Winckelmann's elegant simplicity: from three to two dimensions and back again

DRAWING AND WINCKELMANN'S TASTE FOR ELEGANT SIMPLICITY

Amy C. Smith (University of Reading)

In 1769 the potter Josiah Wedgwood (1730–1795) wrote to his business partner, Thomas Bentley, of conquering France: "We will fashion our Porcelain after their own hearts, and captivate them with the *Elegance* and *simplicity* of the Ancients. But do they love *simplicity*? Are you certain the French Nation will be pleased with *simplicity* in their Vessells?"[1] Presumably in response to Bentley's reassurance, Wedgwood enthused: "I am fully satisfyed with your reasons for the *Virtuosi* of France being fond of *Elegant Simplicity*, & shall, more than ever, make the idea a leading principle in my usefull, as well as in our Ornamental works."[2] This exchange attests to the commercial exploitation of an evolving taste, at the end of the eighteenth century, for simple design among a widening circle of aficionados. This essay is an investigation of the contribution of the art of drawing to this trend, as influenced by the pioneer art historian, Johann Joachim Winckelmann (1717–1768). It also considers the difference between the drawn lines of neoclassical artists and those of ancient vase painters whose work inspired them.

The elegant or 'noble simplicity' to which Wedgwood alludes is a catchphrase long associated with Winckelmann, who combined it with 'silent grandeur'.[3] Winckelmann's 'edle Einfalt und stille Grösse', based on the idea of a 'central form', was embodied in ancient vases as well as the statues of Italy.[4] Like so much that Winckelmann publicized, simplicity was already in vogue, although he gave the

[1] Farrar 1903: 301–302.
[2] Farrar 1903: 273 (17 September 1769).
[3] Winckelmann 1765: 30 (IV) and 1885: passim. Stammler 1962.
[4] Stafford 1980: 65.

expression new meaning in the light of his idealizing vision and experience of antiquities. Simplicity had philosophical and aesthetic dimensions. The Académie Lamoignon—Paris' most prestigious seminar group, which met weekly from May 1667, to discuss art, literature, and politics—celebrated the *simplicité* of the Old Testament and *Iliad*, promoting a simpler lifestyle than that of their hedonistic contemporaries.[5] Fénelon, DuBois, Rollin, and Voltaire wrote of 'noble simplicity' and the Earl of Shaftesbury (1671–1713) extolled its virtue in painting.[6] Anne Claude comte de Caylus (1692–1765), the French antiquarian whose works Wedgwood had consulted, first applied simplicity to ancient pots: "The *elegance* and *simplicity* of their shapes merits attention."[7] Winckelmann echoed Caylus' aesthetic concern for shapes in his celebration of the humble finds from Herculaneum:

> What deserves our attention most, in the utensils of the ancients, particularly their vessels, is the *elegant* form of them; a circumstance, in which all our modern artists must yield to the ancients. All those beautiful forms are founded on the principles of good taste, and may be compared with those of a handsome young man, whose attitudes abound with natural graces. It may be said, that this gracefulness extends even to the handles and ears of their vessels. Would our artists but endeavour to imitate them, their works would soon put on another face.[8]

Winckelmann remarks in his landmark *Gedanken über die Nachahmung der griechischen Werke in der Malerei und Bildhauerkunst* (1755) that "all the Greek

[5] LeBrun 1961.
[6] Jackson 1973: 27.
[7] Caylus 1752: 1.41. Wedgwood was lent the first two volumes of Caylus 1752–1767 in 1767 and purchased a copy in 1769: Meteyard 1865: 1, 480 n. 1.
[8] Anon. trans. from the French, 1771 (1762): 78.

painters are allowed is Contour and Expression." Fuseli's translation of Winckelmann's 'Zeichnung und Ausdruck' here into 'Contour and Expression' matches Winckelmann's alternating usage of both 'Zeichnung' and 'Kontur' to denote the contour or outline that defines the image of a person, animal, or inanimate object. In his *Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums* (1764) Winckelmann extends his interest in contour to drawings *on* the vases:

> …just as Raphael's first sketch of his ideas—the contour of a head or a whole figure drawing with a single unbroken sweep of a pen—reveals the master to the connoisseur no less than his finished drawings, so the great dexterity and assurance of ancient artists are seen in these vessels more than in other works. A collection of them is a treasure trove of drawing.[9]

This attention to line and contour permeates all of Winckelmann's written works, culminating in his first chapter of his *Monumenti Antichi Inediti* (1767): "…a constellation of concepts which revolves around the idea of the beautiful, and which had a catalytic effect on the emergence of outline drawing in the late eighteenth century."[10] In calling attention to the elegance of contour drawings of Greek vases and the drawings that decorated them, Winckelmann spawned an aestheticisation of the Greek vase that transformed it from an antiquarian curiosity to high art. Soon the drawings of Greek vases became more influential than the vases *qua* archaeological artefacts. After consideration of the art of early modern drawing and its changing evocation of Greek vases, I will show that Winckelmann's tastes influenced contemporary collectors, notably Sir William Hamilton, the British Envoy to the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, and also artists, and thus extended Europe's value of

[9] Winckelmann 1885: 37; 1765: 52; 2006: 178. See Kreuzer 1959: 36.
[10] Stafford 1980: 65. Winckelmann 1767: 2.1.

simplicity, as exemplified by the drawings of sixteenth-century Renaissance artists, to an enthusiasm for Greek art.[11] While Winckelmann's influence on collectors and *curiosi*, such as Hamilton, was direct, his influence on most artists was indirect, either through the contacts of those whom he influenced (e.g. Wedgwood through Hamilton) or through his publications.[12] In comparing the images on Greek vases—soon known as vase-paintings—to the drawings of Renaissance masters, Winckelmann appealed to the eighteenth-century appreciation of the art of drawing and spread an interest in Greek vases to an ever wider audience. I will explain how that interest eventually affected both the drawings of Greek vases and, with them, the artistry they represented.

