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Stockholm 2015
Foreign residents and temporary visitors have always perceived Rome differently. Such discrepancies became especially stark after 1814 when the French occupation ended and the Papal government was restored. Travellers and artists flocked to Rome after the ending of the wars. The newcomers sometimes criticized the behaviour of the residents, or entertained wishful interpretations of their actions as though they had resisted the French regime. The predominantly national histories of the foreign artistic communities often treat Rome as a place untouched by politics, a vision of the city as a haven for travellers in search of art and solace. This is an exaggeratedly Romantic view. That both international and local politics were important—and that they were becoming ever more so—is clear from the cases presented below.

*Fall of Napoleon*

News of the capture of Paris in 1814 quickly reached Rome. The Swedish sculptor Johan Niklas Byström (1783–1848), who had lived in Rome since 1810, wrote how Napoleon’s fall was celebrated in the city:

To celebrate the capture of Paris the foreign community decided to hold a dinner, which took place the 21 April in the Casino in Villa Borghese—the most brilliant party I have ever attended and certainly the only one of its kind. We were 135 in number; the majority were artists, 6 to 8 English officers, the Portuguese and Austrian chargé d’affaires and several chevaliers from various nations. Toasts were proposed as canons
were fired, of course first for the Pope, then for England, Russia, Prussia, Austria, Sweden and its Crown Prince etc. ¹

Pope Pius VII returned to Rome on 24 May 1814. The Papal States were largely reinstated during the Vienna Congress and this meant that the Pope and the clergy were once again the leaders of Rome. The public image of Restoration Rome is two-sided: there was the oppressive clergy that re-established the hierarchy and religious oppression of former days, yet this was balanced by the moderation of the Cardinal and Secretary of State, Ercole Consalvi, and other less zealous clerics. ¹ But the immediate consequences for the learned community in Rome were drastic.

Another of the very few Swedish residents in Rome, the orientalist and classicist Johan David Åkerblad (1763–1819), was not so sure of the benefits of the return to Papal rule after the last five years of French occupation. He had lived in Rome during the French Repubblica Romana 1798–1799, and returned to Italy in 1805, remaining there until his death in Rome in 1819.³

In August 1814 Åkerblad sceptically depicted the state of learning in Rome, not only in his own disciplines:

I am sure that [the scholarly] results will find fortune in this capital [Naples], and I hope that literary efforts will have better success there than in Rome where scholar and poor man are synonyms. [...] Our best mineralogist is leaving for Naples, and the best chemist might do the same &c. &c.⁴

No one was sure what to expect from the new Papal government, but a few eminent scholars had already decided to leave Rome. They accepted positions in other Italian states, fearing worsening conditions and new restrictions on research and teaching in Rome. Åkerblad’s premonitions were not positive, and he continued sardonically:

But praised be the heavens, our theologians remain and in this moment they preach beautiful sermons in all the piazzas. It is truly a pleasure to find oneself in Rome at such an edifying moment. It does displease me somewhat to see the arena of the Colosseum covered again after those damned French had it almost entirely dug up [...] making the via crucis more accessible.¹

To facilitate the traditional Via Crucis procession the centre of the arena was filled in again, a telling metaphor for Åkerblad’s fear that the Church would stymie research into the Roman past: would the Church try to re-establish a predominately Christian antiquity (Fig. 1)?

Publication virtually ceased. Åkerblad underlined the lack of serious literary activities in Rome: “I do not think there is any literary news from this country. We are making great cardinals and great sonnets to immortalize them, but as far as I know nothing else is done.”⁶

Åkerblad was sensitive to the changes in cultural policy and immediately noted what the return of ecclesiastical power would entail. Bryström was not dependent on Roman work as he lived on foreign commissions. However, the following year Bryström wrote with less enthusiasm about the return of the clergy. The opulence of the new rule shone in everybody’s eyes:

Here the priests are back in all their humility with princely luxury and shiny gold and silver, prohibiting all pleasures and public entertainments and tormenting the people with their boring monotonous church ceremonies, which they call religion. 2/3 of Rome wish the French were back, and that says a lot.⁷
The Papal government’s initial policies were zealously proscriptive. The zelanti prohibited spoken theatre and the French writer Stendhal quipped that the best actor in Rome was a wooden marionette.\(^8\)

