



## India in Florence: Angelo de Gubernatis and the shaping of Italian Orientalism (1860-1900)

Filipa Lowndes Vicente

To cite this article: Filipa Lowndes Vicente (2021): India in Florence: Angelo de Gubernatis and the shaping of Italian Orientalism (1860-1900), Journal of Modern Italian Studies, DOI: [10.1080/1354571X.2021.1883935](https://doi.org/10.1080/1354571X.2021.1883935)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1354571X.2021.1883935>



Published online: 22 Mar 2021.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

---



## India in Florence: Angelo de Gubernatis and the shaping of Italian Orientalism (1860-1900)

Filipa Lowndes Vicente

Instituto de Ciências Sociais, Universidade de Lisboa\*

### ABSTRACT

Florence as the capital for a new united Italy became a flourishing, and brief, centre for Indian studies. This experience was always entangled with Angelo De Gubernatis's biography and initiatives and when he left for Rome, the city lost its role. Having decided to leave his rich and prolific archive in Florence's main public library meant, however, that Gubernatis returned to the city and placed it on the map of 19th century "oriental studies". Through congresses, exhibitions, museums, a worldwide network of correspondents, journals, academic teaching and travel writing and the protagonism of Angelo de Gubernatis, "oriental", "India" and "Sanskrit" became recurrent words in the Renaissance city and spaces of physical and intellectual encounter between scholars of different origins. In my paper I will also analyse how the investment in "oriental studies" became part of a strategy of affirmation of the new nation of Italy within Europe and within a wider geography where knowledge circulated through written, visual and material forms.

### RIASSUNTO

Capitale dell'Italia appena unita, Firenze divenne, seppur per un breve periodo, un fiorentino centro di studi indiani. Questa esperienza si intrecciò con la biografia e l'attività di Angelo de Gubernatis, tanto da perdere questo suo ruolo quando l'intellettuale si trasferì a Roma. La decisione di lasciare il suo ricco e abbondante archivio alla Biblioteca Nazionale di Firenze, significò, comunque, che De Gubernatis tornasse a Firenze, fissando così la città nella mappa degli studi orientali del XIX secolo. Attraverso congressi, esposizioni, musei, una fitta rete internazionale di corrispondenti, riviste, corsi universitari, scritti di viaggio e l'attività di Angelo de Gubernatis, "Oriente", "India" e "Sanskrito" divennero parole ricorrenti nella città rinascimentale e luoghi di incontro fisico e intellettuale fra ricercatori di varia origine. Questo articolo analizza inoltre anche come l'investimento negli "studi orientali" sia divenuto parte della strategia di affermazione dell'Italia come nuova nazione sia in Europa sia in un contesto geografico più ampio, dove la circolazione della conoscenza avveniva attraverso forme scritte, visuali e materiali.

**KEYWORDS** Angelo de Gubernatis; Florence; Oriental congresses, museums and journals; 19th century orientalism; knowledge production; Indian studies

**PAROLE CHIAVE** Angelo de Gubernatis; Firenze; Congressi, musei e riviste sull'Orientalismo; Orientalismo ottocentesco; Produzione di conoscenza; Studi indiani

\*Av. Professor Aníbal de Bettencourt 9, 1600-189 Lisboa, Portugal.

## Florence: the place of the archive

The vast archive of Angelo De Gubernatis (1840–1913) – which includes hundreds of boxes containing letters from an immense list of correspondents, papers and several photographs – is deposited in the ‘Manuscripts’ section of the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale in Florence.<sup>1</sup> Gubernatis had requested that his personal library (now part of the general library) and his correspondence with thousands of people, the result of a long and rich life of personal relations, should be deposited there, after his death. Most of his correspondence was with men, but also with some women, who wrote and sent letters from far distant corners of the world – first to Florence and then to Rome, after Gubernatis moved there. Many topics and issues were addressed in this *carteggio* (correspondence), reflecting the curious and ambitious dilettantism of a man who always combined writing and scholarship with multiple forms of ‘doing’. He organized congresses, exhibitions and museums, created societies, associations and institutions, founded numerous journals and made long trips to different parts of the world. He was also an avid writer and published books and articles, in a wide array of different genres and formats – including dictionaries, encyclopaedias, stage plays, travel books and even an autobiography at the end of his life.

But his notoriety in these different fields of knowledge does not seem to have always been a synonym for prestige and respect among his peers, who were somewhat sceptical about the excesses of someone who wrote so profusely about absolutely everything (Cimino and Scialpi 1974, 148–149). Some commentators considered that the broad spectrum of his paths of research diverted him from any specialist knowledge, or depth. But in his autobiography, *Fibra. Pagine di Ricordi*, published late in life, as he looked back at his achievements, he remarked:

Whoever accuses me of doing too many things, then tell me if I have done so coldly. It is true, outrageously true. I have fuelled several different passions over the course of my life: theatre, school, history, biography, literature, mythology, folklore, Manzoni, Dante, the Orient, India and, above all, Italy. (Gubernatis 1900, 393; see also Fabbri 2017, 2018)

His archive in Florence offers material proof of these many passions. He himself was aware that his exuberance often disturbed his critics’ ‘blessed academic dreams’. Taking advantage of the freedom offered by writing his memoirs he replied: whoever had achieved more and better should throw the first stone (Gubernatis 1900, 393).

Gubernatis consolidated his career as an academic, intellectual and writer from his base in Florence, expanding the topics of his research and writing, while taking an active role in helping forge the new united Italy. With so many interests, an intense civic life and prolific activity, he soon stood out primarily in two areas – literary studies and Indian studies, becoming a central figure in

Italian orientalism in the second half of the nineteenth century. One of these themes was Indian literature and linguistics, but he often repeated that his main interest was Hindu religious culture, which was inseparable from the Sanskrit language. In this article I aim to trace the context of the fleeting but intense phenomenon of 'Florentine Orientalism'. I will try to demonstrate how it was 'invented' by Angelo De Gubernatis, in his attempt to make the city a centre of Indian studies that would stand out not only in the new united Italy, but also in Europe and even in the broader geographical context of Asian studies, including studies pursued in Asia itself. A wide array of magazines, books, museums, exhibitions, congresses emerged, all containing the word 'Indian', 'Oriental', or 'Asian' in order to clearly identify the sphere of knowledge to which they were dedicated. The proof that Angelo de Gubernatis' name is inseparable from Florence as an 'Orientalist' centre is that after he moved to Rome, Florence lost its influence on the Italian map, its fragile identity soon fading. This period was short-lived and was linked to a limited geographic area, circumscribed in time and space, but it was sufficiently intense to leave legacies and remnants, including magazines and books in libraries, catalogues, lithographs or photographs from the Oriental exhibition in 1878 or the Indian Museum in 1886. Gubernatis exchanged numerous letters with the countless participants in his initiatives. These archaeological vestiges are no longer visible in today's Florence, where the Renaissance layers tend to preclude all others, even more recent periods, up until the present day.

