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I. The Artist as Reader: Outlines of Research

Generally we are more interested in the books artists produced than in those they drew on for their work. Whereas artists’ books have established themselves as collection items and subjects of research with the advent of modernism, we become aware of the books artists owned especially when they land in archives as part of a bequest or when they belong to the inventories of historic artists’ homes or studios. Often enough, even today works of art eloquently – and even perhaps at times too explicitly – inform about what the artist read. The fact is that even the subtlest intermedial allusions and mere anticipation of being able to discover traces of literary affiliations secures the curiosity of interpreters for such works of the visual arts.

To the question put to him in spring 2009 of whether a specific work of art had changed his view of the world, Damien Hirst retorted:

Oh there’s millions! You know, I’ve fucking devoured artworks for years. Just went through Cage and everything. Francis Bacon or Jeff Koons probably changed my life. There’s so many great artists. I remember being in the library of the school, looking at all the books, thinking: Fuck! You know, I’m gonna read all this.¹

The artist as reader is a long story that has not come to an end in the 21st century – as we can see in the above quote.² Hirst’s description of himself is tinged with ambivalence. After all, the statement is from someone whose work conceptually builds on provocation, breaking with tradition,

² The recent exhibitions The Artist’s Library (Centre International d’art et du paysage, Île de Vassivière, 24.02–15.06.2008, curated by Carrie Pilto) and Versions – Artist’s Library (Galerie für Zeitgenössische Kunst, Leipzig, 26.09.2008–04.01.2009, curated by Edina Nagy) present two typical examples.
and exulting in undermining intellectuallity in art, the age-old legitimation of the *pictor doctus*. Of course we do not really know if Hirst actually did read a great number of books. The truth of his remark may have only little relevance for the study of his work. And indeed we would, in the case of an artist such as Damien Hirst, hardly think of reconstructing a history of reception by consulting illustrated art books, although, for the early modern period, this has long determined research on artists as readers. To this day, art-historical research – and specifically the iconological approach – primarily searches for books relevant to images, the erudite text behind the obscurely clever *invenzione*. Taking stock of book titles from artists' inventories, or reconstructing libraries that artists possibly had access to, promised enlightenment on complex iconographies and the work of the learned artist. In contrast, the larger perspective of a history of knowledge and education focusing on artists as readers remains a desideratum for further study.

The ambitions of this introduction are therefore to give a structural outline of the key issues of existing research on the topic and to delineate areas of possible future research using analysis examples. Based on the history of knowledge, the chapters of this volume will then correspondingly elucidate various aspects of how, in the early modern period, artists' education, knowledge, reading and libraries were related to the ways in which they presented themselves. The volume endeavours at long last to go beyond merely publishing inventories by investigating the problem of artists' libraries with a fundamentally stronger emphasis on a discourse-analytical and history-of-knowledge approach. As a result, it is possible to

---


challenge or at least renew the debate on a central concept in recent art-historical research, that of the learned artist, the *doctus artifex* or *pictor doctus*. Dating back to the 16th century and propagated by art theorists, the notion of the ideal artist – who was likewise a well-read intellectual – facilitated acceptance of the visual arts among the liberal arts, and the thread of this art-theoretical construct was later taken up by iconological studies and, more recently, research on artists.5

---

Reading is apparently the greatest proof of refinement when viewed within the context of the social climb of the visual artist. Only through the cultivation of intellect could artists rise above being considered only artisans. Erudition was the means of imbuing their work with a quasi scholarly and philosophical dignity, and for elevating their status to that of the *poeta doctus* or *poeta eruditus*. It is only as reader that the artist can participate in the exclusive culture of clerics, humanists, rulers and courtiers. But the question is not only whether the *pictor doctus* really existed or not. Rather, we must ask, how did it come about that such a figure was integrated into the general history-of-knowledge context of research on the early modern period. To answer this question it is imperative that a crossdisciplinary

---

Comparison be undertaken of all prior rather sporadic studies on artists' reading – of not only books by natural scientists, philosophers, the clergy, legal scholars, but also by craftsmen and the uneducated – in order to outline what artists' reading specifically entails. While the prestige of poets, rhetoricians, philosophers, and theologians was not debated, interestingly enough visual artists developed unique justification strategies by targeting the elevation of their profession from the ranks of an artisanal craft to the status of a liberal art. The process of their social climb was settled temporarily when the academies were founded – in 1563 the inauguration of the Accademia del Disegno in Florence took place and in 1593 Federico Zuccari reorganised the Roman Accademia di San Luca.

This was a sign that the pictor doctus was at least established in Italy as the prototype of the artist. It must be emphasized, however, that such a climb could only materialize concurrent to an increase in opportunities for acquiring knowledge. It was not until the 16th century that, with the invention of printing and a pronouncedly vernacular culture, attempts were made within the book market to conflate knowledge also for the visual-art discipline, to make it available to artists, and draw up rules for all artists to use as orientation through the medium of the book. Printing made the same texts freely available in different cities and countries so that art norms and specific ‘artists’ knowledge’ – in the sense of a body of knowledge familiar to a majority of artists – became widespread, much more so than the face-to-face exchange of knowledge within the workshop situation. All in all, we can safely assume that there was an interaction between practical knowhow acquired as a student and knowledge acquired through independent study and reading (although presumably seldom done systematically). Book collections seemed to take on the function of a collective memory in an externalized form. While they alleviated private memory, they likewise restricted it, which was of more consequence for artists than, for example, theologians. Indeed, the

---


spread and reception of artists’ knowledge in printed form had the result that norms were established for the aesthetic imagination, which always then occurred when learned inventions fed on a canonical preselection of books. On the other hand, this makes the exceptions particularly interesting, as in the case of Leon Battista Alberti, who ostentatiously demonstrated his erudition by a dislike for printed books, greatly preferring handmade books and manuscripts.9

II. Source Material

Undoubtedly, great efforts have been made to describe the educational background of artists and substantiate them on a more a solid stock of data. Frances Ames-Lewis exemplarily succeeded in such a reconstruction of knowledge cultures that were highly relevant for Early Renaissance visual artists.10 In addition, a plethora of related studies investigating the fund of material relevant to education in humanist culture are available.11 In glaring contrast, the problem of artists and their use of books has hitherto hardly ever been systematically investigated especially in a larger time frame.12 The number of publications relevant to the subject of artists’ libraries or artists' reading practices is surprisingly meagre. Jan Białostocki’s article Doctus artifex and the library of the artist in the XVIth and XVIIth century from 1984 is still the standard in research in his unique

attempt to achieve an overall picture based on available – admittedly rather haphazard – sources.13

In regard to which books and manuscripts were possessed by artists, it is hardly an exaggeration to say that we have obtained our knowledge almost entirely to chance finds, to researchers in archives who stumbled across such material while in search of very different things. Correspondingly, also the selection of publications we can find on the topic has been largely determined by which documents and records have been found. But the often very elucidating presentations of historic material only very seldomly explore issues beyond the case in question. Thus, in the meantime, we know of the inventories for the libraries of painters, sculptors and architects such as Filippino Lippi,14 Leonardo da Vinci,15 Albrecht Altdorfer,16 El Greco,17 Vincente Carducho,18 Giovanni Maria Nosseni,19 Inigo Jones,20 Giovanni Antonio Rusconi,21 Carlo Maderno,22 Pietro

14 Carl D., “Das Inventar der Werkstatt von Filippino Lippi aus dem Jahre 1504”, Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz 31 (1981) (373–391) 388–389, nos. 222–233 in doc. II. This inventory is particularly interesting because it is a valuable document for early modern printing. Without detailed comments, the list comprises twelve volumes that the artist stored in his scrittoio: Besides Livy (the only manuscript) and an Ovid written in the vernacular, he additionally owned a bible, Dante’s works (Commedia and Convivio), Petrarch (Canzoniere) and Boccaccio (Ninfale fiesolano and probably also the Decamerone), as well as Poggio Bracciolini (probably the Facezie), a “libretto delle Sibille” (considered by Carl to be a treatise by Filippo Barbieri), a “libro da champagnie” (the statues of a lay brotherhood), and “uno libro di geometria” as the only “textbook”.
Veri,23 Durante Alberti,24 Nicolas Poussin,25 Diego Velázquez,26 Francesco Borromini,27 Alessandro Algardi,28 Andrea Sacchi,29 Carlo Maratta,30 Domenico Guidi,31 Pieter Saenredam,32 Jürgen Ovens,33 Johann Carl Loth,34 Stefano Maria Legnani,35 Pier Leone Ghezzi,36 Matthäus Daniel Pöppelmann,37 Bernardo Vittone, and Lambert Krahe.38 In addition to a number of others. However, the reconstructions of libraries belonging to leading artists, such as Pietro da Cortona, Gianlorenzo Bernini or Peter Paul

35 Dell’Olmo M., Stefano Maria Legnani, “Il Legnanino” (Ozzano Emilia: 1998) 265–266. On this topic see Huub van der Linden’s chapter in this volume.
36 Dorati da Empoli M.C., Pier Leone Ghezzi: Un protagonista del Settecento romano (Rome: 2008) 401–487. See also below, 30–42.
Rubens, were based on sources and information that cannot, ultimately, be verified as pertinent to the cases in question.  

The situation grows even more complicated if we also regard manuscripts. It is well known that especially transcriptions – and a great many of them too – of Leonardo’s treatise on painting were passed on from one artist to another, without them actually owning a copy themselves. Such manuscripts were, of course, not included in inventories. It is generally more difficult to find information on artists’ archives than what we are used to finding on scholars’ archives. Because more sources have survived from the 18th and 19th century than previous, the situation is, overall, more encouraging. Also in this time frame there was an increase in the heuristic value of library inventories for describing artists’ intellectual ambitions. Worth mentioning in this context is the well-documented and therefore rare case of the Danish painter Nicolai Abildgaard (1743–1809). Abildgaard learnt several languages on his own in order to read his books, and he even evacuated his library by himself when Copenhagen was under fire during an attack by the British fleet in 1801.

As Nelson threatened to cannonade the city I evacuated my books, so my room remained empty for six days. During this time I would walk around in it and, again and again, go to pull out a book. I felt as if I had been deserted when I only found the empty shelves. I cannot begin to describe how this filled me with melancholy, so I swore to myself that I would never sell my books.  

---
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A comic pen-and-ink drawing by his close friend the sculptor Johan Tobias Sergel portrays the painter leaning against a print cabinet in a casual pose while reading. The impressive abundance of books in the background is contrasted by numerous empty bottles amassed under the draftsman’s table. The inscription “BIBLIOTECA SERGELIANA” points out an alternative route for arousing the powers of the imagination.42 [See fig. 3] Even the literary subjects Abildgaard chose for his pictures, such as Shakespeare’s dramas, point out how close-knit his library holdings and his favourite books were. Possible sources for unusual subject matter indifferent to the poetic rules, such as Hamlet points at the Ghost of his Father to show his Mother, could have been Shakespeare or Johann Gottfried Herder’s Von deutscher Art und Kunst (Hamburg 1773). In this book, which was part of Abildgaard’s library according to the inventory, the appearance of the ghost was mentioned as an example of the genius of Shakespeare that lay in transgressing the rules of the hierarchy of dramatic kinds.43 This case shows that research on artists’ libraries has the potential of definitely facilitating the study, in the classical sense, of rare forms of iconography and their scope of meaning. Furthermore, the fact that Herder’s publication was present in Abildgaard’s library gives insight into a general history of taste and changing intellectual requirements for artistic activity. A history of knowledge tracing such transformations in the lives of early modern artists is lacking.

