

Catalogues raisonnés are more or less the only place where the backs of work are shown publicly, and even there this is only sporadic and not exhaustive. I do not think that it has ever occurred to a museum, let alone an individual, to exhibit the backs of all the pictures in its/their collection rather than the fronts. And if, here or there, for artistic or pedagogical reasons, attempts have been made, these have not been systematic. Thus the backs of artworks are seen only on occasions that generally have to do with the backstage world of art, so to speak – for example, when selected individuals handle the works and examine them, be they potential buyers (dealers planning an acquisition, clients in an auction house), professional experts (restorers, curators recording details of a work so that the insurance will apply should the work be damaged, experts hired to appraise the value of the objects in a bequest) or those involved in the technical operations that are part of installing works in a given space (the exhibitions team installing a hanging in a museum or for a private collector). Museum storerooms are more or less the only places – or at least, when fitted with steel structures for hanging those works from the collection not exhibited in the galleries, on which, without having to actually handle the pieces, one can freely get a glimpse of the backs just as easily as the fronts, a privilege usually enjoyed only by those who have a professional reason to be there, and not by art lovers in general.

Today, when what goes on behind the scenes is especially important in communication strategies, on the grounds that what is hidden is somehow more interesting than what is immediately shown, and that preparations are of greater interest than the final form, as can be seen from the marked tendency (on television or in the print media) to prefer to show and comment on the run-up to a major exhibition rather than the exhibition itself, one might fear that photographing the backs of artworks (paintings, drawings, and even photographs) is just part of a strategy of spectacularisation, albeit with a degree of subtlety and elegance (it is, you could say, low-key spectacular, aimed at a public whose distinction inclines it to sobriety). Unless, that is, this is a case of the contrary, an operation of desacralisation, helping to point up the ordinariness of what is usually presented as extraordinary – the other side of masterpieces,

so to speak. The series of *Versos* that Philippe Gronon has been working on since 2005, however, is determined by neither of these strategies, even if it plays on certain aspects of both.

Consisting, after four years, of some forty colour pigment prints, mounted on aluminium and framed, the dimensions of these rectangular formats ranging from thirty centimetres to just under two metres, this series of photographs (which should eventually comprise some fifty pieces) is the result of a process that is partly random and partly determined, partly individual and partly collective. Gronon chose his subjects from private collections and then from public collections, with only the latter being specified in the titles he gives his images. The choice of works is always his own free decision, even when the work is commissioned. We might then seek to determine the precise reasons behind each instance, ranging from personal taste to an interest in the symptomatic, even if this choice is generally accompanied or prepared by a proposal from the owner of the works whose backs he will photograph: museums typically present him with a selection to choose from, but in some cases he made his choice while exploring the exhibition rooms, and in others when visiting the storerooms. In certain instances there was no pre-selection, while in others the pre-selection drastically reduced the possibilities. The choices were always motivated in the first instance by the backs of the works he photographed, even if, retrospectively, it seems clear that the relation between recto and verso, as articulated in a certain way by the work's title, sometimes played an important role. In any case, it was never the front alone that determined his choice, except, perhaps, in the case of a commission (and even then we may suppose that the person commissioning him did so for reasons that were not fundamentally different, except as regards taste, from the artist's own).

The first works in the series are the backs of works of modest dimensions, characteristic of classical private collections, and all dating from the nineteenth century. To these were gradually added the backs of larger paintings, from the various decades of the twentieth century, and then from earlier centuries, since the advent of easel painting. Finally, the backs of a framed photograph and of a drawing are also included, although only what the artist says actually identifies them as such. For the back of the artworks is

never that of an image but always that of an object, with the various features that usually enable that image to be presented on a wall (frame, hanging devices, strengtheners) and also features bearing witness to the object's existence and its vicissitudes.

This series follows on logically from the work undertaken by Gronon some twenty years ago, when he was coming to the end of his studies at Villa Arson, with the inaugural series of *Châssis photographiques* (Sheet-Film Holders) in 1988–89. Like his previous works, barring only two exceptions (the *Tas de fumier* [Manure] from 2000–1, the *Châteaux de sable* [Sandcastles] from 2003), it is the result of a photographic operation using a view camera and following a strict principle of seriality, closely and frontally framing objects that are generally flat, and then a printing operation that adopts a scale as close as possible to that of the original object – since 1997, technical developments have allowed a scale of 1:1. Since 2003 (with *Vitrine 1, Sélestat*), the prints have sometimes been in colour, whereas before they were exclusively in black-and-white, even if these colours tend to exclude bright shades in favour of a limited spectrum (a few reds or yellows, yes, but of limited extent). The series thus ensure a perfect match between the represented object and its image, or rather, an identification between the surface of the object as found in the world and the surface of the object that constitutes the photographic image, according to a process of flat duplication, which, in the final print, will even reproduce any irregularities in the edges of the original object (and these can be almost baroque, as in *Verso n°21*) and play simply on the flattening of any slight depth (certain objects present a slight thickness in one or several areas which causes a certain visual play, but the use of the view camera makes it possible to minimise this by giving the same definition to each part of the image, whether they are further forward or back.