Durba Ghosh (2005) identifies his archive as a 'contact zone'. In the second half of the nineteenth century, Florence was effectively a globalized, cosmopolitan, transnational and trans-colonial 'contact zone': a place where many men, and also some women, wrote to Angelo De Gubernatis from around the world. The main form of correspondence was letters, which was the dominant mode of communication and became even easier in the nineteenth century due to the international development of post offices. But we also find postcards, or even photographs (*carte-de-visite*) that were small enough to fit inside an envelope. The subject of much of the correspondence was the institutions, magazines, books, dictionaries, exhibition spaces, or congresses that Gubernatis created, published or organized, first in Florence, and then in Rome.

What was the broader context that explains the existence of something like the De Gubernatis archive in Florence? Why did he donate it to the library in Florence rather than that in Rome, given that he lived the latter part of his life in the city, which became the Italian capital? De Gubernatis' archive, in Florence, in an apparently peripheral location, both in historical and historiographical terms, allows us to multiply the places that are usually associated with Asian Studies in Europe in the 1800s. It also enables us to go beyond the historiography that tends to focus on the intersection between colonialism and Orientalism especially in the British or French cases, and recognize the existence of multiple 'orientalisms' and more heterogeneous and plural

intellectual networks. The archive provides information on the forms of nineteenth-century mobility, the flows and networks of knowledge and correspondence, the sharing of interests and the exchange of objects, ideas and information. It is an exemplary case amongst the panoply of personal archives that are held in both public and private collections. Florence emerges as a city that lay outside the main centres of European colonizing power and knowledge production. In the nineteenth century, and still today, Florence was enmeshed in a Renaissance rhetoric that prevented it from taking full advantage of its other identities.

### **Florence: the capital of united Italy**

In 1859, the Grand Duchy of Tuscany came to an end and Leopoldo II was forced to leave the region, as it was integrated within the newly created Kingdom of Italy. The choice of Florence as the capital of the new Italian nation, between 1865 and 1871, attracted a large number of Italian scholars from the most diverse areas. Even given the fact that the proposal to make Florence the national capital was soon abandoned, in favour of Rome, as confirmed in 1871, this brief period was sufficiently long to have major consequences for the city's intellectual, cultural and university life. In fact, the choice of Florence as the capital of Italy, after Turin, represented a material investment that made it possible to create many academic and institutional institutions, and attracted men who were well prepared to occupy the newly-created positions (see Vannucci 1992; Spadolini 1967, 1979; Pesci 1904).

Once its principal internal conflicts were resolved, Italy could finally look outside (see Mazzoins 2003; Ragioneri 1976). Gubernatis' commitment to reinforcing ties with the main cultural centres in Europe involved a dual dimension: at the same time that he sought to export the idea of Florence as a locus of literary and oriental studies, which were his main research interests, he also strove to import texts and initiatives conducted in this field from the rest of Europe. Not only in France or England, as was often the case, but in an enlarged Europe, stretching from Portugal to Russia. Throughout his tireless activity, studies and publications, he often remarked that he intended to make Italy known to Europe, and Europe to Italy (Minuto 2006; Solitario 1996, 190–191). The consolidation of Italian unification was inseparable from carving out a new place in Europe. But when Italy ascertained that the consolidation of Europe's main nation states was intimately linked to the possession of colonial territories, it also sought to extend its colonial presence. This new colonial dimension had direct consequences on the configuration of Italian Orientalism. In the early decades after Italian Unification, the pursuit of complicity with the Orient was primarily intellectual. But when this goal subsequently became also commercial, the Italian

nation felt the need to accompany Europe in its imperial projects. In the same way that the knowledge and languages of intellectual Europe increasingly became part of ongoing colonization projects, the colonies also provided a justification for the scientific paths pursued by the new and renewed disciplines of knowledge. Angelo De Gubernatis, a central figure in Italian Orientalism, offers a paradigmatic example of this change in attitude. After an initial gaze towards the centre of Europe, seeking to imitate its cultural practices and recreate a kind of Republic of Letters, in line with a humanist tradition, Gubernatis also turned towards a project of building a non-European Italy. Europe developed along both paths in the second half of the nineteenth century which far from being contradictory, actually reinforced and supported each other.

In 1859, by decree of the shortlived *Governo provvisorio della Toscana* (Provisional Government of Tuscany), which anticipated the reign of Italy, the *Regio Istituto di Studi Superiori Pratici e di Perfezionamento* was founded in Florence – the first university institution in a city where culture had no academic traditions (Garin 1959, 3). One of the ideas that led to the creation of this new institution, modelled on the *Collège de France* founded in 1530, was to provide further training to students who had already completed their university studies. Men from all over Italy came to teach the new courses. Many were involved in politics and were emboldened with a progressive spirit that for some had even led to their exile and prison. Eugenio Garin notes how the national revolutionary experience of many professors at this new university – non-Florentine and non-Tuscan – provided them with contacts with intellectual Europe, ultimately with repercussions for the identity of the Institute of Higher Studies in Florence. Angelo De Gubernatis was part of this heterogeneous group of men.

Originally from Turin, Gubernatis, as he wrote in his autobiography, was the first graduate in Letters in the new Kingdom of Italy. He then obtained a scholarship to study abroad, like other Italians of his generation, which enabled him to move to Berlin to work with Albrecht Weber (1825–1901) and socialize with the likes of Franz Bopp (1791–1867), and other prestigious figures in an increasingly consolidated German Orientalism (Cluet 2004, 12–13, 23; Pollock 1993). The success of Gubernatis' academic career, coupled with the scarcity of specialists in oriental languages, may have been why he was invited to join the faculty of the Institute of Higher Studies in Florence, when he was just 23-years-old. His new role as professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Mythology, a position he held between 1863 and 1890, was facilitated by the recommendation provided by Michele Amari (1806–89), then Minister of *Pubblica Istruzione* (Taddei 1995, 2), who wrote on the history of Arabs in Sicily and was known for his orientalist interests. The 'Orient' studied in Florence had several protagonists and several geographies, but Angelo De Gubernatis and India became its main protagonists (Solitario 1996).

## Gubernatis in Florence: creating a university subject

The first Sanskrit university chair was created in Turin in 1852 by Gaspare Gorresio (1808–1891), author of the first European translation of the Ramayana. Up until then, any Italian citizen interested in an Asian language had to travel to Northern Europe to continue their studies with one of the illustrious male scholars who welcomed foreign students. These study centres, in Berlin, Vienna, Paris, or London, were linked to universities or scientific societies, which had already created so-called ‘oriental’ disciplines. They attracted candidates to pursue oriental studies from all over Europe and, later, also from Asia itself. Many became pioneers in their own countries, in the areas of their specialty (Cimino and Scialpi 1974, 136–137). Contrary to the situation prevailing in countries such as Germany, England or France, this was a late orientalism, that only blossomed after Italy resolved its urgent domestic political and social conflicts. When it became a formal discipline, however, it showed the ambition that was soon recognized by countries that had already embraced this field of knowledge, such as Germany. The spirit of collaboration and exchange with other centres of knowledge in Europe, which was one of the prime vocations of the Institute for Higher Studies, was also present in its oriental section, and Germany, with its example of oriental historical-philological studies, was a mandatory reference (Garin 1959, 5, 10).