III. The Artists’ Library as Fact and Metaphor

So far there have been very few targeted attempts to search in archives for material on artists’ libraries on a broader scale and exclusively for the purpose of formulating results from the sources found. Likewise there have been no endeavours to statistically evaluate known inventories and owners’ entries in a larger history-of-knowledge context. On the one hand, the – none too frequent and often unreliable – topical reports we have about artists’ reading habits in biographical literature must be rela-

---

essential reading on Abildgaard’s library and how he saw himself as a pictor doctus see Kragelund P., Abildgaard. Kunstneren mellem oprørerne (Copenhagen: 1999) 9–120.
tivised by comparing them with factual knowledge gained through finds in archives. On the other, it is essential that we compare such archival facts with book lists and a recommended canon of literature for artists, such as is presented in the treatises of theoreticians like Giovanni Battista Armenini, Giovanni Paolo Lomazzo, Luigi Scaramuccia, Willem Goeree, Gerard de Lairesse or Roger de Piles.

Armenini’s *Veri precetti della pittura* divided into categories the books that were essential for artists to read in order to properly meet the demands of their vocation: devotional literature, history books, iconography manuals, and – to excite the powers of the imagination – novels such as *Amadis*, as well as standard literature on architecture with Vitruvius at the top of the list.44 Only shortly afterwards Giovanni Paolo Lomazzo (1538–1600) devoted a chapter in *Idea del tempio della pittura* to the necessary sciences for the painter. In this context he brought up the topic of the ‘Libri necessari al pittore’, but did not name any individual authors despite differentiating between highly divergent areas of knowledge.45

44 See Białostocki, “Doctus artifex” 20.
The painter Charles-Alphonse Dufresnoy, with the publication of the didactic poem and very successful Horace interpretation *De arte graphica*, immediately awakened great interest among art lovers. It was communicated in flawless hexameters, but first had to be translated for his artist colleagues. In the same year it was first published (1667) a French prose version followed, written by the young Roger de Piles (1635–1709) who here too was not sparing in his display of erudition in detailed and extensive *Remarques*. Under the title of ‘The artist’s library and the books he should read, or have read to him’, he put together a canon of literature that ranges from the Bible to André Félibien’s recently published *Entretiens*. He likewise included antiquarian books and publications on medallions, but there is no mention of Italian art theory. Homer and Pausanias were to provide artists with ‘beautiful ideas’; Livy and Flavius Josephus educate them in Roman history; and ‘certain novels’ were allowed to inspire, although this was a dangerous undertaking because they falsified history. The Latin classics were generally recommended in modern translations. And curious artists had the option of informing themselves by reading an *abrége* of Baronius’s multi-volume history of the Church.46 Such particulars make it obvious that, despite the fact it was desirable that artists be educated, they were not to be overburdened by their endeavours.

Published almost simultaneously in 1674, Luigi Scaramuccia’s (1616–1680) book *Le finezze de’ pennelli italiani* divides the books to read subdivided into ‘Historie del Mondo (inter alia Livy, Tacitus, and Justus Lipsius), ‘Historie sacre’ (Josephus Flavius and the Holy Scriptures), and ‘Poesie diverse’. In the last group he listed Virgil and Ovid alongside the moderns Ariosto, Tasso, and Marino [see fig. 4].47 Correspondingly, Jonathan Richardson rounds up his comprehensive list of the Bible, Homer, Thucydides, Livy, Virgil and Plutarch with Spenser and Milton.48 In the eyes of the bookseller and art theoretician Willem Goeree (1635–1711) from Middelburg, the best way to train the imagination and memory was to read the


Quanto sia d'ostile al Pittore il dilettarsi di belle Lettere.

ON dourebbe per mio credere applicarsi niuno a questa Professione, che non fosse versato, almeno in qualche parte, nelle buone Lettere, poiché mai potrà esprimere su le Tele, se non le Carte quello che ben non si possiede; ne possieder si puote, se non foglia ogi accuratessa non si studia, e non si esercita la memoria sopra de Libri; In questa forma più che in alcun'altra si potrà imprimer ciò che voglia dire Historia, o suoloedgiamento Poetico, altrimenti se tu vuoi essere stringerti a domandar altrui come vadano le faccenda, qualunque volta d'vuopo te ne faccia, non bene farai, poiché oltre il dimenticarti per ogni luice accidente di quelle specie che poc'anni visti, molto d'luice vuole ad vn Pittore che sia di qualche portata, l'andare ad ogi'hora mendicando da altri quello, che far da te stesso si potrebbe con vn poco d'applicazione.

Quali i Libri più necessari per g'elezati Pittori.

Se poi tu brama di sapere di quai Libri potresti accompagnarti, fatti, che a mio credere, tra li molti, che frutto recar ti potrebbero, sono li seguenti.

Tito Livio.

Cornelio Tacito.

Giusto Lipo, e simili.

Il Vigilega de Patriarchi, e Profetti.

Gioseffo Historico.

Scrittura Sacra, ed'altri tali.

Virgilio.

Quinto.

Tasso.

Aristote.

Marini, ed' altri Poeti Classici.

Moltissi.
historical works of antiquity, to which he also included Virgil’s *Aeneid*. After roughly sorting the bulk of literature worth reading (“Wat boeken men behoorde te lesen”) in his *Inleyding* he emphasized the advantages of knowledge of other languages even if translations were more readily available in the meantime.⁴⁹ Then he proceeds to underscore the benefits of both antiquarian books as well as manuals and, in fact, every kind of illustrative material in print form, and goes on to individually introduce various compilations containing representations of ancient sculptures (Boissard, Rubens, Perrier, de Bisschop). Young painters eager to learn were to always have their diverse resources at hand, according to Goeree. Thus they could appropriate a rich fund of useful and pertinent knowledge by continually switching between reading and drawing, artistic practice and consolidation of intellectual speculation.⁵⁰

To what extent did artists take such recommendations to heart? Did they only correspond to the ideals of the educated laity, or did they outline the ideal range of literature that we would expect ambitious artists to have had in their bookshelves at the time anyhow? Already a fleeting look at the surviving inventories shows that the titles represented in libraries largely overlapped, that we actually find many of the approved treatises again and again. For example, Flavius Josephus’s description of the War of the Jews was immensely popular north and south of the Alps; De Piles called it the ‘fifth Gospel’ in his list, second after the Bible. [see fig. 5.] Devotional writings, too, such as Ludolph von Sachsen’s *Vita Christi* as well as the *Vitae patrum* and the *Flos sanctorum* were still widely read in the Baroque period. Thomas à Kempis’s small book *De imitatione Christi*, committed to the Devotio Moderna movement, experienced a revival due to the Catholic Reformation and was widely circulated in various

---


⁵⁰ Goeree, *Inleyding* 43: ‘. . . also moet eenen Jong Schilder van de beginner aan, door gedurige oeffeningen van Lesen, Teikenen, Spekuleeren, Kopiëren, ondervragen, praktise-eren en uytvoressen, sijn gemoed met wijsheid soeken te vervullen; op dat hy namaals uyt die opgeleide schappen, eens heerlijke dingen aan de Wereld sou konen ten toon stellen.’
translations. We know from Gian Lorenzo Bernini that, during his stay in Paris, he had someone read this clearly structured and easy-to-read book out loud to him daily, and that he warmly recommended it to his attaché Fréart de Chantelou.

To be concise, all the authors named on the lists of recommended reading can be found among the surviving inventories of artists’ libraries, but never all of them together. What is highly fascinating about library holdings is when they ignore the prescribed guidelines, or their incongruities in which we can recognize the manifestations of individual preferences.

---

In order to analyse such phenomena, research on practices in borrowing books must also be undertaken. It can well be assumed that artists, as studies have verified for humanists, were generous in lending their books to one another or even allowing others access to their libraries. It goes without saying that the advantages of research on the reading habits of artists are great. We need only parenthetically call to mind the rich fund of knowledge that we have at our disposal through research on library history and can draw on in art and social history in the Baroque period – documented in Irene Baldriga’s study of the Giustiniani brothers’ library, Sebastian Schütze’s of the Barberini library, or Victoria von Flemming’s of Scipione Borghese’s. Similar investigations have been undertaken on Vincenzo Borghini, the scholar who advised Giorgio Vasari – as well as the artists of the Florentine Accademia del Disegno – on iconography and drafted iconographic programmes for their paintings. We also know of

---

53 Grafton, *Commerce* 103.

54 In his *Life of Bernardo Cavallino*, the Neapolitan artists’ biographer Bernardo de Dominici reported that the successful Neapolitan painter Massimo Stanzione, respected for his erudition, advised a younger colleague on what to read and also gave him a number of volumes from his own library: The younger colleague ‘fu ancor consigliato da Massimo [Stanzione] ad applicarsi alla lettura de’ buoni Libri di storie e di antiche favole, ed ebbe in prestenza dal Cavaliere (che molti ne aveva) la Scrittura Sacra, le favole di Ovidio, Giuseppe Ebreo [Flavius Josephus], la Gerusalemme liberata del Tasso, la quale egli chiamava il suo divertimento nell’ora che altri riposava, perché gl’altri libri mentovati gli servivan di studio per le cose, che voleva dipingere [. . .].’ De Dominici Bernardo, *Le vite de’ pittori, scultori, ed architetti Napoletani* (Naples: 1745), vol. III, 34. It is noteworthy that he differentiates between reading for practical work-related knowledge and for pursuit of leisure. Of course we must not forget that the author wrote the biography about one hundred years after the events actually took place and that it holds the anecdotal description of an idealized reading canon for young future artists, meaning that we must also comprehend it as recommendations for readers of the *Vite*.


Giovan Pietro Bellori, antiquarian and writer on art, that he was in possession of a private collection of books. With people such as Bellori we are confronted with libraries of persons who, as patrons, collectors, advisers, and theoretists, were at least in part on friendly terms with artists. With a measure of caution, insights into their book collections potentially lead to conclusions about the intellectual motivations and backgrounds of patrons, or elucidate on the cultural knowledge context of an epoch, or describe the microhistory of an elite intellectual culture such as that of a Roman cardinal’s household and entourage. But it is out of the question that we can ultimately conclude that artists who had access to such libraries automatically absorbed the whole intellectual cosmos surrounding the owners thereof.

Focusing on the specific demands of artists, Tom Holert presents in his study on artistic competence in 18th and early 19th century France an epistemologically based examination of artists’ knowledge (Künstlerwissen), investigating which books they owned, what and how they read, as well as their academic education and their practical training as the inseparable entities in building the foundations for artistic competence. Because of the fact that Holert takes his examples from Salon art – primarily discussing Anne-Louis Girodet’s Deluge from 1806 as a planned model painting for the demonstration of artistic knowledge – it is difficult to draw conclusions from the study that are relevant for early modern times, although in a few cases there are obvious reasons to do so. For example, Holert shows us how traditional fields of competence specifically adapted to the needs of the artist were very tightly interlaced, such as anatomy, book and practical knowledge, art-historical pictorial conventions and further visual information. It was the aggregate of this knowledge that


determined the specific education of an artist, which could by no means be adequately understood by only closely studying a certain work on anatomy. [See fig. 6]

IV. Artists’ Libraries?

In the hypothetical reconstruction of artists’ libraries we must also reflect on the term “library”. It is tempting to describe a coherent and unchanging
space for the construct of an ‘artists’ library’, implicitly premising that such a collection of books likewise have a consistent context, and possibly abide by some order or reflect some sort of canon. We immerse ourselves even deeper in speculation when we, in surviving archival findings informing of book ownership, not only attempt to reconstruct a consistent library but also an intellectual profile of its owner. Research has repeatedly fallen into this trap in the case of Peter Paul Rubens, the highly educated humanist and erudite in the authors of antiquity.