The subject of the series also follows logically from several previous ones, inasmuch as it continues a semi-tautological project, or at least a reflexive strategy that began with the first series, the *Châssis photographiques*, which duplicated objects whose function, precisely, is to produce images, and more specifically, gelatin-silver prints made by a view camera. In 2000–1 the artist in a sense opened his work to what preceded and what followed this

technique, and particularly its relation to technological history, with the *Pierres lithographiques – Imprimerie nationale, Paris* (Lithographic Stones – National Printworks, Paris) series, which invokes one of the ancestors of photography, and with that of the *Châssis radiographiques numériques* (Digital Radiographic Sheet Holders), which addresses a development that at the time was limited to cutting-edge uses, but in a dimension that concentrated more on the concrete becoming of the image, integrating the tool of its transformation as an autonomous image in the series of *Cuvettes de développement* (Development Tanks). And since the whole history of photography has it deriving from a history of painting (and not only in the canonical version put forward by Peter Galassi in his 1981 exhibition “Before Photography: Painting and the Invention of Photography,” which is now being challenged), since developments in this medium as regards its artistic regime over the last thirty-odd years generally involve importation of the *tableau* (picture object) model (with Jeff Wall as the point of reference), it is not surprising that painting and the *tableau* should have come to constitute a subject for Philippe Gronon. This subject was given an oblique and so to speak ironic treatment in his series of non-artistic *tableaux* — the *Tableaux de cotations* (Stock Price Information Boards) of the Paris and Lyon stock exchanges in 1992–93, the *Tableaux noirs* (Blackboards) starting in 1997 and through to 2004–6, and the *Tableaux de mouvements* (Control Panels) on lifts in 2004. Here it is subject to direct, frontal treatment. The surprise is due to the fact that we are given painting and *tableau* not as images but as objects.

Since I do not wish to repeat what I have written about Gronon’s work in the past,ⁱ here I shall simply dwell on a number of aspects that seem to me to be more specific to the *Versos* series, all of which are connected to this question of the relation to the work of art as object and not only, or not primarily, as image.

Had he photographed the front of the works he chose, Gronon would still have made visible the question of the object, but he would have blurred it with that of the image, and simply reprised in a more spectacular fashion enabled by the progress of photographic technology (in terms of chromatic quality and print size) the strategy of duplication, a seam mined to exhaustion at the turn of

the 1980s by a number of American artists, foremost among whom was Sherrie Levine. Its aesthetic dimension aside, this operation of duplication is, in any case, more effectively managed by the new processes of reproduction that have been loudly touted in recent years, such as multispectral digital photography (“With this technology, Federico Zeri would never have preferred black-and-white photography” claimed one internet site in 2007ⁱⁱ). To photographically duplicate the backs of artworks is to insist on their nature as objects, their image dimension consequently being that of an image of an object and not an image of an image.

Like a number of other objects photographed by Gronon (especially the *Écritoires* (Writing Surfaces) of the 1990s), the backs of artworks are notable for the way they integrate a strong temporal dimension, as a surface on which the passing of time is inscribed, or at least actions that occurred at different moments in time. These may be human actions, but not necessarily. As on a picture, but more visibly since it is not integrated into an image that the viewer will be concerned primarily to look at and decode, time is inscribed in its effects on the material: cracking of the canvas, yellowing of the paper used to protect the frame or of the labels stuck on it when it is moved, the dirt incrustated in the surface, the dog-earing of the folded canvas – in a word, a whole set of elements that can sometimes take on a picturesque quality, especially if the object is already quite old. But there are also the corrections added by more recent periods and that bear the trace of their times, such as strengthening and support, protection against climatic variations or vibrations, and elements used to attenuate or cancel the effects of time on the image on the front but that are themselves materially visible on the back of the object: the marks of a particular time. In his earlier series Gronon tended to choose objects that did not bear a poetics of the trace, which is always potentially temporal and romantic, but instead exhibited a kind of technological neutrality. In the *Versos* series he runs the risk of the picturesque, albeit, as in the *Écritoires*, a restrained and unspectacular picturesque that is of interest less for the stories it might evoke (but then is the simple mark of passing time really a story, an interesting story, when no salient event is in question?) than for the forms that it produces and displays – those

linear interlacings of cracks, those crooked edges of tucked canvas, those variations of tone in the areas that have been subjected to rubbing (particularly visible and beautiful in *Verso n°31*).

