



FIG. 1. *Madonna and Child with the Infant Saint John*, Giuliano Bugiardini, 1523–25, tempera and oil on cradled wood panel, 44 1/2 × 32 in. (113 × 81 cm). Allentown Art Museum, Allentown, PA.

Philosophies and Tastes in Nineteenth-Century Paintings Conservation

Wendy Partridge

IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY EUROPE many of the difficult philosophical questions of the conservation of paintings were articulated and debated in print for the first time. The first of numerous books specifically on the restoration of paintings, Christian Köster's *Über Restaurierung Alter Ölgemälde*, was published in 1827. Previously, limited information on restoration had been available only in treatises on the art of painting.¹ These new writings argued the level to which cleaning should be taken and approaches to the compensation of losses. These issues were related respectively to a redefinition of patina in the nineteenth century² and to the rise of the field of connoisseurship. Major public controversies concerning restoration began to surface at the end of the eighteenth century. In 1796 the Louvre organized an exhibition of half-cleaned paintings to convince the public that the appearance of the paintings was in fact improving with treatment.³ Between 1846 and 1853 the National Gallery, London was at the center of a cleaning controversy that resulted in the House of Commons appointing a select committee to conduct a public inquiry into management practices and cleaning procedures at the Gallery. The committee's interviews with artists, collectors, connoisseurs, and restorers resulted in a 1,100-page report. Although restoration controversies were not new in Europe, they were a new phenomenon in the public domain and a direct result of the recent formation of national museums.⁴

In this environment, the restoration of early Italian paintings seems to have been especially controversial. Since these paintings had been “rediscovered”

after having been mostly ignored by connoisseurs,⁵ their restoration, like their collection and interpretation, was often a subject of heated debate. In this paper I will focus on only a handful of influential collectors, connoisseurs, and restorers of early Italian paintings whose restorations embodied two representative and contrasting approaches.

The attitudes of the first director of the National Gallery, London, Sir Charles Eastlake (1793–1865), and his restorer, Giuseppe Molteni (1799–1867), like Eastlake an academically trained painter, and the director of the Brera Gallery in Milan during his last six years, will be contrasted with those of the art historian Giovanni Battista Cavalcaselle (1819–1897). Cavalcaselle studied painting at the Accademia in Venice from 1835 to 1840 and with J.A. Crowe (1825–1896) wrote the enormously influential *New History of Italian Painting* (1864) and *A History of Painting in North Italy* (1871). In the 1870s he was appointed director of the art department for the Ministry of Public Education of the Italian State. In this capacity Cavalcaselle was responsible for major conservation projects at San Francesco in Assisi, the Arena Chapel in Padua, and the Camera degli Sposi in Mantua, among others. His approach to these restoration campaigns could be characterized as archaeological, unlike Eastlake and Molteni's tendency to make additions and "corrections" to paintings to bring them into conformity with contemporary taste and the requirements of nineteenth-century collecting. While Cavalcaselle was primarily concerned with issues of stability and retaining visible distinctions between original and restoration, he was not immune from aspects of the taste of his times, as we shall see below. In general, Molteni and Eastlake saw, and therefore conserved, paintings primarily as aesthetic objects while Cavalcaselle tended to view and treat works of art more as historical documents.

Eastlake's circle consisted of the archaeologist Sir Austen Henry Layard (1817–1894) whose collection of Italian paintings was bequeathed to the National Gallery, London in 1916, and Giovanni Morelli (1819–1891), the Italian collector, connoisseur, and writer of the seminal book on



FIG. 2. *Saint Michael*, Piero della Francesca, 1470, oil on poplar panel (identified), 52³/₈ × 23³/₈ in. (133 × 59.4 cm). National Gallery, London. With the 19th-century restorations.



