Antonio Muñoz (1884-1960) and the history of Byzantine illumination: a new field of research in Italy under the aegis of Adolfo Venturi
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In 1953 a pioneering exhibition on the history of Italian book illumination (*Mostra Storica Nazionale della Miniatura*)\(^1\) opened in Rome, at the Palazzo di Venezia. On that occasion, the curator Mario Salmi (1889-1980)\(^2\) invited his older colleague Antonio Muñoz (1884-1960, fig. 1)\(^3\) to participate in a series of inaugural conferences with a paper specifically dedicated to Byzantine book illumination.\(^4\)

In those years, Muñoz’s career had already begun its decline, and this decline was much more evident when one considers how intense and successful his activity had been before. As with most art historians of his generation, in the 1950s Muñoz could boast of several different professional experiences, both in academia and in public administration: he had been a professor, a prolific writer, the founder and first director of the Museo di Roma (1930) and the founder of a popular local journal (*L’Urbe*, 1936). Above all, however, for more than three decades – since being appointed official (1909) and then inspector (1921) at the Soprintendenza ai...
Monumenti di Roma – he had been unanimously acknowledged as a central figure in the administration and conservation of Rome’s monumental heritage. In fact, after his promotion to director of the Ripartizione Antichità e Belle Arti del Governatorato (1929/1930-1944), Muñoz played a key role in coordinating several major urban interventions patronized by Benito Mussolini, which would redesign some of the most symbolic monumental areas in Rome: the Capitolium, Via dei Fori Imperiali, Augustus’ Mausoleum etc. It therefore seems that in 1953 Muñoz would not have been the most obvious choice of scholar for a conference on Byzantine book illumination. At the peak of his career in the 1930s, in fact, he had supported the imperialistic propaganda carried on by Fascism with great enthusiasm, by emphasising the most ‘classical’ features of the history of Rome. This kind of propaganda was naturally inclined to convey a distorted vision of Byzantine civilization, by depicting it as a pale, tardive and corrupted reflection of the glory of the ancient Roman Empire. However, Mario Salmi was well aware that, fifty years before, Muñoz’s opinions had been radically different.

In fact, soon after his graduation in 1906, Muñoz had had his scholarly debut as a specialist in Byzantine art, devoting his early activity primarily to Byzantine Illumination.
book illumination. It was a very unusual field of research for an Italian scholar at the time. At the turn of the twentieth century, indeed, not all Italians recognised the impact that Byzantium had on the development of visual culture in the Middle Ages, nor were they disposed to appreciate its influence on the artistic production in Italy. It seems that Muñoz himself had been not particularly firm in his interest for Byzantine art. Year after year, he had gradually begun to focus on other areas of expertise, in line with his new institutional responsibilities, as well as with their political and ideological implications. Nevertheless, at least at the beginning of his career, Muñoz was acknowledged by his colleagues – both in Italy and in Europe – as the most promising Italian specialist in Byzantine art and illumination.

Muñoz’s debut as a Byzantinist was largely influenced by the teaching of Adolfo Venturi (1856-1941, fig. 2), the founding father of modern art historical studies in Italy, who in 1898 had been appointed the first Italian chair of Art History at the University of Rome. After entering the Faculty of Humanities (Lettere) in


1902 at the age of eighteen, Muñoz began to study under the tutelage of Venturi, from whom he acquired a great deal of information on the most recent methodologies and trends in the history of early-Christian, Byzantine and Medieval art.⁹

At the turn of the twentieth century the city of Rome provided a surprisingly favourable environment for those students who were interested in the artistic production of the Middle Ages – and, in particular, on eastern Mediterranean visual culture.¹⁰ Between 1899 and 1903, in fact, Rome had been selected as the main location for a series of congresses specifically dedicated to the humanities, which involved the participation of several eminent specialists in oriental studies.

Amongst the speakers of the Third International Congress of Historical Sciences (III

---

⁹ See *Lezioni di storia dell’arte del Prof. A. Venturi raccolte da A. Muñoz, anno 1904-1905*, Roma, 1905. This book is extremely rare. I had the opportunity to consult an incomplete copy in Venice, at the Library of the Fondazione Cini, where most of Muñoz’s books were moved after his death in 1960. See also Bellanca, *Antonio Muñoz storico dell’architettura*, 133, fig. 1.