The decorations on ancient black- and red-figure vases, nowadays habitually defined as paintings, are rather drawings. While Greek vase painters used colours (white, yellow/gold, coral-red, and purple) to enliven or distinguish figures on some of their works, the majority were applied in a single colour.[13] Their monochrome nature encourages us to call these decorations drawings. The challenge of distinguishing drawing from painting goes back to the invention of painting, according to the Roman scholar Pliny the Elder: "As to the Greeks … all agree that it originated in tracing lines round the human shadow."[14] Winckelmann likewise sees the interconnectedness of drawing and painting and considers illustrations on Greek vases as paintings or preliminary sketches thereof, for example using the word 'Gemälde'.[15] In the main,

[11] Havens 1953.
[12] Schmidt 2004: 15–16. See Smith 2018; Constantine 2001: 23–44, and 1993: esp. 59 (for influence on Hamilton) and Smith 2017 (for influence on the display of art).
[13] Noble 1988.
[14] *NH* 35.5; see also *NH* 35.43
[15] SW III: 397.

however, he describes them as drawings ('Zeichnungen'), as in his September 1767 letter to Johannes Widewelt, the Danish sculptor (1731–1802):

> Hamilton has the most beautiful collection of earthenware vases, and among these the most admirable, the most beautiful, and the most charming drawing of the world, which one only needs to see in order to get a sense of the splendid painting of the ancients.[16]

Winckelmann and other *curiosi* of his time developed a taste for the simple figural drawings or designs —known in Italian as *disegni*—on ancient Greek vases whose shapes exhibit similarly clean contours.[17] By 1789 a 'Platonic' revival saw Blake, Hegel, and Schelling yearning for artworks that were emblems of transcendental reality.[18] They were responding to and popularising a style of drawing whereby a simple line was understood to evoke the essence of a person or eventually a thing.[19] This linear 'international style' of neoclassicism, which succeeded the painterly style of the Rococo, thus resulted both from and in an aesthetic tradition that championed drawing.[20] In Greek vase painting such drawn contours or outlines likewise defined images of persons, animals, or inanimate objects. Thinner drawn lines—what Winckelmann might have referred to as expression ('Ausdruck')—on painted figures on some vases further articulate anatomy, drapery, or other details.

[16] He refers to Hamilton's hydria signed by Meidias, now in the British Museum, inv. no. 1772.3–20.30.+ (E224; BAPD 220497). On this vessel and its historiography see contribution by Lorenz in this volume XX. See also SW III: 383.
[17] Stafford 1980: 71.
[18] Himmelmann 1971: 602; Starobinski 1973: 113; Stafford 1980: 71–72.
[19] Kant 1790: para. 14, prioritised drawing over colouring.
[20] Stafford 1980: 76.

Since at least the fifteenth century artists, collectors, and others had become acquainted with ancient vases and their *disegni* through the medium of drawing. Artists' sketchbooks and collectors' albums included drawings of Greek vessels and, to a lesser degree, the drawings that decorated them. Each of these representations had its own idiosyncrasies—skewed perspectives, biased restorations, occluded or selected details, illustrations of the decorated surfaces rather than the underlying artefact—so that viewers were challenged to understand the archaeological artefact itself. While the watercolours of black- and red-figure vases by Nicolas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc (1580–1637) are clearly and precisely rendered, the drawings in Cassiano dal Pozzo's paper museum vary greatly in their effects.[21] From ca. 1615 Cassiano had sent artists, including Nicolas Poussin, to draw the antiquities of Rome, but most drawings of vessels in his *Antichità diverse* album are copied from earlier codices.[22] These secondary drawings by anonymous artists generally show views of the complete vessels in plausible three-dimensional renderings that convey their roles as functional objects and their images with fidelity.[23]

Michel-Ange de la Chausse's 1706 publication of his cabinet contains chiaroscuro drawings of entire pots shaded so heavily as to obscure some of the figural decoration (Figure 1).[24] By the early eighteenth century vases were shown in exaggerated perspective, with mouths skewed, either turning towards (Figure 1) or away (Figure 2) from the viewer, so as to emphasize the three-dimensionality of the vase. Yet each

[21] For Peiresc see Chamay 1999: 11–15 and Meyer in this volume.
[22] Vaiani 2016: 24–27. Turner (1992: 142) and Herklotz (1999: 138) recognized that two hands were responsible for equal parts of the album.
[23] Dietrich von Bothmer attributed an Apulian bell krater to the Eton-Nika Painter on the basis of its drawing in this album: Burn 2003: 140, fig. 125; Bailey 1992: 19 (Franks II, fol. 106, 482); Vermeule 1960: 32.
[24] Lyons 1992: 2; de Witte 1865: 18.

vase was rendered with the groundline of the figural scene, and thus the scene itself, in an implausibly horizontal alignment.

Figure 1. Drawing of an Attic black-figure amphora. De la Chausse 1706, 100, figs. 1–2..

Figure 2. Drawing of two red-figure amphorae from the collection of the sculptor François Girardon (1628–1715). De Montfaucon 1719, pl. 71.

De la Chausse's drawings are more polished, however, than those in *Spiega de' vasi antichi*, a catalogue published half a century later (1755) to document the collection of Marchese Felice Maria Mastrilli, from the excavations of Greek tombs at Nola, in Campania.[25] The *Spiega* drawings, which are helpfully presented together with measurements and technical details—such as the colour and quality of the clay, and scholarly commentaries—are careful renderings of both the shapes and decoration.[26] Inscriptions are transcribed so as to render the Greek legible to those who could read and understand it. In the same decade Caylus, himself an engraver, began to publish his mammoth seven-volume *Recueil* (1752–1767), with plenteous drawings.[27] As usual for the time, these technically excellent drawings filled in missing parts of the decoration according to the guesswork of the illustrator and inaccurately conveyed transcriptions of the Greek *dipinti*.[28] Whether or not such inaccuracies were intended

[25] Lyons 2007.
[26] Lyons 1992.
[27] See also Meyer in this volume (xxx).
[28] E.g. Caylus 1752: Plate XXV transcribes HO ΠΑΙΣ ΚΑΛΟΣ (meaning 'The boy is beautiful') as HΔΠΔYS/KΔYΔS.

to mislead, by making the Greek illegible, they perpetuated the outdated myth that the artworks were Etruscan rather than Greek.[29]

Figure 3. A Paestan red-figure bell krater attributed to Python, ca. 360–40 BCE. Ure Museum of Greek Archaeology, University of Reading, inv. 51.7.1. Copyright University of Reading.

Figure 4. Passeri 1770, pl. 123, showing the Paestan bell krater in Figure 3.