FIG. 3. *Saint Michael* (fig. 2), with the 19th-century restorations removed.

attribution *Italian Painters: Critical Studies of Their Works*. Morelli and Otto Müндler, the traveling agent for the National Gallery, London, advised Layard and Eastlake on the availability of paintings. From the mid-1850s on, this group met regularly in Molteni's Milan studio where paintings were examined, cleaned, attributed or reattributed, and often restored while waiting for export licenses.⁶ Molteni's restorations, then, were related to the demands of the art market and collecting. They often involved significant intervention and overpainting, a reflection of Eastlake and Layard's discomfort with precise aspects of early, and non-canonical, Italian painting.

The art market played a significant role in restoration done for collectors, and in the nineteenth century we see a continuation of practices that began with the formation of collections in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The poor condition of a painting could be concealed, as it was in Pisanello's *Virgin and Child with Saint George and Saint Anthony Abbot*, purchased by Eastlake in 1858. Eastlake described the painting in his notebook as having a "blue sky almost rubbed to the ground. The armour and dress of St. George once beautifully finished but now almost obliterated."⁷ The present, pristine appearance of the painting is the result of Molteni's interventions. Early Italian paintings were also reformatted to hide the irregular contours that showed they were often fragments of multi-panel religious furnishings. The Crivelli *Pietà* in the Metropolitan Museum of Art is an early example of a fifteenth-century painting in a seventeenth-century, standard Barberini frame. Reformatting probably occurred more frequently in the nineteenth century than before, as a result of the growing demand from new museums and galleries.⁸ For example, Piero della Francesca's *Saint Michael*, now at the National Gallery, London, was part of an altarpiece where the central panel (now lost) is thought to have been a Coronation of the Virgin.⁹ The step and drapery on Saint Michael's right side had to be overpainted by Molteni to disguise a fragmentary appearance (figs. 2 and 3).

A second nineteenth-century phenomenon, at least in Eastlake's circle, was the professional removal of discolored varnish and old restorations to determine attribution. This was connected to the emerging field of connoisseurship. An *Adoration of the Kings* had been attributed to Mantegna, but after Molteni's cleaning, Layard attributed it to Bramantino with Morelli and Eastlake concurring.¹⁰ Or, again, Müндler in 1862 wrote to Molteni concerning a *Virgin and Child with Infant Saint John and Other Saints* that he believed to be by Mantegna despite the objections of both Morelli and Cavalcaselle. Müндler told Molteni, "you alone in the world can give life to [a painting] extinguished by a very wicked restoration which is hiding the author."¹¹

A dramatic example of a restorer revealing paintings that had had their "life extinguished" was Antonio Marini's work on Giotto's wall paintings in the Peruzzi Chapel in Florence. The

paintings had been whitewashed at the end of the eighteenth century, and in 1826 the Peruzzi family was planning a new decorative cycle. However, with the growing popularity of the "primitives," the family decided in 1840 to see if Giotto's old mural cycle could be recovered.¹² The wall paintings were mostly not true fresco, but painted *a secco* in a less stable glue medium. They began to suffer losses during the Renaissance and were probably first restored as early as the last quarter of the fifteenth century.¹³ Marini left the earlier restorations intact and reconstructed only one head of a bearded worthy from the *Ascension of the Evangelist* and the torso of Saint Elizabeth from *The Birth of the Baptist*. He also reinforced the modeling and outlines of the pale images, resulting in a hardening of expression. The face of the viol player in *The Feast of Herod*, for example, was etherealized in the nineteenth-century restoration with a bow mouth and upraised eyes defined by



FIG. 4. *Feast of Herod*, Giotto, 1320, fresco. Peruzzi Chapel, Santa Croce, Florence. Detail, with the 19th-century restorations.



FIG. 5. *Feast of Herod* (fig. 4), detail, with the 19th-century restorations removed.

the new outlines (figs. 4 and 5). Although the restorer could have argued that he was merely replacing lost original work, the overall result seems to emphasize outline in a manner particular to its time. The even, regular contours are reminiscent of William Ottley's linear illustrations for Séroux d'Agincourt's *Histoire de l'Art par les Monuments* (1823), Carlo Lasinio's *Pitture a Fresco del Campo Santo di Pisa* (1832), or John Flaxman's "primitivizing" illustrations of Dante that pay homage to early Italian painting.

