

UC Riverside

UC Riverside Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

The Wanamaker Bronzes: A Case Study on the Role of Reproductions in American Museums

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4q21r8nm>

Author

Maldonado, Lelian Guadalupe

Publication Date

2021

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
RIVERSIDE

The Wanamaker Bronzes: A Case Study on the Role of Reproductions in American
Museums

A Thesis submitted in partial satisfaction
of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

History

by

Lelian Guadalupe Maldonado

March 2021

Thesis Committee:

Dr. Charles Denver Graninger, Chairperson

Dr. Molly McGarry

Dr. Catherine Gudis

Copyright by
Lelian Guadalupe Maldonado
2021

The Thesis of Lelian Guadalupe Maldonado is approved:

Committee Chairperson

University of California, Riverside

For Austin

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
WORKING WITH REPRODUCTIONS	3
LA FONDERIA ARTISTICA CHIURAZZI	6
CAST MOLD REPRODUCTIONS	7
LOST-WAX CASTING	11
THE CHIURAZZI MOLDS	14
NOTABLE COLLECTIONS OF CHIURAZZI BRONZES	17
HOW DO YOU VALUE A REPRODUCTION?	19
THE WANAMAKER COLLECTION	21
JOHN WANAMAKER AND AMERICAN CULTURAL CAPITAL	23
HOW WAS THE COLLECTION RECEIVED?	24
AN EVER SHIFTING TIDE	30
CONTEMPORARY RESURGENCES.....	33
CONCLUSION: IDENTIFYING A WAY FORWARD	33
BIBLIOGRAPHY	39

INTRODUCTION

The following work was inspired by my experience as a collections intern with the Department of Academic Engagement at the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology¹ during the summer of 2016. Together with my fellow intern, University of Pennsylvania student Marie McFalls, I spent the summer inventorying the museum's collection of early-twentieth century reproductions of artifacts excavated from the archaeological sites of Pompeii and Herculaneum, popularly known as "The Wanamaker Collection" or "The Wanamaker Bronzes". A comparable inventory had not been undertaken since the 1980s, a fact that was largely attributed to the collection's status as reproductions.² At the time of our inventory, the collection had begun to be used in an increasing amount of educational programs, both inside and outside of the museum, which necessitated a renewed interest in the collection's management, as many of the objects used in these programs had become damaged, and others lost.³

¹ Hereafter referred to as simply Penn Museum

² Lelian Maldonado and Marie McFalls, *Wanamaker Collections Intern Guidebook*, 1st ed. (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, 2016), 2.

This belief was continually reiterated by staff, particularly our supervisors in the Academic Engagement Department, Karen Thompson and Stephanie Mach, who felt the bronzes had been mishandled, and whose interest in both the past *and* future of the collection prompted this work. I owe them a large debt of gratitude for their interest, guidance, and encouragement in pursuing this topic.

³ Lelian Maldonado and Marie McFalls, "Wanamaker Bronzes Collection Problems (Internal Document Prepared for Keeper Lynn Makowsky)" (University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, August 2016).

Undertaken over the course of two months, our inventory included identifying conservation concerns, refurbishing housing and storage solutions, and updating the museum's electronic database (EMu) and online collection's site with relevant object information, such as dimensions and catalogue references, as well as photos.⁴ Our goals were understood as follows: 1) to identify potential issues within the collection; 2) to, where possible, correct these issues; 3) to increase the public's access to the collection by providing updated collection information and making it available online; and 4) to survey the contents of the collection in preparation for the development of future learning and education programs. These goals were driven by the belief that, despite being comprised entirely of reproductions, the collection had the potential to be a useful tool for educating and engaging with the public. The entire process was framed as a rediscovery and revitalization project, which begged the question; why were the Wanamaker's "lost" in the first place?

This work explores the role reproductions played in American museums from the end of the nineteenth century on. It does so by focusing on the history of a single collection of objects – the Wanamaker Bronzes produced by the Chiurazzi Foundry. It

⁴ Maldonado and McFalls, *Wanamaker Collections Intern Guidebook*, 6–11; "Medical Implement, Hematome, Reproduction - MS3621 | Collections - Penn Museum," <https://www.penn.museum/collections/object/135313>.

The online collection's page for object MS3621, a hematome from the surgical collection, serves as an excellent example of both our work as well as the types of damage the bronzes had sustained while on display and in use in the museum's educational program. Clearly visible in the pictures of MS3621 are remnants of white paint, left over from the cart the surgical collection was stored in on class room visits prior to our inventory.

looks at their history, from the cultural context in which they were made to who made them and how, as well as their history at the museum that houses them, with its ever changing cast of collectors, keepers, audiences and interests. In doing so, it hopes to determine how the collection has evolved over time, and, in turn, consider how it may continue to evolve in the future. Importantly, it hopes to answer the question of how these objects came to be forgotten, and potentially pave the way to solutions for another; how can we make use of this collection moving forward?

As a whole, the purpose of this work is to support staff at the Penn Museum as they continue their work with the Wanamaker Bronzes and in doing so, hopefully inform the work of museum professionals working with reproductions across the country.

Working With Reproductions

Several works have proved invaluable to shaping the course of this study. Foremost among these are the works of Hillel Schwartz and Yannis Hamilakis. Originally published in 1996, Schwartz's cultural history *The Culture of the Copy: Striking Likenesses, Unreasonable Facsimiles*, represents one of the premiere works on copies produced at the turn of the century. It examines our notions of authenticity and originality, individuality and identity within a cultural context, and explores the complex relationship between 'originals' and 'copies'. It accomplishes this by examining these concepts at a broad level and by exploring their relationship across wide range of topics, from twins to miniatures, and biology to art history. It is a multi-faceted and multi-disciplinary approach to the study of how we perceive and define copies, how we understand them in relation to ourselves, and how we experience them on an individual

as well as a societal level. While *The Culture of the Copy* does not deal exclusively with museum studies or even with objects kept in museums, the theories forwarded by Schwartz, particularly those relating to the cultural basis behind distinguishing and appraising copies, are invaluable in developing an understanding of how collections of reproductions may have been perceived differently throughout their lifetime, and how the perception of these reproductions may continue to change.

In contrast, Hamilaki addresses the role of copies on a much narrower and far more practical level. Influenced by the post-processual interest in sensory experience, Hamilaki's *Archaeology and the Senses: Experience, Memory, and Affect* explores the role of sensory experiences as a fundamental aspect of both comprehending and teaching the past. His work deals extensively with the perceived absence of sensory experience in museums, and what he identifies as the pedagogical ramifications thereof. Notably, Hamilaki's work identifies the benefit of applying reproductions in both academia and education to develop sensory experiences to analyze and teach the past; this includes both experimental archaeologies as well as experiential recreations.

Whereas Schwartz provides us with a theoretical foundation for identifying how the perception and role of copies is determined by culture, Hamilaki's approach to the importance of sensory archaeologies situates this work within an ongoing pedagogical debate regarding museum engagement practices and the practical application of archaeological reproductions. Together, they provide a framework in which to situate this work, and the Wanamaker Bronzes, in a cultural and theoretical past, present, and future.

There are, of course, a large number of additional scholars in both the fields of museum studies and archaeology whose works have contributed to shaping this study and its treatment of reproductions. Works such as Anthony Hughes and Erich Ranfft's *Sculpture and its Reproductions*, which have drawn attention to the role of reproductions in shaping arts and culture, and those such as Frederick Bohrer's *Photography and Archaeology*, which have explored their influence on the development of society and our understanding of human subjectivity. Of particular note, however, is Alan K. Outram's work on reproductions in experimental archaeology, where he argues in favor of distinguishing between "experiential" and "actualistic" reproductions while still legitimizing "less-accurate" reproductions for the sake of broadening the pedagogical potential of experimental archaeology and archaeological recreations by reaching wider and more varied audiences, an argument which underpins this work's approach to the role of reproductions in both archaeological and museum settings in both the past and the future.

