



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Forever Young : the reproduction of photographic artworks as a conservation strategy

Marchesi, M.

Citation

Marchesi, M. (2017, November 30). *Forever Young : the reproduction of photographic artworks as a conservation strategy*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/59473>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/59473>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The following handle holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation:

<http://hdl.handle.net/1887/59473>

Author: Marchesi, M.

Title: Forever Young : the reproduction of photographic artworks as a conservation strategy

Issue Date: 2017-11-30

Coda

Coda

In the last phase of the research, three Dutch artists — Wout Berger, Koos Breukel, and Rineke Dijkstra — have come to the Stedelijk Museum and, independently of each other, they have looked at some of their older photographic works, acquired by the museum some years before. Each artist claimed that his or her work had discoloured too much and they strongly discouraged the display of the photographs in the museum's galleries. They all suggested reproducing the works as a solution to these undesirable changes and substituting the old, discoloured photographs for new, pristine prints.

At the moment of writing, the museum staff is in the process of assessing whether the museum is willing to accept or reject this suggestion. In the meantime, for the purpose of this research and for the museum's evaluation, I posed questions to the three artists about the driving force that informs the reproduction of their respective works. This coda is the result of these meetings and it summarizes the discussions made in front of the photographs about a possible reproduction and the logistics involved in the process.²⁷⁸ All conversations took place in April 2016 at the external repository of the museum.

This coda simply records the ideas that these artists have about the reproduction process, it does not focus on historical contextualization, and there is no analysis of the decision-making; there is also no examination of the possible repercussions that the reproduction may have on the works and the museum. As can be expected, each work of art has its own specific characteristics and each artist has his or her own ideas; however the underlying reasons for reprinting the photographs show similarities with the case studies examined in this dissertation. Despite the fact that the photographs have not yet been reprinted, and thus it is not possible to make a comparison between the various versions, I believe that the discussion of these other works underscores the actuality of the reproduction of photographic artworks as a preservation practice in the museum world and beyond.

²⁷⁸ The term 'interview' is deliberately avoided in order to prevent the impression that these discussions could be regarded as artist interviews. In the field of conservation of contemporary art, artist interviews are well-established research tool for gathering information and acquiring knowledge about works of art and artist practice. Nowadays, artist interviews follow predetermined formats and guidelines of good practice in order to avoid possible biases and, in most cases, two interviewers pose the questions during the interview. According to the *Guidelines to Good Practice: Artist Interview*, developed by the International Network for the Conservation of Contemporary Art (INCCA), the meetings I had with the three artists may be defined as 'Face to face conversations', which follow less stringent parameters and were conducted by one interviewer. For further reference see INCCA 2016 https://www.incca.org/system/files/field_attachments/2002_incca_guide_to_good_practice_artists_interviews.pdf [accessed 28 March 2017].

In general terms, Berger, Breukel, and Dijkstra share similar approaches to and opinions about digital technology. The artists have suggested the use of digital printing for the reproduction of their damaged works, as they believe that this technique is more stable and reliable. This belief should be treated with caution as a lot of research is being carried out to establish the long-term stability of digital prints.²⁷⁹ According to specialist literature, digital prints are also susceptible to unwanted changes: most pigment-based inkjets have a better, darker long-term stability than chromogenic materials, but they are also more vulnerable to surface scratches and abrasions. Moreover, dye-based inkjets are more liable to moisture deterioration in high humidity environments than traditional prints (Reilly 2016). All three artists tend to use analogue and digital technologies in a commingled fashion, with no distinct rupture between the two. They all prefer the austerity and directness of analogue negatives, but they all embrace the opportunities and numerous choices that digital printing gives them.

Like Van Der Kaap's *Xiada (Girls' dorm) Xiamen*, the works being considered for reproduction are created as limited editions and, in some instances, the photographic image was printed in different formats. Each format corresponds to a different edition. For example, two limited editions of Dijkstra's work *Kolobrzeg, Poland, July 26, 1992* exist: one edition is formed by six photographs and two artist's proofs with an image size of 94x75 cm, while the other is formed by fifteen photographs with an image size of 35x40 cm.²⁸⁰ As discussed, a multiple autographic work allows for the coexistence of similar versions, which are conventionally viewed as identical. Differences in preservation and exhibition policy may have a long-lasting effect on the appearance of the various photographic prints. When the reproduction is limited to one or a few versions within the same edition, the inevitable changes in material, printing technique, the possible modifications in formats, and differences in the way the works are displayed, may complicate matters, as these elements can interfere with or even preclude the acceptance of the reproduced works as a substitution of the previous ones. The differences may be too evident to conventionally agree that these groups should be regarded as 'identical'. Works forming a series tend to have a somewhat looser connection to each other than the works within a limited edition.²⁸¹

