1792, St. Petersburg. Pietro, with a romantic attitude of rebellion against the era, writes up his remarks on the fine arts and their effects with an emphasis on the expressive aspect of the painting, addressing his lifelong friend, Prince Nikolai Yusupov the patron of the arts and the founder of the largest art collection in Russia. By compiling these French written pieces preserved in the collection up to the present, our author offers the reader a sensuous tasting of art writing.
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Prologue
An important stage in the history of Russian collecting is associated with Catherine the Great, who founded the Hermitage Museum. Interest in European culture arose in Russia long before the accession to the throne of Peter the Great, but it was from his reign that a new countdown began. Peter I, who began to travel to Europe, primarily to Holland, began to bring paintings from his travels, mostly small works of the German and Dutch schools. Their themes were close to the tsar: seascapes, battle scenes, and still life compositions. The tsar appreciated the Dutch painter Willem van de Velde the Younger and preferred his contemporary Adam Silo, whose paintings can still be seen in large numbers in Peterhof. The works of the Italian masters as well appeared in Russia under the reign of Peter I. The Entombment – was the first acquired and presented to Peter I by the Russian ambassador to Italy in 1720. It turned out that the painting was actually painted by the 16th-century Ferrara artist Benvenuto Tisi, widely known as Garofalo.
Peter I later arranged for his paintings a gallery in the *Monplaisir Palace* and thus laid the foundation for the tradition of collecting Western European paintings and sculptures in Russia. Following the tsar, his entourage began to collect paintings, but his daughter Elizabeth I, made a really significant contribution to the tradition of collecting. For the Tsarskoye Selo Palace, she acquired more than 120 paintings from different European schools.

The next important stage in the history of Russian collecting\(^1\) is associated with Catherine the Great, the founder of the Hermitage Museum. The history of the foundation of the Hermitage collection extends to an event of acquisition belonging to 16th-17th centuries Western painting schools, from the German merchant Johann Ernst Gotzkowski. The purchase was intended to be offered to Frederick II, but Gotzkowski, in order to cover his debts, offered the acquisition to Russia. This

---

happening count as the event of the foundation of the Hermitage collection.

Right after this step, Catherine II realized that important works of art were stored not only in Europe, but also in Russia. Thus, she began to acquire in Europe both individual works from auctions and already established collections. The most famous of these were the collections of Pierre Crozat in Paris, the collection of Lord Walpole in England and the collection of Count Brühl in Dresden. Thus, the works of Raphael, Poussin, Rubens, Bellotto, and other outstanding masters of the 16th-18th centuries ended up in Russia. As a result, by the end of the 18th century, the Hermitage had about 4,000 paintings, not counting ancient monuments, sculptures, drawings and engravings, which put the museum on a par with the largest European collections.
In the meantime, private collections also began to emerge. The diplomat Nikolai Yusupov\(^2\) purchased the Arkhangelskoye estate near Moscow housing a large collection of various European schools. Among the most famous paintings of this collection are two paintings by Giambattista Tiepolo: “Meeting of Anthony and Cleopatra” and “Cleopatra's Feast”, still preserved in the Arkhangelskoye State Museum-Estate.

Patron of the arts and a keen traveler
Prince Nikolai B. Yusupov\textsuperscript{3} was the eldest son of Prince Boris G. Yusupov (1695-1759). Family traditions and membership in the service of the Collegium of Foreign Affairs had a significant impact on his career under a series of sovereigns, including Catherine the Great, Paul I and Alexander I. The Prince had fully demonstrated his devotion to the Russian throne by serving as a senator from 1788, diplomat from 1783 to 1789, and Director of the Imperial Theatres between 1791-1796, as director of the Hermitage in 1797.\textsuperscript{4} As a diplomat, he travelled throughout Europe, to France and Versailles, where he met Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette, to Germany and Prussia, where he met Frederick the Great, to Austria, where he met Emperor Joseph II, and to Italy. During his journey he purchased a large collection of art, acting as a mediator between the tsars and European artists. The Prince was

\textsuperscript{3} Yusupov, Nikolai Borisovich (senator), Russian biographical dictionary: in 25 volumes. – SPB 1896-1918.

\textsuperscript{4} Ivanova, Drugoy Yusupov: Knyaz’ N. B. Yusupov i yego vladeniya na rubezhe XVIII-XIX stoletiy, Istoricheskiy ocherk, Grifon, St. Petersburg 2012. [Another Yusupov: (Prince N. B. Yusupov and his possessions at the turn of the XVIII-XIX centuries, Historical essay, Grifon, St. Petersburg 2012]
interested in collecting for himself alongside collecting for the tsars, and thus his own collection of paintings and objets d'art evolved from the same sources as the Imperial one.

Helping to acquire works of art for Catherine II and her son Paul I, the prince was an intermediary in the execution of imperial orders by European artists. His own collection including over 600 paintings, sculptures, more than 20,000 books, and porcelains, most of which he put on display in his estate became one of Europe's richest collections. Prince's stay in Holland between 1774-1777 greatly impacted his interest in European art and his passion for collecting. As a person versed in fine arts, possessing great knowledge and taste, he joined a Grand Tour and visited England, Portugal, Spain, France, Italy, Austria. In Italy, he met the German landscape painter J. F. Hackert who painted for him the paired landscapes: Morning in the Outskirts of Rome and Evening in the Outskirts of Rome, both completed in 1779 reserved in Arkhangelskoye State Museum-Estate. In 1780's, the Prince carried out the
orders of Pavel I and significantly expanded his ties with artists and agents.

He visited the workshops of the most famous artists – A. Kaufman in Venice and P. Batoni, the engraver J. Volpato famous for reproduction of engravings as the works of Raphael in the Vatican and Rome, Hubert Robert, C. J. Vernet, J.-B. Greuze and J.-A. Houdon in Paris. In 1789 Prince Nikolai, the founder of the famous Yusupov art collection, after being inspired by the decorations of Amour and Psyche he witnessed during his diplomatic visit to Italy, he invites the Italian scenographer Pietro di Gottardo Gonzaga as the chief designer of the Imperial Theatres at St. Petersburg, to him he will later devote his theater in his art estate.

