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Conclusion

The twofold objective of this dissertation is to arrive at a more comprehensive understanding of the Accademia del Disegno and the Accademia di San Luca in their early years and to further practice theory as a framework for cultural and historical research. Both aspects interpenetrate each other. With the help of conceptions of culture, subjectivity, objectivity, and meaning that are offered by practice theories, the interpretation of the academization of art takes a next step in the methodological developments that have been carried out since Nikolaus Pevsner’s *Academies of Art* from 1940. These methodological innovations can be characterized as the switch from the artists’ to the rulers’ point of view (cultural-politics tradition), the implementation of social theoretical concepts, and the greater attention for the archive.

In the past, the composite nature of the Accademia del Disegno and the Accademia di San Luca in their early years – combining the goals and functions of guild, confraternity, client, and art school – has been perceived both as the cause for their limited effectiveness and as an obstacle to a clear and comprehensive understanding of their activities. By conceiving the Florentine and Roman art academies as crossing points of patronage, literary-theoretical, guild, educational, and religious-confraternal practices, most of which underwent transformations at the end of the sixteenth century, this study attempts to disentangle the various activities and functions that were performed within their walls.

The practices are differentiated by focusing on what, according to Theodore Schatzki, constituted their organization. That is to say, the above-mentioned practices are reconstructed by identifying what goals were pursued by, which practical understandings (or skills) were required from, and which rules were observed (or transgressed) by their practitioners. The initial selection of the practices is based on sources, in which the material culture of the Accademia del Disegno and the Accademia di San Luca was described (inventories), as well as on interpretations of historians of these institutions. With regard to the archive, and the selection of the material in general, the strategy adopted in this dissertation differs from that of past interpreters, who, by employing reductionist or essentialist approaches, focused mainly on the educational and cultural-political functions of the Accademia del Disegno and the Accademia di San Luca, at the expense of the religious practices and guild activities that were carried out within their walls. In addition to analyzing these activities, the practice approach adopted in this study has also resulted in a more detailed comparison between the Accademia del
Disegno and the Accademia di San Luca than had thus far been carried out. The description of the social practices shows that, in general, the institutions had similar functions, but that they differed in detail.

The goals (teleoffective structure), rules, and practical understandings of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century religious practices in Italy were dictated by the counter-reformatory Church. Most pertinent to the confraternal function of the Accademia del Disegno and the Accademia di San Luca were the Church’s confirmation of, and emphasis on, the veneration of sacred images and saints, the handing out of charity, and the celebration of the Eucharist. By carrying out these activities within their walls, the art academies participated in contemporary religious practices, albeit in adapted fashion. Compared to other confraternities such as the Virtuosi al Pantheon, the charity handed out by the Accademia del Disegno and the Accademia di San Luca was less frequent and less variable. For instance, they did not provide dowries for the daughters of impoverished members. Another aspect of charity played a greater role in the religious practices of the art academies than in other confraternities. This was the production of sacred images for their rooms and buildings, which was also considered an act of charity, as the treatises of Gabriele Paleotti and Romano Alberti reveal.

Like the religious practices, the guild practices performed in the Accademia del Disegno and the Accademia di San Luca were similar to those of other contemporary corporations. The academicians pursued the goal of protecting and controlling the art market through a system of rules that governed who could legitimately practice the profession and carry out appraisals in the city, the organization of workshops, and the artists’ relationships with patrons, art dealers, pupils, and assistants. The practical understandings that were required from academicians in guild practices are related to these goals and rules. The appraisers had to be accomplished and skilled artists with a complete overview of the art market and the highest moral standards. In Florence, an additional skill required from the officials was a basic knowledge of the civil justice system, as they had to adjudicate cases concerning professional disputes that were brought before the institution’s tribunal. In Rome, the officials of the academy did not have to possess this additional knowledge and practical understanding, because the professional disputes were handled by the tribunal of the cardinal vicar. Compared to the other practices that were employed by the art academies, explicit rules played a greater part in the organization of their guild practices. The records of the civil cases in the archive of the Florentine academy and the difficulties encountered by the Roman institution to control the market show that the rules were frequently broken. Rome had traditionally attracted more foreign artists than Florence, because of the ancient monuments that could be studied
and because of the presence of many potential patrons, i.e. wealthy prelates and aristocrats. This situation made it more difficult for the Accademia di San Luca to enforce their guild rules on the artistic community and, thus, to effectively control the market and the profession.

