

## Born on a train: the impact of Medardo Rosso's internationalism on his legacy

In 1977 and 2014, the Italian Ministry of Culture (Soprintendenza Archeologia, Belle Arti e Paesaggio) declared numerous sculptures by Medardo Rosso (1858–1928) to be of national cultural interest and therefore not exportable.<sup>1</sup> This decree is based on the premise of Rosso's ties to Italy, his country of birth and death, as well as on the Ministry's belief in his relevance for Italian art, culture and history. However, Rosso's national identity has never been secure. Today's claims for his 'belonging' to Italy are complicated by his international career choices, including his emigration to Paris and naturalization as a French citizen, his declared identity as an internationalist, and his art, which defies (national) categorization.<sup>2</sup> Italy's legal and political *notifica* (literally meaning 'notification' or national 'designation'), as it is termed, of Rosso's works represents a revisionist effort to settle and claim his loyalties. Such attempts rewrite the narrative of art history, and by framing Rosso according to exclusively Italian criteria, limit the kinds of questions asked about his work. They also shed light on Italy's complex mediations between laying claim to an emerging modernism and to a national art.

This essay assesses the long-term effects of Rosso's transnational travel upon his national reputation and legacy. I contend that Rosso, by his own design, presented himself as an outsider who did not belong to national schools and nationally defined movements of his time. This was a major factor that contributed to his modernity. Today, his life, career and art continue to challenge ideas about sculpture's entrenchment in projections of national identity. As I will show, Rosso's case highlights specific difficulties faced by sculptors as opposed to painters with respect to discourses of national and international identity. His example calls for a more nuanced reading of the definition of 'cultural patrimony' and perceptions of an artist's national cultural 'belonging' as single, unified or homogeneous.

Such a contested allegiance is not necessarily the case with émigré sculptors from other countries. Many who sought international recognition by emigrating abroad, such as Constantin Brancusi, Alberto Giacometti and Jacques Lipschitz, have not been reappropriated by their respective countries of origin, which seem happy to share these artists with other countries. The enduring internationalism of these artists is part of their modernity and their lasting appeal. Rosso's case is exceptional because of Italy's particular way of conceiving and constructing the concept of national patrimony. Its desire to maintain the notion of culture as something inherited, and its use of culture to lay claim to a sense of ownership, contrasts with the idea of

shared cultural heritage seen in the cases of the abovementioned sculptors. The Italian terms *patrimonio* and *patria* both refer to the patriarchal idea of fatherland. The etymological root of the word 'patrimony' is originally related to the property of the Church or the spiritual legacy of Christ, from the Latin *patrimonium*, a paternal estate, inheritance from a father, or male ancestor. In a marriage, 'patrimony' is defined as that which is inherited. Patrimony gifts a sense of belonging and strives not to be dispersed. One might compare this with the etymology of 'matrimony', which is an action, state or condition related to *mater* or the mother. Matrimony suggests something brought into the marriage, such as the gift of dowry and the gift of life.

Recent research into the internationalization of the arts in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries has focused on painting, leaving a gap where sculpture is concerned. On the whole, when it came to internationalization, sculpture remained more conservative than painting. In the age of 'monumentomania', sculptors still established their reputations through public commissions in their home countries, typically producing traditional monuments that reflected collective national and political ideas. Furthermore, monuments were site-specific and not mobile, thus hampering sculptors' ability to move easily from one country to another.

While many sculptors studied abroad for limited periods (such as the French artists who won the Prix de Rome), worked abroad (as in the case of the French sculptors Jules Dalou in London and Auguste Rodin and Albert-Ernest Carrier-Belleuse in Belgium, or the Belgian sculptors Constantin Meunier and George Minne in Paris), or took part in large construction projects and prestigious foreign commissions (such as Frédéric Auguste Bartholdi, who made the Statue of Liberty for New York), they still, by and large, relied on an association with their countries of origin to promote their reputations at home and abroad. Even the most international of avant-garde sculptors, Rodin, remained committed to institutional recognition in France during his lifetime, despite clashes with French commissioners over his daring proposals. Rodin's international success and popularity around the world after 1900, in fact, depended on his earlier canonization in France. The results in Rodin's case were twofold: transnational canonization and personal gain through increased transnational sales.

The demise of the French Salon opened up new markets for all artists, increasing significantly around 1900. The democratization of art and the rise of internationally minded dealers catering to demand from bourgeois consumers in Europe and the United States led artists to become more entrepreneurial and cosmopolitan. For sculptors, the growing popularity, lower costs and technical improvements of industrially produced serial sculpture afforded an alternative way to make and distribute casts with greater speed and efficiency.<sup>3</sup> The smaller scale of serial casts rendered sculptures portable and mobile, facilitating circulation, transport, exhibition and sales in different cities and to more clients. Seriality also enabled sculptors to disseminate mechanical reductions of their more famous

1. Medardo Rosso (1858–1928),  
*Bambino ebreo* (Jewish Boy,  
1892–94), photograph by the  
artist (date unknown)  
(photo: private collection)



large-scale monuments. The greater ease of producing two-dimensional mechanical reproductions of sculptures in prints, such as those made and sold by the French dealer Adolphe Goupil, provided another modern way for sculptors to extend their reputations abroad.

