

The Fantasy of the Imperishable in the Modern Era

Towards an Eternal Painting

Philippe Sénéchal

At M. Bernard's I saw several magnificent paintings on porcelain by Monsieur Constantin. In two hundred years, Raphael's frescoes will be known only through Monsieur Constantin.

Stendhal, *Voyage en France*, 1837

If we compare the forms that the act of copying has assumed in various civilizations, we cannot fail to notice that a certain number of phenomena are specific to European culture since the Renaissance. Perhaps one of the most singular of these phenomena is the will to create and to possess *imperishable* reproductions of works that have been singled out, at a given moment, as the brightest jewels of Western art. The history of the fortune of Graeco-Roman sculptures has been masterfully related by Francis Haskell and Nicholas Penny in *Taste and the Antique: The Lure of Classical Sculpture 1500-1900*,¹ even if it would no doubt be worthwhile to give further consideration to the critical fortune of materials used for reproduction, and particularly to the particular prestige attached to bronze—from the Mantuan works of Antico² to the reconstitutions of Greek *Urbilder* in bronze, instead of the plaster used earlier, which were executed at the beginning of the twentieth century, such as the two *Doryphoros* that Georg Römer realized from various ancient marble copies of Polyclitus's athlete.³ But, in fact, it was not only in modern Europe that copies were made in bronze. The production of copies using this alloy was particularly prevalent in imperial China after the rediscovery, in the second half of the eleventh century of our era, of a collection

of archaic bronzes from the Shang era.⁴ This is why I prefer to call attention to a practice that appears to me, in contrast, to be unique to the Western world: the copying of renowned paintings in materials that are supposed to defy time.

The desire to make the masterpieces of painting that adorned Saint Peter's basilica inalterable can be said to have begun with the papacy of Urbanus VIII (1623-1644). Mosaic, a material authorized by paleo-Christian precedent and the example of Giotto's *Navicella*, lent itself particularly well to this undertaking.⁵ Once again, the weight of ancient heritage appears to be determinant. The permanence of Roman or paleo-Christian mosaics was a provocative example and challenge. As early as the middle of the sixteenth century, Vasari declares that "mosaic is certainly the most durable form of painting. With time, the other sorts of painting are effaced; mosaic becomes more and more brilliant. Painting disappears and is ruined all by itself, while mosaic enjoys such a long life that it can almost be called eternal."⁶ In 1628, Giovanni Battista Calandra (1586-1644) executed a small altar painting in mosaic, representing *The Triumph of Saint Michael over Lucifer*, after a cartoon by Cavalier d'Arpino. The result was judged disappointing by certain connoisseurs, for the glass tesserae were too shiny and together they produced surface reflections that prevented a good view of the painting as a whole.⁷ This failure impeded the Barberinian plan to replace with mosaic paintings the *pale* of Christendom's most prestigious church. Nevertheless, the idea was reborn at the beginning of the eighteenth century. The humidity in Saint Peter's had caused serious damage to paintings executed on clay under Clement VIII; they were replaced by works of contemporary painters, which were in turn replaced by copies in mosaic. The technical reason was also a pretext for getting rid of *pale* that had become outmoded. The *Studio del Mosaico*, established in 1727 to breathe new life into the Vatican studio created under Gregory XIII (1572-1592), began a systematic campaign to replace paintings. Under the direction of Pietro Paolo Cristofari (1685-1743), Poussin's *Martyr of Saint Erasmus*, Domenichino's *Last Communion of Saint Jerome*, and Guerchino's *Martyr of Saint Petronilla* were among the paintings whose transposition to mosaic, this time, was well received. The pontifical chemist Alessio Mattioli