In the Accademia del Disegno and the Accademia di San Luca, the organization of educational practices was substantially transformed. Although the primary part of the artistic instruction – which consisted mainly of learning how to perform menial tasks such as grinding pigments and preparing canvases – remained the responsibility of the workshops, the basics of disegno and the various subjects subsumed under it, such as drapery, landscape, anatomy, and perspective, were now also taught in the art academies. This entailed that art students could benefit from the expertise and teaching skills of other masters besides their own, as well as from the examples of their peers. The art academies adopted the traditional sequence of learning the principles of disegno through various stages – from copying examples of simple things and individual body parts on paper, to rendering three-dimensional objects from live models or plaster casts, to producing realistic images from the imagination. Although this sequence was not new in itself, its explicit discussion and rationalization in an institutional context in the form of academic lectures and theoretical treatises was.

Another innovation in the artistic-educational practices consisted of the stimulation of learning and advancement through competition, in which students could win prizes, commissions, and improve their rank within the institutions. The most important transformation of the educational practices in the art academies was the combination of practical and theoretical instruction. The educational programs and the treatises on disegno reveal that the academicians conceived their art as a discipline, a profession, or as a liberal art, in which manual, cognitive, and intellectual skills and knowledge were necessarily interwoven. Archival and published sources show that the academies performed these activities in their early years. The documents, however, do not disclose the frequency or constancy of the educational activities. With the exception of Romano Alberti’s notes on the year of Federico Zuccari’s presidency of the Accademia di San Luca, the art academies did not keep books for recording the sessions. The lack of a suitable study and drawing room in the early period of the Accademia del Disegno must have made it more difficult to regularly carry out its educational activities. It seems that the Florentine academy placed a greater emphasis on life drawing (ritrarre dal naturale) and, especially, on the study of mathematics than the Accademia di San Luca. Whereas several professional mathematics teachers were connected to the Accademia del Disegno in its early years, there are no records that the Roman academy employed mathematicians.
The larger amount of plaster casts and reliefs in the Accademia di San Luca shows that drawing after such objects played a greater role in the academic curriculum in Rome than in Florence.

For the reconstruction of the roles of the Accademia del Disegno and the Accademia di San Luca in contemporary patronage practices it has been expedient to borrow concepts from recent publications in patronage studies. In particular, the notion of cultural broker makes it possible to analyze the fluidity of patronage relationships and the change of functions of the academies. In their early years, both the Accademia del Disegno and the Accademia di San Luca performed the function of client in relation to the grand duke and the pope, respectively. The lieutenants and the cardinal protectors functioned as brokers in these relationships, aiding the rulers in the control and supervision of the artistic community and helping the academicians by pleading on their behalf with the rulers. Thereby, they pursued one of the central goals of patronage practices, which was the establishment and conservation of a patronage network. The academies maintained and reinforced the relationships with patron and broker by giving gifts and by commissioning and prominently hanging coats of arms and portraits on the walls of their rooms. The Accademia di San Luca also performed the function of cultural broker itself from the start by constituting a site where professional artists and potential patrons came together and discussed artistic matters in the form of lectures, debates, and the instruction of disegno. In this way, the academies molded the practical understandings of the artists and the letterati. The Accademia del Disegno did not assume this function from the start of its existence. The reason for this was that, unlike the Roman art academy, its membership was reserved for practicing artists. In addition, the patron-client relationship between the Florentine institution and the grand duke was more dominant than that between the Roman academy and the pope, as is expressed by the greater involvement of the luogotenenti compared to that of the cardinale protettori.