Rosso was one of the first sculptors to construct his career outside his home country and to make a reputation without having created a monument. He took full advantage of the growing international status of sculpture, relying on serial sculpture's popularity and especially its mobility. He also employed serial sculpture for artistic experimentation.<sup>4</sup> In all these ways, he engaged with issues that modern sculpture would continue to explore in the following two centuries. After the first decade of the twentieth century, sculptors from Brancusi to Giacometti became famous while living in Paris and would no longer have to create reputations through

traditional site-specific monuments. Nor did they need to seek the full support of institutions in their home countries in order to become successful internationally.

Today, the Italian Soprintendenza has no special provisions for artists such as Rosso whose careers were marked and defined by their transnational mobility and developed in more than one country.<sup>5</sup> It is true that Rosso was born and raised in Italy, where he began his career as a sculptor in the 1880s, but it is also true that he felt unappreciated and misunderstood in his country of origin. Early on, while still a young artist in Milan, he developed a decidedly internationalist outlook. He exhibited in Vienna, Paris and London and befriended internationally minded literary figures such as the writer Luigi Gualdo, who divided his time between Milan and Paris, and Felice Cameroni, who was the first Italian translator of Emile Zola.<sup>6</sup> He also looked abroad for inspiration. His first sculptures reflected a direct interest in French Realism and Impressionism, specifically the works of Honoré Daumier, Gustave Courbet and Edouard Manet.<sup>7</sup> This raises the question of foreign influence: artists have always taken ideas from beyond their national borders, but with the increased international circulation of illustrated newspapers, journals, exhibition catalogues and photographs, this became easier than ever.<sup>8</sup> An artist did not have to travel abroad to become inspired by the art of another country. For all these reasons, Italian critics had difficulty categorizing Rosso's works within national parameters.

The Soprintendenza does not question how artists perceive their individual national belonging and how their particular histories impact their national identity. Rosso's categorization as Italian, both in his time and today, was complicated by the fact that in 1889, at the age of 31, he decided to move to Paris. His decision to leave Italy belongs to the broader phenomenon of displacement and emigration that defined the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Between 1876 and 1914, fourteen million men of working age emigrated from Italy; the primary destination was France.<sup>9</sup> While most Italians left home in search of improved economic conditions, other immigrants were politically motivated, and this was the case to some extent with Rosso. He was disillusioned by the official promises of progressive reform made by the Italian government, promises that remained unfulfilled three decades after the Risorgimento. His move was a form of self-exile, a dramatic sign of protest against his own country.<sup>10</sup> In addition to ideological elements, Rosso's motives were economic and artistic. Like many young artists from other countries, he viewed Paris as the principal metropolis of modern art. It offered numerous opportunities, such as a vibrant art scene, a burgeoning market for sculpture, and a network of sophisticated artists, collectors and critics.<sup>11</sup> Bolstered by his friend Cameroni's encouragement and financing, Rosso viewed Paris's effervescent cultural scene as a place where his radically conceived sculptures, which were not appreciated by critics at home, would find recognition.

And yet emigration does not necessarily mean absorption into another country. Rosso's case shows the difficulties for the foreigner in integrating

into the lively Parisian scene. It also reflects the foreigner's unstable position in Boulanger's France during the Dreyfus years.<sup>12</sup> Additionally, it illustrates the problems faced by an unknown artist struggling to make modern sculpture in an epoch and a city dominated by French sculpture, notably the work of Rodin.

One of the main problems that Rosso faced was his attempt to forge a new, cosmopolitan identity without recourse to national definitions. His brand of cosmopolitanism led him, instead, to tread a fine line between nationalism and internationalism. Many foreign artists who came to Paris hoping for artistic acceptance, fame and market success adopted French-sounding names on arrival, adjusted their art to fit French themes and styles, and sought protection under the umbrellas of French dealers and institutions. In other words, they abandoned their national roots and joined the French scene. The Italian painters Giovanni Boldini, Giuseppe De Nittis and Federico Zandomenighi are examples of this trend.<sup>13</sup> Others took the opposite approach. They used stereotypes of their native countries, and in doing so remained exotic and ultimately unthreatening outsiders.<sup>14</sup> Rosso avoided both extremes. Although he did not fully embrace Paris, neither did he want his work to signal exclusively Italian origins. He constructed his own 'cosmopolitan-as-outsider' identity. At the same time, while drawing on Parisian resources, he resisted assimilation and attempted to give his art a universal flavour.