In 1794, the Prince was elected an honorary of the St. Petersburg Academy of Arts. In 1797, Paul I gave him the supervisory authority of the Hermitage housing the imperial art collection. Pietro was well aware of the Prince's interest in art and collecting and his main artistic preferences consistent with the period of development of the artistic styles in European art.
Rebelling against the aesthetic principles of his era and adopting an avant-garde attitude, Pietro chose to articulate his own system and left a written material to join the Prince's collection. His observations about the peculiarities of imitation in painting and perception in aesthetics found place in a several theoretical treatises published between 1807-1811 in St Petersburg. The narrative of this book has been formed of excerpts from the booklets: “Information to my boss, or a convenient explanation of the theatrical decorator P.G. Gonzague on the practice of his profession”\textsuperscript{5} and “Sentiment, taste and beauty by an artist”\textsuperscript{6}

\textsuperscript{5} Gonzaga di Gottardo P., \textit{Information à mon chef, ou éclaircissement convenable du décorateur-théâtral P.P.Gonzague}, Imprimeur du département des affaires étrangères A. Pluchart, Saint-Pétersbourg 1807. [In French]

\textsuperscript{6} Gonzaga di Gottardo P., \textit{Du sentiment, du goût et du beau par un artiste}, Imprimeur du département des affaires étrangères A. Pluchart, Saint-Pétersbourg 1811. [In French]
Chapter I

The Genuine Artist
1781, Roma

The ruins on the Appian Way, the tomb of Cecilia, reminiscences of the fortresses, triumphal arches, the tragic grandiose of the Colosseum, the ruins of the Forum, the majestically calm Pantheon, the magnificent ensembles of St. Peter and the Capitoline hills, the artistry of Bramante, Michelangelo, Vignola, Bernini, Borromini - in these buildings, the stone sang the history of Rome, its greatness, glory, power, faith, cruelty and humanity. Meanwhile, the Roman theater Alibert was ordering a scenery for the ballet Orpheus by D. Riccardi. Pietro was acquainted with the famous painting schools, the founders of the great Renaissance. Thus, he was convinced that the theory and practice of painting were just a matter of opinion. He was mainly convinced that architecture, like no other areas of art, was able to reflect the spirit, essence, contradictions of its time. In Rome, Pietro understood many other things related to the expression of architecture and the synthesis of the arts.
In the capital of Baroque, he noticed that even unbelievers and freethinkers were fascinated by the theatrical, magnificent papal services. The light and the dark vault of the dome raised up, the cross-lamp hovering in the darkness, all this was done by the expressiveness of the architecture. In his quest, Gonzaga relied on experiments in the field of the perception. How could be possible to evoke emotions in the viewer? He meant not only to be able, but also to know how to do it - to know the causes that give rise to these impressions, to be an artist - a poet and a philosopher. Pietro was interested to walk with youth, listen to their direct judgments about their observations and their faces expressiveness. Their facial expressions were reflecting the expression of the nature. He noticed that things were different when walking around the city. There were many buildings that seemed to claim attention. Thus, he noticed that the expressiveness of the landscape is much more reachable than the expression of architecture.
In this exploration, he saw the main goal of the architect's work, which he considered inseparable from the profession of a theater artist. On the stage, the background was reduced to the views of landscape or architecture. So, it was necessary not only to get acquainted with landscape painters and architects, but to study the expressiveness hidden behind the nature and architecture. In this regard, Pietro perceived Pergolesi's Stabat Mater in a new way, by hearing the music in the walls of the temple during a solemn funeral ceremony.
1785, Paris

Pietro declined an invitation to go to Paris where he was invited to work in his profession. It was told that common sense was disregarded in that capital, and everything there was based only on opinions, and any work was evaluated only on the basis of various theories. Therefore, an artist who wanted to succeed was forced to constantly study those fleeting views that prevail on a given day. So much hypocrisy prevailed that the artists did not know how to be guided by, and those who needed earnings and success lived in constant anxiety, were trying to find out what decisions the wits had finally made in their subtle and exquisite discussions. After a respectable Italian told Pietro, “Paris is not the place where you can hear sincere reviews,” he decides to choose common sense and leaves to the land of fantasies.
1792, St Petersburg

St. Petersburg was already accustomed to the magnificent baroque compositions of Valeriani, Perezinotti and Francesco Gradizzi. The sketches brought on stage by Pietro were not understandable to everyone. The artists of Russian classicism were in search of the landscape nature of Pietro's scenery mastering the panoramic illusionism. Pietro was called to Russia as a theatrical decorator, and the shows were in the direction of the Prince Yusupov, a great lover of the fine arts and protector of the artists. Accustomed to the common technique and language of the artists, the Prince first showed surprise at Pietro's singular words and was dismayed by the artist's way of working, completely original and without other examples. The Prince made the artist attend his house and his table and in front of his guests, he attacked him by surprise, about his ideas that seemed to be in contradiction with the known artistic techniques.
Why discuss when it is easier to show? thought Pietro. Before his departure from Italy, tired from fighting old opinions, he had chosen silence and retreat, determined to remain faithful to his experience and his principles. He thought only to demonstrate, since it was the only evidence of the fine arts and the best way to succeed as an artist. In these circumstances, he understood well that it was his honest duty to reassure the Prince, and it was also very fair to give him an exact account of his abilities, his culture and all his skills in the art he professed; it would have been a bit tumultuous and difficult to have a nice conversation, due to the dispute, as he seems to have wished. Pietro chose to work with the intention of making himself better known through his own works and also with a memory that would have informed the prince about his studies, principles, and opinions to put aware of everything that justified the singularity found in his talent. By having defined himself as being little versed in the art of writing, and due to the constant occupations of his other works, the writing of his diary
proceeded so slowly that the Prince left his duty before it was finished! Considering the success of his first works reassuring his new directors, Pietro gave up on writing a memoir. However, having continued and enriched during his idle moments, he imagined that it could be of some use to the young students of his art and perhaps, of some interest, to amateurs, so he decided to print it with small additions made before and after, on the study of fine arts in general and their effects.
Information à mon chef, ou éclaircissement convenable du décorateur-théâtral P.P. Gonzague
Imprimeur du département des affaires étrangères
A. Pluchart à Saint-Pétersbourg, 1807.
Chapter II

On the study of Fine Arts and their effects
Talent in Fine Arts

Painting and sculpture are arts of prestige and pleasure, and their productions are of interest only for the pleasure and love that they are able to develop. These arts contain two essential and distinct qualities, namely the imitation of everything that is really visible and the expression of all that is only imagined. Representing a figure or a landscape in all variations, lies only in imitation, while the representation of a divinity, needs the ideal that is not existing in reality, it requires to form the idea and known how to be transmitted to others with all the spirit that it contains. Nevertheless, painting always imitates, the first study of the artist should therefore be to learn to imitate before practice to imagine it. To make the image of the existing things and to show only what is seen in the imagination, we must learn to imitate: and it is wise to begin by imitating what really exists, leaving the work exposed to the sight of all, to be able to comfortably compare it at all times, and make it compared by others,
in order to ensure its degree of success. The schools of painting should propose, as a fundamental basis, the clear and exact imitation of visible objects, as they appear to the eye. The task of ornamental painters, who seek the beauty suitable for the decoration of buildings, a spirit of invention, convenience and expression must be familiar to them and taste, grace, elegance and harmony must always direct their brushes. They are true musicians-colorists.

