

Júlia Papp

“PRESENT OF FERENCZ PULSZKY”

JOHN BRAMPTON PHILPOT’S PHOTOGRAPHS OF FICTILE IVORY IN THE HUNGARIAN NATIONAL MUSEUM*

Searching in the photographic archives of the Hungarian National Museum’s central database, you can find a series of photographs (in Box. no. 30) consisting of 265 items, taken around 1850, depicting copies of ivories (fictile ivory) from the ancient, medieval and early modern ages. Dry-stamped by the artist with the inscription “J. B. Philpot Firenze Lungo l’Arno”, 151 out of these items are of a larger format (27,4×19,7 cms), while the remaining 114 are of a smaller format (11,5×6,7 cms) and completed with only a note on the verso saying “J. B. Philpot Firenze Borgo Ognissanti No 17”¹ – thus the photographs were taken by John Brampton Philpot (1812–1878),² born in England (Maidstone) and settled in Florence in 1850. The back of each of these items is provided with the registration date of 1871 and a manuscript inscription, which reads “by courtesy of Ferenc Pulszky”; that is to say, the series were donated by Ferenc Pulszky to the library of the museum, which had come under his direction in 1869 (Fig. 1).³

These series of photographs serve as a spectacular example of “reproductive continuum”⁴ – which played a dominant role in the museological, educational and collector practices of the second half of 19th century – i.e., the contact of the different repro-

ductive techniques (drawings, etchings, plaster casts and electrotypes, paper mosaics, photographs, post cards in mass production and distribution, reproducing replicas of statues for cultural purposes⁵) of art treasures.⁶ A series of photographs made of fictile ivory, that is, a copy of copies, proves a useful illustration of the mutual influence these reproductive techniques exert on each other.⁷

ART REPRODUCTIONS IN THE SECOND HALF OF THE 19TH CENTURY

The history of making art reproductions begins in ancient Egypt,⁸ and it is a well-known fact that many classical Greek sculptures survived only as marble and/or bronze reproductions made in the Roman Empire.⁹ The casts of classical sculptures,

* I have to thank the Hungarian National Museum (Budapest) and the Museo Nazionale del Bargello (Florence) for the reproductions I used as illustrations for my work. This research was supported by the Hungarian Institute Balassi, the National Cultural Fund of Hungary (NKA) and the Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche (Italy).

1 On the verso of small format photographs no. 3/a, 4/a, 1/b, 2/b, 5/a neither a note nor a dry stamp is visible.

2 Becchetti 1978, 20, 36, 65; Zannier 1986, 17; Del Barbarò – Maffioli – Sesti 1989, 33, 45–46, 214; Dewitz – Siegert – Schuller-Procopovici 1994, 52–53, 273, 282; Ritter 1997, 27; Fanelli 2001; Tamassia 2002; Quintavalle 2003, 200, 243, 362; Tamassia 2004, 66–67; Taylor – Schaaf 2007; *Éloge du négatif* 2010, 141–143, 231; Fanelli; Arisi 2011.

3 Cf. Papp 2014; Papp 2014/2.

4 Baker 2010.

5 Gampp 2010.

6 Baker 2010. For more Cf. Fawcett 1995.

7 In the second half of the 19th century it was quite common during an exhibition to place an original work of art and its reproduction or photograph next to one another. Apart from South Kensington Museum – where in 1885 they placed fictile ivory in line with original medieval ivory carvings in order to give an encyclopedic overview of the art history of the period (Baker 2010, 494) – this trend was also transparent in the 1882 historical book exhibition of Budapest, where a series of renaissance illuminated codices borrowed from foreign libraries were exhibited together with photographs of other codices, the originals of which could not be brought to Budapest by the organizers. Farkas – Papp 2007. 130.; Papp 2009, 221.

8 Frederiksen 2010.

9 Landwehr 2010.

which at the beginning were made mostly by Italian workshops, became a part of European royal and aristocratic collections in the beginning of the 16th century, but they were also popular among artists and members of the wealthy middle class. The artwork reproductions – both prints¹⁰ made of paintings and statues and plaster casts of old statues, coins and cameos – had a significant role in academic art studies and – via the collections of schools and universities – in education in general.

By the second half of the 19th century the collection of art reproductions had acquired a new function: by becoming commonly available in Europe, then later in the United States,¹¹ these collections made it possible to study the reproductions of artworks of many museums and private collections and the decorations of both the interior and exterior of buildings from all over the world at the same time and in the same place not only for artists, art students and scholars but for all visitors of the museums. These collections had an important role in the cultural education of the public. The cast collections made it possible to show the history of a genre or the art of a group of people and they were also used to demonstrate the variety of forms in different kinds of (art)works.

Since purchasing plaster cast and electrotype reproductions of art had become more and more popular after the 1850's, both with private individuals (mainly collectors, scientists, architects and artists) and public institutions (museums, universities, art academies), enterprises dealing with reproduction work and organizations trusted with its sales also started to flourish. Established at the end of the 1840's and operating throughout the end of the 19th century, the British Arundel Society,¹² for example, organized meetings, lectures and exhibitions for the intention of collectors or anyone interested, and published catalogues with photographic illustrations of the reproductions on sale at the society.¹³

In commissioning art reproductions, the London based Victoria and Albert Museum, formerly known as South Kensington Museum,¹⁴ played a leading role among all the museums and managed to establish a fruitful relationship with individuals and companies specialized in reproducing art. Among its returning contractors figured the

pioneer of electrotyping, the Birmingham based Elkington Company, which patented their revolutionary method in 1840. In 1853 the company received authorization from the museum to reproduce and market some of its properties.¹⁵

The first director of South Kensington museum, Henry Cole, made relevant efforts to promote the reproductions of the museum's collection, because he presumed these played an important part in shaping public education, culture and taste. Encouraged by the success of Elkington Company during the 1867 World Expo in Paris, he drafted a convention entitled the "International Convention for Promoting Universally Reproductions of Works of Art", which intended to drive forward the mutual interchange of "cast, electrotype, photographic or any other type" of reproductions from major European museums. According to the original copy, which has been conserved up to this day, this convention was signed by 15 European princes. Cole's efforts proved finally successful and in 1873 the reproductions of architectural monuments and sculptures commissioned by the museum were first exhibited in the monumental twin machine halls of the freshly inaugurated Architectural Courts (today known as the Cast courts).¹⁶ In 1873 the museum published a catalogue of the electrotype reproductions they had made of the original pieces in their collections, a total of 80 items completed with high quality photographic illustrations.¹⁷

A noteworthy cast collection which includes several thousand works was placed in the stairwell and on the first floor of the Neues Museum in Berlin (opened in 1855). A detailed catalogue was published in 1866 about this collection, which included the reproductions of artworks from the classical era, the Middle Ages and the Modern Period, among them several ivory carvings.¹⁸

The question of art reproduction by means of photography, plaster cast or electrotype was equally raised during the first Art History Congress held in Vienna in 1873. In the 5th chapter of the Congress entitled "Reproductionen von Kunstwerken und deren Verbreitung im Interesse der Museen und des Kunstunterrichtes", participants discussed the international implications involved in the making and the distribution

10 Lambert 1987; Preciado 1989; Weissert 1999; Gramaccini – Meier 2003; Gramaccini – Meier 2009.

11 E.g.: Schwab 1994.

12 Ledger 1978.

13 E.g.: *Catalogue* 1869.

14 *Price list* 1859; *Catalogues* 1869; *Illustrated* 1873. etc. Cf. Bilbey – Cribb 2007, 160–161; Malcolm Baker: *The history of the Cast Courts*. <http://www.vam.ac.uk/content/articles/t/the-cast-courts/>.

For the details of the publications about reproductions and photographs of artworks published by the museum see James 1998.

15 Bilbey – Cribb 2007, 164.

16 Gibson 1994, 115–116; Bilbey – Cribb 2007, 165, 169–171; Bilbey – Trusted 2010, 466; Plessen – Bryant 2012, 185–186.

17 *Illustrated* 1873. Among the largest collections of art reproduction in the 19th century figured that of the Musée de la Sculpture comparée, founded at the beginning of the 1880's on the proposition of architect Eugène Emmanuel Viollet-le-Duc (1814–1879) and located in the four grand halls of the Palais du Trocadéro in Paris, open for the public and exhibiting plaster cast reproductions of the architectural and sculptural monuments of France.

18 Boetticher 1866.

of art reproductions, as well as in their application for museological and educational purposes.¹⁹

*

One of the earliest known cast collections in Hungary belongs to the protestant lyceum of Aiud in Transylvania. The collection of the institution – as described in detail by the professor of the lyceum, Ferenc Benkő in the end of the 18th century – included, following the tradition of Wunderkammers, rare objects, fossils, animal bones, old coins (mainly found in the region and donated to the lyceum), artefacts from the classical era, weapons and fragments of mosaics,²⁰ and also a collection of plaster casts made of classical relics (cameos): “*in the middle part of [a glass cabinet] is the Lithophilocium, casts of old relics of the ancient Greek and Roman mythology and pagan gods and foreign history made from plaster or resin, in twelve drawer (number 901), and next to them there is a catalogue.*”²¹

Jakab Marastoni (Jacopo Marastoni), the Italian artist who settled in Hungary, placed the plaster cast copies of classical and renaissance statues bought in foreign lands in one of the study halls of the private art school he had founded in 1846.²²

The creation of more significant cast collections in museums – which meant that they could be visited by the general public – began in Hungary (just like in Western Europe) in the second half of the 19th century. Still in the middle of the 19th century, a friend of Ferenc Pulszky, Imre Henszlmann, underlined the importance of the different kinds of reproductions besides original art treasure if you want to get a univer-

sal picture of art history, based on the artefact of the different nations and periods.²³ These ideas spurred Pulszky on in the 1850s to have a significant role in the making and exchanging of fictile ivories found in several public and private collections in London and encouraged him to start as soon as possible the creation of a cast collection of classical statues that he wanted to meet the European standard once he became the director of the National Museum in Budapest in 1869. The exhibition in 1874 included about 200 reproductions which showed the history of Greek sculpture from the beginning to the Hellenistic Period.²⁴ Pulszky paid attention not only to the plaster casts but also to the scholarly photography of artworks both in his writings and in actual practice in the museum.²⁵ In the 1870s the National Museum started to collect statue reproductions which were related to Hungary as well, but the exhibition which had displayed them ended in the middle of the 1920s and the casts were scattered. Several plaster casts were made during the reconstruction of monuments (for example the reconstruction of the Vajdahunyad Castle, the St. Elisabeth Cathedral in Košice, the Matthias Church in Budapest), and some of them also became part of the National Museum. A noteworthy reproduction series depicting medieval and renaissance relics was made in 1894 for the Millennium Exhibition, and these casts were later moved to the National Museum and the Museum of Fine Arts.²⁶

The dupe negatives of the panels found in the cast collection of the National Museum were used to make the plaster casts of the Parthenon frieze, which served as the decoration on the walls of the sculptor’s studio of the Hungarian Royal Drawing School and Art Teachers’ College. Led by József Reichenberger, the educational institution also had its own workshop for making plaster casts.²⁷ In the beginning of the 20th century the parts of the cast collection made by Ferenc Pulszky that were related to the classical era were moved to the Museum of Fine Arts in Budapest, and the new museum continued purchasing plaster casts. From 1908 the cast collection was also open to visitors and in the 1920s it was turned into an exhibition which consisted of more than 600 reproductions of classical statues as well as copies of medieval and renaissance relics. What hadn’t been destroyed during World War II of the collection of the Museum of Fine Art became part of the storage or rural museums and public institutions (Tata, Kecskemét, Komárom, Kalocsa, Debrecen).²⁸

19 “1. In wessen Händen liegen gegenwärtig in Deutschland, Oesterreich, Frankreich, Italien, England und Belgien die Reproduktionen von Werken des Alterthums und der Kunst? 2. In wie weit können und sollen Regierungen auf die Reproduktionen durch Private Einfluss nehmen? – Sollen Staatsanstalten bei Reproduktionen mitwirken und in welchem Maasse? 3. Welche Erfahrungen hat man mit den verschiedenen Reproduktionsmaterialien gemacht? 4. Sollen systematische Reproduktionen und in welcher Weise veranlasst werden, – speciell für Zwecke des Kunstunterrichtes und des kunstgeschichtlichen Unterrichtes? 5. Soll auf die Preise der von öffentlichen Anstalten reproducirten Gegenstände und in welcher Weise eingewirkt werden? 6. Auf welcher Grundlage können öffentliche Anstalten unter einander mit reproducirten Werken in Tausch treten?” In: Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte. Band XXXVI. 1983. Wien – Köln – Graz. 20–21. Cf. Schmidt 1983, 10; Marosi 2006, 330.

