

Constance Jocelyn Ffoulkes and the modernization of scientific connoisseurship

Article (Accepted Version)

Ventrella, Francesco (2017) Constance Jocelyn Ffoulkes and the modernization of scientific connoisseurship. *Visual Resources*, 33 (1). pp. 117-139. ISSN 0197-3762

This version is available from Sussex Research Online: <http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/id/eprint/66374/>

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies and may differ from the published version or from the version of record. If you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the URL above for details on accessing the published version.

Copyright and reuse:

Sussex Research Online is a digital repository of the research output of the University.

Copyright and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable, the material made available in SRO has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Constance Jocelyn Ffoulkes and the Modernization of Scientific Connoisseurship

Francesco Ventrella

Constance Jocelyn Ffoulkes, a disciple of Giovanni Morelli, participated in the critical exchanges that modernized European art history at the turn of the twentieth century. In producing the first comprehensive study of Vincenzo Foppa, Ffoulkes also underwrote important methodological innovations in the practice of connoisseurship, notably the development of a philological method that blended documentary evidence with direct visual examination. This article investigates Ffoulkes' interest in the use and function of photographic reproductions of archival documents and her allegiance to the "historical standpoint" championed by professional journals such as *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft* and *Rassegna d'arte*, to which she contributed. Emphasizing the boundaries that Ffoulkes was obliged to negotiate to secure a foothold within the male profession of art history, this article tracks the evolution of her research methods relative to the international network that enabled and recognized her expertise in the connoisseurship of Italian art.

Keywords: Ffoulkes, Constance J. (1858–1950); Morelli, Giovanni (1816–1891); Frizzoni, Gustavo (1840–1919); Fry, Roger (1866–1934); Maiocchi, Rodolfo (1862–1924); Eastlake, Elizabeth (1809–1893); Berenson, Bernard (1865–1959); Venturi, Adolfo (1856–1941); Foppa, Vincenzo (ca. 1427–1515); Cartwright, Julia (1851–1924); Warburg, Aby (1866–1929); Connoisseurship; Art Historiography; Gender; Women's History

The main contribution made by Constance Anne Jocelyn Ffoulkes (1858–1950)¹ to the study of Italian art is unquestionably her pioneering monograph on Vincenzo Foppa (ca. 1427–1515), co-authored with the Italian historian Rodolfo Maiocchi (1862–1924), also Rector of the Almo Collegio Borromeo in Pavia.² Due to the wealth of archival documents appended to this publication, it remains an irreplaceable tool for Foppa scholars today. Although some attributions have since been revised, the revisions are generally consistent with the chronology of Foppa's works and life proposed by the authors.³ When the monograph was published, connoisseurship was still a disputed and competitive field of art history, with very unspecified borders. Although every connoisseur laid claim to a personal scientific method, reputation often had a greater influence than methodology on the adoption of one attribution over another. Ffoulkes' professional network played an extremely important role in validating her expertise and authoritativeness in the field. Yet good connections were not the only means by which she established her individual voice in the practice of connoisseurship in the field of Italian art.

The methodological innovations implemented by Ffoulkes in the practice of scientific connoisseurship at the turn of the twentieth century were in tune with the period's critical debate. However, writing art history as a woman and a professional also demanded a strategic use of research resources. Her methods seemed to challenge the prejudiced assumption that women had taste but could not have a "good eye." According to Hilary Fraser, the emergence of art history in the nineteenth century "cast new light on the gender politics of both visuality and history."⁴ This is especially true of the history of

connoisseurship. A “good eye” has often been uncritically accepted as the chief tool of the connoisseur, but this quality should in fact be investigated as an artificial construct that apportions value based on the economy of gender. As Caroline Palmer explains in her study of women’s travel writing and connoisseurship, ‘the increasingly scientific approach to art criticism that emerged in the early 19th century offered women an advantage, as it valued individual knowledge acquired through empirical experience above innate taste.’⁵

In her studies of Ffoulkes that preceded the publication of the monograph, Ffoulkes rethought the empirical evidence of early-nineteenth century and underwrote important methodological innovations, notably the development of a philological method that blended documentary evidence with direct visual examination. Although this approach may have distanced her from other connoisseurs in the Morellian camp, she was surely not the only art historian of the period to have frequented both archives and art galleries. In this essay, I suggest that the conjoined use of photographic reproductions and archival research should be read as a modern procedure that equipped Ffoulkes’ critical opinion with the authority of material evidence. An understanding of the ways in which her methods and opportunities were marked by the experience of sexual difference ultimately permits a more equal assessment of the history of art history. The aim of my contribution is not simply to rehabilitate Ffoulkes’ art writing; I also seek to analyze the material conditions that she was required to negotiate within the mostly male profession of connoisseurship.

Empiricism and Photographic Evidence

A disciple of Giovanni Morelli (1816–1891), Ffoulkes started to translate his *Kunstkritische Studien* at the end of 1889.⁶ In January 1890, she published an article in *The Art Magazine* in which fearlessly addressed certain misattributions at the Uffizi Gallery and lamented the tendency of Italian gallery directors to “cling with the most pertinacious steadfastness of purpose” to old traditions rather than embracing the latest discoveries of scientific connoisseurship by updating picture labels.⁷ Ffoulkes thus introduced herself as an advocate of the Morellian method by asserting the primacy of visual analysis, which she had practiced during her European trips.⁸ This criticism came at a significant point in the history of the Florentine Royal Galleries, which had just reopened after a major rehang of the collection prompted by the vice-director Enrico Ridolfi (1829–1910) in 1885–1889.⁹ In addition, members of the English art public were easily able to detect in Ffoulkes’ prose an echo of the quarrel between Wilhelm Bode (1845–1929) and Morelli that was electrifying the British art press in those years, and thereby to associate her with the Morellians led by Elizabeth Eastlake (1809–1903), Austin Henry Layard (1817–1894) and Jean Paul Richter (1847 – 1937).¹⁰

According to Morelli, a student of art should train in galleries, not in libraries; and connoisseurs should not use extrinsic elements to assess works of art, as words do not impress themselves in the eye as pictures do. Morelli insisted that his method was scientific on the grounds that although involving a good dose of intuition, it was based on a schematic process of observation targeting recurring elements in the works of each painter.¹¹ This method could be taught, and – with appropriate exercise and training – replicated. While the name of Morelli gave Ffoulkes the critical authority required to challenge the attributions of other male museum professionals, her stress on empirical principles, founded on training

and close observation, may also be seen as an attempt to appropriate her teacher's pedagogy. Her closing remarks read like a defense of the democracy of the experimental method.

The visitors to foreign galleries are a large body, taken from every class of society and every grade of thought [...] Signor Morelli, by means of his experimental system, has opened up a royal road to the study of Italian art, whereby even beginners may hope to attain to a certain amount of proficiency in distinguishing one master from another. This road is open to all.¹²

By claiming that expertise can be attained through practice, Ffoulkes challenged the assumption that some people may be ill equipped in matters of aesthetic judgment. If the road was "open to all," it could be traversed by women as well as men. Indeed, Ffoulkes inherited from Morelli the pedagogical aspiration to address the student of art rather than collectors and museum directors, who were often the targets of Morelli's castigatory prose.¹³ In signing the review and proposing sound attributions, Ffoulkes distanced herself from the abilities that male critics relegated to feminine instinct for taste. Her advocacy of Morellian empiricism created a space in which women too could learn through practice and exercise and trade their own expertise. Although Ffoulkes' endorsement of the scientific method of connoisseurship did not differ from Morelli's, it was marked by difference.