Inventories mention ‘books’ significantly more often than ‘libraries’ owned by artists. It must not be forgotten, however, that the term ‘library’ not only comprises ownership of a considerable number of books but also a place reserved for keeping them and study. In the early modern period ‘Bibliotheca’ could designate an actually existing collection of books as well as be the metaphor for quite a number of forms of ordering knowledge.\(^{59}\) The library was not just the total sum of written heritage, the locus of memory, and a representation of respective knowledge cultures. In fact, it could itself become an icon of knowledge.\(^{60}\) It effectively became the location in which knowledge was stored by a compilation of books, structured and ordered in some way, and was presented in the light of a universal science. The order of a library could, like that of a Kunstkammer, mirror order in nature, or – if this order was considered lost – reestablish it.\(^{61}\)

But a single book could also accomplish the same thing: an encyclopaedia could hold the entire knowledge of a whole library.\(^{62}\) The encyclopaedia

---

\(^{59}\) Surprisingly, the term ‘library’ does not have an entry of its own in either the *Historischen Wörterbuch der Philosophie* or the *Wörterbuch der philosophischen Metaphern*. In the latter it is only mentioned – in the entry “Lesen” (Reading) by Olaf Breidbach in Konersmann R. (ed.), *Wörterbuch der philosophischen Metaphern* (Darmstadt: 2007) (195–207) 205–206.

\(^{60}\) Breidbach, “Lesen” 205.


could present knowledge order itself by exhibiting methodical strategies for finding information, or it could – as a special subject encyclopaedia – be a storehouse for specialist knowledge (such as 16th-century herbal books or Conrad Gesner’s books on zoology), or take stock of the entire knowledge of an epoch. Correspondingly encyclopaedias were often metaphorically termed ‘Bibliothecae’. Early modern parlance already differentiated between ‘Bibliotheca universalis’ and ‘Bibliotheca selecta’, between different models that stipulated what knowledge was to be collected, how it was to be ordered, and where it was to be kept – as well as whether its scope was to be expanded or restricted. Account must be taken of the fact that we can only inadequately ascertain how – in the context of encyclopaedic knowledge orders – scholarly theorization of the universal library was linked to individual practises of acquiring knowledge by reading books.

Did early modern scientific understanding comprehend the contingent character of an artist’s book collection as a typically haphazard cumulation of volumes at all as a ‘library’? Did artists’ reading imbue them with the dignity befitting a scholar or philosopher so that they can be discussed within the context of library history? Consequently, when in the following ‘artists’ libraries’ are again the topic, we will reflect on the problem of the books belonging to individual artists hardly being referred to as ‘Bibliotheca’ in discussions in the early modern period.

---


Despite the fact that research can only be based on the fragments of artists’ book collections representing the total knowledge they had at their disposal, it nevertheless would be a worthwhile undertaking to investigate what artists’ preferred fields of knowledge were, what role the disciplines played (in the modern sense of organising the sciences and other fields of study into separate disciplines), and in what way was such knowledge possibly ordered. For the moment at least it is true that the fundamentals are missing for a knowledge-history approach, because ‘artists’ libraries’ – resembling a specific kind of ‘artists’ knowledge’ – have not been sufficiently defined as yet. In regard to ‘artists’ libraries’ it probably makes most sense to describe them as a specific way of storing knowledge and assume we are basically dealing with a kind of private specialist or reference library. Thereby its content is nevertheless universal to the extent that the social demands of the pictor doctus required artists to be educated. This corresponds with the observation that in documented libraries we can usually find a compact collection of books pertinent to the disciplines of the artists – be it architecture or painting. This is usually accompanied by a much smaller number of volumes containing an exceptionally rich fund of general knowledge in the areas of natural and moral philosophy, natural history, theology, geography, mythography, poetics, history, etc. Only a comparison with libraries in other disciplines can conclusively determine whether this is a specific characteristic of artists’ libraries. As far as representing knowledge in its entirety goes, it is likewise interesting to know more about the contents of individual books, because the very reduced stock of knowledge in private libraries obviously also gave rise to a preference for certain kinds of books. Thus we must ask to what extent did encyclopaedically organised works, such as Vincenzo Cartari’s Imagini degli Dei and Cesare Ripa’s Iconologia, become the core stock of artists’ libraries. And moreover, it must be determined in how far such books transformed artistic practices by providing information that could be easily ‘looked up’ so that artists no longer had to go through the complex intellectual process leading to an invenzione by reading a variety of literary works and then comparing what they read with visual material. To conclude, there is also the general, fundamentally relevant question concerning early modern behaviour in reading: to what extent did artists not ‘read’ but rather ‘use’ books, and if artists – in addition to the library at home – also kept a set of reference works in their studios, such as anatomical atlases, that they could freely consult at any time while at work. [See fig. 7.]
V. Bibliotheca selecta: The Case of Joseph Werner

We are confronted with a special case of seemingly reified artists’ readings in their designs for series of pictures based on the subject matter of certain
books or illustrations for publications and frontispieces. Here too we find an abundance of possible reading forms. One option was that the client or author stipulated exactly what was to be done and the picture was drawn entirely without the artist reading the book whose subject matter they were to illustrate. Another possibility was that artists literally vied with the book and studied it very closely. And thirdly, it was sometimes the case that a series of illustrations actually implicitly criticized their literary model and are hence documents of a subversive reading within pictorial inventions that explore independent discursive avenues. But there are still examples for palpable and analysable text-and-image relationships that allow conclusions on the impact of reading on artists.

With the Bernese painter Joseph Werner (1637–1711) we are dealing with another kind of case study. Werner pursued his career in a number of European urban centres and could easily count as the prototype of a 17th-century pictor doctus. Werner was fluent in a number of languages, which was highly exceptional for painters in the early modern period. His artistic pursuits reveal a penchant for intellectually complex and cryptic pictorial allegories in his miniatures. Werner initially worked in Rome where he presumably studied art under Pietro da Cortona and Carlo Maratta. From thence he then went to the court at Versailles where he was engaged as a miniature painter. Later he was also in Vienna, Bern, Basel, Augsburg and finally Berlin. There he was the founding director of the academy in 1696. A remarkable self-portrait of the 25-year-old painter has survived that is not only a self-reflection of the artist on his occupation as a painter of miniatures but also on the knowledge derived from books as an intellectual theme within a theme [fig. 8].

---

It can be safely assumed that Werner saw himself as a *pictor doctus*. He owned an impressive art collection and a library. We know about the contents of both through an inventory compiled by his friend and student Wilhelm Stettler, who had the collection under his safekeeping for a period. But what determined the intellect of a man whose self-portrait makes a definite statement on his scholarly claims to virtue and genius? Wilhelm Stettler reported on the books in Werner’s possession, of

Some poetical, historical, and other profound books, such as: Le Dictionnaire Historique, Poétique & Geographique, Quinte Curce de Vaugelas in 4to, l’Iliade, & l’Odyssée d’Homère, French in 8vo; a French Virgil, verse, in 8vo, both printed in Paris; an Italian Ovid, verse, in 8vo; Ariosto’s Orlando Furioso, Torquato Tasso, Il Pastor Fido, Stratonica und Demetrius, probe, all in 12. Iconologia Degli Dei Antiqui, Prose[e]. 8 Le Vite de Patri Prof. 8 Iconologia de Cesare Ripa, in 4. Livre de Portraiture, par Jean Cousin, fol. I am astounded that the last two books, so useful to the painter, were not translated into German a long time ago.68

It should be noted that this ‘artist’s library’ was accompanied by a small collection of paintings as well as a number of drawings and copperplate engravings, including a volume of Anton van Dyck’s portrait engravings and Johann Wilhelm Baur’s *Metamorphoses* series (first printed in Vienna in 1641). It is surprising that the inventory lists just thirteen titles of books that obviously were Werner’s most important possessions, and – if we also include the volumes of engravings – only fifteen in all. Likewise, a careful evaluation of all the inventories of early modern artists’ libraries known to date leads to the conclusion that these libraries were, to the greater extent, modest in size. The largest in the early 18th century belonged to Pier Leone Ghezzi with over 1000 books, followed by Domenico Parodi, who according to his biographer Carlo Giuseppe Ratti owned 700 books;69

---

68 Quoted after Glaesemer, *Joseph Werner* 86.
69 Parodi’s passion for collecting rare books consumed his earnings and distracted him from his main profession: ‘Amante Domenico delle lettere, e delle Scienze, avea speso in libri di molto prezzo quanto gli era riuscito di guadagnare: ed aveasi formato una libreria ricca di seicento, e più, rari volume; intorno a’ quali spendeva la maggior parte del tempo, togliendolo alla sua Professione, senza riflettere al discapito, che per più capi gliene veniva.….’. Ratti Carlo Giuseppe, *Delle vite de’ pittori, scultori ed architetti genovesi*… (Genoa: 1797), vol. II, 121. In particular, his experiments in making gold inspired by reading led to his early death. In criticizing the artist’s waywardness in his studies and fascination with alchemy in view of its dangers to his health, this passage stands in the
in the 17th century Rubens presumably possessed around 500, Saenredam 470, Borromini 459, and Domenico Guidi 375 books. In such cases we can safely speak of proper collections. A number of inventories list about 250 titles (Pietro Veri 260, Pietro da Cortona 222, Vincente Carducho at least 226); others a few less (Durante Alberti and Carl Loth around 100, El Greco 130, Giovanni Antonio Rusconi 146, Velázquez 154, Bernini 169). In contrast, 54 books sufficed Andrea Sacchi, who was generally regarded as an erudite artist, and there were only 19 books in the household of Nicolas Poussin, who was undeniably ambitious on a theoretical level and had earned the status of a ‘philosopher’ among his contemporaries. In comparison: The library of a 15th-century Renaissance philosopher such as that of Pico della Mirandola topped more than 1100 books, and the 17th-century humanist scholar Nicolas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc (1580–1637), comparable to Pico in his ambitions, accrued 5402 volumes in his library.\footnote{Kibre, The Library of Pico della Mirandola; Grafton A., “Giovanni Pico della Mirandola: Trials and Triumphs of an Omnivore”, in id., Commerce with the Classics (93–134) 102. Arzano S. – Georgelin Y., Les astronomes érudits en Provence: Peiresc et Gassendi, see: http://lesamisdppeiresc.fr/bibliothque/conference_arzano.pdf.}

It is hardly conceivable that the 15 volumes in Werner’s possession are in some way representative for the painter’s power of intellect. Indeed, the assortment of books in no way pretends to be a consistent collection. Instead, it comprises the minimal stock of manuals required by an artist as well as the so-called world literature such as Ovid, Virgil, Homer, Ariosto and Tasso – and these not in the original language but in translation.\footnote{Cf. the auction catalogue that was printed in 1667 in Haarlem of Pieter Saenredam’s extensive library in Schwartz – Bok, Pieter Saenredam 184: ‘The most complete category in the sale were the translations from Greek and Latin’.

