

Bernini copycat

We have yet to contend with Bernini's multiples: either multiple originals or, God forbid, copies. Bernini made many of them, especially of his portraits.¹ He famously made two versions of the bust of Scipione Borghese (fig. 1 and pl. 15) when the first marble was damaged.² There are also two versions of the bust of Innocent X (fig. 2 and pl. 14),³ the second perhaps occasioned by a break in the face, but not necessarily so. He made four versions of his bust of Gregory XV (see Zitzlsperger, fig. 1) at the behest of the pope: a marble and three bronze casts. Several years later he made a second marble.⁴ There are also multiple versions, very close to each other, of variously designed busts of Urban VIII.⁵ Bernini made two slightly different casts of the bronze *Crucifix*, the first for the king of Spain (fig. 3) and a few years later another for 'himself' (fig. 4); a third is lost.⁶ When the

1. Gian Lorenzo Bernini, *Scipione Borghese* (first version), 1632, marble, h: 100 cm, w: 82 cm. Galleria Borghese, Rome (photo: Istituto Centrale per il Catalogo e la Documentazione, Rome)



portrait of Clement X was commissioned from Bernini in 1676 or 1677 he was working on at least two and possibly three at once,⁷ while when he made the bust of Louis XIV (see Malgouyres, fig. 1) he worked simultaneously, up to what point we do not know, on three blocks, concerned as he was about the quality of the marble.⁸ To say in every case (and there are more examples than just these)⁹ which is *the* original may be more difficult than Bernini's practice allows, and at times the idea that one is 'first' may not be very meaningful. To achieve excellence in a second, third or fourth performance may offset (if not justify) the rehearsing of an idea already put into form once, as is at times recognized.¹⁰ The point of departure here is simply that there is abundant evidence that Bernini did make many autograph multiples, and this is especially the case for his portraits – marble and bronze alike – for which there was great demand.

That the notion of the 'original' – that singular, unrepeatable autograph work, the first direct expression of artistic imagination and spontaneous creation – emerged in the early modern period is not disputed here. Bernini himself made an important



2. Gian Lorenzo Bernini, *Innocent X* (first version), c. 1650, marble, h: 93 cm (with base). Galleria Doria Pamphilj, Rome. (photo: Gabinetto Fotografico Nazionale 36259)

contribution to the heightened value attached to the original work of art. By his day there was already a practice of connoisseurship and a clear distinction between originals and copies, using these precise words.¹¹ There has been, however, an overly stringent tendency to search for an Ur-object, and to demote later, derivative works to the point that they are virtually invisible. Because of the basic art historical tenet – one that had already taken root in Bernini's day – that copies do not demand the attention of the master, scholars have tried to discern what they presume is studio participation, and its degree, in many of these works. For some busts this is documented, for others not. For example, as a result of the greater value placed on a so-called original or first version, most discussion of Bernini's two busts of Scipione Borghese revolves around the first, cracked, version; conversely, or perversely, the cracked version of the Innocent X bust, which has simply been less visible to scholars, has been virtually eclipsed, though we might presume it preceded and necessitated the intact version and, by the logic of originals, *should be* the one that interests us.¹² Bronzes, which can be produced in

series, suffer particularly under this value system. Whether or not the works vary from work to work, and they all do, the discomfort with these works as copies is notable.

In the seventeenth century not all copies were equal. At this time connoisseurs and art theorists distinguished between copies by lesser artists, and copies of such great accomplishment that the ability to reproduce a work by someone else was in itself a cause of marvel.¹³ The copies I am interested in here, however, are of a specific sort: autograph copies, or very close versions made by the same artist. These works are less discussed than copies made after another artist.¹⁴ Why has the copy by another artist absorbed the question of the copy? Because if artists whose works are worthy of being copied by other artists copied *themselves*, the discipline's belief in a kind of class-system of copying would be undermined. Great artists should not have to *copy* themselves, they should just be themselves. According to this logic, the imaginations of great artists are so rich that they don't repeat themselves. Picasso said: 'Success is dangerous. One begins to copy oneself, and to copy oneself is more dangerous than to copy others. It leads to sterility.'¹⁵ It is because of a pervasive commitment to value among modern scholars that the interrogation of the multiple versions of works, especially by Bernini, has not been thought about much.

And yet the best artists, among them those whom we might consider the most 'autograph' artists of the early modern era, produced many autograph copies.¹⁶ The great painterly performers Titian and Velazquez, for example, repeated

themselves, at times with minor variations, at other times almost exactly. Works such as the Madrid and Naples versions of Guido Reni's *Atalanta and Hippomenes*, and the much-debated question of their chronology, inevitably put the discipline into a hermeneutical crisis: at the moment of the emergence of the singular object, patrons asked for their own versions, and the producers of the singular work repeatedly repeated themselves. There were different motivations for copies; multiples of portraits served ongoing political and diplomatic needs, and copies were needed for cult purposes.¹⁷ Most troubling of all for the original-ists were requests for copies of great works of art because of their artistic excellence, as in the case of Philip II's request to Titian for a copy of his *Martyrdom of Saint Lawrence*.¹⁸ At times, as in the case of Pierre Legros's cult statue of Stanislas Kostka in the cult rooms of the saint at the Jesuit novitiate at San Andrea al Quirinale in Rome, the proposal for a copy came from the artist.¹⁹ Whether the second work was initiated by artist or patron, and regardless of the slight variations between the versions, we need to look more closely at how these artists, leaders in their fields, regarded this use of their talents. Did Bernini agree with Picasso or not?

