

The Materiality of Res Publica

The Materiality of Res Publica:
How to Do Things with Publics

Edited by

Dominique Colas and Oleg Kharkhordin

CAMBRIDGE
SCHOLARS

P U B L I S H I N G

The Materiality of Res Publica: How to Do Things with Publics,
Edited by Dominique Colas and Oleg Kharkhordin

This book first published 2009

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2009 by Dominique Colas and Oleg Kharkhordin and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-0958-6, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-0958-0

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Figures.....	vii
Contributors.....	xv
Chapter One.....	1
Introduction	
Oleg Kharkhordin	
Part I. <i>Res Publicae</i> as Things that Matter to Publics. The Main Comparison of the Book	
Chapter Two.....	11
Rialto: The Medieval Bridge	
Donatella Calabi	
Chapter Three.....	51
The Great Bridge of Novgorod: Republican History through Material Evidence	
Sergei Troianovskii	
Part II. <i>Res</i> in other <i>Res Publicae</i>	
Chapter Four.....	115
The Material Presentation of Thomas Hobbes’s Theory of the Commonwealth	
Quentin Skinner	
Chapter Five.....	159
An Icon of the Republic: Statues of Rampart-Crowned Women in Paris, Prague and Italy	
Dominique Colas	

Part III. Theory for Comparisons

Chapter Six.....	217
<i>Res Publica</i> and <i>Res Publicae</i> : History and Politics of the Terms Oleg Kharkhordin	
Chapter Seven.....	271
How Does Materiality Matter for the Social Sciences? Turo-Kimmo Lehtonen	

LIST OF FIGURES

Chapter Two – Images pp. 33-49

- 2.1 The two islands of S. Marc and Rialto: the delimitation of Rialto where the market is perfectly coincident with the island, 1710”. Venice, ASV, Laguna 764
- 2.2 The Rialto square. Detail of a View of Venice, in Federico Montalbodo, *Paesi nuovamente ritrovati per la navigazione di Spagna in Calcut...*, Venezia 1517
- 2.3 Location of the activities, shops, points of sale and magistrates’ offices in the Island of Rialto, before 1514 (date of the great fire). Reconstruction by the author on the basis of the ancient chronicles and of archive documents, based on the bird’s-eye view of Venice by Jacopo de’ Barbari.
- 2.4 Ancient settlement in the Venetian lagoon with the church (partially in stone) and the wooden houses: BNMV, *Cod. Marc. Lat. Cl. XIV*, c. 23.
- 2.5 J. Heintz, the Young (1600-1678), The procession for the festival of the Redentore with the bridge on boats in front of the island of the Guidecca.
- 2.6 Gabriel Bella, The “magnificent” night of the Redentore, with the bridge on boats in front of the Palladian church in the island of the Guidecca, 1782 ca.
- 2.7 *Bird’s eye view of Venice* by Jacopo de’ Barbari: detail of the Rialto area with the wooden bridge, 1500.
- 2.8 Bonifacio de’ Pitati, *San Lodovico di Tolosa in vesti pontificali seduto in cattedra in atto di fare l’elemosina*. (as pontifex in the position of alms-giver): in the background the Rialto wooden bridge with shops on it, circa 1550, Milan, Pianocoteca di Brera.
- 2.9 The central opening part of the ancient wooden Rialto bridge in a detail of the famous painting by Vittore Carpaccio, *The Miracle of the Cross*, circa 1496.
- 2.10 Vittore Carpaccio, The ancient wooden Rialto bridge in *The Miracle of the Cross*.
- 2.11 Andrea Palladio, plan of the first project, manuscript drawing, 1550 (Vicenza)

- 2.12 Andrea Palladio, façade of the second project of the Rialto bridge, published in his : *Quattro Libri dell'Architettura* 1550.
- 2.13 Antonio Canaletto, Caprice of the Palladian design project for the Rialto bridge from the *Quattro Libri*, later than 1744, Parma, National Gallery.
- 2.14 Location (reconstruction by the author) of the first project by Palladio with the modification of the San Bartolomeo in a rectangular square.
- 2.15 Felice Brunello, design project for a wooden Rialto bridge, Venice, ASV, Provveditori sopra la fabbrica del Ponte di Rialto, b. 3, dis. 9.
- 2.16 Marcantonio Barbaro, drawing showing how the Rialto bridge should be built, as a full centred arch, with plan stones in the lateral piles, Venice, ASV, Provveditori sopra la fabbrica del Ponte di Rialto, b. 3, dis. 4.
- 2.17 Anonymous, solution with a centred arch and a low arch for the design of the Rialto bridge in stone, Venice, ASV, Provveditori sopra la fabbrica del Ponte di Rialto, b. 3, dis. 8.
- 2.18 Francesco Zamberlan, the piers of the Rialto bridge in stone: at the left side the Da Ponte's solution; at the right side the solution "as it should be" following the rules given from the antiquity, Venice, ASV, Provveditori sopra la fabbrica del Ponte di Rialto, b. 3, dis. 11.
- 2.19 Jacopo da Bassano, Portrait of the architect of the Rialto bridge: Antonio da Ponte, Great Britain, private collection.
- 2.20 Antonio da Ponte, design project with only one arch for the Rialto bridge in stone and the shop street on it: first hypothesis with the link to the square of San Bartolomeo, 1588, Venice, ASV, Provveditori sopra la fabbrica del Ponte di Rialto, b. 3, dis. 10 (redesigned by the author as the original is in very bad conditions).
- 2.21 Vincenzo Scamozzi, solution with three arches for the Rialto bridge, elevation, 1587. London, RIBA drawing collection.
- 2.22 Restitution proposed by Paolo Trevisan, of the arch of the Rialto bridge: technical hypothesis of the three centres and different rays, Venice, IUAV 1997.
- 2.23 First design project by Antonio da Ponte for the street with housing and shops, linking the Rialto bridge with the square of San Bartolomeo. Restitution by the author, 1997.
- 2.24 Second design project by Antonio da Ponte for the street with housing and shops, linking the Rialto bridge with the square of San Bartolomeo. Restitution by the author, 1997.
- 2.25 The Rialto bridge as it is today. Photo by the author, 1987.