Ffoulkes' methodology was also distinguished by her use of photographic reproductions. Morelli owned a vast photographic collection that he used for private study, and he was also in the habit of commissioning photographic reproductions to record the condition of pictures before and after having them cleaned in Milan.¹⁴ In his articles, however, he never explicitly supported the use of photographs to substantiate his attributions. It was instead Elizabeth Eastlake, in her important obituary for Morelli, to first draw attention on the use of photography as "an invaluable ally to the connoisseur".¹⁵ Without indicating a flaw in his theories, she nonetheless updated Morelli's methodology by subtly suggesting what had become obvious to every connoisseur since the introduction of the photomechanic process:¹⁶ "a little photograph in your pocket settles the question as no human memory could do".¹⁷ The international sale of reproductions through local agents was already thriving when, two years later, Bernard Berenson (1865–1959) explained the usefulness of isochromatic photography to the study of Venetian painting.¹⁸ These new ideas must have resonated with Ffoulkes when, upon visiting the exhibition of Venetian art at The New Gallery in 1895, she found a set of photogravures commissioned by the collector Herbert Cook (1868–1939) which reproduced works by that were not on display for the purpose of comparison.¹⁹ In her review of the exhibition for the *Revue de l'Art chrétien*, Ffoulkes reflected on this remarkable tool, emphasizing that the photos were there to help "those interested in serious studies." Thus, in a passage which echoes Eastlake's remarks, she went on to note that the opportunity to compare the photographic reproductions with the masters' works exhibited in the gallery was invaluable "for the morphological studies which Morelli had promptly recommended to those who want to enter into the intimacy of the great Italian masters."²⁰ In accordance with the uses of laboratory photography in other scientific fields of the time, from biology to criminology, Ffoulkes referred to photographic reproductions as a supplement to correct the potential fallacies of the eye.²¹ As I shall discuss later, the reliance on the objectivity of photography is a particularly significant indicator of Ffoulkes' negotiation of the gendered boundaries of connoisseurship. Some of the reviews published during these years can be used to map her professional network. Like

another renowned woman art historian of her generation, Maud Cruttwell (1860–1939), Ffoulkes attempted to capitalize on the wide circulation of exhibition reviews to establish or make explicit alliances with fellow connoisseurs or collectors. However, such attempts at cooperation were not always reciprocated. The Venetian exhibition of 1895 was also an important turning point for the career of Bernard Berenson, who had written an essay for the catalogue.²² When his companion and collaborator Mary Costelloe, later Berenson (1864–1945)²³ found out that Ffoulkes had published another review of the Venetian exhibition in *L'Archivio storico dell'arte*, she remarked briskly in her diary that she “cribs a lot of Bernhard’s ideas & facts, with grudging & insufficient acknowledgment.”²⁴ Perhaps the Berensons looked with some suspicion at Ffoulkes, who was publicly recognized as a disciple of the late Morelli, whereas Bernard could only claim the Italian senator as a source of inspiration.²⁵

Ffoulkes must have become fairly familiar with the use of photographic resources in the study of art history, as in 1898 she was employed by the South Kensington Museum to catalogue its photographic collections for 15 shillings a day.²⁶ Whilst this job was a sure indication of an acquired expertise in the field, it may also have triggered some professional anxiety that she would never be emancipated from the ancillary position that most women occupied in the contemporary culture of connoisseurship – an anxiety exacerbated by her interaction with male connoisseurs. When planning a new edition of Crowe and Cavalcaselle’s handbook on Italian painting, Roger Fry decided to ask Ffoulkes for “help in getting up the literature — that would save me a lot of grind.”²⁷ In addition, Bernard Berenson once told Julia Cartwright (1851–1924) that Ffoulkes was “a slave to Morelli,” implying that she lacked methodological originality.²⁸ The link between female connoisseurs and auxiliary scholarship is a complicated problem in contemporary art historiography, raising the question of whether the task of the art historian is simply to arrange sources, or also to discover them. Ffoulkes seems to have moved comfortably between archives, galleries and the writing table, as demonstrated by the number of publications that she had generated by the end of the century. However, as we learn from the diary of one of her closest friends, Julia Cartwright, such publications did not necessarily bring financial security or enhance their authors’ reputation as independent scholars: “I thought of poor Cona’s ten cents a line from *L’Art!*”²⁹ In 1898, she started to lecture at the National Gallery, and like many other women art historians of her generation, made a living as a freelance writer.³⁰

The publication of the second volume of Giovanni Morelli’s studies of the German galleries, and the generally positive comments on its translation in the press, gave Ffoulkes the recognition she was due. Yet the support she received from mostly male professionals did not relieve her of the challenge to her aspirations. Elizabeth Eastlake was particularly sensitive to the professional anxieties of the woman art historian, and took Ffoulkes into her confidence, perhaps as a mark of respect for the late Morelli. “I tell her not to despair,” she wrote to Layard, “I tell her that after the approval she has received from you – the most unmerciful of critics especially when her sex are concerned – she need not give way to her fits of depression.”³¹ After the death of Eastlake, followed by that of Layard in 1894, Ffoulkes had to establish a new support base. In 1895, Ffoulkes became the London correspondent for *L’archivio storico dell’arte* (renamed *L’arte* in 1898) until 1925, when her name disappeared from the journal’s title page. Under the direction of Domenico Gnoli (1839–1915), the *Archivio storico* included a special section, ‘Nuovi documenti’, for the

publication of archival discoveries.³² The kind of documentary and historical research championed by the journal seems at odd with Ffoulkes' Morellian apprenticeship; yet she soon recognized that this approach would prove extremely conducive to the development of the skills she needed to produce new work. In 1896, she began visiting the British Museum to teach herself paleography in preparation for reading original documents in Italian.³³ On her first visit to the archives in Brescia in 1900, she was refused admittance, but Gustav Ludwig (1854–1905), the pioneer of *Kulturgeschichte* in Venice, offered to accompany her.³⁴ The turn of the century marked for Ffoulkes the beginning of a new kind of research that exerted an enduring influence on the development of art history.

The Making of Vincenzo Foppa

The discovery of new documents in Brescia provided Ffoulkes with a concrete opportunity to embark on a monograph contributing to the modernization of the discipline. The resonance of her findings was supported by a number of factors which converged to reenergize the field. Alongside new debates in connoisseurship, the rehang of Foppa's works in the art galleries, and the discovery of new genuine works created appropriate conditions for isolating his artistic personality with even greater certainty.

Since the 1880s, the painter had represented an interesting case study for many connoisseurs, enabling them to test the boundaries of their methods. First, Jacob Burckhardt (1818–1897) compared Foppa's influence in Milan with Mantegna's in Padua and Mantua.³⁵ Morelli followed suit, stressing the importance of this long-overlooked master: "both in the school of Brescia, and especially in that of Milan, Foppa holds the same place that the mighty Mantegna does at Padua and Mantua, Liberale at Verona, Cosimo Tura at Ferrara, etc."³⁶ Foppa was thus considered the father of the Lombard school.³⁷

Berenson's opinion simply corroborated Morelli's: "[i]n northern Italy he ranks, indeed, after Mantegna and the Bellini alone, and his influence was scarcely less, for no nook or cranny between Brescia, the Gulf of Genoa, and the crest of the Mt. Cenis escaped it."³⁸ As a result, according to Berenson, it was crucial to understand Foppa's influence in order to facilitate attributions across such a vast and culturally uneven region. For him, the pictorialism of the Venetian and Lombard painters of the second half of the fifteenth century posed new problems for scientific connoisseurs, who had often been trained in Florentine linear models. Whilst the Tuscan style had been studied as a kind of homogenous dialect, the Northern artists presented a number of external influences that made it particularly difficult to gather them into a single regional category. Berenson maintained that Milan was also home to an identifiable school of painting in this period, although "it was scarcely more indigenous in the one place than in the other."³⁹ Notoriously, he shied away from using documentary evidence to explain his artistic genealogies. In this sense, he remained loyal to Morelli, an uncontested authority among connoisseurs of Lombard painting.⁴⁰

The rehang of the Milanese galleries by the director Giuseppe Bertini (1825–1898) offered contemporary scholars a modern and systematic configuration of works from the Lombard schools that was finally conducive to comparative study. The removal of some works from their original chapels (such as an altarpiece from the church of San Sebastiano, which was relocated in the Castello Museum) allowed others to see the works under

different lighting conditions, and thus to propose new attributions (for works previously ascribed to Bramante, Bramantino or Civerchio).⁴¹