Rosso fits the description of those figures whom the philosopher Samuel Scheffler terms 'cultural cosmopolitans': individuals who 'are not to be thought of as constituted or defined by ascriptive ties to a particular culture, community, or tradition'.<sup>15</sup> For the film theorist Peter Wollen, 'cosmopolitanism asserts neither the need for nationality, nor an identity based upon the lived vicissitudes of expatriation, but for what we might call the voluntary assumption of "dispatiation"'.<sup>16</sup> Such people forged heterogeneous identities drawn from disparate sources and flourished as a result. Scheffler credits cosmopolitans as the catalysts for cultural flexibility and transformation, for they view history and memory as shared rather than bounded, malleable and changing across time and space. They therefore 'demonstrate the very capacities that make it possible for human beings to create culture in the first place ... enrich[ing] humanity as a whole by renewing the stock of cultural resources on which others may draw'.<sup>17</sup> Wollen cites cosmopolitanism as a critical factor in cultural regeneration, yet he also notes that nationalism made this position problematic: in the twentieth century, Paris was

decisively influenced by expatriate artists, even though this influence was later underplayed, denounced, denied or funneled into a national art discourse ... The effect of substantial expatriate presence ... was to encourage a cosmopolitan turn in art, inseparable from the breakthrough and paradigm shift which occurred ... and which later, due to nationalist pressures, was shut down and 'repatriated' as typically French.<sup>18</sup>



On an ideological level, Rosso rejected the idea of nations, nation-states and hierarchies of any sort. His writings and statements indicate that he cultivated a form of cultural anarchism that included a broad sense of universal solidarity. This outlook was characteristic of cosmopolitan and anarchist ideology.<sup>19</sup> The exiled poet and playwright Pietro Gori captured this sentiment in his play *Senza Patria* (c. 1899): 'We are foreigners of every country! We are outcasts! We are bastards!'<sup>20</sup> The new ideal became the world viewed as a single family: 'The whole world is our country/ liberty is our law.'<sup>21</sup> For many Italians, estrangement from the nation-state was seen as 'painful and alienating but ultimately emancipatory, [a realization] that to have no country of one's own means that one is instead a citizen of the world'.<sup>22</sup> After moving to Paris, Rosso would often proclaim that he was a world citizen and a maker of art without borders or limits.<sup>23</sup> His friend the Symbolist poet Jehan Rictus would report Rosso's definition of himself as a 'European anarchist'.<sup>24</sup>

Rosso's ambition led him to avoid the path taken by some Italian sculptors who moved to Paris for success but ended up working unrecognized in the ateliers of major French sculptors.<sup>25</sup> Instead, his autonomous trajectory resembles more closely that of émigré painters. Like other foreigners, he exploited connections from home, but he maintained a measure of separateness, remaining somewhat aloof from institutional settings and avoiding gathering places, clubs, expatriate communities, artistic circles and educational institutions.<sup>26</sup> Rosso's letters to Cameroni during his early years in Paris make no mention of culture shock, the language barrier, or curiosity about local habits. Nor do they convey nostalgia for Italy. Seldom do they indicate discouragement. They also express no enthusiasm on Rosso's part for the city of Paris, an attitude that was not shared by other Italian expatriate artists. The art historian Marion Lagrange writes that for Italian painters: 'Paris, its urbanism, nightlife, cafes, theaters, the Seine ... and Parisian women [were] the first subjects of curiosity'.<sup>27</sup> Anselmo Bucci wanted to 'breathe "the air of Paris"', while for Federico Zandomenighi, the compulsion was to 'look, look, look'. Vincenzo Cabianca wrote, 'Ah! If you could see Paris! It is a fabulous thing', and Giovanni Fattori noted the 'grandiose immense streets and squares', while Edmond de Goncourt mentioned Giuseppe De Nittis's enthusiasm for 'the modernity of the spectacle'.<sup>28</sup> In marked contrast, in his letters to Cameroni, Rosso ignored Parisian landmarks, museums, the new Eiffel Tower and Jules Dalou's plaster model of *The Triumph of the Republic* shown in September 1889 in the Place de la Nation.

As an outsider, Rosso had no access to public commissions: a national monument in France made by a foreigner was unimaginable. Thus he was forced to find other ways in which to attract attention and find patrons, including seeking the support of the noteworthy French dealer Goupil. Goupil's firm promoted artists who were seeking to expand their audiences, but this required a measure of commercial compromise. He encouraged artists who made huge historical paintings to begin making small paintings from which he might produce printed reproductions and photographs. These

were then distributed for consumption around the world.<sup>29</sup> Yet although Rosso wrote to Camerini of 'three bronzes of which one goes to Coupil [*sic*]',<sup>30</sup> no deal seems to have been struck. While Rosso eventually exhibited a few sculptures at the Boussod & Valadon Gallery (formerly under the ownership of Goupil) in London in 1896, the dealer evidently did not see a potential market for prints of his radical sculptures. Perhaps he, like others whom Rosso approached, sensed and disliked the sculptor's desire for artistic autonomy.