- 2.26 The archivolt in the middle of the Rialto bridge as it has been designed by Antonio da Ponte and as it is today. Photo by the author, 1987.
- 2.27 The intermediate street with shops and the linkage with the square of San Bartolomeo, as it was designed by Antonio da Ponte 1588-1591 and as it is today. Photo by the author, 1987.

Chapter Three – Images pp. 95-111

- 3.1 A bird's-eye-view of Novgorod, looking from the northwest towards the southern environs and Lake Ilmen'.
- 3.2 The plan of medieval Novgorod in the 14th – 15th centuries, reconstructed on the basis of archival and archeological sources.
- 3.3 Miniatures of different events, represented in the Illustrated Chronicle of the 16th century (produced for Ivan IV).
- A bridge is dislodged by an inundation
 - Two public assemblies (*veche*) being simultaneously conducted in the opposite parts of the city, and the mediating role of the archbishop
 - The execution of the *strigolniki* heretics, being thrown off the bridge (the 1380s).
 - Building of a new bridge.
- 3.4 Archeological evidence of the developed city infrastructure.
- Street pavements of the Nerevskii end (borough) of Novgorod, 12th century.
 - The thickness of the cultural layer in the Nerevskii end dig, the 1950s excavations.
 - Twenty-nine layers of street pavements of the Chernitsyna street [Nunnery] of the 10th-15th centuries in the Liudin end.
- 3.5 The Great Bridge on the plans and drawings of the 17th -18th centuries.
- Swedish plan of the siege of Novgorod, 1611 (Swedish Military Archive, Stockholm).
 - The Plan of Novgorod from 1745 (Russian State Military Historical Archive).
 - A drawing from the book of travels by Adam Olearius, 1636.
- 3.6 Later representations of the wooden Great Bridge.
- a.-c.) A plan for bridge reconstruction in 1808 (Russian State Historical Archive, St. Petersburg).
 - d.) A temporary wooden bridge, constructed in 1892.
- 3.7 The map of archeological trenches along the line of the contemporary pedestrian bridge.

- 3.8 The winter cycle of underwater research in 2006: looking for the remains of the historic bridge.
 - a.) A pontoon barge for winter diving.
 - b.) Equipment of a diver.
- 3.9 A diver in the process of underwater research on the remains of the bridge.
 - a.) Loosening the soil with the hydraulic water gun.
 - b.) Measuring the distance between piles and their topographic mapping.
 - c.) Cutting a pile specimen for dendrochronological dating of the log.
 - d.) A resulting specimen.
- 3.10 Three dimensional reconstructions of the found log structures.
 - a.) A general overview of trenches 1-3, from the southeastern angle.
 - b.) Trench N° № 3, view from above.
- 3.11 Remains of the wooden Great Bridge on the Volkhov riverbed.
 - a.) An oak pile support of the 13th -14th centuries.
 - b.) A detail of a wooden beam, on which others would be hastened.
- 3.12 A wharf trench N° 5, November 2007.
 - a.) Bulging heads of the 18th century piles.
 - b.) A cleaned part of the bridge support construction, 18th century.
- 3.13 Ceramics from the 12th -18th century, collected during excavations.
- 3.14 Iron and non-ferrous metals' artifacts, collected underwater in the area of the Great Bridge.
 - a.) Iron axes.
 - b.) Locks.
 - c.) Jewelry and details of clothing.
 - d.) Fishing gadgets.
- 3.15 Jewelry, Christian objects and matrices for their production and a analogous body cross.
- 3.16 Finds, linked to monetary circulation in the 15th-16th centuries.
 - a.) One of the first finds – a small copper coin called *pulo*, 16th century.
 - b.) A ceramic vessel for keeping and carrying small coins.
 - c.) A general collection of monetary finds during the first season (2005-2006).
- 3.17 Seals of the city magistrates and commercial stopper seals – those found during the excavations and their analogues, found in other digs.
 - a.) The seal of thousandman Abraham.
 - b.) An analogous seal from Novgorod, found in another dig.
 - c.) A seal of the Great Novgorod (seal of the Council of Lords, 15th century).
 - d.) A seal of the archbishop's vice-regent.

- e) Lead commercial seal from Western Europe.
 - f) Its analogue from a dig in Smolensk.
 - g) Another analogue, found in Brugge (Belgium).
- 3.18A miniature from the chronicle that depicts the Great Bridge destroyed by an inundation, at the time of the rule of Archbishop Vasilii Kalika.

