Antoni Ziemba
UNIVERSITY OF WARSAW

Rocznik MNW. NS | Journal of the NMW. NS
nr | no. 12(48), 2023

Great Forgers of the Past

In memory of Andrzej Reiche

My museum colleague and friend, Andrzej Reiche, who passed away in 2022, discovered that an exhibit in the Gallery of Ancient Art – a miniature obelisk with cuneiform writing, regarded as Assyrian – was, in fact, a modern forgery. This little object serves as a signal or symptom of a broader phenomenon that holds significance for the history of European collecting culture from the Middle Ages to the early 20th century. There would be no great collectors of ancient artefacts had it not been for the practice of producing copies purporting to be original works created by masters of antiquity, their various imitations and pastiches, as well as overt and covert forgeries. Interestingly, these were sometimes perpetrated by the most eminent collectors, such as Duke Jean de Berry, or such artistic personalities as Michelangelo. In dedicating this text to Andrzej, I want it to serve as an introduction and background to his paper, completed as a gesture of commemoration by his fellow Assyriologists from the University of Warsaw.

This is not the place for an extensive history of forgeries of the past, an area already well covered in extant literature. Nor is it worthwhile to tackle the terminological reflection, which is generally complex and occasionally twisted – that is, the question of how to differentiate between imitation, emulation, repetition, reproduction, similarity, copy, replica, pastiche, simulacrum, simulation, stylization, adaptation, plagiarism, falsification, and forgery. This subject also boasts an exhaustive bibliography,[1] but to date, no one has succeeded in defining the exact semantic boundaries of these terms. Consequently, I will merely employ a few spectacular examples to make readers aware of the scope and historical importance of the phenomenon.[2]

[1] See, e.g., Heinz Ladendorf, *Antikenstudium und Antikenkopie*, 2nd ed. (Berlin, 1958); Otto Kurz, *Fakes*, 2nd ed. (New York, 1967); *Oryginał, replika, kopia. Materiały III seminarium metodologicznego Stowarzyszenia Historyków Sztuki, Radziejowice 26–27 września 1968*, Andrzej Ryszkiewicz, ed. (Warsaw, 1971); *Conservazione, falso, restauro*, Federico Zeri, ed. (Turin, 1981); Francis Haskell, Nicholas Penny, *Taste and the Antique. The Lure of Greek Sculpture 1500–1900* (New Haven, 1981); Phyllis Pray Bober, Ruth Rubinstein, *Renaissance Artists and Antique Sculpture. A Handbook of Sources* (London–New York, 1986); Seymour Howard, *Antiquity Restored. Essays on the Afterlife of the Antique* (Vienna, 1990); Aviva Briefel, *The Deceivers. Art Forgery and Identity in the Nineteenth Century* (Ithaca–London 2006); Thierry Lenain, *Art Forgery. The History of a Modern Obsession* (London, 2011); Monica Baggio et al., *Anthropology of Forgery. A Multidisciplinary Approach to the Study of Archaeological Fakes* (Padua, 2019); *Art and Artifice Fakes*, exh. cat., The Courtauld Institute (London, 2023).

[2] I have chosen to omit numerous well and lesser-known instances and scopes of forgery or counterfeiting in the realm of art. For instance, I refrain from elaborating on the imitations and false copies of Albrecht Dürer's prints and the subsequent trial he instituted against Marcantonio Raimondi, or on the introduction of official

It is common knowledge that our awareness of classical Greek sculptures is mainly shaped through their Roman copies. What we do not know, however, is how the Romans treated them: as literal copies, "imprints" of the originals, or as simulations, imaginative recreations of the general appearance of the lost original works. Nor do we know how these copies were made: by replicating the prototype through a cast or a freehand technique, in direct contact with the original or merely on the basis of drawings or even descriptions? The famous Roman copyist Pasiteles, a Greek of Italic origin who ran a flourishing workshop in the 1st century BC,[3] created bronze works from clay models made beforehand and popularized the method of mechanically copying originals using plaster casts. His pupils Stephanos and Menelaos, authors of copies and variants of Greek sculptures as well as original works in the neo-Greek style, worked in a similar way.

Roman copies differ not only in detail but also in the style or mode of their creation: some are more "neo-Attic," others "neo-Asianistic." The *Spinario*, or *Boy with Thorn*, from Rome's Musei Capitolini (Palazzo dei Conservatori), cast in bronze in the 1st century AD, has a completely different type of modelling – softer, with more emphasis on light and shadow – than the marble version created in the first half of the same century and held at the British Museum. The latter is rendered more classically, in the "Attic" manner, which differs still from the satirical-parodistic terracotta variant of the same sculpture kept in Berlin (Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Antikensammlung, Altes Museum) (**fig. 1**). This raises the question of whether such works were only expected to be faithful to the (Hellenistic, 3rd century BC) original, or whether the copyist's personal style was also appreciated. And whether they were only meant to evoke the ideal beauty of classical sculpture or the sculptor in question, acting as variations on his works and style, or whether they were treated as accurate reconstructions, acting as a substitute for unavailable originals.

Roman and Greco-Roman sculptures were also copied, including pastiches of classical Greek statues. There were copies of copies, copies of variations, copies of stylizations and... stylized copies. The so-called *Stephanos Athlete* (**fig. 2**), the figure of a youth made by Stephanos, is a familiar example of the type of sculpture acquired by the Roman upper classes to decorate their private villas in a way that evoked the sophisticated lifestyle and culture of the recently subdued Hellenistic kingdoms of the eastern Mediterranean. Greek sculptors in Athens and Rome, such as Pasiteles and Stephanos, provided Roman patricians with more or less exact replicas of well-known statues from the past as well as new works that imitated or combined various earlier Greek styles. The Stephanos *Youth* is one such amalgam of imitations: the extremely broad shoulders with elevated shoulder bones and the stance bring to

reproduction rights for printed works (in England in 1735). Nor do I discuss the phenomenon of falsifying signatures or the first attempts to authenticate the oeuvre of a living painter (e.g., Claude Lorrain's *Liber veritatis*, documenting all his genuine works as a countermeasure against dishonest imitators and forgers). I bypass cases that could be categorized as self-plagiarism, i.e., the practice of producing two versions of a single composition for various clients, typical of Caravaggio and other painters. I leave aside the "Brueghel-Bruegel enterprise" phenomenon, or the mass production of copies and pastiches after Breugel the Elder in his sons' workshop, particularly the endeavours of Pieter Brueghel the Younger in Antwerp. I have also chosen to exclude the *giorgioneschi* from Pietro della Vecchia, Carlo Ridolfi and Marco Boschini's Venice art forging "business", active in the 2nd half of the 17th c. My focus lies specifically on the falsification of ancient artworks and "archaeological" forgeries.