Copy not

First I would like to look at Bernini's multiples in light of his own professedly negative attitude towards copying. Did he feel the need to justify these works? And if so, how did he do so? My focus here is on portraits because of the sheer number of multiples in that genre, and because it is around the practice of portrait-making that we find in the sources (the two Bernini biographies, and the artist's own remarks as recorded by Chantelou in 1665) a dense thicket of preoccupation concerning the copy – of double-talk.

To begin with, it is around the making of a portrait bust of Louis XIV (Malgouyres, fig. 1), the central focus of Chantelou's diary, that we find Bernini's famous determination *not to copy*. Chantelou writes that, on 29 July, Louis' minister, Colbert

went to the room where the bust [of Louis XIV] was and looked at it with great attention [. . .] Until now he [Bernini] had worked entirely from his imagination, looking only rarely at his drawings; he had searched chiefly within, he said, tapping his forehead, where there existed the idea of His Majesty: had he done otherwise his work would have been a copy instead of an original.²⁰

In this statement Bernini stresses that a portrait by him is a product of his imagination. He wants it to be clear that in devising this imaginative work, he is tied neither to an external reality, the king's features, nor to his own record of the king's features in his sketches of him. Hence the concept of 'copy' here really has two senses: Bernini does not want to copy himself, that is, his own drawings; and he does not want to copy something real. Rather, his preoccupation is to make an 'original' work of art (he uses that word) that is not tied to anything.

Two weeks later, on 12 August, Chantelou records a very similar statement by Bernini that demonstrates his ongoing concern that, in spite of the demand that a portrait resemble its subject, it should be an original work of his imagination:



3. Gian Lorenzo Bernini, *Christ Crucified*, c. 1655–56, bronze, h: 145 cm (top of head to lowest point of foot). Cappilla del Colegio, Monastero de San Lorenzo, El Escorial.
(photo: © Patrimonio Nacional)

He [Bernini] had got it [the bust] to that state in which he saw it from memory, from the image he had formed of it and imprinted on his imagination [. . .] he had not even used his own drawings, lest he should make a copy of his own work instead of an original:²¹ he had made these many studies only 'to soak and impregnate his mind with the image of the King'; those were his own words.²²

Months later, Bernini used virtually the same language of impressing an image on his mind rather than consulting an image of the king with reference to making *an actual copy* in bronze of his now-completed bust of Louis XIV. In a letter to Chantelou dated 14 December 1665, when he was back in Rome, Bernini wrote: 'many princes would like to have a bronze cast of the portrait of his Majesty, and it is so impressed on my mind that I think I can make it without seeing it.'²³ Taken together, these statements are fundamental to the warranted conclusion that Bernini, like any self-respecting early modern artist, was exclusively interested in 'original' works and rejected the practice of making copies.

It is significant that Bernini expressed his reluctance to make a copy or to copy himself in connection with the making of a portrait rather than a *historia*. The genre of portraiture provoked a continuous theoretical crisis in the seventeenth century that, because the portrait was tied to its subject, the practice of portraiture did not rest on the imaginative, intellectually driven basis of the most highly ranked genre of *historia*.²⁴ Bernini's antipathy towards copying comprises a very orthodox view of how to rescue portraiture from its referentiality: by stressing the use of his imagination and memory rather than direct transcription. In the passages cited here, Bernini not only rejects the referentiality of portraiture but he goes on to avoid any reiteration of his *own* impressions and ideas: by rejecting recourse to the referent in his drawings he refuses, he says, to copy himself. He thus implies that every stroke is a new beginning; no preparatory work is preparatory for anything except itself; every work is an original.

Bernini's explicit use of the words 'copy' and 'original' when referring to his *ad vivam* portrait of Louis XIV do not correspond to the precise terms of the portrait debate. Rather, art theorists spoke of what Bernini refers to as copying as *ritrarre* or 'retracing'.²⁵ His talk about working from the imagination is consistent with the good, creative version of portraiture in the discourse on portraiture.²⁶ Bernini's use of 'copy' and 'original' with regard to portraiture thus employs the language of connoisseurship with its ranking of originals and their lesser copies. By introducing words that have very clear values attached to them he seems to be



4. Gian Lorenzo Bernini, *Christ Crucified*, c. 1659, bronze, h: 145 cm (top of head to lowest point of foot). Art Gallery of Ontario, Toronto (Gift of Murray Frum Family, 2006). (photo: Art Gallery of Ontario, Toronto)

making things worse for portraiture, fanning the flames of a theoretical problem in order to come out on top.