The *Spiega* drawings remain a unique experiment, for the etchings in Giovanni Battista Passeri's 1767 catalogue, *Picturae Etruscorum in Vasculis nunc primum in unum collectae*, followed de la Chausse's model (e.g. Figure 4, which represents the vase shown in Figure 4). This publication, printed with Winckelmann's permission when he was Papal Antiquary, is illustrated with drawings of the fronts and backs of the vases. In a few cases details of the drawings on the objects were illustrated separately in split reproductions. The relatively arbitrary distinction of fronts from backs—normally divided by the handles on two-handled objects—persists until the present day and conspires to obscure the third dimension of these 'in the round' artefacts.

Passeri's catalogue was published contemporaneously with Winckelmann's own *Monumenti*, itself beset with production and reception problems, not least because of Winckelmann's untimely death in Trieste the next year.[30] Reviewers were disappointed with its illustrations, unsigned—at Winckelmann's insistence—except

[29] For more on Caylus and 'Etruscomania' see Smith 2018: 20–22.
[30] On his death, 420 of the 600 copies remained unsold: Ferrari and Cavadini 2017: 25.

for that of Antinöos, by N. Mogalli.[31] In this iconographic study, originally entitled *Explanation of the difficult points of the mythology, customs and history of the Ancients, taken from unpublished ancient monuments*, Winckelmann subordinated the monuments to the text, which considered only the subjects illustrated on the monuments, specifically illustrations of Homeric mythology.[32] Thus Winckelmann tried to distance himself from the traditional antiquarian publication of monuments, archaeological finds, or engravings thereof. Yet this "degradation of the engraver went hand in hand with the devaluation of the material and visual aspect of the monuments."[33] Tellingly the French translation (1808–1810) was more successful than the original not least because its editor, Antoine Étienne Nicolas Fantin des Odoards (1738–1820), employed an engraver, François Anne David, to update and 'neoclassisize' its drawings.[34]

Figure 5. Drawings of a Nolan amphora from Nola, formerly in the collection of the painter Anton Raphael Mengs. Attributed to the Dutuit Painter. Winckelmann 1767, pl. 159.

Figure 6. Drawing of the scene on the Nolan amphora depicted in Figure 5. D'Hancarville 1766–67, pl. 3.4.

Like most antiquarian works from which he tried to distance his *Monumenti*, Winckelmann had avoided pure outline engravings, except in the case of a Greek vase in the collection of his friend, Anton Raphael Mengs (1728–1779), a Nolan amphora

[31] Winckelmann 1767: pl. 180. Giovanni Battista Casanova (1730–1795) was originally to execute all of them: Lattanzi 2017; Lolla 2002: 436–37.
[32] Winckelmann 1767: 2, 80. He explained the earlier title in a letter to Marpurg, 8 December 1762: Rehm and Diepolder 1952–57: 2, 276.
[33] Lolla 2002: 433–34, quote at 437.
[34] Ferrari and Cavadini 2017: 35–45.

depicting Athena pouring a drink for Herakles (Figure 5).[35] Hamilton published a colour rendition of the same vase (Figure 6), almost simultaneously, in the catalogue of his first collection of vases, *Collection of Etruscan, Greek and Roman antiquities from the cabinet of the Honourable William Hamilton* (1766–67).[36] A comparison of the two is revealing. In the *Monumenti* drawing the drapery folds on Athena's *epiblema* are true to form—pointed rather than rounded—and the proportions of Herakles' kantharos are closer to the Dutuit Painter's rendition. Winckelmann prefers contemporary renderings to earlier ones:

> Three vases, marked with Greek writing, are contained in the Mastrilli collection at Naples, which were made known, from the first time, by the Canon Mazzocchi, badly drawn, and worse engraved; but they appeared afterwards more correctly drawn at the same time with the Hamilton Vases.[37]

AEGR, written by Pierre François Hugues 'Baron' d'Hancarville (1719–1805), was likewise an experimental work that suffered setbacks, mostly of a financial nature.[38] The 520 plates include 99 illustrations of ornaments and 421 of vases, of which 180 were coloured. The coloured plates with richly bordered engravings were sold individually from the outset. The combination of the line and the contrasting colours

[35] D'Hancarville 1766–67: 3, pl. 49. This vase is now in Paris: Louvre G203, BAPD 203142.

[36] The habitual acronym *AEGR* comes from the French name: *Antiquités Etrusques, Grecques Et Romaines, Tirées Du Cabinet De M. Hamilton, Envoyé Extraordinaire De S.M. Britannique En Cours De Naples*. See Lissarrague and Reed 1997 (esp. for its publication in 1767 despite the '1766' date). *AEGR* included some vases that did not belong to Hamilton and did not include all of Hamilton's own collection. Of the forty-one vases Hamilton obtained from the Mastrilli Collection, now in the British Museum, only sixteen were published in *AEGR:* Lyons 1992: 20.

[37] Winckelmann 1849: 263 (III.IV. 13).

[38] Brylowe 2008: 27–28, 35; Lissarrague and Reed 1997: 287; Jenkins 1996: 49. For the reception of Hamilton's catalogues see Kalkanis 2012. See also Dietrich and Gaifmann in this volume.

(red/black) emphasised the two-dimensionality of the art.[39] Some illustrations showed vases as three-dimensional objects, in perspective, while others show 'unrolled' scenes. Many showed decorations as projected on planar surfaces. Few were shown in pure outlines, although d'Hancarville brought attention to the profile drawings of a vase "where all its parts are measured."[40] The drawings of Mengs' Nolan amphora (Figure 5), however, fell short of the promise of "perfection and fidelity in the drawing."[41] D'Hancarville follows Winckelmann in using Raphael to insinuate the value of these paintings: he picks out two vases—one Corinthian and another Attic—as being "not unworthy of Raphael himself".[42] In the "Preliminary Discourse on Painting"—his only text that considers the history of ancient vases—d'Hancarville integrates seventeenth-century French art theory with references to Classical sources and a reproduction of a Raphael drawing from the collection of Queen Christina of Sweden.[43]

Figure 7. Pelike from Nola, attributed to the Niobid Painter. London, British Museum 1772,03.20.23 (E381; BAPD 206984). Photograph Museum.

Hamilton published his second collection between 1791 and 1795, under the title *Collection of Engravings from Ancient Vases mostly of Pure Greek Workmanship Discovered in Sepulchres in the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies*.[44] After the 1772 sale of his first collection to the British Parliament for the British Museum, he had gone to

[39] Rosenblum 1976: 54.
[40] D'Hancarville 1766–67: 1, 152.
[41] D'Hancarville 1766–67: 1, 4.
[42] D'Hancarville 1766–67: 1, 166, with Constantine 1993: 74. For d'Hancarville see also Vickers 1987 and 1985–86; Haskell 1984.
[43] AEGR 2.21; see Weissert 2005: 6 (fig. 5).
[44] Hamilton 1791–95; Lyons 1992: 9. See Petsalis-Diomidis in this volume.