20 Benkő 1800, 47.

21 Ibid., 43. Cf. Sinkó 1978, 546. The Benedictine Pannonhalma Archabbey also had a significant collection of cameo reproductions (dactyliotheca) in the beginning of the 19th century.

22 Cf. Farkas 2005.

23 Tímár 1990, 156–157. Cf. Marosi 2006, 321, 329–330; Szentesi 2006, 1–2.

24 Ibid., 2006; Szentesi 2006/2; Andó – Szentesi 2009.

25 Marosi 2006. Cf. Farkas – Papp 2007, 107–117; Papp 2009.

26 Szentesi 2006.

27 Szentesi 2005.

28 Andó – Szentesi 2009; Rózsavölgyi 2015. The lectures of the academic conference titled Törékeny

ARTWORK PHOTOGRAPHY IN THE 19TH CENTURY

The spread of photography (including the photography of artworks) in the 19th century brought about a change so revolutionary in visual communication that can only be compared to the results of the printing techniques (woodcut, copperplate) in the 16th century or the booming digitalization of images in the 21st century. In the 1850's a photographic wave started in Western Europe aimed at reproducing relevant architectural monuments,²⁹ and the most valuable art treasures of major museums (British Museum, South Kensington Museum, Louvre) and other collections.³⁰

From the middle of the 19th century onwards European cultural institutions spent more and more on acquisitions of photographic series made up of hundreds – occasionally thousands – of items reproducing the content of national or foreign public and private collections, permanent and temporary exhibitions, as well as architectural monuments, which then became an integrate part (linked to historical preservation, to maintenance of art treasure for museums, to scientific research, to education)³¹ in the recently-born institutional system of art history and archeology. The changes in the preferences of art historical studies can be illuminated by examining the artworks which are most often depicted in photographs in different times, looking at their age, the geographical region of their origin and their genre, while the spread of photographs of artworks and buildings made by the significant European photography companies and workshops (Brogi, Alinari, Braun, Angerer, etc.) sheds light on the

érték: a gipsz a 19–20. századi múzeumi és oktatási gyakorlatban [Fragile Value: Plaster Casts in Practice in Museums and Education in the 19th–20th Centuries] on 19 February 2016 organized by the Institute of Art History, Research Centre for the Humanities, Hungarian Academy of Sciences and the Schola Graphidis Art Collection (Hungarian University of Fine Arts – Secondary School of Visual Arts) gave a lot of important information about the history of the Hungarian cast collections in the 19th century.

29 Mondenard 2002; Carqué 2006; *All the Mighty World* 2004.

30 Physick 1975; Haworth-Booth 1984; Roberts 1995; Hamber 1996; Haworth-Booth 1997; Haworth-Booth – McCauley 1998; Hamber 2003; Baker 2010, 494–495. Charles Thurston Thompson, the official photographer of South Kensington Museum, made thousands of photographs – of the collections of the Louvre in Paris, among others (Photographs by C. Thurston Thompson. Vol. 1.) – to be found today in the Prints and Drawings Study Room of the Victoria and Albert Museum. See the printed works and price lists, e.g.: *Photographic* 1859; *Price list* 1864. etc.

31 “The student of early art must not fail to examine the extremely valuable and numerous collections of photographs of art treasures accumulated in the Fine Art Library of the South Kensington Museum.” Westwood 1876, XIII.

methods, commercial routes, the institutions they passed through and the quantity of the pictures that made it possible for the photographs to become part of the cultural institutions.

Apart from photographers and art dealers, museums occasionally also took up the role of distributor for photographic art reproductions. Supported by the Science and Art Department of the Committee of Council on Education, in 1869 South Kensington Museum and Arundel Society jointly published a price catalogue, which, apart from presenting chromolithographies and line engravings, promotes photographs in support of artistic education and – as it says on the cover – for the aim of making arts widely popular.³² The catalogue described thirteen photo series (each of them consisting of twenty images), including photographs of the portico of the Cathedral of Santiago de Compostela,³³ the Batalha Monastery in Portugal, ecclesiastical metalwork from the Middle Ages, et cetera, and projected the completion of another 11 series of photo reproductions.³⁴ Among the series offered for sale figured a collection depicting the gold of Petrossa found in Romania in the 1830's, and the photos are most likely to have been taken at the World Expo of 1867 in Paris, where the artefact itself was first publicly unveiled.³⁵ A high dissemination of photo reproductions can be well demonstrated by 13 photographs of the same antique artefact made in 1869 by Bucharest based photographer Henric (Heinrich) Trenk, and commissioned by Bucharest based scientist, Alexandru Odobescu, who later donated and sent these series to the HAS in Budapest (Fig. 2).³⁶

In Hungary the 1870s were the beginning of the photographs made of temporary exhibitions (1876: exhibition to aid the victims of the flood; 1882: national book exhibition; 1884: historical exhibition of metalwork), and collections belonging to

32 *Catalogue* 1869. Just like the reproduction catalogue mentioned earlier, this publication also disclosed the documents, letters and announcements of the 19th century English movement involved in making and distributing art reproductions. *Catalogue* 1869, 3–8.

33 The photographs made by Thompson were published by the Arundel Society in 1868: *The Cathedral of Santiago de Compostella in Spain, showing especially the sculpture of the Portico de la Gloria by Mestre Mateo. A series of twenty photographs recently taken by the late Mr. Thurston Thompson.* London, 1868.

34 *Catalogue* 1869, 17–32.

35 *Ibid.*, 21.

36 Farkas – Papp 2007, 83. Dissemination of photographic reproductions of art is well demonstrated by the high quality large format (38 × 18 cm) photograph of Consul Areobindus' ivory tablet from the beginning of the 6th century, made by the English James Baker Pyne in 1864 and filed in the Department of Manuscripts of the Library and Information Centre of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. Inv. N.: Ms 4402/96–108. Photographs of art treasure made by the same Pyne were exhibited in the London Photo Expo of 1862 (<http://www.peib.org.uk>).

museums (1876–1878, National Museum) and ecclesiastical collections (Esztergom, the treasury of the Cathedral). The photographs were more and more often used as previews of the engraved illustrations in publications about art and monuments, and from the 1870s there was an increase in the number of scholarly books (1871: *Decorative Plates from Four Codices of the Bibliotheca Corviniana in Roman Libraries*; 1873: *Relics with Roman Inscriptions in the Hungarian National Museum*) and journals which were illustrated with photographs glued into them or pictures made with photomechanical methods.³⁷

The fact that in Hungarian public collections the photographs of artworks from the 19th century have often many missing pictures and are unprocessed can be traced back to several reasons. The organic progress of the collections of artwork photographs made in the 19th century kept in public institutions was interrupted several times because of the radical political and ideological changes in the previous century, and many photographs were either destroyed or their whereabouts are unknown. Since the progress of technology during the 20th century made it possible to make photographs of better and better quality, the photographs made in the 19th century were no longer used and their preservation was not considered to be important. The situation is illustrated well, for example, by the case of the academy which was the predecessor of what is today the University of Fine Arts, opened in 1871, and which has no remaining photography collection of its own today. The photographs are kept in one of the “special collections” which were outlined recently during the review and preliminary survey of the collection of the library. A photography collection that existed since the founding of an institution and continued to grow undisturbed survived only in the Museum of Fine Arts, and not even there was it a photo archive of its own but it only supported the museum’s main collection, and it very much wasn’t as looked after and categorized as the collections of photographs in Western Europe.

One of the important results of the increased international and Hungarian researches about the history of photography is that while earlier museums considered the photographs of artworks to be only peripheral helping tools of documentation and not “real” artworks (similarly to the artwork reproductions in the 19th century), they had later become autonomous artworks which had their own genre and properties, and analyzing them is an important objective of art history.³⁸ And it is important both to study their role in the development of cultural institutions (educational estab-

37 For the history of the Hungarian photography of artwork cf. Cs. Plank – Kolta – Vannai 1993; L. Baji – Varga 1996; Bán 2002; Farkas – Papp 2007; Papp 2008.

38 Papp 2010.

lishments, museums, monument protection and art trade) in the 19th century and to examine the progress of photography and photomechanical printing processes as well as the stylistic and attitudinal changes in photography.

REPRODUCTIONS OF IVORIES IN THE 17TH–19TH CENTURIES

We can find depictions of famous ivory carvings which have been guarded and kept track of for centuries because of their rarity, age, spiritual (historical or religious) and material worth (meaning that they could become treasures) in several earlier historical or archeological publications – occasionally the same engraving appears in more than one book. The overlaps between these engravings and the relics depicted in the photographs of Philpot’s series prove the centuries-long continuity of the collecting and studying of this genre of art. The French doctor and antiquarian Jean-Jacques Chifflet published in 1624 his book about Christ’s alleged burial shroud (called the Shroud of Turin),³⁹ which had illustrations that present the earlier use of burial shrouds as well as a full page copper engraving illustration of the Byzantine ivory carving which depicts a standing Christ crowning Emperor Romanos II and his wife (*Cat. 111*) (Fig. 3).⁴⁰ The engraving of the carving was published in the appendix of the Latin glossary by the French historian Charles du Fresne, sieur du Cange in 1678,⁴¹ together with the picture of a consular diptych from the 6th century (*Cat. 20*). The publication of Jean Mabillon in the end of the 18th century about the history of the Benedictine Order⁴² includes the description and the copper engraving of the Felix diptych from the 5th century (*Cat. 10*) and the Philoxenus diptych from the 6th century (*Cat. 21*), both of which can be found in the book written by the also Benedictine antiquarian Anselmo Banduri about the relics of Constantinople (Fig. 4).⁴³ The Italian antiquarian Filippo Buonarroti, whose interests included Etruscan relics,

39 Chifflet 1624.

40 In Philpot’s original catalogue the photographs aren’t numbered, therefore we refer to the Philpot photographs as the entry number of Catalogue, which can be found in the end of this publication.

41 Du Fresne 1678.

42 Mabillon 1706.

43 Banduri 1711.

published in 1716⁴⁴ copper engravings of the late antique Basilius diptych (*Cat. 22, Cat. 23*) (Fig. 5) and Rambona diptych, which was made in the 10th century (*Cat. 82–83*), Bernard de Montfaucon, in his monumental archeological works,⁴⁵ showed illustrations of the Anastasius (*Cat. 19*) (Fig. 6) and Basilius (*Cat. 22, Cat. 23*) diptychs and the leaf of Rambona diptych (*Cat. 82*), which depicted the Virgin Mary on her throne.

In Anton Francesco Gori's publications in the 18th century,⁴⁶ which are considered to be among the earliest scholarly works about the history of ivory carvings, we can find the description and illustration of 20 ivories which can also be found in Philpot's photographs – not only well-known late antique relics (for example the Muse and the Philosopher diptych [*Cat. 7*], the Lampadiorum panel [*Cat. 9.*] (Fig. 7), the Aesculapius-Hygieia diptych [*Cat. 1*] (Fig. 8) the Asturius diptych [*Cat. 12*] or the Magnus diptych [*Cat. 20*]) but also a few works from the 9–11th centuries (*Cat. 35, Cat. 37, Cat. 98, Cat. 111*). Several of the carvings published by Mabillon and Montfaucon are also included in Gori's works (for example the Felix, Anastasius, Philoxenus, Basilius diptych) (Fig. 9).⁴⁷

The Italian engraver Raffaello Sanzio Morghen created a representative copper engraving⁴⁸ of the Aesculapius and Hygieia diptych (*Cat. 1*) in 1805, and he dedicated this valuable artwork to Mihály Viczay, who bought it from Felice Caronni in the beginning of the 19th century (Fig. 10). The changing attitudes towards the preservation of old artworks since the middle of the 18th century is illustrated by the fact that while in the above mentioned publication made in 1759⁴⁹ the image shows a diptych that isn't damaged, Morghen, following the growing need for accuracy of the time, depicts the object as it really is, meaning in its damaged condition (Fig. 11). The engraver in the 18th century made the carvings complete in the engraving to make it appear as it presumably had looked when it had been made, copying the ornamentation on the upper left part of the Hygieia panel onto the upper left part of the Aesculapius panel, even though the three remaining ornaments on the upper part of the two panels are different, which means that it's likely that the ornaments on the upper left part of the Aesculapius panel were not the same as those three ornaments.

