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Clérisseau’s Manner: Comparing His Architecture Drawings from a Newly Attributed Collection in the French National Library with Piranesi’s Depictions

Abstract
This paper discusses five works from the recently attributed collection of Charles-Louis Clérisseau’s drawings at the French National Library, which are here published for the first time. In terms of composition, they are clearly comparable to famous prints by Giovanni Battista Piranesi. This paper offers a comparative analysis in order to highlight the originality of Clérisseau’s artistic interpretations.
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Introduction
In the eighteenth century, copying works of antiquity, the Renaissance, and contemporary artists was a common practice when studying drawing. The French artist and architect Charles-Louis Clérisseau (1721–1820), having won the Prix de Rome and arriving at the French Academy in Rome in 1749, thus learned to draw by, among other things, copying the drawings of his teacher of perspective, Giovanni Paolo Panini (1691–1765). This is clearly illustrated by a comparison of Clérisseau’s watercolour with Panini’s from 1731, featuring depictions of the Colosseum and the Arch of Constantine in Rome (Fig. 1a and 1b). It was based on this drawing that Panini created a large-scale oil painting in 1735 (Fig. 1c). Panini positioned the main motif (the Colosseum) in one half of the painting, and in the other half, he incorporated a landscape featuring additional Roman monuments (the Arch of Constantine and the Temple of Venus and Rome). In the oil on canvas variant, Panini introduced a repoussoir along the foreground with ancient objects, thereby framing the edge and directing attention towards the central composition.

It was precisely using the method of copying that Clérisseau later taught his own students, the British artist Allan Ramsay and the architect Robert Adam, who was undoubtedly his most famous pupil. Their joint trip to Italy during Adam’s Grand Tour resulted in numerous pairs of drawings: Clérisseau’s original drawings and Adam’s copies, which he created in order to absorb Clérisseau’s manner. Adam had no ambitions towards developing his own distinctive drawing style; for him, it was enough to reach a level that would allow him to communicate his architectural projects to clients, pictorially and in a contemporary way. In contrast, Clérisseau aimed to develop his own unique drawing style.

The popularity among tourists in Rome of drawings depicting ancient ruins using painterly techniques led to the growth of a sizeable market. In light of this, Clérisseau focused his efforts on architectural drawing and became one of the most famous artists in this genre, which was dominated by the work of Giovanni Battista Piranesi (1720–1778). Piranesi’s powerful depictions of ancient ruins contributed to shaping an idea of Roman architecture in eighteenth-century European imagination. Although both artists targeted the grand-tourist market in Rome, Piranesi was first and foremost a printmaker, and therefore the drawing itself was usually not the final artistic product for him. At the same time, Piranesi did not use drawings as direct templates for graphics, like other printmakers of his age, but changed them...
significantly in the process of creating printing plates. As a matter of fact, he even went against the common practice of making highly detailed drawings for transfer onto copperplates, stating that, “if my drawing was finished, my plate would become only a copy.” For him, drawing was a vital part of the creative process. For Clérisseau, however, the final product was usually created using the faster technique of drawing. While Piranesi produced graphic portfolios, Clérisseau was primarily financed by the sale of his refined studies in watercolour or gouache, based on drawings in pencil, pen, and brown or black ink. In that sense, both artists exploited the possibilities of the media they used: Piranesi’s use of black ink for his prints allowed for a dramatic quality created by contrasts of light and dark, while Clérisseau achieved a naturalistic effect in his drawings through the subtle interplay of light, shade, and colour. While Piranesi’s approach was based on a tectonic, material description of architecture, Clérisseau’s manner emphasized silhouette...
aspects of colour. It was precisely Clérisseau’s mastery of coloured drawing that earned him recognition in the cultural, artistic, and architectural circles of the time.

In his prints, Piranesi glorified the technological accomplishments of the Romans, as well as their openness towards absorbing and refining the achievements of other cultures, creating in the process an entirely original synthesis. Thomas McCormick concludes that, after Panini, Clérisseau’s close friend Piranesi probably represented the single greatest influence on him during his years in Rome. He offers as an example Piranesi’s “stagelike Bibienesque recreations of the Classical world” from 1748, depicting the Forum of Nerva and the Forum of Augustus. Clérisseau’s depictions of these subjects feature a similar viewport and two-point perspective (scena per angolo) to that which Piranesi borrowed from the Bibiena family.