had managed to produce a new kind of opaque glass, called *scorzetta*, that prevented distracting reflections and produced flesh tones and purples of infinite nuance. The irregularities of the tesserae, which had caught light unevenly, were smoothed over by the use of the *levigatura*, a special mode of polishing. Certain traditional characteristics of mosaic were thus eliminated in favor of the pictorial effect and evenness of surface.⁸ The creation of *pale* in mosaics after cartoons by living artists, and the conversion of altar paintings by the masters of the Seicento, were pursued under the directorship of Pier Leone Ghezzi (1743-1755) and that of Salvatore Monosilio (1755-1776). The successes of the *Studio del Mosaico* subsequently encouraged artists to reproduce works conserved outside Saint Peter's basilica. Thus Caravaggio's *Laying in the Tomb*, previously at Santa Maria in Vallicella, today at the Vatican painting gallery, was transcribed in mosaic in 1814 by Raffaele Cocchi (1792-1858) and installed in the chapel of the Holy Sacrament of the Vatican basilica.⁹ But the most ambitious undertaking was no doubt the transposition into tessera of Leonardo da Vinci's *Last Supper*, a tour de force realized in 1817 by Giacomo Raffaelli (1753-1836) and conserved today at the church of Our Lady of the Snows in Vienna. In the case of a mural in poor condition, the mosaic copy served as a substitute that obviated the inevitable disintegration, and it did so even more than copies painted on canvas—however old and large in size, such as the one in the Royal Academy of Arts in London, attributed to Giampietrino, or the one in the Tongerlo abbey, realized before 1545, for these canvas reproductions were themselves subject to alterations in color, craquelures, yellowing varnish, and so forth.

Still, despite its technical success from the end of the eighteenth century on, this costly procedure, which was practiced exclusively by Italian craftsmen, met with competition from other techniques of producing an unalterable copy: painting on enamel, encaustic painting, and especially painting on porcelain. Enamels painted on copper were restricted to copies of limited dimensions; excelling in this technique were Swiss artists, such as Abraham Constantin (1785-1855) and Salomon-Guillaume Counis (1785-1858), who vied with each other in the execution of copies of Raphael's *Madonna della Sedia*.¹⁰ The process met with some fur-

ther success in the Renaissance revival of the nineteenth century, as attested by the creations of Paul Grandhomme (1851-1944) and Étienne-Marie Garnier (1848-1908?) after Mantegna, Botticelli, and Crivelli.¹¹ But, with these artists, the originals, of which they sometimes copied only a detail, became the pretext for small paintings that were sparkling and precious, combining opaque enamels with translucent enamels and glitter.

Beginning in the middle of the eighteenth century, the fascination with the pictorial techniques of the Ancients inspired numerous attempts in France, England, and Italy to rediscover the secret of encaustic painting.¹² But this technique does not appear to have been used much in order to copy renowned paintings, apart from the staggering reproduction of Raphael's *Loggie* in the Hermitage. In 1788 Johann Friedrich Reiffenstein, counsellor to Catherine II, influenced by the writings of the Jesuit Vincenzo Requeño,¹³ had a team of Roman painters directed by Christoph Unterperger realize a complete copy of the Vatican frescoes in encaustic painting on panels, which were then assembled at Saint Petersburg by Giacomo Quarenghi.¹⁴

In the realm of ceramics, the factory at Sèvres, starting in approximately 1761, produced plaques that reproduced contemporary paintings, either as decoration for precious furniture or as autonomous works. The damage caused by a fire to a tapestry of the château of Belleville encouraged Louis XVI to have masterpieces of painting and tapestry reproduced in porcelain. This led to the creation of plaques of *pâte tendre* after Oudry's *Chasses du Roy*, woven at the Gobelins, or, somewhat later, after the suite of *Usages et modes du Levant* that Amédée Van Loo had painted between 1772 and 1775, copied between 1783 and 1786 (Sèvres, Musée national de céramique; and Versailles, Musée national du château). The copy in ceramic could therefore play a role in conservation, or even as insurance against damage, as a talismanic *Ersatz*. It also served to reveal taste by showing which works were given priority in such conservation efforts. Unlike mosaic, this was a work of painting, in which one could, to a certain extent, perceive the work of the paintbrush, the *touche*. Moreover, seen up close, the image remained integral, without fragmentation into multiple elements. But enamel painting on porcelain presented