Chapter Four – Images pp. 138-157

- 4.1 Frontispiece of the earliest English version of Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* (1547).
- 4.2 Frontispiece of Cicero's *De officiis* in the bilingual edition (first published in 1568).
- 4.3 Frontispiece of Thomas Lodge's translation of Seneca's moral works of 1620.
- 4.4 Frontispiece of Vergil's *Aeneid*, first translated in 1553.
- 4.5 Frontispiece, celebrating the lyric arts, of Horace's *Odes* (published in English in 1625).
- 4.6 Frontispiece of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (published in 1565).
- 4.7 Frontispiece of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* reissued in a new and fuller version in 1626.
- 4.8 Frontispiece of the *Iliad* (English version by George Chapman, 1611).
- 4.9 Frontispiece of Alexander Barclay's 1557 translation of Sallust's *Bellum Jugurthinum*.
- 4.10 Frontispiece of Arthur Golding's 1565 translation of Caesar's *De bello gallico*.
- 4.11 Frontispiece of Clement Edmundes's *Observations upon Caesars Comentaries* of 1609.
- 4.12 Frontispiece of Antony Cope's translation of a part of Livy's history (appeared in 1590).
- 4.13 Frontispiece of Philemon Holland's translation of the complete extant books of Livy's history, which first appeared in 1600.
- 4.14 Frontispiece of Hobbes's translation of Thucydides's history, which appeared as *Eight Bookes of the Peloponnesian Warre* in 1629.
- 4.15 Frontispiece of *De cive*, as it appeared in the original Paris edition of 1642. It was the work of the engraver Jean Matheus, who also served as the printer of the book.
- 4.16 Frontispiece of the manuscript copy of *De cive* that Hobbes presented to the earl of Devonshire in 1641, some months in advance of publication.

- 4.17 The emblem entitled ‘America’ from the 1611 edition of Cesare Ripa’s *Iconologia*, one possible source for Hobbes’s depiction of *Libertas*.
- 4.18 Thomas Hariot’s *Briefve and true report of the new found land of Virginia* (1590), which was illustrated by John White’s paintings of native Americans, copied and engraved by Theodore de Bry.
- 4.19 A version of the figure in the frontispiece of Hariot’s book.
- 4.20 The frontispiece in the form of an ink drawing in the unique copy of Hobbes’s *Leviathan*, which he presented to Charles II - probably made by Wenceslaus Hollar - which is virtually identical with the frontispiece in the published version of the text.
- 4.21 Published frontispiece of Thomas Hobbes’s *Leviathan*.

Chapter Five – Images pp. 200-214

- 5.1 Paris as a rampart-crowned woman. Pont Neuf, Paris. 1854 (Photo D. Colas).
- 5.2 Pont Neuf, Paris. Two of the 32 rampart-crowned streetlights (Photo D. Colas).
- 5.3 Paris coat-of-arms above the front entrance to a Paris primary school. Late nineteenth century (Photo D. Colas).
- 5.4 *Politica*, detail of the frontispiece of Justus Lipsius, *Opera Omnia*, 1637; part of an engraving by Galleus from a drawing by Rubens, 1637 (Bibliothèque Nationale de France).
- 5.5 Statues representing two cities on the outskirts of the French capital. Eastern façade of the Hôtel de Ville, Paris. Late nineteenth century (Photo D. Colas).
- 5.6 Soldiers of Louis XIV conquering Limbourg. Porte Saint-Martin, Paris. Pierre Legros, 1674 (Photo D. Colas).
- 5.7 Arc de Triomphe de l’Etoile. “The Triumph of 1810 ” by Cortot, 1836. Postcard, ca. 1900 (Private collection, Paris. Photo D. Colas).
- 5.8 Head representing Paris. Keystone of the Third Arrondissement Hall, Paris, ca. 1867 (photo D. Colas).
- 5.9 Head representing Paris on a fountain of the Place de la Comédie Française. Davioud, 1874 (photo D. Colas).
- 5.10 Head representing Paris on main entrance of the Préfecture de Police, Ile de la Cité, ca. 1865 (photo D. Colas).
- 5.11 Gare du Nord, 1856. Postcard of 1910. The highest statue represents Paris (Private collection, Paris. Photo D. Colas).
- 5.12 “La Défense de la patrie” by Carpeaux on the top of the city hall of Valenciennes. 1948 reproduction of the 1869 statue (photo D. Colas).

- 5.13 Poster celebrating the proclamation of the Spanish Republic. Anonymous, 1931 (Private collection, Paris. Photo D. Colas).
- 5.14 Place de la Concorde, Paris; a view from Les Tuileries. In the foreground the statue representing Lyon; in the background Rouen. Statues by Pradier, 1834 (Photo D. Colas).
- 5.15 “Monument de la Défense de Paris” in what is now the financial district of La Défense. Barrias, 1883 (photo D. Colas).
- 5.16 Statue representing Paris in the Place Clichy, Paris. Doublemard, 1870 (Photo D. Colas).
- 5.17 One of the rampart-crowned statues in the Prague railway station hall. Ca. 1905 (Photo D. Colas).
- 5.18 Female head topped with ramparts and Romanov imperial crown, Prague railway station façade. Ca. 1905 (Photo D. Colas).
- 5.19 “Homage of the Slav Nations to Golden Prague”, mosaic on the façade of the Municipal House, Prague. Karel Spillar, 1912 (Photo D. Colas).
- 5.20 Detail of the mosaic on the Municipal House façade, Prague (Photo D. Colas).
- 5.21 Poster for the 1912 pan Slav Sokol Congress, Prague. Alphonse Mucha (Private collection, Paris. Photo D. Colas).
- 5.22 “Italia” in *Iconologia*, Cesare Ripa, 1603 (Photo D. Colas).
- 5.23 Detail of statue representing Italy in the monument to Alfieri by Canova, 1835. Church of Santa Croce, Florence (Photo D. Colas).
- 5.24 Head representing Italy. Former Italian embassy on the Bosphorus, Istanbul. Late nineteenth century (Photo D. Colas).
- 5.25 Veterans’ demonstration around the statue representing Strasbourg, Place de la Concorde, Paris, at the beginning of World War I. Postcard, 1914 (Private collection Paris, Photo D. Colas).
- 5.26 Statue of Verdun on the summit of the western wing of the Gare de l’Est, Paris (Photo D. Colas).
- 5.27 “Monument de la Défense de Paris” on a pillar, 2007 (Photo D. Colas).
- 5.28 Plaque commemorating Jewish primary school children deported during World War II. Official bouquet laid by Paris city authorities (Photo D. Colas).