Francesca Lui offers another example of analogous compositions by these two artists from a somewhat later period (Fig. 2a and 2b). The view of the Temple of Neptune in Paestum, which Clérisseau created on a trip to Naples in 1761, and Piranesi’s 1778 etching are almost identical in terms of composition. In both images, the pictorial strategies that Piranesi developed under the influence of the Bibiena family’s theatrical designs are visible: the use of light, viewport, and two-point perspective. Nevertheless, the contents of the three planes in both Piranesi’s and Clérisseau’s compositions are all but identical: a dark foreground, groups of ruins with people and animals, behind which the columns of an ancient temple stretch, dividing the image diagonally; they are seen from the side in the middle ground, while the background reveals soft traces of architecture and landscapes. Both artists choose a low viewpoint that enhances the monumentality of the scene, but we are nevertheless faced with two entirely different works when it comes to the expressiveness of the depictions. In contrast to the dramatic, dynamic effects of Piranesi’s work with their emphatic chiaroscuro contrasts, Clérisseau offers a calm depiction of monuments in gentle watercolour shades, despite the fact that the figures in Clérisseau’s depiction are engaged in much more dramatic activities – hunting animals, as opposed to Piranesi’s figures who are exploring ruins.

In this paper, the word “manner” includes, but also highlights the differences in the intellectual and manual components of the artist’s studies. In his Cours de peinture par principes from 1708, the theorist of painting Roger de Piles (1635–1709) distinguishes manner as a “styles of thought” and a “styles of execution” – referring to different manual techniques. Comparing the work of these two artists – the similarities in their subjects and compositions, and the almost entirely divergent spirits they contain – allows us to better understand Clérisseau’s manner in both of its components. In the search for such comparisons, examples from the recently attributed collection of Charles-Louis Clérisseau’s drawings from the French National Library (BnF) allow us to delve deeper into
Smoking Fire (Fig. 3c). Even if it is clear that the two-point perspective and basic architectural elements of Piranesi’s and Clérisseau’s compositions are essentially identical, we are dealing with two entirely independent artistic approaches. The atmosphere of Clérisseau’s Composition, based on brown, grey, and blue tones, is much closer to the quiet discomfort of Piranesi’s Dark Prison than to the more energetic illustration from the Imaginary Prisons series, which it clearly resembles in terms of composition.20 In Clérisseau’s image, the relationship between light and shade appears natural, while in Piranesi’s, the shadows appear almost supranatural, overemphasized to produce a specific emotional response in the viewer.21 While Piranesi depicts the obscure underground labyrinth of an imaginary prison, Clérisseau depicts a similar architectural structure in the light of day. In fact, Clérisseau developed a specific form of artistic expression whereby, in contrast to Piranesi, drawings of architectural forms, whether real or imaginary, did not function as the bearers of dramatic atmosphere for the contemplation of times gone by. Placing architectural forms in realistic environments highlighted their eternal nature, their presence in the contemporary world. For Clérisseau, copying the constructional basis of Piranesi’s print was clearly an entirely compositional exercise, because in his drawing he eventually communicated subjects and a mood that were entirely different from that of Piranesi, and using a different technique. Another of Clérisseau’s drawings

this theme through a comparative analysis of two types of works by Clérisseau and Piranesi: imaginary compositions and real monuments drawn in the field.17

Clérisseau’s vs. Piranesi’s manner

The first of Piranesi’s books to be published, the Prima Parte di Architetture e Prospettive (Rome, 1743), contains an image entitled Carcere oscura (Dark Prison), which is considered to be a forerunner to Piranesi’s famous series of prints Carceri d’Invenzione (Imaginary Prisons). This celebrated series was first published in Rome in 1749–50 and reissued after significant reworking in 1761.18 Image number VI from this collection is entitled Il fuoco fumante (The Smoking Fire). Its composition closely resembles the previously mentioned Dark Prison from 1743, but with the introduction of the fire motif and a more energetic handling of transitions between light and darkness, Piranesi introduces a dynamic quality to the static and cramped nature of the original image, thus generating more powerful sensations in the viewer (Fig. 3a and 3b).19 He employs the scena per angolo and theatrical illumination to heighten the impact of the image.