Martin Conway's (1856–1937) discovery of two unknown works in the Milanese private market helped to revive interest in Foppa.⁴² Prior to this discovery, the Brescian master had received little attention from art dealers outside Italy, and his reputation never rivalled that of other Northern Italian painters such as Mantegna, Leonardo or Bramante. The *Dead Christ in the Tomb* and *Virgin and Child* were the highlights of the Milanese Art Exhibition organized in 1898 by the Burlington Fine Arts Club in London. However, as Gustavo Frizzoni (1840–1919) pointed out in his review, the exhibition also included some non-genuine works: a reminder that Foppa was still associated with many problems of attribution that the connoisseurs of the nineteenth century had failed to resolve.⁴³ In the same year, the Milanese restorer Luigi Cavenaghi (1844–1918) found that a panel he was restoring for the musician and collector Aldo Nosedà (1853–1916), attributed to Vincenzo Civerchio, was in fact perfectly consonant with Foppa's *Virgin of Humility*, which also happened to be in Cavenaghi's studio at the time.⁴⁴ This picture became a point of contention among scholars seeking to establish the stylistic influences of the master.⁴⁵ (This dispute reached a peak in 1909, when the Foppa monograph was published and the Berensons purchased the panel from Nosedà.)⁴⁶

Roger Fry was the first colleague to support Ffoulkes' new researches in a short but enthusiastic notice published in the 'Art gossip' column of the *Athenaeum* in 1901.⁴⁷ A year later, Ffoulkes was able to place three key articles on Foppa in three major European periodicals: the *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft*, *Rassegna d'arte* and *Athenaeum*.⁴⁸ The first article partook in the growing interest in Lombard painting: it appeared in an issue of *Repertorium* that included another article on the school written by Francesco Malaguzzi Valeri (1867–1928).⁴⁹ The *Repertorium* was founded in Vienna at the first *Kunstwissenschaftlicher Kongress* of 1873. Its scientific aspirations were endorsed by a simple format with heavy footnotes and no illustrations.⁵⁰ In this setting, Ffoulkes dealt with two paintings of the Pietà ascribed to Foppa, one in Berlin and the other in the Cernuschi collection in Paris. As "both pictures are known to the writer only in reproductions, it is therefore from the historical standpoint alone that it is proposed to deal with them now."⁵¹ Despite Ffoulkes' advocacy of photographic reproduction, this passage suggested that photographs might not be enough to fix an attribution. At the same time, Ffoulkes introduced the "historical standpoint" as a methodical corrective to the visual examination of photographs. After combing the bibliography of accounts not based on first-hand analysis, Ffoulkes turned to the Cernuschi Pietà and argued that although most scholars agreed that it showed the characteristics of the master, neither the style nor the technique were consistent with the early dates – 1486 or 1487 – suggested by these scholars.⁵² Her reorganization of Foppa's chronology was based on a new document postdating the death of the master. As a result, this documentary criterion became the ordering principle of her remaking of Foppa's corpus.

The tone of Ffoulkes' article in the *Athenaeum* was in keeping with the miscellaneous character of the periodical. By this time, Ffoulkes had amassed enough evidence to propose a later date for Foppa's death. That contribution ended with an expression of hope that "as year by year the discovery of new documents in local archives sheds fresh light on the history of Italian art," the dates of Foppa's birth and death would soon be determined with certainty.⁵³ The decision to place a third article in *Rassegna d'arte*,

which had been founded in the previous year, should be interpreted as another important strategic move relative to the powerful Milanese milieu, which was slowly weakening the legacy of Morelli's anti-historicism. In fact, *Rassegna d'arte*, directed by Francesco Malaguzzi Valeri (1867–1928) with the assistance of Guido Cagnola (1861–1959), presented its readers with an interesting scholarly hybrid, blending the rigorous scholarship espoused by the director with the authority derived from an international circle of connoisseurs, including Frederick Mason Perkins (1874–1955) and Berenson, who were close to Cagnola.⁵⁴ In this article, Ffoulkes jettisoned the misunderstanding that there had been two Foppas, Younger and Elder, by providing further documentary evidence that Foppa's early biographer Baldassarre Zamboni (1723–1797) had got his dates wrong.⁵⁵ The editorial format of the *Athenaeum* had precluded the printing of pictures, but Ffoulkes was able to include six plates in the Italian periodical. As part of her attempt to set the archival record straight, she decided to reproduce in full the document on which her argument pivoted (**Fig 1**). The use of a visual apparatus to support documentary evidence was a novelty in the art press of the time, which must have helped to establish Ffoulkes' authoritativeness in the field. [f] insert Figure 1 near here [/f]

Throughout the nineteenth century, art historians were accustomed to reproducing artists' signatures. From the 1870s, however, the new photomechanical processes, such as photozincography, made it possible to produce facsimiles of documents. As Anthony Hamber explained, "the significance of such a facsimile is enormous. For the first time it was possible to examine an entire manuscript from a reproduction."⁵⁶ Ffoulkes became familiar with photozincography while translating Morelli's second volume. This new technique had already been used by Morelli's German publisher, Brockhaus, when Frizzoni asked Ffoulkes to explain its advantages to Murray.⁵⁷ A few years later, Ffoulkes' familiarity with the process must have been instrumental in forging a methodological alliance between photographs and documents. Ffoulkes had begun not only to champion a philological standpoint alongside Morellian visual analysis but to use photography to enhance her philological method by showing and sharing the trajectories of her archival research. By reproducing the document in full, she made her discoveries verifiable and unassailable.

These three articles lay the foundation for Ffoulkes' new claims regarding Foppa. By dating his death to 1515 rather than 1492, she was able to attribute to the master a whole series of works previously credited to other Lombard artists. Taken together, these studies proposed a distinctive approach that seemed new to the international community of scholars when Ffoulkes was invited to publish an article summarizing her discoveries in the very first issue of *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs* in 1903.⁵⁸ The subtitle of her article, "Gleanings from the archives of S. Alessandro at Brescia," echoed the documentary notes that had become a common feature of some Italian periodicals associated with the *scuola storica* (*L'archivio storico dell'arte* and *Rassegna d'arte*). At the same time, the extensive use of payment records to support the new chronology for Foppa positioned Ffoulkes' intervention on the side of the most rigorous *Kunstwissenschaft*. Fry's early enthusiasm for her discoveries must have been decisive in securing this important publication. Indeed, her article made a substantial contribution to the methodological variety championed in the first issue of the newly founded magazine.⁵⁹ In offering full-page reproductions of the relevant documents, Ffoulkes did not fetishize archival relics but turned documents into a pedagogical tool. Fully legible and clearly printed, the reproductions were positioned

alongside accurate transcriptions to allow the untrained reader to develop some paleographical skills. If this was Ffoulkes' strategy to bolster her argument from a historical standpoint, it was also a singular attempt to expand the democratic principles propounded by Morelli and supported by Ffoulkes a decade earlier. To go beyond Morelli was not necessarily to become anti-Morellian.

In spring 1906, she contacted Aby Warburg (1866–1929) to obtain some information on Pigello Portinari of the Medici Bank in Milan, who had commissioned Foppa for the chapel in Saint Eustorgio.⁶⁰ "I have no hope," she complained, "of finding something on the chapel, but if I could find new information about the bank it would be likely to provide traces which could lead to something else."⁶¹ The letter expressed both Ffoulkes' frustration with the organization of Italian archives and her excitement about "how incredibly worthwhile the searching in archives can be."⁶² As Warburg was familiar with the Medici documents in Florence, Ffoulkes hoped to obtain some information on the Milanese branch and to include in the monograph she was preparing with Maiocchi a notice by Warburg elucidating the matter.⁶³ But Warburg resolved the question differently: by sending a short reply with a bibliographical reference.⁶⁴ Although these letters express some anxieties about the competitive field of archival research (Ffoulkes apprehensively advised Warburg not to share the information exchanged with anyone else), they also illustrate the participatory nature of art history at the time.

Indeed, Ffoulkes' collaboration with Maiocchi was pivotal to the completion of the monograph on Foppa which was mostly based on the documents she had discussed in her previous articles. Maiocchi and Ffoulkes began working together in Pavia in the summer of 1906, during the Rector's three-year hiatus from his job at the Civic Museums.⁶⁵

Meanwhile, I take advantage of my staying to work at the Collegio with an Englishwoman on a collaborative work which will be published in London next winter on the master who created the fifteenth-century Lombard school of painting, Vincenzo Foppa [...].⁶⁶

The work was intense and Maiocchi appears to have been especially tested by it: "I am almost dead with fatigue from the work which I am finishing for the English press in London."⁶⁷ Ffoulkes must have produced a first draft of the manuscript prior to her meeting with the Rector, as she was able to leave Pavia after just one month. Maiocchi was glad to be released from such a demanding task, made even more difficult by a particularly hot summer.