44 Buonarroti 1716.

45 Montfaucon 1722; Montfaucon 1724.

46 Gori 1759; Passeri 1759; Cf. Visconti 2012.

47 Two carvings from the erstwhile Fejérváry collection that are also depicted in Philpot's photographs can be found in Gori's works (*Cat. 1, Cat. 18*).

48 British Museum, Museum number: 1843,0513.1131. Cf. Palmerini 1824, 148, no. 201.

49 Passeri 1759.

The four ivory carvings in the Philpot series – among them the Venatio panel (*Cat. 9*) (Fig. 12), which once also belonged to the Fejérváry collection – are included in the writings of Aubin Louis Millin about his travels in France, written in the beginning of the 19th century.⁵⁰ (*Cat. 3, Cat. 42–49, Cat. 211*). Jean Baptiste Louis Georges Seroux d'Agincourt's posthumous art historical work,⁵¹ published two decades later, includes an engraving which depicts five carvings that also appear in Philpot's photographs (*Cat. 9, Cat. 18, Cat. 21, Cat. 37, Cat. 98*) (Fig. 13). We can find illustrations of the Adam and Saint Paul panels (*Cat. 26*), which are in the Bargello, in the book of Claude Madeleine Grivaud de la Vincelle, published in 1817 (Fig. 14),⁵² and the first part of the four-part book series of Dominique Vivant Denon published in 1829 includes a lithograph of the carving which shows scenes of the life of Saint Paul⁵³ (Fig. 15).

Around 1850 the engineer János Varsányi made drawings of the artworks in the Fejérváry collection,⁵⁴ which included 13 drawings that depicted ivory carvings. Among them was the famous Venatio panel (*Cat. 9*) and the drawings, which are in the Department of Manuscripts of the Library and Information Centre of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences,⁵⁵ show two other carvings which appear in Philpot's photographs (*Cat. 110; Cat. 149*). Some illustrations of carvings which were also photographed by Philpot (*Cat. 1, Cat. 3, Cat. 18, Cat. 32, Cat. 61*) can be found in foreign art historical works published in the 1850s.⁵⁶ The illustration of the Aesculapius and Hygieia diptych drawn and engraved by Llewellynn Jewitt was the endpaper of Pulszky's catalogue published in 1856,⁵⁷ however, the copper engraving was neither as accurate nor as realistic and three-dimensional as the previously mentioned reproduction made half a century ago by Raffaello Sanzio Morghen.

The attempts to show the plasticity of three-dimensional artworks in two-dimensional reproductions – mainly using the chiaroscuro technique – can be found in the reproductions made as early as in the 16th centuries (for example on the engravings of Marcantonio Raimondi [c. 1480 – c. 1534]). Raimondi "created a line grid which helped him schematically illustrate the protrusions and the hollows."⁵⁸ On the engraving of Chifflet's book in the beginning of the 17th century and on the two already

50 Millin 1807.

51 Seroux d'Agincourt 1823.

52 Grivaud de la Vincelle 1817, Pl. XXVIII.

53 Denon 1829, Pl. 38.

54 Szentesi 2002.

55 Ral K 1220/28, 1–9; Ms 4404/64; Ms 4404/68; Ms 4404/77–78. Cf. Szentesi 2002, 39–44.

56 Cahier 1851, Lacroix – Sere 1851, Labarte 1855.

57 Pulszky 1856.

58 Ivins 2001, 108. Cf. Papp 2012, I. 251.

mentioned illustrations in the publication of Du Fresne we can see such a strong graphic emphasis of not only the plasticity but also the ornamentation that the depicted object looks completely different from the way ivory carvings actually are (Fig. 16). In the publications of Mabillon, Banduri and Montfaucon, however, there can be found no evidence of such artistic aspirations: the linear, two-dimensional drawings show almost nothing of the plasticity of the objects (Fig. 17, Fig. 18).

In Gori's publication the drawer and the engraver did their best to demonstrate the three-dimensionality of the object with shading, however, mistakes and wrongly interpreted details can be found here as well: for example, in the image of a late antique diptych the engraver was unable to illustrate the three-dimensionality of the stairs at the bottom of the carving (Fig. 19). During the mechanical reproductions of the objects – for example both the plaster casts and the photographs made of them – such a shortcoming of three-dimensional representation – as seen in Philpot's photograph (Cat. 15) – can no longer occur. Even though the composition of the illustration which depicts Emperor Romanos and his wife crowned by Christ (Cat. 111) is different in Gori's work (Fig. 20) than in the engraving found in the books of Chifflet and Du Fresne (the carving was given an ornate frame), we can find here too the strong emphasis on the ornamentation. The plasticity of the objects is also depicted in Raffaello Morghen's engraving made in 1805, which is an illustration of the Aesculapius and Hygieia diptych.

On the other hand, in the publications of Millin and Seroux d'Agincourt, influenced by the artistic ideas of Classicism and early Romanticism – the best European representatives of which were John Flaxman and Johann Heinrich Füssli – the clean, precise, clearly outlined linear drawings and with it the two-dimensional portrayal became widespread. These properties are also characteristic of the engraving depicting the Aesculapius Aesculapius and Hygieia diptych, which was an illustration in a work published by Felice Caronni in 1806,⁵⁹ who was the owner of the object before Mihály Viczay (Fig. 21). János Varsányi also didn't try to illustrate the plasticity of the artworks in his clearly outlined linear drawings but rather wished to clearly and accurately depict the motifs and their spatial relations with the help of the alternation of thin and thick lines⁶⁰ (Fig. 22).

The monumental publication series titled *Trésor de numismatique et de glyptique* (1834–1850), published by Paul Delaroche, Louis Pierre Henriquel-Dupont and Charles Lenormant had more than 15000 artworks and included illustrations made

by the French engineer, writer and engraver Achille Collas⁶¹ using his newly invented method of engraving (numismatic engraving, medal engraving). These two-dimensional copies were much more accurate, realistic and successful at illustrating the plasticity of the three-dimensional objects (coins, cameos, ivory carvings) than the copper engravings based on drawings made by hand or drawing previews. Between 1825 and 1832 Collas developed the method that made it possible to mechanically create steel engravings of medallions, stamps and other relief artworks (Fig. 23). Collas invented a mechanical printing machine which copied point by point the surface and chiaroscuro of relief artworks onto a steel plate capable of printing engravings. According to his contemporaries, his engravings copy the artworks with “unimaginable faithfulness” (avec une inconcevable fidélité) and “unspeakable truth” (avec une indicible vérité), with such a deceptive accuracy that from a certain distance it looks as if there were real relief artworks on the paper.⁶²

Even though Collas' technique has nothing to do with photography, the engravings made with this method resemble photographs much more than traditional copper or steel engravings. His invention is connected with the growing need for objective reproduction in the 1830–1840s and with the search for new technologies which are capable of keeping out or at least significantly decreasing the mistakes and shortcomings made by the traditional makers of engraving reproductions during both the interpretation of the objects and the drawing and engraving process. Of these new technologies the most spectacular results were achieved by galvanoplasty and photography (daguerreotype, calotype).⁶³

Engravings made of ivory carvings can also be found in two books of the *Trésor de numismatique et de glyptique*, including ten images of ivory carvings also depicted in Philpot's photographs.⁶⁴ It can be a proof of the changing attitudes towards the research of ivory that most of the pictures are no longer depicting late antique works, which were most often discussed in previous times, but carvings from the 9th–10th centuries, and also a Gothic mirror frame. However, the several illustrations (Cat. 10, Cat. 19, Cat. 20, Cat. 21, Cat. 111) in the *Trésor* which can also be found in earlier publications (Du Fresne, Mabillon, Banduri, Gori, Montfaucon) show the continuation of research traditions (Fig. 24).

61 Saur *Allgemeines Künstlerlexikon*. Band 20, München – Leipzig, 1998, 278–279.

62 Flachet 1834, 146–147.

63 Fawcett 1995, 63.

64 Collas 1838: Cat. 10, Cat. 20, Cat. 21, Cat. 25, Cat. 111, Cat. 112, Cat. 113; Collas 1839: Cat. 19, Cat. 63, Cat. 106, Cat. 107, Cat. 147.

59 Caronni 1806, Tav. IX. See Pulszky 1856, 36.

60 See Szentesi 2002.

The previously mentioned foreign publications⁶⁵ in the 1850s were mainly illustrated by woodcuts which tried to depict the plasticity of the engravings, while in Labarte's book, published in London, among other types of engravings there is also a picture made with Collas' method (Cat. 18) (Fig. 25). An important step in the printed photomechanical reproduction of artwork photographs was the two albums containing 74-74 illustrations which were an appendix of the publication titled *Histoire des arts industriels au moyen age et a l'époque de la renaissance*, published by Labarte in Paris in four parts between 1864 and 1866.⁶⁶ In this we can find not only traditional copper engravings but also several chromolithographs and photolithographs,⁶⁷ the latter including photographs which show ivory artworks that also appear in Philpot's photographs (Cat. 3; Cat. 11; Cat. 19; Cat. 32, Cat. 34; Cat. 37; Cat. 125; Cat. 126) (Fig. 26). In the new edition of Labarte's work which was published between 1872 and 1875 in three parts there are both illustrations taken from the earlier albums and pictures made with the newest technology, the photogravure (Fig. 27).

FICTILE IVORIES

By the middle of the 19th century, as new reproduction techniques gained grounds without the risk to damage valuable art treasures, fictile ivory became more and more popular,⁶⁸ for commercial, cultural and scientific usage equally. Excellent Italian reproduction craftsman (formatore) Giovanni Franchi,⁶⁹ the first to use gelatin-based casting techniques in England, received an Award by the Society of Arts for making

the finest fictile ivory at the end of the 1840's, and was known to achieve relevant commercial success, too.⁷⁰ His casts were staged at the World Expo of 1855 in Paris.⁷¹

Fictile ivories also appeared (along with the original ivory carvings) in the art exhibition organized in 1854 in the Marlborough House in London by the School of Design, which moved here in 1853. The photographs of the reproductions, made by Francis Bedford, can be found in the album of the exhibited artworks.⁷²

Spurred on by the commercial sales activity of Arundel Society, in the 1850's casts of ivory carvings belonging to European museums, church treasuries and private collections started to gain higher and higher proportions. "In the spring of 1855 the Society came into possession of a valuable collection of molds and other materials for the manufacture of casts, representing, nearly in facsimile, some of the most interesting specimens of ancient Ivory-carvings now in existence..."⁷³

During the first annual meeting of the society in 1855 Matthew Digby Wyatt⁷⁴ gave a historical lecture on ivory carvings, making ample reference to the experts' opinions and the relevant collections of his time. In the same year Arundel Society commissioned Edmund Oldfield, member of the society's executive committee and one of the founding members, too, to make good use of Wyatt's lecture and classify the different fictile ivories representing different schools and periods. Describing all known types on sale,⁷⁵ Oldfield's catalogue was published in 1855, then a year later its completed version came out, with 9 albumin photo illustrations by J. A. Spencer and the transcript of Wyatt's lecture.⁷⁶ The catalogue included ca. 150 reproductions, plus a pair of 12 items representing the details of the ivory casket of the Cathedral of Sens, and Oldfield's description of the reproduction process itself. The actual fictile ivory collection classified in a chronological order by Oldfield was then exhibited in the society's office.⁷⁷

65 Labarte 1855. The book is an English translation of Jules Labarte's work titled *Description des objets d'art qui composent la collection Debruge Dumenil, précédée d'une introduction historique* /Paris, 1847/.