two drawbacks. For one thing, for a long time only a limited range of colors was available to artists. The palette was expanded only with improvements made at the Sèvres factory, under the direction of Alexandre Brongniart, that is, from 1800 to 1847. For another, the plaques did not attain large dimensions. Here again, technical improvements made by Brongniart made it possible to produce larger plaques, obtained by casting.¹⁵ The most talented painters on porcelain, Marie-Victoire Jaquotot (1772-1855) and Abraham Constantin (the latter having abandoned painting on enamel), then tackled the great monuments of painting, not only on canvas but also frescoes.¹⁶ The first of these painters, whom Louis XVIII dubbed "the king's porcelain painter," wanted her tomb to read as follows: "To Madame Jaquotot, Creator of Inalterable Painting." Her copies of Gérard's *Psyché et l'Amour* (1816) or of Raphael's *Belle Jardinière* (1822) received unanimous acclaim.¹⁷ Madame Jacquotot did not hesitate to enliven the colors in an attempt to restore the original shades, darkened or altered by aging or by clumsy restoration efforts. These copyists on porcelain evinced a sort of demiurgic attempt to rediscover and permanently fix the very essence of a masterpiece. For his part, Constantin owes his ephemeral glory to a series of extraordinary copies after Raphael, including reproductions of the *Stanze*, from *The Miracle of Bolsena* to *The School of Athens*. This last plaque measured no less than 95 by 125 centimeters (Sèvres, Musée national de céramique, Inv. 7645). The problem of the size of the porcelain panels was determinant. As soon as it became possible to do so, the Genevan artist tried to use plaques of the exact dimensions of the original. Such was the case with *Ezekiel's Vision* after Raphael (1821), now at the Galleria Sabauda in Torino (Inv. no. 178), which was part of a lot of seventeen porcelain paintings acquired in 1825 by Charles-Albert of Savoy, then Prince of Carignano. But Constantin also complained "because the difficulty of obtaining plaques force[d him] not to choose [his] subjects, but to copy those whose dimensions were proportionate to the plaque."¹⁸ In any case, when the dimensions were suitable, he tried to perfect the illusion by asking those who possessed his copies to recreate the lighting and display conditions of the original.¹⁹

Beginning in the middle of the nineteenth century, these feats lost some of their ability to dazzle. Not only were they rivaled by the new photographic exactitude—this despite the loss of color—and by the size limitations of the plaques, but in addition they had become preponderantly attached to the work of Raphael and suffered increasingly from the renewed interest in painters emphasizing visible brushstrokes, such as Titian or Velázquez. The loss of the materiality of painting, the impossibility of making the brushstrokes or impasto felt, shocked devotees who were fascinated by the fire of the romantics. On the other hand, painted copies, preferably those made to the original's true dimensions, found ardent defenders. They made up the large pedagogical collections that were attempted both in Paris—from Louis Peisse's Musée des modèles, created in 1834 at the École des Beaux-Arts, to Charles Blanc's ephemeral Musée des copies, open from April to December 1873 at the Palais de l'Industrie des Champs-Élysées, and to the Musée des monuments français du Trocadéro²⁰—as well as in Munich, where, between 1863 and 1880, the jurist and writer Adolf Friedrich von Schack, a great lover of painting, assembled a collection of eighty-five copies on canvas²¹ in addition to his superb collection of paintings by contemporary German masters. If, in Charles Blanc's "European museum," Raphael and Velázquez took up the lion's share, in the Bavarian collection it was the Venetian school that prevailed, with fifty-five copies versus six of Raphael and four of Velázquez. The finest reproductions of Titian and of the Spanish master were due to a great German artist, Franz von Lenbach, who admirably rendered the dashed-off texture of the models.²² And, even among the works of the Urbinate, the chief attraction was the most Venetian in style, the *Velata* of the Pitti museum, copied by Hans von Marées, who accentuated its Titianesque aspects.²³ As for the large sizes, the École des Beaux-Arts was able to exhibit certain impressive true-to-size copies, such as the *Last Judgment* by Xavier Sigalon (1787-1837) and Numa Boucoiran (1805-1869) after Michelangelo,²⁴ and the Schack collection held the *Presentation of the Virgin at the Temple* by August Wolf (1842-1915), after the Titian of the Venice Academy, which measures no less than 3.59 by 7.78 meters.²⁵