The Institute’s oriental section immediately occupied a privileged space in the established fields of knowledge and attracted a group of talented men from other Italian regions to teach there. For example, Carlo Puini (1839–1924), was a professor of Oriental languages and literature at the Florentine Institute of Higher Studies between 1878 and 1920, devoting himself to studies on China, Oriental religions and religious art (Chiodo 1989). He was also a collector of ancient Chinese books and bronzes. This group of Italian Orientalists working in Florence also included Anselmo Severini, as head of Japanese studies; Fausto Lasinio (1831–1914), professor of Indogermanic languages; Ernesto Schiaparelli (1856–1928), scholar of Egyptology; Italo Pizzi (1849–1920), specialist in Persia; and Giulio Cesare (Bruto) Teloni (1857–1943), professor of Assyriology and librarian. The number of different new courses and the men who had the necessary qualifications to teach them led Gubernatis to affirm in 1876 that Florence was the best place in Italy to study oriental languages.

In 1872, the Società Italiana per gli Studi Orientali was founded in Florence by Michele Amari, who appointed Angelo De Gubernatis as its secretary-general and its first Yearbook was published in 1872–1873. This was the first clear sign that Oriental studies aimed to assume its autonomy within the Istituto Superiore, the institution to which they were connected (Taddei 1995, 29; Solitario 1996, 172; Rosi 1984, 105). In 1877 – between the 1876 Orientalist Congress in St. Petersburg and the one held in Florence in 1878 – the Academia Orientale was also founded, in the Philosophy and Philology

department of the Istituto Superiore. The fact that its official inauguration ceremony took place in Angelo De Gubernatis' house was proof, again, of the entanglement between the public and the private, of Florentine institutional orientalism with his personal involvement (Rosi 1984, 105).

Examples of Gubernatis' intention to overcome Italian thematic and intellectual boundaries included two of the magazines he edited – *Rivista Europea* and *Revue Internationale* – and also the *Nuova Antologia*, where, as head of the foreign literature section, he disseminated 'many unknown foreign books and authors' in Italy. These non-specialist cultural magazines, aimed to place Florence, or Italy, firmly on the map of Europe and also reinforce the idea of a global intellectual world which shared the same core body of knowledge (Rogari 1991, 127–128). The many magazines that Gubernatis founded and edited, of an international and contemporary cultural vocation, or of an oriental nature, pay testimony to this Italian desire to look outside, while also encouraging foreigners to pay heed to what was happening in the young nation – to trace an Italy that was not only of the past, but also of the contemporary nineteenth century. Specialist magazines, like dictionaries of living and contemporary writers (see Vicente and Amaral 2019), served as a vehicle for communication between various groups, who were distinct and distant from each other, while contributing to forge an international community of orientalists and writers who read each other's works, confronting the benefits or limitations of the place from which they observed the object of their study.

In addition to the creation of scientific institutions, specialist publications were one of the most visible instruments of Florentine Orientalism. Gubernatis founded, or was linked to the creation of, various oriental magazines that shared a pivotal advantage: the heritage of the famous 'Tipografia medicea-orientale', the typography of oriental characters created in Florence by the Medici in the sixteenth century. In the *Rivista Orientale*, the first publication dedicated to this topic, that was published as early as 1867, Gubernatis announced one of his primary goals: to ensure that Italian oriental studies entered into dialogue with those of the rest of Europe, in a reciprocal movement. The magazine was also committed to publishing articles by prestigious European Orientalists, such as Albrecht Weber, Friedrich Max Müller (1823–1900) or the Scottish-born architectural historian, James Fergusson (1808–1886). On the other hand, Gubernatis tried to project the work being conducted in Italy into an international readership.

*Rivista Orientale* only published one issue, due to financial reasons. But in the following decades, the editorial dimension of Orientalism was reinforced through the publication of two other titles: in 1876, the *Bollettino degli Studi Orientali* and, finally, in 1885, the *Giornale della Società Asiatica Italiana*, a journal that addressed a wide variety of themes, and constituted the main vehicle for conveying national and international news to the Italian community of

Orientalists, and above all to an international community that had access to all its issues, each of which had a specific thematic area. In addition to giving a voice to Italian Orientalists, the *Giornale* also published articles by foreign scholars, in languages other than Italian, and included reviews of new books published in the field, in Italy and abroad, as well as news of the Orientalist congresses that were organized periodically.

The exchange of journals with equivalent institutions from other countries was one of the manifestations of this orientalist cosmopolitanism. Those who published and sent out journals also received others. This enabled the Florentine library to enrich itself with numerous Orientalist-themed magazines, from the four corners of the world (Rosi 1984, 111). Alongside specialist magazines, the number of books published in Florence in the field of oriental studies, as well as the editing of grammars and dictionaries, also reflected the city's dynamism, which benefited from the recent union of Italian Orientalists who had previously worked in isolation (Cimino and Scialpi 1974, 137).

### Writing the history of the present: the canon of the orientalists

Gubernatis's orientalism included distinct approaches and disciplines, spanning linguistics, archaeology, the history of religions, philology, drama and literature. He began by focusing on the Vedas, translating and analysing them from historical and literary perspectives, before embarking on other subjects such as Buddhism, Italian travellers in India, and Indian literature. From an early stage, Gubernatis also began developing a history of orientalism whose scope was international and not just Italian, included present and past practices. While he wrote the *Cenni Sopra alcuni indianisti viventi*, published in 1872, dedicated to Albrecht Weber, his former teacher in Berlin, he was also writing his autobiography as an orientalist (Gubernatis 1872). While speaking about others, he naturally also spoke about himself, situating himself at the heart of Italian orientalism. His book can also be considered in the context of his other exercises to compile biographies of living authors, for example in the dictionaries that he edited in Italian and French that triggered a great deal of correspondence. 'Alive' or 'contemporaries' were words commonly used to refer to authors, in general, or to authors who specialized in Indian studies, which defined the canons of an intellectual generation, amongst a large geographical scope.

In order to establish a contemporary definition of orientalism, in 1872, Gubernatis began by invoking the past, in relation to 'that which orientalism represented to our grandparents'. However, he did so precisely in order to reject this perspective. He stated that in the past an orientalist was:

... a man who knew everything that was useless to know and was ignorant of all that is useful; a kind of Merlin the Wizard who saw everything from the murky

depths of his cave, and when led into the sunlight could see nothing else; a polyglot who spoke every language; a rare antediluvian fossil destined to become a rarity amongst the living; someone worthy of being stored, catalogued and viewed in a museum display case, but who beyond the museum is impossible to find or at least avoid. In Italy, people still ask the strangest of questions to a Sanskrit specialist or an Indianist; the lesser of the evils is when it is assumed that because one knows a bit of Indian, you should be able to tell people how to say crinoline in Hottentot; or when one is asked how is it possible to spend so much time teaching the language of savages who dress in feathers (Gubernatis 1872, 3)

However, he continued, a very different situation had emerged in the nineteenth century. In Europe, no two Indianists were alike. To study India does not mean renouncing one's European identity. He stressed that India has its own worth, but 'for us it has a worth that is essentially in terms of how it relates to us'. One of the Indianist's tasks was to establish a relationship between the Orient and the West, to bring the ancient world to the modern world, and to be a modern studying the ancient.