Nola, in Campania, to build this collection around that of the Counts of Porcinari.[45] In his updates to his *Geschichte,* Winckelmann had compared the outline drawings of some such vases from Campania to Raphael's drawings and the late Baroque school of *disegno* in Rome.[46] Hamilton thus judged his second collection to be of better quality than the first, because of its preponderance of Nolan material (e.g. Figure 7), with simpler drawings and shapes than found with the South Italian vases.

Together with his students, the German artist Wilhelm Tischbein, by then Director of the Accademia di Belle Arti di Napoli, painstakingly engraved the illustrations for this publication in outline and with little ornament. Hamilton explains in the introduction: "By these means the purchase becoming easy, it will be in the power of the lovers of antiquity and artists to reap the desired profit from such excellent models."[47] The text hardly refers to anything outside the pictures on the vases, and the simplicity of the drawings does not detract from their primacy. Since few images are of whole vases, however, the detailed drawings of the decorative surfaces triumphed over any other information the objects might provide. The vase's three-dimensional identity and utilitarian function were already forgotten. Tischbein's alternately thick and thin lines seem to evoke the craft of the Greek artists, who used thick lines for contours or outlines and thinner lines for drapery and musculature. This corresponds to Winckelmann's 'contour and expression'. Viewers not familiar with the vases, however, misunderstood the alternating thick and thin lines: according to a drawing

[45] Tischbein stated that there were 1591 vases in Hamilton's second collection: von Alten 1872: 84. See also Lyons 2007. The sale is recorded in National Archives: CE 4, Original Papers, 1743–1946, Acts and Votes of Parliament Relating to the British Museum, 1753–1824 (20 March 1772) 78. Burn (2003: 142) counts 730 vases Hamilton sold to the British Museum.
[46] Winckelmann 1849: 271 (III.IV.35).
[47] Hamilton 1791–95: 2, 4.

convention that evolved in the 1790s, varying thickness was intended to represent pictorial depth and incidental light.[48] It is on this very point that the volume received criticism:

> What shall we say to our state of the Arts in 1795, when professed Artists, and professed dilettanti, have discovered so very unmathematical an idea of form in general, as to publish works copied from the ancients, or invented in their stile, with Outlines *thick and thin alternately*, like the flourishes of a penman? . . . In making this observation, I do not scruple to say, that I allude to two books lately published; the very tasteful Homer and Eschylus of Mr. Flaxman; and the last volume of Sir William Hamilton's Grecian vases. The last volume, so long expected, so earnestly desired, seems to have given a death's blow to all hope of ever seeing a faithful tracing of any antique design on copper-plate, . . . and Mr. Tischbein has presented us with a heavy translation of these Greek vases, finely flourished, but materially unlike the originals, if proportion, character of heads, stile of hair, or flow of drapery, were considered as worth preserving.[49]

It is unlikely that the author, G. Cumberland, had seen Hamilton's originals, certainly not the second collection drawn by Tischbein, as one quarter had drowned off the Scilly Isles on 10 December 1798, in the Colossus shipwreck, and the rest he sold to Thomas Hope for £4724.[50] The works of John Flaxman (1755–1826), to which Cumberland refers, however, spurred the fashion for outline drawing books *all'antica*. When Flaxman went to Rome in 1787 at the behest of Wedgwood, to supervise his modellers, he produced the book illustrations that cemented his fame and influence

[48] Busch 2001: 26–28.
[49] Cumberland 1796: 16.
[50] Smallwood and Woodford 2003; Vickers 1987. See also Petsalis-Diomidis in this volume.

throughout Europe, starting with *The* Odyssey *of Homer* (1793). His crisp outline drawings were mostly works of his imagination.[51] They seem to convey the drawing style of Classical Athenian red-figure artists, whose work was familiar from the finds from Nola that Winckelmann and Hamilton had admired. Flaxman the sculptor, however, had used thinner lines not so much for articulation of musculature and drapery—as had the Classical Greek vase painters—but to 'flesh out' his figures and indicate incidental light that was in turn suggestive of volume and depth and enhanced the three-dimensionality of his figures. As Werner Busch explains, he shared in this style, which emerged in the 1790s, with a disparate international group of neoclassical artists in Italy and Germany, especially Antonio Canova (1757–1822) and Asmus Jacob Carstens (1754–1798).[52]

Thomas Kirk, a painter and engraver also associated with the Royal Academy, illustrated and edited *Outlines from the Figures and Compositions upon the Greek, Roman, and Etruscan Vases of the late Sir William Hamilton* (1804), "a safe, politically and morally redeemed rendering of Hamilton's projects into a single-volume, English-language-only anthology."[53] Kirk also embraced the idealisation of classical beauty, as he claims to have selected the most tasteful scenes from Hamilton's two publications. He thus put yet another filter—an artist's curatorial hand—between the viewer and the object. This hand also lessened the contrast of thick and thin lines and thus further simplified even Tischbein's lines, which had been influential because of their simplicity. Kirk seems not to have been familiar with the actual vases; while he cites printed sources, he makes no reference to the Hamilton

[51] Watkins and Bindman 2013; Wickham 2010; Wiebensohn 1964: 35.
[52] Busch 2001: 11.
[53] Brylowe 2008: 47.

collection in the British Museum.[54] As drawings are 'copies' of the originals that they render, it is naturally easier to reproduce the drawings than the original three-dimensional objects that they represent. Kirk's drawings conveyed little of the artistry of the originals, but through them Hamilton's vases finally reached a wider audience at an affordable price: £2 2s as compared to £20–40 for a four-volume folio set.[55]

Hamilton had been neither earnest nor effective in his attempts to make the publication of his first collection accessible to artists.[56] Despite his "... hope that Artists, thus enlightened in the true principles of their Art, will soon annihilate those Gothick forms which habit alone renders supportable," *AEGR* illustrations came at a price well beyond the reach of the average artist, for he had prepared his catalogue to be "equally proper for the compleating of a well understood Collections of Prints and designs, or to furnish in a manner not only agreeable but useful and instructive, the Cabinet of a Man of Taste and letters."[57] In the end his expensive volumes were fit for the cabinets of princes, so Hamilton wrote to Wedgwood in March 1773, promising to send rather than sell him the plates. When Hamilton's brother-in-law, Lord Cathcart, eventually lent the plates to Wedgwood, the artist

> … endeavoured to preserve the stile and spirit or if you please the *elegant simplicity* of the antique forms, and so doing to introduce all the variety I was able, and thus Sir W. Hamilton assures me I may venture to do, and that it is the true way of copying the antique.[58]

---

[54] Kirk 1804: v.
[55] *Edinburgh Review* 8 (1804) 487.
[56] Constantine 2001: 73.
[57] D'Hancarville 1766 (1767): preface (repeated in *Geschichte* [SW III: 396]) and 1, 168.
[58] Finer and Savage 1965: 317 (28 June 1789) and 62, for Lord Cathcart. For Wedgwood's relationship with Hamilton see Ramage 1990.