Rosso was equally unsuccessful in approaching other French art dealers such as Georges Petit. He must have known Petit's name from Milan, for, in characteristically optimistic form, he contacted the dealer shortly after his arrival in Paris. But Petit did not seem interested in showing Rosso's works in his gallery in the heart of the city. Rosso wrote to Camerini: 'This spring at Petit's I will gather all these works and with these other ones I will make an exhibition.'<sup>31</sup> But no such exhibition materialized.<sup>32</sup>

Rosso eventually developed a market for his eccentric sculptures that relied on the new success of serial sculpture (reproduced in multiples by mechanical means).<sup>33</sup> He had only very limited market success in Italy, but he was able to sell casts of his sculptures in plaster, wax and bronze to several sophisticated collectors in France, as well as to numerous collectors in Austria, Germany, Holland, Britain and Belgium.<sup>34</sup> Still, the peculiarity of his works left him more economically vulnerable than some of his compatriots. It did, however, allow him to escape criticism for the excessive artistic and commercial accommodation practised by painters such as De Nittis, winner of the 1878 Légion d'honneur, who had been derided by Italian critics for 'making himself Parisian' and 'abandon[ing] himself to the genre sought by the public'.<sup>35</sup>

Rosso found himself caught between French expectations of a performance of Italian national identity (and exhibition of clear signs of a national school) in his art and the beginnings of a pan-European view of modernism. The thirty years he spent in Paris, which represent nearly half of his life, were his most fertile period artistically. He created the greatest number of his most revolutionary works there, deepened his experiments with photography and drawing, came into close contact with the leading artists of his time and the Parisian intelligentsia, and was written about by some of the most important French critics of the period.

A further factor complicating Rosso's belonging to Italy was the fact that he renounced his Italian citizenship on 25 July 1902 and became a French citizen in the same year.<sup>36</sup> Yet he did not consider himself French. His Italian friend Mario Vianello Chiodo recounted how Rosso recaptured and reconfigured his Italian origins into a new myth of international mobility: 'Rosso did not like to say in what city he was born, he did not like such specifications, because of his concept of being an enemy of classifications; if somebody persisted, he would respond that he was born *on a train*, given that his father worked for the railways.'<sup>37</sup> In 1909 the Belgian critic Louis Piérard characterized Rosso as an artist who was completely free from the constraints of national identity:

Rosso is Italian by birth. This has no importance to him: he is ready to learn without a frown that he is not Piedmontese but rather Chinese or Papuan. His internationalism is simple, clean, radical, and impetuous. One must hear him speak about borders and the prejudices that idiots have against a man because he uses a different language with respect to theirs.<sup>38</sup>

Rosso frequently gifted to patrons a small head of a child, known as *Bambino ebreo* (Jewish boy, 1892–94), as if it were a calling card. This gesture may suggest that he identified with the stereotype of the Wandering Jew, as embodied in rootlessness and a perennial feeling of being the outsider. A photograph made by the artist of the *Bambino ebreo* perched on a suitcase (fig. 1) and a drawing of a man packing his bags might further allude to Rosso's sense of himself as a nomadic world traveller. In a letter from Vienna to his friend Jehan Rictus back in Paris, he expressed, in his own idiosyncratic French, his painful awareness of his status as an outsider and his Italian roots:

[I am here] to take advantage ... of whomever has been able to be interested in me and come to know [my works] ... I come here with two works that I brought with me – my calling cards. Like the ancient Genoese goldsmiths did on their voyages. Visiting with their merchandise. You can see how I live and that many people never see me complain believe I am happy and completely in a good mood and completely at ease.<sup>39</sup>

Rosso likely petitioned to become a French citizen in order to further increase his opportunities there rather than because of a national identification with France. In 1900 he had applied to exhibit in the French Pavilion at the Exposition Universelle, probably sensing that this would give his works greater visibility, but he was rejected, almost certainly due to his Italian citizenship. He was also eager to have his works accepted into major French museums such as the Luxembourg, but not out of any feeling of kinship with France. He wished to be seen but not branded, recognized by movements and institutions but not defined or exhausted by classification.

For Rosso, Paris became a springboard for greater international recognition after the turn of the century. From 1900 to 1910 he travelled extensively around Europe to further internationalize his career and reputation. Thanks to expanding European interest in French Impressionism after the turn of the century, he exhibited in Vienna, Berlin, Dresden, Leipzig, Rotterdam, Amsterdam, Brussels, the Hague and London. During his many years abroad, he built a highly sophisticated international reputation that he could never have created had he remained in Italy. His inclusion in landmark shows such as the 1903 edition of the Vienna Secession exhibition, *Entwicklung des Impressionismus in Malerei und Plastik*, situated him among the originators of modern art, and he was included in Julius Meier-Graefe's seminal history of modern art, *Entwicklungsgeschichte der Modernen Kunst* (1904).