The books relevant to the actual discipline of the artist were Ripa’s \textit{Iconologia} and Cartari’s \textit{Imagini degli Dei}. After 1600 they were, so to speak, standard literature in each of the artists’ libraries for which we have surviving documents of the holdings. This suggests that Stettler’s short but exact list may be a compilation of ‘useful’ books as a guideline we can follow (and this definitely included the recreational reading of bellettristic literature), comparable to the above-mentioned reading recommendations of relevant treatises. The confrontation of the description of the books Werner owned with his evident intellectual powers and aspirations gives a very conventional picture of the artist. However, we cannot
satisfactorily answer the question of whether Stettler, by restricting the list to a few prominent authors, wished to articulate the very elevated aesthetic ambitions of the artist or was merely pointing out the epigonal nature of the collection. We can find a similar case in regard to the surviving documents on Werner’s contemporary Joachim von Sandrart, who, in his *Teutsche Academie der Bau-, Bild- und Mahlerey-Künste* (Nuremberg 1675–1680), left ample evidence of his reading habits and efforts as a compiler of knowledge.⁷² However, the fragmentary nature of records on the volumes in Sandrart’s library documented his encyclopaedic interest only very inadequately.⁷³

Also in this case, the paths Sandrart followed in pursuit of knowledge from books were apparently much more devious and more complicated than a positivistic evaluation of inventories will allow us to draw any conclusions about the intellectual profile of artists. And in regard to the reconstruction of specific artists’ knowledge we are confronted with even more difficulties. On learning that Joseph Werner owned a copy of Ripa’s *Iconologia* we of course hear the echo of the painter’s allegoric leanings, as especially testified by his self-portrait: The lion that has been tamed by a cherub corresponds to Ripa’s personification of the “Dominio di se stesso”.

But what was the process behind the appropriation of knowledge that was stored in the book? Is it conceivable that also readers unpracticed in scholarly professional reading methods appropriated knowledge by lectio in the context of memoria, iudicium and ingenium, that is, in the way Antonio Possevino put down in theory for erudite readers in 1593?⁷⁴ Here, just as in the example of Werner, we are confronted with the problem of

---


⁷³ Besides the writings of Palladio, Bosse and Serlio, who were abundantly cited by Sandrart, there is evidence that he also owned a number of volumes of engravings with Roman antiquities, Andreas Vesalius’s *De Humani Corporis fabrica* (Basel, Johannes Oporinus: 1543), several Bibles, travel journals and publications on treasuries such as Tommaso Garzoni’s *Piazza Universale* (first published in Venice, Giovanni Battista Somascho: 1585), Merian’s Bavarian topography from the *Theatrum Europaeum*, Ripa’s *Iconologia*, as well as Dutch editions of Virgil and Ovid – the latter translated by Sandrart’s friend, the poet Joost van den Vondel (Amsterdam, Abraham de Wees: 1671). On the whole the book holdings seem to reflect the interests of an amateur who reads and looks at illustrations rather than those of an Intellectual. The publication of the inventory of Sandrart’s estate: Peltzer A.R., ‘Sandrart-Studien’, *Münchner Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst* N.F. 2 (1925) (103–165) 159–161.

establishing how the actual presence of a book is linked to the specific intellectual abilities of a painter to, for example, deconstruct a codified allegory from Ripa’s *Iconologia* and create something new. For in fact, Werner is illustrative of an artist who claimed to have invented a new type of allegory tailored to his own specific needs.

Highly relevant to the present study’s attempt at a history of knowledge of artists, Werner’s case suggests the simple insight that an artist who possessed only a few books according to surviving records does not necessarily mean that we are confronted with an uneducated artist, just as we cannot automatically conclude that an artist who owned many books was highly learned. This can be alternatively formulated with Heraclitus’s famous fragment, ‘much learning does not teach understanding’, as a fundamental scepticism about every form of polyhistory.\(^\text{75}\) Therefore the heuristic value of a purely statistical evaluation of inventories must be discussed. Those who owned books may not have read them. And if they did read them, it does not necessarily mean that the content was understood. As a result, general statements on artists and their reading habits – that can only be made on the basis of comprehensive data anyway – are put into perspective even if we view sources from a knowledge-history aspect.\(^\text{76}\) In any case, the material that has hitherto been used in discussions is incomplete and was too rashly called upon to usefully substantiate isolated cases. Hardly tenable today, too, is a ‘clean’ history of ideas as was propagated by iconology subsequent to Panofsky and which sought a text reference behind every pictorial detail, the implication being that the information at the heart of every iconographic detail was affixed to a text source accessible to the artist by reading. Hence the mechanisms that link imagery and text, artists and books must therefore be more carefully defined.

In view of the problems that arise if we wish to deduce a programme of imagery based either directly on the stock in a library or via what the artist read, it is appropriate to formulate a few heuristic maxims. The path of interpretation should not proceed from the artist’s library to the picture – it should not succumb to the imagery of the influence of the source – to establish causal relationships of inspiration or illustration. We should

\(^{75}\) Heraclitus, “Fragment B 40”, see Heraclitus, *The Complete Philosophical Fragments*, trans. William Harris, 6 (fragment 40), see: http://community.middlebury.edu/~harris/Philosophy/Heraclitus.html.

\(^{76}\) In a larger context, such a study was undertaken for the holdings of Roman private libraries, see Ago R., “Collezioni di quadri e collezioni di libri a Roma tra XVI e XVIII secolo”, *Quaderni storici* 37 (2002) 379–403.
instead start conversely with viewing the picture. On doing this we should tackle the problems that confront us and the questions left open, targeting possible literary sources and possible image-text relationships: From the image to the library, to the manuscript, to the stock of knowledge of the epoch, and back again. Thus not the catalogues listing the stocks of books that were actually at hand are decisive for determining what artists read, but instead the hints we find that point to possible or probable reading on the part of the artist based on the interpretation of pictures. Analogous to developments in literary studies that advanced from source-influence studies to an intertextual approach, we could go a step further and substitute the problematic medium of the ‘artist’ by directly placing the picture in the universe of texts. And only then proceed with the analysis of the text-image relations. To facilitate such an approach we would have to draft a descriptive apparatus also for art history. This apparatus, abstaining from the use of intentional vocabulary and beginning with the picture, should make it possible for us to describe its interpictorial and multimedia references in a differentiated way. Hence we could show how the picture features as a constitutive element in a specific epistemic constellation in which book knowledge, theories, cultural and religious backgrounds, practical and cognitive skills, scholarly and aesthetic modes of perception and their sensual visualisation are combined.

VI. Bibliotheca Universalis: The Case of the Ghezzi

Books in depictions of studios possibly provide insight into how artists used books for their work. But also here we must enquire into what types of staging and lines of tradition belonging to the classical representations of studioli were adopted in each case? Furthermore we must ask if it is feasible to expect any definite insights into concrete reading practices from them under the circumstances? Additionally, we must question in how far the books portrayed in representations of studios describe the real work situation. Or do they, instead, present themselves within the history of imaginary libraries, whose knowledge-history topoi, forms and

functions were recently outlined and investigated by Dirk Werle in an exemplary way.78

In regard to depictions of studios it is at least possible to correct a rather old opinion. Białostocki, namely, in referring to a series of self-portrait anthologies, stated ‘that artists neither frequently possessed considerable libraries, nor were they willing to portray themselves in the context of books. […] We look in vain for books in the representation of studios or in the self-portraits of the artists’.79

How Giuseppe Ghezzi and his son Pier Leone cultivated their self-image in drawings blatantly proves the opposite. Here an in-depth analysis is called for, not least because of the fact that the two artists continually expanded their book collection, which was without parallel in the early modern period. In 1762, when Pier Leone Ghezzi’s wife Maria Caterina Peroni made an inventory of the library that her husband left after he died, it still comprised over a thousand volumes even though some sections had already been sold.80 Pier Leone’s father Giuseppe obviously laid the cornerstone for this exceptional collection – which can hardly be described as fulfilling a special purpose.

Giuseppe Ghezzi (1634–1721) grew up in the small village of Comunanza near Ascoli Piceno in the region Le Marche, where he was trained by his father Sebastiano to be a painter. After his father died he pursued humanistic studies in Fermo and, moving to Rome in the 1650s, first set himself up there as a lawyer, but later returned to painting. 1674 he became a member of the Accademia di San Luca and, from 1678 onwards, was first secretary to the Accademia for forty years. Ghezzi was furthermore a much-sought-after connoisseur, copyist and restorer of old paintings, and likewise actively participated as a member of the Virtuosi al Pantheon. He wrote the history of this congregation of artists as well as that of the Accademia letteraria dell’Arcadia. He continued to work as an artist and still remained active organisationally at a venerable old age.81

80 Known for a long time, the complete inventory has now been published together with other documents in Dorati da Empoli M.C., *Pier Leone Ghezzi: Un protagonista del Settecento* (Rome: 2008) 401–487. Ghezzi’s own list contained 1150 numbers, but the greater part was already missing at the time stock was taken of the books. Instead some of the stock was inventorized with new numbering. The total proceeds were 2435,80 scudi, whereby sale of the “Libri di Disegni” made up almost half of this amount. See ibid., 475.
The Nationalmuseum in Stockholm houses a red-chalk drawing by his hand. The work belongs to the comprehensive series of artists’ portraits that the Roman collector and biographical author Nicola Pio compiled between 1717 and 1724 to illustrate the artists’ biographies he had written [fig. 9].

The very fascinating series has hitherto been examined primarily in relation to collection history, thereby also largely clarifying questions of authorship for the individual sheets. It remained unnoticed, however, that the female figure visible in the painting on the easel follows a woodcut illustration in Cesare Ripa’s *Iconologia* exactly: The figure depicts a personification of ‘Filosofia’ as a young woman standing upright with her hair loose. She holds a sceptre in her left hand and, in her right, several books, while her gown resembles a tower of steps ‘come depenta dal Boezio nella sua consolatione philosophica’ [fig. 10].

Besides Ripa, the sheet therefore references an authoritative text (i.e. Boethius) whose context is constituted in the generously abundantly filled bookshelf in the background. The compact bulk of thick volumes need not be examined on account of what kinds of books they were. In fact already the well-ordered collection of books articulates that we are indeed looking at a library with encyclopaedic aspirations, so that the artist did not bother about adding book titles. Despite the fact that the artist holds a palette in his hand, the self-portrait addresses less the practical side of his work and instead underscores antecedent intellectual activity, understood

---


83 Here we can likewise see the bits of cloth that were ripped out of Philosophy’s simple dress by the Stoics and Epicureans (*Consolatio I.*,3). Cf. the variant first version of the illustration in *Iconologia di Cesare Ripa* (Rome, Lepido Facii: 1603) 164, modified in the Siena edition of 1611, 246. Ghezzi’s direct model is clearly the woodcut that was first used in the Paduan edition of 1618, 191. On the variant versions of the illustrations and their relationship to the text see Werner G., *Ripa’s Iconologia: Quellen, Methode, Ziele* (Utrecht: 1977) 42, 83.
here literally as his ‘learned background’. The old artist himself is the probable author of the Latin caption that emphasizes his poetic talents.  