A third phenomenon associated with paintings restored under the supervision of Eastlake, Layard, and other nineteenth-century collectors has to do with the "corrections" made over original, undamaged paint. Morelli described Molteni in 1865 as:

a truly outstanding restorer, endowed as he is with a fine artistic sensibility and a passion for ancient art. But because he is a pupil of our Academies he occasionally takes part, just as your excellent Director of the National Gallery [Eastlake] often does, in the battle of the Academies to correct the naïve inaccuracies of the Old Masters, which are almost always the result of their engaging easy-going manner. The naïve imprudence of genius will never be understood by the pedantry of our academicians.¹⁴

In the nineteenth century, generally, there was a willingness to add to a painting if it was felt to improve its appearance. In 1837 Giovanni Bedotti wrote in one of the nineteenth-century restoration books, *De la Restauration des Tableaux*, that to find a buyer the restorer might have to correct the "errors" of the painter, although he should be careful to leave the characteristics of the painter's style and period if possible.¹⁵ Since early Italian paintings were often considered "feeble" and problematic,¹⁶ it is understandable that they especially were seen to need correction.

Eastlake was willing to make corrections where the draughtsmanship in the figures seemed problematic. In 1862, he was considering a Giuliano Bugiardini *Madonna and Child with the Infant Saint John* for purchase (see fig. 1) and noted:

The head of the infant C[hrist] is so placed under a palm tree that the tree seems part of



FIG. 6. *Saint Jerome*, Cosimo Tura, ca. 1470, oil and tempera on wood panel (identified), 39 3/4 x 22 1/2 in. (101 x 57.2 cm). National Gallery, London. Detail during cleaning.

it—This might be rectified by making the gilding of the nimbus a little more conspicuous—the hair might also be brought down an inch & half on the forehead & the top of the head reduced—the nimbus would then also require to be brought lower. The same defect (too much forehead & skull) is observable in the little St. John & might be rectified—his body is also a little too thick.¹⁷

He did not purchase the painting, and these changes were never made. Two paintings Eastlake did purchase and that Molteni restored were Cosimo Tura's *Saint Jerome* and Cima da Conegliano's *David and Jonathan*. Tura was a problematic painter for Crowe and Cavalcaselle as well as for Morelli. Morelli described him as "morose," "grotesque," and a "hard, dry and angular painter, but often very impressive,"¹⁸ and Crowe and Cavalcaselle wrote on Tura's work that:

He had no idea of selection; leanness, dryness, paltriness, overweight of head and exaggerated size of feet and hands, were almost invariable accompaniments of his pictures. In most of them it would seem as if well-fed flesh had become withered by want of nutrition . . .¹⁹

Eastlake seemingly concurred as Saint Jerome's raised arm has been widened (fig. 6) and his



FIG. 7. *Madonna and Child; Saint John the Baptist; Saint Jerome*, Sano di Pietro, ca. 1450–55, tempera on wood panel, $17 \frac{3}{8} \times 12 \frac{5}{8}$ in. (44.1 × 32.1 cm). The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, NY. Portable triptych, with the 19th-century restorations.



FIG. 8. *Madonna and Child; Saint John the Baptist; Saint Jerome* (fig. 7), during treatment, with the 19th-century restorations removed.

exposed bony knee resting on the ground made less angular.²⁰ Similarly, in the Cima, Jonathan's thin leg has been made more massive and muscular.²¹ Not to suggest a continual correspondence in taste between Eastlake and Crowe and Cavalcaselle, it is interesting to note that the latter writers, while favorably disposed to Cima, remarked that he did not have Giovanni Bellini's "largeness or breadth of the shape in figures."²²