It is suggested here that Bernini's use of the words 'copy' and 'original' are exaggerations that point to his anxiety about the practice of portraiture first, and copying second. They suggest, too, that the question of original and copy was elided with the problematic referentiality of portraiture. In the passages cited above the solution to this problematic practice of 'copying' is an insistence on the imaginative nature of the portrait sculptor's work.

Bernini for the copy: portraiture and the hermeneutics of love

Bernini, and later his biographers, transferred the language of original and copy to the relationship between portrait and the portrayed *without* the justification of the imaginative act. Surprisingly, in several cases, Bernini's portraits and one representation of the Saviour are referred to as

copies. Why, if copies were problematic, did this value-laden language reappear to the detriment of the work of art? The short answer is that the subjects of the portraits are of a very exalted sort and the terms used to describe their representations are more a reflection on *them* than on Bernini's works.

First the French king (Malgouyres, fig. 1): the entry for 19 September in Chantelou's diary notes that the queen 'arrived and remarked at once *how like the portrait was*. The Cavaliere Bernini first bowed very low to her, and then said that Her Majesty had *the King so imprinted in her heart and mind that she saw it everywhere, or so it seemed to her.*¹²⁷ The words 'copy' and 'original' are not used in this passage, although the word 'imprint' conveys something of a copied image. This phrase, however, will reappear in the Bernini biographies with the words 'copy' and 'original' added. For now, what is of interest is that Bernini attributes the queen's judgment of the bust of her husband to her imagination and memory, cerebral and emotional processes analogous to that which Bernini used to describe his own artistic process of making the bust. The imprint left on her heart and mind meant that the queen loved the king and understood him. So, rather than thanking her for saying that the bust resembles the king her husband, Bernini attributes the resemblance and the queen's perception of it to love and understanding, the bases for the right kind of representational practices.

Domenico Bernini would recount this same episode slightly differently in his biography of his father: he said that after the queen praised the portrait, Bernini replied that *Your Majesty praises the copy so much because you are enamoured with the original.*¹²⁸ The description of the king as an 'original' who is impressed upon the heart of the queen, his first subject, who loves him so much that she

praises his 'copy', alerts us to a theological source. The phrase should be linked to the claim of the fourth-century Church father Chrysostom who declares in his commentary on St Paul that he understands the writings of Paul – who all Christians should imitate – so well because he loves him so much.²⁹ This idea that love breeds the knowledge that is the best basis for a great portrayal makes love an alternative to the principle of rhetoric, whereby a speaker needs to identify with his subject in order to convey his argument effectively. Thus the queen can praise or appraise the copy because she loves the original.

A third version of the same phrase invoked by Filippo Baldinucci in his biography of Bernini, on this occasion in reference to Bernini's bronze figure of Christ, clinches the theological underpinning of the phrase. Baldinucci says that when Cardinal Sforza Pallavicino could not find words to praise the bronze *Crucifix* Bernini had given to him (fig. 4), Bernini purportedly said: 'I will say to your eminence what I said in France to Her Majesty the Queen when she praised me so highly for my portrait of the King, her husband. "Your majesty praises the copy so much because she is in love with the original."' ³⁰ Calling attention to his own repeated statement here ('I will say to you what I said to Her Majesty'), Bernini's purported comment, like its theological source, brings together the idea of the person as original and the image as copy with the image of Christ. In so doing Bernini, or his biographer, alludes to a deep and long Christian tradition of mimetic thinking: the idea that Christians should impress Christ and his saints on their hearts and minds and form and reform themselves; they should remake themselves in his image; they should copy him.

But again, since the words commonly used to describe Christ and his imitators were not 'original' and 'copy', we see here the language of connoisseurship seeping into this fundamental way of thinking about the self. A sermon from Bernini's time invokes the language of connoisseurship to describe this process of making oneself in the image of Christ or his saints, and it is quite similar to Bernini's comments. The Jesuit General Gian Paolo Oliva, who helped to persuade Bernini to go to Paris, used the word 'original' to describe St Paul as the model for Jesuits who have decided to change themselves.³¹

The transfer of this theological commonplace about bodily and spiritual conformity to a model into the realm of aesthetic judgment (and then back again) suggests that the use of the word 'original' to describe Louis XIV is an expression of deference. The phrase about impressing the image of the king onto the mind or the heart uses the image of the wax imprint that is central to Christian notions of mimesis. It is invoked here to express a licit form of portrait-making, as copying, motivated by love, and producing a unique form of knowledge. Some people, like Louis XIV, are so great that they *deserve* to be copied. The language of original and copy is invoked to make it clear that the original exceeds the copy – just as Christ is greater than all those who fashion themselves in his image. Not all copies are bad.