¹⁰ In particular the Twelfth Congress of the Orientalists (*XII Congresso degli Orientalisti*, 1899), the Second Congress of Christian Archaeology (*II Congresso di Archeologia Cristiana*, 1900) and the Third International Congress of Historical Sciences (*III Congresso Internazionale di Scienze Storiche*, 1903).
Congresso Internazionale di Scienze Storiche, 1903),\textsuperscript{11} for example, there was the German art historian Josef Strzygowski (1862-1941),\textsuperscript{12} who was already known for his controversial theories which emphasised the crucial role played by eastern Mediterranean civilizations in the formation of Western Medieval art. With pioneering books such as Orient oder Rom and Kleinasien\textsuperscript{13} he had contributed substantially to drawing scholars’ attention to territories, monuments and works of art which were still insufficiently explored at the time. Despite being sceptical about some of Strzygowski’s most radical hypotheses, Adolfo Venturi was not totally immune to his influence, and thus introduced several Byzantine works of art into the first three tomes of his seminal Storia dell’Arte Italiana (1901-4).\textsuperscript{14} It is not unlikely, therefore, that those books – along with other educational material prepared by Venturi for his lectures – could help Muñoz in examining some of the most significant issues of the so-called byzantinische Frage (or ‘Byzantine question’). Furthermore, in step with the most important international trends in academic research, Venturi and his school were paying particular attention to sumptuary arts, and specifically to book illumination. In the wake of the methodological innovations introduced by the School of Vienna in the 1890s, this field of study was turning out to be particularly successful. Scholars and research institutions in Europe, in fact, had become increasingly interested in illustrated books, and had begun to promote new critical editions of several important Greek and Latin manuscripts.\textsuperscript{15}

In 1903, even before his graduation, Muñoz started working on L’Arte, a prestigious Italian art historical journal founded and directed by Venturi.\textsuperscript{16} Since his

\textsuperscript{11} Atti del III Congresso internazionale di Scienze Storiche, 7 (Atti della Sezione IV. Storia dell’Arte), Roma: Tipografia della R. Accademia dei Lincei, 1905. Adolfo Venturi was one of the coordinators of the art historical section.


\textsuperscript{14} Adolfo Venturi, Storia dell’Arte Italiana, 1 (Dai primordi dell’arte cristiana ai tempi di Giustiniano); 2 (Dall’arte barbarica alla romanica); 3 (L’arte romana), Milano: Ulrico Hoepli Editore, 1901-4.

\textsuperscript{15} See Antonio Iacobini, ‘Adolfo Venturi pioniere di una disciplina nuova: la Storia della miniatura’, in Adolfo Venturi e la Storia dell’arte oggi, 269-86.

\textsuperscript{16} See Bellanca, Antonio Muñoz, La politica di tutela, 253-67 for an exhaustive list of Muñoz’s publications. In those years, Muñoz also wrote articles and reviews for important periodicals such as Nuovo Bullettinio di Archeologia Cristiana, Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft and
earliest experiences as an art historian, Muñoz revealed a growing curiosity towards early-Christian and Byzantine art, which soon became his primary area of expertise. As a reviewer and regular member of the editorial staff, Muñoz had the opportunity to read and comment on several significant publications devoted to the art of Byzantium, such as the works by Nikodim Kondakov (1844-1925) and especially those by Josef Strzygowski. Such reading activity was not without consequence. Muñoz’s earliest independent contributions, in fact, clearly reveal an unmistakable Strzygowskian influence, as well as a remarkable attention to the importance of book illumination in the development of Medieval visual culture. In his two-part essay on the allegorical representations of ‘Life’ in Byzantine art (1904-6), for example, he pointed out the key role played by book illumination in transmitting some figurative prototypes from the eastern Mediterranean territories to Romanesque Italy. By analysing a group of outstanding Byzantine manuscripts preserved in the Vatican Library – such as The Ladder of Divine Ascent by John Climacus (Vat. gr. 394) and the so-called Barberini Psalter (Vat. Barb. gr. 172, fig. 3) – he argued that illumination had functioned as a primary ‘vehicle’ for conveying some very complex allegorical representations from the eastern Mediterranean to the West. Despite the fact that this essay was clearly the product of a very young and still inexperienced researcher, it was nevertheless rather original from a methodological point of view. Muñoz also showed himself to be already well connected with the scholarly community of his time. In the conclusion of his paper, in fact, he declared that his research had been encouraged by eminent specialists.