CONTRIBUTORS

Donatella Calabi—Professor of the Department of the History of Architecture at the IUAV University of Venice. Visiting Professor of Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales in Paris, and Honorary Fellow of University of Leicester. Honorary President and member of the governing body of the European Association of Urban Historians. Her book on the history, politics and economics of the Rialto bridge (with Paolo Morachiello, 1988) has become a definitive account. Her major recent works include *Les étrangers dans la ville* (with Jacques Bottin, Paris 1999); *La città del primo Rinascimento* (Bari-Roma 2001); *Storia della città*, (Venezia 2001), *The market and the city, XV-XVII century* (London 2004).

Dominique Colas—Philosopher and political sociologist by training; currently Professor of political theory and Russian studies at the Institut d'Etudes Politiques de Paris (Sciences Po). He has served as vice-president of the Association for the Study of Nationalities (ASN). His many books include *Le Léninisme* (Presses Universitaires de France, 1982), *Sociologie politique* (PUF, 1994), *Dictionnaire de la pensée politique* (Paris: Larousse, 1997), *Citoyenneté et nationalité* (Paris: Gallimard, 2004), and *Civil Society and Fanaticism: Conjoined Histories* (translated by Amy Jacobs, Stanford University Press, 1997).

Oleg Kharkhordin—Professor of political science, European University at St. Petersburg. Having finished his PhD at the University of California, Berkeley, he worked as Junior Fellow of the Harvard Academy for International and Area Studies in 1996-99. Returned to Russia after that, but held numerous Visiting Professorships at departments of political science at Yale, Harvard, Institut d'Etudes Politiques de Paris (Sciences Po). Author of *The Collective and the Individual in Russia: A Study of Practices* (University of California Press, 1999), *Main Concepts of Russian Politics* (University Press of America, 2005), co-editor (with Risto Alapuro) of the *Reassembling Res Publica: Reform of Infrastructure in Post-Soviet Russia* (forthcoming).

Turo-Kimmo Lehtonen—Fellow at the Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies. Having earned his PhD in 2000 in sociology from the University

of Helsinki, spent many years in doing research on material aspects of consumer culture, insurance and image technologies. His publications include dozens of items in Finnish, a monograph in English, *Mobile Image* (Helsinki, 2002, co-authored), and articles in *Journal of Material Culture*, *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, and *Journal of Consumer Culture*.

Quentin Skinner— Barber Beaumont Professor of the Humanities, Queen Mary, University of London. Previously Regius Professor of Modern History at Cambridge, founder of the Cambridge School of conceptual history. In his distinguished career Professor Skinner held various positions in Cambridge and also spent a number of years at the Institute for Advanced Studies in Princeton. Author of many path-breaking works, including *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought* (2 vols, Cambridge University Press, 1978), *Reason and Rhetoric in the Philosophy of Hobbes* (Cambridge University Press, 1996), *Liberty Before Liberalism* (Cambridge University Press, 1998), *Visions of Politics* (3 vols, Cambridge University Press, 2002).

Sergei Troianovskii—Vice-President, Novgorod Society for the Antiquities, and the director of archeological excavations of the Novgorod State Museum. Holds a PhD from the Archeological Department of Moscow State University. Between 1993 and 2004 worked in the Novgorod State Museum as a researcher, then—a team leader of excavations in the Kremlin. In 2004-2005 served as Head of the Department of Cultural Heritage in the Novgorod regional administration. From 2005 works as a consultant in the project on underwater archeological exploration of the medieval Great bridge in Novgorod. Author of over 50 scientific and mass media publications in Russian on history and archeology of medieval Novgorod and a permanent participant of international research networks *Castella Maris Baltici* and *Hansearum*.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

OLEG KHARKHORDIN

Political science for the last 100 years traditionally concentrated on the *publica* part of the expression *res publica*, conceiving this notion as a form of government opposed to, say, monarchy. However, the ancients and citizens of Renaissance republics paid as much attention to the *res* part of this expression. The goal of this volume is to draw attention to this *res*, things or affairs that bring people together. A similar insight has been recently offered by the French school of science and technology studies (STS), best exemplified in the works of Bruno Latour, who examines how human communities change to become durable and tangible with the help of networks of very mundane elements that tie them together (pipes, wires, information networks, etc.).¹ However, science and technology studies, aimed at analyzing contemporary intertwining of humans and what they call non-humans, usually ignore the two thousand year long tradition of thinking about *res publica*, starting from Roman thought and going through the Middle Ages to the republics of early modern Europe.

The goal of the present book is to correct this oversight and to examine the role of *res* in different historical versions of *res publica*: starting from the time this Latin expression entered the thought of Cicero and Roman law to the times of *res publica anglicana* (in particular, to the era of Hobbes) and to *la Republique Francaise*.

This book is, to a large extent, a result of an integrated research project, conducted in 2005-7, which first aimed at comparing tangible shared things in the republics of Venice and Novgorod; then other areas of expertise were brought in, for comparative purposes.² Initially, medieval

¹ Another decisive influence is the new sociology of action of Laurent Thevenot that pays a lot of attention to objects.