The fall of Napoleon meant that theoretically at least there was freedom of movement after almost 25 years of war in Europe. Åkerblad was, according to an acquaintance, considering leaving Italy: “M. Åkerblad talks about going to Paris, he is terribly short of funds and he does not receive any news from Sweden.”\(^9\) Another friend summed up Åkerblad’s woes in a single phrase: “Akerbland [sic] is selling all his books to survive”.\(^10\)

**Resistance to French rule**

The French occupation of Italy was a long-neglected period in modern Italian historiography. Recent decades have, however, seen a number of publications dealing with French and, as it is often called, Napoleonic policy in the expanding empire.\(^11\)

Michael Broers’s study *The Napoleonic Empire in Italy, 1796–1814: cultural imperialism in a European context?* uses Edward Said’s concept of “orientalism” in the context of French attitudes and actions in occupied Italy.\(^12\) “Orientalism” is usually connected to later western colonialism and domination in the East. Broers stretches the concept and maintains that French officials in Italy were equipped with “colonial mindsets” and uses a terminology that has been adapted by western powers in more recent occupations:

Nardon [a French official in Parma] came as close to using the term “hearts and minds” as the discourse of the day permitted. Nardon’s vision, and the terms in which he expressed it, is that this is of a western European talking about other western Europeans and although that vision was rich in revolutionary history, it also contained intimations of a later imperialism. Orientalism was at work in a wholly occidental setting.\(^13\)

Broers’s book is in many respects an excellent survey of the French occupation. However, it raises the question of how and with what results recent historiography has been influenced by the theories of domination and subjugation in the wake of Said’s *Orientalism* and the postcolonial field of studies. Broers’s exposé of how the French occupiers dealt with the Italians, which is the main theme of the book, does not easily fit into a pattern of successful domination based on an “orientalist” mindset—at least not in comparison with, for instance, later French extra-European colonial experiences. The time frame, in the case of Rome only five years during the turbulent late Napoleonic wars, 1809–1814, was not long enough for the French to develop adequate policies or strategies. The question is to what degree can the introduction of a model, designed for other times and circumstances, help us to understand the modus operandi of the French in Italy? Does adopting a variant of “orientalism” add anything to our understanding? The explanatory power appears insufficient in relation to the nuances lost by comparing Italy to a colonized society outside Europe. If we agree with Broers’s use of “orientalism” we must also then agree that it has lost its specificity in relation to oriental cultures. The French occupation of Italy must rather be seen in the framework of the long and often conflictual relationship between France and various Italian states; this was not the first time France had invaded the peninsula.
To what extent the population actually resisted the French during the occupations in Italy is sometimes debated, as is the case for the French invasions and occupations in general. Recent authors such as Broers maintain that the resistance has been downplayed in earlier historiography. While this might be the case, the discussion is sometimes tinged by a preference for interpreting any behaviour that may be constructed as a challenge to the French administration and satellite regimes, as resistance. Opposing an occupier is generally regarded as a worthy cause.\textsuperscript{14}

There are many examples of Romans co-operating with the occupying forces. In Rome not everyone was unhappy with the diminished powers of the clergy, and many happily celebrated the French emperor and his endeavours. To what extent this was pure political opportunism or actually heartfelt must obviously be valued from case to case. While scepticism certainly was widespread, many took part in the celebrations.

One episode that illustrates various Roman attitudes towards the new overlords is the celebration of the birth of Napoleon Bonaparte’s first legitimate son, the Re di Roma. As Rome was assigned great importance in the empire, the child was given the title King of Rome.

Many priests had already declined to swear the oath to Napoleon and France and their refusal to celebrate the little king is understandable. Recognizing the Re di Roma implied the negation of Papal power and the projection of French domination into the next generation. In the summer of 1812 a friend of Åkerblad’s, Cardinal Gian Domenico Testa (1747–1832), was imprisoned in the Castel Sant’Angelo. He had publicly protested against the French and refused the oath. He was exiled to Corsica in 1813. Testa had visited Åkerblad just before he was jailed; the latter did his best to convince the cardinal to yield to French demands:
My poor friend Cardinal Testa is since Thursday night at the Castel Sant’Angelo. The night before he came to me, and, even if you do not like it I tried as far as possible to make him conform to what his well-being, and that of his family, and thousands of other considerations require, but it was all in vain. I have not yet received permission to visit him, but I hope to obtain an entry pass to the castle.15