66 Aubenas – Smith 2000.

67 Labarte – album 1864.

68 Dr. Helen Rufus-Ward: *Casts of Thousands: The Rise and Fall of the Fictile Ivory* In: [Association of Art Historians] Annual Conference 2011, 31 March – 2 April, University of Warwick. Section: Same Difference: Material Cultures of Reproduction; Rufus-Ward 2016. To the history of casts of ivory carvings made in the 18th century see Bendetta Chiesi's study in this book.

69 http://sculpture.gla.ac.uk/view/person.php?id=msib7_1206614685; <http://www.npg.org.uk/research/programmes>.

70 Art Journal (14) 1875. 44. Cf. http://sculpture.gla.ac.uk/view/person.php?id=msib7_1206614685.

71 Daily News 23 April 1855. Cf. <http://www.npg.org.uk/research/programmes>; V&A Archive, MA/1/F1178; Art Journal, 1866, vol.5, 286–287.)

72 <http://www.royalcollection.org.uk/collection/2800218/works-of-art-exhibited-at-marlborough-house-1854-fictile-ivory-virgin-and-child>.

73 Wyatt – Oldfield 1856, s. p. For the cast movement in more detail see Helen Rufus-Ward's study in this book.

74 Pevsner 1950.

75 Oldfield 1855.

76 Wyatt – Oldfield 1856. Cf. Gernsheim 1984, 23, no. 51.

77 Wyatt – Oldfield 1856, 27.

In the prologue of the catalogue, Oldfield stresses that fictile ivory is from a financial point of view immaterial, since a whole collection would cost less than one piece of original ivory carving, and yet, for the art historian, a series of collections can provide a multitude of information compared to what you can learn out of a single original piece in any isolated European collection, then he goes on to relate how the collection of reproductions came about.⁷⁸ He adds a list with the names of the owners of the original ivory carvings, ranking from private collectors to public institutions and churches.⁷⁹

Giving a detailed description, two decades later, of the production and sale processes of art replicas, John Obadiah Westwood published another catalogue with a systematic classification of the fictile ivory which completes the original ivory collection of South Kensington Museum.⁸⁰ According to the introduction of the catalogue, the 1850's saw Alexander Nesbitt, and Westwood himself, contributing to the improvement of art reproduction technologies. In order to manufacture the best moulds possible for their reproductions, Westwood and Nesbitt payed a visit to a large number of European museums, treasuries and other collections, where they could work with original ivory carvings. As we read on, we can learn that the finest plaster casts based on the moulds of Nesbitt, Augustus Wollaston Franks, and Westwood – and including not only those sold by Arundel Society, but also the complete collection of fictile ivory at South Kensington Museum – was manufactured by Franchi Company.⁸¹

In this catalogue of monumental proportions (including 975 items and 24 photo illustrations) we are to witness the rising popularity of making art reproductions, and the author undertakes to give us an overview of the continental collections of ancient and medieval ivory carvings, “*in order to direct attention to the specimens of which it would be desirable to obtain fictile copies for the museum*”.⁸² He then gives the precise location of the original pieces.

British governmental body Science and Art Department provided an opportunity for art schools and museums to acquire these fictile copies for educational, scientific

and cultural purposes.⁸³ In 1876 the department published another shorter catalogue, functioning as a price list, which, unlike Westwood's chronological classification, listed the fictile ivory of South Kensington museum in order of the registration numbers, indicating with each of the items the selling price of copies available at Elkington Company or Arundel Society.⁸⁴ At the beginning of the catalogue a copy of the convention promoting the exchange of art reproduction, several official letters and memoranda were enclosed.

Some European museums were quick to obtain their collection of fictile ivories. Even though the Museum of Applied Arts in Vienna (the “k. k. Österreichisches Museum für Kunst und Industrie”) opened only in 1864, a member of the council preparing the establishment of the institution in 1863 had already proposed to buy the plaster casts of the Arundel Society. The two boxes of plaster casts arrived in 1864 via the Artaria art trade, which – most likely for the purpose of making reproductions or for an exhibition – was borrowed by the Germanisches Museum in Nuremberg in 1866.⁸⁵

The museum in Berlin also already had a significant collection of fictile ivory in 1866. Even though the catalogue of the reproduction collection published that year doesn't mention where the artworks were acquired from, we can find so many similarities in the descriptions of the fictile ivories between this catalogue and the catalogue of fictile ivories by the Arundel Society as well as the photographs of the Philpot series that it is certain that the fictile ivories exhibited in the Neues Museum are from the same series. The catalogue mentions the owners of the original ivories in most cases, which several times means the Fejérváry collection.⁸⁶ Because the Arundel Society made reproductions of several fictile ivories belonging to the museum in Berlin it is possible that they were given the series for free, “in exchange” for their assistance.

A proof of how valuable fictile ivories were considered to be in the 19th century is the book about the history of ecclesiastical fashion, published by the English Wharton B. Marriott in 1868 in which we can find in the illustrations three photographs which depict the fictile ivories sold by the Arundel Society and kept in the British

78 “*Its formation is chiefly due to the zeal and taste of Mr. Alexander Nesbitt; but valuable additions have been contributed by Mr. Westwood, the Author of Palaeographia Sacra, and Mr. Franks, of the British Museum.*” Wyatt – Oldfield 1856, 27.

79 *Ibid.*, 31–32.

80 Westwood 1876. Earlier see e.g.: *Inventory* 1869.

81 Westwood 1876, XI–XIII.

82 *Ibid.*, IX.

83 Bilbey – Cribb 2007, 169; Baker 2010, 491; Williamson 2010, 15–18.

84 *Reproductions* 1876. Another extended version of the catalogue bearing the same title was published in 1890, including this time 112 pages instead of the former 88: *Reproductions* 1890. The difference is that the catalogue of 1890 mentions with each item the item codes of the Westwood catalogue of 1876, and includes a 10-page supplement of concordance charts between the copy codes and the Westwood codes.

85 Museum für Angewandte Kunst, Wien. Bibliothek, Aktenarchiv. Aktenzahl: 1863/249; 1863/252; 1863/257; 1864/32; 1866/120.

86 Boetticher 1866, 249–269.

Museum.⁸⁷ The catalogue of fictile ivory published by the society is mentioned several times by Jules Labarte too.⁸⁸

Apart from Victoria and Albert Museum,⁸⁹ today we can find relevant collections of 19th century fictile ivory in many public institutions.⁹⁰

THE FEJÉRVÁRY–PULSZKY COLLECTION

In the art collection of Pulszky's uncle, Gábor Fejérváry,⁹¹ there was a group of antique, byzantine and medieval ivory carvings of outstanding art historical importance. Many of them had been acquired from local collectors, either through exchange or by purchase from their legacies. After the death of Mihály Viczay, for example, "he [Fejérváry] bought several pieces of [Viczay's] collection, which had been sold in Vienna in 1831, including one of the most valuable artworks, an ivory diptych depicting Aesculapius and Hygieia."⁹² In the beginning of the 1840s two young artists in Vienna made watercolor reproductions of the valuable artworks of the Fejérváry art collection at the behest of Fejérváry, however, in the surviving pages of the album titled *Liber Antiquitatis*⁹³ found in the Museum of Fine Arts do not include pictures of fictile ivory. In a publication about Hungarian history and culture Pulszky's friend, Imre Henszlmann wrote a detailed description of the collection in 1846, including the most valuable ivory carvings.⁹⁴ We can also make a reconstruction of the Fejérváry

collection with the aid of the handwritten catalogue made by Pulszky around 1846.⁹⁵ Some of the ivory carvings around 1850 – as mentioned above – were drawn reproductions made by János Varsányi.

Pulszky took part in the Hungarian revolution and the war of Independence of 1848–49, then settled in London,⁹⁶ where he soon joined the intellectual and cultural circles, especially those forming around museums and collectors.⁹⁷ Pulszky seemed to be of the same opinion according to his lecture of 1852 in London, dealing with the optimal arrangement of museological items: "*In the Glyptothek of Munich and the Museum of Berlin collections were conceived on the basis of a general, not a comprehensive plan; by preference of architectural effects and on account of demonstrating royal majesty, completion by plaster cast of the missing parts of monumental art history had been refused, although this was the only way for these museums to become an art school and form authentic historical archives...*

... Among all civilized people, museums should be able to give a perfect picture of art history. All art treasure, which has been forged by the artistic flair of past centuries should be ranged into collections... When establishing such a national institution, it is not the rarity of the artefact that prevails, but the completeness of the collection; it should be provided for that no work of art is missing from it if it is representative of a given artistic period of a given people; where you cannot acquire the missing part out of marble or copper, plaster casts ought to be used instead. By visiting a museum hall, you would then be able to cover 30 centuries of civilization, each century being represented by some artwork, in commemoration of a civilizational milestone beset by the path of human progress, showing us all stations of its glory and fall."⁹⁸

87 Marriott 1868, 232, 237. (Frontispice; Pl. XXIII; Pl. XXIV).

88 Labarte 1864, 6, 11, 28, 43, 63, 73, 88, 201–202, 215.

89 The fictile ivory collection of the museum is guarded in seven locked window cases at Cast Courts. I would like to thank museum curator Glyn Davies for unlocking the cases and thus providing me great assistance in my research work in London.

90 E.g. the collection of ca. 800 items of Powerhouse Museum (Sydney, Australia) acquired in the 1880s (<http://www.powerhousemuseum.com/collection/database>); Wolverhampton Art Gallery (http://blackcountryhistory.org/collections/search/?q=fictile+ivory&cb_submit=Search); Dublin, National Museum of Ireland, Universität Wien, etc.

91 Szilágyi 1988; Szilágyi 1997; Szilágyi 2006.

92 Szilágyi 1988, 31, 35, 37.

93 Szilágyi – Szentesi 2005; Szentesi 2010.

94 Henszlmann 1846.

95 The draft of the catalogue can be found at the Department of Mns. of Országos Széchényi Könyvtár in Budapest. (Fol. Germ. 1273 – ivory items: 39r–45v). Marosi 1997, 52.; Szentesi 2002; Ernő Marosi: *A Fejérváry-Pulszky gyűjtemény késő antik elefántosont tárgyai és helyük koruk művészetében* [The late antique ivory objects of the Fejérváry–Pulszky collection and their place in the art of their period] Pronounced at: The Fejérváry–Pulszky Collection and the Liber Antiquitatis. Workshop, 10–11 February, 2005, Collegium Budapest; Szilágyi – Szentesi 2005.

96 Csorba 1997; Kabdebó 1997.

97 "*Officials of the [British] museum called once to ask me to give a public reading at the Royal London Institution, and tauntingly I replied I'd hold a lecture on the deficiencies of arrangement and management at the British Museum. They were match to my words so I ended up talking about many a circumstances, which the officials knew well about and blamed the elected management for. The reading proved successful. In retort Mr. Oldfield duly underlined those features of the British Museum, which justify its supremacy over all the other European museums, but intentionally failed to answer to my findings; these discussions of ours saw no print afterwards.*" Pulszky 1958, 31. Cf. Riedl 1900; Wilson 2006; Wilson 2010; Williamson 2010, 14.