² INTAS grant 04-79-7107 “Bridges as *res publicae*: implications for modern self-government in Western and Eastern Europe” paid for the bulk of this research.

bridges in both republics—the wooden Rialto in Venice (which existed until 1587) and the Great bridge in Novgorod - were examined as examples of *choses publiques*, or *res publicae*, central for their economic, political and religious importance. For example, the reconstruction of the Rialto in stone in the XVI century took eighty years because of the large construction expenditures, battles over the choice of subcontractors, the relocation of adjacent buildings, and the political message that the bridge design could carry in the context of the Spanish threat and papal politics at that time, and so on. Similarly, the Great Bridge in Novgorod was central for the republican political economy—e.g. administrative units and parishes lying as far away as 500 miles had to supply logs or provide funds for its maintenance and repairs. Also, it played a central role as the site for executions following rowdy public assemblies, and for fights between political factions. Icons incorporated the bridge as a central element of the city, because very often events on the bridge, or misfortunes that happened to it, were taken as expressions of God's will. This gave the bridge a heightened religious significance as well.³

The history of the wooden Rialto has not been provided in detail, in English, until this project. Donatella Calabi from the IUAV University of Venice, one of the authors of the best extant book on the stone Rialto, has now fulfilled this task. Research in Novgorod was also unique. This famous Russian republic (which existed in 1136-1478, until it was captured by Muscovy) was chosen because it does not have remaining medieval archives and thus offers a particularly interesting mirror to the Venetian—or West European, for that matter—experience. Given that there are no public documents that could speak for the republic, the bridge, since it is one of the central things belonging to it, has been entrusted with this role. Underwater excavations were conducted in 2005-7, the results of which are documented in this book. Research was done under four to eight meters of brownish water of a very fast flowing, muddy, northern river, with visibility of 5 cm in the summer and about one meter in the winter. By contrast, in the Venetian lagoon, for example, when one is searching for the remains of medieval boats, vertical steel fencing is hammered

Grants from the Academy of Finland to Kharkhordin, Lehtonen and Risto Alapuro (the latter—within the framework of “Russia in Flux” program) paid for conference travel, writing up and publication preparation. Moscow-based *Dinastia* Foundation paid for the initial presentation of results at the AAASS Convention in New Orleans in November 2007.

³ See this argument initially spelled out in Oleg Kharkhordin, “Things as *Res Publicae*: Making Things Public,” in Bruno Latour and Peter Weibel, eds., *Making Things Public: Atmospheres of Democracy* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2005).

around the presumed sites, water is pumped out, and research performed as if on a dried out riverbed. In London, where research was done on the remains of Roman and medieval bridges, archeologists could work in the wharves, without the need of going underwater. In Novgorod the research was different—the most successful finds occurred in freezing winter conditions of minus 15 degrees Centigrade, when there was clear visibility, no algae in the water and no water transport circulation to thwart research, as in summer. Multiple photos in the chapter by Sergei Troianovskii show this extraordinary effort.

While engaged in comparing empirical findings of the Russian case with those of the Venetian case, achieved after thorough archival searches, it became necessary for researchers to consult and invite for discussions representatives of two other areas of knowledge. The first one is a growing volume of literature on republican political theory, which—after the fall of Marxism—has emerged as the only credible freedom-asserting alternative of liberalism. Quentin Skinner from Cambridge—a renowned representative of this tradition—was progressively more and more involved with discussions of the role of *res* in republican theory. His contribution initially involved a reassessment of the most intense moment of republican experience during the English revolution from the standpoint of an interest in the materiality of this experience. Later he wrote a special piece on the materiality of the Hobbes's representation of *res publica*, which is included as a chapter in this volume.⁴ Dominique Colas from Sciences Po, who was the director of the INTAS team from the West European side, contributed a comparison of the French case with his research on the role of symbols of *la Republique*, and its reliance on the early modern imagery of a woman with city ramparts on her head. My own chapter compressed two years of the project's discussions on the history of the Latin term *res publica* and its importance for political philosophy of republicanism in the article that sums up conceptual development from Cicero to Justinian—in order to evaluate the full theoretical implications of the term.

The second large body of literature, which was also integrated into the project, were contemporary studies of material settings and networks in sociology and anthropology. Turo-Kimmo Lehtonen from the University of Helsinki contributed a disciplined methodological dimension to the largely comparative cross-cultural research, by offering an overview of the

⁴ Professor Skinner gave lectures on both of these topics, the first one during the seminar *The Materiality of res publica*, held at the European University at St. Petersburg on May 25-26, 2007, and the second during the seminar *Lecons de choses publiques*, which was held on April 11, 2008 at Sciences Po in Paris.

latest interest in materiality in social sciences, particularly in works of actor-network theory of Bruno Latour and the work on material culture among anthropologists and sociologists, in the style of Daniel Miller from University College London.

The structure of the book is as follows. In Part 1, “*Res Publicae* as Things that Matter to Publics”, the two main cases of republican concern, i.e. the bridges, are introduced. In chapter 2, Donatella Calabi stresses that bridge-keeping is mentioned as one of the duties of Venetian magistrates since the second half of the XIII century, and the Rialto is one of their central concerns. Every forty to fifty years the bridge is remodeled; every twenty five years from the beginning of a new phase, a restoration may take place. The image, quality and dimensions of the old wooden bridge determined its history in the future. For those who had to reconstruct it in stone what mattered most were which features to eliminate and which to preserve. Given the large expenditure amount and the symbolic significance of the bridge, the decision to rebuild the Rialto in stone was finally adopted only after protracted political fights over contracts, design and imagery. In the end, it was medieval practices of bridge construction and maintenance that were deemed as most important, and this choice signified a path-dependent development of the republic in the future. The chapter describes which tangible concerns constituted the main objects and political points of contention at the time.