If Eastlake and other nineteenth-century collectors were disturbed by weak draughtsmanship, they also appeared to have been bothered by the notion that fifteenth-century works were, to quote William Ottley in 1826, "commonly deficient in the breadth of chiaroscuro . . ."²³ The Sano di Pietro triptych from the Costabili Collection owned by the Metropolitan Museum was probably restored by Molteni's pupil Luigi Cavenaghi (1844–1918) sometime before it was put up for sale in 1885.²⁴ The restorer had recreated lost modeling on the face of the Madonna and to the necks of both the Madonna and Christ Child making the figures more three-dimensional. He also reinforced outlines, shortened such anatomical oddities as John the Baptist's long toes, and for reasons that are difficult to understand, changed Saint John's hand holding the banderole (figs. 7 and 8). The figures in a Giovanni Bellini *Madonna and Child* were also given additional modeling around the same time, especially in the

Christ Child's robes and around both figures' eyes and along the edges of the noses.²⁵ The effect seems to be a sweetening of the expressions and a more regularized physiognomy.

Finally, an examination of Bramantino's *Adoration of the Magi* (an 1862 Layard purchase from the Manfrin Collection in Venice that he sent to Molteni for restoration) is also revealing. Among other changes, Molteni extended and regularized the shadow falling on the building behind the Virgin and repainted the left side of the broken doorway to disguise a difference of color on the lintel.²⁶ Both changes tended to make the play of light and shade across the building more rational.

A final type of treatment Molteni used for Eastlake and his circle was the application of a pigmented varnish. This tended to mute the colors by reproducing the look of an aged varnish, believed by many theoreticians to impart harmony to paintings. Köster, in *Über Restaurierung Alter Ölgemälde*, wrote that disharmonies could be compensated for by leaving dirt and old varnish on pictures and that thanks to this patina, "a picture could become even more harmonious than when made by its creator."²⁷ In 1837 Bedotti concurred, explaining that "to clean a picture well, one must know how to paint since a true artist in cleaning a picture is often forced to use the grime which covers it to give harmony and effect to the painting . . ."²⁸ In 1846 in a letter to *The*

Times concerning the National Gallery, London's cleaning of paintings, John Ruskin lamented the cleaning of Rubens's *War and Peace* since with the old varnish, the painting had:

mellowed by time into more perfect harmony than when it left the easel, enriched and warmed without losing any of its freshness or energy. The execution of the master is always so bold and frank as to be completely, perhaps, even most agreeably seen under circumstances of obscurity . . .²⁹

Conveniently, a pigmented varnish also helped hide abrasions and damages to a painting.³⁰

Harmony was an important nineteenth-century critical concept, and Crowe and Cavalcaselle often praised a work by noting its "soft harmony in colours" and dismissed works with "violent contrasts."³¹ It was also a quality Eastlake thought early Italian paintings often lacked, writing in 1853:

a large portion of those early pictures are full of affectation and grimace; and many persons who have, or fancy they have, a taste for those pictures are insensible to essential elements of painting, such as beauty of arrangement, harmony of coloring, and natural action and expression.³²

If there was not enough harmony, Eastlake seemed to have been quite willing to add patina. In 1861 he wrote to the restorer Raffaele Pinti concerning a Cima *Virgin and Child*:

The Cima da Conegliano would be improved, not by removing anything but by first lowering the tone of the Child's head more nearly to the neutral tone of the rest of his figure; and afterwards by slightly warming the whole picture. The obvious defect now is the difference in tone between the Child's head and body.³³

There is no indication that this was ever done. In Tura's *Muse* however, that Layard bought in 1866 from the Costabili Collection, it appears that Molteni used a pigmented varnish to tone down the pink robe's green lining, diminishing the contrast between the complementary colors (figs. 9 and 10).³⁴ The attraction to patina found an extreme manifestation in Gaetano Biachi's



FIG. 9. *Muse*, Cosimo Tura, ca. 1455–60, oil with egg tempera on poplar panel (identified), 45³/₄ × 28 in. (116.2 × 71.1 cm). National Gallery, London. Before varnish removal.