[3] Maurizio Borda, *La scuola di Pasiteles* (Bari, 1953); Jerry J. Pollitt, *The Art of Ancient Greece: Sources and Documents* (Cambridge, 1990), p. 120; Evelyne Prioux, Éleonora Santin, "Des écrits sur l'art aux signatures d'artiste: l'école de Pasitélès, un cas d'étude sur la notion de filiation artistique," *Topoi. Orient–Occident*, 19, no. 2 (2014), pp. 515–46; *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Sculpture*, Elise A. Friedland, Melanie Grunow Sobocinski, eds (Oxford, 2015), p. 299.

mind male statues of the second quarter of the 5th century BC, while the small head and long legs imitate the style of works created in the mid-4th century BC in line with the canon of proportions drawn up by Lysippos. The soft modelling of the body derives from the 4th century BC statues of Praxiteles and Hellenistic sculpture of the 3rd and 2nd centuries AD.[4] These eclectically combined inspirations gave rise to a new work, a summa of imitations. Stephanos's imitative creation became the basis for further imitations, as more than seventeen ancient copies are known today. One bears the pseudo-signature, "Stephanos, pupil of Pasiteles," and this copy – kept in the Villa Albani in Rome – is currently regarded as closest to the original, representing the best *imitatio imitationum* ("imitation of an imitation"). Plato would probably have said (had he been alive at the time and speaking Latin) that it is a poly-secondary imitation, or more precisely a quadruple imitation – imitation of an imitation of an imitation of an imitation. The divine idea of the young man's beautiful flesh (the veritable prototype) is reflected (as an imprint, image) in the young man living here and now (I), whose shape is reproduced by the statue of Stephanos (II), which is reproduced in the copy from Villa Albani (III), from which further copies are made (IV). Even the double derivative nature of the mimetic image or poem was enough for the philosopher to banish poets and artists from his ideal state (*Res publica*) – the derivative nature of the mimetic image with respect to the idea of things and things themselves, understood as true existence and its reflection, meant that the image (visual or literary) was a reflection of the reflection of an idea, and, therefore, a non-being, marred with non-life, the breath of death. Luckily for artists and poets, various subsequent renditions of Neoplatonism reversed this devaluation of imagery, finding value in the mere reflection or likeness (*simile*, *simulacrum*, etc.), possibly faithful to the original, as the only approximation of the divine truth – the eternal idea of things – available to mortals. This speculative thought-acrobatics concerning the image is not reproduced here for the sake of idle wordplay. I believe that in ancient Rome, it underpinned the widespread acceptance of the status of copies, replicas and imitations, produced en masse and in multiple successive references (these *imitationes imitationum*).

Among the small sculptures, goldsmithery, engraved gemstones and medals owned by the great collectors of the late Middle Ages – Emperor Charles IV of Luxembourg, the French kings Charles V and Charles VI of Valois, dukes Louis d'Anjou and Jean de Berry – there were numerous antique objects, many of which were copies and imitations. What is more, all these connoisseurs – consciously or not – ordered falsified imitations. We know that after 1412, duke de Berry funded a silver-gilt cross, decorated with expensive stones and cameos and made in the workshop of eminent goldsmith Herman Ruissel (Rince) in 1416,[5] for the Sainte-Chapelle treasury in Bourges. The gold figure of the crucified Christ contained a relic of the True Cross

[4] Cf. <https://www.metmuseum.org/art/collection/search/255120>.

[5] *Heiliges römisches Reich deutscher Nation 962 bis 1806. Altes Reich und neue Staaten, 1495 bis 1806*, Hans Ottomeyer, Jutta Götzmann, eds, exh. cat., Deutsches Historisches Museum, Berlin, 2006 (Berlin–Dresden, 2006), pp. 283–84, cat. no. IV 74b; *La Sainte-Chapelle de Bourges. Une fondation disparue de Jean de France, duc de Berry*, exh. cat., Musée du Berry, Bourges, 2004 (Paris–Bourges, 2004), p. 144, cat. no. 53-1; Françoise Baron, Dominique Thiébaut, Danielle Gaborit-Chopin, *Charles V et ses frères* (Paris, 1993), p. 33; Françoise Baron et al., *Les Fastes du gothique. Le siècle de Charles V*, exh. cat., Galeries nationales du Grand-Palais, Paris, 1981 (Paris, 1981), p. 211; *Die Zeit der Staufer. Geschichte – Kunst – Kultur*, vol. 1, exh. cat., Württembergisches Landesmuseum, Stuttgart, 1977 (Stuttgart, 1977), pp. 678–79, cat. no. 863; André de Ridder, *Catalogue sommaire des bijoux antiques. Musée national du Louvre. Département des Antiquités grecques et romaines* (Paris, 1924); Adrien Blanchet, *Les camées de Bourges* (Caen, 1900), pp. 5–7, cat. no. 5.

in the centre and original antique cameos of onyx and sardonyx at the extremities, on both recto and verso. These depicted busts of gods (probably Jupiter, Juno and Serapis) and members of the Julio-Claudian dynasty (Agrippina the Elder, Tiberius, Drusus the Elder).[6] Added to this set – most likely at centre (verso) – were two more "antique" cameos: one with a portrayal of a woman, regarded as Agrippina,[7] the other showing a "Caesar" enthroned, crowned by two Victories,[8] with whom the French duke surely wished to be identified (**fig. 3**). However, the alleged Caesar-Duke was not a real Roman ruler at all. In all likelihood, the depicted person was Frederick II (III),[9] king of Sicily from 1296 to 1337 – there exists another image of him on a cameo kept at the Staatliche Münzsammlung in Munich, which corresponds to the one from the Louvre. Note that a thriving glyptic workshop operated in the orbit of his court in Palermo and Catania, producing imitations of ancient works sold as antiquities (now held in museums in London, Vienna, Naples and elsewhere). This is the source of both "false" cameos used in the *Bourges Cross*. Can this large-scale practice be referred to as the forgery industry? From today's standpoint – definitely. From the historical one – not quite. In that era, notions such as original versus imitated, or antique (ancient) versus contemporary, were, after all, completely different than now, rooted in the general belief in the historical continuity of the Roman Empire. On the other hand, the ideology of "renewal" – *renovatio Imperii Romani* – propagated by Frederick II Hohenstauf (to whom Frederick of Sicily alluded), presupposed an awareness of the distant, lost past of ancient civilization. In this light, these imitations of antiquity may have been deliberate "fakes," forgeries that followed the established policy– whereas Jean de Berry could have been ignorant of this previous-century practice and used both cameos in good faith, convinced they were genuinely ancient. Nevertheless, he was well acquainted with the procedure of producing fake "originals," since he ordered copies of old Dutch and French coins to fill the gaps in his collection of numismatics, glyptics and jewellery. In doing so, he was not guided by a simple need to replenish his treasury, in line with the age-old tradition of counterfeiting money, recorded as early as 670 BC, at the time of Gyges of Lydia, but by an unmitigated collector's motivation – the drive to possess excitingly beautiful and valuable specimens in the most complete sets possible.[10] Before Lorenzo Ghiberti made a name for himself as a respectable sculptor and goldsmith, he produced false imitations of antique medals in Florence in the early Renaissance, most likely with similar, albeit Italian, customers in mind: those with a passion for collecting.[11]