Giuseppe Ghezzi’s son Pier Leone (1674–1755) equalled his father in his ambitions when he staged himself as an artist reading, albeit with less formality than his parent. He too was versed in various sciences and had enjoyed the advantages of a profound artistic education. Supported early by his sponsor Carlo Maratta, he was made an ‘accademico di merito’ in 1705, and in the following year became an official member of the Accademia di San Luca, from thence on playing a leading role in the Roman art scene. Besides his occupation as a history painter and as a much-in-demand society portraitist, Ghezzi worked also in the area of inventing

---

stage machinery and apparatus for festivals, as well as designed compositions for copperplate engravings. Furthermore, he was an art collector and dealer, and was a highly respected expert on antiquity. His variety of interests bears fruit especially in his drawings. In Pier Leone’s eyes this medium allowed much more scope for experiment than painting, even though his paintings, too, were exceptionally original. Not only many of his portraits, illustrations and designs for decorations testify to this, but also his numerous vedute and landscapes as well as his studies of antiquities, which he often supplemented with detailed commentaries. Today, above all his caricatures are famous, all of which he executed with pen and ink in a characteristic hatching technique. The volumes he put together under the title of ‘Mondo Nuovo’ present, in over a thousand sheets, a panorama of Roman society in the first half of the 18th century: the nobility, scholars, artists, clerics, antiquaries, tourists etc.85 Quite often the sitters were portrayed in some relation to books, mostly to point out their special interests. For example, the theatre architect Girolamo Teodoli holds a libretto of an oratorium composed by Pietro Metastasio in his hands. He recites from it, while the treatises written by Andrea Palladio and Vincenzo Scamozzi lie on the table waiting for his attention.86 On the other hand, the Neapolitan history painter Francesco Solimena – who Ghezzi held in high esteem – has been depicted in a very private way. He wears a lounging coat and no wig, devoid of the traits and attributes of the academic grandezza. He has turned away from his easel and is absorbed in reading ‘Favole di Ovidio’, that is, the Metamorphoses, a book that like no other was suited to provide endless sustenance to the creative visual imagination [fig. 11].87
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86 Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Codex Ottob. lat. 3117, fol. 15. Caption: ‘Ritratto del signor marchese Teodoli cavaliere eruditissimo in moltissime cose, il quale eresse di sua invenzione il Teatro Argentina, e molte altre fabbriche fatte con la sua direttione […] 26 aprile 1739.’

Fig. 11. Pier Leone Ghezzi, *Francesco Solimena*, 1736. Pen and ink on paper. Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Codex Ottob. lat. 317, fol. 15.
As far as Pier Leone Ghezzi’s numerous self-portraits are concerned in which he slipped into greatly various roles during his long career, an early drawing from a private collection deserves special attention in the present context [fig. 12].

Ghezzi drew his portrait *en face*. He has placed his idle left hand on a presumably female head, which appears to gaze out of the picture as if alive. The small scale denotes its artefact character. It is true that the situation depicted in the picture corresponds with that of painting a self-portrait. However, the drawing that is being executed in the picture is not of the artist’s face but bears the features of the small bust he has positioned so that he can portray its mirror image. Obviously he must hold it in place because the small head is missing a pedestal. At the same time the draftsman can haptically examine the visual data. As a result we are confronted by the play of successive degrees of mimesis: The picture expresses an intra-pictural relationship between the drawing of his self-portrait, the drawing of the bust, and the drawing of the act of drawing the bust. It is noteworthy that Ghezzi accentuated the simultaneity of observation and writing down, concept and embodiment, that he depicted his own head disproportionately large as he leant forward, intent on the creative act. The strongly emphasized forehead is the sovereign over his hands, and likewise has the command over the measuring instruments lying on the table. They have no practical relevance for drawing a portrait, and are thus to be interpreted, in this context, as metaphors for judgement.

_abbiamo in questo secolo, ed io Cav. Ghezzi Mè ne sono lassato memoria quando fui in Napoli, il di 8 Aprile 1735._


89 Probably the distorted the proportions and the undeniably youthful facial features have tempted interpreters to date the drawing as an early work: according to Giulia Mancini we are faced with ‘un un suo precoce autoritratto da bambino’, and Anna Lo Bianco estimates the age of the draftsman to have been, at the time, ‘all’età di circa quindici anni.’ But none of Ghezzi’s works prior to 1698 can be definitively dated. The costumes and style of drawing speak, however, for a production date of around the first decade of the 18th century. Similar motifs and parallels in styles can be found in his informal _Self-portrait in the Studio_ in the Fondazione Custodia in Paris (ca. 1705) and in the 1708 portrait of his friend the musician Quirino Colombani (Cod. Ottob. lat. 312, fol. 59).
and the docta manus – the learned hand – of the artist. With the pair of compasses we think of the famous maxim in which Michelangelo warned that an artist should carry ‘the compass in his eyes’ (le seste negli occhi). In this context it seems reasonable to suppose that the bust of a female head, held as if it were the insignia of rulers, is a personification of ‘Idea’. This would at least fit in with the scenery in the background, where a reference library is visible behind a curtain that has been drawn aside.
On the only partially visible spines of the tomes we can read ‘PET[RAR] CA’, ‘EUCL[DE]’, ‘VETRU[VIUS]’ and ‘L. VINCI’ – a canon that even in its extreme compactness makes the scope of the draftsman’s interests known. Whereas the treatises of a more practical kind on geometry, architecture, and painting can be assigned to his active hand, the higher realms of poetry represented by the *poeta laureatus* has been placed at the same level as his head. The personal library, divided into sections according to fields of studies, is a kind of externalized memory, and the curtain that has been pushed aside points out that it is used when required, for *utilitas privata*. In this drawing the motif of the library is only loosely reminiscent of the grand staging of the same in the self-portrait of Ghezzi’s father Giuseppe. Pier Leone’s sovereignly sketched self-presentation as the *draftsman in his studio* strikes us, entirely without foregrounded allegory, as presenting a personal set of rules for the art of drawing based on observation and speculation while supported by literary erudition.

A sheet in the Albertina contains related subject matter. It is also to be ordered among Ghezzi’s self-portrait drawings, even though it appears to be an interior devoid of figures – at least on the surface [fig. 13].\(^{90}\) The carefully composed drawing is of a studio that is obviously an attic. It is a well-lit working space without any luxuries; everything in it can be traced back to the artistic profession. Indeed, only the actual painter is missing. What we have here is one of the earliest examples of the representation of an interior as a vehicle for a hidden self-portrait: an arrangement of inanimate things has replaced the portrait.\(^{91}\)

Despite the wash that subtly renders light and shade and despite the ease and accuracy in the use of perspective, the spatial illusionism in the drawing is only subsidiary to an objectivized stilization. Suggestions of picturesque disorder have been consolidated into a highly disciplined contour drawing that imbues the single objects in the representation with special significance, while likewise taking stock of them. Thus the drawing lays bare its specific structural framework and is engaged with its own fabrication; it is, so to speak, a peep into an artist’s workshop. The way the fixtures and working utensils have been put together leads us to

---


\(^{91}\) See the standard literature on this topic: Chapeaurouge D. de, “Das Milieu als Porträt”, *Wallraf-Richartz-Jahrbuch* 22 (1960) 137–158.
Fig. 13. [Col. Pl. 3] Pier Leone Ghezzi, *The Artist's Studio*, 1712. Pen and ink on paper. Vienna, Albertina.
conclude that, besides artistic production also reproduction demands to be acknowledged.

As the artist himself is absent we look to the easel for a protagonist, it being his main piece of equipment for art production. There our curiosity is aroused by the fact that we can only see the canvas that the artist is currently working on from the back. While the empty chair, together with a prepared palette, insinuates a disrupted sitting for a portrait, the horizontal format of the canvas urges us to conjecture that a different genre is concerned here. And the drawing in question is ultimately a combination of an interior, a still life and a landscape. The latter comes into play through the window in the upper part of the wall as a picture within a picture. The interplay of these elements allows us to reconstruct a ‘portrait’, namely that of the draftsman. It is left up to the viewers of the sheet to fill in the various blanks. They are guided by the concrete references provided by a seemingly careless cumulation of reference works comprising hefty tomes that invite us to read the titles on their spines. The detail that the books are presented in the drawing as laid out and not standing – which facilitates reading – underscores their significance by showing that they are in use. The question concerning the assortment need not be asked. What lies at the top is always what is currently being consulted. A regrouping of the pile of books in a different order articulates that knowledge is in perpetual motion.

The twenty-odd book titles may at first glance not seem a very balanced out selection, but if we inspect the pile more closely we find that it is definitely oriented toward the above-mentioned canon of authors. Therefore it comes as no surprise to find Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* (‘Meta. Ovidi’) and Josephus (‘Giosef Historico’), then widely read, right on top, followed by a selection of poetical and historical classics of antiquity and early modern

---


93 ‘The rules of genre in art restrict subject matter to a specific world and its properties and modes (*modus essendi*). Then, in order to include exceptions, they genre-specifically transform these into an acceptable mode. Therefore a genre is a complementary totality, the multiplication of a unity of its characteristic, closely related and alien elements.’ Kemp W., “Beziehungsspiele: Versuch einer Gattungsoetik des Interieurs” in Heck K. – Jöchner C. (eds.), *Kemp-Reader: Ausgewählte Schriften von Wolfgang Kemp* (Munich-Berlin: 2006) 123–138.
times. The assortment of books is rounded off by several treatises on architecture, Italian editions of Dürer’s *Four Books on Human Proportion* and *Four Books on Measurement*, as well as Ripa’s indispensable *Iconologia*. A skull set on a single book peeps out from the second shelf that is partly veiled by the curtain. The title of the volume is clearly legible, reading ‘Euclide’. This fits in nicely with the triangle form of the set square hung above, whereas the extremely topical combination of skull and book seems a distant echo of the symbol-laden *vanitas* still lifes that were popular in the former century. Paradoxically, the macabre prop animates the empty space by gazing in the direction of the easel.

And yet another book lies apart from the staple, further to the right on a small single shelf together with sheets of music, directly under a guitar hanging on the wall. ‘Appiano’ has been inscribed in mirror writing on the book – certainly not a very canonical author. Appian of Alexandria’s *Rhomaika*, surviving only in fragments, is a key source for the history of the Roman Civil Wars. We can safely conclude that, because of the fact that it was in Ghezzi’s reference library and in the company of Livy, Josephus, Tacitus and Plutarch, the artist was greatly interested in the historiography of antiquity. Possibly he was even engaged in reading this book at the time he was working on the drawing. Just as the musical instrument that is always at hand – a reference to Ghezzi actually playing an instrument himself – the book fulfills the therapeutic function of a diversion for the artist from the toils of painting, something to pass the time with and banish gloomy thoughts. Taking the interpretation even further, we could also comprehend the stringed instrument, related to Apollo’s lyre, as an allusion to the ‘ambiencce’ of the neighbouring landscape painting, of the harmonious combination of colours that we, of course, due to it being a drawing, can only imagine.

The easel that proffers the reverse side of a canvas and the painter’s equipment that has been put down are not only indices of the artist just

---


95 Besides other instruments Ghezzi played the violin and the spinet, see Rostirolla, *Il “Mondo novo”* 15–29.
having left the scene. These details also emphasize the endless creative potential of a space in which there is a continual rotation between active work and pausing to reflect, between conception and production that constantly brings forth new works of art. The principle of creative diversion becomes manifest in the evocation of an apparently only just vacated interior. The observer fills this ‘break from work’ by having a look around the studio and, on account of the fixtures, objects and utensils, can draw conclusions on the artist’s work practices and his intellectual makeup. We are enticed to interpret rather by the suggested than the articulated meaning in the web of relationships between the objects in the picture – such as conceptualized painting utensils, to which the books also belong – and, above all, the compacted selection of book titles. Carefully calculated, not without a touch of coquetry, and with the temporal quality of a snapshot, this drawing documents the working methods of a true virtuoso. Unfortunately it is not possible to determine whom the artist was addressing with the sheet, if he intended it for an artist friend, a conversation partner, or a patron. The drawing certainly does not have an introspective character and seems to expect an attentive observer who can appreciate the erudition of the author of the picture by reading its articulate signs.