Thank God I am well and I did not suffer too much from the tropical heat and the intense work of this last month, because of that Englishwoman and Foppa. Now it is all finished and the manuscript is already in London.⁶⁸

Ffoulkes shared her experience of this productive summer in a letter prompted by a request from Adolfo Venturi (1856–1941) to elaborate on the collaborative process of writing the monograph for a forthcoming review. In her response, she explained that both authors had put equal effort into the monograph and divided the work based on their particular areas of competence and knowledge of the documents found in Brescia and Pavia.

He [Maiocchi] had been originally intending to do a life of Foppa himself, but having seen that I was already far advanced with my study, he sent me, with the utmost generosity, the copies of all the precious material he had found in the archives in Pavia; then, he dedicated himself to studying my Mss. with me, adding also those pages which make reference to the documents in Pavia, as, for instance, to the frescoes of S. Giacomo, the ancona of S. Maria Gultieri, and others. Moreover, there is no topic in the book which we have not discussed

in depth; I have been to Pavia at least six times and for six weeks at a time, and Monsignor came to London as well in order to review the final draft with me. He also saved me from many errors of method, criticism, and paleography into which I would otherwise have fallen. Hence, the book is as much his as it is mine, and due to his great goodness and kindness we succeeded in carrying out every task in full without experiencing even the smallest difference; I feel very honoured to be considered worthy of collaborating with a professor so learned and renowned in Italy as is Monsignor Maiocchi.⁶⁹

Interestingly, when Venturi eventually published his review, he chastised Maiocchi for his focus on archival evidence and his lack of analysis and observation, but praised Ffoulkes as “autrice devotissima del Morelli.”⁷⁰ It seems that he not only decided to ignore the information provided by Ffoulkes in her letter, but he also neglected to observe that her contribution to the monograph was the summation of a method of research very much steeped in the networks of the *scuola storica*.⁷¹ Venturi seems to have resisted the possibility that Ffoulkes had moved on from the Morellian method of the 1890s, while at the same time using his praise of her work to highlight Maiocchi’s comparative lack of connoisseurship.

Ffoulkes and Maiocchi were equally well prepared to embark on a comprehensive biography of the master. Yet the experiences of the two scholars were not identical. Maiocchi had trained in Christian archaeology at the Gregorian University in Rome, and was a proponent of the *scuola storica* championed by the interdisciplinary journal *Rivista di scienze storiche*, which he had founded in 1901.⁷² The *scuola storica* endorsed a systematic exploration of the archives in many regional superintendencies, which, following unification and the founding of the Kingdom of Italy in 1861, scholars had started to catalogue and cross-reference, thus laying the foundations for many of the documentary discoveries that modernized historical scholarship.⁷³ As Maria Grazia Albertini Ottolenghi has shown, Maiocchi was not only very familiar with the state of documentary research on Lombard artists; he also maintained a close dialogue with other art historians of his generation, such as Francesco Malaguzzi Valeri, the co-editor of *Rassegna d’Arte*.⁷⁴ However, Maiocchi’s reliance on documentary evidence seems to have had some shortcomings. Perhaps the most striking example is the failure to recognize Foppa’s hand in the Bottigella altarpiece (**Fig 2**). Albertini Ottolenghi argued that Maiocchi’s attributions were always cautious. As his own expertise lay in documents, he preferred to quote the opinions of eminent connoisseurs on stylistic matters.⁷⁵ The attribution of the Bottigella altarpiece to Leonardo Vidolenghi (1446–1502), based chiefly on documentary evidence of the presence of that artist in the church of S. Tommaso (where the altarpiece was commissioned by Matteo Bottigella (1410–1486)), can only be justified by Maiocchi’s somewhat parochial desire to retain certain works in the School of Pavia.⁷⁶ This example also shows that documentary evidence alone was not enough to produce a correct attribution. [f] insert Figure 2 near here [/f]

Connoisseurship and the Web of Expertise

The Foppa monograph contained reproductions of many known works by the master, alongside a full set of documents transcribed in the appendix. As the *Crucifixion* at the Accademia Carrara in Bergamo was Foppa’s only signed work, connoisseurs had made various arguments for influences on the young Foppa that moved him around the map of Northern Italy, geographically orienting his activities according to minor changes in his pictorial style, as if responding to variation in his spoken accent or dialect. Both Cavalcaselle and Berenson agreed with Vasari that Foppa was

trained in Padua at around the same time as Squarcione.⁷⁷ However, Foulkes and Maiocchi proposed that Foppa's pictorial style had been influenced by another Northern approach, and completely ruled out the traditionally accepted connection with Padua.⁷⁸

This work was taken very seriously by the professional community, and it is indeed remarkable for the web of expertise woven in its pages, ranging from documentary evidence to stylistic evaluation and technical analysis. In keeping with her inclination for collaborative scholarship, Ffoulkes commissioned Christiana Herringham (1852–1929) to produce a two-page account of the technique and conditions of the two Foppas in London: *The Adoration of the Kings* at the National Gallery and the fresco fragment *The Young Cicero Reading* in the Wallace Collection.⁷⁹ Herringham, elsewhere dubbed by Ffoulkes “distinta conoscitrice,” was an expert in quattrocento tempera and fresco techniques.⁸⁰ The *Adoration* altarpiece had been acquired in 1863 by the National Gallery as a Bramantino, and was only later identified as a genuine Foppa by Crowe and Cavalcaselle.⁸¹ This panel offered a particularly interesting case study for investigation of quattrocento techniques, as it demonstrated the co-existence of tempera painting with an oil medium; as Herringham noted, “[t]here was endless experimenting in North Italy with complicated varnish mediums.”⁸² Herringham remarked on the embossed plasterwork of the Kings' collars (in fact a form of incised ornamentation designed to imitate precious stones), and showed how the patterned design in gold leaf had been made using an adhesive mordant.⁸³

The fresco fragment in the Wallace Collection had only recently been included in the repertoire of accepted works by the Brescian master. Eugène Müntz's (1845–1902) attribution of the fragment to Foppa remained unpopular until Berenson revived it in the 1890s.⁸⁴ However, as Silvia Davoli has demonstrated, Morelli had already assigned to Foppa the “affreschi rappresentanti cose romane” in his 1862 ministerial report on the Medici Bank in Milan, which at that time was undergoing its umpteenth renovation after having been sold to the Valtorta family. There is no evidence that either Ffoulkes or Maiocchi was aware of Morelli's opinion on this piece.⁸⁵ Allegedly saved by Giuseppe Bertini during the demolition of the bank, the fresco must have been situated on the parapet of the courtyard's upper loggia. To illustrate this, Ffoulkes and Maiocchi created a composite plate from a reconstruction of the plan and elevation of the courtyard of the Medici Bank that had been prepared by Agostino Caravati after Bertini's original 1863 watercolors for publication in *Arte italiana decorativa e industriale* (**Fig 3**).⁸⁶ This fresco was particularly important because it had not been transferred onto panel or canvas; it was a piece of the actual wall of the Medici Bank. Herringham identified, one by one, the many retouchings on the fragment, and emphasized the painter's ability to handle pigments, as the blue of the leg on the bench appeared to be only terra verde.⁸⁷ [f] insert Figure 3 near here [/f]

Gustavo Frizzoni's review of the monograph in *L'arte* was very enthusiastic, but its author was not particularly appreciative of the methods by which the attributions had been advanced. To him, the work was largely a biography.⁸⁸ Similarly, the Foppa monograph was dubbed “an excellent example in reconstructive biography” in the *Athenaeum*; however, the reviewer also indicated the scholarly compass of such an enterprise, which rivalled “the best efforts of modern German and Italian scholarship.”⁸⁹ Interestingly, both reviewers seem to have distanced Ffoulkes from the methods of Morellian connoisseurship that she had helped to disseminate in Britain during the 1890s. Indeed, this work championed the new methodologies that had grown up in Milan and Florence around the encounters between cosmopolitan connoisseurs and local archivists. Other examples of this kind of scholarship, which was scientific in scope although not always written by academic scholars, are Maud Cruttwell's *Luca and Andrea Della Robbia* (1902) and Herbert Horne's *Botticelli* (1908). Writing for *The Saturday Review*, Laurence Binyon (1869–1943) praised

Ffoulkes in terms that offer valuable insights to gauge her contribution to contemporary methodological innovations.