The obsessive concern with preserving traces of threatened masterpieces found quite involuntary confirmations in the events of the day. Thus Louis Auvray, who championed the cause of museums of copies, could easily argue his case by recalling, in 1873, that the copy painted after Titian's *Death of Saint Peter the Martyr*, made in 1842 by a student of Ingres, Eugène Appert (1814-1867), was one of the few remaining traces of the sublime canvas after the original was destroyed in the 1866 fire that had ravaged the church of Santi Giovanni e Paolo in Venice.²⁶ For the rest, Auvray's book *Le Musée européen* has been wrongfully neglected and scorned. This painstaking work, which he published in order to support the creation of his friend Charles Blanc—this Museum of copies attacked by his political opponents and by advocates of photographic galleries—contains most of the arguments in favor of such a collection. The word "European" must be taken seriously. Wishing to assemble in Paris copies of masterpieces conserved in the various galleries of Europe, the promoters of the Museum established in the Palais des Champs-Élysées never lost sight of the Denonian ambition of the Musée Napoléon, which for several years had made possible the collection of the most extraordinary *membra disjecta* of Western art. At the time a nearly complete history of painting could be read at the Palais du Louvre, at least in terms of the canon of the time. The aspiration to totality is one of the distinctive characteristics of the nineteenth century. Therefore the loss of the irreplaceable moment when this historical totality had been embodied remained a thorn in the side of numerous French experts. In his compendium, which is a guide to the various gallery rooms, Auvray never fails to point out which works used to be present in the Louvre—and at times one can detect a spiteful note, or at least unabashed rationalization for the Napoleonic plundering. Thus regarding Raphael's *Transfiguration* and the same painter's *Madonna di Foligno*, he speaks of "two masterpieces that were once in France's possession and that should be to this day."²⁷ Charles Blanc's Musée des copies is seen as a nostalgic prosthesis of this irreversibly amputated Louvre,²⁸ but also of the Louvre that, in any case, will never be able to possess the frescoes of the Renaissance masters that are the flower of Italy, even if Italy allows them to decay in disgrace.²⁹ Above all reigns the

didactic and democratic intent, in virtue of four postulates: art can be taught; the list of key works is known; the public has a right to know these treasures; only the rich can travel. Thus the need for facsimiles.³⁰

Auvray's conceptions might seem out of date and definitively associated with a Third Republic that was prone to pedagogy. Yet his ideals have just recently found their most grandiose application. Several months ago in Naruto, Japan, the Otsuka Museum of Art was inaugurated: a gigantic museum of copies on ceramic of masterpieces of Western painting, from antiquity to the present day.³¹ The selection aims to present examples of most movements and most countries, and with a few exceptions is limited to landmark works, from the *Aldobrandine Wedding* to *Guernica*.³² Painting is understood here in a broad sense, for the collection includes the *Battle of Arbela*, a mosaic that is itself the reflection of a painting from antiquity. A new procedure has made possible a form of photographic enameling of large plaques, which may be set next one another in order to reproduce immense works such as the Scrovegni chapel or the vault of the *Last Judgment* from the Sistine Chapel. This collection is made up of true facsimiles, for each work is duplicated true to size. The museum creator, Masahito Otsuka, wishes both to exhibit inalterable copies and to make accessible to the public an entire legacy that is unfamiliar to the Japanese, to initiate the public to a culture that they would be able to know first hand only by traveling to Europe some day, and to do so by seeking to create the illusion of being face to face with the original, by virtue of viewing conditions that are analogous at least in terms of the volume of the rooms, as at the Musée des monuments français. The plaques are surprisingly matte; still, because of the artificial lighting, the shininess that had such a distracting effect in the case of the mosaics of papal Rome or of the Sèvres copies on enamel or porcelain is not totally absent. Moreover, the orthogonal lines where the plaques meet prove somewhat disturbing to the view of the work whole. Nevertheless, this sterilized Pantheon represents a staggering accomplishment. This place is the tangible manifestation of the persistence of the idea of the masterpiece, of the possibility of a canon, of a naïve faith in the eternity of art, with regard to and against all the desacraliza-

tions of postmodernism. It would be absurd, however, to dismiss postmodernism haughtily, to see it as nothing but a simulacrum condemned to the status of kitsch, like those ridiculed a bit too smugly by Umberto Eco in his *The War of the False*, following his odyssey in the United States.³³ First of all, a faithful reproduction, in color and true to size, possesses more than its mere pedagogical virtue, which is already far superior to that of a slide, which reduces all works to a standard format. The sensory impact of the exact dimensions upon any viewer, whether ignorant or erudite, is crucial. Centuries of engravings and over a century and a half of photography have accustomed us to contemplate reproductions that are *reduced* and has led us to see this disadvantage, whether consciously or not, as secondary, whereas in actual fact it constitutes a major loss, a fundamental departure from the artist's wish.³⁴ And above all, the Otsuka Museum is a magnificent testimony to the Westernization of Japan, obviously through the choice of works and through the fact that it adopts the notion of collecting copies, like its French or German predecessors of the era of eclecticism; but also, and even more profoundly, because it forms the crowning paroxysm of a dream of perfect and incorruptible duplication that has traversed European civilization from Rome of the seventeenth century.