Adopting a practice approach entails adhering to a dynamic conception of culture and, thus, not only distinguishing practices from each other, but also analyzing their junction, transformation, division, and integration. That the practices could overlap with each other in the art academies has become clear from discussions of their sites and of some of their objects and artifacts. The reused sheets of paper that contain both receipts of alms and drawings are visual testimonies of how confraternal and educational practices overlapped in the Accademia di San Luca. The religious-confraternal practices of the academies overlapped with their secular activities. The Accademia del Disegno used the feast of Saint Luke to
employ some of its artistic-educational activities by having young artists contribute ephemeral works of art.

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, artistic and literary practices overlapped and merged in cultural academies. By using the vernacular, organizing lectures for the general public as leisure activities, and discussing a wide variety of subjects, including the visual arts, cultural academies distinguished themselves from the universities. Arguably the most important difference, however, was the fact that cultural academicians participated in the production of poems, plays, dances, operas, and scientific experiments. The combination of theoretical and practical activities in the cultural academies was taken over by the Accademia del Disegno and the Accademia di San Luca. This is manifested in their discussions about the _imprese_, in which an iconographic element and a motto together conveyed the meaning or essence of the institutions. These discussions and designs are examples of how literary elements merged with visual art in the art academies.

The theoretical treatises that were written by academicians and the lectures about the arts and _disegno_ that were organized within the walls of the academies are further evidence of the integration of literary and artistic-educational practices. A difference between the art academies in this respect was that the lectures in the Florentine institution dealt with mathematical subjects, with the exception of an anonymous speech about natural philosophy. In Rome – at least during Zuccari’s presidency – the lectures covered themes pertaining more specifically to the arts, such as history painting, the nature of beautiful sculpture, and _disegno_. More importantly, whereas the lectures in the Accademia del Disegno were delivered by professional scholars and _letterati_, and were mainly directed at the artists, the discourses in the Accademia di San Luca were held by artists for a mixed public of fellow practitioners and amateurs. Contrary to the Accademia del Disegno, the Accademia di San Luca was open to gentleman-amateurs from the beginning. This means that, as far as the lectures are concerned, the integration of literary and artistic practices was more advanced in the Accademia di San Luca than in the Accademia del Disegno in their early years.

With respect to the theoretical treatises that originated in the context of the art academies the situation was reversed, as more authors belonged to the Florentine than to the Roman institution. In fact, taking into account Zuccari’s and Cigoli’s membership of both art academies, all artist-authors were affiliated to the Accademia del Disegno and only two of them to the Accademia di San Luca. The very fact that the theoretical treatises were written by professional artists and that they dealt with the arts shows that painters, sculptors, and architects were in the process of developing the practical understandings of _letterati_. It is possible that
some of them – especially Vincenzo Danti and Alessandro Allori, and perhaps also Benvenuto Cellini – wrote their works as admission pieces for the Accademia Fiorentina. However, by expounding a method for learning disegno and by emphasizing practice these treatises suggest that they were also part of the practical training program in the Accademia del Disegno. The treatises shared a theoretical background, based on the Aristotelian scheme of the arts and sciences and, more importantly, on the psychological and epistemological processes of knowledge acquisition and divulgation. The relation between art – specifically disegno – and nature occupied a central place in this conceptual framework. Disegno was understood as an intellectual and physical skill that enabled the artist to acquire knowledge about nature by extracting the forms from the objects, and subsequently, to express this knowledge on paper. Some artist-authors such as Cellini and Allori focused on the more practical aspects of the development of disegno in the artistic training. Others such as Danti, Vasari, and especially Zuccari also explicitly addressed the more intellectual aspects and epistemological background.