Fig. 3 Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Barb. gr. 172 (Barberini Psalter), fol. 131v. Fig. 7 from Antonio Muñoz, ‘Le rappresentazioni allegoriche della vita nell’arte bizantina’, in L’Arte, 7, 1904, 130-45; 9, 1906, 212-16.

\[\text{Byzantinische Zeitschrift: see for example Antonio Muñoz, ‘Byzantinische Kunstwerke in der ‘Mostra dell’Antica Arte Senese’, in Byzantinische Zeitschrift, 13, 1904, 705-8.}\]

such as the philologist Karl Krumbacher (1856-1909) and especially the praefectus of the Vatican Library Franz Ehrle (1845-1934), who had given permission for the publication of the above-mentioned manuscripts.

Besides these important contacts, in these early years Muñoz could rely on the support of some notable Russian personalities who used to live or travel in Rome. In particular, his friendship with Count Grigorij Stroganoff (1829-1910), a famous and passionate collector of Byzantine works of art, became an important factor in the improving of his knowledge of Russian art historical literature, which was almost completely unfamiliar to Italian scholars. With the help of Stroganoff and his friends, therefore, Muñoz could get acquainted with some unusual fourteenth- and fifteenth-century Slavic illuminated manuscripts, such as the so-called Kiev Psalter (St. Petersburg, National Library of Russia, ms. F.6) and the Uglich Psalter (ms. F.I.5), both of which were still unknown in Italy. In those same years, Muñoz furthered his education by travelling to Russia, Greece and other eastern Mediterranean territories. In the winter of 1905 he took his first journey to Constantinople, and had the opportunity to enhance his knowledge of Byzantine illuminated books. In fact, thanks to the recommendation of his maternal uncle Riccardo Zeri – who was director of the Royal Italian Hospital in Constantinople – Muñoz was authorised to examine the rare collection of manuscripts preserved in the Topkapı Sarayı, including the so-called Seraglio Octateuch (Topkapı Sarayı Müz., ms. G.I.8, fig. 4).

Soon after his return to Rome, Muñoz planned to continue his

---


19 Thanks to Stroganoff, Muñoz had the opportunity to meet Nikodim Kondakov, one of the founding fathers of Byzantine art history, with whom he established a long-lasting friendship. In contrast to what was reported by Foletti, _Da Bisanzio alla Santa Russia_, 214, we are well informed that Muñoz met Kondakov long before the 1914-18 war, and most probably in 1905-6: see Antonio Muñoz, ‘Il Giubileo di N. Kondakov’, in _Nuova Antologia_, 5, 123/207, 1906, 551-52; Antonio Muñoz, ‘In memoria di un grande bizantinista russo. Nicodemo Kondakov’, in _Il Marzocco_, 32/22, 1927, 1-2; Antonio Muñoz, ‘Novità sulla pittura bizantina’, in _Pan_, 2.5, 1934, 14-35: 14. See also Moretti, ‘Gregorio Stroganoff’, 120-22; Foletti, ‘Nikodem Pavlovitch Kondakov’, XXX-XXXVIII. Recently, Iacobini, ‘La Sapienza bizantina’, 15-17 has published some letters sent by Muñoz to Stroganov in 1924. As a demonstration of respect, in 1906 Muñoz was appointed member of the Imperial Archaeological Society of St. Petersburg.