There is, as in any photograph, but here in a more exacerbated way, a spatial inscription of the temporal, a notion that is both static and dynamic. For the photographic object is first of all a contemporary object: the single date in the title of the work is that of the image made by Gronon and not that of the image on the front of the object he photographed. But this date is also the result of a duration, the time that has elapsed up to the taking of the photograph since the making of the object in the photograph (which making can go back much further than the image presented on the front – for example in the case of an old frame being used for a painting from the twentieth century, as in *Verso n°29* – even if the images made so far do not allow us to date this situation). *Verso n°24* is an extreme example of this, showing the back of one of those paintings by On Kawara which consist of the date of their making painted in white on a monochrome ground. The image is particularly mute when it comes to the inscription of time on the surface. We can read on the label stuck in the inner edge of the stretcher that the painting dates from 1982 (to be precise, it is a painting of and from 25 January 1982), but nothing tells us what has happened in the twenty-five years that have elapsed between that time and Gronon taking the photograph, apart, perhaps, from that fine, more or less horizontal line that bars the bottom of the zone of yellow-grey canvas, which could be either a random drawing resulting from handling or, more probably, a line of accumulated dust. On the front, time was transformed into a sign; on the back, the object has taken the place of time, and the signature and the artistic action (the making of the object, including the irregular cutting of the canvas and its stapling onto the stretcher) become the elements of a material composition that is fully contemporary.

Many of the photographs do however bear more explicit indications as to time in the form of elements that can be dated in a variety of ways, even if these indications are always spatially presented in the same contemporaneity of this new object that is the photograph. Frequently – but not systematically, which shows

that this is not the artist's main concern – we see labels or other bits of writing indicating a dateable historical event that happened to the picture object. There are for example labels from the exhibitions in which the artwork featured, sometimes bearing the name of the company that transported it and usually giving the precise dates – not the dates when the object was moved and handled, which we would expect to be the case here, but the dates of the public presentation of the image of which this object is the support. There also labels indicating the owner or successive owners (at least when these are not private individuals but dealers and institutions), with handwriting and supports that clearly convey the changes of period, and inventories in some cases correcting an earlier number. Then there are the marks made on the canvas, those of the producers referencing the period when those particular suppliers of artistic materials were active, and inventory marks (sometimes indicating the succession of political regimes). And finally, there are all the handwritten or printed inscriptions that refer to what is on the front and indicate the maker of the image, sometimes even duplicating the type of image, as in *Verso n°23*, which is dominated by a stamp made by Robert Indiana bearing much information about the image and how it was made. In some cases new attributions are proposed, the latest of which is not necessarily to be seen on the object itself, but only in the title given by Gronon, which repeats the attribution validated by the inventory of the collection when the photograph was taken. The most spectacular case of this is *Verso n°32*, in which an old inscription rich in biographical detail presents the portrait on the other side as a self-portrait by Michelangelo, whereas the more recent labels have it as a portrait of Michelangelo by Giuliano Bugiardini, while a label manifestly from an intermediary period refers it to Bandinelli.

Not all these snatches of writing are direct inscriptions of time, except when they are superimposed on one another in such a way that the viewer can reconstruct the order of events (*Verso n°13* and *Verso n° 35* are two very different examples). They cry out to be decoded, read and interpreted, and will be, albeit in different ways, depending on what the person looking at the work knows regarding both the history of art exhibitions and the history of collections or attributions. Yet the essential part of the image remains perceptible

to all inasmuch as this decoding is only a supplement with respect to an inscription that is always visible prior to its being legible (even an undated piece of paper can be dated by how old it appears to have grown, the precision of this dating being very much of secondary importance in any case).