Although based on the same Aristotelian (and Varchian) conceptual ground plan, the treatises do not express a univocal view on how the educational practices should be organized in the academies. Cellini and Allori emphasized the practical nature of disegno in their discussions of the correct order of teaching the parts of the anatomy. Zuccari’s double-layered notion of disegno and his corresponding two-part educational program for the Accademia di San Luca constitute the most comprehensive account of the relationship between theory and practice in the artistic process and it encompasses the conceptions of most of the other artists discussed. However, that his views were not unanimously shared by the other artists is visible from the reluctance of some of the academicians to participate in the lecture program. With his mathematical conception of disegno Cigoli also diverged from Zuccari’s point of view. However, that Zuccari’s and Cigoli’s arguments were ultimately based on the same idea about the relation between art and nature, is shown in the examples of scientific application of images by Galileo and the Accademia dei Lincei. Whereas Galileo and Cigoli emphasized the mathematical and perspectival utility of disegno and disegni in representing the lunar world, the Linceans and Zuccari underlined their value for natural philosophy and natural history.

The integration of the literary and artistic practices probably stimulated the divergence of artistic-educational and guild practices in and outside the academies. As already stated, before the foundation of the academies, the education of artists was the responsibility of the workshops and the rules were determined by the guilds. Although the Accademia del Disegno and the Accademia di San Luca assumed the
function of the guild, the educational activities became the responsibilities of the academies proper and were partly modeled on the activities of the literary and cultural academies. In addition, the integration of artistic and literary practices instigated the division within guild practices in Rome and Florence. Some artists, in particular some of the Roman painters, claimed that they should be exempt from the obligatory tax and entrance fee for membership of the guild, because they claimed to practice a liberal profession. They used the academy as an instrument to control other artists, who were granted a lower status and who were obliged to pay their dues to the guild. This fissure in guild practices was also manifested in the different names used for major and minor artists, i.e. gentilhuomini and pittori grossi.

Another innovative aspect of the application of this practice theoretical framework to the study of the academization of art is the attention for the various types of power at work in the social practices of the Accademia del Disegno and the Accademia di San Luca, rather than only focusing on the relationship to their rulers. The operations of power are made visible by focusing on evidence of struggles and resistance. In the context of the guild practices, the struggle between gentilhuomini and pittori grossi is manifested by the oppositional strategies they employed in selling their works. The former emphasized the liberal nature of their activity by giving away their products to important and wealthy patrons, in the expectance of receiving higher rewards. Thereby, they explicitly distinguished themselves from the latter, who usually received a fixed price per finished product or even per day. The gentilhuomini attempted to formalize this distinction by discriminating between the academicians and the general body of the artists in both institutions, whereby the latter were subjected to stricter rules. Many of the pittori grossi, however, resisted the power of the gentilhuomini by ignoring the rules, for instance about paying taxes. This form of power is connected to the guild practice because it ties in with the changing goals, rules, and practical understandings of the guild within the academies.

The existence of a different but related type of struggle is revealed by the disagreements among the artists about the curriculum and the sequence of the artistic training. In Florence, this was expressed by the different emphases in the theoretical treatises, for instance on cognitive (Danti) or physical (Allori and Cellini) or on both (Vasari) aspects of the training program. In Rome, some of the artists opposed Zuccari’s lecture program by refusing to participate in it. These disagreements over educational practices are interesting because they reveal that the artists thought differently about the nature and the future of their profession. Artists opposing the proposed transformations of the
practices probably felt that they did not possess the skills to pursue the new goals in a satisfactory fashion. By contrast, those who advocated the transformations conceived of themselves as particularly apt in the proposed changes. For instance, it is no coincidence that Zuccari stressed the importance of developing the artists’ intellectual abilities in speech, writing, and through practicing disegno, because he was well versed in all these activities. In other words, by changing the educational practices some practitioners could become more, and others less, dominant than before. Therefore, the disagreements about, and resistance to, the reforms can be understood as power struggles from a practice-theoretical point of view.