After reflecting on the role of the contemporary Indianist, Gubernatis made an assessment of the situation of Indian studies in the various European countries (Gubernatis 1872, 5–24). Greece and Spain had one Indianist each, while in Britain there were many who sought to know everything relating to the people they had the responsibility to 'administer', expressing a clear relationship between knowledge and the imperial project. Although Gubernatis does not delve into the benefits of knowledge in the exercise of power, he nonetheless implies that correct administration of the British colony was inseparable from the knowledge achieved. Even the British women who lived in India devoted time to studying Indian languages, customs and history. The British studied in order to raise awareness and promote knowledge, Gubernatis continued, even when this meant supporting Indianists of other nationalities, such as the Germans, and subsidizing their research, promoting their work and inviting them to teach in British universities. While acknowledging the supremacy of Germany, England and France with respect to studies on India, Gubernatis concentrated on Italy, documenting its leading scholars, drawing up a genealogy of their works and reaffirming the effort they were making towards the intellectual development of the young nation. He stated that it was the only southern European country in which India could be studied: and that this could not be done in Turkey, Albania or even in Portugal, which had had a colonial relationship with India since the sixteenth century.

### **The International Congress of 1878: the apogee of Orientalist Florence**

Angelo De Gubernatis was one of the key figures involved in the organization of the International Congresses of Orientalists that were held first in Florence,

in 1878, and later in Rome, 1899. Between the two dates, in 1892, he attended the London congress, as a delegate of the Italian government, where he had the honour of delivering one of the inaugural speeches, alongside two distinguished Orientalists of the older generation.

The first three Orientalist congresses were held in Paris, London and St. Petersburg, in 1873, 1874 and 1876, respectively. It was in St. Petersburg, on the occasion of the 1876 congress, that governments were invited to send their representatives for the first time, thereby revealing a growing involvement of national official entities in an event of a scientific and academic nature. It was also in the 1876 St. Petersburg Congress that the young Angelo De Gubernatis, as the official Italian delegate, helped nominate Florence to host the next congress (Taddei 1995, 19; Solitario 1996, 173; Rosi 1984, 106). The sense of legitimacy rooted in Gubernatis' already extensive curriculum, as well as the political and diplomatic work conducted in the Russian capital, helped ensure that Florence was chosen to host the next congress. Florence therefore came before Berlin, which had a much greater tradition of studying oriental languages, and only hosted this international meeting in 1881. The desire to affirm Florence as the new 'Athens of Italy', enunciated by Gubernatis himself, overcame the financial obstacles that were caused, to a large extent, by the transfer of the Italian capital to Rome (Minuto 2006, 34–49). Interestingly, whereas London and Paris were the only cities that hosted the Congress on two separate occasions during the nineteenth century, Italy was the only country to also host the Orientalist Congress on two occasions, but in different cities: Florence in 1878 and Rome in 1899. It was only in the twentieth century that the first Orientalist Congress was held in Asia, in 1904, in Hanoi – a colonized city.

In the inaugural speeches of the 1878 International Congress of Orientalists, led by its president Michele Amari and Angelo De Gubernatis, the role of Florence in the recent flourishing of oriental studies in Italy was once again reiterated. Recognizing that until recently Italy was not part of the international map of Oriental studies, the reference to its ancient history, on the contrary, made it possible to multiply Italy's credits as a broker between the 'West' and 'East'. The congress symbolized the resumption of a chronology of Italian oriental studies that had its origins in the dawn of the modern era. However, the new character of this nineteenth-century relationship meant that the objective was not to convert Asia, or to plunder it, but rather to get to know and understand it, as Gubernatis explained (Amari and Gubernatis 1878–82, 157). Amari also ended his speech by praising the nineteenth century, which he said was a time when the world witnessed the 'most wonderful movement that Europe had ever made towards the Orient', that was quite different from the motivations of missionaries or merchants, for whom study was a mere accessory to their main endeavours. Amari simply avoided talking about political-colonial issues: 'I won't talk about the political endeavours that are now

underway over there; but how splendid are the intellectual endeavours!' (Amari and Gubernatis 1878–82, 153). Clearly, this Florentine Orientalism did not want to be confused with the language of contemporary Indian colonialism, and preferred to emphasize the utopia of an encounter of ideas and knowledge, while avoiding addressing issues of politics, religion, or commerce. The ambition of Florentine Orientalism was to promote knowledge.

To avoid the presence of the unknown 'curious' onlookers, participation required an official invitation. Women were certainly considered to pertain to the group of onlookers, since their presence was kindly declined. One of the British participants, who travelled from India, had to ask for a special authorization so that his wife, with whom he shared Orientalist interests, could attend the sessions (*Bollettino Italiano* 1876 [10–11], 210). However, women were able to participate in the multiple cultural and social events organized in parallel with the congress, and even acted as promoters of private receptions and historical-cultural visits. At the end of the congress, its president thanked all the citizens who had contributed to the welfare of foreign participants, by accompanying them to the 'train station' and organizing visits, excursions and dinners.

### The predominance of India as a subject of Florentine Orientalism

When analysing the proceedings of the conferences of the Orientalist congresses, it becomes evident that the 'Orient' was far from uniform – its boundaries were diffuse, unstable, and subjective, adapted in function of the desires of those who enunciated them, who were above all the European men who produced this knowledge. The programme observed a geographical classification that welcomed a diversity of 'orients'. But when we compare the proceedings of several Orientalist congresses, it becomes evident that the specific interests of each of the organizers, which sometimes coincided with the colonial interests of their respective country, tended to determine the geographical inclination of each congress. For example, in the first Orientalist congress, held in Paris in 1873, the clear focus was Chinese and Japanese studies whereas in the third, held in St. Petersburg, the main focus was Central Asia. Defined more by what they excluded rather than by what they included, the boundaries of the 'Orient' in certain cases even included the African continent or South America, as long as a connection with Asia could be justified, as took place in the 1899 Roman Congress.

In this period it also became difficult to define exactly what it meant to be an Orientalist, which broadly referred to someone who dedicated themselves to studying the Orient. Regardless of whether someone was an expert in languages, history, or archaeology, he might be called an Orientalist or, at most, a sinologist or Indianist. By contrast, an equivalent expert who worked with European subjects would be classified in terms of the thematic area in which

they worked, such as archaeologist, philologist or historian. If someone devoted themselves to subjects that were not 'Western' or 'European', it was the geography rather than the theme of their studies or the chosen approach that defined them as an Orientalist. Typically they were men, because it was almost exclusively men who produced legitimated knowledge in all fields of knowledge, even in the second half of the nineteenth century, when an increasing number of women began to timidly participate in scientific discourses and the disciplines where they were consolidated.