What deserves special praise is the admirable temper of Miss Ffoulkes' writing; it is quite free from the barren acrimonies of the partisan and from exaggerated laudation of its subject; it is also lucid and unpretentious in style. Like Mr. Horne, Miss Ffoulkes and her Italian collaborator believe that no sound study of the history of art can proceed without the control of documents; and those relating to Foppa are printed at the end of the book.⁹⁰

The comparison with Horne casts some light on the role of Ffoulkes' monograph in the development of art history in general, and in the history of connoisseurship in particular. Binyon establishes a continuity between Horne and Ffoulkes in their use of documents to support their arguments. In fact, like Ffoulkes, Horne amended Botticelli's date of birth by referring to unpublished documents. Horne and Ffoulkes had already published side by side in the first issue of *The Burlington*, together with Bernard Berenson, whose article on the *Alunno di Domenico*, as is well known, relied on a completely different methodology: inferring the personality of an artist by looking at nothing but the artist's works.⁹¹ However, we must also note that Horne's and Ffoulkes' methodologies addressed two very different objects of study. The name of Foppa did not move the souls of art lovers as that of Botticelli had done for nearly half a century. Horne's aim was to strip Botticelli of the mythologizing veneer that had made it difficult to access the master's original works.⁹² In contrast, Ffoulkes and Maiocchi had to construct Foppa from scratch.

The historical standpoint and the curious eye

The introduction to their monograph offers an important measure of the methodological shifts occurring within connoisseurship at the time. The authors declared very clearly how they moved across two methodological camps that had come to oppose one another at the beginning of the century:

In this volume the life of Foppa has been treated from the historical rather than from the critical standpoint, the conclusions being founded upon the testimony of documents, wherever this was possible. [...] Only by such means can we ever hope to achieve a history of art resting upon the sure foundation of established fact, and not upon the visionary fabric of individual impressions.⁹³

Whilst the 1890s were characterized by opposition between the old and the new criticism (the latter associated with Morelli's scientific connoisseurship), the first decade of the new century was seeing a shift towards the Italian and German philological approach. The international circulation of magazines identifying themselves as professional and scientific and the increased mobility of art historians and connoisseurs promoted by national research centers and networks in Italy must have facilitated a methodological hybridization. One would read in this passage the voice of Maiocchi alone, but as the methodology of earlier studies on Foppa demonstrates, that statement resonates with her career in a very precise way. Yet Ffoulkes did not need to reject her teacher to validate her own reputation at this point. Indeed, the book is dedicated "to the memory of two who will ever stand pre-eminent among the pioneers of art criticism and of documentary research in the nineteenth century."⁹⁴ The first is Gustav Ludwig, to whom "students of the historical and documentary side" are especially indebted, as Ffoulkes' own experience showed; interestingly, Ludwig is also renowned for having formed a photographic collection, which is now part of the

Kunsthistorisches Institut in Florence.⁹⁵ The second is obviously Giovanni Morelli, whose name was “a household word to all those who devote themselves to the serious study of Italian art, from the historical and critical standpoint.” Everyone familiar with the Morellian method remembers his invectives against the “art historians”. Yet by positioning Morelli’s name next to Ludwig’s, Ffoulkes wisely decided to bypass the methodological oppositions underpinning the quarrels of the nineteenth century, seeking instead to modernize connoisseurship.⁹⁶ We witness here an act of appropriation, not conscious erasure.

The process of appropriation is completed by a mention of Berenson’s *North Italian Painters*. This reference is especially surprising given how little Berenson’s methods shared with those deployed in this monograph. Yet a closer reading reveals that the aim here is not adulation; quite the opposite. The authors use Berenson’s name to represent the attitude of the new generation of connoisseurs, who try to move away from Morelli only to go back to “the problem as Morelli left it.” Although the passage conveys the false modesty appropriate to introductions, its encomiastic tone also veils the implication that Berenson had been unable to come up with anything that Morelli had not discovered already – unlike Ffoulkes. Indeed, in *North Italian Painters* (1907), Berenson had decided to ignore the new chronologies proposed by Ffoulkes in her three articles published in 1902-1903. Roger Fry did not excuse this oversight in his review of Berenson’s book for *The Burlington*, in which he reminded the author that Ffoulkes’ discoveries had been discussed in the same first issue of the magazine to which Berenson too had contributed.⁹⁷

In her study of the politics of the disciplinary shift from art history to visual culture, Irit Rogoff suggested that the latter elicits a cultural awareness of vision that conveys a shift from the “good eye” to the “curious eye,” enabling issues such as desire, corporeality and sexuality to be treated historically.⁹⁸ Whilst Rogoff’s comments were constructed as a critique of the elitism of connoisseurs who considered a “good eye” a natural gift, this article has shown that the “good eye” too has a history that can be analyzed using the methods of visual culture. Ffoulkes’ shift from visuality to documentality may be explained as part of her attempt to forge new alliances with proponents of the “historical standpoint” in Italy and Germany without losing touch with the “critical standpoint” that had secured her professional status in Britain a decade earlier. However, her hybrid methodological innovations also represent a response to the need to navigate a male profession as a woman. I have suggested that Ffoulkes’ research methods must be investigated as an oblique response to the ideologies of gender operating in *fin-de-siècle* connoisseurship. By deploying visual and documentary resources to vividly represent the evidence supporting her arguments, Ffoulkes equipped herself with a “curious eye” that must be interrogated historically if we are to understand how the culture of connoisseurship engaged not only with the formation of disciplinary art history but with the intersecting production of gender, value and authority. As she could not possess the “good eye” ascribed to the male connoisseur as a distinct physiological ability to respond to quality in art, Ffoulkes visualized on the page a new and complex philological method of trading her critical authority. Indeed, she re-envisioned the methods of scientific connoisseurship by using her “curious eye” for documentary research to compensate for her lack of a “good eye”, alleged by Victorian visions of gender. No longer perceived as a producer of ancillary works anonymously compiled to facilitate the serious scholarship of the male connoisseur, Ffoulkes gained validation through her “historical standpoint”: by excavating documents from the archives and transcribing and reproducing them for anyone to read. Ffoulkes took Morelli’s principle of democratic connoisseurship and made it her own by demonstrating that one is not born a connoisseur, but becomes one.

Footnotes

This research was sponsored by a Leverhulme Early Career Fellowship. I would like to thank Caterina Zaira Laskaris (Almo Collego Borromeo, Pavia), David McClay (John Murray Archive, National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh), Ilaria della Monica (Biblioteca Berenson, I Tatti, Florence), Maddalena Taglioli (Centro Archivistico, Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa), Donata Vicini (Biblioteca Civica Bonetta, Pavia) and Claudia Wedepohl (Warburg Institute Archive, London). My special gratitude to the two anonymous readers for their extremely generous feedback and indication of bibliographical references and archival sources.

¹ Constance Jocelyn Ffoulkes was born in 1858 Holywell, Flintshire North Wales from John Jocelyn Ffoulkes and Mary Ann Proctor Beauchamp from Eriviat Hall, Denbighshire. Constance was the youngest of seven sisters and never married (National Library of Wales, Eriviat Estate Record GB 0210 Eriviat). The family estate went to her sister Edith Caroline when she married Philip Humberstone in 1873 (National Library of Wales, Ms.11982D). Constance Ffoulkes died in 1950 aged 92 in Cheshire leaving a wealth of £12.625, 9s. 2d. (National Probate Calendar, Index of Wills and Administrations, 1858–1966).

² Constance Jocelyn Ffoulkes and Monsignor Rodolfo Maiocchi, *Vincenzo Foppa of Brescia, founder of the Lombard School. His Life and Work* (John Lane: New York and London, 1909).