The issue of transforming artistic education also played a role in contemporary patronage practices. Vincenzo Borghini admonished the artists of the Accademia del Disegno for engaging in a theoretical debate concerning the relative nobility of painting and sculpture (paragone) and he stressed that they should stick to their trades. The reason for this was that this debate had led to disturbances and quarrels, which reflected badly on the academy’s patron, Cosimo I. As luogotenente of the duke, Borghini was responsible for the order and peace in the institution. Although Borghini’s critical remarks should primarily be understood from the context of the quarrels about the paragone, it is possible that his aim was to curtail the artists’ theoretical ambitions in general. The type of power employed in this instance, in the context of patronage practices, was different from those discussed above, insofar as it had a top-down, rather than an horizontal, structure. In this context, the theoretical treatises composed by the academicians in the same period are ambivalent. On the one hand, the fact that they wrote theoretical treatises and that they disagreed with each other on the future of the educational practices can be understood as a form of resistance against the patron and the lieutenant. On the other hand, by placing the notion of disegno at the center these texts emphasized the unity of the arts, rather than their difference (as in the paragone). Safeguarding the institution’s unity was, of course, strongly encouraged by Cosimo I and Borghini.

From the perspective of the integration of artistic and literary practices, Borghini’s admonition had another significance. By acquiring each other’s practical understandings – i.e. theoretical knowledge about the arts, debate and rhetorical skills, and the basics of disegno – the artists and the letterati both obtained a higher social status. However the letterati could have perceived the artists’ acquisition of their abilities as a loss of status for themselves, because it made these abilities more common and ordinary. Borghini is a case in point. On the one hand, he was not only an important artistic advisor to the Medici, selecting artists and creating iconographic programs for the decorations in the grand ducal
palaces and events, he also produced preparatory designs for these decorations himself. This means that he followed Baldassare Castiglione’s advice that the perfect gentleman and courtier had to understand the arts and know how to draw. On the other hand, Borghini’s admonitions to the artists about their theoretical activities can be understood as attempts to frustrate their ambitions to acquire the skills of letterati. In other words, Borghini opposed the theoretical explorations of the artists because this damaged his status as a letterato.

Although more positive about the artists’ contributions to the paragone than Borghini, this also explains Benedetto Varchi’s reservation and ambiguity towards their status in the debate. While actively supporting the artists’ literary productions by soliciting their views and arguments about the relative nobility of painting and sculpture, Varchi criticized their input for not touching upon the essence of the issue, namely that both arts are one because their goal – the imitation of nature – is the same. Varchi’s and Borghini’s arguments can be seen as a partial resistance to the transformation and integration of literary and artistic practices, which itself was in part an attempt to overthrow existing power relations. Moreover, this was a different type of power, insofar as it did not operate top-down between an absolute political ruler and his subjects, nor horizontally between (former) members of the same profession, but obliquely or diagonally between people with different professions and different social positions, i.e. artists and letterati. This is the context, to which historians of the art academies refer, when they hold that the academization of art was an attempt to elevate the social status of the artist. From the practice approach taken in this study it has become clear that this development can be understood from the point of view of the integration of literary and artistic-educational practices and the struggles that were connected with it.

Finally, the overlap between the religious-confraternal and the secular practices that were performed by the art academies could lead to conflicts. In Florence, these difficulties were limited. The Accademia del Disegno encountered problems with some of the convents, to which they were connected in their early years. However, this was probably not so much a conflict between the monks and friars’ religious practices and the academy’s secular ones, as the result of the artists’ construction and decoration activities. These episodes also show that Cosimo I’s power was not absolute, because some of the monks successfully opposed the presence of the artists in their convents, which had been arranged by the duke. What is more, the reason why the Accademia del Disegno was allowed to continue their secular and organizational activities in the Cappella della Santissima Trinità in Santissima Annunziata probably had more to do with the fact that some of the academicians were friars in the
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convent, and especially Giovanni Angelo Montorsoli, who donated the chapel to the institution, than with Cosimo I’s wishes or desires.