Chapter 3 on the medieval wooden Great Bridge of Novgorod presents a similar story. It was the only multi-season bridge in all of Russia until the end of the XVII century, when the first stone bridge was built in Moscow. The rest of the country used floating bridges in the summer, and drove on ice in the winter. But its greatness lay not in its architectural quality, but rather, in its political, cultural and economic significance. Economically, this very sizable thing tied the republic together because even distant parishes had to submit means and supplies to maintain this single crossing across the river that separated the city. Politically, it served as the site where warring city factions could meet, and where, at the decision of the popular assembly, the condemned were thrown into the water. Many a local magistrate lost his life this way. Archbishops (the only archbishops in Europe selected by lot!) mediated the conflicts, but frequently could not stop them, even when they physically blocked access of warring parties to each other by staging a cross-bearing procession on the bridge. Trade flourished on the bridge, though we are not sure whether it was there during the republican era. Underwater archeological research has shed more light on these aspects of city life. Further comparison of the story of the Great Bridge with that of the Rialto is a task for the future,

however. Novgorod research has to reveal more features of the political economy of the bridge enabling one to find more direct parallels between the two stories. It should be pointed out, however, that both bridges were built next to German trading houses, and had central significance for internal republican life, given the huge public expenditure of bridge maintenance and reconstruction.

Part 2 of the book, called “*Res* in other *res publicae*”, contains chapters by Quentin Skinner and Dominique Colas. Both articles offer reflections on the importance of the materiality of symbols rather than just the materiality of the republican concerns themselves. Skinner shows how the demands of rhetoric pushed Hobbes to present his argument on sovereignty in the most vivid, that is, visible way—accessible to a reader in his or her quality as a viewer of illustrations to a book. Analysis of frontispieces of Hobbes’ books, as well as the images from other books of the time allows us to draw a conclusion on the thrust of Hobbes’s argument on *res publica*, including *res publica anglicana*, just created in the result of the English Revolution.

In his chapter, Colas takes off from the ancient Greek and Roman definition of a polity as a piece of land delimited by a wall; i.e. by ramparts. This meant that a city could be represented by Cybele, the earth goddess, figured as a rampart-crowned woman. The same iconographic model could also represent politics itself—this is how Rubens used it. The model is present in several modern European cities. In Paris in the early nineteenth century, dozens of statues of rampart-crowned women representing cities in the French national space or European capitals were erected. Later in the century, during the Third Republic, between 1871 and 1914, the French authorities sought to make it clear that their *res publica* was republican in character. For the city of Paris this meant that thousands of images of the city’s coat-of-arms or symbol, topped with a circle of ramparts, came to adorn public buildings, and that female statues representing Paris and other cities were figured with the same crown. Prague imported the model from France in the early twentieth century to assert its claim that it was a capital city, even though the nation-state in which it held this function did not yet exist, and would not exist until the end of the Habsburg Empire. In Italy, where individual countries were already being represented in the Renaissance as human figures wearing a crown of ramparts, the model seldom figured a capital because unifying Italy was a long and complicated process. Concluding with a reflection on the disappearance of the model of the rampart-crowned republic in Paris today (the statues are still there, but they are no longer viewed in accordance with the intention behind them), Colas finds not that there the

public space is regressing but rather that it is being invested with new forms, new, strong « public things » of many sorts that can no longer be integrated into a great narrative of the sort that *la République* has been in France.

Part 3 of the book considers the theoretical implications of paying more attention to the *res* part of the expression *res publica*. My own chapter deals with the history of the Latin term from the time of Cicero to the time of emperor Justinian and his codifiers, with a particular attention to the “thingly” connotation of the term. It first examines the expression *res publicae* (in the plural form), looking for those instances in Roman law, when this expression was used to denote “things public.” Then it examines republican usage around the time of Cicero. After that the term *res publica* in the singular form is studied in the same way. Both exercises yield a conclusion that extant usage rarely points to the things. Rather it mostly designated public affairs, rather than things, if it designated anything at all. The connotation of “things public” progressively intensifies with the growth of the Empire and the need to codify and streamline its laws, which are supposed to point rather unambiguously to the empirical referents of expressions *res publica* and *res publicae*.

But the key part of the chapter goes a bit beyond a detailed analysis of historical word usage, and concentrates on a debate between Cicero and Ceasar on the thingness of *res publica*. Imperial habit—from Ceasar to Justinian—was to either point to the tangible good that could be called *res publica*, or to expunge the usage that referred to incorporeal *res publica* as nonsense. Republican habit, best exemplified by Cicero, would claim that a definition of what was in *res publica* interests was always subject to a clash of different speech acts, naming *res publica*. And it was this clash and contention that testified to the republican quality of politics. The materiality of the republic then lies in the materiality of speech acts involving it and its interests, and the essay finishes by posing a question on a general theory of Roman speech acts as a key to a mystery of *res publica*.

Finally, a chapter by Turo-Kimmo Lehtonen considers a general topic of how materiality features in recent debates in social sciences. When the concept of materiality is encountered in contemporary public discussions, it is mostly in the context of critiques of the current Euro-American way of life. Critics deplore an obvious spread of “material values” of consumer civilization and a hedonistic search for pleasure that eschew concern for the public good. Starting from the analysis of this usage—which points to a situation largely incompatible with republican concerns—the chapter moves on to explore the concept of materiality in different theoretical

traditions. Classical forms of materialism, i.e. ontological, ethical and historical, do not seem felicitous for our concerns with understanding materiality in a contemporary world. Recent debates in social sciences are then overviewed: on which grounds is it claimed that the concept of materiality is something that really matters for social sciences? And what is meant by “materiality” in this context? The chapter ends by a programmatic conclusion: materiality might become a central concept for human sciences, if we are to understand what life in contemporary world consists of. One may add: studies of the *res* part in the classical tradition of thinking about *res publica*, and of acting on or in the interests of *res publica* will surely address this point.