98 Magyar Múzeumok (2) 1996, 1. 28. In 1869, as soon as Pulszky became director of the National

Fejérváry died at the end of November 1851. After a few months following the death of his uncle, Pulszky found a way to bring the collection he had inherited from him to England.⁹⁹ He organized an exhibition out of the items of the Fejérváry collection between 23 May and 9 July at the locations of the Archaeological Institute of London, the catalogue of which was compiled by Imre Henszlmann staying at the time in London.¹⁰⁰ The catalogue listed the total collection on exhibit, including the valuable ivory collection¹⁰¹, which Henszlmann – and the foreign press with him – considered the biggest of all, in line only with the collection of the Library of Paris.¹⁰² As a good example of “reproductive continuum”, the exhibition aligned original art work and reproductions: “*Cast of a Consular Diptychon in the treasure of the Cathedral of Halberstadt in Germany*” – according to the catalogue.¹⁰³

The ivory carvings exhibited in 1853 in London, provided experts with the opportunity of comparing the transition period between roman and medieval arts but – as Pulszky writes in his memoirs – their research was invariably hindered by “the quasi impossibility of reproduction, for previously no private, nor public collector would allow for ivory reliefs to be reproduced in plaster for fear that this process by wetting the originals may damage them. However I conceded the request of Mr. Nesbitt, and let him cast my ivory antiques in gelatin, then have them electrotyped by Franchi, formatore of South-Kensington Museum,¹⁰⁴ on condition that if this reproduction method is extended

and an exchange program between the collectors starts I should have a right of option in acquiring the exchange copies first. I finally managed especially after the French museum was so quick to approve of the casting and exchange programs. Thus came to life the plaster cast collection originally been made for the members of Arundel-society, and at the exhibition of which I made a speech too...”¹⁰⁵

Partly for family reasons, partly for his change of interest in collection trends,¹⁰⁶ Pulszky sold some parts of his collection during his stay in England. The most valuable part of this collection, the set of ivory carvings,¹⁰⁷ was first proposed for sale for the British Museum but on account of a recent acquisition of the same nature, representatives of the museum turned down Pulszky’s offer. In 1855 the ivory antiques ended up in the hands of Liverpool based merchant and jeweler Joseph Mayer, who in 1867 and in the course of the subsequent years donated them to the city museum of Liverpool founded in 1851.¹⁰⁸ Upon Mayer’s request Pulszky made a catalogue for his ivory carving collection, referring himself to the work of Edmund Oldfield mentioned earlier. “Still, we shall try to group them [i.e. the byzantine carvings] in some rather extensive classes, thus, for instance, as Mr Oldfield did, in his excellent catalogue of the casts of the Arundel Society.”¹⁰⁹

Pulszky’s activity and the Fejérváry collection soon became an integrate part of the West European scientific life. In London in his lecture on drinking horns Matthew Digby Wyatt said: “They have been supposed by M. Pulszky, and other authorities, to have been executed in some of the Portuguese settlements, either in Africa or the East. The most important specimens of this class are to be found in the Fejérváry, the Kircherian, the Florentine, and the Newcastle-on-Tyne collections.”¹¹⁰ Speaking of Pulszky’s collection Wyatt ranks it among the richest collections of ivory carvings.¹¹¹ In the reproduc-

Museum of Budapest, he started to prepare a collection he meant to be of European quality and to consist of reproductions of antique statues. Szentesi 2006; Szentesi 2006/2; Andó – Szentesi 2009.

99 Szilágyi 1997, 28; Pulszky 1958, 31.

100 Henszlmann 1853. “The antique collection of my belated uncle has arrived in London. I had known its artistic and archeological value well and I wanted to show it to the English public since I was very proud of it and I knew how high it would rank among the other private collections. Fejérváry had had all his famous objects drawn, so I handed the drawings to the secretary of the archeological institute in Rome, Braun Emilio, who, on the basis of these drawings, made a full introduction to the collection through various issues of the *Bullettino del istituto. The archeological society in London, whom I had previously contacted, was only too pleased to let me exhibit my collection in public, using their locations and cabinets. Henszlmann, who was in London at that time wrote a catalogue to it. The collection consisted of several parts, some of it a selection of Egyptian treasury from the collection of baron Stürmer... a collection of ivory reliefs, which gives a fairly good representation of the reliefs’ history, starting from the consular diptychs and the Byzantine or Carolingian carvings up to the 16th century;... By means of this exhibition I managed to get to know the most famous collectors in London...*” Pulszky 1958, 134–135.

101 Henszlmann 1853, 38–41.

102 Gibson 1994, XX. Cf. Westwood 1876, IX–X.

103 Henszlmann 1853, no. 659. Cf. *Cat.* 13.

104 In his letter of 9 September 1854, J. O. Westwood asks permission for reproduction of two pieces of ivory carvings belonging to Pulszky’s collection. Országos Széchényi Könyvtár, Dept. of Mms.

Fond VIII/1158. Quoted by: Gibson 1994, 116. (Note 9).

105 Pulszky 1958, 135.

106 *Ibid.*, 136.

107 Szilágyi 1997, 29. “He had a rather hard time to bid farewell to his invaluable ivory collection, whose loss is one of the most severe ones ever incurred by the public collections of Hungary.” Szilágyi 1988, 37.

108 Gibson 1994, XX–XXI; Rufus-Ward 2013. “...the collection is now exhibited in the museum of Liverpool in the company of several prehistorical bronze objects from Hungary...” Pulszky 1958, 136. Cf. Gatty 1883; Gatty 1883/2.

109 Pulszky 1856, 30. “This lengthy introductory study (*General Remarks on Antique Ivory Carvings*) was considered as a pioneering work in its time and today it is still worth reading.” Szilágyi 1997, 29.

110 Wyatt – Oldfield 1856, 11.

111 *Ibid.*, 15. Wyatt in his lecture of 1855 made a detailed description of a retable – found in the collection of Joseph Daniel Böhm, Pulszky’s former mentor and friend on behalf of his father, as well as director of the imperial numismatic collection in Vienna – which David Falcke had bought from him. *Ibid.*, 14–15. The art work, which has been kept in the British Museum after the

tion catalogue of Arundel Society, Oldfield lists ten items out of Pulszky's collection, stressing two of its best known items, the Asklépios-Hygieia diptych (*Cat. 1*) and the Venatio-panel¹¹² (*Cat. 9*). The collection of Fejérváry, the most significant pieces of the collection and Pulszky's catalogue are also mentioned in Jules Laberte's monumental work about the history of Medieval and Renaissance art.¹¹³

Writing on the ancient and medieval ivory carvings of South Kensington Museum, expert of the middle-ages and collector William Maskell makes several mention of Pulszky's approach. Describing the so-called Stilicho-diptych of the cathedral of Monza, (*Cat. 11*) he criticizes him for dating it back to age of Valentinianus III: "So attributed by Mr. Pulszky: but Mr. Oldfield, a much better authority, suggests that it may be given to Valentinian II., in which case the date would be about A.D. 380. The earlier date is supported by the great beauty and admirable execution of the diptych."¹¹⁴

In contemporary literature on the history of ivory carvings the items of the Fejérváry-Pulszky collection and Pulszky's catalogue of 1856 regularly appear.¹¹⁵ In the introduction of his fundamental publication, Adolf Goldschmidt underlines that although in his work published in the middle of the 18th century and entitled *Thesaurus veterum diptychorum...*, Anton, Francesco Gori drew public attention on this sector, systematic collection started only in the 19th century when in 1853 in London the Fejérváry collection, which is so rich in ivory carvings, was brought before the public.

museum acquired it in 1858 (Inv. N.: OA.1343. Cf. Dalton 1909, no. 390, Pl. XCII.; Pieper 1964; Haussherr – Väterlein 1977, no. 432.) is estimated by recent research study to date back to the late 18th century Germany: Jones 1990, no. 2.

112 Wyatt – Oldfield 1856, 4. Cf. Gibson 1994, nos. 5–6 and 7. On the Venatio-panel Cf. Kádár – Tóth 2000, 86.

113 Labarte 1864, 7, 11, 24, 27–28, 190–193, 199, 201–204, 291.

114 Maskell 1872, XXIX. Made in ca. 395, the diptych represents high rank Roman military officer Flavius Stilicho (Stilico), his wife Serena and his son Eucherius under the reign of Valentinianus II (375–392). Oldfield in his catalogue relates Pulszky's opinion: "The standing figures of the Lady and the Boy have been explained by Mr. Pulszky with much probability as representing the Regent Galla Placidia, and her son Valentinian III." Wyatt – Oldfield 1856, 4. Pulszky writes in his memoir that during his lecture at the exhibition of Arundel society "I pointed out that the figures of the diptych of Monza refer to Valentinia and his mother on the one hand, and on the other, to Theodosius." Pulszky 1958, 135. Pulszky's view on certain pieces are quoted by Maskell in another publication: Maskell 1876, 27, 31, 33, 34. etc.

115 Molinier 1896, 2, 13, 51, 81. etc.; Dalton 1909, XV, XLIX., 32, 126; Delbrueck 1929, XVIII. "In der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jh.s kam die Forschung nicht wesentlich weiter, obwohl das Niveau sich hob; charakteristisch für diese Zeit ist das Kluge Buch Pulszkys (1856). Ein neuer Anstoß erfolgte durch die Sammlung von Photographien und Abgüssen, welche die Arundel-Society in den fünfziger Jahren unternahm; auf ihr beruht in der Hauptsache Westwoods reicher Katalog (1876)." 2.; Goldschmidt 1934, Bibliography, n. pag.; Vollbach 1952, 13; Gibson 1994, XVIII–XX. etc.

Apart from the efforts made by Westwood, Nesbitt, Franks, Wyatt and the Arundel Society, he makes mention of Pulszky's catalogue of 1856, as well as the publications of William Maskell and Westwood, which established the grounds for further comparative research in the sector.¹¹⁶

THE PHOTOGRAPHIC SERIES OF JOHN BRAMPTON PHILPOT

From 1859 Ferenc Pulszky stayed in Turin,¹¹⁷ then in 1863 settled in Florence, where he kept a rather popular literary saloon in a rented mansion called villa Petrovich Sulla Costa situated over Via Bardi. As part of the celebrations all over Italy on the occasion of the 600th anniversary of Dante's birth, he gave a party in his saloon and made a speech on the dinner gala organized at Palazzo Serristori.¹¹⁸

In September 1866 Pulszky returned from immigration to Hungary and three years later occupied the position of director to the National Museum of Hungary (1869–1894). During the meeting of the archeological committee of the Hungarian Academy of Science in 1867 an announcement was made about a donation to the academy's library by committee member Ferenc Pulszky, of valuable books,¹¹⁹ as well as "a rather high number of photographs representing almost the complete collection of ivory carvings".¹²⁰ Three years later the collection of photographs was transferred to the library of the Hungarian National Museum. Ferenc Pulszky "gave a stunning gift to the museum library by offering a series of 272 photographic pages depicting ivory carvings for the intention of the museum. Hardly do we need to stress the progress in antique studies triggered by such collections, and thus the value of this gift shall speak for itself".¹²¹

116 Goldschmidt 1914, 1, 100.

117 Pulszky 1958, 370.

118 Ibid., 378–379. Cf. Király 1997, 101.

119 See Department of Manuscripts of the Library and Information Centre of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. RAL 1093/1866, RAL 61/1867; RAL 214/1867.

120 "Archaeologiai Közlemények" 1868 (VII) (new vol. V) 83.; "A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Értesítője" 1868 (II) 162–163.

121 "Archaeologiai Értesítő" 1870 (IV) 263. "On account of the rather modest proportions of his apartment in Budapest, he donated his books to the Academy, including archeological books, and the *Liber Antiquitatis* (although these were later transferred to the National Museum under his direction, and are

In Ferenc Pulszky's Memoirs we can find a great number of references to his views on photographing art work. Formerly kept in folders, the drawings of Raffaello and Michelangelo were exhibited on the corridor connecting the palaces of Uffizi and Pitti in Florence. These handmade drawings "...had formerly been guarded in a stricter fashion than the engravings, so that when I first visited Florence back in 1833, I had to apply for a permission at the embassy for the guard of the picture gallery to show me the drawings of Rafael and Michelangelo, which were kept in a handy cabinet secured by a double lock. Beforehands hardly had there been five or six persons a year to see these art treasures, which by now, multiplied by means of photography and in public distribution, have become a piece of indispensable data in art history and have given the opportunity for every one dealing with renaissance culture to make their own personal judgement directly upon encountering the expression of great artists and the various stations of their creations."¹²² Photos can also provide great assistance in differentiating the originals and the copies made of these drawings. "In case of hand-made drawings such an identification between originals and copies had been almost impossible until photography came to multiply the original items kept in various collections and this way made it possible for them to be directly compared."¹²³ During the period before the rise of photography, Frankfurt based art collector Johann David Passavant traveled around European museums and made an inventory of Raffaello's works. "His book came out in a time when hand-made drawings had not yet been multiplied by photography or photoprinting, and especially when private owners used to think that multiplication by photography would deprive their art treasures of the privilege to be visited on any location or permission other than those approved of by themselves. Therefore a scrutinized comparison would have been impossible back then, and even public collections proved reluctant to have their hand-made drawings photographed, until Prince Albert, the husband of the Queen of England, made an exemplary action in this subject matter."¹²⁴ Being a fervent art collector, Albert decided to gather all the available reproductions of works of Raffaello, Michelangelo and Leonardo. On account of the vast proportion of work his enterprise required from him, he ended up concentrating exclusively on Raffaello. "Upon his request, kings and public institutions started to get all the Raffaello drawings in their possession photographed, and

kept in the Archeological Library)." Szilágyi 1988, 38. On Ferenc Pulszky's private collection sold in 1868 abroad cf.: Szilágyi 1997, 30. The photography collection at the moment (as mentioned earlier) consists of 265 pieces, the whereabouts of 7 photographs are currently unknown.