What did the Fourth Congress, held in Florence, add to the previous specialist congresses? One of the most obvious differences between the Florentine event and its former counterparts was the focus on India, a fact that reflected the particular interests of its main organizers. This Indian focus continued beyond the 1878 Congress. When the *Società Asiatica Italiana* was created in 1886, one of the letters written by a non-European, and published by the *Giornale della Società Asiatica Italiana* (Wefyk 1887 [I], xxvi), took the opportunity to make a critique: Ahmed Wefyk Effendy, 'one of the most rising and enlightened young men of the Turkish empire' with a 'liberal mind' and a deep knowledge of French and British language and literature (Edrehi, 1857, 176) claimed to know many people who wanted to become members, provided that the new journal differed from 'its older sister publications, which were completely fixated on Indianism'. Aware of this Indian protagonism of Florentine Orientalism, which was overtly recognized in the case of the museum, but which in the case of the *Società Asiatica* appeared to be disguised by a more comprehensive geographical scope, the secretary, Giulio Cesare (Bruto) Teloni, used the inaugural speech to reassure members who were interested in other Asias and who feared that the Society might adopt 'an approach that was too one-sided, to the benefit of Indian studies'.

The proceedings of the Florentine congress, which reflected the conference programme, revealed a clear geographical focus on North Africa and India. The first volume contained texts on Egyptology and African languages, ancient Semitic languages, and Assyriology and Arabic studies, while the second focused on Indo-European and Iranian studies, Indian studies, as well as studies on Central Asian languages and, in the last section, Chinese, Indochinese and Japanese studies. China and Japan, which in previous congresses had been the main subject of interest, were analysed in a single section, that was clearly secondary. The official languages of the scientific event – Italian, Latin, French, English and German – reflected the cosmopolitan vocation of this type of event, while illustrating one of the main criteria for participation: Asians who wanted to attend had to be able to communicate in one of these European languages. The 'oriental' languages were studied but were not used as an instrument of intellectual communication between peers.

Beyond its clear focus on India, the principal contribution of the Florentine congress was to encourage the participation of Indians. Delegates were chosen as intermediaries between India and the congress, and there was incitement for the participation of Indianists from India, who had not yet established any relationship with European Orientalism. It was difficult to contact Indian Indianists without having recourse to intermediaries who, integrated in the British administrative, educational or cultural structures, dominated studies on the colonized country in its European configuration. As a result, many of the delegates did not actually participate in person at the congress, and solely intervened as a kind of representative or intermediary who, in turn, were meant to foster the involvement of other people. Georg Bühler (1837–1898), the German Indianist who lived in Bombay, agreed to contact one or two ‘indigenous Indianists’ and look for Sanskrit manuscripts that were of interest to the congress organizers. The aim was to achieve an encounter between West and East, which, for more than ten years, had been affirmed as one of the objectives of Italian Oriental studies.

In the Asian case, it is likely that there were powerful deterrents related to the practical difficulties and significant costs of travel, as well as the precepts of caste, which discouraged Brahmins from travelling abroad. This was the case of the Bengali Ragendralala Mitra (1822–1891) that Gubernatis visited on his trip to India (Gubernatis 1887a, vol. III, 41–42). He was a prestigious archaeologist and Sanskritist from Calcutta who became the first Indian to preside over the Royal Asiatic Society of Calcutta. In a letter replying to the Florentine call, Mitra, the only delegate of Indian origin, revealed his long-cherished desire to visit Europe, which was something that had been forbidden due to the rules inherent to his caste. In addition to wanting to become familiar with the artistic works of Italy, as the birthplace of the arts, he wanted to present himself to European Indianists, who had done so much to make known the ancient history of India among the world’s most civilized nations. Recognizing that the constraints that made it difficult for Brahmins to travel abroad were changing, he hoped that, at the date of the congress, which was scheduled two years after the date on which he sent the letter, it would be possible for him to attend and, perhaps even, bring some friends (Mitra 1877, 291). In another letter sent to Gubernatis, dated February 15, 1877, he thanked the latter for the portrait that he had sent him, promising him that he would place it next to the other photographs he had of ‘Europe’s most distinguished orientalist’. He also referred to the exchange of publications between India and Florence. He hoped that his health, which he stated was not as robust as he would like, would allow him to meet most of the ‘wise men of Europe’ who would be attending the Florentine congress. However, he ultimately was unable to attend the congress in 1878.

The participation of Indians in the Florentine congress therefore had to assume other forms, which were listed in the inaugural speech: sending

objects to the exhibition; collaboration with Italian diplomats in Asia, who had been commissioned to prepare a report on the literature of each Asian country; and competing for the prize that had been established to celebrate the first Italian international congress (Amari and Gubernatis, *Bolletino Italiano*, 1878–82, 151). Countless scholars who lived in Asia, but who were not necessarily ‘Asians’, responded positively to this European call. The *Bolletino* confirmed this by publishing all the letters received. But the initial intentions failed to be materialized, since the only ‘Indian’ who attended the congress was José Gerson da Cunha (1844–1900). In the list of participants in the congress – the speakers and also audience members – there is no reference to any other ‘Oriental’.

The existence of these international networks, formally constituted by journals, publications, societies, museums, institutions and informally visible through the exchange of personal correspondence, were beneficial to everyone. If the instruments of knowledge – written, institutional or visual – created by Gubernatis were legitimized by the presence of Indian names among their peers, they also benefited locally from the fact that they saw their names projected beyond their immediate circle and gained recognition in the context of a European knowledge that was overvalued in the context of Imperialism. The idea that indigenous knowledge, coming from within, should be praised and valued only if it observed criteria that were established by European knowledge, viewed as the only tradition of knowledge that was capable of attaining a certain critical level, was found in multiple forms and stated in several contexts. But if this idea was not always expressed in a colonial context, as we can see in the case of Gubernatis, knowledge that was identified as European was imbued with an intellectual ‘authority’ that presupposed a clear hierarchy of knowledge (Said 1978, 19). The relations between those who produced knowledge in Europe or India while observing European standards, on the one hand, and those who produced studies in India within the context of local knowledge, on the other, emerged as a theme of many speeches, articles in specialist journals and in letters addressed to journals, both in India and Europe.

The 1878 Congress can be viewed as the culmination of Florence’s Orientalist experience, since it is both the peak of a series of initiatives and the starting point for many others. Studies of India continued to predominate over studies of other parts of Asia. In addition to the publication of books, specialist magazines and the continuation of university courses, the post-1878 phase of Oriental Studies was marked by the musealization of oriental knowledge. It was also characterized by the transition from a more linguistic, philological and literary approach to another, that was closer to the new social sciences developed in intellectual Italy in the 1880s, above all in the field of anthropology (Campana 2001, 325).

After the 1878 congress, for which an *Esposizione Orientale* had been organized, the idea of creating an Indian museum in Florence was launched, wherein such an institution should expand the scope of its collections over the years to become 'oriental'. In 1886, almost ten years after the International Congress of Orientalists, Gubernatis, upon his return from India, created the Museo Indiano and the Società Asiatica Italiana which had their respective *Giornale*. Established at the museum's headquarters, the Società intended, first and foremost, to represent and serve the entire nation, promoting studies on Asia in Italy and representing the country in the international community of oriental studies. It also aimed to establish partnerships with similar institutions in London, Paris, Berlin, Calcutta or Bombay (Gubernatis 1887b, xvii–xxxvii).