Åkerblad made excuses for attempting to get Testa to give in to French demands as the addressee, Louise von Stolberg (Countess of Albany), abhorred Napoleon and French rule.16

Soon the French military disasters in Russia became known in Rome and the Re di Roma came to be regarded as yet another sign of Napoleonic megalomania. In 1813 a satirical dialogue between Pasquino and his fellow talking statue Marforio appeared:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARFORIO</th>
<th>Tell me Pasquino, tell me the truth</th>
<th>Tell me Pasquino, ma dimmi il vero</th>
<th>Tell me Pasquino, ma dimmi il vero</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What happened to the French army</td>
<td>Dell’armata francese che ne fu?</td>
<td>Dell’armata francese che ne fu?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASQUINO</td>
<td>It was nullified.</td>
<td>Divenne uno zero.</td>
<td>Divenne uno zero.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARFORIO</td>
<td>What will we do with the little king?</td>
<td>Del picciol re che ne faremo?</td>
<td>Del picciol re che ne faremo?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASQUINO</td>
<td>We’ll send him to the dogs.</td>
<td>Alli bastardi lo manderemo.</td>
<td>Alli bastardi lo manderemo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARFORIOE</td>
<td>And what will happen to his mother?</td>
<td>della madre sua che ne sarà?</td>
<td>della madre sua che ne sarà?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASQUINO</td>
<td>Full of horns she will return to her dad.</td>
<td>Piena di corna al padre tornerà.</td>
<td>Piena di corna al padre tornerà.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARFORIOE</td>
<td>And of Napoleon, the strong, the eternal?</td>
<td>di Napoleone, il forte, l’eterno?</td>
<td>di Napoleone, il forte, l’eterno?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASQUINO</td>
<td>If the devil wants him, he will go to hell.</td>
<td>Se il diavolo lo vorrà, andrà all’Inferno.</td>
<td>Se il diavolo lo vorrà, andrà all’Inferno.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Thorvaldsen’s Alexander frieze

French cultural policies in Rome were often conceived on a grand scale and the city was given an important place in French artistic education. Large archaeological excavations were undertaken—the Colosseum is only one example—and the Roman academies were supported by the French regime. Another example of the works commissioned by the French was the extensive renovation of the Palazzo del Quirinale that began in 1811. The palace was to become Napoleon and the Re di Roma’s Roman residence. The iconographic programme for the redecoration was elaborate.

A number of artists were contracted, both Italians and foreigners, among them the Danish sculptor Bertel Thorvaldsen (1770–1844). Thorvaldsen had arrived for the first time in Rome in 1797. His contribution to the decoration of the palace was a frieze, showing the entry of Alexander the Great into Babylon, a reference to the military glories of Napoleon and his future triumphant entry into Rome. Napoleon’s identification with previous great military commanders is well known (Fig. 2).

The frieze, over 35 metres long, stresses that Alexander entered Babylon without violence, like Napoleon’s planned entry into the second city of the French Empire. The frieze depicts Alexander and his Macedonian soldiers but also the defeated Babylonians. Thorvaldsen had not dealt with oriental motifs before and Åkerblad served as his archaeological advisor and supplied information on how to depict the “Orientals”, their physiognomy, dress and attributes. Åkerblad wrote how he was present during the making of the frieze at the palace in the spring of 1812: “Between the digs that become more interesting every day and the artists that are working with the decoration of the Quirinal Palace, I spend quite a few hours here every day.”
The frieze met with great acclaim and earned Thorvaldsen the epithet of “the patriarch of bas-reliefs” (Fig. 3). There are innumerable laudatory comments by residents and travellers. Caroline von Humboldt for one was enthusiastic. Napoleon was informed about the results, obviously in the most positive terms. It is said that he ordered a marble version of the frieze to adorn the Temple de la Gloire de la Grande Armée in Paris. This was never completed and the Temple is now known as the Madeleine church.