³ The author of the most recent Foppa monograph claims that the documentary apparatus compiled by Ffoulkes and Maiocchi “is substantially complete still today”. See Maria Grazia Balzarini, *Vincenzo Foppa* (Milan: Jaca Book, 1997), 13. According to the latest bibliography on Foppa, Ffoulkes’ and Maiocchi’s book is still “fundamental”: see Giovanni Agosti, Mauro Natale, Giovanni Romano, eds, *Vincenzo Foppa. Un protagonista del Rinascimento* (Milan: Skira, 2002), 196.

⁴ Hilary Fraser, *Women Writing Art History in the Nineteenth Century. Looking Like a Woman* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 3.

⁵ Caroline Palmer, “‘I Will Tell Nothing that I Did Not See’: British Women’s Travel Writing, Art and the Science of Connoisseurship, 1776–1860”, *Forum for Modern Language Studies* 51, no. 3 (2015),

⁶ Ffoulkes also translated the second volume on German galleries which appeared the following year. Giovanni Morelli, *Italian Painters: Critical Studies of their Work. Vol. 2, The Galleries of Munich and Dresden*, transl. by Constance J. Ffoulkes (London: John Murray, 1893). The project of translating Morelli’s third volume was never accomplished.

⁷ Constance Jocelyn Ffoulkes, ‘Misnamed Pictures in the Uffizi Gallery’, *The Magazine of Art* 13, no. 1 (1890), 191.

⁸ During the late 1880s Ffoulkes travelled Europe chaperoned by her father in order to visit the major art galleries, especially in Germany. Already in 1887, she was cutting her teeth on a handbook of the Dresden gallery, a somewhat unoriginal work, but an important document of her apprenticeship with Morelli. Constance Jocelyn Ffoulkes, *Handbook of the Italian Schools in the Dresden Gallery* (London: W.H. Allen, 1888).

⁹ Enrico Ridolfi, *Dei Provvedimenti e lavori fatti per le rr. Gallerie e Musei di Firenze negli anni 1885-1889* (Florence and Rome: Tip. Dei Fratelli Bencini, 1890).

¹⁰ Ffoulkes was introduced to Elizabeth Eastlake by Giovanni Morelli in 1887, during one of his trips to London, when she also met the Richters and the Layards. C. J. Ffoulkes to A. H. Layard, 7 March 1890. Add. Ms. 39045, British Library, London. For another evidence of Ffoulkes’ meeting with the Richters, the Layards and Morelli at Hampton Court in July 1887 see Dietrich Seybold, ‘Louise M. Richter (1850–1938) — A Diarist of the Morellian Era (and beyond)’ in <http://www.seybold.ch/Dietrich/LouiseRichter> [accessed November 2016]. Ffoulkes was again visiting the galleries in Florence accompanied by Jean Paul Richter in December of the same year. G. Morelli to A. H. Layard, 19 December 1887. Add. Ms. 38965, British Library, London.

¹¹ Morelli explained the fundamentals of his system in ‘Principles and Method’, in *Italian Painters*, Vol. 1, 1–63.

¹² Ffoulkes, ‘Misnamed Pictures’, 191.

¹³ See Jaynie Anderson, ‘The political Power of Connoisseurship in Nineteenth-Century Europe : Wilhelm von Bode versus Giovanni Morelli’, *Jarbuch der Berliner Museen* 38 (1996), 107–119.

¹⁴ Dorothea Peters, “‘Das Schwierigste ist eben ... das, was uns da Leichteste zu sein dünkt – nämlich das Sehen.’ Kunstgeschichte und Fotografie am Beispiel Giovanni Morellis (1816- 1891)”, in *Fotografie als Instrument und Medium der Kunstgeschichte*, ed. Costanza Caraffa (Berlin and München, 2009), 45–75. For an account of Morelli’s relationship with the Milanese restorer Giuseppe

Molteni (1800-1867) see Jaynie Anderson, *The Restoration of Renaissance Painting in mid Nineteenth-Century Milan*, *Storia e Teoria del Restauro* 21 (Florence: Edifir, 2011).

¹⁵ Elizabeth Eastlake, 'Giovanni Morelli: The Patriot and the Critic', *Quarterly Review* 173 (July 1891), 248. Eastlake was also the author of a groundbreaking early essay on photography which appeared in the *Quarterly Review*, 101 (April 1857), 442-468.

¹⁶ Anthony Hamber, 'The Photography of the Visual Arts', *Visual Resources* 5, no. 4 (1989), 148.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ Bernard Berenson, 'Isochromatic Photography and Venetian Pictures', *The Nation* 57, No. 1480 (1893), 346-347, also reprinted in *Visual Resources* 3, no. 2 (1986), 134-138. Patrizio Aiello has convincingly argued that Berenson's interest in the use of photography for the connoisseurship of old masters must have been influenced by Gustavo Frizzoni, who mentored him in the early 1890s. Patrizio Aiello, 'Gustavo Frizzoni and Bernard Berenson', *Concorso. Arti e Lettere* 5 (2011), 10. It is also interesting to notice that, as Hilary Fraser has demonstrated, in 1893 the Berensons were in contact with Eastlake who became an inspiration for the young couple of connoisseurs. See Fraser, *Women Writing Art History*, 37-39. For an account of the production and sale of loose photographic prints see Anthony Hamber, *'A Higher Branch of Art': Photographing the Fine Arts in England, 1839-1880* (Amsterdam: Gordon and Breach, 1996).

¹⁹ *Venetian Art. Thirty-Six Reproductions of Pictures Exhibited at the New Gallery, 1894-95* (London: Blades, East & Blades, 1895).

²⁰ Constance Jocelyn Ffoulkes, 'L'exposition d'art venitien à Londres', *Revue de l'Art chrétien* 38, March (1895), 137. Translation mine. This feature is also emphasised in another review by Woldemar von Seydlitz, 'Die Ausstellung venezianischer Kunst in der New Gallery zu London im Winter 1894-95', *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft* 18 (1895), 209.

²¹ Here I am referring to Lorraine Daston and Peter Galison's argument that photography provided the epistemological foundations for modern conceptions of objectivity. See Lorraine Daston and Peter Galison, *Objectivity* (London: Zone Books, 2010). For a discussion of the relationship between criminology and connoisseurship see Carlo Ginzburg, *Clues, Myths, and the Historical Method* (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989), 96-125.

²² Bernhard Berenson, *Venetian Painting, chiefly before Titian, at the Exhibition of Venetian Art, The New Gallery, 1895* (London: Vacher and Sons, 1895).

²³ Mary and Bernard Berenson married in 1900, but for facility of expression I have decided to refer to 'the Berensons' also when I am talking about their formative collaboration during the 1890s.

²⁴ Mary Berenson's Diary 1893-95, 17 November 1895. The Bernard and Mary Berenson Papers. Biblioteca Berenson, Villa I Tatti, The Harvard University Center for Italian Renaissance Studies, Florence.

²⁵ Although a follower of the Morellian method, Berenson met Morelli in Bergamo only once, the year before he died. Ernest Samuels, *Bernard Berenson: The Making of a Connoisseur* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1979), 105.

²⁶ Angela Emanuel, ed., *A Bright Remembrance. The Diaries of Julia Cartwright 1851-1924*, (London: Widenfled and Nicolson, 1989), 224. This diary is an invaluable source for the life of 'Cona' Constance Ffoulkes and other women art writers of that generation. For a study of the photographic service of the South Kensington Museum, and especially the role of women after the death of Charles Thurston Thompson, see Erika Lederman, 'Isabel A. Cowper: First Female Official Photographer of the First Museum Photographic Service?', <http://www.vam.ac.uk/blog/factory-presents/international-womens-day-historic-women-va> [accessed November 2016]

²⁷ Roger Fry to Helen Fry, July 8, 1904, in *Letters of Roger Fry*, Vol. 1, ed. Denys Sutton (London: Chatto & Windus, 1972), 223.

²⁸ *The Diaries of Julia Cartwright*, 188.

²⁹ *The Diaries of Julia Cartwright*, 188.