²⁷⁹ Since 2007, the Image Permanence Institute has embarked on one of the most comprehensive research projects on the strengths and vulnerabilities of digital prints technologies. The results of the research are shared with the public on the website Digital Print Preservation Portal, also known as the DP3 Portal. For further reference see <http://www.dp3project.org/> [Accessed 28 March 2017].

²⁸⁰ The photograph at the Stedelijk Museum is part of the edition with an image size of 94x75 cm.

However, changes and modifications may also disrupt their mutual aesthetic or presentational relationship.

Wout Berger

In November 2015, Wout Berger (b. 1942) visited the repository of the Stedelijk Museum to see seventeen of his works, acquired by the museum over the years. He was particularly interested in examining the photograph *Schaatsers (Uitdam)* (1982) (fig. 56).²⁸² The work was conceived as a limited edition, but Berger does not recall how many prints exactly form the edition.

The chromogenic photograph shows a wide landscape in the winter at sunrise or, more likely, at sunset. In the distance, the sun dimly brightens the sky with a soft orange light and, on the horizon, outlines of the land and the trees are detectable. A group of people is skating on an extended iced surface; the farthest two skaters are sharply rendered, while the closer ones are barely recognizable, appearing like indistinct shadows. In the foreground, the dark grey, almost black, ice clearly shows the marks of the skating.

In the process of creating a new edition of *Schaatsers (Uitdam)*, Berger decided to visit the Stedelijk Museum so that he could look at the work he had produced in 1982. When he saw the print kept at the museum, he realized that the yellow and the cyan dyes had partially faded, while the magenta dye had retained its intensity. This process — very common in analogue chromogenic prints — causes an imbalance in the colours and, as a result of the fading, the photograph has a reddish cast.²⁸³ The same had occurred with the other five photographs in the museum's collection.²⁸⁴ After this unpleasant 'discovery', Berger discussed with the curator the possibility of reprinting his works, but, until now, he has never reproduced any of his photographs for preservation reasons.

²⁸¹ In general terms, a series can be defined as works of art that share a common theme. Famous examples are the paintings made by Claude Monet (1840–1926) that have the same theme, such as the *Haystacks* series, the *Rouen Cathedral* series, and the *Water Lilies* series. Pieces forming the series do not necessarily have the same format and they are not necessarily framed in the same way. Different types of work, such as drawings, sculptures, paintings, installations and videos, may be part of the same series.

²⁸² The English translation of the title is *Ice Skaters (Uitdam)*. Uitdam is the name of a small village close to the IJsselmeer lake in the northern part of the Netherlands and it indicates the place where the artist shot the image.



Figure 56 Wout Berger, *Schaatsers (Uitdam)*, 1982, Stedelijk Museum Amsterdam, chromogenic photographic print.

On 19 April 2016, when discussing the possibility of reproducing his photographs, Berger declared that the condition of the discoloured prints was so disturbing that he discouraged their display as artworks. The photographs should be presented to the public only for educational purposes, as examples revealing the irreversible

²⁸³ The reddish cast present in many chromogenic photographs is the result of what is known in specialist literature as 'dark fading'. Dark fading refers to the degradation of the cyan, yellow, and magenta dyes caused by relatively high temperatures and, to a lesser extent, relatively high humidity levels. This process mainly takes place when photographs are stored in the dark, as light does not play a role in the degradation. As a result of dark fading, photographs show an overall colour shift caused by the fading of the three dyes at different rates. In comparison with the cyan and the yellow dyes, the magenta dye has generally a good stability in the dark and this has an effect on the appearance of chromogenic materials. Cyan and yellow dyes fades away, while the magenta remains the most visible, and this is what gives the photographs a reddish tone. For further reference on dark fading see Wilhelm and Brouwer 1993, 163–210.