VII. Book and Books: ‘Il libro mio’

Inevitably the question must remain unanswered as to how ‘select’ knowledge from books found its way into the heads of artists and was then transposed into pictures. Can reading transform the artistic imagination? Can reading even have a derogatory effect on creativity? Do artists read books in a different way to philosophers and scholars? Did they even have time, in the past, to hunt for books or read at leisure? What significance did the aesthetic character of a book or its monetary value have for their desire to possess books? But an even more basic question would be to ask if there is a methodical and constructive way of describing the connection between owning books, individual reading habits, and the invention

---

of pictorial ideas that can be utilized for art-historical study of meaning. Research has not yet really considered – at least not systematically – the questions of if artists read books at all, and if so how? And then, if they did read them, were they then engrossed by them, or did they excerpt from books like scholars? And finally, in what form were the topical orders of knowledge that were relevant for scholarly practice also relevant for the concerns of artists? Elizabeth McGrath succeeded in clearly demonstrating how Rubens used his books, and above all those of the Greek and Roman historians, just like an exceptional *pictor doctus* for the generation of ideas for pictures. In his methods he resembled a scholar by making detailed excerpts and confronting these with pictorial *invenzioni*. The thematic choices as well as modes of expression could thereby definitely be indebted directly to a textual experience. Nevertheless it must be emphasized that Rubens undoubtedly was a special case, and we cannot simply take him as a paradigm for making similar conclusions about other artists’ study practices even if they also had a humanist background.

But it still remains that the historical situation, too, must be described: that the canon of what was read was often very limited, that books were expensive, that some of the books available could not be read because, especially in the case of artists, the language barrier was insurmountable (and this was particularly true for Latin). This definitely counts for the relationship of the artist to books, to the one book, and the way in which he or she may have acquired knowledge stored therein. Of course the sources are mute on the subject of the process of reading or on that of a special individual relationship to a specific book. The title of Pontormo’s diary ‘il libro mio’ is a late conjecture, and can be by no means understood as a contemporary indication of great intimacy toward to this compilation of self-observations, dietary measures, and brief comments on the progress of his own art works. Generally any book with personal notes of any kind could be accepted as ‘libro mio’ in the 16th century. An especially strong emphasis on and emphatic relationship to printed material (‘my Virgil!, ‘my Homer!’) as we typically know from the era of sentimentalism

---

98 For the literary history see Werle, *Copia librorum*.
100 See Maria Berbara’s contribution on Hollanda in this volume.
is not at all characteristic for artists in the early modern period. [see figs. 14 and 15]

And still there certainly would have been preferences, ‘favourite authors’ and the like. Especially Pontormo’s meagre diary entries give us a palpable impression of artists’ familiarity with certain classical literature. Indeed, the difference of opinion between him and his friend and student Bronzino on the phrasing of a verse from the Canzoniere required exact knowledge of the text on the part of both artists.\textsuperscript{102} Of Bronzino was said that he knew Dante entirely and Petrarch for the most part by heart. An active member of the Florentine Accademia degli Umidi, he himself wrote

\footnote{\textsuperscript{102} Ibid., entry from January 17, 1555. On this topic see Cécile Beuzelin’s contribution in this volume, esp. pp. 77–81.}
many sonnets and burlesque poems that were praised by professional writers.\textsuperscript{103} And it is well-known that the same is true for Michelangelo. In Michelangelo's biography, Ascanio Condivi describes how the artist's study of the classic Tuscan authors inspired his own poetry while writing the 'Divino'.\textsuperscript{104} Michelangelo's special affinity to the poet who wrote the

\textsuperscript{103} Bronzino ‘dimostra l'avere tutto Dante e grandissima parte del Petrarca nella memoria assai più oltre che non crederebbero per avventura quelli i quali non sanno che sì come la poesia non è altro che una dipintura che favelli, così la pittura non è altro che una poesia mutola,’ Benedetto Varchi wrote in a 1539 letter to the painter Tribolo, see Parker D., Bronzino: Renaissance Painter as Poet (New York: 2000) 17.

\textsuperscript{104} Condivi Ascanio, \textit{Vita di Michelangelo Buonarroti} (Rome, Antonio Blado: 1553) chapter XLIV, see, on Michelangelo’s study of Dante, also sections XVI and LI.
Commedia was such an established fact that Pierfrancesco Giambullari dedicated his Difesa della lingua fiorentina e di Dante (Florence 1556) to the artist, and Donato Giannotti had the ‘gran dantista’ appear as expert in his dialogues on Dante’s hell (De’l sito, forma, & misure dello Inferno di Dante, Florence 1544), stating that: Nobody knows more about this monumental epic poem (‘intenda e possegga’). Giovan Battista Gelli and later likewise Giovanni Battista Guarini said the same of him. The fact that Michelangelo actually identified with his great countryman (and his fate as an émigré) was no secret and the notion of both having a kindred artistic mind was an accepted topos by the mid-Cinquecento at the latest. It is true that the notion is in part based on the successful self-fashioning of an artist who was much admired for his terribilità and, already very early in his career, demonstrated exceptional talent. Relevant to the above is the problem of a concept of style spanning the various arts, which necessitates knowing precisely which books were read. Specialized knowledge based on previous and repeated study of a favourite author was obviously very widespread, in particular amongst Florentine artists and artisans. But as yet it has neither been established along which avenues appropriation of such knowledge took place nor the range of literature that was likewise read.

VIII. Notes in the Margin

With marginal notes and sketches we are entirely dependent on the analyses of a few scattered traces left by the reader. Every now and again they can be verified as being executed by the hand of a certain artist. However, like the legacies of libraries and books, the study of marginalia has largely been restricted to isolated cases. This is astounding, as marginalia are extremely eloquent documents for the knowledge-history assessment of competence in reading and comprehension of artists, if only because they continued the traditional practice among scholars of annotating texts.
since the Middle Ages. Marginalia are often related to underlined passages, are basically extensions thereof – in a textual framework in which reflection on what is read precipitates itself. Hence they were valuable also in their mnemonic function inasfar as they facilitated the finding of passages in some way significant for the reader, or record what the author condoned or disapproved of. As ‘critical apparatus’ such commentaries become part of the book and can be of use to other, later readers. Under certain circumstances they can possibly guide reception, but the appeal of marginalia naturally lies in their often subjective bias and the impulsive character of some comments. Especially Giorgio Vasari renewedly provoked his readers, many of whom were artists, to voice their point of view in the margins of the pages, either to reinforce opinions, to emphatically agree, or disagree with unmerited judgements, or merely correct facts or supplement the content.

The editions of Vasari’s Vite in which El Greco and the Carracci left their annotations are surely the most famous examples of a reading practice involving commentary and correction of text on the part of artists. They are highly valuable documents because they pertain to Vasari’s normative categories and judgements. And furthermore, we can recognize their individual art-theoretical positions in their sometimes pointed aphoristic tenor. Thus El Greco’s commentaries, mostly in Spanish, side with primacy of color in opposition to the Florentine ideal of disegno. In sporadically sarcastic comments, he also broods on Michelangelo’s Vita, debating the artist’s superiorities and deficits as a sculptor, painter and architect – whereby we can often palpably discern the fruits of the Greek artist’s Venetian schooling and his worship of Titian. The postils of the Carracci emphasize much more polemically the independence of North Italian painting, in particular the tradition of Venetian painting represented by Titian, in contrast to the canon supported by Vasari that was oriented toward Florence and Tuscany. It is noteworthy that the postils

---

107 As a textual genre, marginalia have hardly been the subject of systematic study as yet. However, see Corsten S., "Marginalie", in Lexikon des gesamten Buchwesens (Stuttgart: 1985–), vol. V (Stuttgart: 1999), 66; Sherman W.H., Used Books: Marking Readers in Renaissance England, Material Texts (Philadelphia: 2008).


109 See Bodmer H., “Le note marginali di Agostino Carracci nell’edizione del Vasari del 1568”, Il Vasari 10 (1939) 89–127; Dempsey C., Annibale Carracci and the Beginnings of
were often by several hands. El Greco’s copy of the *Vite* formerly belonged to Federico Zuccari, who made critical comments in the margins on Vasari’s views and judgements.\footnote{110} In the case of the Carracci the handwriting of seven different authors of marginalia could be discerned, which has to do with the complicated provenance of the volume. The visibility of usage obviously was an added enticement for subsequent readers to also add their observations and opinions, allowing a trail of comments to emerge as a paratext.\footnote{111} When attentive and critical readers vocalised their disapproval of the printed content, or likewise demonstrated their superior knowledge, for example, with a scholarly reference, they undoubtedly did so with subsequent readers in mind – readers who might be interested in their annotations and who they sought to win over to their point of view. The marginal notes (postils) were, despite being later supplements, always directed at future generations as a continuous dialogue. Through research of marginalia we can safely anticipate, also in the future, further decisive impetus for our knowledge about artists and their reading practices.\footnote{112}

---


IX. Artists’ Reading Practices and Volgare Culture

The observation has often been made that when the traditional manuscript was replaced by the printed book in the early modern period also the content and reception of knowledge underwent a change. The threat of an overwhelming bulk of knowledge due to the printing press certainly increased. And furthermore, an exclusive scholarly culture was now faced with an ever-growing laiety in the public sphere which now had comparatively easier access to knowledge. Knowledge became ubiquitous through the printing press, and there was a strong tendency toward textualisation. As a result, attempts were made at ordering knowledge in encyclopaedic works and catalogues. With the advent of printing reading grew much more widespread among laypeople who not understand Latin, as the market for books in the vernacular continually grew. Through research on the history of reading and on reading reception we have today a concise idea of how knowledge was conveyed through translations, such as the uncannily strong impact of the volgare culture on the printing and reading practices of the laity who did not understand Latin.113 While we must read the book list that was compiled for Leonardo da Vinci with caution, it shows clearly that the painter and natural philosopher mainly read books in the volgare, although he owned books in Latin as well.114 Rubens remained an exception. He was known among humanists as the ‘bene doctus’ because of his excellent humanistic education and his sound

---


knowledge of Latin, which was mirrored by the large number of Latin volumes in his library.\textsuperscript{115} In biographical literature references there is seldom mention of an artist having knowledge of Latin.\textsuperscript{116} The knowledge was probably conveyed by translations in the vernacular, imitations or paraphrases of the classics, and additionally through collections of *loci communes* (commonplace books). For the early modern period it suffices in this context to point out Bodo Guthmüller’s research on the mediation of mythological knowledge using the example of Ovid – who was a key author for artists too.\textsuperscript{117} Ovid was practically only consulted in vernacular editions in which the content had been totally transformed into a moralizing adaptation of the original text. Such editions were based on a prose paraphrase dating back to the Trecento and the Ovid interpretations of the Bolognese scholar Giovanni del Virgilio. The reading habits displayed here can be described as a general problem in the case of artists: How did they read, which texts were preferred, and what were they able to understand? To what extent did lack of knowledge of foreign languages...