LA FONDERIA ARTISTICA CHIURAZZI

Any history of the Wanamaker Collection must begin with the story of the Chiurazzi Foundry and its molds. This first chapter aims to provide the history behind the production of the Wanamaker Collection, as well as supply the cultural context in which Chiurazzi Foundry's reproductions were made and purchased, in order to provide a basis for our understanding of how the bronzes were perceived once in America. In addition to this, this chapter also provides supplemental information on the process by which the reproductions were made, as a matter of specific interest to those working with the Wanamaker Collection.⁵

Commonly known as either *La Fonderia Artistica Chiurazzi* or *J. Chiurazzi & Fils*, the Chiurazzi Fine Art Foundry was founded in 1870 by Gennaro Chiurazzi Sr. (1840-1906), a Neapolitan *cesellatore* (engraver).⁶ The foundry was one of several founded in the city of Naples in the years after the Naples National Archaeological Museum (*Museo Archeologica Nazionale di Napoli* or MANN) began to dispense individual permits to copy the objects in its collection.⁷ Over the course of its long life,

⁵ During my time at Penn, it became clear that one of the predominant issues facing staff working with the collection and sharing it with others was a lack of understanding how the reproductions were made. As I began researching this paper, it became abundantly clear that this lack of historical context for their production represented a major obstacle to the museum's attempt to garner historical appreciation for the collection. Accordingly, I have reproduced my research here, in the hopes that it may be of use in that regard.

⁶ Luisa Fucito, ed., *Fonderia Artistica Chiurazzi: La Forma Dell'Arte*, 1. ed, Luoghi Della Memoria, no. 4 (Napoli: Altrastampa, 2001), 13, 16–17; Mattusch and Lie, *The Villa Dei Papiri at Herculaneum*, 343; Chiurazzi, "Our Story," 3, accessed June 1, 2017, https://static1.squarespace.com/static/572f9c32d210b899879d4e78/t/573798f6d210b8ad848bd049/1463261432228/Chiurazzi_Story.pdf.

⁷ Mattusch and Lie, *The Villa Dei Papiri at Herculaneum*, 342.

the foundry has produced a wide variety of products ranging from bronze and marble sculptures, to mosaics and ceramics.⁸ Their most sought-after works, however, have always been their masterful reproductions of objects from antiquity.⁹ Arguably, the most popular of these reproductions have been their bronze hollow-cast sculptures, which are produced using a form of cast-molding known as lost-wax casting.¹⁰

Cast Mold Reproductions

Some of the most popular types of physical reproductions produced during this period were “cast mold” reproductions, which were highly valued for their ability to produce near exact replicas of objects with minimal intervention by the artist.

The first step in creating a cast mold reproduction is producing a mold of the original object or model. This is typically accomplished by applying a layer of molding material directly to the object and allowing it to dry. In modern molds, this material is often a blend of plaster or epoxy.¹¹ At the turn of the century, however, composites of sand and clay were far more common.¹² Once dried, this material forms a rigid “frame” that can then be used to cast replicas out of liquid or molten materials.¹³ For more

The museum began to dispense permits shortly after it became a public institution in 1877; see the follow section for further information.

⁸ Ibid., 343.

⁹ Ibid., 342–43.

¹⁰ Ibid., 345–46; Carol C. Mattusch, ed., *The Fire of Hephaistos: Large Classical Bronzes from North American Collections* (Cambridge, Mass, 1996), 20–21.

¹¹ Andrew Martin, *The Essential Guide to Mold Making & Slip Casting*, 1st ed, A Lark Ceramics Book (New York: Lark Books, 2006), 27.

At least, this is the case with hand-poured or “frosted” molds. Increasing numbers of molds are being produced using 3D printed plastic and laser cut metal alloys.

¹² James M. Tate and Melvin O. Stone, *Foundry Practice: A Treatise on Molding and Casting in Their Various Details* (The H.W Wilson Company, 1904), 1.

¹³ Ibid., 15–17; Martin, *The Essential Guide to Mold Making & Slip Casting*, 15–16.

complex objects, these molds are constructed and joined in several pieces in order to preserve the original dimensions of the object.¹⁴ Once the cast is complete and the casting material has set,¹⁵ the mold is taken apart¹⁶ and the reproduction is “completed.”¹⁷

This is, of course a simplified version of the process. In reality, the rendering of individual steps may vary widely depending on the reproduction. This is equally the case with modern casts as it is with those produced at the turn of the century. In both cases, the process varies largely depending on the object being molded as well as the type of material being cast. Metal, glass, and clay slip were some of the most popular materials used in nineteenth century casts, and each called for a distinct set of materials and processes.¹⁸ For instance, glass molds were typically made of iron and bronze rather than plaster, and had to be molded and produced in a separate casting process.¹⁹ Rather than

Like ceramics clay or metal alloys. Modern cast molds also use liquid plastic.

¹⁴ Martin, *The Essential Guide to Mold Making & Slip Casting*, 9.

For instance, a handled cup would require a three-piece mold in order to reproduce the “interior” and “exterior” edges of the handle and to keep the cast from becoming “locked” (stuck) inside the mold.

¹⁵ Martin, *The Essential Guide to Mold Making and Slip Casting*, 13. Setting depends entirely on the object being reproduced. In ceramics, solid reproductions are typically produced using a “solid-casting” method, wherein the casting material is allowed to dry entirely before the mold is removed. In contrast, hollow objects are produced using a “slip-casting” method, wherein the casting material is gradually added to the mold, until the desired thickness is achieved.

¹⁶ This process varies. Some molds are designed for just a single cast, and are subsequently destroyed during this process, while others may be re-used.

¹⁷ The process of “completion” varies from mold to mold, but typically entails joining pieces, finishing seams, and additional processes like sealing or painting.

¹⁸ Khan, Sheikh, and Al-Shaer, *Evolution of Metal Casting Technologies*, 5; Helen Sheumaker and Shirley Teresa Wajda, eds., *Material Culture in America: Understanding Everyday Life* (Santa Barbara, Calif: ABC-CLIO, 2008), 81; E. M. Stern, *Roman Mold-Blown Glass: The First Through Sixth Centuries*, 1st ed (Rome, Italy: “L’Erma” di Bretschneider in association with the Toledo Museum of Art, 1995), 45–46.

¹⁹ Stern, *Roman Mold-Blown Glass*, 46.

being poured, molten glass was then blown into the mold.²⁰ Similarly, the varying chemical composition of different metal alloys called for variations in the sand-and-clay composites used in producing metal-casting molds.²¹ Despite minor variations such as these, all of these materials still employed a mold to form and cast their reproductions.

It is this aspect of cast molding that made the process so popular; the ability to produce multiple copies of a single object with relative ease contributed to a massive growth in the commercial and industrial production and manufacture of glass, ceramics, and cast metals in the nineteenth century.²² In America, manufacturers like the American Pottery Manufacturing Company (est. 1833) capitalized on the cast mold process in order to mass-produce affordable stoneware for middle-class consumers.²³ By the turn of the century, cast molds were used to create everything from tableware to bridges.²⁴ Accordingly, the nineteenth century saw several major technological advancements; the first molding machine, the first die casting machine for print media, and the first electric arc furnace for commercial production.²⁵ Altogether, these advancements were intended

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Tate and Stone, *Foundry Practice: A Treatise on Molding and Casting in Their Various Details*, 1–2.

²² Stern, *Roman Mold-Blown Glass*, 46; Sheumaker and Wajda, *Material Culture in America*, 81; Khan, Sheikh, and Al-Shaer, *Evolution of Metal Casting Technologies*, 5–6.

²³ Sheumaker and Wajda, *Material Culture in America*, 81.

Though it is worth noting - as Sheumaker and Wadja do - that the production of the models and molds for these mass-produced ceramics still required the labor of highly-skilled mold-makers and artisans.

²⁴ Ibid.; Khan, Sheikh, and Al-Shaer, *Evolution of Metal Casting Technologies*, 5.

²⁵ Khan, Sheikh, and Al-Shaer, *Evolution of Metal Casting Technologies*, 5.

to improve on the quality and commercial viability of the final cast. At least a few where applied to the reproduction of antiquities.²⁶

That said, it is important to keep in mind that, despite these advancements, cast molding remained an imperfect science. While, in theory, a cast made from a direct mold should produce an exact replica of the original, in reality, cast molds are incapable of producing perfect copies. While how and how much they differ from the original varies depending the mold and casting process, this is true of *all* cast molds. Individual materials, their chemical composition, and even the physical structure of the object being reproduced²⁷ can all have a major impact the quality of the cast. Irregularities stemming from uneven casts, improperly set materials, and the seams produced by the molding process²⁸ are some just some of the most common issues. Accordingly, the skill of the individual who produces the mold and creates the subsequent cast plays a key role in mitigating these issues and determining the quality of the final reproduction. The ability to produce accurate molds contributed greatly to the popularity of the Chiurazzi foundry and its molds.

²⁶ J. G. Reinis and Antoine-Louis Barye, *The Founders and Editors of the Barye Bronzes*, 1st ed (New York: Polymath Press, 2007), 43–44.