*Titian* up to a certain age, with his timid and exact imitation satisfied more than with the frank and masterful of mature age. This artist is certainly very much lovable, when he is a pupil of nature, which when he is a master of art. In *Raphael’s Pharaoh* who listens to the interpretation of dreams, put the index finger of the left hand of the king to the lips, because he had observed that men, in the moment of grasping an idea of letters, fix the looks and do the same. The ideal of the celestial apparitions of saints, angels, and other deities made visible as bodies similar to ours is the imitation of the clouds illuminated by the sun in their momentary
evolutions. Every painter is an inventor when he composes of his imagination, traces reminiscences of what he observed in the original of nature and the best inventor is still the best observer, with the only difference that the work of those who have originally drawn from life, will be affected by this originality and will have a more open character, so to speak, without knowing the beech, it will turn out much more interesting.
Art of Drawing

Why is excellence in the fine arts of drawing so scarce today that schools are so widespread, in fifteenth century, without schools and almost without models, there was such a high number of artists who excelled? In the past only one artist excelled in several arts and the painters were not historians, portraitists and landscapers, but often sculptors and architects at the same time. Painters were not involved in sculpture or architecture; whereas each profession had been divided into several branches; whereas the historical painter no longer made portraits, landscapes, whereas architecture in turn was classified into civil, military, naval and aerostatic. Perhaps, stopping too much in theory, made us lie blindly toward a fictitious knowledge lacking from the observation, study, and application of our sensitive and intellectual faculties. In the arts of drawing there is a big difference between the talent of one pupil and that of another. What is the use of having the imagination to be a portraitist or an
engraver? What is the use of exercising so much the memory of the students, when the essential thing is to teach them to observe, to feel and to express? What is the use of giving all students the same lessons, when the talent and dispositions of each person would require an individual one? Every individual not only has a singular inclination that it is good to discover and cultivate but each nation has its own different genius of its natural constitution and national character. Yet, rather than enslave oneself to the tastes and manners of other nations, wouldn't be better to assert one's own inclinations and bring them to compete with those of the other nations? Pietro approves of the praiseworthy English pride, jealous of preserving in everything its own national character and taste. The expressiveness of the famous print of the death of General Wolf is natural, sublime and original. Nothing more interesting than this representation. Yet there is nothing Greek, nor Roman, everything is English and the whole idea of the art of imitating is lost. The representation of their national historical subjects, their architecture and their
customs, displays all the pathetic tones with the dignity and grace convenient to the subject. Doesn't the spontaneous originality of the Flemish painters, despite their low and often unimportant subject matter, prevail over the most magnificent artistic productions for the accuracy and clarity of representation? The example of the English and the Flemish, who in their own way have chosen without aping the taste of other nations, should animate the patriotic spirit of the directors of the schools to discover and cultivate the particular national genius, whatever it may be, rather than imperfectly following that of a different nation. In the works of *Dernier*, we count the hair of the beard, the pores of the skin and the smallest details in the clothes and their fabrics, they are quite singular, perfect in their kind and certainly surprising. This artist has wisely been able to draw his cue from the tireless national spirit that comes first of all for assiduity and that often balances the admirable impulses and easy graces that are the prerogative of other nations and that it would be out of place to contend and unfruitful to imitate. Travelers
crossing Germany and travelling through England are most impressed by the singularity the national monuments offer them more than from all the other buildings. Those who travel through Spain see the indifference in the immense and heavy masses of modern convents and churches and, on the contrary, are happily struck by the extraordinary form of Moorish monuments and their ancient Gothic buildings. Italians devoted, threw large arches and developed the cues of the linear and *aerial perspective* in the pictorial representations, only after the total extinction of the foreign school, when they were forced to form themselves in the fifteenth century, since there was no nation in vogue that produced its fashion and deserved to be imitated. Although the ancient Romans were imitators of the Greeks, they did not build, on closer inspection, that small buildings, even if vast, never large buildings. *The Roman baths, the Colosseum, the Pantheon*, the temples of peace, sun and moon, the basilica of Caius Cestius, the mausoleums of Augustus, J Hadrian, the triumphal arches, etc. are not Greek
buildings, it is well known. The vaults, the arches and all the suspended curved walls that freed the architecture from the obligation of the architrave and gave way to the grandiose, are Roman inventions. Italians, however, who for their natural constitution have a sure and delicate underlying sensitivity, are less subject to the sumptuous scraps of intellect, imagination and taste and to the errors of reasoning. Their poetry, their music, painting and architecture have a more general and unconstant success. Pietro points out the errors in the methods of the schools by believing that the arts, in Italy as elsewhere, were no longer in a condition of vigor due to the abuses rooted in the old institutions of education and blindly adopted by the new ones.
On the Imitation in Painting

It is often repeated that painting is a lovable art for the beautiful that it shows us, and it is interesting only because of the interesting object that it imitates. The general purpose of all the art of imitation is to represent absent objects, or to transport them, so to speak, where we know that they cannot be found by their nature. The peculiarity of painting is to make this transposition in a more incisive and interesting way in itself, for the sole strength of its imitative means. It happens very often that we don’t like the person represented in a portrait and we strive with great interest to compare it with the original that is of our sole knowledge and we are pleasantly surprised and happy to find expressed all its traits and distinctive qualities. In this case, the interest derives from the sole accuracy of the imitation and from the fact that we are in a position to make a precise comparison of it to detect all the degrees of similarity.

“Before I saw real lions, I paid no attention to the representations of lions so common in homeland. It was
only after seeing some of them alive, that I was able to
distinguish what was good and bad imitated, and to
have an interest in the representations of lions.”

The different levels of imagination, the condition of
the moment and the preferences of the inclination mix
so naturally and modify the operation. So that each one
will form a different image of Olympus, Tartarus, and
everything that does not have a sensitive existence.

Representations of clichés, which are called views,
produce the same interest that we have in portraits. We
are equally concerned to make the comparison with all
the qualities and circumstances known in the original,
of the imitated landscape, to distinguish all the details
and nuances that characterize its physiognomy.