In Rome, the academy’s religious practices were embedded differently from those in Florence. This was due to the vicinity of the Vatican, the role of the pope (and cardinal protector) as patron(s), and the possession of their own, albeit almost derelict, church. There were some incongruities among the views of the papacy and the artists concerning the activities of the Accademia di San Luca. Although dependent on the pope’s support for legitimizing the institution and for the arrangement of their headquarters, the members of the Accademia di San Luca were able to adapt and transform of the papal orders. As shown by the bulls of Gregory XIII (1577) and Sixtus V (1588), the papacy envisioned the Accademia di San Luca as an institution for teaching both artistic and religious doctrine (dottrina Cristiana). Moreover, there is no mention of a hierarchical relation between the two branches of the institution, the confraternity and the academy. However, as is shown by archival and published sources, the artists emphasized the artistic education and they placed the academy, as a governing body, above the confraternity. The lack of control and the minimal presence of the cardinal protectors in the institution were the reasons why the papacy could not enforce its views and it gave the academicians the opportunity to alter them.

That the papacy and the Roman artists approached the arts from different social practices – religious and artistic-educational, respectively – is also shown from the comparison of the treatises of Gabriele Paleotti and Romano Alberti. Although agreeing about the nobility of painting and about the usefulness of art for bringing believers closer to God, the authors approached these issues from different social practices. Whereas Cardinal Paleotti warned for the errors and abuses of painters and painting – and thereby underwrote the objective of counter-reformatory practices – Alberti focused more on the cognitive aspects of painting and on the intellectual skills of the painter. Thereby, like the other artist-authors discussed, Alberti adhered first and foremost to the goals of contemporary artistic and theoretical practices. These examples show that the practices of the Accademia di San Luca were not completely determined by the Catholic Church, that the artists could contest papal authority, and that they had a form of agency for organizing their own practices.

The second objective of this dissertation has been to further practice theory by developing its concepts through comparisons of its proponents, and by applying the interpretative framework that is based on these comparisons to a new, cultural-historical research object, i.e. the academization of art in Italy in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.
The interpretative framework that was distilled from the practice-theoretical literature consisted of a dynamic and pluralist notion of culture and different perspectives on the relationships between subjectivity and objectivity and on that between theory and practice. Concerning subjectivity, individual agency and identity are related to the social practices, in which someone has been trained and in which she is currently participating. With regard to objectivity, the practice-theoretical position entails a functionalist notion of the meaning of objects and artifacts.

These general viewpoints were concretized in the comparison of the work of Pierre Bourdieu and Theodore Schatzki. The interpretative framework that has been used for this study owes more to Schatzki than to Bourdieu. The reason for this is that Schatzki’s conception of social reality, consisting of relatively small and overlapping social practices, is better suited for multi-causal explanations for actions and for polysemantic analyses of actors, objects and institutions than Bourdieu’s view of the social as consisting of larger fields of practices with their own logics and forms of capital. Moreover, unlike Bourdieu, who developed his theoretical concepts in his studies of nineteenth- and twentieth-century France, Schatzki’s theory is not constructed in relation to a particular society or culture. Therefore, it is more generally applicable and, thus, also to the academization of art in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Italy. For this reason, Schatzki’s notions of teleoaffective structure, practical understandings, and rules have been used to reconstruct the social practices employed in and by the art academies. This interpretative framework was complemented by an element from Bourdieu’s work that is missing from Schatzki’s theory, namely the different forms of power and struggle that are at work in social practices.

This interpretative framework has been used primarily as a way of organizing the material and of describing and reconstructing the practices carried out by the Accademia del Disegno and the Accademia di San Luca, as well as the various types of struggles within them. Theoretical reflection on interpretative framework and arguments related to practice theory have been largely omitted from the discussions and descriptions of the practices of the Accademia del Disegno and the Accademia di San Luca in order not to interrupt flow of the analysis. However, here a brief reflection on the method used and its future application in cultural(-historical) research is warranted and expedient.

In previous chapters, the teleoaffective structure (hierarchized goals, ends, and tasks and moods) and practical understandings (skills) were generally identifiable and have been useful in differentiating practices from each other. However, explicit rules were not always readily discernable. The goals of actions and skills can often be derived
from arguments and products of practitioners, especially when comparing them with each other. Rules are more difficult to reconstruct, because they are usually left implicit. Only when participants disagree with each other about the future of the practice or in the training of neophytes are rules made explicit. It can be assumed that most of the content of these discussions and teaching activities took place verbally and only a small percentage has been recorded in writing. This should be taken into account when applying this interpretative framework to new research objects. Especially in historical research, it will be difficult to describe the rules that organize the practices – even when focusing on disagreements and education – and there will probably be more to say about the practical understandings and teleaffective structures.