Though many, like Achilles Collas' reducing lathe, were geared towards a popular rather than professional market for historical reproductions. That is not to say that historical cast mold reproductions did not benefit from developments in the field as a whole – that is a thread we will return to later in the paper.

²⁷ As noted above, more complex objects often require more pieces to form their mold. This can cause issues during casting and setting, particularly when the reproduction is removed from the mold(s).

²⁸ Also known as *fettles*.

Lost-Wax Casting

The type of cast molding employed by the Chiurazzi foundry is a form known as “lost-wax casting”. The practice of lost-wax casting in the Mediterranean can be dated as far back as the tenth century BCE.²⁹ Archaeological evidence indicates that the ancient Greeks were using this method to cast “large-scale hollow bronze statues” as early as the sixth century BCE, with excavations at the ancient Athenian Agora indicating the presence of as many as thirty ancient foundries near the center of the city.³⁰ Carol C. Mattusch suggests that these findings are indicative of a “bronze-casting industry [that] flourished in [Athens] on both a large and small scale for a period of about twelve hundred years, from the sixth century B.C. to the sixth century A.D.”³¹

Minor technical advances notwithstanding, the process of lost-wax casting has remained relatively unchanged since ancient times.³² In fact, methods used by foundries such as the Chiurazzi closely resemble those that would have been used by foundries in ancient Athens.³³ The Chiurazzi foundry has long prided itself in preserving this practice,

²⁹ Mattusch and Lie, *The Villa Dei Papiri at Herculaneum*, 20.

³⁰ Mattusch, *The Fire of Hephaistos*, 20; Carol C. Mattusch, *Greek Bronze Statuary: From the Beginnings through the Fifth Century B.C* (Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell University Press, 1988), 53–54.

³¹ Mattusch, *The Fire of Hephaistos*, 20; For more information, see Carol C. Mattusch, *Bronzeworkers in the Athenian Agora*, ed. American School of Classical Studies at Athens, *Excavations of the Athenian Agora*, no. 20 ([Athens] : Princeton, N.J: American School of Classical Studies at Athens ; Available from Institute for Advanced Study, 1982).

³² Mattusch, *The Fire of Hephaistos*, fig. 2.

³³ *Ibid.*, 20.

Mattusch notes the biggest change has been the “production of thinner and more economical bronzes.”

which Mattusch refers to as a “Neapolitan tradition of fine engraving.”³⁴ In 1885, Gennaro Sr. went so far as to establish a school for the express purpose of training orphans from the local *Albergo dei Poveri* in order to help preserve this tradition.³⁵

In lost-wax casting, as in traditional cast molding, the first step necessitates a “master mold” being taken of the original object.³⁶ In some cases, this may be a clay artist’s model, or even reproduction itself.³⁷ Hot wax is then poured into the mold and allowed to coat the inner surface.³⁸ The remaining wax is poured out, leaving a thin coating on the inside of the mold.³⁹ This produces a hollow, freestanding “wax working model” that can either be finished or “revised and improved.”⁴⁰ Mattusch explains that such revisions “might involve adjusting limbs and adding wax locks of hair, or ears, or a

³⁴ Dario Lucia et al., “Top-Down Archaeology with a Geometric Language,” *Computer-Aided Design and Applications* 5, no. 1–4 (January 2008): 74–75, doi:10.3722/cadaps.2008.483-496; Mattusch and Lie, *The Villa Dei Papiri at Herculaneum*, 343.

From the Italian *cesellatore*, which can also be translated as ‘carver’ or ‘chiseler’

³⁵ Mattusch and Lie, *The Villa Dei Papiri at Herculaneum*, 343; Chiurazzi, “Our Story,” 3–4.

It is likely that at least some of these students were part of the “specialized” labor force employed by *La Societa Chiurazzi-De Angelis* (also known as *Founder Reunite*) a brief collaboration between Chiurazzi and *cesellatore* Sabatino de Angelis.

³⁶ Mattusch, *The Fire of Hephaistos*, 21.

As with the cast-molds discussed in the previous section, this “master mold” might be comprised of several pieces depending on the complexity of the model.

³⁷ Ibid.

Pliny notes that the sculptor Arkesilaos’ “clay models used to sell for more to artists themselves than was paid for the finished works of others”; these models could have been alerted to make additional cast-bronze sculptures, and were highly valued as a result. (Pliny, *Natural History*, 35.155-6)

³⁸ Ibid., fig. 3.

³⁹ Ibid.

Mattusch notes that “this process was not standardized” and represents the biggest difference between ancient and modern lost-wax bronzes.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 21.

nose,” and were often implemented in antiquity to correct discrepancies between the wax model and the original, or to “individualize portraits.”⁴¹ This is also the case with modern wax models, such as those produced by the Chiurazzi Foundry.⁴² Mattusch refers to this the “skilled artistic work” of lost-wax casting.⁴³ Once it is completed, the wax mold is then re-sectioned and prepared for casting. This is done by creating a series of wax funnels, gates, and vents that will allow molten material to be poured into the mold.⁴⁴ The mold is then inverted and placed inside a clay investment mold with its center filled.⁴⁵ It is then baked to remove the wax and allow the molten material to pass into space left behind.⁴⁶ The material is then poured and allowed to set over the course of a few days, after which the completed cast is removed, and the bronze segments left over from the funnel-gate-vent system are removed.⁴⁷ The resulting segments are then joined and the reproduction is completed.⁴⁸

While the process by which the bronzes were produced is in itself a fascinating one, one of the most important points we should take away from its study is an understanding of the manner in which the long history of lost-wax casting in both Naples and the Mediterranean, when coupled with the immense care and attention to detail undertaken by the Chiurazzi’s *cesellatore*, produced casts that were simultaneously

⁴¹ Ibid., 21, cat. no. 43

⁴² Ibid., fig. 4

⁴³ Ibid., 24.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 24, fig. 3

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 25, fig. 7.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 25, fig. 3

perceived as being of a finer quality as well as “more authentic” than other similar reproductions. This belief was openly encouraged by Gennaro and his sons, Federico and Salvatore, who emphasized the “traditional” character of their products and work.⁴⁹ This likely contributed to the early demand for Chiurazzi reproduction in the United States, where collectors would have been drawn by the ability to acquire and own readily produced “antiquities” for their collections.

The Chiurazzi Molds

The Chiurazzi Foundry published two major catalogues of reproductions after the turn of the century – the first in 1905, and a second in 1929.⁵⁰ The modern foundry still uses the 1929 catalogue, which lists approximately seven hundred unique bronze and marble reproductions.⁵¹ These reproductions are made using molds taken directly from objects at institutions such as the Vatican, the Louvre, and the British National Museum, a large number of which could only be seen in person at the time.⁵² However their most popular material was sourced from the MANN.

Founded in the mid-eighteenth century, MANN houses one of the world’s largest and most significant collections of Greco-Roman antiquities.⁵³ At the turn of the

⁴⁹ Ibid., 57–58.

⁵⁰ Gennaro Chiurazzi, *J. Chiurazzi & Fils - Fournisseurs de Cours et Musees - Etablissement R. Albergo De’ Poveri* (Milano: Stabilimento Cromotipolitografico Wild & C., 1905); Salvatore Chiurazzi, *Chiurazzi - Fonderie - Ceramica - Marmeria* (Napoli: Tipografia Montanino, 1929).

Per Mattusch, an updated edition of the first catalogue was produced in French in 1910.

⁵¹ Mattusch, *The Fire of Hephaistos*, 343–44.

⁵² Chiurazzi, “Our Story,” 3.

⁵³ “Storia Del Museo — Sito Ufficiale Del Museo Archeologico Nazionale Di Napoli,” accessed June 8, 2017, <http://cir.campania.beniculturali.it/museoarcheologiconazionale/storia-del-museo>.

nineteenth century, their collection included a wide variety of objects from across the Mediterranean, including a large number of objects recovered from the archaeological excavations at Pompeii and Herculaneum.⁵⁴ More than a third of the Chiurazzi Foundry's 1929 catalogue is made up of Objects from MANN, with two hundred and forty five sculptures attributed to its collections.⁵⁵ Of these, fifty seven are from the Villa dei Papiri in Herculaneum.⁵⁶ These objects make up the majority of Penn Museum's collection of bronzes.