In this series the inscription of time is first of all an inscription of uses. It is well known that the primary use of these objects is to be looked at, but by choosing to show the backs and not the fronts, Gronon favours the material uses of the object so that the visual use is now limited to the new object that is the photograph he has created. Each painting, each work of art comes to us in our contemporaneity as the product of a chain of uses, a chain of receptions. Yet the photographs in this series only preserve from this chain the actions that have left some trace on the object itself, those actions that have been performed by the producers of the materials making up the object, namely, the artist, the owner or owners, and the people who have handled it (stewards, curators, transporters, those who have hung the painting – functions that could all be performed by a single person in the case of a private collection). The users generally remain anonymous, except when the artist, or someone standing in for the artist for the occasion, appends a signature, whether accompanied or no by a comment (address, description, technical recommendations, which are sometimes quite elaborate and require certain contortions if one is to read them, as in the case of *Verso n°19*, which is but one panel of a triptych, something we can learn by reading the indications written there). It is the paintings' use that is perceptible. The artist is no art historian and is not going to write an exhaustive history of art shows, of how the painting has been handled (frame, recanvassing, protection), retitling and re-attribution, but only to show the object such as its use has rendered it, along with those elements that others may use differently. History isn't rectified here, unlike perspective, an operation that is made possible by the use of a view camera, rather than a simpler model, for shooting the picture (which would necessarily produce a convergence of the parallaxes according to the chosen vanishing point). Nothing suggests that these elements are exhaustive; they are merely indications of use. Gronon's pictures are a history of the reception in acts, or rather the reception in forms, as

is shown in exemplary fashion by *Verso n°35*, where the series of individuals who took care of the object (painted by Monet) for temporary shows and inventories in the collections of the museums of Saint-Étienne took care to place in a neat circle the labels they applied to the back of a painting whose image is also circular, the most recent restorer opting to respect this layout, moreover, by affixing an octagonal protection over the labels though without completely concealing them.

I said that the backs of these objects were worth our attention first of all for the forms that are there for us to see, for the material, concrete presence of the elements that we can make out there. Yet they also refer to an especially important world outside the frame in a way that has only been sketched out in Gronon's work to date. The titles accompanying them or the reference suggested by this or that indication found on a label or in a bit of writing leads us to always view them both for themselves (and, I repeat, that remains the principal interest here) and for the connection they have with objects beyond the frame, in this case with the images on their fronts. In this sense, if we were looking for parallels in other series by the artist, we would find them less in those that focus on non-artistic paintings than in the photographs of library index cards, the *Catalogue des manuscrits de la bibliothèque vaticane, Rome* (the Manuscripts Catalogue of the Vatican Library, Rome—1995) and the *Catalogue de la table des matières de la bibliothèque de l'Assemblée nationale, Paris* (the Contents Catalogue of the National Assembly Library, Paris—1996). The names there evoke works that the photograph doesn't show. Or we could look to his series on electric guitar amplifiers (begun in 2003), in which sound is invoked yet cannot be present in the image. It is indeed almost impossible to look at these objects without seeing them in tension with the images they serve as a support for and which the title points to (focusing upon the person who created the image on the front of the painting and not the other producers of the object).

The indications, even minor ones, are always enough to put the imagination to work piecing together a plausible image, or at least a type of image, since many of the *Versos* provide no more elements than what makes it possible to refer to a generic image – that of an anonymous animal (*Verso n°9*), portrait (*Verso n°10*) or landscape

(*Verso n°11*), to mention only photos from 2005 – whose back doesn't allow the viewer to know either the style (except for what one can deduce from the dimensions), date (except that the photos obviously feature works from before the start of the twentieth century), or even medium (*Verso n°10* might be a photograph, a drawing or a painting on cardboard – it is in fact a photograph; the others could be works done using a technique that a re-canvassing or mounting on canvas hinders us from recognising from the back). Admittedly these are examples that go back to the start of the series. There they coexisted with other objects from private collections whose appearance is hard to picture, unless one is a specialist in the work of Henri and Ernest Rouart (no less than five works of theirs were photographed), artists who are known today less for their art than for a family name that suggests that one of them was a friend of Degas and that both are in all likelihood the ancestors of a contemporary popular writer. But even in the case of works from public collections that come at times with the name of an especially prestigious artist, it is rare for viewers to have in their mind's eye more than a generic image after reading the indications, unless they are endowed with an in-depth understanding of the collections of the museum where the work was found, or have done some research, which of course the internet makes relatively easy nowadays.