Rosso saw himself as part of a larger and broader international history



of modern sculpture. In the Vienna Secession catalogue, he was placed in a history that included Jean Antoine Houdon, Jean-Jaques Caffieri, François Rude and Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux, while living sculptors exhibited, in addition to Rosso, were Rodin, Constantin Meunier, Jules Desbois, Alexandre Charpentier, François-Rupert Carabin, Emile Bourdelle, Camille Lefèvre, Pierre Félix Fix-Masseau, Gaston Toussaint and the Norwegian sculptor Gustav Vigeland. Rosso was the only Italian-born modern sculptor included in the show. This confirms the fact that nineteenth-century Italian sculpture played no role in the narrative of modernism traced by Meier-Graefe, and that Rosso had gained access to that narrative through internationalization.<sup>40</sup> His point of origin was noted as Paris in the catalogue, indicating how the boundaries of national identity for émigrés were continually shifting. In another critical move with respect to his earlier grouping with the Italians at the Exposition Universelle, Rosso was now being billed among the most important French and European sculptors of the time.

Rosso's last years of international expansion occurred in the context of the cultural climate of the turn of the century, which was characterized by rising nationalism and imperialism on the one hand and an expanding internationalist climate on the other. Artists were expected to shore up national traditions, while their lives were cosmopolitan and their practices were shaped by cross-cultural collaboration. Rosso's continued efforts to create an international legacy increasingly clashed with the nationalist ideals developing in Italy.

After a twenty-one-year absence from his country of origin, in 1910 Rosso participated in his first exhibition in Italy, titled *La prima mostra dell'impressionismo francese e delle sculture di Medardo Rosso*. The aim of the show, organized by Ardengo Soffici and held in Florence, was to introduce Italians to French Impressionism. However, what was meant to be his triumphant homecoming – now as a cosmopolitan artist seen through the lens of Impressionism – elicited instead ferocious criticism that Rosso had suppressed his Italian roots. Between 1910 and 1914 he continued to maintain Paris as his home base, but he travelled back to Italy for numerous exhibitions there. He stayed in Italy during the First World War. After the war ended in 1918, he went back to Paris, but returned to Italy permanently in the same year.

The story of Rosso's reappearance in Italy in the final decades of his life, at a time when the country was making an uneasy transition into modernity, is one that remains to be written. In addition to the nationalistic factors, his well-known resistance to categorization impeded any easy absorption into the history of modern Italian art. He continued to oppose others' attempts to position him as the forefather of modern Italian art by rejecting acclaim from Futurists such as Umberto Boccioni.<sup>41</sup> At the same time, the implications of Rosso's return within a growing nationalist climate need to be taken into account. His case demonstrates his enduring sense of his own difference and autonomy with respect to the Futurists' nationalistic enterprise.

Still to be analysed is the role played by interactions between Rosso's

supporters and detractors in Italy during his late years. In an increasingly rigidly nationalistic European environment, Rosso befriended Benito Mussolini's lover, Margherita Sarfatti, who reframed Rosso's art within the regime's Novecento Italiano movement. However, this was another national category that Rosso did not accept easily. Neither did some modern Italian sculptors accept Rosso. The regime sculptor Arturo Martini would attack Rosso's small, anti-heroic 'impressions' depicting vulnerable figures as weak and alien to the virile Fascist image of Mussolini's Italian *popolo*. Martini had been intrigued by Rosso in 1908 but soon rejected his ideas, stating that he was unable to decide whether Rosso was a 'European value or a Milanese waste product'.<sup>42</sup>

From 1910 until his death in 1928 Rosso rarely exhibited again outside Italy, and his international reputation all but disappeared. After his death, whatever remained of his legacy in Italian museums was due entirely to the tireless efforts of his Dutch patroness Etha Fles, who divided her large collection of the sculptor's work among the national museums of Rome, Venice, Turin and Florence, despite resistance from Italian museum authorities.

Rosso's posthumous reputation also remains to be studied. For years there was no agreement in Italy among critics and sculptors about his belonging to Italy. Some critics such as Ardengo Soffici, who continued to publish books on Rosso in Italy, felt that Rosso was 'great *because* [he was] *traditionally Italian*'.<sup>43</sup> Others, such as the critic and journalist Giuseppe Prezzolini, disagreed. Prezzolini wrote to Soffici:

I don't believe that your book, not even today, will succeed in convincing Italians that Rosso is a great artist; but with the aggravating factor that by now I believe that Italians are right, in the sense that in this way they deny an art that is not in their tradition; and that you yourself, with other works and writings, comfort them to exclude Rosso from their tradition.<sup>44</sup>

Rosso survived internationally only through a handful of enlightened art historians, such as Carola Giedion-Welcker and H. W. Janson, who included him in their histories of modern European art.