Excavations at the Villa began some two hundred years prior to the publication of the foundry's first catalogue. The first recorded excavations of Herculaneum began in 1709 under Emmanuel-Maurice, Duc de Lorraine and Prince d'Elboeuf (1677-1763).⁵⁷ Subsequent excavations were carried out by Charles of Bourbon (1716-1788), King of Spain and founder of MANN, in 1738.⁵⁸ The city was destroyed alongside Pompeii during the eruption of Mount Vesuvius in 79 CE. Both cities were buried by a thick layer of volcanic ash that ultimately preserved them.⁵⁹ The Villa was unearthed in 1750, and gradually excavated over the course of the following decades. Under Charles, significant artifacts recovered from the excavation were moved off site. Initially, the artifacts were moved to the King's Palace at Portici, where he constructed the *Museo Ercolanese* (also known as the *Museo Herculaneum*) to house them. Visitors to the museum were required

⁵⁴ Mattusch and Lie, *The Villa Dei Papiri at Herculaneum*, 342.

⁵⁵ Ibid.; Chiurazzi, *Chiurazzi - Fonderie - Ceramica - Marmeria*.

⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁷ Mattusch and Lie, *The Villa Dei Papiri at Herculaneum*, 1.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 33.

⁵⁹ For more on the eruption of Vesuvius, see Pliny, *Eps*, 6.16 & 6.20

to obtain permits to view the artifacts, and were expressly forbidden from taking notes or making drawings.⁶⁰ As a result, the first catalogue of objects from Herculaneum was not produced until 1754, when Ottavio Antonio Bayardi published his *Catalogo Degli Antichi Monumenti Dissotterati Dalla Scoperta Citta di Ercolana*.⁶¹ Despite Charles' restrictive stipulations, the artifacts recovered from Herculaneum fascinated the public, and were highly praised by who visited the early museum.⁶² Moreover, the extraordinary circumstances surrounding the preservation and discovery of Pompeii and Herculaneum generated a powerful public fascination with those sites. The artifacts were considered national - even global - treasures. That said, while many professionals were critical of the methods being used to excavate the site, there was substantial competition among early scholars as to who would lead the excavations.⁶³ The subsequent competition, coupled with Charles' restrictions, greatly limited the public's access to both the site and its artifacts.

Unfortunately, this was still the case some hundred years later when the Chiurazzi Foundry began marketing its reproductions. As a result of the artifacts' relative inaccessibility, the foundry's reproductions were highly sought after by collectors at the

⁶⁰ Mattusch and Lie, *The Villa Dei Papiri at Herculaneum*, 56–57.

Our primary source for the museum, John Winckelmann, published his account from memory, four years after his two month stay at the museum in 1758.

⁶¹ Ibid., 65.

Which, while descriptive, lacks any illustrations of the artifacts recovered from either the city or the Villa.

⁶² Ibid., 56–61.

⁶³ Ibid., 100.

turn of the century. As a result, a large number were purchased by museums the world over, all of which were eager to finally have access to the once restricted royal collection.

Notable Collections of Chiurazzi Bronzes

As a result, there are a large number of Chiurazzi Bronzes in the United States alone. Some went to private collectors while others, like the Wanamaker Collection, were purchased for museums and public viewing. One of the larger collections in the United States was commissioned by the Ringling Museum of Art in 1925; the same year he established his museum in Sarasota, Florida, John N. Ringling (1866-1936) commissioned fifty Chiurazzi bronzes for his collection.⁶⁴ His purchase included several full-sized reproductions that, after being displayed elsewhere for a short period of time, were installed in the museum's courtyard.⁶⁵ The Ringling Bronzes, as they were known, were inscribed with the Chiurazzi Foundry's signature.⁶⁶ Promotional material describes one reproduction as being "cast from an ancient Roman marble copy of a Greek Bronze Original," with the 'original' Roman marble "located at Museo Nazionale, Naples, Italy."⁶⁷ Unlike the Wanamaker Bronzes, which were colored to match the bronzes

⁶⁴ Mattusch and Lie, *The Villa Dei Papiri at Herculaneum*, 346; "History of The Museum of Art," *The Ringling*, accessed May 22, 2017, <https://www.ringling.org/history-museum-art>.

Ringling and Mattusch both falsely claim that this "constituted the largest Chiurazzi collection in existence" at the time. See footnote 132.

⁶⁵ Mattusch and Lie, *The Villa Dei Papiri at Herculaneum*, 346.

Mattusch indicates they were "first installed" at two of Ringling's real estate developments" but does not indicate where, only that they were moved when the museum was formally dedicated in 1931. Further information regarding their earlier homes is lacking.

⁶⁶ Ibid.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

recovered from Pompeii and Herculaneum, not all of Ringling's reproductions were produced in their original medium.⁶⁸ For instance, Mattusch notes that "[Ringling] chose to buy a bronze version of Michelangelo's David...for Ringling seems to have decided upon that medium for most of his replicas, including the laocoon group after the ancient marble sculpture in the Vatican."⁶⁹ Despite this, the Ringling bronzes nevertheless drew a substantial amount of attention to the new museum.⁷⁰

Additional purchases of Chiurazzi Bronzes in the United States can be attributed to the Carnegie Museum of Art, the Carnegie Museum of Natural History, the Baltimore Museum of Art, the Metropolitan Museum of Art, and the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.⁷¹ In addition to these collections, the foundry's records suggest the presence of several major collections abroad. The foundry claims to have collections at the Louvre, the National Museum of Bargello in Florence, the National Museum of Scotland, the Staatliche Museum in Berlin, the Vatican Museum, the Victoria and Albert Museum in London, and the University of Cambridge Museum.⁷² For the most part, the collections acquired by these museums appear to have served a similar purposes to those acquired by their American counterparts, though it is difficult to be sure, as few list their collections or maintain public records related to their purchase. The sheer number of acquisitions,

⁶⁸ Mattusch, *Enduring Bronze*, 156–57; "Expedition Magazine | '...Very Best Inspirations of the Past,'" accessed May 22, 2017, <https://www.penn.museum/sites/expedition/very-best-inspirations-of-the-past/>.

⁶⁹ Mattusch, *Enduring Bronze*, 156–57.

⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁷¹ Mattusch and Lie, *The Villa Dei Papiri at Herculaneum*, 342; Chiurazzi, "Our Story."

⁷² Chiurazzi, "Our Story," 7.

however, indicates that there was, at the very least, a widespread desire to collect and view these items, regardless of the fact that they were reproductions.

How Do You Value a Reproduction?

Based on this brief history, one can comfortably conclude that the Chiurazzi Bronzes were highly sought after by both collectors and museum audiences at the turn of the century. Their popularity can be ascribed to several factors: 1) the ability of the foundry to produce near-accurate replicas; 2) the manner in which the Chiurazzi's *cesellatore* defined themselves as skilled artisans who were a part of a long tradition closely tied to the production of original casts; 3) the foundry's access to objects associated with major discoveries that had long been inaccessible to museums and collectors; and, as we will see in the following chapter, 4) the fact that the foundry provided collectors with the opportunity to share these antiquities with their communities, thereby increasing their own cultural influence and significance. Altogether, these factors provided the Chiurazzi Bronzes with a relatively large amount of cultural capital, which saw them exhibited at museums across the world, and their status as reproductions largely overlooked. The first two points in particular - as Schwartz argues in his discussion of "authentic music" - "[muddy] the waters of authenticity" by "confusing" the distinction between originals and copies. They do so by defining the reproductions' authenticity on the basis of its 'relative' rather than its 'direct' fidelity. That is to say, they recreate the *circumstances* of production without capturing its *phenomenality*, as in Schwartz's differentiation between studio recording and the "authenticity" of a live performance. Together, these factors form the basis of what Schwartz calls "the authenticity of a copy",

which, given the sufficient technology or cultural investment, can be indistinguishable from the “authenticity of an original”.⁷³ In the case of the Chiurazzi Bronzes, however, this has more to do with the issue of legitimacy than authenticity. The bronzes were not meant to replace the originals, but rather stand-in for them, like stunt doubles in early Hollywood movies.⁷⁴ This is the same process by which the sculptures uncovered at Pompeii and Herculaneum were classified as “authentic original works” despite being themselves reproductions of earlier Greek sculptures - only at several hundred years remove. In both cases, people were aware that they were reproductions, but in the absence of the “real thing”, accepted them on the basis of their ability to provide a convincing, and moreover, *satisfying* reproduction of the original. This is only exacerbated by the socio-cultural pressures of the third and fourth points.

In the following chapter, we will turn our consideration to the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, and the reception of the Wanamaker Collection in an attempt to understand how cultural capital may affect the perception of reproductions and how, in turn, perception may affect their cultural capital.

⁷³ Hillel Schwartz, *The Culture of the Copy: Striking Likenesses, Unreasonable Facsimiles*, 4. printing (New York, NY: Zone Books, 2000), 311.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 164.