Hamilton was also emphatic about the importance of autopsy, and in the aforementioned note to Wedgwood encouraged him "… to be very attentive to the *simplicity* and *elegance* of the forms, which is the chief article, and you cannot consult the originals in the museum too often."[59] Wedgwood shared Hamilton's hope that "The collection of Etruscan vases in the British Museum will ever be resorted to for the finest models of *elegant* and *simple* forms."[60] His enthusiasm for first-hand study is evidenced by his investigation of the Portland (or Barberini) vase. This cameo—'myrrhine'—glass amphora, first recorded by Peiresc, had been in the collection of the Barberini family for 150 years, until James Byres sold it to Hamilton in 1782.[61] When Hamilton auctioned it, in 1784, Flaxman wrote to Wedgwood urging him to come to London to see the vase, as he had just done.[62] Wedgwood had been trying to copy the work, which he finally obtained on loan from the son of its owner, the Duchess of Portland. Then he complained to Hamilton:

> When I first engaged in this work, and had Montfaucon [1719] only to copy, I proceeded with spirit, and sufficient assurance that I should be able to equal, or excel if permitted, that copy of the vase; but now that I can indulge myself with full and repeated examinations of the original work itself, my crest is much fallen, and I should scarcely muster sufficient resolution to proceed if I had not, too precipitately perhaps, pledged my self to many of my friends to attempt it in the best manner I am able.[63]

[59] Morrison 1893: 1, 19.
[60] 16 June 1787 from Wedgwood to Hamilton. Finer and Savage 1965: 307.
[61] The vase is now in London, British Museum 1945,0927.1.
[62] Reilly 1992: 315.
[63] Finer and Savage 1965: 295. Just as Montfaucon's work had provided him source material, Wedgwood had freely used Caylus' *Recueil* as a source of inspiration rather than reproduction in his creation of lamps, cameos, plaques and vases.

Figure 8. A page from Flaxman's sketchbook depicting, among other things, the pelike shown in Figure 7. Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge.

Figure 9. Frontispiece of d'Hancarville 1767, with a dedication to Hamilton's stepbrother, King George III, showing the pelike illustrated in Figure 7.

Flaxman's zeal for autopsy is likewise evidenced by his use of real Greek ceramics in his studio, although he also made use of drawings of Hamilton's collections: perhaps Wedgwood had given him access to the *AEGR* plates. A page from Flaxman's sketchbook (Figure 8) reproduces the shape and designs from a pelike now in the British Museum (Figure 7) that had been in the collections of both Mastrilli and Hamilton and is published in *AEGR*.[64] Although the British Museum purchased it from Hamilton in 1772, it is unlikely to have been displayed there before 1773. Flaxman's acquaintance with it through *AEGR*, however, is revealed by the fact that his copy of the shape of this vase at the top (near centre) repeats its depiction in the lower right corner of the frontispiece to that volume (Figure 9). Flaxman also used Tischbein's simple line drawings of Hamilton's second collection, for his *Odyssey* illustrations as well as his work for Wedgwood. His 1776 *Apotheosis of Homer* scene is based on Tischbein's drawing of Hamilton's calyx krater, now in the British Museum, that shows a musical contest.[65]

[64] Ramage 1989. The vase is illustrated in d'Hancarville 1766–67: 1, pl. 122.
[65] London, British Museum 1772,03.20.26 (E460; BAPD 213525); Hamilton 1791: fig. 130. On the *Odyssey* illustrations, see Schmidt 2005; Burn 2003: 144; Wiebensohn 1964.

Figure 10. Blue-and-white transfer ware dresser plate from the Greek series, after 1806, depicting Zeus with his thunderbolt. Photograph by the author, with the kind permission of the Trustees of the Spode Museum Trust.

Figure 11. Hamilton 1791, 1, pl. 31, source image of the vase shown in Figure 10.

It is clear that, despite the absorption of private collections into public museums, most designers employed in the potteries worked primarily from drawings and not from the pots, in their adoption, imitation and replication of forms and designs from antiquity. Wedgwood's enthusiasm for first-hand scrutiny of the Portland Vase, noted above, is in fact the exception that emphasises the rarity of his opportunity. Were Wedgwood and Flaxman's contemporaries also influenced by *AEGR* or other publications of vase collections? Flaxman included *AEGR* among desiderata of 'Books essentially useful in the Arts', and the Royal Academy Council resolved to purchase, but "…there is no evidence of a copy having entered the RA Library until the present incomplete set arrived on 6 August 1835 as part of Prince Hoare's bequest to the Academy of books and prints from his library in London."[66] Perhaps the relative expense and unavailability of Hamilton's first vase publication simply inhibited artists from receiving inspiration from it. The influence of the catalogue of the second collection was greater than that of the first, because of both its simpler lines drawings and the fact that it was translated quickly into German, from 1797–1800. Yet Kirk's drawings that were adaptations of Tischbein's (as explained above) were even simpler. Josiah Spode II (1755–1827) reproduced pots from both of Hamilton's collections in his

[66] At a meeting on 23 October 1801 (Council Minutes III, 113-14). https://www.royalacademy.org.uk/art-artists/book/collection-of-etruscan-greek-and-roman-antiquities-from-the-cabinet-of-the (accessed 7 July 2018).