In conclusion, a few additional hypotheses may be proposed in explanation of this aspiration on the part of European artists. Since the seventeenth century, such a quest presupposed the convergence of a certain number of conditions: the weight of the Graeco-Roman heritage; a consciousness of the historical development of art and the singling out of a certain number of artists as heroes, results of Vasari's monumental *Vite* that were reinforced by museums as these became increasingly accessible to the public; the existence of a restoration practice that was both increasingly regulated and increasingly the subject of debates³⁵; and finally, beginning in the eighteenth century, technical competition among various countries and among individual artists.

Translated from the French by Jennifer Curtiss Gage

Notes

1. New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1981.
2. R. E. Stone, "Antico and the Development of Bronze Casting in Italy at the End of the Quattrocento," *Metropolitan Museum of Art*, XVI (1982): 87-116.
3. The first version, realized in 1910-12, previously at the municipal museum of Zzczecin, is today housed in the National Museum in Warsaw; the second, executed in 1920-21, adorned the Hall of Honor of the University of Munich until its destruction in 1944. See R. M. Schneider, "Polyklet: Forschungsbericht und Antikenrezeption. Polyklet zwischen Winckelmann und Furtwängler: Ein Forschungsbericht," in H. Beck, P. C. Bol, and M. Bückling (eds.), *Polyklet. Der Bildhauer der griechischen Klassik*, exhibition catalogue, Frankfurt-am-Main, Liebighaus, Museum alter Plastik, 17 October 1990 - 20 January 1991 (Frankfurt-am-Main and Mayence, Liebighaus and Philipp von Zabern, 1990), pp. 473-504.
4. See D. Elisseeff's article in this same issue, "Copying in Imperial China."
5. On the renewal of interest in Roman and paleo-Christian mosaics in the Rome of Pope Barberini, see H. Whitehouse, "Copies of Roman Paintings and Mosaics in the Paper Museum: Their Value as Archaeological Evidence," in *Cassiano dal Pozzo's Paper Museum*, I = *Quaderni Puteani*, 2, n. d. [Olivetti, 1992], pp. 105-121; J. Osborne and A. Claridge, *The Paper Museum*, Series A. Part II, vol. I, *Mosaics and Wallpaintings in Roman Churches* (London, Harvey Miller, 1997); and I. Herklotz, *Cassiano dal Pozzo (1588-1657) und die Archäologie des 17. Jahrhunderts* (München, Hirmer, 1998).
6. G. Vasari, "Del mosaico de' vetri et a quello che si conosce il buono e lodato," in *Vite de' più eccellenti pittori, scultori et architettori* (Florence, Torrentino, 1550 and Giunti, 1568); R. Bettarini and P. Barocchi, ed., I, *Testo* (Florence, 1966), p. 148.
7. In 1759, Calandra's alterpiece was withdrawn, then exiled to the Macerata cathedral. On Calandra, see A. González-Palacios, "Giovanni Battista Calandra, un mosaicista alla corte dei Barberini," *Ricerche di storia dell'arte*, 1-2 December 1976, pp. 211-226.
8. S. Röttgen, "The Roman Mosaic from the Sixteenth to the Nineteenth Century: A Short Historical Survey," in A. González-Palacios and S. Röttgen (eds.), *The Art of Mosaics: Selections from the Gilbert Collection* (Los Angeles, Los Angeles County Museum, 1982), pp. 19-43; D. Petoichi, M. Alfieri, and M. G. Branchetti, *I mosaici minuti romani dei secoli XVIII e XIX* (1981); and G. Cornini, "Lo Studio Vaticano del Mosaico," in M. Alfieri, M. G. Branchetti, and G. Cornini, *Mosaici minuti del 700 e dell' 800*, exhibition catalogue, Vatican City, Braccio di Carlo Magno, October - November 1986, (n. p., Edizioni del Mosaico, 1986). The author was unfortunately unable to consult F. Di Federico's work, *The Mosaics of Saint Peter's: Decorating the New Basilica*, University Park and London, 1983.
9. In 1843, Aguatti created, for the art market, a reduced version of it in *mosaico minuto*, now in the Gilbert Collection. See S. Röttgen, "The Roman Mosaic..." cited in previous note, pp. 132-133, no. 41.
10. R. M. Mason and M. Natale (eds.), *Raphaël et la seconde main*, exhibition catalogue (Geneva, Cabinet des Estampes et Musée d'Art et d'Histoire, 12 January - 25 March 1984), Geneva, 1984, pp. 189-221.