If we consider a drawing entitled Composition from the BnF collection, recently attributed to Clérisseau, we can detect an indisputable compositional similarity to Piranesi’s The Smoking Fire (Fig. 3c). Even if it is clear that the two-point perspective and basic architectural elements of Piranesi’s and Clérisseau’s compositions are essentially identical, we are dealing with two entirely independent artistic approaches. The atmosphere of Clérisseau’s Composition, based on brown, grey, and blue tones, is much closer to the quiet discomfort of Piranesi’s Dark Prison than to the more energetic illustration from the Imaginary Prisons series, which it clearly resembles in terms of composition.20 In Clérisseau’s image, the relationship between light and shade appears natural, while in Piranesi’s, the shadows appear almost supranatural, overemphasized to produce a specific emotional response in the viewer.21 While Piranesi depicts the obscure underground labyrinth of an imaginary prison, Clérisseau depicts a similar architectural structure in the light of day. In fact, Clérisseau developed a specific form of artistic expression whereby, in contrast to Piranesi, drawings of architectural forms, whether real or imaginary, did not function as the bearers of dramatic atmosphere for the contemplation of times gone by. Placing architectural forms in realistic environments highlighted their eternal nature, their presence in the contemporary world. For Clérisseau, copying the constructional basis of Piranesi’s print was clearly an entirely compositional exercise, because in his drawing he eventually communicated subjects and a mood that were entirely different from that of Piranesi, and using a different technique. Another of Clérisseau’s drawings
from the BnF offers us a composition that is not entirely identical, but nonetheless comparable to Piranesi’s *Carceri d’Invenzione* (Fig. 4a and 4b). The complexity of the scene is in keeping with Piranesi’s compositions, but here too Piranesi and Clérisseau enter varying subjects into a similar basic scene in varying ways. These related, but highly diverse images serve as a compelling introduction to a comparison of Piranesi’s and Clérisseau’s approaches to the same motifs, which they both studied on site.

**The Appian Way as depicted by Piranesi and Clérisseau**

The BnF collection holds three drawings by Clérisseau of the tombs that line the Appian Way. These are works based on rapid onsite studies of ancient ruin scenes, such as can be found among Clérisseau’s studies held in the Hermitage and Sir John Soane’s Museum.22 It is known that Clérisseau completed his outdoor studies afterwards, and often reproduced them in multiple versions.23 One drawing depicts the Mausoleum of Caecilia Metella, while the remaining two show a great pyramidal tomb from the second century AD (Fig. 5a, 6a, 7). These are among the most imposing monuments of the Appian Way. Piranesi drew them too, publishing the images in the third volume of *Le Antichità Romane* in 1756–57.24 Piranesi dedicated one plate to a great pyramidal tomb (Fig. 6b) and six whole plates to the Mausoleum of Caecilia Metella in *Le Antichità Romane* – evidence of his research into the engineering accomplishments and skills of the ancient Romans. Although Piranesi created several prints of the Mausoleum of Caecilia Metella, a view of the structure’s back from the northeast is singled out here (Fig. 5b). This view of the monument is comparable to Clérisseau’s drawing (Fig. 5a). Piranesi and Clérisseau’s drawings both depict similar parts of the subject, but from different viewpoints. Both focus on the original mausoleum – a rotunda atop a square base, behind which one sees the remains of a fortified castle that was attached to the mausoleum in the early fourteenth century, when medieval battlements were likewise added to.
the top of the structure, thus transforming it into a defensive tower. But while Piranesi uses a low viewpoint, very close to the mausoleum, in order to give a sense of its grandiosity, Clérisseau positions the viewer at a distance, thus offering an optimal rendering of the relationship between the elements of the architectural structure in the landscape as a whole.