FIG. 10. *Muse* (fig. 9), after varnish removal.

attempt, while restoring the Bardi Chapel, to create the look of an aged varnish on Giotto's frescoes.³⁵

In contrast to Eastlake's restoration practices was Cavalcaselle's more archaeological approach. Cavalcaselle opposed the integration of losses in the artist's style or any sort of reconstruction or additions; in 1877 he wrote regulations for restoration work undertaken by the State:

It does not matter if you recognize a restoration, in fact, you should be able to recognize it, since what is necessary is respect for the original work at least for works belonging to the State. A lie, even a beautiful lie, must be avoided. Scholars should be able to recognize in a restored picture what is original and what is new ...³⁶

Cavalcaselle was not the first person to articulate this view, and his position was the less popular side of an ongoing debate. The head of the Accademia in Venice, Pietro Selvatico, with whom Cavalcaselle had studied in Padua between 1840 and 1844,³⁷ recommended in 1842 restricting the treatment of paintings to structural stabilization. The Florentine restorer Ulisse Forni in his 1866 book *Manuale del Pittore Restauratore* criticized this recommendation. Forni countered that Selvatico had advocated leaving paintings in ruins and therefore making them impossible to appreciate.³⁸

The restoration work supervised by Cavalcaselle at the Arena Chapel (1868–71) and Assisi (1872–73), not surprisingly, focused on stabilization not reconstruction. In 1871 Cavalcaselle wrote that at Assisi, “the work to be done comes down to securing the intonaco which is threatening to fall and stabilizing the paint which is separating from the intonaco.”³⁹ To prevent continuing water damage to the frescoes, Cavalcaselle also urged that the roof be repaired, the outside walls replastered, and the windows sealed. There was no provision for reconstruction of lacunae, and losses were toned back with a neutral watercolor.⁴⁰ There were precedents for this type of treatment, and as early as 1836 various government commissions were working to prevent further deterioration of the frescoes while prohibiting

any retouching or reconstruction.⁴¹ Not only in Assisi, but in other sites in Italy this was the case, and in 1831 the local arts commission in Lucca instructed the restorer Michele Ridolfo to leave the large lacunae in frescoes by Amico Aspertini if these areas could not be reconstructed accurately.⁴²

Both Cavalcaselle and Morelli were involved in the 1867–77 restoration campaign of Mantegna's Camera degli Sposi, and their points of view are interesting to compare. Cavalcaselle originally vetoed a campaign in Mantua since both the *intonaco* and paint layer were sound. Morelli, however, felt strongly that the paintings would be improved if the overpaint from a past restoration effort was removed and if the faded colors of the festoons and the illusionistic wall hangings were “refreshed.” Morelli and Cavenaghi were appointed by the Minister of Education to undertake the restorations. When the government fell shortly after the appointment, Morelli lost his position,



FIG. 11. *Jacob Deceiving Isaac*, Giotto, ca. 1290, Upper Church, St. Francis, Assisi. After the Cavalcaselle restoration campaign.

and Cavalcaselle agreed to take over.⁴³ This did not improve Morelli and Cavalcaselle's often inimical relationship, and Morelli wrote highly critical remarks concerning Cavalcaselle's restoration, accusing him of having destroyed the paintings.⁴⁴ Some of Morelli's animosity was probably related to sloppy workmanship and poor materials used by Cavalcaselle's restorers,⁴⁵ but his criticism also appears to have been based on a different conception of how restored paintings should look. In 1912 Cavenaghi wrote of Cavalcaselle's restoration at Mantua that the system of "using tints similar to the dominant color . . . forgot that restoration is an art and not a mechanical operation,"⁴⁶ probably expressing the by-then-deceased Morelli's opinion as well.