Pietro uses this term of physiognomy to designate
the combination of shapes and appearance of visible
objects. The ideal of this kind of imitation creates the
profession of the Landscaper, whose main interest, at
least the most general, is directed as much to the
rightness of ideas, as to real objects, to their more
precise similarity and to the air of truth that emanate.
With exact imitation is intended not the dry imitation made by some Germans. The following observations proposed are not abstract theories, it just requires to observe with some attention: the surrounding air and the vapors mix with the objects according to their distance covering them with bluish or reddish, depending on the light that hits them and mixes with them; and the divergent rays of the light reflected by the objects bring to our eye their most uncertain contour, if they are far away; their dispersion and refraction disturbs the sharpness of the transmitted images. A rotten tree trunk, a corpse, some perfectly imitated sweeps give more satisfaction than the most beautiful subject badly rendered. It is therefore indisputable that in painting, the interest is often directed more to the degree of accuracy of the imitation, than the degree of beauty of the object. One abandons the portrait of one's mistress, if it is poorly painted, but one carefully preserves that of one's enemy, if it is done really well. What an interest in the ugly subjects of the many Flemish painters! The eye is attracted to it
inconceivably, while it usually flows away from the most beautiful weakly executed images. Mr. Falconet, to whom one can refer, speaks enthusiastically of the prestige of art, about a painting of the Amsterdam City Hall, by Wan- der-Helst, which represents a gathering of arquebusiers who eat and drink. This illusion - he says - is subject to the truth that directs it in general order, down to the smallest details. The illusion of art is so in accord with that of nature, that the observer is the part of that whole; he would speak of it with greater or less confidence and would not tell one what he would gladly address to another. When painting puts our sensitivity in the same state that the presence of the true would provoke to the sight, it fulfills its purpose, the rest is individual concerning the personal dispositions of the artist and the viewer. It is good, without a doubt, that painting preferably deals with beautiful objects and beautiful forms; but it is not true that the essence of art is to embellish and produce the visible beauty that nature hasn’t created. Producing the visible beauty that nature has rejected, is the task of
another art, which will soon be discussed as the subject of decoration in architecture. Pictorial differs from poetic art, in fact, poetry works on the imagination to move the feeling, while painting, on the contrary, acts on the feeling to excite the imagination. For these different operations and the materials used, there must be an essential diversification that must be considered and treated in various ways. Painting should always remember that our existence is more sensitive than spiritual. Thought and imagination transport us outside our sphere and provide us beautiful dreams which painting can grasp and fix for our satisfaction. The natural beauty attracts us and exerts on our sensitive faculties. The moral task of art has already been reaffirmed and it would be superfluous to repeat how painting shows us the beautiful deeds of men, and purposely puts them before our eyes, to stimulate the spirit of emulation and serve as an example. In the same way, it can produce new feelings and give birth to new ideas with emblems, allegories and combinations of elegantly associated objects and forms, almost in
epigrams, where the spirit can find subtle meanings, as seen in the paintings of Herculaneum and Rome and in almost all the palaces and churches of Europe. Pietro points out that with all these wits and evolutions of ingenuity, painting will never match the interest that eloquence, poetry and, perhaps, music can provoke with their most delicate means that are expressed in subsequent moments. It is therefore precisely in imitation that painting surpasses all other imitation arts. The essential thing is to replace the thing with its appearance, and the appearance will replace the thing, thanks to its more correct similarity.

In the works of Titian, Van Dyck and numerous other Italian and Flemish painters, this goes so far as to contradict our own reflection. The more we look at them, the more we see what is not there, while what really is, disappears. The real flat surface of the painting loses all meaning for the observer. Only the deceptive takes our attention and captures us completely. When imitation reaches such a point of magic, it deserves our admiration only for the artifice,
regardless of the subject. So before fully forming his style, Gonzaga decided the rest of Italy and especially Rome. He observed very carefully what was done in the most famous schools and in the best workshops. Everywhere were methods of work and frantic research to create the beautiful ideal, with blind deference to what was famous and original. The study and exercise of painting was only a matter of points of view. *It was no longer an art to imitate, but rather an art to show how one thinks about painting.* Only the landscape artist *Hakert* and some of his students, studied in Rome, the true and the beautiful of nature directly, without interpreters and managed to attract the preferences and attention of amateurs; but the professors treated them as servile imitators; he is a landscape painter, they said, who copies nature like portraitists. This artist, however, showed us as a master, the different aspects of uncultivated and embellished nature with precise similarity and a lot of energy. Vernet was also trained on nature and studied, so to speak, the passionate traits of physiognomy. The thunderstorms,
the calms, the mists in its marinas are extremely expressive. These two artists knew with excellence, in the right way, to reproduce the appearance of the absent objects and make the effect with an equivalent imitation. After seeing Rome, Pietro recognized the validity of a passage by Rousseau in his Emilio. I expected that the famous works of the Vatican artists would oppose and deny it and I did not dare to adopt it until after this trip. Here he states: "I would be careful - he says - from entrusting my student to a drawing master, who would give him only copies to imitate and who would make him practice only on drawings that it has no other masters than nature itself, nor other models than objects. I want him to have before his eyes the original itself and not the paper that represents it, to draw a house from a house, a tree from a tree, a man from a man, so as to accustom him to observe bodies and their appearances well, and not to take for true imitations, false and conventional. I would also dissuade him from drawing by heart in the absence of objects, until the moment when, by dint of frequent
imitations, their exact figures would impress themselves well in his imagination, for fear that, substituting for the truth of things, bizarre and fantastic figures, he would lose the knowledge of the proportions and the taste of the beauties of nature.” After the authoritative thought of the Geneva philosopher, painting becomes the art of substituting the appearance for the reality of visible things. It is not the art of moving and expressing, but the art of imitating what it expresses and moves. This opinion has often been contradicted, with the support of the catechism that suggests adding something to the expression of nature and embellishing it; but he has always answered: “Do you want to show the beauty that always pleases? Choose the most beautiful combinations in nature and imitate them. Do you want to express clearly and strike? Choose in nature the most significant moments and imitate them carefully, and let graces and forms of expression never be without a pattern recognizable by every simple sensible and attentive observer.”
If the fixation of the intellect and taste takes hold of the painter, he will say nonsense with his mind and taste; his art will become too difficult and exclusive to enjoyment and fleeting lightness and fashion. Relying entirely on authority, precepts and rules is not the most appropriate attitude for the study of painting; it requires attachment, feeling and a spirit of observation. *When painting becomes imaginary, it uses its ultimate energy*; it is its extreme state and the beginning of its decadence. The main purpose of the fine arts and the interest of the artist, as well as his duty, is to make sure that his productions are enjoyed as generally as possible.

The artist must therefore not expect the simple viewer to put himself at a level of knowledge, support the same study and struggle to understand the artist as much as the artist should do to be understood. The artist *endowed with common sense* and who acts according to what he feels, sympathizes naturally and necessarily with the whole sensible world; and he doesn’t care to be in contact with the sect of the pedantic
complacent and with the crowd of the stunned. What we call good taste is common sense applied to pleasant things. As for the taste, Gonzaga considers it as the gallant court of the human soul. Common sense is our true wisdom and pure reason is luxury wisdom. schools are in charge of the knowledge necessary for the pupils to deal with the difficulties in their beginnings and to enlighten them in the common exercise of art; that the ambitious artist rises from himself to the sphere of men and is formed by his own observations, with regard to the relationships of sympathy of artificial combinations with human sensitivity.
Chapter III

*Sentiment, Taste and Beauty by an Artist*
On Feeling

Pietro continues his narrative on such an essential faculty, called sentiment subordinate to the soul and is well appreciated occupying a place between our inherent sensitivity and the ability to contemplate. Feeling, is characterized by life, impulses, obstacles and the ability to think. *All we have a soul, an inner sense and external organs of perception*, and these are the councils as deeds, debates and verdict, or, more precisely, examination, discussion, executive powers. *Inner excitement* suppresses weak organs when it is stronger than them, but only irritates more powerful ones, and that is why a person turns out to be brave or a coward. So, the feeling commands us and almost completely guides us, thanks to it we are good or bad, good or evil, and our most significant deeds are unraveled and moved forward. Painters are very interested in this, for the most enduring success of the arts depends on the feeling that seems to be their innate soil, and very often the quibbles of wit and the pointer
of reason only intimidate and discourage them.