Among the Orientalists who welcomed the creation of the Società Asiatica and the Museum or who expressed their gratitude due to the honour of being made honorary members, was Albrecht Weber, the former professor of Gubernatis, and Max Müller, given that Gubernatis was the main promoter of his Aryanist ideas in Italy. Associating language and race, Müller defended the common origin of the Indo-Aryan races, and ultimately the common origin of Europeans and Indians. These theories were received with great enthusiasm by the Indian elites in certain regions since they were considered to express appreciation for India. Non-Europeans, thus, also welcomed the Società Asiatica and the Museum (Ballantyne 2002; Rabault-Feuerhahn 2016). The well-known Indian professor Ramkrishna Gopal Bhandarkar (1837–1925), a specialist in Sanskrit, who was also elected as an honorary partner, wrote in December 1886 that 'nothing is more gratifying for an Indian than to observe how European nations are interested in the literature and antique treasures of this country' (quoted in Gubernatis 1887b, xxvii).

### From Florence to Rome

In 1890, four years after the opening of his Indian Museum and having already consolidated his place amongst Florentine scholars, Angelo De Gubernatis was invited to hold the Chair of Italian Language at the University of Rome, and also to teach Sanskrit at the same university. The only Orientalist who continued to work in Florence was Carlo Puini, and from 1893 the discipline of Sanskrit was taught by Paolo Emilio Pavolini (1864–1942) (Jacoviello 1998, 501). In the Società Asiatica Italiana, Gubernatis ceased to serve as effective president and became its honorary president. He was replaced by Fausto Lasinio until the latter died in 1914 (Rosi 1984, 112).

This exhibition-based and visual phase of Florentine Orientalism was also intrinsically linked to the figure of Angelo De Gubernatis. As occurred with other dimensions of Indian studies in Florence, his departure from the city also affected the project of an 'India' displayed in the cradle of the

Renaissance. It soon became evident that the Tuscan city's protagonism in the world of oriental studies was primarily the result of specific circumstances, in terms of people and favourable conditions, rather than a deep-rooted cultural and intellectual tradition. Following the cessation of investments to make Florence the capital and the departure of many leading figures, who moved to Rome, initiatives related to 'Oriental' languages and cultures began an inexorable decline. The consequences of Gubernatis' departure revealed how crucial a role he had played within Florentine Orientalism.

Further evidence of the gradual intellectual and cultural transition from Florence to Rome was the transfer of the headquarters of several periodicals to Rome, such as the *Nuova Antologia* and even the *Giornale della Società Asiatica Italiana* (Rogari 1991, 130). It was therefore no accident that when the International Congress of Orientalists was held in Italy in 1899, more than twenty years after the Florentine Congress, Rome was chosen as the host city, with Angelo De Gubernatis as its president. Gubernatis' move from Florence to Rome also had immediate effects on his interests and on the subjects of his correspondence. Due to his organizational prolixity, he changed his geographical focus as quickly as he changed his fields of scholarship. In the early twentieth century – as revealed by his correspondence with Portuguese scholars during this period (see Vicente and Amaral 2019) – his interest increasingly focused on an idea of the 'Latin world' and Latin literature, at the same time that he discovered South America.

Coinciding with, but also due to, Gubernatis' move to Rome, in the last decades of the nineteenth century, Florence began to lose the role it had played in the consolidation of oriental studies in Italy. Rome, which, as the new capital of Italy, benefited from major institutional, economic and intellectual investment, started to assume an increasing role in this area. Like Gubernatis, many other specialists from a wide array of areas moved to the capital, lured by the greater prestige that this change would bring them and the career progression that it represented. The fact that one of the leading scholars in oriental studies left Florence, accompanied by general weakening of the city in the map of the new nation under construction, helps explain the short but intense duration of this orientalist Florence.

## Conclusion

'Oriental', 'Orientalist' or 'Orientalism' have always been unstable words, that include a variety of positions, and a multiplicity of meanings that may even contain conflicts and contradictions (Lowe 1991, 105, 127–128). We could say, however, that it was in the second half of the nineteenth century that the word began to be associated with international congresses, museums, collections, institutions of knowledge, specialist journals or self-styled scholars. 'Orientalism' as an academic discipline lasted from the late eighteenth century,

when the term became commonplace, until around fifty years ago, in 1978, when Edward Said published his famous book, *Orientalism*. From the moment when Said critically and politically analysed Orientalism as a way for the West to appropriate and dominate the 'East', it was never possible to use this term unconsciously or uncritically again. Said's book was not published in all countries at the same time and his ideas were discussed much earlier in the United States and in Britain than in other countries, such as Portugal or Italy.

For many years much of the bibliography on the subject was dedicated to British Orientalism in the Indian colonial context, in a bipolarity that, naturally, tended to favour a single discourse – of the colonizers and colonized, of those who write and of those who are written about, of those who hold power and those who do not. Said primarily focused on the geography of the Middle East and recognized the limitations of not addressing the production of Orientalist knowledge in Germany, Italy, Russia, Spain and Portugal, and also explained why he did not do so (Said 1978, 17–19). What would Said have written if he had looked into these expressions of Orientalism that were peripheral and marginal in relation to the history and historiography produced in the main centres of power, which were almost always centres of colonial power? Over recent decades, a proliferation of studies has revealed the multiplicity of voices, and the contradictions, concessions, silences, hesitations and heterogeneity of the 'Orientalist' discourses, as well as the many inequalities and differences between different centres of knowledge. There are obvious hierarchies between the colonizer as the person who produces the discourse – where power and knowledge are intertwined – and the person who is the object of this discourse and power. But other types of distinction also exist; within Europe there are also inequalities and hierarchies within 'orientalisms' in which Southern Europe – Portugal or Italy – is relegated to a subordinate position by Northern Europe, especially Germany and Great Britain.

However, even within the specificity of a country, orientalism developed in different ways throughout the second half of the nineteenth century and through different lines of research. When the name of the nation associates itself with the scholarly subject – 'Italian orientalism' we can find heterogeneity and differences in time, space, and in its different protagonists. Gubernatis, Florence and India become entangled in numerous ways. For Gubernatis, as we have seen, India, Hinduism, Sanskritism, Aryanism, literature and religion, language and history, started as the central axis of his theoretical and practical efforts in putting Florence, and himself, on an international map of orientalists/isms. This had been his scholarly formation and there was certainly a willingness to legitimate what he knew and what he was, his first studies in Germany and the possibility of him becoming the biggest specialist in an area of studies where there were no other Italian competitors. At the beginning of his scholarly career, this knowledge on India was centred in its past, and in a supposedly equal relationship – Italian's past, India's past, Latin, Sanskrit –

however there are meaningful differences in the writings of the young Gubernatis and the more mature Gubernatis. His transition coincides both with his trip to India in 1885–1886 and with Italy's first colonial efforts on the African north-eastern coast, not a coincidence, we could argue. Africa, then, became the possible first step to an Italian return to India, a commercial one, as it had happened with their merchant ancestors, but also a territorial one. In the introduction to his *Peregrinazioni Indiane*, Gubernatis seems to have lost his scholarly restraint: Italy had already become a centre of Indian studies, so it could now take a step further and occupy a part of the actual territory of India. Why not Diu, the small, neglected and forgotten, territory under Portuguese rule? It had commercial and geostrategic advantages and could be the entering door for a more ambitious Italy, one that had already consolidated its 'unitedness' and could finally look further into a colonial identity, as all other European nations seemed to be doing.