Although Cavalcaselle's restoration choices were archaeological, they also seem to have been related to a Romantic appreciation for pure, primitive simplicity and even a taste for the picturesque ruin. Cavalcaselle's vision of the Assisi restoration

project was, "to conserve what has remained of the old, restoring . . . to its primitive character even that part disfigured by additions and later changes."⁴⁷ In practice this involved a proposal to remove any Renaissance or Baroque additions to the church, a re-gothicization common in projects all over Europe at the time. When the appearance of frescoes from the Upper Church after Guglielmo Botti's restoration in 1872 is compared to a mid-twentieth-century and a 1978–79 campaign, Botti's restoration (supervised by Cavalcaselle) seems to underscore the damaged and worn look of the images (figs. 11, 12, and 13). While all three campaigns are similar in avoiding reconstruction, Botti's restoration eschewed any attempt to use his watercolor tone to integrate the image.

In conclusion, Cavalcaselle and Eastlake were scholars who cared passionately about early Renaissance painting and felt that they were presenting these works in the best possible light. Because



FIG. 12. *Jacob Deceiving Isaac* (fig. 11), after a mid 20th-century restoration campaign.



FIG. 13. *Jacob Deceiving Isaac* (fig. 11), after the restoration campaign of 1978–79.

of their different views concerning the nature of the paintings, however, they restored them in radically different ways. Furthermore, their concerns about levels of cleaning and loss compensation still have not been definitively resolved, since there are usually no easy answers, and decisions often can only be made on the basis of taste and aesthetic judgment. Generation upon generation has reinterpreted works of art both in writing and through restoration, and it is difficult to maintain that a particular approach will ever be definitive.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This paper began as a seminar report for a wonderful class taught by Keith Christiansen. I would like to thank Keith Christiansen for his advice and encouragement as well as Dianne Dwyer Modestini, Margaret Holben Ellis, Jennifer Sherman, and Sue Ann Chui for their support and thoughtful criticisms during the many drafts of this paper. Constance Lowenthal's editorial suggestions were also superb.

Wendy Partridge is Associate Paintings Conservator at the Intermuseum Conservation Association in Cleveland, Ohio. She earned a degree in Paintings Conservation and an M.A. in Art History from the Conservation Center, Institute of Fine Arts, New York University.