The one who first uttered the word feeling already felt that one can feel in so many different ways, and there are so many different shades of feeling. Feeling can also be confused with imagination, an ability that is effective, animated, exaggerated. The imagination can be considered something like an annoying relative, so it needs to be developed, and so do sages and artists, especially if it is combined with a good memory that serves as an archive for all that is happening in man. All this affects the sense, it does not in itself create some unifying center, an important laboratory that perceives sensations, analyzes and delivers ideas or perceives thoughts and carries them out in accordance with the impulses of the mind and will. Anything that is not passed through this eye of the needle will turn out to be gross sensuality or barren contemplation. Therefore, feeling, can also make any of us happy. But to be happy does not mean to be in absolute peace. We walk through the garden or through the gallery, where everything remains unchanged, and only while reading, or in a
concert, or at a performance, where everything is in motion and replaces each other, we are able to stay put for a while, without being bored. Entertainment needs variety—the strongest exciter of sensuality and the most enticing need of the artist and art lover. But, fortunately, we are quite rich in events in the field of feeling and from a mature examination we see that the resources here are inexhaustible. Different properties of objects and different ways of perceiving them form countless combinations and shades that inevitably affect us when we first meet or each time in a new and different way. Pietro believed that physical pleasure, in fact, consists in the fact that the object has lost its novelty, for example, they excavate where no one has previously dug, or excavate in another way until all possible tactile combinations capable of producing irritation are exhausted, and this is what gives pleasure to the sensual, just as the intellectual pleasure for the mind is the discovery of the beautiful, the true, the truthful and their various applications and uses.
We can satisfy the feeling either the first way or the second. Although the truthful and intellectually beautiful do not represent the immediate object of feeling, this ability can be felt by adjacency and it is inevitably present in all states of mind. From this arises an infinite number of causes and even more complicated are the effects and everything that can attract both the viewer and the artist. However, in their fascination with mainstream taste, artists now seem to neglect the usual and more correct contact with the senses and seek only to shine with fictional false refinements, trying to please the dominant taste and adapt to the requirements of present taste. At any given moment, this can be beneficial and cause applause. But what will become of these works when the character of the mind and taste change and a different opinion prevails? It is not these lightweight means that will give the right to claim posthumous glory. All works that focus only on the modern state of mind and taste have only local and temporal significance, are subject to the same
vicissitudes as people, as well as the vagaries of the mind, a changeable slave to fashion. Only those of them survive, which are created in accordance with the unchanging forms of feeling inherent in any time and any nation. Innate passions are about the same always and everywhere, and false ones are erased over time, no one else knows the models they imitated, and for posterity they turn out to be puzzles. What will many of Molière's comedies turn into when all notion of what was worthy of ridicule in his time is lost? Speaking of morality, one can one get rid of the emotions of the heart and harden one's conscience only through many efforts, and it is very difficult to overcome one's feeling and pervert it in such a way that it is possible to change or suspend its usual action. We see the same thing in the field of entertainment: no matter how hard we try to assimilate the manner that enjoys the greatest success, it is impossible to constantly play a memorized role—and most often hypocritical one—and nature returns us to our inner tact, which is the conscience of our spiritual well-being; ultimately, any reasonable person enjoys in
his own way, according to his inclinations.

It may be argued that if a person has a heart and a feeling, he also has a head and a mind that are worth at least as much, and that the pursuit of the ideal is the most brilliant of his faculties: surely all this must be applied and all must be satisfied. However, in the case of works of fiction, an exception should be made, no matter what has been said or written about it so far. *The arts seem to be divided into two varieties, quite different from each other.* The goal of some is imitation, the goal of others is fiction, and the latter independently create their own images, while the former only make a selection among what has already been created before and imitate it. *Poetry, painting, sculpture can only grasp the expression of their models and imitate them, without deviating from them.* Music, architecture, eloquence—these are the true arts of fiction, for they create their own images, freely expressing themselves in their own way, and, apparently, the ideal belongs more to their sphere precisely because they do not follow patterns. It is not difficult to understand that the
hut or grotto that they try to impose on architecture as its prototype are by no means generalizing types in the same way as for the music of nightingales; and what pattern can be found in nature for eloquence? *If a fictional ideal can serve as a good seasoning for the arts of imitation,* why deny them the help of external brilliance? An artist with wit, better animates and revives his imitations, is easily subject to excitement, seeks, improves, always seeks to give the truthful even more sharpness, to catch his more profitable side and boldly emphasizes it. It is admirable that wit, as far as possible, animates and animates our creations. But let it always be done in full accordance with the feeling and very carefully and restrainedly, for unreasonable revival and light wit easily lead to exaggeration and bizarreness. For Italians, two of their illustrious poems usually serve as a touchstone to test readers: Tasso's *The Liberated Jerusalem* and Ariosto's *Furious Rolland.* In the first of them, feeling dominates, and everything in it deeply touches and enchants, and in the second, the wit reigns and everything irritates and
dissipates to the extreme.

Thus, the inclinations of young people can be predicted by whether they prefer the first of these poems or the second. Let consider to what extent the driving forces of the heart alone are able to help the artist and which of the other inclinations generated by the feeling can serve as an effective plot in the fine arts, which will only be discussed here. An excellent quality, the most attractive and imbued with the emanation of feeling, is simplicity. *Ingenuity is an ornament of moral feelings*. Upon proper consideration, we will find that simple-mindedness is the beauty of what the genius of the arts is capable of creating. Simplicity is bland and trivial if it is not simple-minded, and a mind without simplicity usually turns out to be only witticisms and wriggles. *Common sense*, cannot be anything other than the best state of feeling—a feeling that is delicate and powerful, as expressed quite well in the word itself, includes general conscientiousness and everyday wisdom.
The ancients were guided more by their minds than by anything else. They subtly debated and scattered sparkles of wit, wanting to sparkle and cause the admiration of others, but, taking practical actions, relied only on reason. The surviving monuments serve as evidence of this, and in this way many great and beautiful things were created. “Everyone, with the help of the inner feeling in them, knows without any rules whether this or that work or reasoning is good,” Cicero said. And Quintillian added: “Not on the basis of reasoning they evaluate works created in order to touch and like us, but with the help of some inner feeling that cannot be explained.” The powerful talents of Lucretius and Michelangelo are inferior in grace to the talents of Horace and Raphael, just as the Platonists are inferior to the Epicureans in sensual pleasures. But everything has its time: sensuality develops before feeling, and it develops before reason. So, people were wild at first, then became poets and only at the end became philosophers. It is in no way humiliating for art to admit
that such a situation is quite tolerable, for it is undoubtedly better to act successfully, limiting oneself to one's own sphere, than to go beyond it and make mistakes. The greatest artists of Greece and Italy blossomed precisely surrounded by a civilization that was halfway between this primitive simplicity and the highest culture, between barbarism and luxury. When we visit an art gallery, a palace or a garden many times, or re-read a poem, or repeatedly watch a magnificent performance in the theater, we’re gradually and involuntarily possessed by indifference to all the efforts of the imagination and mind fascinated, when it comes to imitation, or something that is close to natural where embellishment is concerned we are not able to reconcile that the artists in the paintings miss the ligaments, veins, and wrinkles of the skin that reflect tissue fluidity, movement, and life. Doing so is highly recommended, but artists studiously avoid it, although it would help them *embellish human nature in their imitations*. We applaud the music so mindlessly when it has abandoned melody in order to portray the screams
of pain, the sound of the wind, and the rumble of carts. Or we praise pedantry, which at all costs wants to find in nature the prototypes of architecture. Indeed, we seek to embellish with the art of imitation, imitate with the art of decoration, and are not content with pure reason alone when it comes only to feeling and its corresponding expression. All these refinements, we are witnessing to ourselves that we are in some way possessed by madness. Or we are at the mercy of the condescension born of a desire to be polite. The pretense generated by the desire shows that we have reached the extreme limits of sophistication. But is it worth the trouble to be hypocritical because of such empty vanity. And if there really are people who can only enjoy what is unusual, let's feel sorry for them, since they need such ornate entertainment, and leave them alone.