11. See *Copier Créer*, exhibition catalogue (Paris, Musée du Louvre, 26 April - 29 July 1993), Paris, RMN, 1993, pp. 296-297, no. 199.
12. J. Guilherme, *L'Atelier du temps*, Paris, 1964, pp. 177-185; A. Conti, *Storia del restauro e della conservazione delle opere d'arte*, [Venice,] Electa, [1973], pp. 141-143; D. Rice, *The Fire of the Ancients: the Encaustic Painting Revival*, Ph.D., Yale University, 1979; T. S. Watts, "J. H. Müntz, Horace Walpole and encaustic painting: Müntz's experiments in England," *Apollo* (October 1994): 37-43; and M. T. Caracciolo, "Deux toiles de Cades retrouvées en Russie. Théories et pratiques de la peinture à l'encaustique à Rome, vers 1780," *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* (October 1996): 155-172.
13. V. Requeño, *Saggi sul ristabilimento dell'antico arte de' Greci e de' Romani pittori*, Venice, Giovanni Gatti, 1784.
14. In fact, the empress had dreamed since the end of the 1770s of realizing a facsimile of the *Loggie*, but it was only ten years later that the idea of executing it *all' antica* was seized upon. M. T. Caracciolo, "Deux toiles de Cades..." cited in note 12 above, particularly pp. 163-167.
15. A. Lajoix, "Alexandre Brongniart et la quête de la reproduction en couleurs," *Sèvres*, no. 1, 1992, pp. 64-73, and no. 2, 1993, pp. 52-58 and 76-78; T. Préaud, "Brongniart as Technician," in D. E. Ostergard (ed.), *The Sèvres Porcelain Manufactory. Alexandre Brongniart and the Triumph of Art and Industry, 1800-1847*, exhibition catalogue (New York, The Bard Graduate Center for Studies in the Decorative Arts, 17 October 1997 - 1 February 1998), New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1997, pp. 53-63; Ead., "Brongniart and the Art of Ceramics," *ibid.*, pp. 65-73; and Ead., "The Nature and Goals of Production at the Sèvres Manufactory," *ibid.*, pp. 75-95, and particularly pp. 84, 86, and 89.
16. A. Lajoix, "Tableaux précieux en porcelaine," *L'Estampille / L'Objet d'art*, no. 247 (May 1991): 108-123. On Madame Jaquotot, see R. Rückert, "Marie-Victoire Jaquotot, 1772-1855: porcelain painter and virtuoso pianist," *Weltkunst*, LV-15 (August 1985): 2103-2109; and LV-17 (September 1985): 2352-2358; and A. Lajoix, "Marie-Victoire Jaquotot (1772-1855) et ses portraits pour la tabatière de Louis XVIII," *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de l'Art français* (1990): 153-171. On Abraham Constantin, see D. Plan, *Abraham Constantin peintre sur émail et sur porcelaine*, Geneva, Éditions de Genève, 1930; and R. M. Mason and M. Natale (eds.), see note 10, pp. 198-218.
17. These two plaques are conserved in the Musée national de céramique de Sèvres, Inv. 7259 and Inv. 16854 respectively.
18. *Lettres adressées au baron François Gérard, peintre d'histoire, par les artistes et personnages célèbres de son temps*, Paris, 1886, p. 329.
19. Regarding his painting on porcelain after the *Fornarina* (1823, 58 x 48 cm., Sèvres, Musée national de céramique, inv. 7251), Constantin asked Brongniart "that it not be exposed in too bright a light, like the original exhibited in the Tribuna, of which [his] copy is in precisely the same shade. In addition, Monsieur, please tilt it and light it from above, with the source of light just over it." Sèvres, Archives de la manufacture, box T 9, bundle 3, letter dated 14 December 1822, cited by A. Lajoix, "Alexandre Brongniart..." *op. cit.* note 15 above, p. 76. The masterpiece of Sebastiano del Piombo, which was then thought to be by Raphael, is conserved in the Uffizi and measures 66 x 53 cm.
20. On Peisse, see N. Laneyrie-Dagen, "Louis Peisse et le 'Musée des modèles' à l'École des Beaux-Arts," *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de l'Art français*