THE WANAMAKER COLLECTION

In 1904, Philadelphia department store owner John Wanamaker (1838-1922) placed an order for more than four hundred and fifty bronze reproductions with the Chiurazzi Foundry.⁷⁵ His order included several “statues...portrait busts, furniture, vases, candelabra, weights, and musical, architectural, and medical instruments,” the majority of which were reproductions of objects from the excavations at Pompeii and Herculaneum.⁷⁶ At the time, his order constituted one of the single largest collections of Chiurazzi Bronzes in existence. The bronzes were produced in Italy and shipped to America, where they first appeared (by personal agreement between Wanamaker and the foundry) at the Royal Italian Pavilion of the 1904 World’s Fair in St. Louis, MO.⁷⁷ The reproductions were well received by the public; among the pavillions many visitors were President Theodore Roosevelt and his wife, Edith.⁷⁸ Curators Ann Brownlee and Lynn Makowsky argue that “the [foundry’s] work was shown to great advantage in this setting and introduced the reproductions to a new group of potential buyers.”⁷⁹ The bronzes were displayed at the pavilion through the end of the year, after which they were shipped to

⁷⁵ This figure varies. Mattusch states the collection was approximately four hundred figures, while curators Brownlee and Makowsky state it was more than four hundred and fifty. Alternatively, the Museum's website claims there are more than five hundred total objects in the collection. During my time at the museum, the figure commonly given was closer to seven hundred. This figure is, surprisingly, the least likely of the four. Over the years, several objects containing multiple parts, particularly lamps and candelabra, were broken up, with individual pieces itemized and inventoried as distinct materials. This is one of the major issues that will be discussed in Chapter 3.

⁷⁶ “Expedition Magazine | ‘...Very Best Inspirations of the Past.’”

⁷⁷ Ibid.

⁷⁸ Ibid.

⁷⁹ Ibid.

their final destination, the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Anthropology in Archaeology, where John Wanamaker served as a board member.⁸⁰

They arrived at the museum in 1905 and were promptly installed alongside several other reproductions and original objects in the “Graeco-Roman Section” of the museum’s Pepper Hall.⁸¹ They were unveiled in May of that year, to overwhelming acclaim.⁸² The general consensus was that the bronzes, soon dubbed the “Wanamaker Collection”, were a major boon to the museum, university, and the city of Philadelphia. Sara Yorke Stevenson, then a recently retired board member and curator of the museum, as well as one of its founding members and prominent archaeologist, wrote that the bronzes would,

“...enable students and laymen alike to study at home [in Philadelphia] the history and civilization of foreign regions which the majority are unable to visit, and they bring to our own people the very best inspirations of the past, placing them in touch with the artists and artisans of the ancient world to which the new world is indebted for the elements of its own culture.”⁸³

For these reasons, she went on to assert that, “[the city of] Philadelphia owes a debt of sincere gratitude to Mr. Wanamaker.”⁸⁴

⁸⁰ Ibid.; “Penn Museum - Rome Gallery,” accessed June 9, 2017, <https://www.penn.museum/exhibitions/signature-galleries/rome-gallery>.

⁸¹ “Expedition Magazine | ‘...Very Best Inspirations of the Past.’”

⁸² Ibid.

⁸³ Ibid.

⁸⁴ Ibid.

John Wanamaker and American Cultural Capital

Like many of the great patrons of art and culture from his era, John Wanamaker got his start in business. Born in Philadelphia in 1838, Wanamaker made his fortune through a series of increasingly successful department stores.⁸⁵ Like his contemporaries, Andrew Carnegie and John D. Rockefeller, Wanamaker gave his time, money, and name to a series of philanthropic endeavors, including several charities in the Greater Philadelphia Area and a series of major donations to the newly established University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology.⁸⁶ It was by virtue of these donations that Wanamaker became a major figure in the cultural landscape of Philadelphia, and that he was named board manager of the museum in 1896.⁸⁷ Dedicated to bettering and expanding the lives of Philadelphia's citizens, these donations had the additional benefit of contributing to Wanamaker's cultural influence in the city, and his ability to accumulate, disseminate and control cultural capital at will. As noted in the previous chapter, one of the prevalent factors behind the early popularity of the Chiurazzi Foundry's reproductions was their appeal to collectors and donors as easily-accessible objects of high cultural capital. A man like John Wanamaker or Andrew Carnegie could easily acquire a collection of highly-sought after objects - like those from the Pompeii and Herculaneum collections - without incurring the additional cost and trouble of

⁸⁵ *Contemporary American Biography: Biographical Sketches of Representative Men of the Day : Representatives of Modern Thought and Progress, of the Pulpit, the Press, the Bench and Bar, of Legislation, Invention and the Great Industrial Interests of the Country. 1895* (Atlantic Publishing and Engraving Company, 1895), 362.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 362–63.

⁸⁷ "Expedition Magazine | '...Very Best Inspirations of the Past,'" accessed May 22, 2017, <https://www.penn.museum/sites/expedition/very-best-inspirations-of-the-past/>.

funding a major expedition or purchasing a “priceless” original. At the same time, however, they could still reap the benefits of providing these materials to the public, and the control their introduction gave them over the cultural landscape. There is no doubt that the Wanamaker Collection was highly valued upon its donation to the museum in large part because of Wanamaker’s association with it. In turn, it is highly probable that the classical nature of the Wanamaker Collection is more reflective of the cultural interests and values of Wanamaker and his contemporaries rather than those of Philadelphia's citizens and the museum’s primary audience.

Nevertheless, the Wanamaker Collection eventually fell out popularity, which begs the question; how is cultural capital *lost*, specifically in cases of reproductions? The answer, as with many things related to reproductions, has to do with perception, and can be understood in part through the evolving interest with the collection as a whole.

How Was the Collection Received?

One of our best sources for the academic reception of the Wanamaker Bronzes comes to us not from the Penn Museum, but rather the Field Museum in Chicago. It comes in the form of a inventory catalogue produced by Frank B. Tarbell, Professor of Classical Archaeology at Chicago University. Tarbell’s 1909 *Catalogue of Bronzes etc., in Field Museum of Natural History*, provides us with a unique insight into how the reproductions may have been viewed by scholars at the time. It includes detailed description of all the objects in the collection, and attempts to identify individual objects and their uses. It also represents one of the most complete catalogues of bronze reproductions from MANN available from this period. Based on the language used in the

introduction, one can infer that its primary goal was the independent study of objects from Pompeii and Herculaneum. In it, Tarbell notes,

“Inasmuch, therefore, as a complete and scientific account of the Naples bronzes has never been issued, it has seemed worthwhile to prepare a somewhat detailed catalogue, with illustrations, of these reproductions. It has, of course, been out of the question to furnish particulars as to technical processes employed in manufacture, such as might be expected from a catalogue of originals. And it has been equally impossible in most cases to make out to what extent the originals have been repaired since their discovery, or to what extent objects have been combined without proof...but even if some liberties may have been taken in the past which a scrupulous director of a museum would not take to-day, there is not the slightest reason to suspect any essential falsification of the witness of these objects to ancient life.”⁸⁸

This was published in 1909, just four years after Sara Yorke Stevenson delivered her rousing speech at the opening of the “Greco-Roman section” at Pepper Hall, and nearly two hundred years after the initial discovery and excavation of the original artifacts. Tarbell, who establishes that his intent is to produce a “complete and scientific account” of the Naples bronzes, is all-too aware of the shortcomings of utilizing reproductions in his study. He cannot study how they were made, for one, nor can he establish what changes have been made to the bronzes in the modern period.⁸⁹ Nevertheless, the

⁸⁸ Tarbell and Dorsey, *Catalogue of Bronzes, Etc., in Field Museum of Natural History*, v.7:no.3(1909):93.

⁸⁹ Not properly, anyways.

existence of this volume indicates that the collection provided him with sufficient evidence to produce his catalogue - which he argues is the first of its kind. In reality, several catalogues, including the 1754 edition by Bayardi, had been in circulation for some time. What is significant about Tarbell's edition, is that it is a "scientific" one. Written in the early 1900s, it is already moving toward the more professionalized language that we will see in the following chapter. It is clearly written in a more formal and academic format than Bayardi's catalogue, or any of the catalogues produced prior, which were more romantic and antiquarian in nature.⁹⁰ Despite its issues, Tarbell emphasizes that "there is not the slightest reason to suspect any essential falsification of the witness of these objects to ancient life." That is to say, the Chiurazzi bronzes are as accurate as they need to be for the purpose of his study, and that they accurately represent the different aspects of ancient life being studied. It is clearly a matter of relative accuracy, and thereby relative academic legitimacy; there is no doubt that at least part of this admission is praise for the foundry's skill in staying close to the original. Nevertheless, his concern with "liberties" and "scrupulous directors" indicates that, as early as 1909, there was a growing sense among museum professionals that "accurate enough" was not always good enough, and that Tarbell's volume serves as an indication of the ongoing process of professionalization that would later contribute to the declining use of reproductions.