The field of fine arts is vague, in comparison with science requires greater freedom, undoubtedly greater respect for the individuality of the artist. Originality is a property that should be given the greatest importance, and even more so should be appreciated
now because so many talents existed before us. However, one should not lose the presence of spirit, and every artist must boldly strive to develop his own manner, capable not only of emphasizing the good qualities of his chosen plot and ennobling it, but also of helping this artist to stand out among others. Many artists recklessly abused the vague uncertainty of their work and, wanting to attract attention, whimsically focused, believing that it was much better to enjoy a high-profile fame than a good reputation; however, this is fraught with great danger, and therefore it is necessary to carefully weigh everything before embarking on such a disastrous path. However, this useful and brilliant originality also depends on the special manner of feeling inherent in this artistic personality. *Human organisms*, both internally and externally, are characterized by quite different combinations of qualities that make up various physiognomies and various characters that allow one artist to distinguish from another, and the more he is himself, the more he differs from others.
Only artificial forms of civilization, culture and fashion turn us into the same inside and outside, like plowed fields. But how do we recognize the boundary of this risky idiosyncrasy without allowing it to turn into self-will and keeping it reasonable? And where should we stop? To do this, we must again turn to our inner tact for help and rely on common sense. The marbles of Michelangelo and Puget are full of feeling and have all the means of life, and this to some extent compensates for their lack of a perfectly beautiful appearance. “Which of the Greek statues conveys the feeling of folds of skin, the softness of flesh and flowing blood with such perfection as they are conveyed in the works of this illustrious contemporary of ours?” asked Falconet in his discourses on sculpting printed in Lausanne Truly, nature seems to be angry at the misplaced pride of the copier who wishes to correct it, and she does not appreciate the portraitist who wishes to flatter her: she is not too protective of the ventures of both and responds to them with coldness.
An artist who more clearly feels the internal influences of external combinations will perceive them more strongly, will be better able to distinguish them, and he will have a whole reserve warehouse of them, better equipped with images and motifs and richer in ideas. This manifestation of inner tact irritates the mind and causes what is commonly called inspiration. Indeed, if art did not resist national inclinations with such tenacity, if it tried to resist submission to those exotic tastes that the dominant opinion imposes on it, then every nation would have its own architecture, and in the same way every nation would have its own music. The spheres of these two arts are so inseparable from the innate predilections of the people and climatic conditions that the trends of their development are often opposed even to universal opinion and desire. The Greek architecture is more beautiful than all others, and although its elements have been studied, analyzed and established everywhere and throughout Europe they depict that they strictly follow its prescriptions, but what is done by one people is very different from
what is done by another, and this is easy to detect even when they say: Italian style, French, English, German, etc. In fact, of all the arts, architecture is probably the most attached to what is natural, the most related to the needs of the population, and perhaps the most influential. How Constantinople would have changed if it had been rebuilt in a European way, even keeping Turkish poetry and music intact!
On Taste

Having taste primarily means the ability to enjoy all that nature that art offers to our vital and spiritual abilities for our pleasure. Pleasure can be obtained from a good dinner, the scent of a rose, a musical piece, a beautiful garden, a beautiful poem and equally from a subtle idea, a beautiful thought. For it is also possible to enjoy a beautiful thought, and every man, whether he is more sensual, sentimental, or spiritual, enjoys in his own way, and in everyone his own taste. But to make a stew, compose a poem and prove any truth does not mean to have only taste – it also means to possess skill and art, talent, genius. And the one who perceives and enjoys, at the same time, feels satisfaction from the fact that he makes a discovery, thinks, combines, knows how to do. Despite its great demands and claims, the taste, apparently, is nevertheless very lazy, does not want to do anything, but only wants to taste everything and evaluate everything.
The scholarly and fair D'Alembert once said that when an artist's imagination is at work, then one part of his mind seems to stand aside to observe and make judgments about what the other part creates. This observing part is taste, which, dare I say, is usually just common sense when applied to objects that give pleasure, and can be considered good taste only insofar as it obeys common sense, which highly values wit and imagination, restrains us in everything and, truly, is truly everyday wisdom. The most sensible taste, indeed, must be the best taste. However, one should not lose sight of the subtle distinction pointed out by D'Alembert: in fact, it is not at all the same thing that has been composed before, and this seems to be the difference between an artist and an art lover. The latter only have to worry about how to acquire the knowledge necessary to enjoy properly, and artists are also obliged to possess all the skill and talent that is necessary to satisfy the smartest taste, that is, good taste.
Taste is debated because they want to know more than to enjoy, and also because evaluation takes precedence over pleasure. True sages believe that for the sake of their tranquility, one can do without anyone's approval, they enjoy in their own way and also allow others to enjoy. Sensuous individuals can easily fall into immoderation but will never become disputants. They choose unpretentiously and savor without swagger everything that can attract them - from cooking to metaphysics and enjoy without hesitation. In fact, there is a big difference between the anxiety of a curious person and the addiction of an amateur. If we properly understand what is happening in ourselves, you understand to yourself that the center of the human personality, which we call “I”, is not at all in the head and the purely instinctive movement made by everyone. If we are talking here and not exactly about the “I” of metaphysicians, then at least we are referring here to the “I” of the artists. But let's assume that viewers are supremely impressionable and have an innate ability to enjoy the true qualities of our
creations. Not only the degree of sensitivity, but also the degree of diligence, exercise and reflection that the audience gone through will create a difference in their position and give them a criterion in evaluating the artist who will satisfy them. Indeed, the degree of experience greatly enriches the innate and primordial taste of the audience, shapes and modifies them in such a way as to put into them countless artificial requirements created by habit and opinion, which it is very profitable for a skilled artist to find out and take into account; but in turn, the audience, wishing to taste everything, must also have an idea of the actually increasing refinements, in which the diligent artist constantly moves forward, wanting to satisfy both himself and his viewers. The vicissitudes of these fluctuations affect the development of taste so much that they immensely increase the difficulty of studying and applying it, and one has to argue about these two relative differences rather than about the taste itself.
Artists and collectors will never be able to come to an agreement, and they will never agree with each other, unless, by means of almost equal diligence, they develop their abilities to the same extent, are not at the same level of knowledge and sophistication, and do not coincide completely. Only this interconnection of sensuality with sensuality, feeling with feeling, and design with design can give rise to sympathy and mutual understanding in the relationship between the world and the arts. So, it is quite well known that diligence and exercise are always more and more discovered and improved, and also attracted to themselves. Therefore, we are constantly changing, and what was at our level yesterday at a certain stage, is no longer same today, it became more difficult to satisfy due to the fact that it reached a higher degree of diligence, practice, discovery, habit, etc. – in progression, and even to the point of madness, which is the last limit of human pleasure. Clearly, the success of our dinner party depends on two factors: the condition of our guests' stomachs and the skill of the cook.
If simply gather hungry people or temperate sages who care only about healthy food, even if not too pleasant, it would not be so difficult for the cook to satisfy them; but if they are connoisseurs who sit down at the table only for the sake of entertainment and pleasure, then it is a completely different matter, and here the cook will have to rack his brain, down to the ideal and metaphysical. In this case, he needs to take into account the degrees of refinement, diligence, satiety, disgust, and only on the basis of all this information the art of the chef will be able to manifest itself in such a way as to satisfy the greedy, demanding or languid and capricious appetites of the guests and receive their gratitude. The fellow diners will have to submit to the sophistications of various stews, if they want to fully taste the pleasure of a ceremonial dinner.