In 1963 Rosso was suddenly propelled back on to the international art scene by Margaret Scolari Barr, who wrote the first English monograph on the sculptor and organized a solo exhibition at the Museum of Modern Art in New York. This show brought Rosso's art to the attention of post-war American artists such as Jasper Johns, and scholars such as Jack Burnham, Jeffrey Taylor and Rosalind Krauss. However, in the 1970s, Rosso was fully reclaimed by Italy and reframed within the nineteenth-century Italian Scapigliatura movement, a tale of local origins that he himself had denied. In view of all these conflicting ways of understanding Rosso, it seems that a more nuanced understanding of his national loyalties is still needed. Perhaps the Soprintendenza, rather than taking a patrimonial approach and laying an exclusive claim to Rosso, should consider a new matrimonial project of sharing him with the world.

1. Unless otherwise noted, all translations in this essay are by the author.

See, for example, Nello Ponente, 'Bene per il Van Gogh, ma il Medardo Rosso?' *Paese Sera*, 16 December 1977. The Ministry's documents are not available on a public database and therefore cannot be consulted. Information on notified works has been gleaned from interviews with private collectors who wish to remain anonymous.

2. For a detailed study of Rosso's internationalism, see Sharon Hecker, *A Moment's Monument. Medardo Rosso and the International Origins of Modern Sculpture*, Berkeley, CA, University of California Press, 2017.

3. Jacques de Caso, 'Serial sculpture in nineteenth-century France', in Jean Wasserman (ed.), *Metamorphoses in Nineteenth-Century Sculpture*, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 1979, p. 3.

4. Sharon Hecker, 'Reflections on repetition in Rosso's art', in Harry Cooper and Sharon Hecker (eds), *Medardo Rosso: Second Impressions* (exh. cat.), New Haven, CT, Yale University Press, 2003, pp. 23–67; Sharon Hecker, 'An *Enfant Malade* by Medardo Rosso from the collection of Louis Vauxcelles', *Burlington Magazine*, 152, 1292, 2010, pp. 727–35; and Sharon Hecker et al., *Medardo Rosso's Bambino Ebreo: A Critical and Technical Study* (forthcoming).

5. At present, the Italian Soprintendenza's motivations for a claim to national patrimony do not consider an artist's own nationality or his/her own sense of national belonging or whether the artist's career developed outside of Italy. For current regulations, see [http://www.beniculturali.it/mibac/export/MiBAC/sito-MiBAC/Contenuti/MibacUnif/Comunicati/visualizza\\_asset.html\\_635368730.html](http://www.beniculturali.it/mibac/export/MiBAC/sito-MiBAC/Contenuti/MibacUnif/Comunicati/visualizza_asset.html_635368730.html) (accessed 5 February 2018). I thank Giuseppe Calabi for this reference. See especially Note 6, which claims that even a work by a 'foreign' artist can be considered to be part of Italy's national patrimony. For a challenge to the concept of expansionist interpretations of cultural property laws, see Luis Li and Amelia L.B. Sargent, 'The Getty bronze and the limits of restitution', *Chapman Law Review*, 25, 2017, pp. 25–50. The authors state, 'there must be logical limits to the reach of cultural patrimony laws [...] While cultural patrimony laws are valuable protective tools under many circumstances, their reach is not infinite, and when used as a sword rather than a shield, the justification for nationalization breaks down.'

6. See Paolo Tortonese (ed.), *Cameroni e Zola: Lettere*, Paris, Champion, 1987.

7. See Hecker, as at note 2, especially chapters 1, 2, 3, 6 and 7.

8. See Ann Hallamore Caesar, Gabriella Romani and Jennifer Burns (eds), *The Printed Media in fin-de-siècle Italy*, Oxford, Legenda, 2011.

9. Rudolph J. Vecoli, 'The Italian diaspora, 1867–1976', in Robin Cohen (ed.), *The Cambridge Survey of World Migration*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2010, pp. 114–22. See also Corrado Bonifazi, Frank Heins, Salvatore Strozza and Mattia Vitiello, 'The Italian transition from an emigration to an immigration country', *IDEA Working Papers*, 5, 2009, p. 6, [http://www.idea6fp.uw.edu.pl/pliki/WP5\\_Italy.pdf](http://www.idea6fp.uw.edu.pl/pliki/WP5_Italy.pdf) (accessed 3 February 2018).

10. On Rosso's politics, see Hecker, as at note 2, especially chapters 1, 2, 3 and pp. 107–08.

11. See Susan Waller and Karen Carter (eds), *Strangers in Paradise: Foreign Artists and Communities in Modern Paris, 1870–1914*, Burlington, VT, Ashgate, 2015. For a study of Italian artistic emigration to Paris, see Marion Lagrange, *Les peintres italiens en quête d'identité, Paris 1855–1909*, Paris, CTHS–INHA, 2010.

12. See Rachel Esner, "'Art knows no fatherland': internationalism and the reception of German art in France in the early Third Republic", in Martin H. Geyer and Johannes Paulmann (eds), *The Mechanics of Internationalism: Culture, Society, and Politics from the 1840s to the First World War*, London, German Historical Institute, 2001, pp. 357–74.