⁹⁰ For more examples, see Mattusch's section on the publication of the antiquities at Portici, see Mattusch and Lie, *The Villa Dei Papiri at Herculaneum*.

On that note, we will return to Stevenson's speech, which emphasized the value of "[enabling] students and laymen alike to study at home...[that which they] are unable to visit."⁹¹ Like Tarbell, Stevenson saw the Chiurazzi Reproductions as an opportunity to study what had not been accessible for study prior. Unlike Tarbell, she emphasized the benefit this poses to "students" and "laymen," not just professionals. The Wanamaker collection was seen as a tool for public education and, to that end, it did not appear to have drawn any criticism. Moreover, according to Brownlee and Makowsky, it was not the only set of reproductions, Roman or otherwise, put on display at the new museum.⁹² The 2002, *Guide to the Etruscan and Roman Worlds at the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology* produced by Penn Museum notes,

"While a clear line is drawn today between genuine ancient artifacts and replicas in museum displays, that line was not so firmly drawn for museum audiences in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. When the Museum opened in 1899, the displays in Pepper Hall on the second floor, the core of the classical galleries, were a creative combination of cast replicas and archaeological collections acquired in Italy."⁹³

⁹¹ "Expedition Magazine | '...Very Best Inspirations of the Past.'"

⁹² Ibid.

⁹³ University of Pennsylvania, Donald White, and Lee Horne, eds., *Guide to the Etruscan and Roman Worlds at the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology*, 1st ed (Philadelphia, Pa: University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, 2002), 3.

Thanks to excavations lead by the university overseas, the new museum had access to far more original artifacts than the Field Museum.⁹⁴ Accordingly, if the Penn Museum was comfortable displaying reproductions alongside their originals, and found them beneficial to public audiences, this would indicate that the views expressed by Tarbell in his introduction were not yet commonplace within the museum community, and that reproductions were still viewed as useful for certain educational purposes. It would also explain the Carnegie Museum of Art's 1907 purchase, the purchase of Ringling's 1925 collection, and the sheer numbers in which they were purchased by both established and fledgling institutions around the world. Interestingly, it may also explain why Ringling chose to exhibit his sculpture collection in a non-standard format; they were meant for public audiences, not scholars.⁹⁵ Like his infamous circus, they were meant to entertain, not necessarily educate.

Going by these early impressions, we are presented with an image of reproductions at the turn of the century that places them in relatively high, if at times precarious, regard. At both Penn and the Field Museum, they served to fulfill academic as well as educational needs, providing scholars and the general the public with access to materials and experiences that were otherwise unobtainable - experiences that educated

⁹⁴ Alessandro Pezzati, Jane Hickman, and Alexandra Fkeuscgnab, "A Brief History of the Penn Museum," 6, accessed June 9, 2017, https://www.penn.museum/documents/publications/expedition/pdfs/54-3/a_brief_history.pdf.

⁹⁵ As far as I am aware, not formal study has ever been carried out using the Ringling Bronzes as its basis. If there has, there does not appear to be any indication of it in the available sources.

as well as entertained. Despite the ongoing developments in curatorial practice noted in Tarbell's work, it is clear that Penn Museum's staff perceived the reproductions in a positive and manner. I would argue that this view was likely born from the same dichotomy present in Tarbell's work, and in Outram's all-important distinction between the function of an "experiential" and "actualistic" reproduction. There is a sense of experience as being part and parcel of education, particularly in regards to objects of classical antiquity - an issue of cultural capital and its provision that deserves a paper unto itself. There is every reason to believe that the early Penn Museum valued its reproductions alongside its original artifacts for the variety of educational experiences they provided their audiences.

For contemporary professional and the staff at Penn museum, the intersection between academic interest, conservation demands, and public engagement is of major concern. Accordingly, one might expect that these collections would still be a major part of their respective museums when, in fact, the opposite is true. For some reason, despite the apparent benefits and socially ascribed value of the reproductions, they fell out of use at both Penn and elsewhere, and into relative obscurity. In our next and final chapter, we will consider the disappearance of the Wanamaker Collection, and try to fit it into our understanding of its contemporary resurgence.

AN EVER SHIFTING TIDE

The Wanamaker Collection remained on display in the “Graeco-Roman” Section of Pepper hall until at least 1906.⁹⁶ It is unclear when the move began, but the collection did not remain on display for much longer. Sometime in the 1920s, the collection was moved to storage, after which it appears to have been largely ignored considering its earlier celebrity.⁹⁷ Collection records indicate that the collection was hardly touched between then and the 1980s, when the last major inventory of the bronzes was carried out.⁹⁸ After that, inventories were sparse, and conservation efforts appear to have been minimal. In some cases, objects were moved to private spaces, like offices, and many were lost.⁹⁹ As noted in the introduction, the collection saw relatively little use until the mid-2000s, and only then on a small scale. Unfortunately, the objects that were used at that point in time (predominantly smaller objects from the surgical and architectural collections) were severely mismanaged. Many were damaged or broken.¹⁰⁰ Academic use was similarly sparse, as there does not appear to be any major academic work on the

⁹⁶ University of Pennsylvania, White, and Horne, *Guide to the Etruscan and Roman Worlds at the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology*, 4 fig. 3.

⁹⁷ Drawn from eMu conservation and inventory records of collection reviewed over the summer of 2016.

⁹⁸ Maldonado and McFalls, *Wanamaker Collections Intern Guidebook*, 2.

See above note; this marks the last major inventory before the summer of 2016.

⁹⁹ This was the case with object numbers MS3575 and MS3830, a series of Head Vases, one of which was found during inventory, after having been moved to an office for more than a decade.

¹⁰⁰ Maldonado and McFalls, *Wanamaker Collections Intern Guidebook*, 2.

For example, a large number of objects from these collections were covered in non-conservation paint after being exhibited on a rolling cart for students. Many lacked proper housing, for storage or otherwise, and were often handled without gloves.

collection prior to that of Brownlee and Makowsky. Looking at the records and inventory, it is almost as if the Wanamaker Collection just vanished overnight, replaced by new acquisitions as the museum grew into its modern buildings.¹⁰¹ This appears to have been the case for many collections of Chiurazzi bronzes, both in the United States and abroad.¹⁰² Until recently, very little has been known of what became of these collections. The main exception appears to be the Ringling museum, where the majority of the bronzes commissioned for the museum's landscaping remain on display, including the bronze David.¹⁰³ For a collection that once appeared across the world as a treasured relic of history, this represented drastic change of fortune.

These changes reflect ongoing developments in the way reproductions were perceived after the turn of the century. Their value as cultural capital plummeted and their once wide use cases were quickly limited. The question remains, why?

The answer has to do with the changing perception of “objectivity” and the ever-growing concern with *who* and *what* defined “truth” and “authenticity” that became the theoretical focus of museum studies in the mid twentieth century. Subsequently, a great deal of attention was dedicated to the museum's role in ensuring the determination and preservation of the “real” in the age of New Media. This view expressed by Fred

¹⁰¹ University of Pennsylvania, White, and Horne, *Guide to the Etruscan and Roman Worlds at the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology*, 4–6.

¹⁰² Having visited in the Field Museum in April of 2017, there does not seem to be any indication they were ever part of the collection on display, though we will discuss relevant changes to their online collection in the following chapter.

¹⁰³ Mattusch, *Enduring Bronze*, 156–57.

Schroeder in his contemporaneous work, *Twentieth-century Popular Culture in Museums and Libraries*, where he writes,

“It...appears probably that museums will continue to play an increasingly dominant role as a cultural institution in this society. We must see that the museum finds the language of communication to speak meaningfully to its audience. This is unlikely to happen without real object...contemporary collecting [will be] a pivotal part... of [assuring] the unquestioned authenticity of an object in an age when technology will be able to produce forgeries and frauds with increasing ease and accuracy.”¹⁰⁴

Schroeder’s definition of “contemporary collecting” recalls Tarbell’s earlier notion of “scrupulous director of a museum.”¹⁷⁹ As a whole, there was a prevailing sense that visitors went to museums to experience the “past” - an objective series of events determined by curators. It was widely felt that reproductions, unless carefully presented as such, broke this illusion, and engendered distrust in the organization. This was a death knell in the age of new media, and the insecurity of the museum’s future. It was as much a matter of legitimacy as a matter of marketing – who wants to come see a fake? For many museums, the answer was obvious. Fakes are not valuable. Fakes cannot even be studied. This belief runs counter to Schwartz’s conception of copies and reproductions as

¹⁰⁴ Fred E. H. Schroeder, ed., *Twentieth-Century Popular Culture in Museums and Libraries* (Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling Green University Popular Press, 1981), 15.