Copious copies: the phrase is copied again in Domenico Bernini's life of his father. This third appearance of the phrase – praise for the copy out of love of the original – is used to describe Bernini's portrait of his lover in the 1630s, Costanza Bonarelli. Bernini portrayed her twice: in a bust (pls. 16–17) and in a painting that

is now lost.³² Domenico writes that ‘a painting of Costanza [. . .] and the bust and head in Florence, [are] both of such good taste and lively in style that even in the *copies* you can see how in love the Cavaliere was with the Original’.³³ For the idea that the best representations of a person are those created by those who love them Domenico had two sources: Chrysostom, which he (as a historian of the Church) surely knew, and Lucian’s *Imagines*, parts of which concern portraiture. In the following passage Lucian is making an accurate verbal image of Pericles’ lover – not his wife – Aspasia:

Next we must delineate her wisdom and understanding. We shall require many models there, most of them ancient, and one, like herself, Ionic, painted and wrought by Aeschines, the friend of Socrates, and by Socrates himself, of all craftsmen the truest copyists because they painted with love. It is that maid of Miletus, Aspasia, the consort of the Olympian [Pericles], himself a marvel beyond compare. Putting before us, in her, no mean pattern of understanding, let us take all that she had of experience in affairs, shrewdness in statecraft, quick-wittedness, and penetration, and transfer the whole of it to our own picture by accurate measurement.³⁴

There are two points to make about this passage, an antecedent for the Christian hermeneutics of love. First, since Lucian calls Aeschines and Socrates the truest portrayers because they depicted with love, love is thereby connected with accuracy of portrayal. Second (and related to this first idea) is the ardent desire that the portrait of the beloved be accurate and true. In early modern portrait discourse the *image* of the beloved is typically a mere shadow of the real flesh and blood beloved.³⁵ But in the particular genre of the portrait of the beloved, which can never be true enough to nature, it is only through love that the truest resemblance can be achieved. It is suggested here that in referring to Bernini’s portrait of Costanza as a ‘copy’, Domenico is trying to convey something about his father’s relationship to his lover, rather than about the verisimilitude of the bust per se. Just as the word ‘original’ was invoked to describe Louis XIV in order to express the excess of the original, the same might be said of the woman Bernini was madly in love with. Domenico’s use of the word ‘copy’ for Bernini’s bust and lost painted portrait of Costanza allows the biographer to express Bernini’s submissive love for Costanza and the types of representation that can arise from it.

Taken together, these variants on the concept of praising the copy because you are in love with the original, as applied to these three works (the busts of Costanza and Louis XIV, and the crucified Christ), show us a Bernini apparently in favour of the copy. The works of which Bernini will produce a so-called copy are thus specific and of the highest rank. There is, in other words, a scale of models before which Bernini kneels and copies: the beloved, who one can never portray accurately enough; Louis XIV, the bearer of absolute power; and Christ, who all men should imitate. In these various applications of the word ‘copy’ and ‘original’ the practice of making likenesses *out of love* is excused if not endorsed. Bernini was anxious about the referentiality of portraiture. But to some models even Bernini submitted out of love and deference.

Montoya: where image exceeds referent

The language of copy and original appears once more in Domenico's biography of his father, in the story of Bernini's bust of Pedro de Foix Montoya (frontispiece). The bust represents a Spanish prelate in Rome, a much less exalted subject than those previously under discussion. This famous anecdote, told with minor variation in the two Bernini biographies and in the diary of Chantelou, revolves around a witty discussion about the bust by high-ranking cardinals, during which both the bust and Montoya are present. Bernini, said Domenico, had conducted the work 'with such spirit and resemblance that whoever wanted to take delight in comparing attentively the original ('l'Originale') and the copy ('la Copia') was heard saying that either both were fake or both real [. . .] that that statue had no need of a soul to appear alive'. Maffeo Barberini, the future pope, purportedly said on that occasion, when Montoya entered the room: 'This is the portrait of Monsignor Montoya.' And then, turning to the bust, he said: 'And this is Monsignor Montoya.'³⁶ This episode invokes a particular theme of early modern portrait discourse: the delight in the confusion between referent and art object that works of great verisimilitude inspire. It is possible that the way the story is shaped by Domenico is not meant to reiterate the portrait dilemma but to resolve it. Domenico refers to Montoya as 'original' and the bust as 'copy' without anxiety that he will invoke portraiture's lesser status. This is because Domenico says that if anyone compares the two they will find that either both were *finti* (fictions) or both were real. The subordination of the art object to its referent that plagued portraiture is now open to question. So when Maffeo Barberini pronounces that the image *is* the person and the person is an image, we can take it on his authority that the portrait has equalled or even exceeded its referent. Problem solved. When Bernini recounted this anecdote to Chantelou he said that Montoya had left the bust in Bernini's studio for a long time, and that this had the effect of making a man who had 'been remarkable in nothing' into a topic of discussion.³⁷ Taken together, the two accounts suggest that the portrait is no longer empty of soul, a mere exterior, lacking in breath. The portrait exceeds life. In other words, owing to Bernini's bust, less was now more, and this holds for both the bust and the man. Perhaps this was possible with Montoya but not the king. In other words, this language of value – copy, original – is invoked around the bust of a lesser figure in order to be turned on its head.