In his depictions of ancient monuments, Piranesi is focused on the creative achievements of Roman engineering, and virtuosity in the processing of materials and construction techniques, but he surrounds them with a composition of imaginary and identifiable elements in the natural and built landscape that constructs the illusionistic atmosphere of the scene. He allows his imagination to run free, emphasizing a sense of ephemerality through the vegetation that grows across the monument, the scattered architectural elements, and the dynamic gestures of the human figures exploring the ancient ruins. The human figures are present not only as visual measurements that contrast with the massive monuments; rather, their vitality draws attention to the “heroic scale” of Roman engineering. We sense the “quizzical air of Piranesi’s people,” as Tait notes, “who disturb rather than extend the artist’s shooting mood.”

On the other hand, Clérisseau transmits the outline of the overall architectural composition to paper and depicts only the tomb itself in great detail, with a clear understanding of ancient forms and decorative elements. The key aesthetic characteristic of his drawing is an airy polychromy in the representation of ancient monuments through sophisticated nuances of grey and brown wash, with details meticulously underscored with brown ink, while the other parts of the composition are coloured using atmospheric perspective. As with his depiction of the Temple of Neptune in Paestum, the built and natural environments serve as picturesque backgrounds for the central motif, drawn with a clear desire that it appear realistic.

The same kind of variations in approach can be found when we compare Piranesi’s and Clérisseau’s depictions of the monumental Pyramidal Tomb (Fig. 6a and 6b). Clérisseau’s alternate depiction of this subject (Fig. 7), arranged in three planes, features considerably more greenery than the previous work. This offers a clear insight into Clérisseau’s blend of eighteenth-century architectural conventions in landscape drawing and painting (notably the repoussoir in the foreground) with a realistic, recognizable landscape. This approach
6.a Charles-Louis Clérisseau, Via Appia sepulcro, c. 1755. Pen, black and brown ink, brown and grey washes and watercolour on paper, 23.7 × 31.5 cm. Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Paris, ref.no. FR-BNF40363184, 99, Ub–43b (3) - Fol.

Charles-Louis Clérisseau, Via Appia sepulcro, oko 1755., pero, crni i smeđi tuš, smeđi i sivi lavirani tuš i akvarel, 23,7 × 31,5 cm, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Pariz

6.b Giovanni Battista Piranesi, Veduta di un gran masso, avanzo del sepolcro della Famiglia de’ Metelli sulla Via Appia cinque miglia in circa fuori di Porta S. Sebastiano nel casale di S. Maria Nuova, in: Le Antichità Romane, t. 3, Rome, 1756–57, Plate XV. Etching, plate: 43.5 × 46.7 cm. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Rogers Fund, transferred from the Library, Accession Number: 41.71.1.3(15)

Giovanni Battista Piranesi, Veduta di un gran masso, avanzo del sepolcro della Famiglia de’ Metelli sulla Via Appia cinque miglia in circa fuori di Porta S. Sebastiano nel casale di S. Maria Nuova, 1756–1757, bakropis, 43,5 × 46,7 cm, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York


Charles-Louis Clérisseau, Via Appia sepulcro, oko 1755., pero, crni i smeđi tuš, smeđi i sivi lavirani tuš i akvarel, 15,6 × 30,5 cm, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Pariz
closely mirrors Panini’s application in his aforementioned painting featuring the Colosseum motif.

**Conclusion**

Clérisseau’s artwork uniquely transformed the inspirations from Panini and Piranesi. He embraced the veduta tradition of Panini, which involves topographic scenes reimagined in a picturesque yet undramatic way. Influenced by Piranesi, he enhanced his approach to perspective, and shifted his focus towards the intricacies of architecture and sculpture. Clérisseau did not present Roman antiquity with the same power of imagination that Piranesi possessed; rather, Clérisseau was the traveller and researcher whose originality lay precisely in transferring to paper large numbers of softly coloured, picturesque compositions constructed using subjects that were archaeologically and architecturally accurate both in their details and as a whole. In terms of genre, both Piranesi and Clérisseau used elements of capriccio in their œuvres, but Clérisseau’s inclination towards fantasy is entirely different from Piranesi’s. While Clérisseau’s drawings, which stand out for their archaeological reliability, appear close to nature even when they are radically imaginary, in Piranesi’s work almost every drawing appears, to a greater or lesser extent, to be a fantasy. The newly attributed drawings by Clérisseau attest to this, but they also emphasize the difference between the originality in the manual and intellectual components of Clérisseau’s drawings.