Several established Renaissance sculptors dabbled in copying ancient works. Two of them were Tommaso della Porta (c. 1546–1606) and his brother Giovanni Battista (d. 1597), who, apart from highly regarded original works, created false heads, busts and figures of ancient Greeks and Romans and were also involved in large-scale trade in (genuine or fake)

[6] The Louvre, Paris, inv. nos. MR 48, MR 49, MR 53, MR 55, MR 58, MR 59.

[7] The Louvre, Paris, inv. no. MR 54.

[8] The Louvre, Paris, inv. no. MR 80.

[9] In historiography, Frederick is given the number II, but he referred to himself as the Third, emphasizing his succession to Frederick II Hohenstauf, King of Sicily and Holy Roman Emperor.

[10] For a description of Duke de Barry's collecting as a parasexual drive, see Michael Camille, "'For Our Devotion and Pleasure': The Sexual Objects of Jean, Duc de Berry," *Art History*, no. 2 (April 2000), pp. 169–94.

[11] "Dilettosi auco di contraffare i conj delle medaglie antiche" – Giorgio Vasari, *Le Vite de' Piu Eccellenti Pittori, Scultori et Architettori*, 2nd ed. (Florence, 1568). As cited in *Le opere di Giorgio Vasari*, Gaetano Milanesi, ed. (Florence, 1878), vol. 2, p. 223 [further: Vasari–Milanesi with the volume number].

antiquities.[12] Tommaso was lauded by historiographers Giorgio Vasari and Giovanni Baglione.[13] The former praised that he "worked admirably well in marble, he imitated antique heads so perfectly that his productions in that kind have been sold for those of antiquity, and his masks [faces, mascarons or death masks?] have never been equalled. I have one of these last myself; it is in marble, and I have placed it in a chimney-piece of my house in Arezzo, where all men take it to be an antique."[14] According to sources, in July 1563, when Tommaso moved from his native Porlezza to the capital, he brought three statues and eleven marble busts to the port of Ripetta in Rome, presumably for sale. In 1578, cardinal Pier Donato Cesi, a well-known collector of books, medals and antiquities, purchased seventeen antique figures from him for 1,500 scudi (given the number of the objects, the sum indicates these were most likely imitations, and not original works). The Venetian ambassador to Santa Sede, Michele Soriano, purchased six ancient statues from the two brothers, which they renovated and delivered to his residence. Vasari claims that Tommaso created 12 marble heads of Roman Caesars, a rarity on the art market of the time. These were acquired by Pope Julius III, who kept them in his chamber as valuable *rarità*, having rewarded Porta with an annual salary of 100 scudi.

However, not all forgeries were made for profit. Two exquisite Renaissance masters – Donatello and Michelangelo – also "made their mark" on the history of artistic falsification. The former created a monumental, more than a metre high bronze sculpture of Amor-Attis[15] (Museo del Bargello, Florence), most likely on commission from Lorenzo di Bartolomeo Bartolini Salimbeni on the occasion of his wedding in 1438.[16] The object Donatello so deftly imitated *all'antica* was probably the figure of *Attis Altieri* (Musei Vaticani, Museo Chiaramonti, Rome, inv. no. 1656) or a similar one. In 1568, in the second edition of his *Lives...*, Vasari recorded the statue as a work by Donatello kept in Agnolo Doni's house (*un Mercurio di metallo di mano di Donatello*), but the author's name was soon lost to posterity. In the 17th and 18th centuries, the figure was deemed to be a fully antique, Greek, "Greco-Phrygian" or Roman creation. It was regarded as such in 1641 by eminent humanists and historians of antiquity Luca Holstenio (Lucas Holste, Holstein, Holstenius) and Cassiano del Pozzo, who noted the bizarre juxtaposition of elements of the dress (Mercury's sandals, the wings of Amor-Eros, the tail of Pan or a faun, Hypnos's belt, Attis's trousers, etc.), which seemed to them "as if Phrygian, the one you see in figures of Attis." Donatello's authorship was only revisited by Luigi Lanzi in 1782.[17] In a nutshell: the result of a brilliant stylization *all'antica* achieved by the master of Florentine Quattrocento turned into a pastiche regarded as an ancient original. Without

[12] Gerda Panofsky, "Tommaso della Porta's 'Castles in the Air'," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, vol. 56 (1993), pp. 119–67.

[13] Vasari-Milanesi, vol. 7, pp. 550–51; Giovanni Baglione, *Le vite de' pittori, scultori et architetti, dal pontificato di Gregorio XIII del 1572 in fino a' tempi di Papa Urbano Ottavo nel 1642* (Rome, 1642), pp. 151–52.

[14] "Ha avuto ancora Milano un altro scultore, che è morto questo anno [1606], chiamato Tommaso Porta; il quale ha lavorato di marmo eccellentemente, e particolarmente ha contrafatto teste antiche di marmo che sono state vendute per antiche; e le maschere l'ha fatte tanto bene, che nessuno l'ha paragonato; ed io ne ho una di sua mano, di marmo, posta nel camino di casa mia d'Arezzo, che ogni uno la crede antica." Giorgio Vasari, *Lives of the Most Excellent Painters, Sculptors, and Architects*, tr. Mrs. Jonathan Foster (London, 1850), as cited in: <https://en.m.wikisource.org/wiki/Lives_of_the_Most_Excellent_Painters,_Sculptors,_and_Architects/Lione_Lioni>.