- (1985): 217-241. On Blanc, see A. Boime, "Le Musée des Copies," *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, 6e. période, t. LXIV (1964): 237-247; usefully corrected and completed by B. Foucart, "Copies, répliques, faux. IV. Le XIX^e siècle. Les modèles élusifs et le 'musée des copies,'" *Revue de l'Art*, no. 21 (1979): 23-29; P. Vaisse, "Charles Blanc und das 'Musée des Copies,'" *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte*, 39 (1976, 1): 54-66; and P. Duro, "Le Musées des copies de Charles Blanc à l'aube de la III^e République. Catalogue," *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de l'Art français* (1985): 283-313.
21. The collection was bequeathed to the German emperor in 1894; today it constitutes the Schack-Galerie, property of the Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen. See E. Ruhmer (ed.), *Schack-Galerie* [Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen, Gemälde Kataloge, 2], München, 1969, 2 vols. Schack wished to possess reflections of the art that he preferred and that was in museums for all time, and especially to juxtapose modern art to ancient art to see if the former withstood the comparison without being crushed. He explained his rationale in *Meine Gemäldesammlungen*, Stuttgart, 1889/3.
 22. Franz von Lenbach actualized no fewer than seventeen copies for Count Schack, who was particularly proud of the *Charles V at the Battle of Mühlberg*, copied in 1868 after the Prado Titian, to its true dimensions (3.36 m. x 2.8 m.), for which he had to have a special canvas made in Paris. See E. Ruhmer (ed.), *Schack-Galerie*, cited in preceding note, I, pp. 501-506; and II, fig. 194.
 23. *Ibidem*, I, pp. 524-526; II, fig. 198.
 24. Realized between 1833 and 1838, this painting can still be seen in the chapel of the Petits-Augustins.
 25. Wolf's copy was executed in 1877-1878. E. Ruhmer, cited in note 21 above, pp. 583-585.
 26. L. Auvray, *Le Musée européen. Copies d'après les grands maîtres au palais des Champs-Élysées*, Paris, Librairie Renouard, Henri Loons successeur 1873, p. 60. On this copy, see P. Duro, cited in note 20, p. 286, no. 4. L. Auvray had already expressed his wish to see the copies painted by the residents of the Académie de France in Rome reunited in a single location and presented to the public, in "Chronique des Arts," *Revue artistique et littéraire*, 1 (1860): 181-183.
 27. L. Auvray, cited in preceding note, pp. 20-21. See also *ibid.*, pp. 46, 49, 65, and 97.
 28. *Ibid.*, p. 12: "Every year artists seem to see an increase in the series of master paintings that the Louvre does not possess and that they come to study"; and p. 98: "This room contains no fewer than sixteen copies after Raphael, bringing to thirty-three the number of reproductions of his paintings whose originals the Museum cannot possess."
 29. *Ibid.*, p. 56, regarding the frescoes of Piero della Francesca in Arezzo: p. 59, on the *Madonna del Sacco* by Andrea del Sarto in Florence; p. 66, on Giotto's frescoes at the Arena in Padua; pp. 74 and 76 for Michelangelo's *Last Judgment*; and p. 110 for Raphael's *School of Athens*.
 30. *Ibid.*, p. 12: "Those who cannot travel as tourists would have before their eyes, classified by school and arranged chronologically, the masterpieces that are scattered throughout the monuments and the richest galleries of Europe." The Musée des copies would even be one of the first to have provided detailed labels for visitors. See *ibid.*, p. 113: "We therefore congratulate Monsieur le Directeur des Beaux-Arts ... for placing beneath each frame a badge containing the subject of the painting, the name of its creator, the school to which it

belongs, the dates of the artist's birth and death, the place where the original painting is found, and the name of the author of the copy that is displayed. This is of great service to the visitors who cannot buy a catalogue; it provides free instruction, and this should be the case for all collections held by the State."

31. I am grateful to Philippe Malgouyres for having brought this museum to my attention.
32. The composition of the anthology merits a study of its own, one that would incorporate the critical reception of any given artist in Japan, as well as the granting or refusal of permission by any given museum or owner to reproduce the work in the agency's or individual's possession.
33. Paris, Grasset, 1985; *Faith in Fakes: Essays*, trans. William Weaver, London, 1986.
34. Sculpture suffers less from this obstacle, since galleries of plaster reproductions make it possible to see all the copies in the exact dimensions of the original.
35. See A. Conti, see note 12 above.