Restoration visitors

The first years of Restoration Rome were difficult for both Italian and foreign scholars and artists. Many of them lost whatever means of survival they had been able to eke out during the French occupation. But foreigners began to arrive and they helped to compensate for the loss of French patronage. Åkerblad compared them to birds of passage: “Our many Englishmen, like a multitude of migrating birds, are now leaving one after another.” Among the many writers and artists who visited Italy after the wars were a number of Scandinavians. One of these was the Swedish writer and poet Per Daniel Atterbom (1790–1855), who arrived in the city in 1818. Atterbom mentioned the Swedes he met in Rome:

Byström talks about Sweden and Carl XIV with warmth, and does thus not resemble Åkerblad, who according to rumour cultivates his disinclination for his fatherland so far that he says he is Danish. This Åkerblad lives only a few steps away from me, but I surely never visit him. He who despises Sweden should be despised by Sweden and by every Swede, especially if he is of Swedish origin. Åkerblad’s way of thinking is even more despicable if it is true, as is said, that it is only caused by an injured ego.
The asterisk refers to a note at the bottom of the letter which has been partly destroyed at the edge: “*[This is] said in Germany, but Byström knows nothing about this, though he has told me [?] other anecdotes about [Åkerblad].” Atterbom admitted that Byström did not actually know that Åkerblad denied his Swedish nationality. When Atterbom two years later published his heavily-edited travel letters from Italy his judgement was even harsher: “[Åkerblad] gives himself out as being Danish, and takes every opportunity among foreigners to depict the Swedes as barbarians and idiots.” All uncertainty was erased and the rumours were now stated as facts.

Atterbom was a great admirer of Thorvaldsen and visited both his studio and the Quirinale. There was talk in Rome about whether the frieze was actually a subterfuge critique of Napoleon and the French conquests. This has been rejected by most later art historians. Thorvaldsen talked little about politics and the testimonies we have of his opinions are mostly second-hand. Atterbom wanted the frieze to be critical of Napoleon and read it as a political statement against him:

In truth, as Napoleon never undertook his planned travel to Rome to see the frieze that was ordered to adorn the Quirinal Palace for his entrance […] Though I do leave aside, whether he should have felt himself flattered had he noticed the freedom-loving Babylonians rowing as fast as they could across the Tigris, and if he would have understood this cunning nod to the voluntary nature of the Babylonians’ joy. (Fig. 4)

The foreigners who came to Rome after the city was liberated and returned to Papal control did not always easily accept that Thorvaldsen and most other artists in Rome had worked for the French regime. Most foreign residents could hardly have afforded to decline commissions or work offered by the French administrators during the occupation. This does not mean that everyone embraced
the politics of the power holders of the day. Åkerblad certainly was critical of the French regime in some cases. During the previous French occupation of the city in 1798–1799 he had with dismay observed how art, antiquities and manuscripts were transported to Paris. But he could not share Atterbom’s idealistic view. He knew what moral choices the decades of revolution and war had confronted everyone with, especially those that had needed to make a living under the occupying forces.

The rumours about Åkerblad that Atterbom first treated as gossip and later stated as fact took on a life of their own. A traveller from Norway who met Atterbom repeated the accusation, adding the completely spurious fact that Åkerblad had been offered a professorship in Sweden: “Ackerblad [sic], who calls himself a Dane and has refused a professorship in Uppsala because he finds it too cold there.”39 Similarly, a Dane wrote to Åkerblad’s old friend Friedrich Münter in Copenhagen: “Akerblad does not want to go back to Sweden: “it is too cold up there”. He is so Italianized and partly Danefied (– he is counted as a Dane) that he does not appeal much to his compatriots in Rome, the poet Atterbom, the good sculptor Byström and others.”40 However, despite Åkerblad’s unhappiness with Swedish politics and feeling that he indeed had been treated with negligence by the authorities in Stockholm, he still maintained contacts with Swedes and Sweden, whatever his detractors gossiped.

Reading Atterbom and the diaries of other Nordic visitors makes it clear that they moved almost exclusively in foreign circles in Rome. Their interactions with Italians, except when it came to everyday matters, were few. This contrasts with Åkerblad and other permanent foreign residents’ long integration into Roman social life. Notwithstanding what he might have thought about Sweden and the Swedes, it is understandable that he had no great interest in socializing with every Swede that showed...
up in Rome. Atterbom himself was not too keen on meeting other Swedish travellers in Rome and wrote about them in the same letter where he criticized Åkerblad: “Like the Swedish Nobility and Military in general, they can only be the judges of uniforms, balls, horses, w[hore]s and dogs. When one adds a great deal of cooking and serving knowledge the entire extent of our noble youths’ worldview is given account for.” But Atterbom did of course not publish such a stark judgement on the Swedish upper classes.