Whereas previous interpretations of the academies focused on a single type of power relation, namely that between the academicians and the political ruler, in this study attention has been paid to different types of power and struggle. It has become clear that power was not only at work in the patronage practices of the academies, but also among the practitioners of different professions and even among various types of artists themselves. There was not one (or a small number of) dominant actor(s), but there was an interplay of power relations and persons with different functions in the social practices. This situation could either lead to negotiations or to disagreements and struggles. It has become clear that the disagreements were not simply the results of personal preferences, but that these preferences themselves were related to the practices, in which the actors were trained and participate. This should be taken into account in future applications of this interpretative framework by trying to interpret disagreements and personal preferences from the social practices, in which the actors participate.

The methodological choice of focusing on various power relations was inspired both by Bourdieu’s emphasis on the struggle of dominant versus dominated actors in a field and by Schatzki’s pluralist notion of culture. However, this synthesis deserves more justification and elaboration from a theoretical point of view. For instance, one important question that remains to be answered is whether Bourdieu’s cultural critical perspective can be reconciled with Schatzki’s essentially descriptive concepts. In other words, is it possible to disentangle the descriptive use of Bourdieu’s notion of power from its critical or normative use? Although this study suggests – from an empirical point of view – that it can, more theoretical work has to be carried out to defend this move conceptually, for instance, by showing how Bourdieu’s notion of power can be systematically related to Schatzki’s concepts.

A different but related theme that can be further explored theoretically is that of the problem of explaining the relationship of
reproduction and innovation of social practices, which is a problem for social-constructivist approaches in general. 1334 Because individuals become who they are through socialization, training, or molding in and through social practices and they learn how to reproduce these practices, it is not clear how innovation, change, and criticism of these practices can be explained. This study has given a possible direction such an explanation can take by suggesting that overlapping and conflicting practices can lead their practitioners to creative and critical positions and actions.1335

Regarding the conceptual relationship of theory and practice, the artists’ treatises discussed in this study can be fruitful for current day practice theorists. Especially when connecting these treatises to the educational practices that were performed in the academies, it becomes clear that there the academicians conceived of their work as consisting of a complex interplay between theory and practice. In their writings, the artists did not simply reject or downplay the manual or practical aspects of the arts, but presented complex (Vasari) and occasionally sophisticated (Danti and Zuccari) accounts of the relation and interpenetration of theory and practice, and of intellectual and manual activity. Others, while working from within the same basic (Aristotelian) framework, even emphasized the practical nature of their work – at least with respect to the first steps of the educational program (Cellini and Allori). This entails that the academization of art was not simply an instance of the ‘demotion of practice’ and it, thus, nuances the standard view of the history of Western thought as presented by practice theorists. What is more, the arguments developed by the artists can offer a fresh perspective from which to consider the relationship between theory and practice. Of course, this is not to say that the ideas the artists developed on the basis of the Aristotelian framework are correct and that current day practice theorists should adopt them. Rather it means that these ideas can be used as objects of comparison for developing their own concepts. For instance, Zuccari’s account of the relationship between the processes of knowledge acquisition and artistic creation can offer a different perspective on the transition from pre-reflective and non-conceptual forms of knowledge to conceptual and linguistic understanding, as well as on how one becomes an expert through various stages of skill acquisition, issues which are subjects of debate in cognitive science and artistic research.1336

What implications do the practice approach developed in this study have for future research? With respect to the analysis of other art

1334 Schatzki himself is aware of this issue, which is shown by the fact that he makes social change and evolution central themes in his second book. See Schatzki 2002.
1335 See for similar arguments Sewell 1992 and Janara 2006.
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academies the following can be said. It is correct that the Accademia del Disegno and the Accademia di San Luca were important models for later art academies. However, instead of focusing on an alleged essence of the art academy, with the help of the interpretative framework developed and employed in this dissertation it has become possible to analyze in more detail in what way the institutions were similar. This can be done by comparing the organizations of the practices carried out within these academies. For instance, the goals, practical understandings, and rules in the educational practices, the role of disegno in these practices, and the extent to which painting, sculpture, and architecture were united in other academies can be compared with the Accademia del Disegno and the Accademia di San Luca.