²⁸⁴ The other discoloured photographs are three prints of the work *Tulpen* (1978–1973) — in English *Tulips* — unique numbers: FA 2882, 3.1999-K81954, 3.1999-K81664; *Friesland (Vuur)* (no date) — in English *Friesland (Fire)* — unique number FA 2884; *Horn Head (Ireland)* (probably 1984 — in English *Horn Head (Ireland)* — unique number FA 2885.

fading of chromogenic photographs. He also added that, should they be substituted with reproductions, these original prints should be kept in the repository as archival documents. Berger underscored the importance of his supervision of the reproduction process. Currently, the artist leaves the printing of his photographs to professionals, but despite this outsourcing, he is the only one who can decide on issues such as the image's transparency and the photograph's colour balance. Berger has noticed that photo labs generally tend to print photographs too dark and this insight makes his involvement in the process paramount, to ensure the rendering of the image's transparency and colour balance according his wishes.

When asked about the constituent elements of his photographs, he argued that the image is the most important element of the work and he makes an effort to print the image in such a way that it looks as natural as possible. He perceives the format of the initial photographs as a constituent element and the production of a work with a different size implies the creation of a new work, as was the case with the second edition of *Schaatsers (Uitdam)* (2015).²⁸⁵ The artist has decided to make a second edition of this work, as a larger dimension would augment the visibility of the details present in the winter landscape, in particular the ice marks in the foreground. According to Berger, a change in dimension influences the appearance of the photograph and this results in a different work. The artist always wanted to print a large format photograph of this image, but this was technically impossible back in 1982. At that time, he used to print all his photographs, but he did not have the equipment or the know-how to produce large-format photographs.

The artist does not place specific importance on the preserving of initial techniques and materials. In the event of a reproduction, the new work can be manufactured by using the materials and technology available at that moment. Nevertheless, Berger has distinct ideas about the type of materials that should be employed: he prefers matt photographic paper as this gives a softer, quieter look to the image, whereas glossy paper makes it harsher. He has stopped employing the Diasac® face-mounting, as he believes that this method has an impact on the discolouration of his photographs.

Above all, Berger has a pragmatic relationship with photography's technological advances as the analogic and digital worlds are mixed and fused together. In his artist practice, there is no distinct line between these two technologies, but the artist

²⁸⁵ The 2015 edition is formed from six inkjet photographs + 1 artist proof. The size of the photographs is 100x135 cm and the technique is pigment print on Ilford® Gold fibre silk paper, glued on Dibond® and framed with museum glass. The photo lab De Verbeelding in Purmerend, the Netherlands printed this edition. For further information on this edition see <http://www.zerp.nl/wout-berger.html> [accessed 28 April 2016].

selectively adopts the method that suits him best. In fact, he embraces the best of both worlds, avoiding any constraints imposed by either system. He still uses analogue negatives as he has more affinity and is more confident with this technology. He chooses analogue negatives for their superior 'plasticity' and their capacity to contain all the image's information. The selected image is then digitally scanned. This is done for two reasons: firstly, to be able to use modern printing technology and, secondly, as a preservation measure. After the scanning, the image is digitally printed. In this way, the artist can judge the photograph by looking at contact sheets, rather than on the monitor of a computer.

Regarding the reproduction of the six discoloured photographs at the Stedelijk Museum, Berger declared that the negatives would guide the way the photographs would be printed. If the condition of the negative were still good, he would print the photographs analogically, while if the condition does not allow it, then the negatives would be scanned and printed using digital technology.

In conclusion, during the first discussion about reproduction, Berger provided insights into what he truly considers the constituent aspects of his photographs: the image, the size, the colour, the transparency and, above all, his presence, in order to make an informed decision about all these elements. Contingent features are the materials and the techniques to be used in order to achieve what he, as the creating artist, deems fundamental for the substitution of the discoloured prints.