Maybe it was not by chance that the Gubernatis that moved to Rome in the last decade of the nineteenth century and the first one of the twentieth century, when he died, is also the man that choose to invest in the idea of *Latinidade* and developed a new interest in South America, on the other side of the world, but closer to a genealogy where Italy could place itself. For Gubernatis, and for other scholars in different places, there was a seductive potential in the idea of a wide Latin world which had Rome and Italy as its most defining and earliest mentor. Therefore, we could argue that if Florence became the site for starting and consolidating his career, his name and his recognition as a scholar of India, Rome was the place where he could explore other paths. The main proof that Florentine orientalism was entangled with Angelo De Gubernatis – his project and desire – was that, when he left, the city ceased to identify as such. However, having decided to leave his rich and prolific archive in Florence's main public library meant, somehow, that Gubernatis returned to the city and placed it on the map of nineteenth-century 'oriental studies'.

## Note

1. This article is part of the research I conducted for the book *Outros Orientalismos. A Índia entre Florença e Bombaim (1860–1900)*, published in Portugal, in 2009, and in India and Italy in 2012.

## Funding

The translation of this text, from Portuguese to English, signed by Martin John Dale, was paid by national funds through FCT – Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia, I.P., within the project UIDP/50013/2020.

## Notes on contributor

**Filipa Lowndes Vicente** (Lisbon, 1972), a historian, is a researcher at the Institute of Social Sciences (ICS) of the University of Lisbon. In 2015 she was a visiting professor at King's College, University of London and in 2016 at Brown University, Providence, USA. After completing her PhD at the University of London (Goldsmiths College, Department of Historical and Cultural Studies), she started working on Colonial India in the 19th and 20th century and on Italian orientalism. Amongst other publications, her post-doctoral research resulted in the book *Other Orientalisms: India between Florence and Bombay (1860-1900)* published first in Lisbon (2009) and then in Italy and India (2012).

Another book on Colonial India has been published recently in Lisbon, *Between Two Empires: British Travellers in Goa (1800-1940)*. This work reflects on colonial comparisons between British and Portuguese colonial experiences, and historical and ethnographic writing on Portuguese India written in English and published in the English-speaking world, India or England. She coordinated a two-year funded research project *Knowledge and Vision. Photography in the Portuguese Colonial Archive and Museum (1850-1950)*, and the result was an edited book with 30 authors - *The Empire of Vision. Photography in the Portuguese Colonial Context (1860-1960)*, published in 2014.

Her work has concentrated on different kinds of knowledge production in a specific colonial context and on the circulation of this knowledge within a global context, crossing national and colonial borders. Her approach is mainly historical, but her research work greatly benefits from other areas, from visual culture to anthropology. Apart from her most recent work on the intellectual history on India, in Italy or in India itself, some of her other research interests, centered mainly on the 19th and 20th centuries, are the history of collections, museums and exhibitions and the circulation of people, images and objects, mainly in colonized contexts.

## References

- Ballantyne, Tony. 2002. *Orientalism and Race: Aryanism in the British Empire*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Campana, Andrea. 2001. "Sino-Yamatologi a Firenze fra Ottocento e Novecento." In *Firenze, il Giappone e l'Asia Orientale. Atti del Convegno internazionale di studi* (Firenze, 25–27 Marzo 1999), edited by Adriana Boscaro and Maurizio Bossi, 303–348. Florence: Leo S. Olschki.
- Chiodo, Elisabetta. 1989. "Carlo Puini orientalista eclettico." In *La Conoscenza dell'Asia e dell'Africa in Italia nei Secoli XVIII e XIX*, edited by Aldo Gallotta and Ugo Marazzi, vol. III, t. I. Naples: Istituto Universitario Orientale.
- Cimino, Rosa Maria, and Fabio Scialpi, eds. 1974. *India and Italy*. Exhibition organised in collaboration with the Archaeological Survey of India and the Indian Council for Cultural Relations. Rome: IsMEO.
- Cluet, Marc. 2004. "Avant-propos." In *La fascination de l'Inde en Allemagne 1800–1933*, edited by Marc Cluet. Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes.
- Edrehi, Moses. 1857. *History of the Capital of Asia and the Turks: Together with an Account of the Domestic Manners of the Turks in Turkey*, vol. 1. Boston: reprinted for his son Isaac Edrehi.
- Fabbri, Lorenzo. 2017. "Angelo De Gubernatis e la mitologia comparata." *Studi e Materiali di Storia delle Religioni* 83 (1): 143–169.

- Fabbri, Lorenzo. 2018. "Angelo De Gubernatis pioniere degli studi di mitologia vegetale in Italia: Esame critico della Mythologie des plantes." *Studi e Materiali di Storia delle Religioni* 84 (1): 300–321.
- Garin, Eugenio. 1959. *Un secolo di cultura a Firenze. Da Pasquale Villari a Piero Calamandrei* (Florence: La Nuova Italia).
- Ghosh, Durba. 2005. "National Narratives and the Politics of Miscegenation: Britain and India." In *Archive Histories: Facts, Fictions, and the Writing of History*, edited by Antoinette Burton, 27–44. Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press.
- Gubernatis, Angelo De. 1872. *Cenni sopra alcuni indianisti viventi*. Florence: Tipografia Editrice dell'Associazione.
- Gubernatis, Angelo De. 1887a. *Peregrinazioni Indiane*, vol. III, *Bengala, Penglaiab e Cashmir*. Florence: L. Niccolai.
- Gubernatis, Angelo De. 1887b. "La Società Asiatica Italiana ed il Museo Indiano. Primo Resoconto." In *Giornale della Società Asiatica Italiana*. Florence: Le Monnier.
- Gubernatis, Angelo De. 1900. *Fibra: Pagine di ricordi*. Rome: Forzani e C. Tipografi del Senato.
- Jacoviello, Michele. 1998. "Il Museo Indiano di Firenze nella stampa fiorentina e nazionale." In *Angelo De Gubernatis. Europa e Oriente nell'Italia Umbertina*, edited by Maurizio Taddei, vol. 3: 475–526. Napoli: Istituto Universitario Orientale.
- Lowe, Lisa. 1991. *Critical Terrains: French and British Orientalisms*. Ithaca, NY and London: Cornell University Press.
- Mazzonis, Filippo. 2003. *La Monarchia e il Risorgimento*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Minuto, Emanuela. 2006. "Corrispondenza dall'Italia: Angelo De Gubernatis e la Contemporary Review." *Antologia Vieusseux*, XII (34): 31–60.
- Pesci, Ugo. 1904. *Firenze capitale (1865–1870) dagli appunti di un ex-cronista*. Florence: R. Bemporad & Figlio.
- Pollock, Sheldon. 1993. "Deep Orientalism? Notes on Sanskrit and Power beyond the Raj." In *Orientalism and the Postcolonial Predicament*, edited by Carol Breckenridge and Peter van der Veer. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Rabault-Fuerhahn, Pascale. 2016. "Comparative Mythology as a Transnational Enterprise: Friedrich Max Müller's Scholarly Identity through the Lens of Angelo De Gubernatis's Correspondence." *Publications of the English Goethe Society* 85 (2–3): 145–158.
- Ragioneri, Ernesto. 1976. "La Storia Politica e Sociale." In *Storia d'Italia. IV: Dall'Unità a oggi*, t. 3. Turin: Einaudi.
- Rogari, Sandro. 1991. *Cultura e Istruzione Superiore a Firenze. Dall'Unità alla Grande Guerra*. Florence: Centro Editoriale Toscano.
- Rosi, Susanna. 1984. "Gli studi di Orientalistica a Firenze nella seconda metà dell'800." In *La Conoscenza dell'Asia e dell'Africa in Italia nei Secoli XVIII e XIX*, edited by Aldo Gallotta e Ugo Marazzi, vol. 1, Tomo 1: 103–120. Napoli: collana "Matteo Ripa", Istituto Universitario Orientale.
- Said, Edward W. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon.
- Solitario, Francesco. 1996. "Angelo De Gubernatis: pioniere dell'Orientalistica Italiana nell'Ottocento." In *La Rinascenza Orientale nel Pensiero Europeo: Pionieri lungo tre secoli*, edited by Grazia Marchianò, 165–199. Pisa and Rome: Istituti Editoriali and Poligrafici Internazionali.
- Spadolini, Giovanni. 1967. *Firenze capitale*. Florence: Le Monnier.
- Spadolini, Giovanni. 1979. *Firenze capitale: Gli anni di Ricasoli*. Florence: Le Monnier.
- Taddei, Maurizio. 1995. "Angelo De Gubernatis e il Museo Indiano di Firenze: Un'immagine dell'India per l'Italia Umbertina." In *Angelo De Gubernatis: Europa*