Do it again: the busts of Scipione Borghese

When Bernini comes to actually make a copy of a bust, his two biographers can justify it, albeit in their own ways. In carving the bust of Cardinal Scipione Borghese a crack had appeared, or been made in the course of the work's execution (fig. 1). The pope was waiting to see it; the cardinal could not be disappointed. A bust with a crack running all the way around the head was not acceptable, so Bernini produced a second bust (pl. 15).³⁸ The biographers stress the speed with which Bernini pulled this off. Baldinucci says: 'Without telling a soul he worked for fifteen nights (which is all the time he had for that tedious task) on

another bust exactly like the first and not one jot less beautiful.’ By calling the task ‘tedious’ and saying that the second bust was ‘exactly like the first’ Baldinucci unguardedly identifies the second bust as a copy, though he avoids the word.³⁹ Domenico, who says the work was ‘produced in three days’ without stop, stresses, by contrast, the differences between the busts, which a cardinal is able to discern without the first bust present. Domenico also avoids using the words ‘original’ and ‘copy’ – he refers to the ‘first’ as such, and not to a second but rather to an ongoing activity of making the portrait.⁴⁰ But with the two busts compared to each other and the second appearing more lively in Domenico’s account, Bernini’s own bust rather than the sitter becomes the referent for his work. Because Bernini’s second work surpasses the first, it is a repeat performance.

In many ways Bernini’s production of portraits, and a few of their copies, is analogous to the process-oriented rather than goal-oriented nature of theatrical performance as defined recently by Tzachi Zamir: ‘Theatrical repetition (whether rehearsed or performed for an audience) is process-oriented: it is the capacity and the action of living afresh the enacted sequence of events.’⁴¹ Although actors perform the same play night after night, ‘at its best, acting projects and mostly is a singular, first-time encounter’. Zamir, however, also distinguishes such process-oriented acting from ‘mechanical’ forms of repetition (such as cooking) whose goal might be the production of an object. So it is striking that, for instance, Domenico Bernini’s description of the execution of the second version of the bust of Scipione Borghese renders the second time around as a ‘singular, first-time encounter’ with all of the qualities of engagement that convince us that Bernini’s was not a mechanical activity. Of course we know that Bernini’s engagement with the *commedia dell’arte* brought him into an arena of spontaneous performance.⁴² Perhaps this helps to explain a desire to characterize Bernini’s repetition as different in kind from the mechanical forms of copying that were so problematic.

Taken together, these works and the anecdotes that surround them provide solutions – or alibis – for the always already repetitive practice of portraiture and the copies of those portraits that were inevitable in the world that Bernini inhabited. That the discussion should have developed around the portrait has to do with the problematic referentiality of the portrait to begin with and the demand for copies of authoritative images. Faced with commissions for multiples of a work that he considered singular, Bernini submitted and deferred to the authorities who commanded these copies. But it is likely that Bernini would have claimed that he did not make copies. He made a virtue not out of copying himself, but out of repeating the act of creation, of doing it again. Bernini and his biographers later did their best to frame such work as repeat performances rather than, as Baldinucci put, it the ‘tedious’ work of a copyist. Tzachi Zamir would have wanted to reassure Bernini that repetition is productive, that it opens up a ‘qualitative spectrum’ that ‘concerns how one inhabits the same possibility’.⁴³ If we take all of this seriously, we might reappraise some dearly held connoisseurial truths that ground many judgments: the first work of a series should not be presumed to be, but could be, the best one, or it could be a dress rehearsal for an improved performance. This would open us up to a fresh look, a second take, on the many multiple versions and copies in Bernini’s *oeuvre*.

1 All the busts, lost or extant, that have been attributed to Bernini or his workshop have now been gathered in a comprehensive checklist with bibliography in A. Bacchi, C. Hess and J. Montagu (eds), *Bernini and the Birth of Baroque Portrait Sculpture* (exh. cat.), J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles, and National Gallery of Canada, Ottawa, 2008, pp. 284–96.

2 *Ibid.*, A25a–b, p. 290.

3 *Ibid.*, A30a–b, pp. 291–92.

4 The surviving marble of Gregory XV in the Art Gallery of Ontario, Toronto, which many scholars consider inferior (that is, to a lost original), has been considered a copy and dated to 1627. Three bronze versions are in the Galleria Doria Pamphilj, Rome, the Museo Civico di Bologna and the Carnegie Museum of Art, Pittsburgh. Because the marble bust considered as ‘original’ was documented in the Ludovisi collection only in 1675, the notion that the Toronto bust is later and a copy is based entirely on what I hope to prove is an *a priori* presumption of the superior quality of a first version; for the series see Bacchi et al., as at note 1, A7a–e, p. 285.

5 *Ibid.*, A17a–e, A18a–e, pp. 287–88.