Koos Breukel

The Dutch photographer Koos Breukel (b. 1964) initiated a discussion regarding reproduction with the museum staff of the Stedelijk Museum by suggesting a reprint of the photograph *Cosmetic View nr. 3* (2005) (fig. 57), which is kept in the museum's collection. This work is available as a limited edition of ten prints and the museum purchased the fourth one. It depicts a close-up portrait of a boy's face against a grey neutral background. The gaze of the sitter seems asymmetrical, as one eye looks downwards while the other is looking into the camera. The photograph is part of a series of portraits that Breukel made about people with eyesight problems and who had all visited the same oculist. The majority of those portrayed have prosthesis in one eye, while some are blind in both eyes. With these pictures, Breukel seems to investigate the lively connection between senses and prosthesis, between the darkness and the sparkle of an artificial iris, and, in a way, he is reversing the cliché that considers the eyes to be the mirror of the soul (Zwagerman 2006). The *Cosmetic view* series falls within Breukel's larger artistic research and photographing of people that have

suffered some kind of injury and recording how they have managed to cope with either physical or emotional 'wounds'.

On 8 April 2016, when discussing the possible reproduction of *Cosmetic View nr. 3*, Breukel made clear that the main reason for him to reprint this photograph was the discolouration, which made him feel ashamed of the work's appearance. The colours' imbalance, with the fading of the yellow and cyan dyes and retention of the magenta dye, has resulted in a prevalence of reddish tones in the print. Breukel was rather categorical about the way he perceives this alteration: the photograph does not look right anymore as it is completely discoloured and he would feel 'ashamed' if the museum put it on display. He said the 2005 print could be kept in the museum's storage or it could be disposed of.

This is the first time that Breukel had approached a museum with a request to substitute a discoloured photograph. Additionally, the artist also declared that, given enough economic support from institutions or funds, he would like to substitute other discoloured prints at the Stedelijk or other museums.



Figure 57 Koos Breukel, *Cosmetic View nr 3*, 2005, Stedelijk Museum Amsterdam, chromogenic photographic print.

When asked about the details of the reproduction process, the artist stated that the new picture would be an inkjet printed on baryta Hahnemühle® paper, rather than a chromogenic photograph.²⁸⁶ He also added that, back in the 2000s, he was not satisfied with the technology available at the time. Breukel has a pragmatic approach — he follows and adopts photographic technological innovations when these become accessible. For Breukel, materials and processes are contingent features prone to changes and advances. If the reproduction process takes place, he will allow technological improvements. Consequently, in particular the colours would be different as they would be better. The image, the dimensions, the frame, and the presence of a mount are instead considered as constituent features that must be kept as close as possible to those in the original photograph. Regarding the mount and the frame, he added that these were specifically chosen for the series *Cosmetic View*. He declared that he normally does not use any special mounting for his pictures, but, in this case, he decided otherwise. In his eyes, these elements are an integral part of the work and, as such, should be treated with extra care.

Rineke Dijkstra

A couple of years ago, the Dutch artist Rineke Dijkstra (b. 1959) approached the Stedelijk Museum suggesting the reproduction and substitution of some of her older photographs kept in the museum's collection. In the past, she had reprinted a number of her works, mainly for two reasons: as exhibition copies for travelling exhibitions and as long-term loans, or to substitute and replace discoloured original prints with new, pristine photographs.²⁸⁷ For Dijkstra, discolouration cannot be a prevailing element of her photographs as viewers should properly engage with her works, rather than be distracted by the presence of an imbalance in the colours. During the reprinting, the artist aims to remain as close as possible to the original photograph, but she also allows improvements. The image, however, always remains the same as no changes are permitted and thus it should be considered as a constituent feature of the work.

²⁸⁶ For further reference on Hahnemühle® paper see <http://www.hahnemuehle.com/en/hahnemuehle.html> [accessed 21 May 2016].

²⁸⁷ In the past, Dijkstra has decided to reproduce a set of her photographs part of the series *Almerisa*, which were owned by a business company, as these had been displayed for years in direct sunlight and were completely faded. The initial chromogenic photographs have been substituted with inkjets prints on Dibond®.



Figure 58 Rineke Dijkstra, *The Nugent R.C. Highschool, Liverpool, England, November 11, 1994, 1994*, Stedelijk Museum Amsterdam, chromogenic photographic print.

On 25 April 2016, when discussing the possibility of reproducing some of her works, Dijkstra made clear that she would like to reproduce at least three photographs due to image discolouration: *Kolobrzeg, Poland, July 26, 1992 (1992–1995)*, *De Panne, Belgium, August 7, 1992 (1992–1995)*, *The Nugent R.C. Highschool, Liverpool, England, November 11, 1994 (1994)*.²⁸⁸

²⁸⁸ Unlike traditional portraits, which are titled with the subject's name, Dijkstra's titles follow strict rules: firstly, the name of sitters, if known; secondly the location and country where the image was taken; and thirdly, the date of the taking moment. It may be that there is an interval of years between the photographs' taking and the making moment. Her rules are even stricter for museum labels; each piece of information must be written one under the other.