In conclusion, one should mention people who helped during research and preparation of this book, which turned out to be a joint undertaking bringing many people together. The first to thank is Aivar Stepanov, the head of the archeological section of the Russian Divers’ Union, who organized and supervised the underwater excavations in Novgorod. Without his talents and perseverance we would not have achieved such a remarkable result in such a short period of time. Assistants at the Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies have spent lots of time and effort helping research, with Kirsi Reyes and Svetlana Kirichenko being most important in finally bringing this book together. We should thank translators who rendered texts into English—Evgenii Roshchin for the Troianovskii chapter and Amy Jacobs for the Colas chapter, while special thanks go to Caroline Bruzelius for editing the Calabi chapter and Kirsi Reyes for the rest of the volume.

The editors gratefully acknowledge permissions to reproduce images that were granted to us by the Diatēca of the Department for the Study of Architecture of the IUAV Università degli studi di Venezia, the library of the Novgorod State Museum, the Huntington library, the Houghton library, the Cambridge University library and Bibliothèque nationale in Paris. We thank individual authors of photos and graphs who gave us permissions to include them in this volume—Dominique Colas, Sergei Troianovskii, Valentin Ianin, Aivar Stepanov, Sergei Lutsyi. Last, but not least, I should thank my wife Estelle, who, during the years of research, shared joys and sorrows in this project, which started by comparing Venice and Novgorod and evolved into a larger undertaking of bringing Europe together on the basis of a shared republican heritage.

PART I.

***RES PUBLICAE* AS THINGS THAT MATTER
TO PUBLICS.**

THE MAIN COMPARISON OF THE BOOK

CHAPTER TWO

RIALTO: THE MEDIEVAL BRIDGE

DONATELLA CALABI

The First Bridge on the Grand Canal

Chronicles of the 15th century often attributed the first bridge on the Grand Canal of Venice to the Lombard Master Barettier and dated it to 1173, during the rule of Doge Sebastiano Ziani¹. According to these sources, this bridge was reconstructed on a larger scale in 1255². Earlier sources, however, suggest that the first bridge was built only much later, in 1264, under Renier Zeno³. In fact, Andrea Dandolo tells us that until the rule of Zeno (doge between 1253 and 1268), the city of Rialto was separated by a canal (“Civitas quoque Rivoaltina [...] mediatione canalibus actenus divisa fuerat”) and only at that time was it united by a wooden bridge “ex ligni pontis constructione unita est”. According to this account, the new bridge replaced a system of ferry boats paid for by a coin (moneta), and it is thought that this could be the origin of the name of the first bridge (“Ponte

¹ Antonio Vitturi, *Cronaca di Venezia dalle origini al 1396*, BNMV (Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana di Venezia, hereafter cited only as BNMV), ms. It. VII, 2051 (=8271), c. 17 v.;

Cronaca detta Venera fino al 1580, BNMV, Ms. It. VII, 791 (=7589), c. 67 v.; Giorgio Dolfin, *Cronaca Veneta dalle origini al 1458*, BNMV, ms. It. VII, 794 (=8503), c. 69 r.; Marin Sanudo, *Vite dei Dogi*, in Ludovico Antonio Muratori, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, edited by Giovanni Monticolo, Città di Castello 1900-1911. vol. XXII, 286.

² Giambattista Galliccioli, *Delle memorie venete antiche profane ed ecclesiastiche* (Venice, 1795), vol. I, 145.

³ Andrea Dandolo, “Chronica per extensum descripta,” ed. E. Pastorello, in *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, ed. Ludovico Antonio Muratori (Bologna, 1941-49), vol. XII, 313.

della Moneta”). Other scholars think that this name has to do with the existence of an ancient Mint on the embankments⁴.

From the outset, the new bridge of 1264 was open to everybody: noblemen, citizens, and foreigners; it was thus common property, and in that sense could indeed be seen as a gesture of equity, almost the fulfilment of civic duty (Fig. 2.1, 2.2).

The unification of a city hitherto divided into two parts is an important feature of the growth of Venice in the Middle Ages. In the historiographical tradition that links the bridge to Doge Sebastiano Ziani, its construction was related to the aristocratic legitimization of the government of the Republic. The builder of the bridge, Barettier, was the same master who had earlier erected the two columns from Constantinople on St. Mark’s Square: these were thus projects that demonstrated a skill for ingenious structures, both symbols of the greatness of Venice’s maritime and commercial empire.

In the *Capitolare* (registers) of the *Ufficiali sopra Rialto* (the Officers of the Rialto), maintenance of the bridge (*lo fato del ponte della riva dela moneta*) is mentioned as one of the duties of the magistrates starting in the middle of the 13th century⁵. The officials were charged with the care and maintenance of the afore-mentioned bridge (*cura e salvation del dito ponte*)⁶. On the right side of the city, however, the new *insula* was not yet fully formed: for a long period there was only a slaughter-house and the first few residences built by the Gradenigo and Orio families in the 11th century after the creation of the market. The two parishes of San Giovanni and San Matteo emerged only in the 13th century⁷.

The urban situation at the end of the 11th century and for the following hundred years maintained polycentric and discontinuous settlements on the two embankments of the ancient river (the Grand Canal), although there is evidence of an increasing tendency toward the expansion of the residential nuclei and the progressive unification of the two parts (Fig. 2.3, 2.4).