For any work whose purpose is to entertain, all those circumstances on which the success of the dinner depends apply - yes, they will forgive us this joke. *In aesthetics, what is pleasurable is nothing more than the correspondence of the relationships between what is*
affected and what the impact is applied to. The sympathetic reciprocity of the corresponding physical constitutions goes even further than is commonly thought, and it may be the basic principle of any physical and moral attachment. It's a universal connection. However, more reliably and more connected with the subject of the arguments is that in the practice of fine arts first of all there is interest, and it is preserved only due to the mutual meeting of circumstances at the same level. Everything that is below the current level of the viewer will seem vulgar, boring to him, and everything that exceeds his ability to accommodate will be incomprehensible to him, will not impress and even turn out to be unpleasant. For one is always somewhat annoyed to see how what is meant to entertain us can give us pleasure only if it is treated as if it were of the greatest importance. If there were no fraction of happy frivolity that can and wants to engage only in pleasure, the arts would become fastidious and lose all their fans. But fortunately, this kind of Epicurean wisdom is quite common these days, and
thanks to the inequality of material well-being, it is possible to intelligently engage in innocent, pleasant and completely useless things. But there are also venerable sages who are busy with their more important affairs and duties and are completely ignorant of the art of making pleasures. Although they are not avid voluptuous, they are very receptive to the impressions produced by the fine arts, and are quite good at enjoying their results, not caring at all about how they achieve these results, and only this is what they need in order to be good amateurs. But these people, who are more judicious than the curious, are far from the easiest to satisfy, precisely because they can only be interested in the result, because the ways and means are unknown to them and are quite indifferent, and thus in relation to them art is deprived of any other possibilities than to attract them with genuine success, and it is here that aesthetics is subjected to the most decisive tests. On the contrary, experts, if you manage to prove to them that everything was done according to the rules and methodically, will easily forgive you
failures and the insignificance of the result. They are even more willing to display their critical abilities than their addictions, and by their nature they are more likely to debate, analyze, dissect, mentalize and philosophize to the point of unconsciousness than to get carried away. Venerable sages, about whom we have just spoken, despite the result which can give them pleasure and a pleasant impression, are not interested in penetrating into the essence of a significant musical work to understand what parts it consists of and how skillfully is combined. When it comes to the art of painting, they will not distinguish the art of perspective from chiaroscuro, as well as the purpose of the color chord and the meaning of the pictorial composition. However, they are touched by the illusory expression of the theatrical spectacle that struck them. They will not go too far into the question of why their spectacle of an excellent tragedy has so moved them, but they will be content to have touched them, no matter by what means they have achieved it. The minds will willingly engage in the analysis of the art of erecting buildings or will
penetrate into the performance of any work - including the compilation of seasonings for various stews. The ability to discover the components of the whole well, the dexterity of the worker, the art of achieving success – all this does not concern taste, which seems to declare with a smile to a skillful artist: ‘Act, and I will see what you get as a result of your ability to act.’ But the artist, constantly busy with his work, exhausts himself as a result of incessant art. His feeling is saturated with effects, and moreover so saturated that he, wanting to satisfy himself, in his works is forced to constantly resort to various tricks and countless refinements, thanks to which he always finds himself at least one step ahead of the most attentive of his viewers, and therefore, striving for perfection, may be misunderstood. That's why it's so hard to agree on taste. Alembert argues that an artist should only work for connoisseurs, and that it is worse for viewers if they are ignorant; and, having made art out of music, he would like to create another art out of listening to it, like how the Militia created art out of the ability to see for the
convenience of those who have to show. Too far in their desire to dictate laws go those who wish to control our tastes and force us, because of our weakness, to obey, or blush for our innocent entertainments. In fact, is it worth the labor to study so much and expend so much effort in order to arm oneself with excessive sophistication in the field of pleasure? After all, this quality would also require complete tranquility and ease of spirit, so that a person would be threatened by boredom if he did not resort to the help of fine arts. So, in everything that concerns taste, a constant unevenness of circumstances prevails, and the arrow of the scales invariably hesitates, despite the efforts of high minds to stop it. About what is associated with taste, they still continue to argue, without coming to an agreement. If there were a definite and generally accepted theory of beauty, it would be very good for taste, which ultimately requires only beauty; but artists do not yet have to hope to be enlightened by anyone, and the arts in the meantime need more than ever the means and dissemination in order to be appreciated.
For entertainment must correspond to the degree of growth of culture and sophistication. To understand now what taste is actually interested in now would be to take at least the first step towards knowing what is pleasurable to us, and perhaps to the knowledge of beauty itself, which is nothing more than pleasant in the true sense of the word. Indeed, the cause is interested and given importance only in accordance with the results it has achieved. Nevertheless, it will be appropriate to note here that in practice the distinctive property of beauty is that it deeply touches us and completely possesses us, occupies our senses and fascinates us with strong impressions, often even sad and frightening. On the contrary, the pretty only slightly teases us and entertains us. And the pleasant, apparently, occupies a middle place between them - attracts us more generally and always voluntarily, leaning preferably to the side of the cute, then the beautiful. The enlightened and sharp-minded amateurs, who are strong in their knowledge and wholly devoted themselves to the love of the arts, also set the tone and
command opinion, for they have the time necessary for these pursuits and all the means necessary to give themselves weight and attain fame; and if, in addition to knowledge, they also have good innate abilities that make up the appropriate tact — that inner touchstone that responds to the features of beauty and marks its impact — then they can do art greatly, keep artists at bay, and make the scales tip in the direction they need to. But may the lord of art protect you from simple and dry knowledge and from a mind devoid of naturalness. Then there can be no certainty in anything, the scales oscillate minute by minute following the swing of thoughts, plans, subtleties, witticisms, disputes, and thus taste will not be able to act correctly. Sensual drives are all the more persistent, they are the simplest, and they are satisfied first of all, and, therefore, they do not give much space to human passions. The drives that are generated by a secure life, pampering and an understanding of the meaning of the arts are what exercise the taste more and subject it to the most powerful tests. Thus, it is not so much the vices of the
senses as the restlessness of the mind, curiosity, whims, inventions, whims that muddy its source and weaken its influence, and this is why it is so rare to meet a truly good taste. Thus, the practical application of taste seems to be as much related to the undertaking that reveals, exalts and sustains as with nature, which creates its embryo and principle, and perhaps by better nurturing this embryo it is possible to create a better taste. Therefore, without going into the question of whether it is not better to give taste complete freedom, let us consider how to regulate the application of taste in practice, how to make it more acceptable to all, and how to reach universal agreement so that there is no need to argue about taste anymore. None of our abilities are more in line with common opinion than common sense. There are no intermediate links between it and pure reason, I think. This is his personal Council. Even the mind feels its bridle and is influenced by it, is afraid of it, and cannot escape its dependence on it with impunity.
Finally, *common sense*, by its very nature, evaluates accurately, is free from illusions, and is not at all inclined to argue. Therefore, the less controversy about tastes would arise, the more common sense there would be.
On Beautiful

