arts Collection, UC Davis

Daguerreotyped, was never published.

²⁶ Ritter, Dorothea. *Venice in Old Photographs, 1841-1920*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1994: 26.

²⁷ Ruskin, John, Bruce Rogers, and Collection Pforzheimer Bruce Rogers. *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*. London: Smith, Elder, and Co., 1849: 194-196.

²⁸ Zannier, Italo. *Veneto: Fotografie Tra '800 E '900 Nelle Collezioni Alinari = Photographs: Mid 19th to Early 20th Century*. Firenze: Alinari 24 ore, 2010: 12.

²⁹ Seta, Cesare De. "Introduction." In *Le Grand Tour: In the Photographs of Travelers of 19th Century = Dans Les Photographies Des Voyageurs Du XIXe Siècle = Nelle Fotografie Dei Viaggiatori Del XIX Secolo*, edited by Italo Zannier. Venezia; Paris: Canal & Stamperia; Canal Editions, 1997: 7-11.

³⁰ Zannier, Italo. *Le Grand Tour: In the Photographs of Travelers of 19th Century = Dans Les Photographies Des Voyageurs Du XIXe Siècle = Nelle Fotografie Dei Viaggiatori Del XIX Secolo*. Venezia; Paris: Canal & Stamperia; Canal Editions, 1997: 15-18. For a more detailed account of photography's role on the Grand Tour, see Zannier's essay "Photographers in the places of the sun."

³¹ Zevi, Filippo. *Alinari, Photographers of Florence, 1852-1920*. [Florence]; London: Alinari Edizioni & Idea Editions in association with the Scottish Arts Council; Distributed by Idea Books, 1978: 11-12.

³² Ritter, Dorothea. *Venice in Old Photographs, 1841-1920*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1994: 29.

³³ Riegl, Alois. "Der moderne Denkmalkultus, sein Wesen, seine Entstehung," translated into English as "The Modern Cult of Monuments: Its Character and its Origin," (trans K. Forster and D. Ghirardo) *Oppositions* 25 (Fall 1982): 21-50. [orig. Vienna, 1903]: 21-23, 34. Riegl's definition of a historical monument: "a monument arises from the particular, individual stage it represents in the development of human activity in a certain field... The more faithfully a monument's original state is preserved, the greater its historical value: disfiguration and decay detract from it... It is the task of the historian to make up, with all available means, for the damage nature has wrought in monuments over time... The objective of historical value is ... to maintain as genuine as possible a document for future art-historical research." (34)

³⁴ Longworth, Philip. *The Rise and Fall of Venice*. London: Constable, 1974: 297.

³⁵ Ritter, Dorothea. *Venice in Old Photographs, 1841-1920*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1994: 63.

³⁶ Hibbert, Christopher. *Venice, the Biography of a City*. London: Grafton Books, 1988: 288.

³⁷ Ibid.