NOTES

1. Monica Bianchi, "Patina: appunti per una definizione" in Antonio Boschetto (ed.), *Itinerari: Contributi alla Storia dell'Arte in Memoria di Maria Luisa Ferrari*, Vol. 3. Florence: Studio per Edizioni Scelte, 1984, p. 106.
2. *Ibid.*, pp. 109–10.
3. Philip Hendy, *An Exhibition of Cleaned Pictures (1936–1947)*. London: National Gallery, Printed for the Trustees, 1947, p. xviii.
4. Jaynie Anderson, "The first cleaning controversy at the National Gallery 1846–1853" in Victoria Todd (ed.), *Appearance, Opinion, Change: Evaluating the Look of Paintings*. London: UKIC, 1990, p. 3.
5. Francis Haskell, *Rediscoveries in Art: Some Aspects of Taste, Fashion, and Collecting in England and France*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1976, p. 45.
6. Jaynie Anderson (ed.), "Dietro lo pseudonimo" in Giovanni Morelli, *Della Pittura Italiana: Studii Storico-Critici. Le Gallerie Borghese e Doria-Pamphili a Roma*. Milan: Adelphi, 1991, pp. 529–30.
7. Jaynie Anderson, "The rediscovery of Ferrarese Renaissance painting in the Risorgimento," *The Burlington Magazine*, Vol. 135, No. 1085 (August, 1993), p. 545.
8. Alessandro Conti, "Vicende e cultura del restauro" in Federico Zeri (ed.), *Storia dell'Arte Italiana 10. Part 3: Situazioni, Momenti, e Indagini*, Vol. 3: *Conservazione, Falso, Restauro*. Turin: G. Einaudi, 1981, pp. 68–9.
9. Allan Braham, "The 'improvement' of Pre-Raphaelites: case histories of some fifteenth-century Italian panels," *Apollo*, Vol. 101 (May 1975), p. 360.
10. Jaynie Anderson, "Layard and Morelli" in F.M. Fales and B.J. Hickey (eds.), *Austen Henry Layard tra l'Oriente e Venezia*. Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 1987, p. 114.
11. "Voi solo il unico al mondo potete renderli la vita estinta da scelleratissimo restauro intanto che mascherà l'autore . . ." *The Travel Diaries of Otto Mündler 1855–1858* (ed. C.T. Dowd, introduction by Jaynie Anderson), *The Walpole Society*, Vol. 51 (1985), p. 62.
12. Leonetto Tintori and Eve Borsook, *Giotto: The Peruzzi Chapel*. New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1961, pp. 32–4.
13. *Ibid.*, pp. 15 and 29.
14. Anderson 1993 (cited in note 7), p. 546.
15. Conti 1981 (cited in note 8), p. 77.
16. Séroux d'Agincourt remarked, "However useful some knowledge of the works of the earliest stages of the Renaissance may be for the History of Art, it would be dangerous to pursue our studies of them too far: above all, we must avoid the kind of enthusiasm felt by certain modern artists for these experiments, which are still too feeble from every point of view to serve as models." Haskell 1976 (cited in note 5), p. 46.
17. *The Travel Diaries of Otto Mündler* (see note 11), p. 23.
18. Giovanni Morelli, *Italian Painters: Critical Studies of their Works, the Munich and Dresden Galleries*. London: John Murray, 1907, p. 128.
19. J.A. Crowe and G.B. Cavalcaselle, *A History of Painting in North Italy from the Fourteenth to the Sixteenth Century*, Vol. 2. London: John Murray, 1912, p. 228.
20. Jill Dunkerton, "Cosimo Tura as painter and draughtsman: the cleaning and examination of his *Saint Jerome*," *National Gallery Technical Bulletin*, Vol. 15 (1994), p. 43.
21. Braham 1993 (cited in note 9), pp. 366–7.
22. J.A. Crowe and G.B. Cavalcaselle, *A History of Painting in North Italy from the Fourteenth to the Sixteenth Century*, Vol. 1. London: John Murray, 1912, p. 241.
23. William Ottley, *A Series of Plates Engraved after the Paintings and Sculptures of the Most Eminent Masters of the Early Florentine School*. London, 1826, Introduction.
24. Anderson 1993 (cited in note 7), p. 546.
25. Conti 1981 (cited in note 8), plates 84–5.
26. Jill Dunkerton, "The technique and restoration of Bramantino's *Adoration of the Kings*," *National Gallery Technical Bulletin*, Vol. 14 (1993), p. 44.
27. Conti 1981 (cited in note 8), p. 77.
28. "Pour bien nettoyer un tableau, il faut savoir peindre, car le véritable artiste, tout en nettoyant un tableau, est souvent forcé de se servir de la crasse qui le couvre pour donner de l'harmonie et de l'effet à la peinture . . ." Bianchi 1984 (cited in note 1), p. 111.
29. Anderson 1990 (cited in note 4), p. 4.
30. Alessandro Conti, "Giovanni Morelli ed il restauro amatoriale" in Giacomo Agosti, Maria Elisabetta Manca, and Matteo Panzeri (eds.), *Giovanni Morelli e la Cultura dei Conoscitori: Atti del Convegno Internazionale, Bergamo, 4-7 Giugno, 1987*. Bergamo: P. Lubrina, 1993, p. 167.