[15] Also interpreted as an image of Mercury (since 1568), Lucifer (1630) [sic], Perseus or Mercury (1677), Cupid (since 1778), Roman tutelary deity Harpocrates, Amor-Hercules, Faun, Mithra, Priapus, and Amor Pantheos.

[16] Andrea Ciaroni, *Dal Medici al Bargello*, vol. 2, *I Bronzi del Rinsascimento. Il Quattrocento*, with Charles Avery, collection catalogue, Museo Nazionale del Bargello, Florence (Florence, 2007), pp. 56–63 [with full literature].

[17] Ibid., p. 58.

doubt, in his work, the sculptor sought to reproduce the antique form and iconography as faithfully as possible, but certainly without resorting to devious deception. Nevertheless, he might well have been satisfied with the secondary effect of involuntarily deluding his audience over the subsequent two centuries.

With Michelangelo, the situation was entirely different. This is a well-known anecdote.[18] In 1495, the young, 21-year-old artist, then on the threshold of fame, executed a marble life-size sculpture in Florence, the *Sleeping Cupid*, showing the deity as a child of six or seven years of age (currently presumed lost)[19] (**fig. 7**). Following the advice of his patron, Lorenzo di Pierfrancesco de' Medici, Michelangelo aged his work: he buried it underground and excavated it after some time, simulating the discovery of an antique sculpture. The figure, stained with soil and perhaps also treated with acid, looked ancient, and as such, it was sold in Rome, through art dealer Baldassare da Milano, to cardinal Raffaele Sansoni Riario for a substantial sum of 200 ducats (although the sculptor is said to have received barely 30 scudi). Michelangelo travelled to the Eternal City in connection with this transaction, finding lodgings near the Palazzo Riario. There, he triumphantly announced his authorship of the supposedly antique sculpture – according to another version, it was revealed to the cardinal by Lorenzo di Pierfancesco de' Medici himself. In both cases, this was to demonstrate the artistic genius of a sculptor capable of such a faithful imitation of ancient masters. Initially angered at falling for this stratagem, Riario soon directed his wrath at the treacherous dealer, forcing him to return the money, and paid a handsome fee to Buonarotti, even taking him under his wing (though the said patronage is a little dubious, since Michelangelo did not make a single work for Riario). The figure was then bought by the Duke of Valentinois – the famous Cesare Borgia – who gifted it to the equally famous Isabella d'Este, the Marchioness of Mantua, art collector and patron of artists. Initially, she, too, regarded the work as an ancient artefact, only later discovering that it was created by a contemporary sculptor. This, in a nutshell, is the whole story – a young artist resorting to a deliberate forgery to draw attention to himself, demonstrate his skill and talent, and gain a high-profile reputation. A case not unlike that of Ghiberti, who – as has already been said – began his career by falsifying ancient medals.

Almost the same scenario repeated itself in another era marked by an obsessive worship of antiquity: the triumph of Neoclassicism in the late 18th and early 19th centuries. The culprit here was Anton Raphael Mengs, perhaps the most important artist representing the *all'antica* style beside Jacques-Louis David. In the atmosphere of enthusiasm and archaeological fever pitch that accompanied excavations at Herculaneum (1738), Pompeii (1748) and Stabiae (1749), influenced by Johann Joachim Winckelmann's theories on aesthetics and art history, ancient art historians, antique dealers and collectors all longed to own antique paintings, referred to as Pompeiian, or at least imitations thereof. This frenzy was exploited by shops and studios producing forged works, such as Giuseppe Guerra's infamous workshop in

[18] Giorgio Vasari, *Le Vite de' Piu Eccellenti Pittori, Scultori et Architettori*, 2nd ed. (Florence, 1568); *Le Opere di Giorgio Vasari*, Gaetano Milanesi, ed. (Florence, 1881), vol. 7, pp. 147–50 (see also newer edition: Giorgio Vasari, *Le Vite de' più eccellenti pittori scultori e architettori, 1550 e 1568*, Rosanna Bettarini, Paola Barocchi, eds, 11 volumes (Florence, 1966–87), vol. 6, pp. 14–15); see earlier account provided by Ascanio Condivi, Michelangelo's pupil and biographer (Rome, 1553, fol. 10r–10v), quoted by Milanesi in *Le Opere di Giorgio Vasari*, op. cit., p. 342.

[19] Paul F. Norton, "The Lost Sleeping Cupid of Michelangelo," *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 39, no. 4 (December 1957), pp. 251–57; Rona Goffen, *Renaissance Rivals: Michelangelo, Leonardo, Raphael, Titian*, 2nd ed. (New Haven–London, 2004), p. 95; Deborah Parker, *Michelangelo and the Art of Letter Writing* (Cambridge, 2010), p. 11; Bober, Rubinstein, op. cit., pp. 98–99, cat. no. 51; Jane Kingsley-Smith, *Cupid in Early Modern Literature and Culture* (Cambridge, 2010), pp. 11–13.

Rome.[20] Mengs also took advantage of the situation, though not for commercial gain. He devised a prank, wanting to thumb his nose at Winckelmann – his friend and something of a celebrity among Roman intellectuals and artists, who would soon become the father of modern European archaeology and art history.