122 Pulszky 1958, 411.

123 Ibid., 413.

124 Ibid., 413.

gradually private collectors came to follow their examples..."¹²⁵ and thus a collection of tremendous volumes was compiled, complete with an inventory undertaken by Carl Ruland, the prince's librarian, after Albert had died.¹²⁶

Besides plaster casts, Pulszky paid a minute attention – both in his writings and his actual management of the museum – to photographing art treasures.¹²⁷ We can get a fairly good picture of his views on it by consulting his writings on museums published in 1875.¹²⁸ Apart from listing the most famous series of art photography, he stresses that fact that exhibiting these photographs in museums or letting the public visit them in libraries is still almost impossible anywhere. Notwithstanding the aforementioned, the British had by then discovered that photography was the most effective way of promoting arts and influencing public taste. "Management of the British Museum have already undertaken the photographic reproduction of their most valuable art treasures, in view of science, on the one hand, and on the other, for the intention of educational institutions." Among our duties on a local scale, he underlines the importance of reproducing the monuments of our national patrimony, either by means of plaster casts or photography, and creating a "photographic image collection" by gathering these reproductions into a collection at the Hungarian National Museum.¹²⁹ This program of his had been partially realized when in the 1870's at the National Museum under his direction, the photographic reproduction of art treasures started.¹³⁰

As it turns out from his memoirs, Pulszky knew Philpot quite well: "...Spurred on by prince Albert's collection, photo reproductions have become rather popular and an indispensable tool for studying art history. Management of the gallery of Florence have proved most liberal in this matter and provided photographers easy access to reproduce all the hand-made drawings in their possession. British photographer Philpot chose to shoot

125 Ibid., 414.

126 Ruland 1876. Cf. Montagu 1986; Montagu 1995.

127 Marosi 2006. Cf. Farkas – Papp 2007, 107–117; Papp 2009.

128 In his autobiographical writings he lays an emphasis on the role of museums in shaping public culture: "...art treasure, as the noblest artefact of human genius, is to be considered as such a heritage, which is not the sole propriety of its owner, but the foundation of public culture and a moral property belonging to all future generations. This approach has only recently become prevalent, it is our century that was the first to witness picture collections no more as luxurious products but as tools for shaping public culture, and to see measures taken to make them available for the pleasure of an open public." Pulszky 1958, 405–406. Pulszky also took part in 1873 at the first congress of art historians in Vienna dealing, as mentioned earlier, with the question of art reproduction. Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte. Band XXXVI. 1983. Wien – Köln – Graz. 22.

129 "Vasárnapi Ujság" 1875. no. 30 and 31; "Budapesti Szemle" 1875. 242–257; Pulszky 1914, 218–240. Cf. Marosi 1997, 55; Sinkó 2012, 293.

130 Farkas – Papp 2007, 107–114.

over a thousand of them, but preferred at the beginning the taste of his clients or tourists to the requirements of art history; later on I befriended him and, upon my encouragement, he indeed started to photograph everything that was of real interest.”¹³¹ Searching in the discarded boxes of the collection, Pulszky found an old woman’s head, which was identical to the one crayoned by Michelangelo and admired by visitors to the gallery, but it looked too mangled and damaged to be put on display. “On my request Philpot made a photographic reproduction of it and since then it has made its way into the patrimony of manuscript collections.”¹³²

JOHN BRAMPTON PHILPOT AND ARTWORK PHOTOGRAPHY

Considered as the pioneer of photography and an amateur of calotypes, John Brampton Philpot is primarily known to be a photographer of landscapes and architectural monuments. Among other places, his photographs of churches and buildings from Tuscany can be found in the Gabinetto Fotografico della Soprintendenza del Polo Museale Fiorentino (Gabinetto Fotografico Uffizi) and the Museo Nazionale Alinari della Fotografia, as well as in the Gabinetto Fotografico Nazionale di Roma.¹³³ On some of the 28 very rare and valuable, large negative calotypes kept in the photography collection of the Uffizi the signal J. B. Philpot is written with ink. One picture (42×29 cm large) depicts a firework near the Ponte alle Carraia. The photographs of Philpot which were kept in the so-called Becchetti collection (Collezione Becchetti)¹³⁴ of the Gabinetto Fotografico Nazionale (GFN), the photography collection of the Istituto Centrale per il Catalogo e la Documentazione (ICCD) in Rome include landscapes of Florence, Pisa and Siena, stereo pictures of genre art (dyers at the Ponte Vecchio), a portrait of a man, a painting of Murillo and a photograph of a marble re-

131 Pulszky 1858, 414–415.

132 Ibid., 415.

133 According to the website of the Censimento dei Fondi fotografici Toscani there are Philpot photographs in the following Italian collections as well: Istituto Statale d’Arte Duccio di Buoninsegna, Siena; Archivio Fotografico Toscano, Prato; Archivio di Stato di Arezzo, Arezzo. Cf. <http://censi.aft.it/>.

134 Fanelli; Tamassia 2004, 66–67.

lief. On the back of the visiting card-sized albumen photograph from the collection of the GFN Antonio Niego (Naples), which depicts the Palazzo Ricardi in Florence, the address of the photographer’s workshop is Lung’Arno Acciajoli Nr. 20.

However, Philpot regularly dealt with photographing artworks. In December 1856 he participated in the exhibition of the Photographic Society of Scotland in Edinburgh with two landscapes depicting Florence, and a series of calotypes made of the Ghiberti gate of the Battistero and the side gate of the dome.¹³⁵ Apart from his landscapes of Pisa, a number of his photographic art reproductions can be found in the collection of the Rijksmuseum of Amsterdam, some of them representing the works of Leonardo da Vinci, Rubens, Claude Lorrain, Tiziano and Parmigianino.¹³⁶

Among the works of other photographers from Tuscany, the images made by Philpot were also put on display in class 10 (chemistry) section 5 (photography) (Classe X. Chimica, Sezione V. Fotografia) of the Esposizione Nazionale di Prodotti Agricoli e Industriali e di Belle Arti, that is, the first national expo in Italy held in 1861 in Florence.¹³⁷ Although the catalogues of the exhibition fail to indicate the titles and other features of the photographs on exhibit, there is a photoimage on the internet made by Philpot, on the verso of which a manuscript writing (Firenze, Esposizione Italiana 1861 – La Maddalena – Santarelli scolpi) claims that his photograph depicting the Penitent Magdalene by sculptor Emilio Santarelli was indeed exhibited.¹³⁸

We can find an album entitled *Le XXVIII statue di illustri toscani scolpite da XXIV toscani artisti e inaugurate nel portico degli Uffizi dalla deputazione fiorentina negli anni 1842–1856. Fotografie di M. J. B. Philpot*, which contains reproductions made of the statues of famous artists from Tuscany decorating the peristyle of the Piazzale degli Uffizi.¹³⁹

135 No. 748. View of Florence, Waxed paper; No. 764. Florence, Waxed paper; No. 789. Ghiberti’s Gates, Florence, Albumen; No. 790. Side Door, Florence Cathedral, Albumen. <http://peib.dmu.ac.uk/index.php>.

136 <https://www.rijksmuseum.nl/en/search?v=&s=&q=philpot>.

137 In the catalogue his family name was indicated by mistake as his first name. “2722. BRAMPTON-PHILPOL [sic] Giovanni, Firenze. – Fotografie.” In: Esposizione 1861, 130; “4821. BRAMPTON PHILPOT, Giovanni, Firenze – Fotografie.” In: Esposizione 1862, 201. Photography is most likely to have qualified in the chemistry section of the expo because at the early stage of development of this new reproduction technique of fixing and developing images, many chemists experimented with it.

138 [http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Philpot,_John_Brampton_\(1812-1878\)_-_Firenze_Esposizione_Italiana_1861_-_La_Maddalena_-_Santarelli_scolp%C3%AC_.jpg](http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Philpot,_John_Brampton_(1812-1878)_-_Firenze_Esposizione_Italiana_1861_-_La_Maddalena_-_Santarelli_scolp%C3%AC_.jpg).

139 Tamassia 2002, 9.

As we learn from Pulszky's writings, Philpot made a good deal of photography of the drawings at Uffizi, which he offered later on for sale in various commercial catalogues.¹⁴⁰ More than 20 items from this series are kept in the photo collection of the Kunsthistorisches Institut in Florence – Max Planck Institute, which, according to the inventory books starting from 1898, was in possession of a lot more Philpot photographs, since in the first book alone the photographer's name appears in 35 items. Recent research identified with the help of Philpot's catalogue pictures which didn't have the name of the photographer in the inventory books. Around 1925 quite a lot of Philpot's photographs – as shown by the seal (Als Doublette ausgeschieden) next to the item – were taken from the collection as a duplicate. The hundreds of photographs of the drawings in the Uffizi which are also part of the Philpot series can be found in the photography collection of the Bibliotheca Hertziana in Rome. Incidentally, the Alinari brothers (Fratelli Alinari), the famous photographers in Florence had already been making photographs of the drawings in the Uffizi in 1857. In 1858 they had been commissioned by Prince Albert, the husband of the Queen of England, to photograph Raphael's drawings both in the collection of the Accademia in Venice and the private collection of Archduke Karl Ludwig of Austria in Vienna. In 1859 the Alinari brothers had already been selling their series consisting of 310 photographs for the price of 1000 lire, titled *Disegni di Raffaello e d'altri maestri esistenti nelle gallerie di Firenze Venezia e Vienna riprodotti in fotografia dai Fratelli Alinari e pubblicati da L. Bardi in Firenze*.

According to the directory of the library of the Drawing School in Budapest, (made in the 19th century) the institution bought a photo series made by Philpot and his photographer business partner Jackson which consisted of 477 photographs of drawings of Italian artists of old.¹⁴¹ In the library of the successor of the institution, the Hungarian University of Fine Arts, at the moment there are more than 600 Philpot photographs depicting old drawings. Nine folders contain only Philpot photographs and three other folders include them and other photographs as well. On the albumen photographs with the dry stamp with the inscription *Philpot & Jackson Firenze Borgo Ognissanti 17* not only the letter P and the negative number of the photograph can be seen but also the name of the artist of the drawing or the word Ignoto (unknown). On some photographs only Philpot's seal can be seen. The photographs can be easily identified with the catalogue published later by Philpot & Jackson in

140 Philpot 1865.

141 A M. Kir. Országos Mintarajztanoda és Rajztanárképezde könyvtárának Czimjegyzéke. [The Directory of the Library of the Hungarian Royal National Drawing School and Art Teachers' College.] Budapest, 1883. 66–72.

1870, which included the name of the artists and the subject of the pictures as well as their negative numbers and was 86 pages long.¹⁴²

THE PHOTOGRAPHS OF FICTILE IVORIES

For the purpose of identifying the series of photographs kept in the National Museum of Hungary we can have recourse to an undated catalogue published by Philpot & Jackson Company, the title of which – *Catalogue de Photographies des Sculptures en Ivoire pour illustrer l'histoire de l'art depuis le II jusqu'au le XVI Siècle. Collection unique Philpot & Jackson 17 Borgo Ognissanti 17 Florence* – suggests a content of listed photographs depicting ivory carvings.