In this instance Gronon is playing in a way on the widespread fantasy that wants to know what is going on behind the scenes in a work of art or, to borrow a well-known book title, to reveal the “hidden side of masterpieces.”ⁱⁱⁱ He is indeed providing access to information that generally remains concealed from the public. Yet if he were doing only that, the interest of his project would certainly be quite limited; it would even be a bit ridiculous to use such time-consuming and costly means as view-camera photography and large-format pigment prints, not to mention the aluminium backing, only to show what a photograph shot with a portable phone could render just as well (I take that tool as an example because it is the one I use to photograph this or that detail from the back of a work I find interesting when reporting on a piece). There is of course a certain beauty to resurrecting in this way the fantasy of a

photograph that can penetrate objects and see what would be otherwise hidden without its assistance, a possible re-enchantment of a documentary practice that has barely been used since the invention of X-rays and the vogue for spirit photography that existed in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. It is also pertinent of course to raise the question of whether we look in the same way at the back of a painting done by a practically unknown eighteenth-century artist (*Verso n°26*, whose title names a certain Archeville as the painter, whereas the image tells us that this artist was born deaf and dumb, a trait that is more exceptional than the portrait of the academy member featured on the obverse) and one where the artist's name and the collection it comes from point to a masterpiece (as in *Verso n°34*, the back of a Titian hanging in the Louvre, although in this instance an especially unspectacular object in itself). Yet that would be to forget that the merit of Gronon's *Versos* lies first of all in what they factually show and then in what they suggest in terms of creating tension with absent images.

The viewer, male or female, enriches the image that they actually see (that of the back of a piece of art) with what their memory or imagination provides with respect to the absent image (the obverse of the same object), the fundamental process of artistic or aesthetic vision, which is made literal here. Sometimes the back seems to be a continuation of the reconstituted front to such an extent that we can think of it as a revelation of the processes that produced the front, as in *Verso n°22*, where all the bullet holes and a few drips of paint seem like a crystallisation of Niki de Saint-Phalle's "shooting painting"; or in *Verso n°36*, which shows that a "cross-shaped" picture by Noël Dolla actually involves the stitching together of four squares of dyed cloth. On the other hand, sometimes the back seems to have no connection whatever with what one may assume about the front. Such is the case with all those objects (*Verso n°11* to *Verso n°17*) where the eye sees first and foremost a surface of dented plastic or openwork chipboard. This represents recent systems for protecting works put in place by the Musée National d'Art Moderne/Centre Pompidou, although nothing betrays a connection with the materials that are in fact used to support the image designated by the title and written indications

(these initial materials can be seen at times thanks to a certain transparency or the traces of them left behind), often with an additional contradiction between what one may know about the lyrical character of the image and the highly rigid nature of what the photograph displays. Thus *Verso n°16*, which we know is the back of a primitivist abstraction by Bram van Velde that once belonged to Samuel Beckett, highlights the writer's name, written out far more legibly and more often than the painter's, a particular irony springing from the fact that that name is now bound up with the slightly shaky minimalism put on display by the photograph rather than the entangled, violently coloured forms of the image that Beckett in fact admired. The same holds for *Verso n°38*, the back of a 1921 purist still life by Ozenfant, which only features an old piece of canvas and an old stretcher, similar to those used in the nineteenth century, along with a collection of pegs, rings and other systems for hanging the work, not to mention a series of handwritten comments on a long white label. This seems a far cry from the modernity that Ozenfant, the driving force behind *L'Esprit nouveau*, laid claim to (at most, only the brand name of the maker of the canvas might seem to refer to the stylisation of 1920s signage; the rest, like the stretcher bars for example, can only be dated to the year 1958 thanks to the artist's notations). Sometimes the back and the image we imagine on the obverse have a tense relationship that involves neither reduplication nor contradiction. An unnumbered *Verso* from 2008, for example, features an image with the same monumental dimensions and several of the same materials (car paint, aluminium) as the image with the signature of Pascal Pinaud that figures on the obverse, except that the obverse is characterised by its homogenous, industrial aspect, like the fragment of a Fiat Panda Shopping indicated by the title, exactly where the back shows random splashes of paint. The latter do exist in Pinaud's work, albeit in paintings other than the one photographed.

Gronon shares more with Pinaud than the fact that both studied in Noël Dolla's studio at the Villa Arson, and like him Gronon creates pictures with things that don't have the material characteristics of paintings. In his *Versos* series, he lends this operation an additional twist by taking one more step dialectically

into the self-referential and not only doing a painting of a painting, not only doing a painting of what is not a painting but is in fact its support, but doing a photograph that is a tableau of what is not a tableau but the condition that makes a tableau (painting) possible.