'Greek' series of blue-and-white transfer ware from 1806 (Figures 10–11).[67] In creating the transfers Spode's designers are said to have consulted primarily Kirk's secondary engravings in *Outlines*.[68]

Winckelmann's greatest influence on painters and sculptors was through his last publication, *Monumenti*, ironically insofar as its 100 engravings were more influential than the text. Despite complaints about their quality, many of these engravings were copied, for example, by Mengs (e.g. *Perseus and Andromeda*, 1777), Jacques-Louis David (*Leonidas at Thermopylae*, 1811-1814), and Canova (*Theseus and Minotaur*, 1783). In Mengs, with whom he had worked on the decoration of the Villa Albani, Winckelmann had found a partner for his theorizing on lines, enthusiasm for Greek design, and imitation of antiquity.[69] He had dedicated his *Geschichte* to Mengs, whom he then considered the best modern painter, bar Raphael himself, but by the 1760 publication of *Description des pierres gravées du feu Baron de Stosch*, Winckelmann abandoned his idea that modern art could match that of antiquity.[70] In *Abhandlung von der Fähigkeit der Empfindung des Schönen in der Kunst und dem Unterrichte in derselben* (1763), he writes rather of observation and contemplation of beauty.[71] By the 1767 publication of *Monumenti*, Winckelmann had lost hope that Mengs might herald an artistic renaissance. In the *Monumenti* preface he complains that aesthetics had been subordinated to hermeneutic and antiquarian expectations; encourages artists to attend to 'manners' of antiquity; and concludes that the Greek imagination—not

[67] http://www.spodeceramics.com/pottery/printed-designs/patterns/literature-mythology-arts/greek (accessed 7 July 2018).
[68] Williams 1949: 185. Brylowe 2008.
[69] Potts 1980. See also Roettgen 2013: 125 and 2003: 2, 156–62
[70] Micheli (2017: 261) suggests Winckelmann's work on the Stosch gems, from 1757, encouraged him to champion the primacy of the 'pure line of design'.
[71] Lattanzi 2017.

climate—was responsible for the beauty of their art.[72] According to Heyne and others, Winckelmann had taken on the guise of an antiquarian.[73]

Conclusion

In the second half of the eighteenth century the Greek vase was subjected to competing interests—aesthetic, mercantile, and technical—that agreed on the line as the preferred means of representation of the profile of a vessel and any figural decoration thereon. The vase is not alone: to this day much archaeological material is represented by drawings that make it easily intelligible to students and scholars trained in the conventions of its presentation. The drawn line has prevailed as a design element and as the preferred means of archaeological illustration. The reasons for its persistence range from its ease of execution and effectiveness in communication to the relative economy of its reproduction. The ancient Greek vase itself was redefined, at the end of the eighteenth century, particularly by those who had not seen it first hand. Those beyond the elite circles of collectors and antiquaries familiar with the history of drawings of Greek vases could have misunderstood or ignored the conventions whereby it had come to be presented in a linear two-dimensional format. It evolved from a shapeless and disproportionate three-dimensional artefact hidden in the shadows of Renaissance antiquarian texts to a bearer of meaning, conveyed through precise yet subjective linear renderings of its figural scenes. The Greek vase thus played an important part in the triumph of the line, by the nineteenth century. Since then the Greek vase has been represented, and thus remembered and revered, as a simple image on a flat surface, while the vessel itself, its material constitution, has often been side-lined.

[72] Winckelmann 1767: xxxvi.
[73] Heyne 1963: 23; see Harloe 2017.

D'Hancarville's foldout pages and idealized, coloured, but flattened images of the scenes with which Hamilton's Greek vases were decorated have been reproduced and redrawn in subsequent scholarship. Their contrasting black and red colours draw attention to the contour line that separates the colours and thus reinforces the flatness of the image. Yet each redrawing introduces new stylistic changes and aberrations from the original vase 'paintings' that they sought to illustrate. The 'expression', the thinnest lines that describe the details of musculature, drapery, and much else, are lost from all but the most precise renderings.

The proliferation of drawings of Greek vases—which did not constitute the art that Caylus, Hamilton, and Winckelmann had urged artists to create in imitation of ancient vases—perhaps discouraged Winckelmann's zeal for the art of imitation.[74] Do viewers of Flaxman's art—whether flat line drawings or the three-dimensional reliefs produced by Wedgwood —realise that his ancient creations are largely imaginary? Does it matter to them? The gaudy orange outlines on Spode's blue-and-white 'Greek' pattern (Figure 9) recall the shapes of the original Greek vessels whose drawings Kirk purported to represent. Yet Kirk's drawings are third- or fourth-generation copies, as he had copied Tischbein's drawings, some off which were based on the drawings of Neapolitan engravers, few of whom were lucky enough to have had a brief encounter with an original Greek vase. Such drawings and replications in pottery took the British upper-middle class of the early nineteenth century and later generations far from the actual Greek vase. Would these viewers in turn be disappointed if confronted with the breadth of shapes, decorative styles, and figural

[74] Caylus 1952: 1.114–15.

images represented by Hamilton's actual vase collection? Perhaps, if their first point of contact with a Greek vase had been its flattened two-dimensional image on a nineteenth-century plate. Or perhaps not, if they had first encountered Greek vases through Hamilton's *AEGR*, which had given Flaxman multiple ways of viewing a single Nolan amphora. After copying these views into his notebook (Figure 10) and contemplating the possibilities, he replicated its light-on-dark scene on a 'black basalt' lebes gamikos and adapted it to a dark-on-light 'encaustic' painting on one of Wedgwood's caneware products.[75] At least Flaxman, for one, fulfilled Winckelmann's wish, to capture the spirit of the ancients without slavish copying, but mediated through his own distinctive style.[76]

[75] Black basalt lebes gamikos: London, British Museum 2011,5015.1.
[76] Ramage 1989: fig. 5.

Bibliography

Von Alten, F. (ed.). 1872. *Aus Tischbeins Leben und Briefwechsel* (Leipzig: E.A. Seemann).

Bailey, D.M. 1992.'Small Objects in the dal Pozzo–Albani Drawings: Early Gatherings' in I. Jenkins and J. Montagu (eds), *Cassiano dal Pozzo's Paper Museum* (Milan: Olivetti) 3–30.

Brylowe, T. 2008. 'Two kinds of collections: Sir William Hamilton's vases, real and represented', in *Eighteenth-Century Life* 32: 23–56.

Burn, L. 2003. 'Words and pictures: Greek vases and their classification', in K. Sloan and A. Burnett (eds), *Enlightenment. Discovering the World in the Eighteenth Century* (London: BM Press) 140–49.