13. See Lagrange, as at note 11, and Norma Broude, 'The Italian expatriates: De Nittis and Zandomenighi', in Waller and Carter, as at note 11, pp. 27–42.

14. For numerous examples, see the essays in Waller and Carter, as at note 11.

15. Samuel Scheffler, *Boundaries and Allegiances: Problems of Justice and Responsibility in Liberal Thought*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2002, pp. 112–14.

16. Peter Wollen, 'The cosmopolitan ideal in the arts', in George Robertson et al. (eds), *Travellers' Tales: Narratives of Home and Displacement*, London, Routledge, 1994, p. 191.

17. Scheffler, as at note 15, p. 113.

18. Wollen, as at note 16, pp. 193–94.

19. On Italian immigration and anarchism, see Kenyon Zimmer, "'The whole world is our country': immigration and anarchism in the United States, 1885–1940", PhD dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 2010.

20. 'Noi siamo gli stranieri di ogni patria! ... Siamo i reietti! Siamo i bastardi!' Pietro Gori, *Senza Patria: Scene sociali dal vero in due atti ed un intermezzo in versi martelliani*, Buenos Aires, Libreria Sociologica, 1899, quoted in Zimmer, as at note 19, p. 1. Translation by Zimmer.

21. 'nostra patria è il mondo intero e nostra legge è la libertà'. Ibid., quoted in Zimmer, as at note 19, p. 1. Translation by Zimmer.

22. Ibid., p. 1.

23. Medardo Rosso, 'Concepimento-Limite-Infinito', *L'Ambrosiano*, 12 January 1926; and Medardo Rosso, 'Chi largamente vede, largamente pensa: Ha il gesto', *L'Ambrosiano*, 15 January 1926.

24. 'anarchiste européen'. Jehan Rictus, 'Journal quotidien, 1898–1933', 12 February–31 March 1915, Département de Manuscrits, NaF 16176, entry dated 22 February 1915, 44, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Paris. See Jean-François Rodriguez, *Rictus, Soffici e Apollinaire, paladini dello scultore Medardo Rosso tra Parigi e Firenze: "Cette nouvelle Affaire Dreyfus artistique"*, Prato, Pentalinea, 2003, p. 66.

25. Matteo Gardonio, 'Scultori italiani alle Esposizioni Universali di Parigi (1855–89): Aspettative, successi e delusioni', PhD dissertation, Università degli Studi di Trieste, 2008, p. 98.

26. For examples of typical gathering places for Italian émigré artists in Paris, see the numerous references in Lagrange, as at note 11.

27. 'Paris, son urbanisme, sa vie nocturne, les cafés, ses théâtres, la Seine ... et ses Parisiennes sont les premiers sujets de curiosité.' Lagrange, as at note 11, p. 45.

28. 'respirare "l'aria di Parigi"'; 'guardare, guardare, guardare'; 'Ah se tu potessi vedere Parigi! È una cosa favolosa'; 'l'aspetto grandioso immenso – le lunghe strade – larghe come piazze'; 'la modernité du spectacle'. All of these quotes are drawn from ibid., pp. 45–47. I have provided here the original Italian quotes rather than the French translations given by Lagrange.

29. See 'Goupil & Cie / Boussod, Valadon & Cie Stock Books', Getty Research Institute, [http://www.getty.edu/research/tools/digital\\_collections/goupil\\_cie/](http://www.getty.edu/research/tools/digital_collections/goupil_cie/). For a case study, see Pamela Fletcher and Anne Helmreich, 'Local/global: mapping nineteenth-century London's art market', *Nineteenth-Century Art Worldwide*, 11, 3, 2012, <http://www.19thc-artworldwide.org/index.php/autumn12/fletcher-helmreich-mapping-the-london-art-market> (accessed 6 April 2018). On Goupil's marketing of Italian painters, see Lagrange, as at note 11, pp. 262–74.

30. 'tre bronzi dai quali uno va a Goupil [sic]'. Carteggio Medardo Rosso–Felice Cameroni (1889 giugno–1892), Biblioteca d'arte—Biblioteca archeologica—Centro di alti studi sulle arti visive—CASVA, Milan (referred to hereafter as 'Rosso–Cameroni Correspondence') L18, published in Luciano Caramel (ed.), *Mostra di Medardo Rosso (1858–1928)* (exh. cat.), Milan, Società

per le belle arti ed esposizione permanente, 1979, pp. 102–03. In L17, 3 January 1890, unpublished, he identifies the bronzes as *Birichini*. In L 21, undated, unpublished, he fears he lost the Goupil deal because he could not deliver bad casts.