As for the beautiful in the true sense of the word, the beautiful can be nothing but order. A good order expresses the plot through proper choice of means, from this inevitably flows the beautiful, the delightful, and in the same way the beauty of the Pantheon can equally serve as models of order. Even in nature, the beautiful lies in periodic repetition and symmetry. Of what exists in nature, including trees, flowers and grasses, the most beautiful is the one in which the parts are most correctly distributed – branches and leaves, symmetrically cut and harmoniously colored. Pericles and Augustus believed that when everything is calm in the country, it is desirable to maintain in the citizens with the help of art a love of beauty, that is, under any circumstances to educate them in the idea of the best order of things, exercising feeling and intellect, so that the sense of moral beauty is not lost.
AD FINEM

Consequently, according to Pietro’s statements; expression, is only an emanation of the feeling, from whose depths and depending to our attachments grow and develop, and inspiration most often comes from that point. The imagination is adherent to the canonical observations and on memories experienced, so the fertility depends on the accuracy of the feelings and experiences. Common sense directs the fiction created by the imagination, tolerates the quibbles of wit and fairly evaluates the expressiveness. This primacy of common sense in choosing models or creating ghosts serves as a source of correspondences – qualities that are extremely necessary when they want to make a good impression. The models will not do any good if they are inappropriate and not related to the plot, and the best way to interpret them will be fruitless if it is not dictated by the plot or not fits with it at ease. Talent, ingenuity, enthusiasm also depend on the fruitfulness
of the feeling.

The one who exercises his feeling more will also be able to reveal it to a greater extent and better understand the motives of the impressions and their gradations experienced will be richer in means. In addition, the consciousness of one's own power inspires courage in a person, as well as impulses that give rise to great undertakings. “Great designs are generated by the heart,” said one contemporary writer who is worth as much as any sage of antiquity. Order, clarity, and the vigor of style are other properties associated with the power, inactivity, or anxiety of feeling, and contrary to all the luminaries of knowledge, you will be disordered, incomprehensible, or weak if the pesky passions keep you anxious or prevent you from feeling the sympathy that brings objects closer together, their most characteristic features, and their highest expression. If an artist really has an innate talent, he should strive only to satisfy himself, and then others will be satisfied with it. Pietro states that science, training and knowledge alone will not create an excellent artist.
Knowledge is good when it helps talent, adds new qualities to it and facilitates the execution of ideas. Therefore, one should not give up what can facilitate the path to the goal. The fine arts have brilliant techniques and methods that are infallible as to their conduct and mechanism, and it is absolutely necessary to study and observe them. But this is not enough: the artist must always fully master his art. Knowing and being able to apply knowledge are two very different properties, and they should not be confused. However, there are many people who know a lot, but do not know how to apply their knowledge. In addition to professional knowledge, a professional mind is also necessary.

Pietro in his digression about fine arts states that the man who only knows how to learn and retain has no talent for the fine arts, and the student, to whom everything must be shown, is absolutely unsuitable for this exercise. It is always necessary to know, in the fine arts more than in any other case, that the essential thing is to know how to make good use of what he knows. The student must develop talent and taste
without enslaving it and to excel, they must absolutely have their own personal opinion. Whoever leaves his art as he found it, is a mediocre artist, even after Raphael, Michelangelo and Palladio. It would certainly be more originality in artists, if in schools one were freer to follow one's own particular inclinations. When it comes to know a work to pronounce on its value, as a judge or connoisseur, it is not enough only to be sensitive to the effects, but one must necessarily have all the knowledge that art requires. Pietro recommends the artists to be wise enough to find all the means to make themselves understandable and clear as if it were a matter of agreeing on a language or reading hieroglyphs. Yet, the satisfaction of becoming aware of all the means of art, through which the artist achieves success, is a real pleasure, even if completely different from that of rejoicing in the result alone. This activity interests and pleasantly occupies many amateurs; but usually spirit of analysis and order is tasteless and those who love to penetrate the artifice are usually not very fond of what rejoices and lose the pleasure of illusion, almost like the
theater artists who see things in the wings as they are and not as they appear; and yet they are curious gods prefer to the illusion enjoyed by the audience, the satisfaction of going on stage to see the real state of things. The artist takes advantage of this curiosity of the amateurs who are not content to feel but try to know more, as well as those who need to know in order to feel, and that is why there are so many pedantic, advice distributors and talkers. The skilled artist, who skillfully rides the spirit of the moment will certainly have an ephemeral success, like the opinion and taste that follows. The artist who will wisely deepen the relationships that the objects of art can have with the natural human sensitivity will perhaps be less acclaimed by the best talents of the moment, who erect themselves as judges and who boast of commanding over the arts, but will have a more general and constant success that will be appreciated everywhere and at all times by sensitive and uncorrupted souls.
THE END
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