The first two works are part of a series of twenty photographic works known as *Beach Portraits*, made by Dijkstra between 1992 and 2002. Within this series, each photograph was printed as a limited edition of six and the dimensions of the photographs within the edition may vary. The series is formed by portraits of boys and girls — many of whom are on the brink of adulthood — standing on the beaches of various countries: from the United States to Poland, from Belgium to Ukraine. The monumentality of the photographs, emphasized by the images' low perspective, is counterbalanced by the vulnerability of most of the adolescents, who are inexperienced in posing in front of a photographic camera. The other work is a portrait of a boy from a secondary school in Liverpool, England, in front of a greyish background (fig. 58). The teenager wears a white shirt, a black tie with a red and yellow dash, and green badge pinned on the tie. Also in this series, Dijkstra draws attention to adolescence as a challenging period when the human body changes from childhood to adulthood. In this particular photograph, the boy's face distinctly shows the marks of puberty.

From a material point of view, all three works were printed as chromogenic colour photographs and glued onto aluminium sheets. To avoid any undulation, Dijkstra's big formats are always pasted onto a flat material. Nowadays, the artist uses inkjet on Dibond® as a preferred technique and as material for either the reproduction of older photographs or for the creation of new works.

As a work practice, Dijkstra still employs analogue negatives for the taking moment of her photographs. These are subsequently scanned and the photographs are printed as inkjets from the resulting digital files. The artist likes to photograph with analogue technology as, according to her, this is simpler and more straightforward than digital technology. During the shooting with an analogue camera, she needs only be concerned with the diaphragm and the shutter speed, whereas with a digital camera she has to make many choices, and to take into account too many options. Moreover, the slowness of the process appeals to Dijkstra: for each shoot she needs to reset the camera and this action enhances both her concentration as well as that of the sitter.

Like the other artists described in this coda, Dijkstra employs a commingling of techniques and materials with no definite distinction between analogue and digital technology. She uses whatever technology or material suits her best during the creative process. She believes that the colours and the colour separation of inkjets are superior to those of chromogenic photographs making them more 'intense' than analogue photographs. Generally, Dijkstra spends a lot of time and energy in testing in order to get the 'perfect' colours for her photographs. Dijkstra recalls for example how back in the 1990s the Kodak® 4x5 inch analogue negatives had a different character as the current ones. The former ones were softer in colour and in image's contrast.

The reproduction process from analogue to digital is laborious. As the 'plasticity' of

analogue images is very difficult to replicate in digital prints and due to the difficulties encountered in this 'translation', Dijkstra makes endless tests. From her previous experience of reproducing chromogenic photographs into inkjets, the artist needs to be involved in the process of testing the image's colour and contrast. During our conversation, Dijkstra declared that she is the only person who can define these fundamental characteristics. In this regard, the direct intervention of the artist is a constituent feature, while the materials and the techniques are regarded as contingent properties.

Another constituent feature is the presence of white edges around the photographic images. For Dijkstra, this white boundary fulfils an important artistic function, as it isolates the photograph from the frame and, consequently, the viewer's attention focuses on the entire image and not just on the portrayed figures. The figure becomes too monumental without the white borders as it moves too much to the fore. As a result of this 'movement', the unity of the image's composition is interrupted and the background does not interact with the figures in the foreground. In the event of reproducing the Stedelijk Museum photographs, Dijkstra declared that she would keep the borders, but she is now contemplating the possibility of changing how these are made: in the current versions, the borders correspond with the white cardboard of the window mats, while future versions may have white edges that are part of the photographic images. Attention should be drawn to the fact that this change might produce a different visual effect: the edges would become integral to the image, rather than being a physical element — with its own material properties like thickness, texture, and colour — placed on top of the work.