Around 1758–59, Mengs – working with the young Giovanni Battista Casanova (also a close friend of Winckelmann's) – painted a panel fresco *Jupiter and Ganymede* (Galleria Nazionale d'Arte Antica, Palazzo Barberini, Rome, inv. no. 1339)[21] (**fig. 5**). In it, he combined two ancient models: the Capitoline Jupiter and the ephebic youth from Greek vase painting. Well aware of Winckelmann's love of Raphael, he referred to the Renaissance master's frescos in Rome's Villa Farnesina, while emulating the encaustic technique of Roman paintings. He cited the work as an authentic piece found during excavations at Portici near Naples, or the Viterbo region. This friendly forgery fully deceived Winckelmann: not only did he acquire the piece for the Albani collection he curated and effusively enthused about it in letters to his friends from 1760–62,[22] but he even had it reproduced in his *Geschichte der Kunst des Altertums* (1764), where he elatedly praised the work with his typical grandiloquence: "surpassing all paintings from Herculaneum known today," "Jupiter's lover is certainly one of the most exquisitely beautiful figures surviving from antiquity, and I would not be able to find any other countenance comparable to his beauty; it exudes such lust that his entire soul seems to be fully absorbed in this kiss" (book VII, ch. III).[23] The historian only discovered the forgery in 1766, bitterly recounting it in his letters to Christian Gottlob Heyne, the famous classical philologist, and Heinrich Wilhelm Muzell-Stosch, himself owner of a collection of antiquities. Winckelmann subsequently broke off his friendship with Mengs and Casanova and had his publisher remove the illustration and passage concerning *Jupiter and Ganymede* from *Geschichte der Kunst des Altertums*. The scandal was all the more painful for the aesthete, as it undermined his position of an erudite expert on ancient art (he claimed that antique artists painted in the tempera rather than fresco technique) and ridiculed him as a homosexual admiring the 16-year-old (as he himself wrote) Ganymede in Mengs's painting. In fact, Winckelmann was semi-open about his homosexuality, as his subsequent relationships – the fleeting romance with Johann Heinrich Füssli or the more lasting ones with Adam Friedrich Oeser and Friedrich Reinhold von Berg – were known to the public. These were of no importance for his position in papal Rome, which was more jeopardized by his worship of nudity and ancient paganism that was out of keeping with his conversion to Catholicism, allegedly motivated by greater sensualism

[20] Tamara Griggs, "Ancient Art and the Antiquarian: The Forgery of Giuseppe Guerra, 1755–1765," *Huntington Library Quarterly*, vol. 74, no. 3 (September 2011), pp. 471–503; Delphine Burlot, *Fabriquer l'antique. Les contrefaçons de peinture murale antique au XVIII^e siècle* (Naples 2012 (see particularly ch. 2: "La supercherie de Giuseppe Guerra (1749–1761)," pp. 65–100).

[21] Burlot, op. cit., ch. 4: "Le Jupiter et Ganymède (1760)," pp. 115–24 and cat. no. 21. See also Thomas Pelzel, "Winckelmann, Mengs and Casanova. A Reappraisal of a Famous Eighteenth-Century Forgery," *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 54, no. 3 (September 1972), pp. 300–15; Steffi Roettgen, *Anton Raphael Mengs 1728–1779. Das malerische und zeichnerische Werk*, vol. 1 (Munich, 1999), pl. 7; Delphine Burlot, "Storia di un falso: il Ganimede di Mengs," *Arte Illustrata*, no. 4 (54) (1973), pp. 256–70; Massimo Ferretti, "Falsi e tradizione artistica," in *Conservazione, falso, restauro*, op. cit., pp. 115–95, particularly p. 159; Steffi Roettgen, *Mengs, la scoperta del neoclassico* (Venice, 2001), p. 242; Carolina Brook, Valter Curzi, *Roma e l'antico: realtà e visione nel '700*, exh. cat., Fondazione Roma Museo, Palazzo Sciarra-Colonna, Rome, 2010–11 (Milan, 2010), p. 413.

[22] Letters quoted in Steffi Röttgen's paper "Storia di un falso: Il Ganimede di Mengs," *Arte Illustrata*, no. 4 (54) (1973), pp. 266–68.

[23] Ibid. [tr. AS].

and emotiveness of religious experience than the one offered by his native Protestantism.[24] Even in 1786, twenty years after the painting's provenance was revealed, Goethe pondered in his *Italian Journey* with admiration and disbelief, how a painting "almost too beautiful for Raphael himself" could have been created by a contemporary artist.

It is difficult to say whether Mengs really wanted to ridicule Winckelmann, who was not just an influential figure but also his good friend. The painter allegedly only confessed to the forgery on his deathbed, revealing it to his sister who was watching over him. His prior silence suggests he had no intention of publicizing the fact of having deceived Johann Joachim. Were it to be a prank, it would have been a private one, yet even that is unclear: the situation can hardly count as mocking a learned colleague, given he did not know the truth for almost seven years, until 1766, when the case went to light! Perhaps Mengs indeed had the intention of poking fun at the famed erudite when creating his forgery, yet when Winckelmann reacted with unbridled enthusiasm, revealing to all and sundry the discovery of an antique masterpiece, the situation got out of hand and the painter decided to remain silent to protect his colleague and friend from ridicule (a strategy that eventually backfired).

Moving on: the profession of restoring ancient objects appeared as early as the first Renaissance. One of its earliest representatives was Donatello, whom Vasari described as having renovated the antique white marble sculpture of Marsyas at the Palazzo Medici in Florence, placed near the entrance to the garden, as well as "countless" ancient heads above portals and doors, which he supplemented with ornaments bearing the coat of arms of Cosimo de' Medici.[25] Nowadays, researchers believe that the *Marsyas* was in fact renovated by Mino da Fiesole with the help of his pupil Giovanni Battista Foggini.[26] Yet, this does not change the fact that early Renaissance sculptors were professionally tasked with repairing antique statues. Oftentimes, such conservation, renovation or restoration involved partial reconstruction. The original relic of a sculpture was supplemented with new limbs or a new creation would be assembled from fragments of several works – also a forgery of sorts. Apparently, Andrea del Verrocchio engaged in similar activity as early as the 1470s. According to Vasari, Cosimo de' Medici, who owned many ancient Roman works (*anticaglie di Roma*), had a beautiful white marble statue of *Marsyas* placed in the entrance to his garden or courtyard (it seems to be the same sculpture as the one repaired by Donatello). Since Cosimo's nephew, Lorenzo, had a torso with the head of another "very ancient" Marsyas made in red marble, the collector decided to set the two works together. He commissioned Verrocchio to renovate and supplement the "red" *Marsyas*; the artist fitted the original statue with legs, thighs and arms so well that Lorenzo, delighted with the result, positioned the figure alongside his uncle's *Marsyas*, flanking the entrance to the garden (both sculptures survive in the Uffizi) (**figs. 6, 7**).[27] Vasari

[24] Louis A. Ruprecht, Jr., "Winckelmann and Casanova in Rome: A Case Study of Religion and Sexual Politics in Eighteenth-Century Rome," *The Journal of Religious Ethics*, vol. 38, no. 2 (June 2010), pp. 297–320. Homoerotic relations between luminaries of the Enlightenment in Germany and Italy were described by Simon Richter, "Winckelmann's Progeny. Homosocial Networking in the Eighteenth Century," in *Outing Goethe & His Age*, Alice A. Kuzniar, ed. (Stanford, 1996), pp. 33–46.