Made up of ten pages, the unillustrated catalogue contains the data of 172 photographic items. Based on the objects represented in the photographs, the editor of the catalogue used seven categories for classification: 1. diptychs of mythological themes; 2. consular diptychs; 3. biblical representations from the 4th–8th centuries; 4. barbarian ivory carvings from the 10th–11th centuries; 5. byzantine ivory carvings; 6. ivory carvings of the Italian and German schools from the 13th–14th centuries; 7. mirror cases from the 14th–15th centuries. Under some of the categories we can find “sub-categories”, the third one, for instance, includes photographs made of the statues of the 8th century ivory cases located in the Cathedral of Sens, the wood carvings bearing an influence from the 8th century and the ivory carvings of the Carolingian period. This type of detailed classification suggests that the editor of the book was an expert of the topic: in my view the extent of Philpot's or his fellow photographer Jackson's knowledge, regarding the history of ivory carvings, is unlikely to have been vast enough to classify these art treasures. The item numbers of the catalogue range from 2621 to 2794, thus the photographic series, with the exception of two images, would be included in the catalogue of the 172 items. (The number 2791 and 2792 are missing from the catalogue) Succession of the listed items irrespective of the numerical order suggests that their thematic classification was retrospective.

142 Philpot 1870. Cf. Philpot 1865.

As far as a Hungarian contemporary, art historian Béla Czobor knew the photographs had been commissioned by Pulszky: describing a motive in an ivory carving Czobor wrote “it is not as distinctly perceivable as in the photographic reproduction ordered by Ferencz Pulszky in Florence, and donated by him, together with the complete series of photographs depicting ivory carvings, to the Hungarian National Museum”.¹⁴³ Supposing that Pulszky had actually encouraged Philpot to produce these series, he is still unlikely to have been the author of the catalogue, and not only because he fails to mention it in his memoirs, but also because on several occasions the editor of the catalogue, when providing the location of the original item, indicated erroneously the Fejérváry collection, as in the case of item “2705. Une Dame et un Monsieur jouant aux dames, La chasse au Faucon. Collection Fejervary”.¹⁴⁴ (Cat. 144), i.e., a reproduction made of a 14th century mirror case depicting a couple playing chess, which came into the collection of the Louvre in 1856 from the Alexandre-Charles Sauvageot collection of Paris.¹⁴⁵ In 1836 the Louvre purchased the triptych of the *Vièrge ouvrant* from the Louis Gaspary collection, while Philpot’s catalogue states it actually comes from the Fejérváry collection: “2766. Un Triptyque, au milieu, l’Eternel, Christ sur la Croix et l’Enterrement, à gauche Christ devant Pilate, Christ portant la Croix et la Flagellation, à droit l’Annonciation, les femmes au tombeau. Noli me tangere, en bas les quatre Évangélistes. Collection Fejervary”.¹⁴⁶ (Cat. 141).

There is another error, but this time the other way round, which seems to undermine Pulszky’s authorship. Concerning the 4 ivory carvings of a 5th century case kept in the British Museum,¹⁴⁷ we can read the following:

“2647. La Résurrection et l’incrédulité de S. Thomas, VI.^m siècle. Cathedral de Milan.

2646. Christ devant Pilate, Christ portant la Croix, le Crucifement et le suicide de Judas, VI.^m siècle. Cathedrale de Milan.”¹⁴⁸

Since these four items (Cat. 38, Cat. 39) came into the possession of William Maskell from the Fejérváry collection, and were sold to the British Museum in 1856, Pulszky is unlikely to have written that these art treasures were located in the cathedral of Milan. However, the editor of the catalogue did not

ignore the fact that the ivory carvings of the Fejérváry-Pulszky collection had come to Liverpool: “Collection Fejervary à présent à Liverpool”¹⁴⁹ – according to the description of a photography representing a reproduction of the Aesculapius-Hygieia diptych.

Besides the above examples, we can find several mistakes concerning the location of the original art treasures listed in the catalogue. The editor suggests that many items are kept in the royal museum of the Hague, while none of these items can be found in this collection. Writing of the British Museum’s ivory case with runic inscriptions (Franks Casket, Auzon Casket), Philpot’s catalogue says: “2742. Morceau d’un Coffre Scandinavien. Musée Royal de Copenhague.”¹⁵⁰ (Cat. 79), but the item had actually been purchased in an antique shop in 1857 by Augustus Wollaston Franks, then donated by him in 1867 to the British Museum. The catalogue makes no mention of the collection on exhibit, of the conditions of its photo reproduction, nor of the authorship of the catalogue itself, indicating simply the name of the publisher, *Florence, Etablissement de J. Pellas*, on the last page.

Regarding the way they are structured and in view of the items represented, there are a lot of similarities between Philpot’s catalogue and the work published in 1856 by Wyatt and Oldfield, so the editor of Philpot’s catalogue is most likely to have known this work. There are many names – belonging to private owners or collections in possession of the originals of the reproductions – that are listed in both writings, but we can find some discrepancies, as well: the collection of the library of Brescia figures in Philpot’s catalogue, but is missing from Wyatt & co.’s. This latter lists a lot less of the former Fejérváry collection than Philpot’s catalogue, which means that Philpot’s editor included additional data concerning the former collection’s photo reproductions from after 1856.¹⁵¹

Even if the title of the catalogue suggests that the photos should represent ivory carvings made between the 2nd and the 16th centuries, it is certain that the photographs could not depict the original art treasures but only their plaster cast reproductions. Apart from the texture of the items represented, there are several added parts which make it obvious for the beholder. It seems improbable that Philpot had toured all the European private and public collections, in which the

143 “Egyházművészeti Lap” (1) 1880, 75.

144 Philpot cat., 9.

145 Paris, Musée du Louvre, inv. n.: OA 117.

146 Philpot cat., 9. Paris, Musée du Louvre, inv. n.: LP 1143.

147 Dalton 1909, item 7.

148 Philpot cat., 3.

149 Philpot cat., 1.

150 Philpot cat., 6.

151 To the similarity between the catalogue of Philpot and Pulszky 1856 see Cecilia Olovsson’s study in this book.

reproduced ivory carvings were kept according to the catalogue, and the unified manner of their installation also appears to support the assumption that these items had been photographed at the same place. Almost all of them were placed into a crevice covered with a velvet lining. In some cases, the items were fastened by wires or tiny nails to the crevice in the background. (*Cat. 93, Cat. 78, Cat. 99*). Our modern approaches and reflexes focused on the protection of art treasures would convince us that the items thus photographed could only be reproductions of the originals, for today no private or public collector would allow for its original ivory carvings to be fastened in such an indecent fashion, yet we can find a great deal of similar examples in the museological practices of those days. Displaying the proportions of the depicted art treasures, and added most likely for the sake of the photographic session, the scales we find on top a photograph made by György Klösz of the Hungarian National Museum's original ivory carving collection in 1870, show this valuable medieval artwork fastened by tiny nails to a cardboard sheet¹⁵² (Fig. 28).

The question of the unified manner of installation in case of Philpot's photographs can be answered in two possible ways: either the reproduced items were placed in a crevice for the sake of the photographic session only, or they were photographed in a temporary or permanent exhibition, where they had been put on display in an opening on the wall. The fact that one of the reproductions (*Cat. 95*) is balanced with a broken stick, which seems to be providing a provisory solution, supports the idea that the items were arranged in preparation of a photographic session, rather than in view of a public exhibition. I have no information about the items of which Philpot made his photo reproductions.¹⁵³ It is possible that the photographs were made of Pulszky's fictile ivories, but they may as well have been taken of another private or public collection of fictile ivory in Florence. On the photograph *Cat. 154* two copies made of the same reproduction can be seen – it is possible that in the photographed collection there were two or more copies made of other reproductions as well.

A part of the large format items in the photocollection of the Hungarian National Museum bear an identification number which corresponds to the one – indicating, as we can read in the footnote of the first item, the number of

the negative (“*Le numère [sic!] marginal indique le numère [sic!] de la négative.*”) – listed in Philpot's catalogue.¹⁵⁴ (The numbers were written on the photographs later, except for the photograph (*Cat. 169*) which depicts the reproduction of the flabellum in the Bargello in Florence, in this case the number 2681 is etched onto the negative.)

An almost complete series of Philpot's photographs is found in the collection of the Museo Nazionale del Bargello in Florence, and some of the other photographs of the series are kept in other collections in Italy.¹⁵⁵ On the 169 photographs in Florence which were glued later onto the cardboard the black frame is broader than on the photographs in Budapest, which means that in the latter series the photographs were cropped and glued onto cardboards marked with Philpot's dry stamp. Comparing the photographs in the Bargello and the large photographs in Budapest reinforced the theory that the latter too depict artworks that appear in the Philpot catalogue even though the negative number of the photographs isn't visible on every picture. In front of some of the numbers visible in the photographs, we can see a capital P – referring most likely to the initial of the photographer – the same way as on the sheets of the Philpot series kept in the Courtauld Institute of London, whose numbering – just like that of the series kept in Budapest – corresponds to the items listed in the catalogue, i.e., to the number of the negatives in the photo series.¹⁵⁶

Philpot also indicated the number of the negatives in his new catalogue containing the photo series he had made of the Uffizi drawings.¹⁵⁷ This publication of 85 pages provides in alphabetical order the names of the artists and the titles of the artworks photographed. Philpot is most likely to have started the photo reproduction of the drawings by the works of Raffaello since we can find them on negatives no. 2–11, and later on, in several sequences, making up six pages altogether in the catalogue, and depicting 232 works of the master of

154 Philpot cat., 1. The negative numbers are missing from the following photographs in Budapest: 2621–2664; 2688–2695; 2697. We were unable to discover the reason for this.

155 For the detailed description of the photo series and its history see the paper written by Benedetta Chiesi in this book. Of the 20 Philpot photographs in the university in Bologna (La Biblioteca del Dipartimento di Storia Culture Civiltà) for example 13 photographs depict reproductions of ivory carvings. Cf. <http://sol.unibo.it/SebinaOpac/Opac?action=search&thAutEnteDesc=Philpot%2C+John+Brampton&startat=0>.

156 Philpot 1870. Cf. “*Le lastre sono attualmente conservate presso il Courtauld Institute di Londra e ciascuna lastra ha il contrassegno P, seguito dal numero del disegno descritto nel catalogo succitato.*” Tamassia 2002, 9.

157 Philpot 1870.

152 Farkas – Papp 2007, 113.

153 In her paper in this book Benedetta Chiesi attempts to identify the collection of reproductions photographed by Philpot.

Urbino.¹⁵⁸ Based on the numbers of the negatives found on the photographs of the Raffaello drawings, Philpot seems to have undertaken the reproduction of the fictile ivory collection roughly at the same time: in the photo catalogue containing the reproductions of the drawings, for example, numbers 2601–2620 indicate the drawings of Raffaello, while in the catalogue on the fictile ivory collection – as we saw – the numbers indicated range between 2621 and 2794. The closest item numbers referring to the Raffaello drawings are between 2796 and 2798 so the photo reproductions of fictile ivory must have been inserted between these numerals.¹⁵⁹

For the purpose of dating those photo reproductions which depict the fictile ivory collection of the Hungarian National Museum, we can rely on the fact that up until around 1865, Philpot pursued his activities in a workshop at 1187 Lungo l'Arno, and after 1865, at 17 Borgo Ognissanti.¹⁶⁰ In the large format images, which – as we could see – bear a higher order of numbers in the series, the address of Lungo l'Arno is indicated, while in the small format images bearing a lower order of numbers in the series, the address of the second workshop, i.e., Borgo Ognissanti is printed, just like in the catalogue. These series of photographs must have been taken before 1867 since this is the year when they came into the possession of a public collection in Hungary, most likely before 1866 that is, prior to Pulszky's return home from Italy, where he had probably taken the series from.