Following de Piles’ definition, we could say that Clérisseau copied Piranesi’s compositions in order to develop “styles of execution,” based on which he developed his own “styles of thought.” Their closeness, the time spent drawing together in the field and, more generally, their continued collaboration over the course of many years, make it more difficult to determine who documented a particular monument first. Given the level of similarity in their interpretations, however, this information is in fact irrelevant. In essence, even when they depict the same subjects, one of these artists represents the “speaking ruins” and the other the “quiet grandeur” of ancient architecture.

**Notes**

* This paper is a result of the research project of the Institute of Art History in Zagreb *Art and Architecture of Urban Settings in Croatia* (UrbArH, 2023–2027) funded by the European Union – NextGenerationEU.
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Clérisseauova manira: usporedba njegovih crteža arhitekture iz novoatribuirane zbirke u Francuskoj nacionalnoj knjižnici s Piranesijevim prikazima

U članku se raspravlja o djelima iz nedavno atribuirane zbirke crteža Charles-Louisa Clérisseaua iz Francuske nacionalne knjižnice, koja se ovdje prvi put objavljuju. Odabrani Clérisseauovi akvareli iz te zbirke kompozicijski su nedvojbeno uspoređiviv s poznatim grafikama Giovannija Battiste Piranesija iz serije grafika Carceri d’Invenzione (1761.) te antičkim spomenicima koji se nalaze duž Via Appia iz Piranesijeve serije grafika Antichità Romane (1756./1757.). U radu se donosi usporedna analiza njihovih djela, kako bi se istaknula originalnost Clérisseauove manire. Pojam manira ovdje uključuje intelektualnu i manualnu komponentu umjetnikova stvaralaštva – i ističe razlike među njima. U djelu Cours de peinture par principes iz 1708. godine, teoretičar slikarstva Roger de Piles (1635. – 1709.) razlikuje maniru kao »stilove mišljenja« i »stilove izvedbe« – misleći na različite izvedbe tehnike. Usporedba djela dvojice umjetnika – sličnosti u njihovim temama i kompozicijama, te gotovo potpuno različite intelektualne interpretacije – omogućuje nam da bolje razumijemo Clérisseauov maniru u obje njezin komponente. Primjeri iz Francuske nacionalne knjižnice omogućuju usporedbu dvaju tipova Clérisseauovih i Piranesijevih radova: jedno su arhitektonske fantazije (capriccio), a drugo crteži stvarnih antičkih spomenika. Za Clérisseaua je kopiranje konstrukcijske osnove Piranesijevih grafika s prikazima arhitektonske fantazije bila isključivo kompozicijska vježba, jer je u svom crtežu komunicirao potpuno različitu atmosferu od Piranesijeva, koristeći pritom izražajne mogućnosti tehnike akvarela. Unatoč kompozicijskim sličnostima, Clérisseau nije predstavio rimsku antiku istom snagom imaginacije kakvu je posjedovao Piranesi. Bio je putnik i istraživač čija je originalnost bila upravo u prenosu na papir velikog broja nježno obojenih pitoreskih kompozicija s klasičnim motivima koje su bile arheološki i arhitektonski točne, kako u detaljima tako i u cjelini. Žanrovski gledano, i Piranesi i Clérisseau su koristili karakteristike capriccio u svojim opusima, no Clérisseauova sklonost arhitektonske fantazije posve je drukčija od Piranesijeve. Dok se Clérisseauovi crteži, koji se ističu sjevero arheološkom pouzdanošću, doimaju realističnima čak i kad su radikalno imaginarnima, u Piranesiju se djelu gotovo svaki crtež čini, u većoj ili manjoj mjeri, fantazijom. Novoatribuirani Clérisseauovi crteži naglašavaju razliku između originalnosti u manualnim i intelektualnim sastavnicama Clérisseauovih crteža. Slijedeći de Pilesovu definiciju, mogli bismo reći da je Clérisseau kopirao Piranesijeve kompozicijske konstrukcije slike kako bi razvio »stil izvedbe« te na temelju toga izgradio vlastiti »stil mišljenja«.

Ključne riječi: Charles-Louis Clérisseau, Giovanni Battista Piranesi, 18. stoljeće, grafike i crteži, Carceri d’Invenzione, Via Appia, Antichità Romane