\textsuperscript{115} On this topic see Baudouin, “Rubens” 231–233; Arents, *De Bibliotheek*.


and reading the classics in the vernacular lead to independent visual characteristics that possibly were due to misinterpretations and mistakes in translation? Guthmüller brought forward a chief witness to verify the fact that partial misinterpretations of the classics occasionally occurred due to new audiences or marked shifts in reading practices, namely, in the case of several iconographical details in Giulio Romano’s frescos in the Sala dei Giganti in Palazzo del Té in Mantua.\textsuperscript{118} A translation error occurred as far back as the Trecento and was still to be found in vernacular Ovid editions throughout the early 16th century. In any case, it probably explains the existence of a particular iconographical feature that otherwise strikes us as incongruous as part of the mythological subject of the fall of the giants (Ovid, \textit{Metamorphoses} I, 151–162): We are able to discern monkeys amongst the avalanche of rocks. Of course they can be easily interpreted as a negative moral reference, which, in the context of the fall of the giants and the overarching theme of \textit{superbia punita}, seems logical enough. But there is no mention of such a detail in Ovid’s \textit{Metamorphoses}. Guthmüller demonstrates that in an early manuscript presumably the simple error of the word ‘scires’ being transcribed as ‘simiae’ (monkeys) was to blame, which could then be commonly found in the vernacular tradition of the 16th century. Trecento commentators had already explained the moral behind the unusual detail: The monkeys grew out of the blood of the giants killed by Jupiter: ‘e il sangue lor in scimie si converse’. Therefore the monkeys are symbols for the degradation of the proud. As the giants were symbols of \textit{superbia} by virtue of their lack of respect for the god Jupiter, the monkeys who were born of their blood were symbols of wickedness in people – who were transformed into monstrous creatures because of their greed and arrogance.

An iconographic analysis of this kind, at least to an extent, runs counter to an emphasis on comprehending education as humanist at the time. Instead it strongly suggests that, by means of translation, the myths of antiquity were transformed into vehicles for non-classical content. A comprehension of the impact of reading adapted to this situation is therefore another decisive element in our pursuit of a better understanding of artists’ reading practices. In the surviving inventories of artists’ libraries of the late 16th and early 17th centuries we do in fact find some proof that many

\footnote{Guthmüller B., “Ovidübersetzungen und mythologische Malerei: Bemerkungen zur Sala dei Giganti Giulio Romanos”, \textit{Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz} 21 (1977) 35–68.}
artists did probably read translations. Even artists who were particularly fond of reading such as Durante Alberti and Pietro Veri owned just about only books in the vernacular. They probably had not learnt Latin and read also literature from other European countries only in translation.

X. Reading the Book of Nature: The Case of Palissy

But we also have the contrary cases of artists who defined themselves by means of their rejection of book learning. This phenomenon has been subject to much scholarly research in recent times. But the situation is even more complicated than it at first seems.

Bernard Palissy (1510?–1589?) gave public lectures from 1575 to 1584 in Paris. He expressly invited ‘everyone who was educated’ and requested entry fees. The audience lists, as communicated by Palissy himself, included the names of all the leading doctors and scholars living in Paris at the time. Like those held by anatomists, his lectures were accompanied by practical demonstrations, especially by presenting examples from his collection. Palissy’s *Discours admirables* (1580) is a product of these lectures. In the publication that adopted the literary form of the dialogue, theory opposes practice and loses in the end.\(^{119}\)

Because the *discours admirables* explicitly reject the ideal of the *poeta doctus*, they provide a few special insights into the problem of what was peculiar to reading habits amongst artists as well what comprised their specific knowledge. Palissy opposed every form of erudition, declaring unabashedly that he had no knowledge of Latin\(^{120}\) and therefore could not read the authors of antiquity. He literally lauds himself on account of his lack of erudition, asserting that it was precisely because he was free of the shackles of scholarship that he could force nature to reveal its secrets to him. In his own words:


\(^{120}\) ‘I should have been very pleased to understand Latin and to read the books of these philosophers, to learn from the ones to contradict the others.’ Palissy B., *The Admirable Discourses*, trans. A. La Rocque (Urbana: 1957) 155.
I have had no other book than the sky and the earth, which is known to all, and is given to all to know and to read in this beautiful book. Now, having read in it, I have studied earthly things.121

Palissy claimed that he was able – alone through his practical skills that he gained through hard work in producing ceramics – to impart more knowledge on geology, hydrology, agronomy, and palaeontology than philosophers of nature. He promised his readers right at the start of his book:

I can assure you, reader, that in a very few hours […] you will learn more natural philosophy about the things contained in this book, than you could learn in fifty years by reading theories and opinions of the ancient philosophers. 122

In recent research in the field of history of science, especially Pamela Smith repeatedly uses Palissy for evidencing a ‘profound reorientation in attitudes to the material world and material things’ that ‘took place in Europe in the 16th and 17th centuries’.123 She maintains that by investigating how persons who were considered to belong to the lower cultural eschalons actually saw themselves invalidated the classical differentiation between high and low culture. Palissy’s dictum, that he ‘read’ alone the earth and the sky and no books ‘expresses a specific artisanal epistemological radicalism, one that can be termed “material literacy”.124 Smith’s basic hypothesis on this matter is worded as follows:

The knowledge of artisans was transmitted by doing and imitation, rather than by the study of books, and artisanal guilds, their rituals, apprenticeship training, and unwritten techniques constitutes the means by which artisanal knowledge and techniques were reproduced. Such training led to what I call an ‘artisanal literacy’, which had to do with gaining knowledge neither through reading nor writing, but through a process of experience and labour. […] We might regard this as a nontextual, even a nonverbal literacy.125

---


122 Palissy, *Admirable Discourses* 27.


124 Smith, *Body of the Artisan* 100; Smith, “Giving Voice” 76.

125 Smith, “Giving Voice” 76.
Artisanal knowledge was passed on ‘by doing and imitation’. She asserts that Palissy’s declaration was radical and challenged traditional structures of learning, arguing that his knowledge was, in contrast, productive knowledge because it could be put to use directly. In her eyes Palissy adopted the standpoint of *vita activa* in opposition to *contemplativa*.127

According to Smith, Palissy – just as Cennino Cennini, Leonardo da Vinci, Albrecht Dürer, or Wenzel Jamnitzer did before him – demonstrates how a specifically ‘artisanal epistemology’ was beginning to prevail over the traditional Aristotelian distinction between theoretical knowledge based on deduction from principles and practical knowledge concerning the making of objects.

In the meantime we are constantly confronted with this term in history-of-knowledge literature for the early modern period. Admittedly it is not new, at least as far as the issue it addresses is concerned. For example, the classic studies by Leonardo Olschki, Edgar Zilsel, Ernst Kris, Paolo Rossi and Pierre Duhem long ago investigated the significance of artisans and engineers for a revaluation of learned knowledge. The authors based their research on an extensive fund of historical material, but at no time asserted that skills and knowledge specific to artisans and navigators was knowledge as such. Even if the writings of engineers and technicians were increasingly consulted by scholars and scientists, this does not mean that the observations therein already had the status of knowledge, even in the eyes of the philosopher and propagator of empirism Francis Bacon.132

---

132 Already Charles Webster pointed out that: ‘Such figures as Agricola, Palissy and Stevin were willing to bridge the gulf between the scholar and the craftsman; they had exhibited the enormous potentialities of literate technology. On the other hand neither the scholastic philosopher nor their critics could satisfy Bacon that they were sufficiently aware of the need to relate natural philosophy to its natural roots in experience.’ Webster C., *The Great Instauration: Science, Medicine and Reform 1626–1660* (London: 1975) 337–338.
What is new in Smith's hypothesis is alone that henceforth not only tradesmen and craftsmen but also artists wished to be considered artisans who were elevated by means of trade-specific knowledge (‘artis- nal knowledge’), and that this type of knowledge was based purely on empiricism and not on a theoretical frame. For all that, the concept of artisanal epistemology seems to rest on a number of fundamental misunderstandings. But exactly the clarification thereof makes it possible to define the relation between artists’ reading practices and knowledge more precisely: Traditionally epistemology is a theory of knowledge that asks what makes scientific knowledge out of knowledge. In the recent French variety of historical epistemology the question was historicized. This leads to a comprehension of epistemology as ‘reflection on the historic conditions – under which and the means with which things are made into objects of knowledge – that trigger the process of gaining scientific or scholarly knowledge and keep it going’. Classical historical epistemologists such as Gaston Bachelard underscore the fact that scholarly or scientific knowledge is constituted against everyday knowledge by abandoning any lifeworld points of reference. In Bachelard’s eyes, Palissy would be an example for pre-scientific thought due to the fact that he donned the vestments of empiricism and pretended not to have to integrate his observations into a system of thought in which they would first acquire validity through experience. At crucial points Palissy merely referred to the divine order of nature. From Bachelard’s point of view, Palissy should be counted among the group of naturalists who were the ‘victims of metaphors’, whereas indeed it was the lot of the ‘scientific intellect’ to ‘struggle unrelentingly against images, analogies and metaphors’. The same is true for the concept of empiricism, which cannot be simply legitimized by appealing to appearances, but must be integrated within a theoretical framework in various ways.

---

135 On this topic see Bachelard G., Die Bildung des wissenschaftlichen Geistes (Frankfurt: 1987) 51, 68–69, 84.
137 Ibid., 80.
The status of Palissy’s ‘learned’ knowledge still remains unclear—although it was, after all, mediated through word and script. In this context it would be desirable to discuss his strong criticism of the alchemists, which, for example, William Newman interprets as the principal goal of the *Discours*.\(^{139}\) Incidentally, in Smith’s eyes, ‘artisanal epistemology’ was assigned to alchemists too. Likewise we must ask if one can really lump Paracelsus, Dürer and Palissy together in this way. First, however, the concepts of nature, experience and knowledge called upon by Smith need to be specified more closely both historically and systematically. Indeed, in the 16th and 17th centuries they were understood in a variety of ways, while also the supposedly counter position represented by Aristotelism, or ‘the’ theoretical science, in no way formed a monolithic block, so to speak.\(^{140}\) It is general knowledge that Aristotle left an extensive body of writings that by no means only analysed ethical and political practice but also practical knowledge in the natural sciences that cannot be acquired through deduction, as is especially the case in biology and meteorology, that is, in key areas for Palissy. Such a comparison of positions always oversimplify more or less, and the assertion based on it, that a specific kind of artists’ knowledge exists without them having to read books, can only serve as a kind of assurance.

Additionally, Palissy’s writings are extreme examples from the hand of an artist-author, whose literary ambitions target the self-image of an exceptional talent by following mythical examples in a manner directly counterfactual to other artists’ biographies.\(^{141}\) In this way Palissy sought to imbue his life with the aura of exceptionality. This description of his dramatic struggle with the elements of earth and fire allude to similar forms


\(^{140}\) Smith, “Giving Voice” 84: ‘“science” meant theoretical knowledge that could be ascertained with certainty, usually by deductive means.’

of boldness among the gods and demigods of antiquity (such as Daedalus and Vulcan), and, on closer scrutiny, his alleged spontaneity proves to be pure stylization. This attitude certainly makes Palissy radically different to a modern writer such as Montaigne who, with his creative self-confidence, did not need such a construct to underpin the rareness of his talents. Another point of debate is whether we are doing Albrecht Dürer a favour if we, as Smith does, praise him as an artisan. After all, he fought all his life to be recognized as an artist. In fact we must generally ask if, when an artist made claims to knowledge, this was recognized within a knowledge culture, and if so, which factors were then relevant? Actually, talk of straight ‘naturalism’ in face of Palissy’s highly artificial art objects appears to be a subsequent illusory construction that interprets a historic text much too literally. For, to unmask the radical nature of Palissy’s dictum, we need only mention that the metaphor of ‘reading from the book of nature’ is in fact ancient. Likewise we must doubt whether here a new kind of empiricism is being propagated. For it is clear that Palissy’s constant references to his collection in order to visually evidence what his writings fail to palpably convey has, in the text, an ostentatively polemic function. Moreover, the fact that some of Palissy’s ceramic objects were not simply casts from nature but were instead representations and descriptions after examples in books, such as in that of Pierre Belon [figs. 16 and 17].