research on this codex, by publishing a whole monograph and an elaborate photographic album with more than forty plates. These challenging editorial projects, however, remained unaccomplished, since in 1907 the official edition of the Seraglio Octateuch was published by the Russian art historian Fëdor Uspenskij.\textsuperscript{21} Muñoz’s career received a significant boost with his involvement in the Exhibition of Italo-Byzantine Art (\textit{Esposizione di Arte Italo-Bizantina}, 1905-6, fig. 5) in the Greek Abbey of Grottaferrata, near Rome. The \textit{Esposizione} – which must be considered as the first temporary exhibition dedicated exclusively to Byzantine art\textsuperscript{22} – had originally been conceived as a celebration of the ninth centenary of the Abbey’s foundation (1004), but it soon evolved into a much more ambitious project, involving some of the leading Roman-based specialists in the fields of archaeology and art history. The organising committee was directed by the historian Louis Duchesne (1843-1922), and included the archaeologist Joseph Wilpert (1856-1944), the \textit{hegoumenos} (abbot) Arsenio Pellegrini (1849-1924), as well as some notable exponents of the state institutions for the conservation of artistic and monumental heritage, such as Corrado Ricci (1858-1934) and Adolfo Venturi. Since his own professor was a member of the committee, Muñoz was invited to collaborate on the overall organisation of the event. After some initial difficulties in managing relations with the austere monks in Grottaferrata,\textsuperscript{23} Muñoz’s input became crucial.


\textsuperscript{23} More specifically, the monks did not appreciate the objections raised by Muñoz against the neo-Byzantine illuminations executed by the School of Paleography at Grottaferrata. According to Muñoz, in fact, such works lacked historical accuracy and could not be considered as ‘truly Byzantine’. See Paola Micocci, ‘L’evento attraverso gli occhi limpidi e
during the negotiation with the Russian aristocrats and collectors who lent several pieces for the exhibition. Furthermore, he was commissioned to write a brief guide (fig. 6) and an official catalogue, in which he analysed the whole group of exhibits in the light of the most up-to-date international research.24

In spite of all these efforts, however, the Esposizione was for the most part unsuccessful. Due to bureaucratic and financial impediments, in fact, the overall number of exhibits was substantially reduced in relation to the original planned list. The exhibition therefore never became an internationally relevant event, nor did it play any significant role in the development of research on Byzantine art. Nevertheless, the experience was extremely important in establishing Muñoz’s reputation as a Byzantinist. It was during the Esposizione, in fact, that he chose the main topic of his first monograph:25 the Codex Purpureus Rossanensis, better known as the Rossano Gospels (Rossano Calabro, Museo Diocesano, Codex Purpureus).


25 Antonio Muñoz, Il codice purpureo di Rossano e il frammento sinopense. Con XVI tavole in cromofototipia, VII in fototipia e 10 illustrazioni nel testo, Roma: Danesi, 1907. According to
After a very difficult negotiation with the authorities of the city of Rossano in Calabria, this outstanding manuscript was transferred to Grottaferrata specifically for the exhibition in April 1905. Muñoz was strongly determined to take advantage of this opportunity, so he closely examined the codex, taking several accurate chromophototypes, with the intention of preparing an annotated edition. Meanwhile, however, the presence of the Rossano Gospels at Grottaferrata was obviously drawing the attention of many other scholars. Joseph Wilpert, for example, commissioned some water-colour reproductions of the illuminations, hoping to publish them in a dedicated volume. But Muñoz was faster and preempted his older colleague: this act caused a rift between him and Wilpert, and he was publicly reprimanded even by Strzygowski in the Byzantinische Zeitschrift. Concurrently, the authorities of Rossano threatened to sue the monks in Grottaferrata for having allowed Muñoz to take pictures of the Gospels without the necessary authorisation. In order to prevent any possible risk, the manuscript was immediately sent back to Rossano in late 1906, and the hegoumenos Pellegrini could not even begin to arrange for its restoration – which had actually been planned when the Codex had been lent to the exhibition.

---

Eugenio Ponti, ‘Ritratti romani: Antonio Muñoz’, in L’Argileto – Bollettino bibliografico bimestrale, 1, 1927, 15-16: 15, Muñoz had chosen the Rossano Gospels also as the main topic of his dissertation in 1906.