¹⁷⁹ Ibid.; Tarbell and Dorsey, *Catalogue of Bronzes, Etc., in Field Museum of Natural History*, v.7:no.3(1909):93.

being culturally defined, placing the “burden” of discernment on museum professionals whilst simultaneously robbing audiences from the ability to conceive of alternative approaches for themselves. In the end, it diminished the perception of reproductions on both sides.

A Contemporary Resurgence

While the large majority of collections of Chiurazzi bronzes fell victim to the decline of reproductions, many have also benefited from their contemporary resurgence. At Penn Museum, in addition to the ongoing inventory, a small part of the collection is currently on display to the public for the first time in several decades, in the Roman gallery. Chiurazzi’s Bronzes have also made a comeback at the Field Museum - at least online after they “[laid] unstudied in the collections since the 1920s.”¹⁰⁵ At the Getty Villa, which houses one of the newest collections of Chiurazzi Bronzes, there was recently a major exposition of their collection, which brought several additional Chiurazzi bronzes to the museum on loan.¹⁰⁶ This exposition was attended by both Carol C. Mattusch and Luisa Fucito (in her capacity as the modern foundry’s archivist) as well as the current owners of the foundry, which has come under renewed interest as increasing numbers of bronzes come out of storage.¹⁰⁷ Coming out of a bankruptcy and

¹⁰⁵ wparkinson, “The Roman and Etruscan Gallery,” Text, *The Field Museum*, (February 21, 2011), <https://www.fieldmuseum.org/science/blog/roman-and-etruscan-gallery>.

¹⁰⁶ About The Author David Saunders et al., “Chiurazzi Bronzes, from Pompeii to Malibu,” *The Getty Iris*, August 30, 2011, <https://blogs.getty.edu/iris/chiurazzi-bronzes-from-pompeii-to-malibu/>.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid.

recent re-acquisition, the foundry recently applied for historic status in Italy - though they were denied.¹⁰⁸

Increasingly, Chiurazzi bronzes have come to be regarded as valuable in their own right. Overtime, the “authentic copy” has become an “authentic original.” This was the case during my time at Penn, and served as a large inspiration for my interest in the history of the foundry, its workers, and its molds. In many ways, Mattusch was right when she referred to the foundry as representing a lasting “Neapolitan tradition,” as even if we stripped them of their association with Rome, with Herculaneum, or even the Villa dei Papiri, the bronzes produced by the Chiurazzi Foundry would now be counted as valuable pieces of art and history in their own right.¹⁰⁹ This increased interest in their history is also reflected by the increased scholarly interest in the history of the Chiurazzi foundry, in collectors like John Wanamaker, and in the collections programs of museums like Penn currently being written. That being said, while some work, like that Fucito’s and Mattusch’s on the Naples’ foundries and their relationship with the Villa dei Papiri indicate a growing interest in this “new” field of Neapolitan art and post-classicism, they are nevertheless out-stripped by histories focused on museums and collectors. For most museums, it seems to be a matter of personal investment. That said, we must also contend with the unfortunate fact that the Chiurazzi molds are among the last of their kind, and that they have suffered a series of mismanagements that may mean they will not be

¹⁰⁸ Ibid.

¹⁰⁹ See “La Fonderia Artistica Chiurazzi” in Chapter 1.

around for much longer. The Chiurazzi Bronzes we have may remain the only bronzes we have.

That said, while I was at Penn there was also a prevailing notion that the Chiurazzi Bronzes may still be valuable to the study of Roman life - at least for the public. The fact that my time with the Wanamaker collection was spent working with the museum's engagement department is not a coincidence. In general, the return of the Chiurazzi Bronzes seems to be closely associated with a concomitant push in museums to develop new forms of public engagement, or at least replicate old ones. This appears to be the reason for the Field Museum's online publication of their bronze collection, and was a driving force behind the 2016 inventory of the Wanamaker bronzes.¹¹⁰ It all came down to accessibility - the bronzes needed to be made accessible and readily available for study at all levels of academia.

This is also the impetus behind a new project to scan, digitize, and publish the Wanamaker collection online in 3D.¹¹¹ It, and all of the other projects associated with the 2016 inventory, are now vital for many of the same reasons that Tarbell's catalogue was important in 1909. Increasingly, many of the bronzes produced by the Chiurazzi foundry are now inaccessible at MANN. A large number of objects have been removed from display and put in storage. Yet again, we find the artifacts recovered from Herculaneum

¹¹⁰ wparkinson, "Roman and Etruscan Collections," Text, *The Field Museum*, (January 12, 2011), <https://www.fieldmuseum.org/node/4946>.

¹¹¹ Emily French, Private Correspondence. "Working on the Wanamaker Bronzes," March 2017.

just out of reach.¹¹² At Penn, the common consensus was clear - in the age of instant communication, a photograph of a reproduction can be infinitely more valuable than the original, particularly when the original is listed on a dusty finding aid, half a world away.

Altogether, the reemergence of Chiurazzi bronzes across the world seems to be closely associated with a renewed appreciation of artisan craftsmanship - though this time, for its creative nature. Their new applications are not defined by authenticity, but rather by purpose - specifically purpose that is informed by community needs, rather than professional ones.

¹¹² A reoccurring complaint during our inventory of the bronzes was MANN's lack of online collection, or easily obtainable catalogue.

CONCLUSION: IDENTIFYING A WAY FORWARD

Interestingly, many of the topics discussed in this work also seem to apply to the production and utilization of reproductions through new technologies, which are seeing increasing utilization in professional and academic settings. These “new” reproductions come in a variety of forms, formats and processes - far too many to name here. Their applications have already far out-stripped those of any non-digital reproductions to date; even those of the Chiurazzi bronzes. These digital or “new” reproductions, to draw an altogether apt comparison with the “new” media that spawned them, fulfill a wide variety of use cases and serve a multitude of purposes. While some, like photography, have been around long enough to be considered “old,” they are all unified by their utilization of digital technology.

If we to define reproductions broadly as “being any object(s) or phenomena, either temporary or permanent, that are purposely and deliberately made to resemble a pre-existing object, set of objects, or phenomena”, then digital or “new” reproductions” would be any object(s) or phenomena that are made by means of digital rather than “manual” or mechanical processes. In film and photography, this would mean any images captured using digital rather than chemical processes, as well as anything recorded digitally after exposure.

By this definition, digital reproductions occupy many of the same spaces as “new media,” and as a result, incur many of the same problems. Accordingly, one might argue that Schroeder’s concern with the state “contemporary collecting” is still highly relevant. To some extent, this is true. Tarbell’s “scrupulous” curator has by no means become

obsolete. What has changed, however, is the focus on purpose, rather than objectivity. Usefulness, rather than “trueness.” This is key, especially when we consider it alongside the “deliberate” aspect of our definition. It provides us with an altogether more satisfactory way to sort and understand the use and application of digital reproductions in our work. GIS, 3D Modeling and Printing, even video games and virtual reality all open up to us. The question then is not “is it a reproduction” or even “how or why should we collect this” but rather, “how can we use this?”

These are the questions being asked of the modern curator, and, by my argument, the question that should be posed of *every* reproduction. Whether the Penn’s collection remains online, or ventures back out into classrooms or in the shape of digital 3D-objects, the primary question should not be one of authenticity, or even legitimacy. Ascribing cultural capital to reproductions in relation to original artifacts has already failed us once. Moving forward, reproductions should be assessed based on their potential, and their ability to explore and the questionable realms of authenticity and “actualization” and in doing so provide us with an expanded understanding of our past.