Åkerblad was unusually integrated in Roman social and scholarly life. There were also generational differences between the two Swedes. Åkerblad was initially a fervent supporter of the French Revolution and wished for political change in Sweden. He also knew well what it meant to live through occupation and war. He served in the Russo-Swedish War of 1788–1790 and had seen war close-up both in the Ottoman Empire and during his decades in France and Italy. The politically naive Atterbom did not have any personal experiences of war and the choices locals and foreign residents were forced to make to accommodate the occupiers. He also accepted the Swedish political situation as a given and did not seem to have any problems with pledging his allegiance to the soon-to-be crowned Swedish King and the present ruling classes.

There was of course no lack of opportunists in Italy. Åkerblad mocked those who changed their opinions and flattered the new overlords immediately after the fall of Napoleon. In 1816 he heatedly commented on the opportunism of an Italian scholar who had already during the previous decades changed his allegiances according to who ruled the peninsula: “Please notice how well he has chosen the moment [...] to insult the French. Oh, what an infamous sort is that of the arse-lickers!”

Nostalgia or politics?

The foreign communities in Rome are generally well investigated in the art histories of the originating countries. That many artists and travellers who stayed for briefer or longer periods in Rome had little contact with the surrounding Roman society is sometimes acknowledged. This often meant that these foreigners were unaware or uninterested in local political issues, other than those that could be confirmed in the various lieux communs on the Italian character, not wholly different from today. Nevertheless, recent investigations have proven that Rome was not the backwater that it is sometimes portrayed as in the many national histories of art.

An often-used image—and metaphor—for the foreign community in Rome is that of the Cimitero acattolico, the mainly Protestant graveyard outside the San Paolo city gates. It has long been a site of pilgrimage for Nordic visitors to Rome. It might in many ways be regarded as one of the main sights of a Romantic view of early 19th-century Rome with its association to both British Romantics and the German and Scandinavian literary and artistic communities. Burials were only allowed at night and the resulting images are suggestive night scenes (Figs. 5, 6).

Åkerblad’s burial in 1819 was certainly not a “Romantic moment”; it was surrounded by polemics. The Swedish Consul in Rome, Ulisse Pentini, explained to his superior in the foreign service that he
was not involved in the funeral arrangements because: “As I had seen in the parish registry that Mr Åkerblad had signed himself as Baron d’Åkerblad of the Irish nation I thought it best not to interfere any more with his funeral [...] because this gentleman appears to have himself renounced his nation.” But Pentini did get involved as his superior subsequently remarked: “The Swedes avoided rendering their last homage to their compatriot because they learned from M. Pentini that the deceased had publicly disowned his fatherland.”

Whether the Swedes showed up or not, Åkerblad’s Roman friends certainly attended the funeral. They would not have abandoned Åkerblad on the basis of spurious accusations of him “disowning the fatherland”. The inscription on Åkerblad’s tombstone—it is unknown who paid for the stone or wrote the epitaph—reads: “In memory of Joann. David Ackerblad, Swede [...] this [stone] was raised in 1824 so that a man known for his learning abroad will not lack a memorial because of the neglect of his own.” Åkerblad’s friends accused the Swedes of not caring about their dead.

In the cases of Åkerblad and Atterbom it is obvious how ideas of nationality and identity influenced Romantic ideas about their importance. As regards Sweden, in particular, it had become clear that the period of Swedish greatness was finally over after the loss of Finland and its last German provinces. To attack the fatherland was not appreciated. Similarly, at a higher level of European politics Atterbom wanted to believe that Thorvaldsen had introduced into his own artwork subterfuge counter-messages to Napoleonic propaganda, something that today appears improbable.

Questions pertaining to nationality and politics are of course more complicated than the single denominator of “national origin”. When trying to understand both what happened in Rome during these years, as well as getting a hold on how the early 19th century has been treated in Roman historiography, it is important to include more keys of interpretation. As shown above, national and international politics played a role, both within the single national communities and in a larger perspective.

Some of the authors of works on the foreign communities in Rome seem to have taken what was depicted in the artworks from the period, both in images and literature, at face value. It might be time to leave the osteria and the idyllic view of foreign and, not unimportantly, male artists drinking and socializing, served by mainly anonymous locals. The turbulence of the decades following the French Revolution affected Italy and Rome, as it did many other European localities. Early 19th-century Rome may have been slightly less golden than many artworks—consciously or not—have tried to convey. Or is it only we that want to see them in this light—have we become the leccaculi of a Romantic past?
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