26 The official documents are currently preserved in the Archivio Storico del Monumento Nazionale di Grottaferrata, b. 9, fasc. 72, nn. 11-12; b. 11, n. 40. I am grateful to Claudia Barsanti and Claudio Santangeli for their help during the consultation of these documents.


29 See the documents preserved in the Archivio Storico del Monumento Nazionale di Grottaferrata, b. 9, fasc. 72, nrr. 15-16, 19-20. Muñoz was directly involved in the plans for the restoration of the Rossano Gospels. With a letter sent to Corrado Ricci (Ravenna, Biblioteca Classense, Fondo Corrado Ricci, nr. 24683), for example, he accurately described some technical issues concerning the preservation status of the manuscript.
Despite those difficulties, Muñoz managed to publish his monograph in early 1907 (Il codice purpureo di Rossano e il frammento sinopense). The book had not been designed to be a real facsimile of the manuscript, but still it was a very challenging work, which contained some luxurious full-scale colour pictures of the Gospels’ illuminations (figs. 7-8). In the preface, Muñoz proudly declared that he wanted to provide his readers with an innovative volume, with the support of the most advanced and reliable techniques for the reproduction of illuminated manuscripts: ‘Differently than the techniques commonly used nowadays, [...] we have decided to take our pictures directly on the original manuscript, so that our reproductions have been made exclusively with mechanic means, without any human intervention [...] This is the only way to guarantee a complete accuracy in a reproduction of an ancient work of art’. In Muñoz’s opinion, in fact, most of the secondary literature on the Rossano Gospels should have been considered outdated precisely because of the lack of ‘accuracy’ of the illustrations. That was the case with Arthur Haseloff’s book (1898), whose plates were defined by Muñoz as ‘absolutely inadequate’.

The opening essay was clearly inspired by Strzygowski’s theories. The Rossano Gospels – as well as the fragmentary Sinope Gospels (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Suppl. gr. 1286)31 – were seen as obvious evidence of the ‘oriental’ origin of some of the most important artistic trends in early-Christian and Medieval art, both in Italy and in Europe. In order to establish a sufficient number of connections between East and West, Muñoz took into consideration several different works of art, some of which were already familiar to most scholars – such as the eleventh-century frescoes in Sant’Angelo in Formis – while others had been just recently discovered. That was the case with the early-Medieval frescoes preserved in the old church of San Saba in Rome, which had been unearthed only seven years before, and which were assumed by Muñoz to have been significantly conditioned by the same iconographic schemes of Christ in the Rossano Gospels.32 In Muñoz’s opinion, it was possible to identify the actual origin of the manuscript by analysing in depth the main stylistic features of its illuminations. In fact, both the Rossano Gospels and the Sinope Gospels – dated paleographically to the late fifth/early sixth century – were the products of a very eclectic and sophisticated workshop, one capable of developing several different ‘manners’. On a closer look, these ‘manners’ were totally unrelated to the traditional ‘classic’ Roman art, so that it was impossible to suppose that they had been developed in Italy. More plausibly, they had been imported to western Europe from the eastern Mediterranean territories, and had become so widespread as to even influence artistic activity in Rome in the early Middle Ages. It was much easier, then, to explain the affinities between the Rossano Gospels’ illuminations and some notable early-Medieval wall-paintings in Rome, such as the frescoes in San Saba and in Santa Maria Antiqua, as well as those recently discovered in some fifth and sixth-century catacombs.