While refraining from adopting an essentialist approach, in order to understand art academies, and especially early modern ones, it is a good idea to start with the practices discussed here: religious, guild, educational, literary, and patronage. Although it is possible to add other practices – for instance, economic practices could be differentiated and analyzed apart from the others discussed here – these are the most relevant ones for understanding these Italian art academies. They can be used as objects of comparison for these academies in later periods and for art academies elsewhere. Religious and guild practices may be less important in later academies, but that is a matter to be decided by empirical investigation. What is more, remnants of these practices can still be present, i.e. the feast of San Luca and obsequies for deceased members of the Accademia del Disegno are still organized in the Cappella della Santissima Trinità – although it is now commonly called the Cappella di San Luca or Cappella dei Pittori. And even if the practices are nominally the same, such as in the case of education or patronage, their organizations can differ substantially. With the help of the notions of teleoaffectivity, rules, and practical understandings, and by looking for the various types of power that can be exercised, it is possible to analyze other academies and compare them with the practices performed by the Accademia del Disegno and the Accademia di San Luca. The meanings and identities of later art academies – including, of course, the Florentine and Roman art academies themselves in later periods – can be understood by analyzing the similarities and differences of their social practices with those of the Accademia del Disegno and Accademia di San Luca in their early years.

Finally, the practice approach can be adopted for studying other institutions and cultural phenomena, such as the current academization of art and the debate surrounding it, i.e. the development that artists can obtain PhD degrees on the basis of artistic research. In this debate, ontological questions about the nature and essence of art, epistemological
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questions about the type of knowledge works of art embody, and methodological questions about how artistic research should be carried out play important roles. In this context, the current integration of art academies with universities can be compared with the integration of artistic-educational practices with literary and scientific practices in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. As in the case of the theoretical treatises written by academic artists in the sixteenth century, one of the fundamental questions on the background of this debate is whether artists should be content just producing their works or whether they can, and even should, engage in theoretical and literary reflection on their profession and practice. Furthermore, as discussed above, the different solutions offered by artists, letterati, and scientists on the question of the relationship between the artistic process and the process of knowledge acquisition can offer new input in discussions on the ontological, methodological, and epistemological status of artistic research.

The practice approach adopted in this study at once provides a comprehensive and a detailed understanding of the Accademia del Disegno and the Accademia di San Luca in their early years. One of the most important methodological imperatives for this study, which was borne out by the discussion of practice theories, was that of refraining from totalizing interpretations and ascribing fixed essences to the Accademia del Disegno and the Accademia di San Luca. Instead, the objective has been to uphold a pluriform vitality of interpretation. By seeing these institutions as crossing points of different but overlapping practices with differing organizations, it has become possible to understand some of their seemingly confusing and ambiguous aspects, such as their didactic and cultural-political functions. The practice approach also made it possible to integrate in the analysis aspects of these institutions that had hitherto been neglected in the literature, such as their religious and judicial functions.

Furthermore, this study has offered a sustained application of practice-theoretical concepts to a new object, period, and cultural phenomenon. The combination of Schatzki and Bourdieu allowed for detailed descriptions of the practices and their overlap or divergence, while also focusing on the role of power and resistance, and understanding the transformation of practices with the help of these notions of power, resistance, overlap, and divergence. The substantive reconstruction of the social practices of the Accademia del Disegno and the Accademia di San Luca has shown that it is possible to fruitfully
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apply practice theory to historical sources, which suggests that it can be used as a model for future research.