Busch, W. 2001. 'Die Neudefinition der Umrißzeichnung in Rom am Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts', in M. Stuffmann and W. Busch (eds), *Zeichnen in Rom 1790–1830* (Cologne: Walther König) 11–44.

De Caylus, A.C. 1752–67. *Recueil d'antiquités égyptiennes, etrusques, grecques et romaines* (Paris: Duchesne).

Chamay, J. 1999.'Nicolas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc (1580–1637): Der größte Raritätensammler seiner Zeit' in M. Flashar ed., *Europa à la Grecque. Vasen machen Mode* (Munich: Biering & Brinkmann) 11–17.

De la Chausse, M.-A. 1706. *Le grand cabinet Romain ou recueil d'antiquitez romaines* (Amsterdam).

—1993. 'Winckelmann and Sir William Hamilton', *Oxford German Studies* 22: 55–80.

Constantine, D. 2001. *Fields of Fire* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson).

Cumberland, G. 1796. *Thoughts on Outline*, *Sculpture, and the System That Guided the Ancient Artist in Composing Their Figures and Groups* (London: W. Wilson).

Farrar, K.E. (ed.) 1903. *Letters of Josiah Wedgwood 1762 to 1770*. Repr. 1982 (Manchester: E.J. Morten Ltd.).

Ferrari, S. and N.J. Cavadini (eds). 2017. *J.J. Winckelmann (1717–1768).* Monumenti antichi inediti. *Storia di un'opera illustrata* (Milan: Skira).

Finer, A. and G. Savage (eds). 1965. *The Selected Letters of Josiah Wedgwood* (London: Cory, Adams & Mackay).

Hamilton, W. 1791–95. *Collection of Engravings from Ancient Vases mostly of Pure Greek Workmanship Discovered in Sepulchres in the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies* (Naples).

D'Hancarville, P. 1766–67 (1767–76). *Collection of Etruscan, Greek and Roman antiquities from the cabinet of the Honourable William Hamilton* (Naples).

Harloe, K. 2017. 'Kritische Zeitgenossen: Lessing, Heyne, Herder' in M. Disselkamp and F. Testa (eds), *Winckelmann-Handbuch: Leben–Werk–Wirkung* (Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler) 258–67.

Haskell, F. 1984. 'D'Hancarville: An adventurer and art-historian in eighteenth-century Europe' in E. Chaney and N. Ritchie (eds), *Oxford, China and Italy: Writings in Honour of Sir Harold Acton* (Florence) 177–91.

Havens, R.D. 1953. 'Simplicity, a Changing Concept', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 14: 3–32.

Herklotz, I. 1999. *Cassiano dal Pozzo und die Archäologie des 17. Jahrhunderts*. Munich.

Heyne, C.G. 1963. 'Loebschrift auf Winckelmann', in A. Schulz (ed.), *Die Kasseler Lobscriften auf Winckelmann* (Berlin: Winckelmann Gesellschaft) 17–27.

Himmelmann, N. 1971, 'Winckelmanns Hermeneutik', in *Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur* 12 (Mainz).
Hofter, M.R. 1999. '"Johann Joachim Winckelmann und die '"hetrurischen Gefässe"' in M. Flashar ed., *Europa à la Grecque. Vasen machen Mode* (Munich: Biering & Brinkmann) 18–27.
Jackson, W. 1973. *Immediacy. The Development of a Critical Concept from Addison to Coleridge* (Amsterdam: Rodopi).
Jenkins, I. 1996. '"Contemporary minds". Sir William Hamilton's Affair with Antiquity', in I. Jenkins and K. Sloan (eds), *Vases & Volcanoes. Sir William Hamilton and his Collection* (London: British Museum Press) 40–64.
Kalkanis, E. 2012. 'The Visual Dissemination of Sir William Hamilton's Vases and their Reception by Early 19th-Century Scholarship (c. 1800s–1820s)', *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 75: 487–514.
Kant, I. 1790. *Critik der Urtheilskraft* (Berlin: Lagard und Friederich).
Kirk, T. 1804. *Figures and Compositions upon the Greek, Roman, and Etruscan Vases of the late Sir William Hamilton* (London: William Miller).
Kreuzer, I. 1959. *Studien zu Winckelmanns Aesthetik: Normativität und historisches Bewusstsein* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag).
Lattanzi, L. 2017. 'The artistic reception of Winckelmann's *Monumenti Antichi Inediti* in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries', in S. Ferrari and N.J. Cavadini (eds), *J.J. Winckelmann (1717–1768).* Monumenti antichi inediti. *Storia di un'opera illustrata* (Milan: Skira) 125–45.
LeBrun, J. 1961. 'Le Père Pierre Lalemant et les débuts de l'Académie Lamoignon', *Revue d'Histoire littéraire de la France* 61: 153–76.
Lissarrague, F. and M. Reed. 1997. 'The collector's books', *Journal of the History of Collections* 9: 275–94.
Lolla, M.G. 2002. 'Monuments and Texts: Antiquarianism and the beauty of antiquity', *Art History* 25: 431–49.
Lyons, C.L. 1992. 'The Museo Mastrilli and the culture of collecting in Naples, 1700–1755', *Journal of the History of Collections* 4: 1–26.
— 2007. 'Nola and the historiography of Greek vases', *Journal of the History of Collections* 19: 239–47.
Meteyard, E. 1865–66. *The life of Josiah Wedgwood, from his private correspondence and family papers in the possession of Joseph Mayer, F. Wedgwood, C. Darwin, Miss Wedgwood and other original sources with an introductory sketch of the art of pottery in England*. 2 vols. (London: Hurst and Blackett).
Meyer, H.C. xxx (forthcoming)
Micheli, M.E. 2017. 'Lanze e Winckelmann. Una Nota', in B. Arbeid, S. Bruni, and M. Iozzo (eds), *Winckelmann, Firenze e gli Etruschi. Il padre dell'archeologia in Toscana*. *Catalogo della mostra Firenze, Museo Archeologico Nazionale.* 26 maggio 2016–30 gennaio (Pisa) 261–72.
de Montfaucon, B. 1719. *L'Antiquité expliquée et représentée en figures* (Paris (1722–1724).
Morrison, A. 1893. *The collection of autograph letters and historical documents formed by Alfred Morrison. The Hamilton and Nelson papers*. 2 vols. (London).
Noble, J.V. 1988. *The techniques of painted Attic pottery*, rev. ed. (London: Thames & Hudson).
Passeri, G.B. 1767–75. *Picturae Etruscorum in Vasculis nunc primum in unum collectae* (Rome: J. Zempel).