But how could such ‘manners’ possibly reach western Europe? Given the current location of the Rossano Gospels – said Muñoz – the answer was very simple. They had clearly passed through southern Italy (specifically Apulia and Calabria), which was traditionally an area influenced by Greek Christianity, and which therefore became a natural channel for the diffusion of the new trends soon after the fall of the Roman Empire:

The later Byzantine influences which we know well by documents (such as those imported by Greek artists who arrived in Montecassino on request of

---

Abbot Desiderius in the eleventh century) only provided a new boost to an already well-established oriental tradition in southern Italy. At the dawn of Christianity, therefore, we should be discussing an eastern root, rather than an eastern influence.\(^\text{33}\)

By studying the Rossano Gospels, then, Muñoz was trying to emphasise the primacy of southern Italy as the main path for the transmission of new trends in the West, long before the arrival of the Goths and the Lombards from northern Europe. In this way, Muñoz distanced himself surprisingly from his mentor Strzygowski, who at this time was hypothesising that oriental trends could have arrived in Italy via Germany, travelling on an ideal, ‘continental’ path.\(^\text{34}\) With his monograph on the Rossano Gospels, therefore, Muñoz finally proved that he had acquired his own independence as an art historian, and the concept of a ‘southern Italian path’ became a personal leitmotiv in his essays.\(^\text{35}\)

*Il codice purpureo di Rossano e il frammento sinopense* received very positive reviews,\(^\text{36}\) and definitively helped Muñoz to reinforce his professional standing in the field of Byzantine studies. The book reached the scholarly community at an opportune moment, since at the time the Vatican Library was publishing the official editions of some of its most precious Byzantine manuscripts: the Joshua Roll (Pal. gr. 431), the *Menologion* of Basil II (Vat. gr. 1613), the *Topographia Christiana* of Cosmas Indicopleustes (Vat. gr. 699) and the *Homilies* of James of Kokkinobaphos (Vat. gr. 1162).\(^\text{37}\) In comparison with such outstanding initiatives, Muñoz’s


34 See e.g. Josef Strzygowski, ‘Das orientalische Italien’, in *Monatshefte für Kunstwissenschaft*, 1.1, 1908, 16-34.

35 See e.g. Antonio Muñoz, ‘Le pitture del Dittico di Boezio nel museo cristiano di Brescia’, in *Nuovo Bullettino di Archeologia Cristiana*, 13, 1907, 1-14: 13-14; Muñoz, *L’Art byzantin*, 75-96. This last chapter was also published as a separated offprint and entitled ‘Les origines orientales de la miniature de l’Italie méridionale’.


contribution to the history of illumination, although remarkable, was much more limited. Aside from a few short essays, his most relevant work on the topic was a short catalogue published in 1905 and dedicated to the Greek illuminated manuscripts preserved in the ‘minor’ libraries in Rome (Chigi, Vallicelliana and Casanatense, fig. 9). Each entry of the catalogue was accompanied by several photographs, many of which had been expressly commissioned by Muñoz himself.


39 Antonio Muñoz, I codici greci miniati delle biblioteche minori di Roma, Firenze: Alfani e Venturi, 1905. In the Library of the University of Michigan there is a copy of this volume (ND 2920 M97), which has been scanned and uploaded on the archive.org portal, and which arguably comes from the private library of Grigorij Stroganoff. In fact, immediately after the ex libris, it is possible to notice the presence of a message written by Muñoz for his Russian friend: ‘Ant. Muñoz prega il Sig. Conte Stroganoff di non dimenticarsi delle fotografie della sua collezione. Quando potrò venire col fotografo? Via Pace 36’.
Despite being extremely concise, this book was originally planned as part of a much more challenging project. In the preface, in fact, Muñoz declared that:

Studies in Medieval art, which are currently prospering especially abroad, will never get any chance to make real progress if we do not undertake to popularise as many works of art as possible – both published and unpublished – with the support of modern photographs […] Only when we have had some really good reproductions of all the Greek illuminated manuscripts preserved in Europe and in Asia will we be able to produce a real history of Byzantine illumination. Therefore, I believe that my book will turn out to be useful, and I hope to have the opportunity, in the future, to publish all the other manuscripts in Venice, Milan, Turin, Padua, Parma, Siena, Florence, Palermo, Messina.