³⁰ On freelance art writers, see Amy M. Von Lintel, "Excessive industry": Female Art Historians, Popular Publishing and Professional Access', in *Women, Femininity and Public Space in European*

Visual Culture, 1789–1914, ed. Temma Balducci and Heather Belnap Jensen (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014), 115–130.

³¹ Elizabeth Eastlake to A. H. Layard, 12 January, 1893. Add. Ms. 38972, British Library, London.

³² Franca Varallo and Gianni Carlo Sciolla, *L' «Archivio Storico dell'Arte» e le origini della «Kunstwissenschaft» in Italia* (Edizioni dell'orso: Alessandria, 1999).

³³ *The Diaries of Julia Cartwright*, Saturday 14 November 1896, 209.

³⁴ Gustav Ludwig to Wilhelm Bode, 5 January 1901, cited in Martin Gaier, “Die heilige Ursula hängt mir schon ellenlang zum Hals heraus” Gustav Ludwig tra storia artistica e culturale 1895–1905”, in *Presenze tedesche a Venezia*, ed. Susanne Winter (Rome and Venice: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 2005), 131–175.

³⁵ Jacob Burkhardt, *Der Cicerone. Eine Anleitung zum Genuss der Kunstwerke italiens*, Vol II, 2 (Seeman: Leipzig, 1884), 649.

³⁶ Ivan Lermolieff [Giovanni Morelli], *Kunstkritische Studien über italienische Malerei*, Vol. 3, *Die Galerie zu Berlin*, ed. Gustavo Frizzoni (Brockhaus: Leipzig, 1893), 107–8.

³⁷ Malaguzzi Valeri, the Italian authority on Lombard painting at the time, strongly disagreed with the founding position ascribed to Foppa and critiqued Ffoulkes' and Maiocchi's decision to support it in the very subtitle of their monograph. Francesco Malaguzzi Valeri, ‘Vincenzo Foppa in una recente pubblicazione’, *Rassegna d'Arte* 9, no. 5 (1909), 84–88.

³⁸ Bernard Berenson, *North Italian Painters of the Renaissance* (London: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1907), 99.

³⁹ Berenson, *North Italian*, 92–3.

⁴⁰ For Berenson's connections with the Milanese circles of connoisseurship see Patrizio Aiello, ‘Gustavo Frizzoni e Bernard Berenson’; Chiara Ficcadori, ‘Aldo Nosedà e Bernard Berenson’; Stefano Bruzzese, ‘Dal carteggio di Guido Cagnola. Le lettere di Bernard Berenson’, in *Concorso. Arti e Lettere* 5 (2011), 7–68. I would like to thank Ilaria della Monica for pointing me to these excellent studies.

⁴¹ Gustavo Frizzoni, ‘Rassegna d'insigni artisti italiani a ricordo dell'incremento dato ai Musei di Milano dal direttore Giuseppe Bertini’, *L'Arte* 2, no. 8–10 (1899), 147–158.

⁴² Martin Conway, *The Sport of Collecting* (New York: Frederik A. Stokes, 1914), 26–37.

⁴³ Gustavo Frizzoni, ‘Exposition des maitres de l'école lombarde à Londres’ in *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* 20, no. 3 (1898), 295–297.

⁴⁴ Giovanni Agosti, ‘Vincenzo Foppa, *Virgin of Humility with Angels (Madonna della siepe)*’, in Carl Brandon Strehlke and Machtelt Brügggen Israëls, *The Bernard and Mary Berenson Collection of European Paintings at I Tatti* (Milan: I Tatti and Officina Libraria, 2015), 252–256.

⁴⁵ For a discussion of the panel's critical reception see Agosti's, entry on ‘Vincenzo Foppa’ in *The Bernard and Mary Berenson Collection*, 252–256.

⁴⁶ For the negotiations with Nosedà see Giovanni Pagliarulo, ‘Alcune precisazioni sui dipinti di Vincenzo Foppa nella collezione Berenson’ in *Vincenzo Foppa. Tecniche d'esecuzione, indagini e restauri*, ed. Massimiliano Capella, Ida Gianfranceschi and Elena Lucchesi Ragni (Milan: Skira, 2002) pp. 203–208; Ficcadori, ‘Aldo Nosedà e Bernard Berenson’, 31–56.

⁴⁷ [Roger Fry], ‘Art Gossip’, *Athenaeum*, no. 3855, 14 September (1901), 358.

⁴⁸ A fourth notice appeared in *Rassegna*, to deal with a document related to Foppa found in Milan, ‘Vincenzo Foppa e la famiglia Caylina di Brescia’, *Rassegna d'arte* 2, no. 1 (1902), 3–5.

⁴⁹ Constance Jocelyn Ffoulkes, ‘Notes on two pictures ascribed to Vincenzo Foppa’, *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft* 25 (1902), 65–81.

⁵⁰ Giovanni Agosti, *La nascita della storia dell'arte in Italia: Adolfo Venturi dal museo all'università 1880–1940* (Venice: Marsilio, 1996), 73.

⁵¹ Ffoulkes, ‘Notes on two pictures’, 65.

⁵² Ffoulkes, ‘Notes on two pictures’, 76.

⁵³ Constance Jocelyn Ffoulkes, ‘Vincenzo Foppa: Some New Facts’, *The Athenaeum*, no. 3877, February 15 (1902), 21–218.

-
- ⁵⁴ Alessandro Rovetta, 'La "Rassegna d'arte" di Guido Cagnola e Francesco Malaguzzi Valeri' (1908-1914)', in *Percorsi di Critica. Un archivio per le riviste d'arte in Italia dell'Ottocento e del Novecento*, ed. Rosanna Cioffi and Alessandro Rovetta (Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 2007), pp. 281-316. See also Alessandro Rovetta, 'Francesco Malaguzzi Valeri a Milano tra la "Rassegna d'arte" e *La Corte di Ludovico il Moro*', in A. Rovetta and G. C. Sciolla, *Francesco Malaguzzi Valeri (1867-1928). Tra storiografia artistica, museo e tutela* (Milan: Scalpendi, 2014), 89-105. For a recent study of Mason Perkins see Fausto Nicolai, 'Frederick Mason Perkins as Art Adviser, Agent and Intermediary for American Collectors of the Twentieth Century', *Journal of The History Of Collections* 28, no. 2 (2016), 311-325.
- ⁵⁵ Constance Jocelyn Ffoulkes, 'Cenni su Vincenzo Foppa', *Rassegna d'arte* 2, no. 11-12 (1902), 168-173. Ffoulkes had already published in this journal another article on a document related to Foppa found in Milan, 'Vincenzo Foppa e la famiglia Caylina di Brescia', *Rassegna d'arte* 2, no. 1 (1902), 3-5.
- ⁵⁶ Anthony Hamber, 'The Photography of the Visual Arts', 149.
- ⁵⁷ C. J. Ffoulkes to J. Murray, 17 October 1892. Ms. 40401, John Murray Archive, National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh. These letters explain the vicissitudes of the translation of Morelli's handbook and also shed light on the technical aspects of printing photographic reproductions.
- ⁵⁸ Constance Jocelyn Ffoulkes, 'The Date of Vincenzo Foppa's Death. Gleanings from the Archives of S. Alessandro at Brescia', *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs* 1, no. 1 (1903), 103-121. For a discussion of women art writers' contribution to professional periodicals, see Meaghan Clark, 'The Art Press at the Fin de Siècle: Women, Collecting, and Connoisseurship', *Visual Resources* 31, no. 1-2 (2015), 15-30.
- ⁵⁹ See Caroline Elam, "'A More and more important work": Roger Fry and the Burlington Magazine', *The Burlington Magazine* 145, no. 1200 (March, 2003), 142-152.
- ⁶⁰ C. J. Ffoulkes to A. Warburg, Aby 04/05[1906]. GC/2096, Warburg Institute Archive (WIA), London. Ffoulkes arrived to Warburg via Heinrich Brockhaus (1858-1941), the director of the Kunsthistorisches Institut in Florence, because she was trying to get hold of Giovanni Poggi, who was the expert on the Medici banks.
- ⁶¹ C. J. Ffoulkes to A. Warburg, 18 May 1906. GC/2098, WIA. My translation.
- ⁶² C. J. Ffoulkes to A. Warburg, 18 May 1906. GC/2098, WIA. My translation.
- ⁶³ C. J. Ffoulkes to A. Warburg [08 August 1906]. GC/2099, WIA.
- ⁶⁴ A. Warburg to C. J. Ffoulkes, 13 August 1906. *Kopierbuch* I, 268, WIA.
- ⁶⁵ It is not clear to me how the two scholars got together. On possible link could be Frizzoni, who must have been in touch with Ffoulkes after the death of Morelli, but also as another author at *L'Arte*. In 1894 Frizzoni had started to advise Maiocchi on the reorganization of the Malaspina and Civic Museums, which he directed. On Frizzoni and Maiocchi, see Donata Vicini, 'Rodolfo Maiocchi Conservatore del Museo Civico (1894-1906 e 1909-1910)', *Bollettino della Società Pavese di Storia Patria* 114 (2014), 95-117. Another possible line of contact must have come via the Kunsthistorisches Institut in Florence. But I have found no evidence for that.
- ⁶⁶ R. Maiocchi to Patrono del Collegio, 21 July 1906. 'Protocolli Patronali', b. 19, fasc. 1, Archivio del Collegio Borromeo, Pavia. My translation.
- ⁶⁷ R. Maiocchi to Patrono del Collegio, 12 August 1906. Archivio del Collegio Borromeo. My translation.
- ⁶⁸ R. Maiocchi to Parono del Collegio, 18 August 1906. Archivio del Collegio Borromeo. My translation.
- ⁶⁹ C. J. Ffoulkes to A. Venturi, 5 February [1909]. 'Fondo Venturi', Archivio della Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa. My translation.
- ⁷⁰ Adolfo Venturi, 'Recensioni', *L'Arte* 12, no. 2 (1909), 239-241.
- ⁷¹ Prior to her contacting Warburg, Ffoulkes had mobilised a number of researchers to acquire archival information relating to Foppa and his patrons: Gustav Ludwig (1854-1905), Francesco Novati (1859-1915), Giovanni Poggi (1880-1961) G.M. Vittadini to F. Novati, 29 June 1901. 'Carteggio Novati', Biblioteca Braidense, Milan. Cited in Leonardo Andreoli, *Intorno a Novati*.