e *Oriente nell'Italia Umbertina*, edited by Maurizio Taddei, vol. 1. Naples: Istituto Universitario Orientale.

Vannucci, Marcello, ed. 1992. *“Un amor literario”: Firenze ottocento*. Rome: Newton Compton.

Vicente, Filipa Lowndes, and Ana Rita Amaral, ed. 2019. *Literatura e Irientalismo. Cartas de escritores portugueses a Angelo de Gubernatis (1877–1921)*. Lisbon: Tinta da China.

## Primary sources

Ai signori delegati italiani e stranieri corrispondenti del comitato ordinatore del quarto congresso internazionale degli Orientalisti. 1878–1882. *Bollettino Italiano degli Studii Orientali* new series, II(7): 125, 126.

Amari, Michele. 1878–1882. Chiusura del Congresso. *Bollettino Italiano degli Studii Orientali*, new series, II (8–15): 199.

Amari, Michele and Angelo De Gubernatis. 1878–82. Inaugurazione del Congresso. *Bollettino Italiano degli Studii Orientali*, new series, II (8–15): 150–158, 158.

Anón. 1876. Terzo Congresso degli Orientalisti. *Bollettino Italiano degli Studii Orientali* I (7–8): 154–158.

*Atti del IV Congresso Internazionale degli Orientalisti tenuto a Firenze nel Settembre 1878*. 1880. 2 vols. Florence: coi tipi dei successori Le Monnier.

BNCF, Manoscritti, Carteggio Angelo De Gubernatis, Cass. 154.

Bühler, Georg. 1877. Lettera di Georg Bühler, Pisa, 23 Marzo 1877. Quarto Congresso Internazionale Degli Orientalisti – Continuiamo a pubblicare le Lettere de’ Signori Delegati stranieri, che hanno fatto adesione al Quarto Congresso e promesso di cooperarvi. *Bollettino Italiano degli Studii Orientali* I (18): 359.

Elenco dei membri presenti al Quarto Congresso Internazionale degli Orientalisti. 1878–1882. *Bollettino Italiano degli Studi Orientali* new series, II (8–15).

Gubernatis, Angelo De. 1876. Congresso Internazionale degli Orientalisti a Pietroburgo: Relazione del Delegato ufficiale italiano a Sua Eccellenza il Ministro della Pubblica Istruzione. *Bollettino Ufficiale del Ministero della Pubblica Istruzione* II (10): 827–834.

Gubernatis, Angelo De. 1878. Firenze e la Mostra Orientale. *La Nazione* (26 August).

Gubernatis, Angelo De. 1878. Il terzo Congresso degli Orientalisti. *Nuova Antologia*, III (11).

Gubernatis, Angelo De. 1878. Quarto Congresso degli Orientalisti. Storia dei primi quattro congressi. *La Nazione* (9–10 September.).

Gubernatis, Angelo De. 1886. *Peregrinazioni Indiane*, vol. I, *India Centrale*. Florence: L. Niccolai.

Gubernatis, Angelo De. 1887. *Peregrinazioni Indiane*, vol. II, *India Meridionale e Seilan*. Florence: L. Niccolai.

Gubernatis, Angelo De. 1900. *Fibra: Pagine di ricordi*. Rome: Forzani e C. Tipografi del Senato.

Mitra, Ragendralala. 1877. Lettera di Ragendralala Mitra, Calcutta, 6 Dicembre 1876. Quarto Congresso Internazionale degli Orientalisti – Incominciamo col pubblicare le Lettere de’ Signori Delegati stranieri, che hanno fatto adesione al Quarto Congresso e promesso di cooperarvi. *Bollettino Italiano degli Studii Orientali* I (14–15).

Morgan, E. Delmar, ed. 1893. *Transactions of the Ninth International Congress of Orientalists held in London, 5th to 12th September 1892*, 2 vols., vol. I, *Indian and Aryan Sections*. London: Printed for the Committee of the Congress.

- Pullè, Francesco Lorenzo. 1878. IV Congresso degli Orientalisti. *La Nazione* (26 September).
- Pullè, Francesco Lorenzo. 1878. IV Congresso degli Orientalisti: I Membri del Congresso. – Gl' Italiani. *La Nazione* (17 September).
- Pullè, Francesco Lorenzo. 1878. IV Congresso degli Orientalisti: La Esposizione Orientale. *La Nazione* (11 September).
- Vicente, Filipa Lowndes. 2009. *Outros Orientalismos: A Índia entre Florença e Bombaim (1850–1900)*. Lisbon: ICS.
- Vicente, Filipa Lowndes. 2012. *Altri orientalmi. L'India a Firenze (1860-1900)* (translated by Mario Ivani). Firenze: Firenze University Press.
- Vicente, Filipa Lowndes. 2012. *Other orientalmisms: India between Florence and Bombay 1860-1900* (translated by Stewart Lloyd-Jones). New Delhi: Orient Blackswan.
- Wefyk, S. E. Ahmed. 1887. *La Società Asiatica Italiana ed il Museo Indiano. Primo Resoconto. Giornale della Società Asiatica Italiana*, vol. I. Florence: Tipografia dei Successori Le Monnie.