[25] Vasari–Milanesi, vol. 2, p. 407.

[26] Francesco Cagliotti, "Due 'restauratori' per la antichità dei primi Medici: Mino da Fiesole, Andrea del Verrocchio e il 'Marsia rosso' degli Uffizi," *Prospettiva*, no. 72 (1993), pp. 17–42, and *Prospettiva*, no. 73/74 (1994), pp. 74–96.

[27] Vasari–Milanesi, vol. 3, pp. 366–67. Copies of the two Marsyas figures went on to decorate Michelangelo's tombstone, symbolizing the Medici Garden: a collection of ancient sculptures where sculptors came to study. The place would later give rise to the Florentine Accademia de Disegno – see Fredrika Jacobs, "(Dis)assembling:

gushes over the sculptural virtuosity of the torso, particularly the vivid rendition of its tense veins and "nerves," yet is rather succinct about the artistic quality of Verrocchio's additions, merely noting that "he did well" (*fece bene*). This was a conscious move of the writer, who wanted to promote the statue as one of the showpieces of the Medici collection: a "purely" antique artefact. And he fully succeeded in doing so. Elsewhere in his *Lives...*, in *Proemio della parte terza*, Vasari praises Marsyas's torso as a paragon of beauty, imitated by artists of *la terza maniera* – the third epoch (mature Renaissance from the time of Raphael and Michelangelo), while regarding Verrocchio's additions as exemplifying the previous era – *maniera seconda* – and criticizing his imperfect finish and "dry" execution (*insecchisce la maniera*).[28] These disapproving remarks should not, however, be treated literally – they served the educational aim of the author, who wanted to demonstrate stylistic progress in art rather than pass judgment on Verrocchio's skills. All in all, Vasari's attitude to the procedure of "total" supplementation of antique sculptures with new parts is positive. He thereby accepted the creation of statues purporting to be ancient, genuine *anticaglie* – artefacts from the Greco-Roman past. *Et fictum factum fit*.

The professions of sculptor, conservator, copyist and falsifier (for not a forger, I daresay) came together in the activity of a certain Florentine-Roman artist, once of high repute, now regarded as barely mediocre. Valerio Cioli of Settignano (c. 1529–99), mentioned by Vasari as a "sculptor and academician," collaborated with Michelangelo on commissions for the Vatican palace and basilica. Apart from original creations, such as fountain figures, he restored (or rather remade) antique sculptures, for instance for the Roman garden of cardinal Ippolito d'Este and Palazzo Pitti in Florence, "creating new arms for some, new feet for others, and for others still, all sorts of missing parts," states Vasari.[29] One such part-renovation, part-original work, and part-falsification is a large figure of *Narcissus* from London's Victoria and Albert Museum (inv. no. 7560-1861), also known as *Michelangelo's Cupid* (for many years, since the mid-19th until the mid-20th century, it was regarded as the master's work, which he reputedly sold to the banker Jacopo Galli)[30] (**fig. 8**). In fact, it was made by Cioli around 1560–64, per-

Marsyas, Michelangelo, and the Accademia del Disegno," *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 84, no. 3 (September 2002), pp. 426–48. It remains uncertain whether *Marsia rosso* in the Uffizi is the one Vasari described as renovated by Verrocchio, or whether it was another *Marsyas*, mentioned in a 1586 letter sent from Rome by Giovanni degli Alberti, the bishop of Cortona, to Cavaliere Antonio Serguidi, first secretary to the Grand Duke of Tuscany, Francis I. The document details various marble works shipped by sea via the port of Livorno, including the *Skinned Marsyas* (*Marsia scorticato*), gifted to the duke by Virginio Orsini. In fact, both accounts (Vasari and Alberti) may refer to the same figure. As for the *White Marsyas*, its provenance is only confirmed since the mid-16th c., when it was already kept at the Capranica collection in Rome, acquired in 1584 by cardinal Ferdinando de' Medici with the whole Palazzo della Valle-Capranica. The work was later held at the Villa Medici on Pincio hill, before being transferred to Florence in the late 18th c. and moved to the Uffizi. The "white" *Marsyas* is regarded as a Roman work from the 2nd c. AD, while the "red" one – as a Roman copy of a Hellenistic original from the 3rd – 2nd c. AD; see Guido A. Mansuelli, *Galleria degli Uffizi: Le statue* (Rome, 1958), pp. 87–88, cat. no. 56 ("white" Marsyas) and pp. 88–90, cat. no. 57 ("red" Marsyas); Hugo Meyer, *Der weiße und der rote Marsyas. Eine kopienkritische Untersuchung* (Munich, 1987); Shigetoshi Osano, "Due 'Marsia' nel giardino di Via Larga: La ricezione del "decor" dell'antichità romana nella collezione medicea di sculture antiche," *Artibus et Historiae*, no. 34 (XVII) (1996), pp. 95–120; Caterina Maderna, "*Überlegungen zum 'roten' und zum 'weißen' Marsyas*," in *Gedenkschrift für Andreas Linfert: hellenistische Gruppen* (Darmstadt, 1999), pp. 115–40.

[28] Vasari-Milanesi, vol. 4, p. 10.

[29] Vasari-Milanesi, vol. 9, pp. 129, 140–41.

[30] Victoria and Albert Museum, London, inv. no. 7560-1861. See the Victoria and Albert Museum catalogue online: <https://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O70453/narcissus-statue-cioli-valerio>, [retrieved: 31 October 2023] [with full literature].

haps using the torso of a Roman copy of a Greek or Greco-Roman original, and transforming it into a new work. He added his own head and supplemented the forearm, shoulder, chest, neck, left part of the torso, the external part of the left thigh and the right ankle (the left arm is a 19th-century reconstruction).[31] The resulting figure was well-suited (also through the subject) for a crowning piece of a garden fountain (and is known to have been used as such up to the first half of the 19th century, at the Florentine Gualfonda (Valfonda) gardens and Orti Oricellari). How should one describe this statue? Is it an antique piece (*anticaglia*), a pseudo-antique artefact, or a reconstructed, altered, maybe even "fake" antique work?