Erudizione e Conoscenza Storico-artistica in Italia, 1880-1915. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Milan (2011).

⁷² Maria Grazia Albertini Ottolenghi, 'Il contributo di Rodolfo Maiocchi alla Storia dell'Arte', *Bollettino della Società Pavese di Storia Patria* 114 (2014), 120.

⁷³ Guido Lucchini, *Le origini della scuola storica. Storia letteraria e filologia in Italia (1866-1883)* (Bologna: Il Mulino, 1990).

⁷⁴ Albertini Ottolenghi, 'Il contributo di Rodolfo Maiocchi', 121–122.

⁷⁵ Albertini Ottolenghi, 'Il contributo di Rodolfo Maiocchi', 127.

⁷⁶ Ffoulkes and Maiocchi, *Vincenzo Foppa*, 240.

⁷⁷ See Berenson, *North Italian*, 92. Cavalcaselle's opinion rested on an ambivalent passage from Vasari which he supported with a stylistic comparison. Joseph A. Crowe and Giovan Battista Cavalcaselle, *A History of painting in North Italy* [1871], ed. T. Borenius (London: John Murray, 1912), 317.

⁷⁸ In 1903, Ffoulkes had already given the panel to Foppa, ruling out previous attributions to a non-existent Foppa Il Giovane. See Ffoulkes' entry on 'Foppa, Vincenzo' in *Bryan's Dictionary of Painters and Engravers*, Vol. 2 (London: MacMillan, 1903), 178–179.

⁷⁹ [Herringham], 'The Technique and Condition of Foppa's Pictures in London', in Ffoulkes and Maiocchi, *Vincenzo Foppa*, 287–288.

⁸⁰ C. J. Ff. [Contance Jocelyn Ffoulkes], 'Notizie d'Inghilterra', *L'Arte* 8, no. 3 (1905), 213. On Herringham's expertise see Meaghan Clarke's article in this issue.

⁸¹ Joseph Crowe and Giovan Battista Cavalcaselle, *A History of Painting in North Italy*, 7–8.

⁸² [Herringham], 'The Technique and Condition of Foppa's Pictures in London', in *Vincenzo Foppa*, 287.

⁸³ [Herringham], 'The Technique', 288. For a recent technical report on the picture see Jill Dunkerton and Carol Plazzotta, 'Vincenzo Foppa's *Adoration of the Kings*', *National Gallery Technical Bulletin* 22 (2001), 18–28.

⁸⁴ Eugène Müntz, *La Renaissance en France et Italie à l'époque de Charles VIII* (Librairie de Firman-Didot : Paris, 1885), 261; and Berenson, *North Italian*, 219.

⁸⁵ Silvia Davoli, 'Italian Renaissance art from the Both de Tauzia collection, now at the Wallace Collection', *Journal of the History of Collections* 25, no. 3 (2013), pp. 398, 404.

⁸⁶ Agostino Caravati, 'Il palazzo del Banco Mediceo a Milano I', *Arte italiana decorative e industriale* 4, no. 4 (1895), 30–32.

⁸⁷ [Christiana Herringham], 'The Technique', 288.

⁸⁸ Gustavo Frizzoni, 'Vincenzo Foppa pittore (A proposito di una recente pubblicazione)', *L'Arte* 12, no. 4 (1909), 249–261. It is important to point out that Frizzoni did not include his piece in the section devoted to reviews, but among the main articles of the journal. This article appeared two issues after Venturi's review of the monograph.

⁸⁹ Anon., 'Fine Arts', *The Athenaeum*, no. 4300, March 26 (1910), 374.

⁹⁰ Laurence Binyon, 'Books on Italian Art', *The Saturday Review*, 25 September (1909), 381.

⁹¹ On the origins of *The Burlington Magazine* see Helen Rees Leahy, 'For Connoisseurs: The Burlington Magazine 1903–11,' in *Art History and its Institutions: Foundations of a Discipline*, ed. Elizabeth Mansfield (London: Routledge, 2002), 231–45; and Barbara Pezzini, 'The Burlington Magazine, The Burlington Gazette, and The Connoisseur: The Art Periodical and the Market for Old Master Paintings in Edwardian London', *Visual Resources*, Vol. 29: 3 (2013), 154–183.

⁹² On Horne's historical rescue of Botticelli's from the enthusiasm of the aesthetic revival see Caroline Elam, 'Herbert Horne: "A Kind of Posteritorious Distinction"', in *Sandro Botticelli and Herbert Horne: New Research*, ed. Rab Hatfield (Florence: Syracuse University Press, 2009), 169–203. For a discussion of Horne's independent apprenticeship as an art historian in Florence see Ian Fletcher, *Rediscovering Herbert Horne: Poet, Architect, Typographer, Art Historian* (Greensboro: ELT Press, 1990), 117–143.

⁹³ Ffoulkes and Maiocchi, *Vincenzo Foppa*, xi.

⁹⁴ Ffoulkes and Maiocchi, *Vincenzo Foppa*, xiii.

⁹⁵ See Costanza Caraffa and Almut Goldhahn, *Gustav Ludwig. The photographic bequest*, online exhibition <http://photothek.khi.fi.it/documents/oau/00000045> (accessed November 2016).

⁹⁶ In this direction, Ffoulkes may have been supported by Frizzoni who, in the biography of the senator, emphasized the influence of the historian Giovanni Capponi in Morelli's apprenticeship in Renaissance studies. See Giovanni Frizzoni, 'Giovanni Morelli. Ein Lebensbild', in *Kunstkritische Studien*, Vol. 3 (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1893), 354–5.

⁹⁷ Roger Fry, 'The Painters of North Italy', *The Burlington magazine for Connoisseurs* 12, no. 60 (March 1908), 348.

⁹⁸ Irit Rogoff, 'Studying Visual Culture', in *The Visual Culture Reader*, ed. Nicholas Mirzoeff, (London and New York: Routledge, 2003), 14–26.