Potts, A. 1980. ‘Greek Sculpture and Roman Copies I: Anton Raphael Mengs and the Eighteenth Century’, in *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 43: 150–73.
Ramage, N.H. 1989. ‘Owed to a Grecian urn: the debt of Flaxman and Wedgwood to Hamilton’, *Ars Ceramica* 6: 8-12.
— 1990. ‘Wedgwood and Sir William Hamilton: Their personal and artistic relationship’, *Proceedings of the Thirty-fifth Wedgwood International Seminar* (Birmingham, Al.): 71-90. http://issuu.com/josiahw/docs/1968-3/3?e=0.
Rehm, W. and Diepolder, H. (eds). 1952–57. *Winckelmanns* Briefe. 4 vols. (Berlin: De Gruyter).
Reilly, R. 1992. *Josiah Wedgwood* (London: Macmillan).
Roettgen, S. 1999–2003. *Anton Raphael Mengs. 1728–1779*. 2 vols. (Munich: Hirmer).
— 2013. ‘German Painters in Naples and Their Contribution to the Revival of Antiquity, 1760–1799’, in C.C. Mattusch (ed.), *Rediscovering the Ancient World on the Bay of Naples, 1710–1890. Studies in the History of Art* 79. *CASVA Symposium Papers* 66: 123–40.
Rosenblum, R. 1976. *The International Style about 1800. A Study in Linear Abstraction* (New York: Garland).
Schmidt, S. 1999. ‘“Ein Schatz von Zeichnungen”. Die Erforschung antiker Vasen im 18. Jahrhundert’, in M. Flashar (ed.), *Europa à la Grecque. Vasen machen Mode*. (Munich: Biering & Brinkmann) 28–47.
— 2004. ‘Sammler – Abenteurer – Antiquare. Die Erforschung und Publikation antiker Vasen im 18. Jahrhundert’, in H.U. Cain et al. (eds), *Faszination der Linie. Griechische Zeichenkunst auf dem Weg von Neapel nach Europa* (Leipzig: Antikenmuseum der Universität Leipzig) 8–20.
— 2005. ‘Die Ausdruckskraft der Linie. Tischbein, Flaxman und die Asthetikder Umrißradierung’, in M. Petras (ed.), *Hancarville und die Hamiltonsche Vasensammlung* (Stendal: Winckelmann Stiftung) 31-40.
Smallwood, V. and S. Woodford. 2003. *CVA Great Britain* 10. *Fragments from Sir William Hamilton’s Second Collection of Vases Recovered from the Wrech of HMS Colossus* (London: British Museum Press).
Smith, A.C. 2017. ‘Winckelmann, Greek Masterpieces, and Architectural Sculpture: Prolegomena to a History of Classical Archaeology in Museums’, in A. Lichtenberger and R. Raja (eds), *The Diversity of Classical Archaeology*. *Studies in Classical Archaeology* 1: 23–46.
— 2018. ‘Greek vases in Naples’ ottocento laboratory of curiosity’, in K. Harloe, C. Neagu and A.C. Smith (eds), *Winckelmann and Curiosity in the 18th-Century Gentleman’s Study* (Oxford: Christ Church) 9–38.
Stammler, W. 1962. ‘“Edele Einfalt” zur Geschichte eines Kunsttheoretischen Topos’ in *Wort und Bild. Studien zu den Wechselbeziehungen zwischen Schrifttum und Bildkunst im Mittelalter* (Berlin: E. Schmidt) 161–92.
Starobinski, J. 1973. *1789—Les emblems de la raison* (Paris: Flammarion).
Stafford, B.M. 1980. ‘Beauty of the Invisible: Winckelmann and the Aesthetics of Imperceptibility’, in *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 43, 65–78.
Turner, N.J.L. 1993. ‘Some of the copyists after the Antique employed by Cassiano’, in *The Paper Museum of Cassiano dal Pozzo. Quaderni Puteani* 4 (Milan) 27–37.
Vaiani, E. 2016. *The Paper Museum of Cassiano dal Pozzo. A Catalogue Raisonée*. Series A. *Antiquities and Architecture*. Part 5. *The Antichità diverse album* (London: Harvey Miller Publishers).

Vermeule, C.C. 1960. ‘The Dal Pozzo-Albani drawings of classical antiquities in the British Museum’, *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 50: 5–78.
Vickers, M. 1985-86. ‘Imaginary Etruscans: Changing Perceptions of Etruria since the Fifteenth Century’ in *Hephaistos* 7–8: 153–68.
— 1987. ‘Value and Simplicity: Eighteenth-century Taste and the Study of Greek Vases in *Past & Present* 116: 98–137.
Watkins, J. and D. Bindman. 2013, *John Flaxman: Line to Contour* (Birmingham: Ikon).
Weissert, C. 2005. ‘Kunsttheorie versus Wissenschaft. D’Hancarvilles Kritik an den bemalten antiken Vasen’. in *Arbeitskreises für Theorie und Geschichte der Kunstgeschichtsschreibung* 4: 7–20.
Wickham, A. 2010. *The language of line: John Flaxman’s illustrations to the works of Homer and Aeschylus* (London: Royal Academy of Arts).
Wiebenson, D. 1964. ‘Subjects from Homer’s *Iliad* in Neoclassical Art’, *The Art Bulletin* 1: 23–47.
Williams, S.B. 1949. *Antique blue and white Spode*, 3rd ed., repr. 1987 (London: Batsford).
Winckelmann, J.J. 1765. *Reflections on the painting and sculpture of the Greeks: with instructions for the connoisseur, and an essay on grace in works of art.* Trans H. Fusseli (London: A. Millar).
— 1849. *The History of ancient Art Among the Greeks*, trans. G.H. Lodge (Boston: Monroe).
— 1885. *Gedanken über die Nachahmung der griechischen Werke in der Malerei und Bildhauerkunst. Erste ausgabe 1755 mit Oesers Vignetten* (Stuttgart: Göschen).
— 1965. *Sämtliche Werke*, J. Eiselein (ed.), 12 vol. (Donaueschingen) 1825–29, repr. Osnabrück.
De Witte, J. 1865. *Études sur les Vases Peints* (Paris: aux bureaux de la gazette des beaux-arts).