6 On the Escorial version and documents for the other two, see R. Wittkower, *Bernini. Sculptor of the Roman Baroque*, London, Phaidon, 4th edn, 1997, cat. 57. For the rediscovered lost second version, presumably that given by Bernini to Cardinal Sforza Pallavicini (Art Gallery of Ontario), see T. Montanari, ‘Percorsi per cinquant’anni di studi berniniani’, *Studiolo*, 3, 2005, p. 281, where Montanari opens the door for the repeat performance by referring to a second autograph version.

7 Bacchi et al., as at note 1, A36, L21–23, pp. 292, 296. For Cartari’s diary entry of 5 May 1676: ‘I was with Monsignor Montecatini in the room where Signor Cavalier Bernini makes his sculptures; in that room he was working on a bust of Pope Clement X and said that Signor Cardinal Altieri wanted it to keep in his Chamber. Another marble was being roughed out to make another one like it, to be placed in the Refectory of SS. Trinità dei Pellegrini; and he said that he would make one for the library’; Hess and Bacchi, as at note 1, cat. 6.12. The block of marble ordered in 1677 for the portrait for Trinità dei Pellegrini is noted in the payment as for ‘making a copy of the portrait of Pope Clement X’. For the documents that suggest this copy was executed by a pupil, see E. Aleandri Barletta, ‘Note sul Clemente X di Gian Lorenzo Bernini’, *Commentari*, 16, 1965, pp. 282–86.

8 R. Wittkower, *Bernini’s Bust of Louis XIV*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1951, p. 6.

9 There were marble (now lost) and bronze versions of a bust of Paul V, Bacchi et al., as at note 1, A5a–b, p. 284,

and cat. I.3, pp. 92–95, and multiple versions of the bust of Cardinal Richelieu, *ibid.*, A29a–d, p. 291, and cat. 6.4, pp. 250–53.

10 For example, in presenting Bernini’s *Urban VIII* (National Gallery of Canada, Ottawa), Wittkower wrote that its ‘superb quality is immediately evident, even in the problematic medium of reproductions’; R. Wittkower, ‘A new bust of Pope Urban VIII by Bernini’, *Burlington*, 111, 1969, p. 60.

11 See R. Spear, ‘What is an original?’, in J. C. Luo (ed.), *Perspectives on Connoisseurship of Chinese Painting*, Washington, DC, 2008, pp. 89–135; E. Cropper, *The Domenichino Affair. Novelty, Imitation, and Theft in Seventeenth-Century Rome*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 2005; M. Loh, *Titian Remade. Repetition and the Transformation of Early Modern Italian Art*, Los Angeles, Getty Research Institute, 2007.

12 Bacchi et al., as at note 1, A30a, p. 291.

13 J. Muller, ‘Measures of authenticity: the detection of copies in the early literature on connoisseurship’, in K. Preciado (ed.), *Retaining the Original: Multiple Originals, Copies, and Reproductions*, Washington, DC, 1989, pp. 141–49 and Spear, as at note 11.

14 See Spear, as at note 11, p. 107.

15 D. Ashton (ed.), *Picasso on art: a selection of views*, New York, Viking Press, 1972, p. 86.

16 See Spear, as at note 11, pp. 96–111 for numerous examples.

17 For an excellent example in history painting, see A. Colantuono, *Guido Reni’s ‘Abduction of Helen’: the politics and rhetoric of painting in seventeenth-century Europe*, New York, Cambridge University Press, 1997. The widely diffused court practice of making copies has not been the subject of a specialized study, but is absorbed into the catalogues of the *oeuvres* of the court painters. José Luis Colomer notes that to grant permission to make a copy of a royal portrait constituted a diplomatic gesture. In such a case the value of the prime object lies in the ownership of the likeness, more akin to copyright; J. Luis Colomer, ‘1650: Velázquez alla corte pontificia; galleria di ritratti della Roma ispanofila’, in F. Checa Cremades (ed.), *Velázquez, Bernini, Luca Giordano: le corti del Barocco*, Milan, 2004, pp. 37–55.

18 Titian produced a version of his Venetian altarpiece with some variation. See especially M. Falomir, ‘Tiziano: replicas’, in M. Falomir (ed.), *Tiziano* (exh. cat.), Museo del Prado, Madrid, 2003, pp. 77–91.

19 E. Levy, ‘Reproduction in the “Cultic Era of Art”’, Pierre Legros’s *Stanislas Kostka*, *Representations*, 58, 1997, pp. 88–114.

20 ‘il [Colbert] est allé dans la salle où est le buste qu’il a considéré

longtemps [...] que jusqu’ici il [Bernini] avait presque toujours travaillé d’imagination, et qu’il n’avait regardé que rarement les dessins qu’il a; qu’il ne regardait principalement que là dedans, montrant son front, où il a dit qu’était l’idée de Sa Majesté; que autrement il n’aurait fait qu’une copie au lieu d’un original’; P. Fréart de Chantelou, *Diary of the Cavaliere Bernini’s Visit to France*, trans. M. Corbett, ed. A. Blunt, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1985, p. 89 (29 July 1665); P. Fréart de Chantelou, *Journal de Voyage du Cavalier Bernin en France*, ed. Milan Stanić, Paris, Macula/L’Insulaire, 2001, pp. 95–96.