Unfortunately, although the book was favourably received by most scholars,\(^{40}\) Muñoz never managed to fulfil his purpose, since his attention soon turned to other fields of research, and his professional life began to change very rapidly. Between 1909 and 1910, in fact, Muñoz was employed in the Soprintendenza ai Monumenti, leaving the academic environment in which he had worked exclusively theretofore. Furthermore, in July 1910 Count Stroganoff died in Paris; suddenly, Muñoz lost a very important mentor, who had provided a fundamental link to the community of Russian scholars. When he was appointed supervisor of the restoration of Santa Sabina and Santi Quattro Coronati (1913-14), Muñoz became increasingly involved with the conservation of the monumental heritage in Rome. Therefore, he gradually distanced himself from Byzantine studies, which had monopolised his attention until then, but which, outside academia, were still a neglected field of research in Italy.

On the occasion of Nikodim Kondakov’s eightieth birthday (1924) and death (1925),\(^{41}\) Muñoz temporarily turned back to his early interest in Byzantium, and wrote a few short contributions in memory of the founding father of Byzantine studies in Russia.\(^{42}\) These papers, however, were basically the transcriptions of the notes he had taken twenty years before. For example, in the essays published in the Byzantion journal (1924) and in the miscellaneous book Studi Bizantini (1925), Muñoz essentially revived the information and the photographs that he had gathered in Constantinople in 1905-1906.\(^{43}\)

---


\(^{41}\) Foletti, Da Bisanzio alla Santa Russia, 73-84.


Being determined by unplanned circumstances, Muñoz’s return to Byzantine studies was short-lived.44 Once he was appointed director of the Ripartizione Antichità e Belle Arti del Governatorato (1929/1930), in fact, he devoted himself completely to glorifying the splendour of the ‘First Rome’, as required by the imperialistic ideals of Fascism. With the paper presented at the Fourth National Congress of Roman Studies (IV Congresso Nazionale di Studi Romani, 1935), for example, Muñoz denied the existence of a significant Byzantine influence on Italian art.45 By emphasising the integrity of the Roman artistic tradition during the Middle Ages, he definitively proved himself to be no longer a follower of Strzygowski. Now as a successful professional he was one of the most influential authorities in the Fascist administration of Rome’s monumental heritage.

On closer analysis, this change in attitude was probably not a mere expression of political opportunism. In fact, even after the fall of Fascism, when his fame and fortune began to decline, Muñoz apparently did not turn back to his previous opinions.46 Yet, surprisingly, even at the peak of his career as a Fascist administrator, Muñoz never really ceased to consider himself as a specialist in Byzantine art. On a number of occasions, he proved to be still quite independent from the bombast of the official propaganda. The lecture notes of his course on the history of Medieval art at the University of Rome,47 for example, give evidence that, still in the late 1930s, he was somehow disposed to recognise the prominence of the Byzantine influence in the development of Italian visual culture during the Middle Ages: ‘The whole country had to bow to that splendid art brought by the Byzantine conquerors: it was so rich and majestic, permeated with the spirit of the Orient, and yet still classic’. Furthermore, these notes reveal that in those years Muñoz was still fascinated by the history of early-Christian and Byzantine illumination. A whole series of lectures, in fact, had been dedicated to manuscripts such as the Sinope Gospels, the Rabbula Gospels (Florence, Biblioteca Mediceo Laurenziana, Plut. 1.56), the Joshua Roll, and especially the ‘magically enchanting’ Rossano Gospels. Apparently then, despite his official abjuration of the Strzygowskian approach to art history, Muñoz did not repudiate completely his earlier experience as a Byzantinist. A final example of this two-sided behaviour is provided by an interesting yet disregarded paper, which appeared in the Pan journal in 1934. Although this paper was intended for publication in a notoriously pro-Fascist periodical, Muñoz did not

46 In his review of the Mostra Storica Nazionale della Miniatura (see n. 1), for example, Muñoz declared himself to be sceptical about the existence of a significant Byzantine influence on Southern Italian illumination. See Antonio Muñoz ‘“Ridon le carte”. La Mostra della miniatura a Palazzo Venezia’, in L’Urbe, 17.1, 1954, 3-7; 17.2, 1954, 8-12.
hesitate to show his appreciation for the art of Byzantium, by recalling nostalgically his juvenile trip to Kiev (1911), when he had the opportunity to admire icons and mosaics together with ‘Nicodim Kondakov, the old master of all of us scholars of Byzantine art’.48
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