Furthermore, Dijkstra expressed her wish to change the format of the three photographs, but she also added that this alteration could only take place in consultation with the museum staff. The reason for her to reproduce the photographs larger than the actual size is an increase in their monumentality. In the past, the artist has experimented a lot with different sizes in her efforts to find a balance between the photograph's size and the work's message. An excessive increase of the *Beach Portraits* underscored the vulnerability of the sitters too much. The photographs should be monumental from a distance, but create an intimate relationship with the viewer at a closer look, as the observer should be able to relate to the portrayed figures. The artist also argued that the type of image determines the format: for example, photographs that do not depict vulnerable sitters can bear a larger format. In general, for Dijkstra, photography is a medium that enlarges things: it makes emotions look more intense, it makes elderly people look older. She now believes that the best format for the *Beach Series* is a photograph with the dimension of 167x140,5 cm and with an image size of 130x104,5 cm, rather than the current Stedelijk Museum's photographs that have

a dimension of 120x 100 cm with an image size of 94x75 cm. She also added that a change of format is never a reason to initiate the reproduction activity. Other factors such as discolouration or damage of the photographic surface start the process, but when the decision is taken, then the artist might envision some modifications to the work. In the event of the reproduction of these three works, the format of the photographs should be regarded as a contingent property.

Dijkstra's relationship with format during the reproduction of her photographic works greatly differs from those of the other artists examined in this dissertation. All the others have made an effort to replicate the exact dimensions of the initial versions. For them, format — together with the correspondence to the initial image — is a constituent element of their work. For Dibbets and Berger, an alteration in size implies a different work. As discussed, Dibbets disapproves of improvements in this direction, because the use of a bigger format indicates an anachronistic use of the photographic technologies and materials that an artist has at hand. The printing limitations back in the 1970s forced the artist to find alternative solutions, which enabled the creation of wall-filling works such as *Comet Sea 3°–60°*. In Berger's case, the 2015 limited of *Schaatsers (Uitdam)* was achieved by changing, among other things, the dimensions of the photograph. For Berger, a different size indicates the creation of a new work. The majority of the artists studied in this dissertation as well as the staff of the Stedelijk Museum consider format a constituent feature of the work.

The museum had already discussed Dijkstra's proposal to reproduce the three photographs and their possible modification in terms of dimension and printing technique in 2013. At that time, the museum only considered the reprinting of the photographs viable if the initial technique and format was respected. The staff viewed these two elements as indicative of Dijkstra's artistic development and, in the museum's view, the modification of the work's dimensions would erase the artist's struggle to achieve a good balance between the image's size and monumentality. For the museum, it was important to maintain a clear link with the initial works, those that the museum had acquired in 1995 and in 1996.

The envisaged reproduction also brings into question the consistency within a series. The Stedelijk Museum owns another photograph, part of the *Beach Series: Hilton Head Island, S.C., USA, June 27, 1992*. This work had already been reprinted around 2005, due to an unexpected and unwanted staining of the initial print. Being printed more recently, this version shows no signs of disturbing discolouration and, for this reason, the artist regards its reproduction less critical than the reproduction of the other works in the series. However, the reproduction of the other two with different techniques, materials, and possibly with a larger format would disrupt the uniformity within the series. Dijkstra declared that there should, ideally, be a consistency of

Coda

technique, format, and presentation within a series and, for this reason, she encourages the reproduction of the entire *Beach Series* of the Stedelijk Museum. When asked about the possible inconsistencies arising during a retrospective with photographs from other collections, the artist did not have a clear-cut answer. She suggested the making of fully consistent exhibition copies, as she has previously done for a travelling exhibition in 2005 and 2006.

Dijkstra also has an explicit view about what should happen to the discoloured versions. Generally, at the moment of substitution of the original for the newly reproduced photographs, she demands the restitution of the discarded prints, which are subsequently destroyed in her presence. In the event of the reproduction within a museum setting, she might contemplate the possibility of the original versions being kept as documentation. In this light, it might be possible to suggest a similar course of action as has occurred with Van Der Kaap's case studies: partial removal of the aesthetic qualities and subsequent demotion of status from artwork to archival reference if the work is kept in the museum, or full withdrawal of aesthetic qualities that justify physical elimination of the discarded versions.

In sum, this coda has briefly presented three other fascinating cases in which artists contemplate reproduction as a preservation strategy to counter the fading or the degradation of their own photographs. It also underscored the actuality of reproduction of photographic artworks as a museum practice. It showed several similarities with aspects discussed in the dissertation, but it also emphasized the need for further research, especially regarding digital technology and about the complex relationship that might occur among the various works forming a limited edition.