21 Bodart argues that Boselli drew upon Bernini’s resistance to making busts after paintings in trying to justify that a sculpture after a painting remains an original work. See the passages cited in D. H. Bodart, ‘L’excellence du portrait par Gian Lorenzo Bernini, ou la ressemblance à l’épreuve de l’idée’, *Studiolo*, 4, 2006, p. 56, n. 22.

22 ‘il [Bernini] l’avait [le buste] mis en l’état qu’ils le voyaient de mémoire, et sur l’image qu’il en avait formée et imprimée dans son imagination [...] qu’il ne s’était pas même servi depuis de ses dessins, afin de ne pas faire une copie de son propre ouvrage au lieu d’un original; qu’il ne les avait faits à diverses fois que *per inzupparsi ed imbeversi dell’immagine del Re*, ce sont ses propres mots’; Chantelou, *Diary*, as at note 20, p. 115 (12 August 1665); Chantelou, *Journal*, as at note 20, pp. 115–16.

23 ‘Molti principi vorrebbero un getto di bronzo del ritratto di sua Ma.ta, et io l’ho tanto impresso nella mente che penso poterlo fare senza vederlo’; Chantelou, *Journal*, as at note 20, p. 287.

24 On the early modern theory of portraiture, see especially L. Freedman, ‘The concept of portraiture in art theory of the cinquecento’, *Zeitschrift für Aesthetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft*, 32, 1987, pp. 63–82 and, with specific reference to Bernini, see Bodart, as at note 21.

25 See R. Preimesberger, ‘Bernini portraits, stolen and nonstolen, in Chantelou’s “Journal” and the Bernini “Vite”’, in M. Delbeke, E. Levy and S. F. Ostrow (eds), *Bernini’s Biographies: Critical Essays*, University Park, PA, Pennsylvania State University Press, 2006, p. 206.

26 For an excellent contextualization of Bernini’s view of portraiture in light of the portrait discourse, see Bodart, as at note 21.

27 ‘la Reine est venue, qui d’abord a dit que le buste ressemblait beaucoup. Le Cavalier, après l’avoir saluée profondément, a dit que Sa Majesté avait l’image du Roi si imprimée dans le cœur et dans l’esprit, qu’il lui semblait la voir partout, ou que tout lui

semblait tel’; Chantelou, *Diary*, as at note 20, pp. 208–09 (19 September 1665); Chantelou, *Journal*, as at note 20, pp. 188–89.

28 D. Bernini, *Vita del Cavalier Gio. Lorenzo Bernino, descritta da Domenico Bernino suo figlio*, Rome, Rocco Bernabò, 1713, p. 136: ‘Quando egli dopo di haver da lei molto udito, finalmente a lei così disse, V.M. loda tanto la Copia, perche è innamorata dell’Originale.’

29 M. Mitchell, *The Heavenly Trumpet: John Chrysostom and the Art of Pauline Interpretation*, Louisville, KY, Westminster John Knox Press, 2002, pp. 38–40. It is not surprising to find Chrysostom’s commentary echoed by Domenico Bernini, a church historian in whose *vita* of his father other instances in which theological ideas fed his biographical agenda can be found; E. Levy, ‘Chapter 2 of Domenico Bernini’s *Vita* of his father: mimeses’, in Delbeke et al., as at note 25, pp. 159–80.

30 Page references are given to the original edition and to the most accessible modern editions in Italian and English. F. Balduino, *Vita del cavaliere Giovanni Lorenzo Bernini scultore, architetto e pittore, scritta da Filippo Balduino*, Florence, Stamperia di Vincenzo Vangelisti, 1682, p. 74; F. Balduino, *Vita di Gian Lorenzo Bernini*, ed. S. S. Ludovici, Milan, Edizioni del Milione, 1948, p. 148; F. Balduino, *The Life of Bernini*, trans. C. Enggass, intro. M. Delbeke, E. Levy and S. F. Ostrow, University Park, PA, Pennsylvania State University Press, 2006, pp. 81–82. Subsequent citations will refer to the three texts as Balduino 1682, Balduino 1948, and Balduino 2006.

31 The sermon likens Ignatius to Saul in his spiritual ‘transformation’ and then sets out the former as the example for Jesuits: ‘Tal’essi [Ignatius’s biographers] ce lo figurano, che appena puà la fede umana sottometerli a crederlo, si austero ne’ digiuni, si perseverante nelle vigilie, si divoto nelle preghiere, si rigido nelle penitenze, si inconsolabile ne’ sospiri, si dispregiato nell’abito, si contento ne gli affronti, si festoso ne’ disagi, si celestiale ne’ disegni, si apostolico ne’ costumi, qual l’adoriamo idea di consumata santità ne’ primi mesi della conversione. Questo è l’Originale proposto dallo Spirito santo a’ Figliuoli d’Ignatio, se bramano di cambiarsi in altri huomini, di quei che vennero in questa Casa’; G. Paolo Oliva, *Sermoni domestici detti privatamente nelle case romane della Compagnia di Giesù*, Venice, Paolo Baglioni, 1712, p. 532.