31. 'per questa primavera da Petit raduno tutti questi lavori e con questi altri faccio un'Esposizione'. Rosso–Cameroni Correspondence, L17, 3 January 1890, unpublished. The passage is cited in Paola Mola and Fabio Vittucci, *Medardo Rosso: Catalogo ragionato della scultura*, Milan, Skira, 2009, p. 106.

32. Paola Mola and Fabio Vittucci describe a man noted by Rosso anonymously as 'questo signore', whom they believe must be Petit, as waiting for a cast of a work titled *Après la visite* (ibid., p. 104). This is not made explicit in Rosso's letter.

33. For a detailed discussion of serial sculpture as related to Rosso's market, see Sharon Hecker, 'The modern Italian sculptor as international entrepreneur: the case of Medardo Rosso', in Jan Baetens and Dries Lyna (eds), *Art Crossing Borders: The International Art Market in the Age of Nation States*, Leiden, Brill, 2018.

34. On Rosso's European collectors, see Hecker, as at note 2, pp. 148–49 and chapter 8.

35. 'abbandonato al genere ricercato [dal pubblico]'. Diego Martelli, 'Exposition des Beaux-Arts à Paris 1870', *La Rivista Europea*, 1 June and 1 August 1870. Cited in Lagrange, as at note 11, p. 90. I have provided here the original Italian quote rather than the French translation by Lagrange.

36. For the original document, see n. 1902X 003313, Archives Nationales, Ministère de l'intérieur, Paris. Rosso may also have requested French citizenship in order to obtain a divorce from his wife in Italy, where divorce was not legal.

37. 'non amava dire in che città era nato; non gli piacevano tali precisazioni, sempre per il suo concetto nemico delle classificazioni; a chi insisteva in proposito, preferiva rispondere che era nato *in treno*, dato che suo padre era funzionario delle ferrovie'. Mario Vianello Chiodo to Margaret Scolari Barr, 27 November 1959, unpublished, Archives of Marco Vianello Chiodo, London.

38. 'Rosso est Italien de naissance. Cela n'a pour lui aucune importance: il est prêt à apprendre sans sourciller qu'il est, non Piémontais, mais Chinois ou Papou. Son internationalisme est simple, net, radical et fougueux. Il faut l'entendre parler des frontières et des préventions que les sots ont contre un homme parce qu'il use d'une langue différente de la leur.' Louis Piérard, 'Un sculpteur impressionniste, Medardo Rosso',

*La Société Nouvelle*, 15/1, vol. xxxiii, 1909, p. 57.

39. 'J'en vien avec deux travaux que j'avais porté avec moi – mes cartes de visite. Comme ils fesait les voyages les anciens orfèvres genois. Visitant avec leur marchandise. Vois tu comme je vit et que bien des gens me plaignant jamais me croyent heureux et tout a mon bonheur tout a mon aise.' Medardo Rosso to Jehan Rictus, undated but from Vienna, published in Giovanni Lista (ed.), *Medardo Rosso: La sculpture impressionniste*, Paris, L'Échoppe, 1994, p. 85. Rosso's idiosyncratic French has been left intact.

40. Another 'Italian' exception

was the painter Giovanni Segantini, who had spent most of his career in Switzerland. The internationalism of the sculptor Prince Paolo Troubetzkoy, born in Italy of Russian descent, has yet to be studied systematically.

41. In 1912 Boccioni hailed Rosso as genial, poetic and revolutionary. 'I am referring to Medardo Rosso, an Italian, the only great modern sculptor who attempted to open a wider scope for sculpture, to render through plastic expression the influences of an environment and the atmospheric links which tie it to the subject.' Umberto Boccioni, *Manifesto tecnico della*

*Scultura Futurista*, Milan, Direzione del movimento futurista, 1912, n.p. English translation in Umberto Boccioni, *Futurist Painting Sculpture (Plastic Dynamism)*, trans. Richard Shane Agin and Maria Elena Versari, Los Angeles, Getty Research Institute, 2016, pp. 166–68, 178–84.

42. 'valore europeo o cascame milanese?' Arturo Martini, *Colloqui sulla scultura, 1944–1945*, ed. Nico Stringa, Treviso, Canova, 1997, p. 9.

43. 'Rosso è grande perché tradizionalmente italiano'. See Ardengo Soffici to Giuseppe Prezzolini, 16 November 1929, in Giuseppe Prezzolini and Ardengo Soffici, *Carteggio*, vol. 2,

1920–1964, ed. Maria Emanuela Raffi and Mario Richter, Rome, Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1982, p. 82.

44. 'non credo che il tuo libro, neppure oggi, riuscirà [*sic*] a convincer gli Italiani che Rosso è un grande artista; ma con l'aggravante che ormai ritengo che gli Italiani abbian ragione, nel senso che negano così un'arte che non è nella loro tradizione; e tu stesso, con altre opere e scritti, li conforti a escludere Rosso dalla loro tradizione'. See Giuseppe Prezzolini to Ardengo Soffici, 6 September 1929, in Prezzolini and Soffici, as at note 43, p. 81.