This modus operandi was practiced by other sculptors who dabbled in renovation, such as Ippolito Buzzi (1562–1634) or Orfeo Boselli (1597–1667). It is to Buzzi that we owe today's appearance of the famed statues from the Ludovisi collection: *Dying Gaul* (Musei Capitolini, Rome), *Cupid and Psyche* and *Apollo Citharoedus* (both in Palazzo Altemps, Rome), *Castor and Pollux* (Prado, Madrid) and the sleeping *Hermaphroditus* from the Uffizi. *Cupid and Psyche* is a combination of two antique male torsos with Buzzi's additions; *Apollo Playing the Cithara* (**fig. 9**) only contains two authentic fragments: the trunk and right leg, the rest being the result of the renovator's free imagination; and in the *Castor and Pollux* group, Buzzi fitted one of the figures from the 1st century AD with the head of Antinous from Hadrian's time. Renovation and reconstruction were also practiced by the greatest sculptors of the 17th century: Gian Lorenzo Bernini, Alessandro Algardi, Ercole Ferrata, and Francesco Maria Nocchieri. Bernini (rather discreetly) restored *Ares Ludovisi* by Lisyppos (or Scopas; Palazzo Altemps, Rome) and the *Sleeping Hermaphroditus* from the Borghese collection (the Louvre, Paris), whom – with less restraint – he provided with a delightfully soft mattress.

During the age of Enlightenment and Neoclassicism, the time of Grand Tours and educational tourism in Italy, the role of renovators/copyists/falsifiers grew even further, seeing the rise of subsequent workshops producing "antique" sculptures, engraved gemstones and vases. This prompts a provocative question, namely: to what extent scientific – historical and archaeological – understanding of antiquity, which replaced the traditional fascination of antiquarians and collectors, fuelled by passion rather than matter-of-fact studies of the past, was based on the knowledge of mass-produced copies, imitations, pastiches, fakes and conservators' reconstructions? The case of Winckelmann and Mengs is very telling here. However, this was a singular example. More topical in this context is the close (albeit not in the erotic sense) friendship between the great scholar and the most famous renovator and plagiarist of antique works of his time: Bartolomeo Cavaceppi (c. 1717–99).[32] The latter accompanied Johann Joachim in his last, fateful journey to Germany in 1768 (which ended with his murder in a hotel room at the hand of a certain Francesco Arcangeli in unclear circumstances). Since 1734, Cavaceppi had served as the conservator of antique sculptures from the

[31] John Pope-Hennessy, "'Michelangelo's Cupid': the end of a chapter," *The Burlington Magazine*, no. 98 (1956), pp. 403–11; id. (assisted by Ronald Lightbown), *Catalogue of Italian Sculpture in the Victoria and Albert Museum*, vol. 2 (London, 1964), pp. 452–55, cat. no. 482.

[32] Inga Gesche, "Antikenergänzungen im 18. Jahrhundert: Johann Joachim Winckelmann und Bartolomeo Cavaceppi," in *Antikensammlungen im 18. Jahrhundert* (Berlin, 1981), pp. 335–41; Seymour Howard, *Bartolomeo Cavaceppi. Eighteenth-Century Restorer* (New York–London, 1982); Carlos A. Picón, *Bartolomeo Cavaceppi. Eighteenth-century restorations of ancient marble sculpture from English private collections*, exh. cat., Clarendon Gallery, London, 1983 (London, 1983); *Bartolomeo Cavaceppi. Scultore romano, 1717–1799*, Maria Giulia Barberini, Carlo Gasparri, eds, exh. cat., Museo del Palazzo di Venezia, Rome, 1994 (Rome, 1994); Dagmar Grassinger, "Cavaceppi, Bartolomeo," in *Geschichte der Altertumswissenschaften. Biographisches Lexikon*, Peter Kuhlmann, Helmuth Schneider, eds (Stuttgart–Weimar, 2012), col. 204–06. Der Neue Pauly. Supplement 6.

famous collection of cardinal Alessandro Albani, which was being academically researched by Winckelmann. Thanks to his relationship with the cardinal, Cavaceppi secured numerous commissions from foreign travellers passing through Rome, particularly British collectors. Soon, his renovating skills gained Europe-wide renown. The antique mania, which erupted around the mid-18th century, brought the most famous European collectors to his renovation studio, including the Prussian king Frederick II and empress of Russia Catherine II, alongside the leading intellectuals of the era, such as Johann Wolfgang Goethe, and artists, such as the young Antonio Canova. Cavaceppi himself diligently catalogued his renovations and copies in *Raccoltà d'antiche statue*, ostentatiously printed with rich illustrative material.[33] Therein, he contained, among others, his renovation of the most important sculptures from the Capitoline Museums made during the pontificate of Benedict XIV. Despite being meticulously documented in *Raccoltà*, the copies of antique statues he produced en masse – usually without a signature (in a deliberate gesture?) – were often taken for original artefacts.

A tour de force of Cavaceppi's renovation efforts – the *Apollo Citharoedus* – is one of the showpieces of Berlin's museums (Antikensammlung, Altes Museum, Berlin, inv. no. SK 44)[34] (**fig. 10**). This is a Roman copy of a Greek work from the 4th century BC, probably executed in the 2nd century AD. It was acquired in 1766 by Frederick the Great from antiquarian and antique dealer Giovanni Ludovico Bianconi, active in Rome. From Winckelmann's letter, we discover that prior to the sale, the statue was renovated by Cavaceppi. The artist added the right arm (from the elbow) and the entire left arm with a *kithara* and chlamys hung over it; he supplemented the entire left leg, the right leg from the knee, the feet, the base and support in the form of a tree trunk; he reconstructed parts of the neck, the penis and scrotum, and fitted the headless body with the head of another Roman copy of Apollo, sculpted in a different kind of marble. In fact, it was Cavaceppi who rendered the statue a Citharoedus – Apollo during *kitharodia*, singing and playing the *kithara* (or zither, an old Greek lyre). Prior to his additions, this was merely a headless and near-armless torso, with a stump of a leg, which could have represented almost any young antique deity, demigod or athlete. Cavaceppi himself decided that the body would be devoid of pubic hair, as he imagined it to depict Apollo as a young man. In a nutshell, the original ancient relic turned into an entirely new invention, a paraphrase of the antique theme and a pastiche of the antique style – it was not a reconstruction of an old Roman piece. One could venture to say that – showcased by the renovator as an ancient statue – it became a forgery. True, sanctioned by the customs of the day, but a forgery nonetheless. Winckelmann was not yet familiar with this work around 1756, when he wrote his textbook on ancient art (not published until 1764), so the relationship between emerging literature on archaeology and art history is simple here: if anything, it was the renovator who could have been guided by the scholar's knowledge contained in the book, and not the other way round. Both of them, however, were responsible for shaping the modern canon of beauty and the popular image of antiquity. Cavaceppi's workshop and circle produced numerous copyists, who (literally) supplemented this canon, among them Vincenzo Pacetti, author of the main form of the *Barberini Faun* (1799, Glyptothek, Munich)[35] (**fig. 11**) and Carlo

[33] *Raccoltà d'antiche statue, busti, teste cognite ed altre sculture antiche restaurate da Cav. Bartolomeo Cavaceppi scultore Romano* (Rome, 1768–1772).