Still for the purpose of dating these photographs, indirect data are provided by the making dates of reproductions depicting the items of the former Fejérváry–Pulszky collection. Consulting the concordance chart derived from the 1876 Westwood publication of the collection's modern catalogue,¹⁶¹ we can learn when these items came into South Kensington Museum. With one exception,¹⁶² Philpot's series contain photos of all the reproductions formerly known as the Fejérváry–Pulszky collection – i.e., already in commercial distribution – and acquired by the museum between 1854 and 1858,¹⁶³ but there are no photos of

those items, which came into the possession of the museum in 1873 and which must have been made much earlier.¹⁶⁴ In the price lists of fictile ivories published in 1876 and in 1890,¹⁶⁵ we can find 38 items from the former Fejérváry–Pulszky collection, only 16 of which had been made before 1873, so Philpot's series cannot but contain photo reproductions made until 1858. However, in Westwood's catalogue we can find a few reproductions which were made after 1870 and the photographs made of these reproductions also appear in Philpot's series. This must mean that of certain carvings there were several reproductions available, made in different times.

One of Philpot's photographs depicts a reproduction of a Gothic mirror frame (*Cat 146*, right picture) which was exhibited in the world exposition of 1873 in Vienna and at the time belonged to Ferenc Pulszky.¹⁶⁶ The reproduction of the artwork was also published by Imre Henszlmann in his paper written in German about the exhibition's artworks and in his catalogue written in Hungarian (*Fig. 29*).¹⁶⁷ It is very likely that the artwork is the same as the mirror frame which can be found in Raymond Koechlin's catalogue published in 1924 and is listed as Number 1888 (*Fig. 30*), however, the ornaments on the frame (dragons) which in 1873 were damaged and partly missing were later repaired. The current whereabouts of the artwork is unknown, however, we know for sure that in the turn of the twentieth century it was in the collection of Paul Garnier. Since it wasn't part of the artworks sold to Mayer we can't rule out the possibility that Pulszky acquired it after the sale of the ivory carvings in 1855. Either way, what is certain is that its reproduction is part of the collection of which Philpot made the photographs in the 1860s.

Numbers indicated in the small format items of the Budapest collection range with a lot of gaps between 1393 and 1643, while those between 1560 and 1643 actually bear the initial of capital P. Then again, searching among the small format Philpot photographs kept in the Hungarian National Museum, we can find a number of items, which bear the same numbers as the photo re-

158 Negatives corresponding to his photographs made of Raffaello's drawings range between 2 and 3234, but the catalogue contains only 232 items depicting the artist's works.

159 Some of the Philpot photographs fail to contain the number of the negative, but based on the descriptions, we can still identify a part of them with the items listed in the catalogue.

160 Fanelli. Cf. Tamassia 2004, 66.

161 Gibson 1994.

162 *Ibid.*, no. 36. Westwood 1875, '55. 41. – thus the reproduction was made in 1855 or after.

163 *Ibid.*, nos. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 20, 40. The fact that the Museum in London did not acquire every reproduction in the same year as they were made suggests that there are three items which

came into its possession only in 1858, while these items had already been listed in the catalogue of Oldfield and published by Arundel Society in 1856. *Ibid.*, nos. 8, 10, 20. Out of the ten reproductions, there was only one missing from the collection of Arundel society. *Ibid.*, no. 14.

164 *Ibid.*, nos. 2, 18, 24, 25, 27, 28, 31, 35. According to Gibson not all the items of the collection were reproduced.

165 *Reproductions 1876, Reproductions 1890.*

166 "Mittheilungen der K.K. Central-Commission zur Erforschung und Erhaltung der Baudenkmale" (XIX) Wien, 1874. 238.

167 Henszlmann 1876, 173–174.

productions of the Uffizi drawings (1541–1542, 1551, 1554, 1560, 1566, etc.), thus the photographer must occasionally have used the same order of numbers for several series of negatives. As already mentioned, Philpot made the small photographs later than the large ones that appear in his printed catalogue. However, the installation was identical: on some of the small pictures it can be clearly seen that the objects were in the same hollow, padded with black linen or silk, as during the making of the earlier photographs (*Cat. 148*, *Cat. 219*). But in some cases the fastening of the objects is different than before: the same object is fastened with a nail in the large photograph (*Cat. 109*) but with a wire in the small photograph (*Cat. 176*). It's the same with the images *Cat. 111* (a large photograph) and *Cat. 174* (a small photograph). The installation and the fastening of the Gothic mirror frame seen in the right side of the large picture (*Cat. 146*) is the same as in the small picture depicting the same artwork (*Cat. 219*), however, the shadow of the nail is different, and on the large picture the artwork is much more three-dimensional than on the small photograph.

We can conclude from the fact that the arrangement of the artworks, the sharpness of the picture, the lighting setup that emphasizes the plasticity of the reproductions, etc. are much higher standard in the large photographs than in the small ones that the latter were only meant to be a sort of “preview” for the purpose of documentation and not high standard artwork photographs intended to be sold. The photographer sometimes cut off a little bit of the artwork in the small pictures, for example the sides or the bottom, to make the photographs fit the support cards which were the size of a visiting card, and some of the photographs have bad lighting setup and are blurry.

Though most of the small photographs in Budapest show artworks appearing in Philpot's catalogue, we can also find almost 30 pictures that are not part of the catalogue. One could draw the conclusion from this that Philpot perhaps not only made the two series in different times but he also used different collections. However, the fact that the artwork found on the upper part of the photograph Number 157 has the same crack on it as can be seen on the small photograph made of this reproduction (*Cat. 275*) is proof that Philpot most likely used the same reproduction collection for both series.

There are many doubles among the photographs, some of them representing the same item in large and small formats, others being small format blown-

ups of a detail found on a large format item.¹⁶⁸ The images represent approximately 200 items, the majority of which could be identified by reference to older and more recent studies dealing with ivory carvings. The bulk of these photoshoots depict the art treasures of the British Museum and the Victoria and Albert Museum (known until 1899 as South Kensington Museum) in London, the Louvre and the Bibliothèque National in Paris and the Bargello in Florence, but we can find reproductions of the artwork kept in the Vatican Museums, the Novara Cathedral, the Museum of Darmstadt, the treasury chamber of the dome of Halberstadt, the Museum and Library of Berlin, the castle museum of Milan, the treasury chamber of the dome of Sens, the city museum of Brescia, the Museum of Liverpool, the treasury chamber of the dome of Monza, the Cathedral of Salerno, the Museum of Lyon, the Bodleian Library of Oxford, the treasury chamber of the dome of Aachen, the Museum of Cluny in Paris, and the city library of Amiens etc.

The photo series donated by Ferenc Pulszky to the museum were well-known with Hungarian researchers. There is an article in *Egyházművészeti Lap* (Paper of Ecclesiastic Arts), written anonymously, but most presumably by editor-in-chief Béla Czobor,¹⁶⁹ which gives a detailed description of an ivory carving kept in the British Museum and representing the crucifixion and a suicidal Judas.¹⁷⁰ The author argues that in the illustration provided by courtesy of the *Archaeologiai Értesítő* the bag laid out by the feet of Judas is not as distinct as in the photo reproduction commissioned by Ferenc Pulszky in Florence and later donated to the Hungarian National Museum. Based on similar techniques applied for marble relief carvings, Czobor judges the art treasure to be of the 5th century. “*Dobbert was the first to draw the attention of men of expertise on the congress of archeological association of Berlin on 2 May 1876... in the course of which he presented the photo reproduction of the original artwork.*” In a footnote, the author of the Hungarian ecclesiastic periodical mentions that “*the photo was taken by Philpot-Jackson in Florence, and it can be found under number 2646 in the photo catalogue*”. As we have seen, this item actually figures in Philpot's catalogue under the group called *Troisième Série*. *Diptyques* et

168 In the series, some of the photos bear the same numbering, for example there are two of each small format photo no. 871/1–5, and the same holds for the large format photographs, with numbers N-871/46 and N-871/108 missing from the series.

169 N. N.: *A legrégebb fészületek* [The Oldest Crosses]. In: “*Egyházművészeti Lap*” (1) 1880, 70–77.

170 British Museum, London, ca. 420–430. Registration number: 1856,0623.7. Bought from William Maskell in 1856. Cf. *Cat. 38*.

Hegiothyrides aux Sujets Bibliques du quatrième siècle: “2646. *Christ devant Pilate, Christ portant la Croix, le Crucifiment et le suicide de Judas, VI.^{me} siècle. Cathédrale de Milan.*”¹⁷¹ We do not know where Czobor got the number of the photograph from since the Philpot image of the Hungarian National Museum depicting the same ivory carving bears no identification number, nor do we find any reference to it in the report of art historian Eduard Dobbert¹⁷² participating in the congress of the Berlin association: “*Darauf hielt Herr Dobbert einen Vortrag über das Verhältniss der altchristlichen Kunst zur Antike und namentlich über den Charakter der ersten Crucifixdarstellungen. Er legte ein Elfenbeinrelief mit der Kreuzigung Christi in photographischer Abbildung vor und suchte nachzuweisen, dass dasselbe älter sei, als die gewöhnlich für die älteste, auf uns gekommene Kreuzigungsdarstellung gehaltene Miniatur in der syrischen Evangelienhandschrift des Rabulla v. J. 586, in der laurentianischen Bibliothek zu Florenz befindlich.*”¹⁷³ Although I have found no copies of it after searching in the libraries and public collections of Hungary, it is possible that Czobor knew Philpot’s catalogue.

According to the author of the ecclesiastic article, the ivory relief depicting Judas drew the attention of archeologists, and especially the attention of British Museum department ward Franks, and Franz Xaver Kraus from Germany. A drawing made after this relief and “*based on a photographic reproduction of the original*”, was later published by Kraus in his inaugural academic treatise.¹⁷⁴ The illustration of the relief would also be published by Dobbert¹⁷⁵ “*since it is more distinct in a drawing than in the one we have in our possession. With the assistance of this drawing, made after the original artwork, we can make out in the photo that what seems to be a snake by the feet of Judas is no other than the undone ribbons of a money bag, and what seems to be an apple is no other than one of the coins pouring out of the bag. The same drawing of this interesting cross was published on page 92, r. vol. of ‘Archaeologiai Értesítő’, but the author of the article had been led astray by the Kraus chart and his lack of criticism of it;... although the photograph made by Philpot ... makes it absolutely obvious.*” In the footnote there

is another reference to the photograph in Budapest: “*The elder photographic reproduction – as we have mentioned above – can be found in the archeological library of the H. N. Museum.*”¹⁷⁶ There are references in several foreign archeological magazines to photograph number 2646 in Philpot’s catalogue. “*Gut photographirt bei Philpot et Jackson. Catal. de phot. des sculpt. en ivoire etc. (Flor.) p. 3. No. 2646.*” – as we can read in a later book of the above mentioned Kraus,¹⁷⁷ and the photograph is also mentioned in the British Museum’s catalogue of 1901 presenting the art treasures of early Christianity.¹⁷⁸

The church historian Georg Stuhlfauth, who was a professor at the university in Berlin, knew about and used Philpot’s photography series – or at least parts of it. He published a book in 1896 about the history of early Christian ivory carvings, and he mentions in the description of ten artworks the photographs made by Philpot (including their negative number). He references Westwood’s catalogue several times (while criticizing F. X. Kraus, who in his opinion made many mistakes while making his extracts) and at item Number 17 he also makes a reference at the fictile ivories in the collection of the university in Berlin, made by the Arundel Society.¹⁷⁹

171 Philpot cat., 3. Indicating the cathedral of Milan as location of the artwork is an error.

172 Dobbert took part in the art history congress of Vienna in 1873. In: *Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte*. Band XXXVI. 1983. Wien – Köln – Graz. 21.

173 “*Archaeologische Zeitung*” Berlin, 1876, XXXIV. 42. At the end of his speech Dobbert showed photo reproductions of the mosaic of the Galla Placidia shrine in Ravenna. *ibid.* 42.

174 Kraus 1879, 26.

175 *Jahrbuch der königlichen preussischen Kunstsammlungen*. Berlin, 1880. I. 46.

176 “*Egyházművészeti Lap*” (1) 1880, 75–76.

177 Kraus – Sauer 1896, 506.

178 *Catalogue* 1901, 50.

179 Stuhlfauth 1896. Searching for the words “Philpot” and “Arundel” on the website <https://archive.org/stream/altchristliche00stuh#page/n7/mode/2up>. We know that the fictile ivories once kept in the collection of the university – thanks to the kind assistance of Tomas Lehmann, a member of the Faculty of Theology in the Humboldt Universität in Berlin – with one exception either disappeared or were shattered during World War II.