The system of the street networks that evolved was simple: each island had a center with a church and a square (*campo*) on a canal (*rivo*), and private streets (*calli*) linked the *Mansiones* of the church’s founders; a

⁴ Paolo Morachiello, “Le rovine del vecchio ponte,” in *Rialto. Le fabbriche e il ponte*, ed. Donatella Calabi and Paolo Morachiello (Turin: Einaudi, 1987), 173-85.

⁵ ASV, *Capitolare degli Ufficiali sopra Rialto*, 6.

⁶ Andrea Dandolo, “Chronicon,” X, 6, 37, in *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, ed. Ludovico Antonio Muratori, vol. XII, 372.

⁷ Roberto Cessi and Annibale Alberti, *Rialto. L’isola, il ponte, il mercato* (Bologna, 1934), 9-17.

single street linked one *confinium* to the next, usually on the other side of a canal. The only existing connection between San Marco and Rialto was the public continuation of the *Mercerie*, the main public street after 1160, a street which had become ducal property in 1114 (for the part of it called *Mercerie dell'Orologio*). There were few public streets, or *viae majores*.

The creation of a system of magistrates devoted to public works and to the control of private initiatives was rather late (1124: *pro ripis et pro viis publicis et pro viis de canali*). Their responsibilities, covering all the networks of streets, even private ones, began in 1268, while the *Collegio* of the three *Judices supra Publicis* (Magistrates of the Public Domain), responsible for the recognition of the rights of land- and water-ownership, began in 1282. Even the bridges were private institutions: they were mainly wooden structures for the land traffic between one *confinium* and another, and gave access to the houses located on a canal or on a water basin. Only at the end of the 13th century did the construction and the maintenance of the bridges, and participation in their expenses by those involved, require communal authorization. By 1267, there was an office *ad aptandum pontes* (for the management of bridges) in Venice⁸.

The principal bridge for the renewal of the city was of course the Rialto: but unfortunately there is almost no documentation of the original structure. It may be surmised, however, that the first Rialto Bridge was built on boats, and, as noted above, it was probably constructed between 1200 and 1250, as there is no documentation between 1173 and the end of the 12th century⁹. By 1277, however, the *Maggior Consiglio* forbade any kind of boat to stop and sell wine or other products near the bridge¹⁰, thus confirming the existence of such a structure. It also became necessary to enhance the flow of pedestrian traffic, to block the use of space on the bridge for private purposes, and prevent excessive weight on the wooden structure. In July 1293 the *Ufficiali sopra Rialto* were charged with keeping the bridge empty of shops and stands, and closing it with a key, so that it could not be opened without their permission. Although there

⁸ Waldimiro Dorigo, *Venezia romanica* (Venice: Istituto Veneto di Scienze, 2003), vol. I, 162-65.

⁹ Donatella Calabi and Paolo Morachiello, eds., *Rialto. Le fabbriche e il ponte* (Turin: Einaudi, 1987), 175.

¹⁰ ASV (Archivio di Stato di Venezia, hereafter cited only as ASV), *Ufficiali sopra Rialto*, now in *Provveditori al sale*, b. 2, R. Capitolare 2B, cap. 48, c. 5 v.

were abuses, the magistrates could now impose a toll for passage over the bridge intended as a maintenance fund¹¹.

In 1310 there was a conspiracy in Venice in which the conspirators went over the bridge to get to San Marco Square (and thus attack the city government), but, once defeated, they passed over the bridge again to conceal themselves in a doctor's home in Rialto. In their retreat, the conspirators opened the drawbridge to stop their pursuers¹². The fact that the bridge could be opened and closed, in this instance, symbolizes the important role of the bridge as a safeguard of the government against the enemies of the Republican state.

The bridge had no balustrade or railing, and shops were not permitted on it, but small-scale trade occurred nonetheless. With the decision of 1287 to clear the square and the *loggia* near the bridge on the Rialto market side—from the market porticoes as far as the stairs of the bridge—and to create Rialto Nuovo as an extension of the market, access to and use of the bridge could more easily be controlled¹³. A few years later, temporary commerce and beggars were prohibited from the market and the bridge¹⁴. But in Venice rigor was always mitigated by pity, and soon permits for these activities were again issued by the magistrates. In 1309 the Signoria instituted rules that permitted foreigners to sell grain, flour, vegetables and imported goods as long as these merchants sold the items themselves (not at a stand owned by others)¹⁵. These resolutions were confirmed again in 1317, 1324 and 1332. We know that in order to avoid these prohibitions some Venetians acquired homes in Mestre so that they could qualify as “foreigners” and be able to sell their goods on the bridge¹⁶. The aim of this legislation was to keep the central spaces clear and ordered for an easy passage across the bridge.

The inability of the magistrates to enforce rigid regulations on the use of the space of the bridge and market led in time to more liberal legislation. But at the same time, the physical structure of the bridge was weakening. Although no major repairs were undertaken, as with any old edifice maintenance must have been important. Unfortunately, we don't

¹¹ Roberto Cessi, ed., “Deliberazioni del Maggior Consiglio”, in *Atti delle Assemblee costituzionali italiane dal medio evo al 1831* (Bologna: Forni, 1970-71) vol. III, 346, record for July 1293.

¹² G. A. Avogadro, in *Archivio Veneto* (1871), vol. II, 216-17.

¹³ Roberto Cessi, ed., “Deliberazioni del Maggior Consiglio”, vol. III, 206, 22 June 1288.

¹⁴ ASV, *Capitolare degli Ufficiali sopra Rialto*, cap. 48.

¹⁵ ASV, *Maggior Consiglio, Presbiter*, c. 67, 23 October 1309.

¹⁶ ASV, *Capitolare degli Ufficiali sopra Rialto*, 5 May 1332, 149.