[34] Sascha Kansteiner, "Der Apollon mit der Kithara im Pergamonmuseum," *EOS*, no. 19 (2002), pp. VIII–X.

[35] The sculpture, discovered around 1624 in the moat of Castel Sant'Angelo, underwent multiple renovations. In 1628, Arcangelo Gonelli gave the figure a semi-reclining supine position. In 1679, Giuseppe Giorgetti and

Albacini, responsible for the appearance of the *Farnese Venus* (*Aphrodite Kallipygos*, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, Naples).[36]

The above list of sculptural examples should be extended to include the workshops of professional imitators of Pompeiian paintings, the most famous of which was the aforementioned Giuseppe Guerra (1709–61), who developed a profitable business in Rome falsifying works from Herculaneum/Pompeii and selling them to collectors as paintings smuggled from excavations sites near Naples.[37] He offered them to eminent personalities, including cardinal Alessandro Albani, the English king George II, baron Karl Heinrich von Gleichen-Rußwurm, as well as random aristocrats passing through Rome on their Grand Tours. Between 1754 and 1755, he provided the Jesuits with more than 40 works for Musaeum Kircherianum in Rome (a public collection established by Athanasius Kircher in 1651). Guerra's forging enterprise, which deluded even Mattia Zarillo, curator of the royal museum in the Palace of Capodimonte and archaeologist working at Herculaneum, was discovered, among others, by Winckelmann and count de Caylus, and put on trial initiated by the prime minister of the Kingdom of Naples. Guerra managed to avoid punishment owing to the intervention of cardinal Alberico Archinto, the papal secretary of state. Even in September 1760, father Paolo Maria Paciaudi wrote to Caylus: "every day, Guerra works on paintings of various formats, as per the buyers' wishes. This is common knowledge, yet he firmly maintains to have found them outside Rome, in some ruins that belong to him."[38] Clearly, Guerra was an ordinary forger, one of many, and his activity was of no influence on the modern scholarly vision of antiquity.

The art (?) of forging artworks in the 19th and 20th century is well-known on account of spectacular events and figures. Let us leave aside the all-too-publicized case of Han van Meegeren and his "Vermeers," which fooled Abraham Bredius and other scholars. The wave of high-profile forgeries was born out of the extreme commercialization of modern collecting and museology. The forgers sometimes made astronomical profits. In 1896, the Louvre purchased the famed Tiara of Saitaphernes for 200,000 francs in gold, regarding it as an authentic piece from the 3rd century BC, although in reality, it was executed in 1880 by Israel Rouchomovsky, a goldsmith from Odessa. He was commissioned to make several works *all'antica* by two dealers, the Hochman brothers, who unscrupulously sold them as genuine antique pieces. In the third quarter of the 19th century, Italian artist Giovanni Bastianini (1830–68)

Lorenzo Ottoni changed the position to a semi-sitting one, utilizing stucco to fill in the areas where fragments were missing (part of the head, the entire left arm and right leg, drapes and other minor elements). Pacetti later replaced the stucco complements with marble ones and repositioned the right leg. In the 1960s, the figure's position was changed again and the previously added left arm was removed. See *Encyclopedia of the History of Classical Archaeology*, Nancy Thomson de Grummond, ed. (London, 1996), pp. 118–20.

[36] An earlier 16th-century restorer (before 1594) added the missing head, positioned with the face turned backward, so that Venus was gazing at her nude buttocks, which enhanced the sculpture's erotic appeal. Albacini (c. 1786) replaced the head, arms and one leg, but maintained the pose from the previous renovation, allowing the figure to continue looking back over her shoulder. See Haskell, Penny, *Taste and the Antique...*, op. cit., pp. 316–18; Raffaele Ajello, Francis Haskell, Carlo Gasparri, *Classicismo d'Età Romana. La Collezione Farnese* (Naples, 1988), p. 50; Stefano De Caro, *The National Archaeological Museum* (Naples, 2001), p. 38.

[37] Giuseppe Consoli Fiego, "False pitture di Ercolano," in *Napoli Nobilissima*, vol. 2, no. 4 (1921), pp. 84–88; Michelangelo Cagiano de Azevedo, "Falsi settecenteschi di pitture antiche," *Bolletino dell'Istituto centrale del restauro*, vol. 1, no. 1 (1950), pp. 41–43; Massimo Ferretti, "Falsi e tradizione artistica," in *Storia dell'arte italiana*, X, *Conservazione, falso e restauro* (Turin, 1981), p. 156; Tamara Griggs, "Ancient Art and the Antiquarian: The Forgery of Giuseppe Guerra, 1755–1765," *Huntington Library Quarterly*, vol. 74, no. 3 (September 2011) pp. 471–503.

[38] *Correspondance inédite du comte de Caylus avec le p. Paciaudi, théatin*, Charles Nisard, ed., vol. 1 (Paris, 1877), p. 207.

produced (in good will) several splendid statues in the style of Donatello, Verrocchio, Mino da Fiesole and other old Italian masters, which were then sold as originals to renowned museums, including London's Victoria and Albert Museum and the Louvre. Perhaps the most renowned master forger was Alceo Dossena (1878–1936), whose sculptures were of such virtuosity that they were accepted by art historians, museum directors and well-known collectors. In actual fact, Dossena did not intend to forge these works. In his opinion, he merely provided antiquarians with pastiches in various styles: archaic, Hellenistic, Roman, Gothic and Renaissance. Upon discovering that his *Virgin and Child*, for which he received 50,000 lire, was resold for three million as a Renaissance piece, he publicly declared the authorship of this and other works.

Fraudsters and forgers, all sorts of *pasticheurs*, copyists, restorers and reconstructors managed to trick the most eminent scholars and the most significant museums, many of whom and which had long insisted on the authenticity of their exhibits. Praise be to Andrzej Reiche for being astute enough to recognize a forger's hand in the piece from the National Museum in Warsaw.

Translated by Aleksandra Szkudłapska