Late modernism and the neo-avant garde movements have long since given the *parerga* of the traditional artwork (frames, stretchers, pedestals, and so on) the dignity of an artwork in its own right.^{iv} So there is nothing surprising in the fact that postmodernism eventually came to take a look behind the work and not only around it. Thus, since the 1960s, several artists (Timm Ulrichs, Giulio Paolini, Claude Rutault) have created pieces that consist of presenting the backs of artworks, with no additions other than a few tricks of the trade. Ulrichs' photograph showing its own reverse with stretcher and labels (*Bildrückseitenbild*, 1961–68) is surely the most accomplished example of this tautological deconstruction.^v When Gronon's *Versos* were first exhibited in the United States in the autumn of 2008, by coincidence they were shown at the same time as a series with the same title by Vik Muniz, which the Brazilian artist had also been working on for several years. But Muniz's *Versos* are different in that they are the three-dimensional recreation of the backs of well-known paintings (and only well-known paintings, such that any viewer can form a clear mental image of what the front side ought to show) from the collections of the main American museums, executed, as the press release states, "with a team of dedicated craftsman, artists, forgers, and technicians," based on a systematic study of the objects carried out "in partnership with the curatorial and conservation departments of MOMA, the Guggenheim and the Art Institute of Chicago."^{vi} Muniz's pieces differ above all in that they work on the question of trompe l'oeil first and foremost, whereas the concept is very much secondary to Gronon's art. What makes a trompe l'oeil piece interesting is precisely the imitation of three-dimensionality, the impossibility of telling the fake from the real thing that the technique generates. In the end there are precious few examples in art history of trompe l'oeil being reduced to a back of a painting with no additional elements;^{vii} in a way Cornelis Norbertus Gijsbrechts' 1670 *Back of a Painting* (Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen) set such a

standard known to all that there has been no need to repeat it. This is because the value of a trompe l'oeil is measured in the complexity of the illusions it presents. When John Frederick Peto depicts the back of a painting, as in *Lincoln and the Pflieger Stretcher* (1898, oil on canvas, 25.4 x 35.5, New Britain Museum of American Art), he adds a contrast in the form of a torn photograph to lend greater interest to his subject, suggest a narrative and so on. The title, moreover, places the photo and its famous model front and centre. It is significant that there aren't really any backs of paintings in the work of other American trompe l'oeil artists, who enjoyed extraordinary success in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, painters like John Haberle and William Harnett.

Because he remains a photographer, Gronon drastically reduces the marks of his technical prowess precisely where trompe l'oeil artists make a show of them. Because he is a photographer, Gronon doesn't want to devote himself solely to quasi-art historian experiments, as a conceptual artist would, or to humorous variations like some nineteenth-century cartoonists, who would have turned the painting hung backwards into a recurrent trope that would have cropped up almost as frequently as the monochrome painting. Because he is a photographer, Philippe Gronon creates paintings.

ⁱ Readers are welcome to refer to my discussion of Philippe Gronon's work in my book *Platitudes. Une histoire de la photographie plate*, Paris: Gallimard, 2006, pp. 192-204, where I consider the nature of flatness in his photographs, and to relate this to the images of the *Versos* series, an exercise that would have taken up too much space here and, I fear, tried their patience somewhat.

ⁱⁱ Didier Rykner, "La numérisation multispectrale en démonstration au Palais des Beaux-Arts de Lille," *La Tribune de l'art*, 22 September 2007:

(http://www.latribunedelart.com/Musees/Musees_2007/Lille_Lumiere_Technology_532.htm).

ⁱⁱⁱ Rose-Marie and Rainer Hagen, *Les dessous des chefs-d'œuvre*, Cologne: Taschen, 2007.

^{iv} In this regard, it would be well worth the trouble one day to pick up on such research and delve into the subject more deeply. An examination of the question can be found in *Le cadre & le socle dans l'art du 20ème siècle*, Serge Lemoine, ed. (Dijon: Université de Bourgogne; and Paris: Musée National d'Art Moderne, 1987).

v A selection of this kind of work is reproduced in the catalogue *Iconoclash: Beyond the Image Wars in Science, Religion and Art*, Bruno Latour and Peter Weibel (eds.), Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 2002, 594-602.

vi Press release for the Vik Muniz exhibition *Verso* at the Sikkema, Jenkins & Co. Gallery, New York, 6 September – 11 October 2008.
(http://www.sikkemajenkinsco.com/vikmuniz_pressrelease4.html).

vii See Patrick Mauriès (ed.), *Le Trompe l'oeil, de l'Antiquité au XXème siècle*, Paris: Gallimard, 1996.