Bibliography

- “Architecture | Getty Villa.” Accessed June 3, 2017.
<http://www.getty.edu/visit/villa/architecture.html>.
- Bohrer, Frederick N. *Photography and Archaeology*. Exposures. London: Reaktion Books, 2011.
- Chiurazzi. “Our Story.” Accessed June 5, 2017.
https://static1.squarespace.com/static/572f9c32d210b899879d4e78/t/573798f6d210b8ad848bd049/1463261432228/Chiurazzi_Story.pdf.
- Chiurazzi, Gennaro. *J. Chiurazzi & Fils - Fournisseurs de Cours et Musees - Etablissement R. Albergo De' Poveri*. Milano: Stabilimento Cromotipolitografico Wild & C., 1905.
- Chiurazzi, Salvatore. *Chiurazzi - Fonderie - Ceramica - Marmeria*. Napoli: Tipografia Montanino, 1929.
- Coates, Victoria C. Gardner, and Jon L. Seydl. *Antiquity Recovered: The Legacy of Pompeii and Herculaneum*. Getty Publications, 2007.
- Contemporary American Biography: Biographical Sketches of Representative Men of the Day: Representatives of Modern Thought and Progress, of the Pulpit, the Press, the Bench and Bar, of Legislation, Invention and the Great Industrial Interests of the Country*. 1895. Atlantic Publishing and Engraving Company, 1895.
- Dorrell, Peter G. *Photography in Achaeology and Conservation*. 2nd ed. Cambridge Manuals in Archaeology. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- “Expedition Magazine | ‘...Very Best Inspirations of the Past.’” Accessed May 22, 2017.
<https://www.penn.museum/sites/expedition/very-best-inspirations-of-the-past/>.
- Fucito, Luisa, ed. *Fonderia Artistica Chiurazzi: La Forma Dell'Arte*. 1. ed. Luoghi Della Memoria, no. 4. Napoli: Altrastampa, 2001.
- Gardner Coates, Victoria C., and Jon L. Seydl, eds. *Antiquity Recovered: The Legacy of Pompeii and Herculaneum*. Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum, 2007.
- Graham, Beryl, ed. *New Collecting: Exhibiting and Audiences after New Media Art*. Routledge, 2016.

“Home — Sito Ufficiale Del Museo Archeologico Nazionale Di Napoli.” Accessed June 10, 2017. <http://cir.campania.beniculturali.it/museoarcheologiconazionale>.
Hughes, Anthony, and Erich Ranfft, eds. *Sculpture and Its Reproductions*. Critical Views. London: Reaktion Books, 1997.

J. Paul Getty Museum. *Guide to the Getty Villa*. Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Trust, 2005.

———. *Guidebook: The J. Paul Getty Museum*. J. Paul Getty Trust, 1978.

———. *The J. Paul Getty Museum Guide to the Villa and Its Gardens*. Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Trust, 1989.

Jameson, John H., ed. *The Reconstructed Past: Reconstructions in the Public Interpretation of Archaeology and History*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press, 2004.

Khan, Muhammad Azhar Ali, Anwar Khalil Sheikh, and Bilal Suleiman Al-Shaer. *Evolution of Metal Casting Technologies: A Historical Perspective*. Cham: Springer International Publishing Imprint: Springer, 2017.

Maldonado, Lelian, and Marie McFalls. “Wanamaker Bronzes Collection Problems (Internal Document Prepared for Keeper Lynn Makowsky).” University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, August 2016.

———. *Wanamaker Collections Intern Guidebook*. 1st ed. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, 2016.

Martin, Andrew. *The Essential Guide to Mold Making & Slip Casting*. 1st ed. A Lark Ceramics Book. New York: Lark Books, 2006.

Matthews, S.K. *Photography in Archaeology and Art*. London: John Baker, 1968.

Mattusch, Carol C. *Bronzeworkers in the Athenian Agora*. Edited by American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Excavations of the Athenian Agora, no. 20. [Athens] : Princeton, N.J: American School of Classical Studies at Athens ; Available from Institute for Advanced Study, 1982.

———. *Enduring Bronze: Ancient Art, Modern Views*. Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum, 2014.

———. *Greek Bronze Statuary: From the Beginnings through the Fifth Century B.C.* Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell University Press, 1988.

- , ed. *The Fire of Hephaistos: Large Classical Bronzes from North American Collections*. Cambridge, Mass, 1996.
- “Medical Implement, Hematome, Reproduction - MS3621 | Collections - Penn Museum.” Accessed September 14, 2017.
<https://www.penn.museum/collections/object/135313>.
- Moss, Dorothy. “Considering the Copy.” *American Art* 21, no. 2 (2007): 15–16.
doi:10.1086/521884.
- Neuerburg, Norman. *Herculaneum to Malibu: A Companion to the Visit of the J. Paul Getty Museum Building : A Descriptive and Explanatory Guide to the Re-Created Ancient Roma Villa of the Papyri Built at the Wishes of J. Paul Getty in Malibu, California, 1970-1974*. The Museum, 1975.
- Outram, Alan K. “Introduction to Experimental Archaeology.” *World Archaeology* 40, no. 1 (2008): 1–6.
- “Penn Museum - Mediterranean Section.” Accessed June 9, 2017.
<https://www.penn.museum/about-collections/curatorial-sections/mediterranean-section>.
- “Penn Museum - Rome Gallery.” Accessed June 9, 2017.
<https://www.penn.museum/exhibitions/signature-galleries/rome-gallery>.
- Pezzati, Alessandro, Jane Hickman, and Alexandra Fkeuscgnab. “A Brief History of the Penn Museum.” Accessed June 9, 2017.
https://www.penn.museum/documents/publications/expedition/pdfs/54-3/a_brief_history.pdf.
- Reinis, J. G., and Antoine-Louis Barye. *The Founders and Editors of the Barye Bronzes*. 1st ed. New York: Polymath Press, 2007.
- rhlgroup. *Moulds of the Masterpieces at Chiurazzi Foundry Naples Italy*, 2015.
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=m8fxpCigKps>.
- Ross, Richard, and Kenneth D. S. Lapatin. *Seeing the Getty Villa*. Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Trust, 2005.
- Saunders, About The Author David, Annelisa Stephan David Saunders I’m assistant curator in the Department of Antiquities at the J. Paul Getty Museum, co-curator of Apollo from Pompeii: Investigating an Ancient Bronze In 2009 I. curated The Golden Graves of Ancient Vani at the Getty Villa I’m currently developing exhibitions on Aphrodite, on a group of large South Italian vases that were restored in the 19th century Exhibitions aside, my main research interests lie with

ancient Greek vase-painting, iconography Annelisa Stephan I'm senior Web writer/editor at the J. Paul Getty Trust, editor of *The Iris* What does a Web editor do all day? She writes, et al. "Chiurazzi Bronzes, from Pompeii to Malibu." *The Getty Iris*, August 30, 2011. <https://blogs.getty.edu/iris/chiurazzi-bronzes-from-pompeii-to-malibu/>.

Schroeder, Fred E. H., ed. *Twentieth-Century Popular Culture in Museums and Libraries*. Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling Green University Popular Press, 1981.

Schwartz, Hillel. *The Culture of the Copy: Striking Likenesses, Unreasonable Fascimilies*. 4. printing. New York, NY: Zone Books, 2000.

Sheumaker, Helen, and Shirley Teresa Wajda, eds. *Material Culture in America: Understanding Everyday Life*. Santa Barbara, Calif: ABC-CLIO, 2008.

Stern, E. M. *Roman Mold-Blown Glass: The First Through Sixth Centuries*. 1st ed. Rome, Italy: "L'Erma" di Bretschneider in association with the Toledo Museum of Art, 1995.

Stone, Peter G., and Philippe G. Planel, eds. *The Constructed Past: Experimental Archaeology, Education, and the Public*. One World Archaeology 36. London ; New York: Routledge, 1999.

"Storia Del Museo — Sito Ufficiale Del Museo Archeologico Nazionale Di Napoli." Accessed June 8, 2017. <http://cir.campania.beniculturali.it/museoarcheologiconazionale/storia-del-museo>.

Tarbell, Frank Bigelow, and George Amos Dorsey. *Catalogue of Bronzes, Etc., in Field Museum of Natural History: Reproduced from Originals in the National Museum of Naples / By F. B. Tarbell -- ; George A. Dorsey --*. Vol. v.7:no.3(1909). Chicago: Field Museum of Natural History, 1909. <http://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/21493>.

Tate, James M., and Melvin O. Stone. *Foundry Practice: A Treatise on Molding and Casting in Their Various Details*. The H.W Wilson Company, 1904.

True, Marion, and Jorge Silvetti. *The Getty Villa*. Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Trust, 2005.

University of Pennsylvania, Donald White, and Lee Horne, eds. *Guide to the Etruscan and Roman Worlds at the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology*. 1st ed. Philadelphia, Pa: University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, 2002.

wparkinson. "Roman and Etruscan Collections." Text. *The Field Museum*, January 12, 2011. <https://www.fieldmuseum.org/node/4946>.