32 See S. McPhee, ‘Costanza Bonarelli: biography versus archive’, in Delbeke et al., as at note 25, pp. 315–76.

33 'Quello tanto decantato di una Costanza si vede collocato in Casa Bernini, & il Busto, e Testa in Marmo della medesima nella Galleria del Gran Duca, l'uno, e l'altro di così buon gusto, e di così viva maniera, che nelle Copie istesse diede a dividere il Cavaliere, quanto fosse innamorato dell'Originale'; Bernini, as at note 28, p. 27.

34 Lucian, *Essays in Portraiture (Imagines)*, trans. A. M. Harmon, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 1925, p. 287. An alternative translation reads as follows: 'Next, her wisdom and understanding must be represented. We shall need many examples there, mostly ancient ones, and one Ionic like herself. Aeschines the friend of Socrates and Socrates himself represented her, both of them exceedingly true craftsmen because they worked with eros. That example of the famous Aspasia of Miletus, with whom the most wonderful Olympian [Pericles] lived. Putting before us [Aspasia's] no mean image of understanding, let us bring to bear as much as she had of experience in affairs, acumen in politics, and quickness of wit, and with

accurate measurement transfer it all to our own portrait'; M. M. Henry, *Prisoner of History*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1995, p. 75.

35 E. Cropper and C. Dempsey, *Nicolas Poussin: Friendship and the Love of Painting*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2000, pp. 178ff.

36 Bernini, as at note 28, p. 16. Baldinucci does not invoke the words 'original' and 'copy' in his otherwise similar recounting of the anecdote. Baldinucci 1682, as at note 30, p. 6; Baldinucci 1948, as at note 30, p. 76; Baldinucci 2006, as at note 30, p. 11. For close analysis of these passages, compare the essays by E. Levy, 'Chapter 2 of Domenico Bernini's *Vita* of his father: mimeses', and R. Preimesberger, 'Bernini portraits, stolen and nonstolen, in Chantelou's *Journal* and the Bernini *Vite*', in Delbeke et al., as at note 25, pp. 159–80, 201–22.

37 Chantelou, *Diary*, as at note 20, pp. 125–26 (17 August 1665); Chantelou, *Journal*, as at note 20, pp. 123–24.

38 Although cardinal nephews were not customarily buried in

elaborate tombs, it is tempting to think that one of Bernini's busts, executed when the cardinal was near to death, may have been intended for a tomb since it was typical that a second version of a funerary bust was made for the family palace. For extensive analysis of the biographical passages on the two busts, see Levy, as at note 29, pp. 165–71.

39 Baldinucci refers to the bust as 'un altro simile, di non punto minor bellezza del primo'; Baldinucci 1682, as at note 30, p. 7; Baldinucci 1948, as at note 30, p. 77; Baldinucci 2006, as at note 30, p. 12.

40 'In tanta agitazione de' Suoi sopravvenne Gio:Lorenzo, che risaputo il fatto, con intrepidezza di animo domandò nuovo marmo, & avido di convertire in sua Gloria I difetti istessi della Natura, intraprese in altro sasso il lavoro, nè mai quindi si tolse per lo spazio di trè giorni [. . .] Fù portato dunque nel giorno stabilito al Pontefice, mà facilmente riconobbe il Cardinale da una certa non sò quale espressione più viva, che quella non era la figura, che alcuni giorni avanti haveva veduto, e necessitate Gio:Lorenzo a scuoprire il fatto, volle

il Papa, che quivi ancora si portasse il primo Ritratto'; Bernini, as at note 28, pp. 10–11.

41 T. Zamir, 'Theatrical repetition and inspired performance', *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 67, 2009, pp. 366–67.

42 I. Lavin, 'Bernini and the art of social satire', in I. Lavin (ed.), *Drawings by Gianlorenzo Bernini from the Museum der Bildenden Künste Leipzig, German Democratic Republic* (exh. cat.), Princeton University Art Museum, 1981, p. 37. This idea of a repeat performance offers proof that the first performance was not an accident. And so, as Tod Marder has recently pointed out, in the famous episode of young Gian Lorenzo's encounter with Paul V, the pope purportedly asked him to draw in front of him so as to prove that this was indeed the boy whose reputation had brought him before the pontiff. T. A. Marder, 'Bernini Fanciullo prodigio della ritrattistica', in T. Montanari (ed.), *Bernini Pittore* (exh. cat.), Galleria Nazionale di Palazzo Barberini, Rome, 2006, pp. 211–21.

43 Zamir, as at note 41, p. 369.