31. Crowe and Cavalcaselle 1912 (cited in note 22), pp. 24 and 244 or Crowe and Cavalcaselle 1912 (cited in note 19), p. 229, for example.
32. Haskell 1976 (cited in note 5), p. 54. Eastlake was not alone in this opinion. The Accademia di Belli Arti in Pisa wrote in 1859 concerning the use of a wax consolidant on frescoes by Benozzo Gozzoli at the Campo Santo; they acknowledged that the wax had altered the colors throwing the “general harmony” out of balance, but felt this was acceptable since, “*ora chi non sa che il pregio principale della pittura di quel secolo consiste più nella purezza del disegno, nella verità dell’espressione, che nel maestero del chiaro-scuro o nel artificio del colorito . . .*” Conti 1981 (cited in note 8), pp. 79–80.
33. Jaynie Anderson, “A ‘most improper picture’: transformations of Bronzino’s erotic allegory,” *Apollo*, Vol. 139, No. 384 (February 1991), p. 22.
34. Tura’s *Muse* was examined at the National Gallery, London before a conservation campaign in the 1980s. It was discovered that the varnish had been deliberately tinted with blackish and red-brown pigment particles, possibly by Molteni. Layard had sent the *Muse* to Molteni in 1866. Although no treatment records are extant, Molteni’s correspondence and other letters referring to his work mention artificial patination of paintings using a varnish pigmented with Cassel earth. Jill Dunkerton, Ashok Roy, and Alistair Smith, “The unmasking of Tura’s *Allegorical Figure*: a painting and its concealed image,” *National Gallery Technical Bulletin*, Vol. 11 (1987), pp. 9–13.
35. Conti 1981 (cited in note 8), p. 78.
36. “*Poco importa che si conosca il restauro, che anzi lo si dovrebbe conoscere, ma quello che è necessario si è che sia rispettato l’originale della pittura almeno nelle opere appartenenti allo Stato. La bugia, anco detto con bel garbo deve essere tolta di mezzo. Lo studioso potrà conoscere da un dipinto restaurato a questa maniera quello che è originale da quello che è nuovo . . .*” Donata Levi, *Cavalcaselle, Il Pionere della Conservazione dell’Arte Italiana*. Turin: G. Einaudi, 1988, pp. 350–51.
37. *Ibid.*, p. 7.
38. Ulisse Forni, *Manuale del Pittore Restauratore*. Florence, 1866, pp. 12–13.
39. “*Il lavoro da farsi si riduce a fermar gli intonachi che minacciano a cadere, ed assicurare il colore che si isola dall’intonaco stesso.*” Levi 1988 (cited in note 36), p. 337.
40. *Ibid.*, pp. 337–9, 347.
41. Irene Hueck, “La Basilica Franciscana di Assisi nell’ottocento: alcuni documenti su restauri progettati ed interventi eseguiti,” *Bolletino d’Arte* Ser. VI, 66 (1981), p. 144.
42. Conti 1981 (cited in note 8), p. 80.
43. Michele Cordaro, “Vicende conservative dei dipinti murali” in Michele Cordaro (ed.), *Mantegna: La Camera degli Sposi*. Milan: Electa, 1992, pp. 334–6.
44. Giovanni Morelli, *Italian Painters: Critical Studies of their Works. The Borghese and Doria Pamfili Galleries in Rome*. London: 1900, p. 82.
45. Codaro 1992 (cited in note 43), p. 237.
46. “*passare tinte approssimative al colore dominante . . . dimenticava che il restaurare è un’arte e non un’operazione meccanica.*” Conti 1981 (cited in note 8), p. 169.
47. “*Conservare quanto è rimasto d’antico restituendo . . . al suo carattere primitivo anche quella parte deturpata dalle aggiunte o mutamenti posteriori.*” Levi 1988 (cited in note 36), pp. 340–41.

PHOTOGRAPHY CREDITS

- Fig. 1, p. 18. Allentown Art Museum, Allentown, PA, Samuel H. Kress Collection, 1960 (1960.10 KB).
- Figs. 2 and 3, pp. 20–21. ©National Gallery, London.
- Fig. 6, p. 23. ©National Gallery, London.
- Fig. 7, p. 24. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, NY, Gift of Irma N. Straus, 1964 (64.189.4). Photograph ©The Metropolitan Museum of Art, all rights reserved.
- Fig. 8, p. 24. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, NY, Gift of Irma N. Straus, 1964 (64.189.4). Photograph ©The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Department of Paintings Conservation, all rights reserved.
- Figs. 9 and 10, p. 25. ©National Gallery, London.