144 Kemp, “Palissy’s philosophical pots” 80: ‘His cabinet was designed as a didactic tool to bring the viewer face-to-face with empirical reality.’
145 ‘I have set up a cabinet in which I have placed many admirable and monstrous things which I have drawn from the bowels of the earth, and which give reliable evidence of what I say, and no one will be found who will not admit them to be true, after he has seen the things which I have prepared in my cabinet, in order to convince all those who do not believe my writings [or do not wish to otherwise have faith in my writings]…. in proving my written reasons, I satisfy sight, hearing, and touch, and for this reason defamers will have no power over me; as you will see when you come to see me in my little academy’.

Fig. 17. Bernard Palissy, *Oval bassin with coiled snake, large crayfish, etc. on a smooth white background*, c. 1570–1590. Lead-glazed ceramic. Sèvres, Musée national de Céramique.
It is important to take careful note of the rhetorical or topical construction of Palissy’s writings and the said techniques of self-stylization that he used to establish himself within scholarly traditions – and through which he possibly only first was accepted by his contemporaries. Already Duhem recognized that Palissy’s alleged unlearnedness was a pose, and tried to prove that Palissy extensively plagiarized Cardano even on issues he criticized the latter for. Duhem therefore even doubted if it were really a fact that Palissy could not understand Latin. Moreover, the body of writings that Palissy consulted grows more extensive daily due to research. Even though we are confronted here with the lucky case of an artist who openly informs us about what he read and what he did not, we unfortunately cannot depend on the information he so freely imparted about himself. Instead we must remain aloof in our judgement thereof and recognize that this information reveals a traditional pattern characteristic for early modern scholarly texts, which consisted of eclectic, combinatorial, intertextual writing and combining various other text fragments.

Palissy read books, but he in fact did deal with them differently. Therefore we can rightfully see in him the predecessor of Francis Bacon, which has already often been asserted.\textsuperscript{151} The books and the knowledge of the ancients have here acquired a different status.\textsuperscript{152} They were not rejected, however, but instead collected so that the traditional knowledge between their covers could be re-examined. A transformation took place in reading, and books turned into practical objects or tools that artists took with them into their studios. The same is true for Palissy. With Palissy, too, we are again confronted with the question concerning artists’ libraries and the specific nature of artists’ reading practices.

\textit{XI. The Unexpected in the Library}

It would be very wrong to trivialize what and how artists read, to reduce them to the level of not having been schooled in Latin and, to a great extent, uneducated. An interesting inventory has survived from Jürgen Ovens (1623–1678) from Tönning in Northern Germany that gives insight into the intellectual household of an artist. Indeed, what we learn from the inventory we would hardly expect by just being acquainted with his pictures. This artist often stayed in Amsterdam, where he painted the \textit{Conspiracy of Claudius Civilis} for the townhall, and had been a student of Rembrandt. Later he lived in Friedrichstadt but maintained close contacts to Holland. Having learnt his art from Rembrandt he can hardly be described as original, and in his history paintings he remains true to the influence of his master. As court painter to the Dukes of Schleswig-Holstein-Gottorf, he had a great variety of responsibilities and was espe-


cially called on to paint portraits, which left him very little time to develop individual pictorial concepts. If we did not have the inventory, we would estimate Oven’s talents as occasionally very good although technically inconsistent, and, on the whole, consider him to be an average German Rembrandt epigone whose paintings could hardly lay claim to masking higher intellectual aspirations. The inventory of his estate however brings very other contexts to light.\textsuperscript{153} Of course we must be very careful in dealing with the information also in this document; the inventory was first compiled for his widow’s estate in 1691, and Ovens had already died in 1678. Nevertheless, we find an impressive list of book titles in it, many of which we would not expect to find in an artist’s library. In fact, much more than literature of the ancients we find a plethora of religious books and devotional literature – and in a quantity that brings us to surmise that the artist was probably seriously interested in theology. A number of questions spring to mind in regard to the inventory; and the first, of course, demands that we ask if it really is of the personal estate of the artist. Because his art collection is also listed on the inventory this seems, at least at first glance, very probable. The inventory has a number of surprises in store, because although works such as chronicles, translations of the classics and also several Bibles were standard items in artists’ libraries of the 17th century and can also be found in a similar makeup in the case of Joachim von Sandrart, other sections of the collection urge us to ponder on their relevance. Of the latter group is an obvious preference for certain authors such as Jacob Cats and Sebastian Franck, who are represented by an impressive number of books. Perhaps we can here observe the manifestation of an early concept of ‘favourite authors’? But we are even more surprised by the unusual bias in this artist’s library – because in it there is not a single book on art theory to balance out an overwhelming quantity of theological literature. The fact that the books are mostly Dutch infers

that they were very probably owned by Ovens due to his many longer sojourns in Amsterdam, some of them lasting several years. A document such as Ovens’s inventory inevitably raises questions that can hardly be answered by conventional art-historical analysis. Was the artist truly a picitur doctus with a wide span of learned interests that specifically included theology; or was he perhaps also engaged in pastoral work in the parish of Friedrichstadt? Or did these books have another owner and were only deposited with his widow, and therefore do not allow us to arrive at any conclusions about Ovens’s intellectual ambitions? It is highly likely that the estate of this artist does not stand alone in the history of reception, and many source publications leave general doubts as to whether they can be with certainty considered as part of the legacy of an artist and the basis for far-reaching speculation on his or her intellectual aspirations.

An evaluation substantiated from a knowledge-history viewpoint is still a desideratum, also for the inventory just discussed. And this kind of evaluation can only lead to definite insights into 17th-century devotional reading practices if it is scrutinized within the context of history of theology and education. Such an investigation would also take denominational peculiarities into account alongside the variously differentiated canons of the European national literatures. Since the later 16th century, in Catholic states, typical post-conciliar writings such as the Roman Missal and Breviary or the Tridentine Canones et Decreta joined the league of established types of contemplative devotional literature, for example, the lives of the saints, penitentials, meditations on the rosary etc. In contrast – besides an obviously different kind of spirituality – in Protestant and Lutheran regions people very often owned Bibles themselves, and intensive study thereof played a prominent role, also as a means of alphabetization. We must likewise bear in mind the role played by regionally greatly differing options for buying books, the availability of certain authors, or the imposition of sanctions against the possession of certain heterodox literature.

Crossdisciplinary approaches of this kind have as yet practically not been pursued in the research of artists’ reading practices in the early modern period. They would necessitate that the description of individual cases be embedded in knowledge-culture contexts. Also the research field of the early modern period must be closely defined. And, in relation to artist readers, additionally the technologies and facts of book market history must be investigated – such as the suppression of manuscripts by the printing press, a reduction in book prices in the 16th and 17th centuries, and the regional or national and international circulation of stocks of knowledge.
in printed books.\textsuperscript{154} We must also not forget to consider the phenomenon of a ‘belated early modern era’ in German-speaking Europe, as has been succinctly described by Heinz Schlafler for German-language Baroque literature from Martin Opitz to Christian Hoffmann von Hofmannswaldau. Devastated by the Thirty Years’ War, German-speaking regions were first decisively shaped by imitation and tentative appropriation of antiquity – the basis of Renaissance humanism and Italian Mannerism – in the 17th century, so that here the reception of literary innovations of 16th-century national Roman literatures was ‘delayed’.\textsuperscript{155} Schlafler’s thesis was inevitably criticized because it failed to consider the impact of Neo-Latin literature and also because it was based on a notion of literature that was too restricted to do justice to the early modern period. Sufficient evidence does in fact exist to substantiate the phenomenon of ‘delayed’ reception in the case of art literature and the reception of humanist art theory. Key works were only available relatively late in German translation, as we can observe in the case of Ripa’s \textit{Iconologia}, which was first published only very late in 1647, 1659 and 1669 in German translations of various lengths, in individual selections, and varying quality. And what is also noteworthy is that they were not translated from Italian editions but from Dutch translations belonging to German artists.\textsuperscript{156} The history of knowledge specific to artists therefore mirrors the general conditions of knowledge mediation through printing, dissemination of books, and translations.


With this volume of chapters our goal is to enlighten on the above-mentioned questions relating to the education, reading habits, and knowledge of artists. In keeping with expectations, the chapters here too involve mostly case studies devoted to specific artists, inventories, or art-theoretical problems that foreground reading practices. The editors unanimously decided to not include contributions that alone held the promise of revealing new archival material, or only accept such a chapter under certain prerequisites. Instead we gave preference to contributors who went beyond art history and explored related material from a knowledge-history angle, and, at the same time, increased the latitude of who is considered an artist by also elucidating on the libraries of musicians, architects, and philosophers in their chapters. Furthermore, the selection of contributions that investigate artists’ libraries in different countries is designed to offer insight into regional peculiarities as well as complex transnational exchange processes and asynchronous manifestations. Hence the order in which the chapters appear is loosely connected to the chronology of the subject matter.
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157 See Rainer Bayreuther’s contribution in this volume.
Fig. 18. Final vignette of the biography of Guercino from Carlo Cesare Malvasia, *Felsina Pittrice* (Bologna: 1678).
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PART ONE

THE POSSESSION OF BOOKS AND INDIVIDUAL READING
Several studies have been consecrated to the culture of the painter Jacopo Pontormo (1494–1557) and his rapport with the scholars of Cosimo I’s court. These studies have been primarily based on the analysis of two documents: a letter written by the painter to Benedetto Varchi on the superiority of the arts, dated the 18th February 1547, and the diary (diario) that Pontormo kept between 1554 and 1557. These two documents have revealed the painter to have possessed a certain knowledge of both literature and science and to have been in relation with the most important scholars of Cosimo I’s court: Benedetto Varchi (1503–1565), Giovan Battista Gelli (1498–1563), Vincenzo Borghini (1515–1580), Luca Martini (?–1561).

Another habitually exploited source of information on Pontormo’s culture is Varari’s Life of Pontormo, which reveals the painter’s knowledge of Latin and provides precious details about his social network: collaborators, friends and patrons.

In spite of this interest in Pontormo’s culture, little attention has as yet been paid to his education. No real attempts have been made to establish whether Pontormo actually studied Latin or if he borrowed books. The first aim of this article is thus to hypothetically retrace the painter’s literary education: how he learnt to write and read and, in particular, how he acquired his knowledge of Latin. Following this, we shall consider the books that the painter may have possessed, the libraries which he would have had access to and the circulation of books in early sixteenth-century
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Florence. Lastly, we shall analyse Pontormo’s interest, attested by his diary, in scientific works and in questions of natural philosophy.

1. Pontormo’s Literary Culture

Several factors point to Jacopo Pontormo’s literary culture. As may be expected, Vasari furnishes the first indication. According to the biographer, it was the painter’s maternal grandmother, Monna Brigida, who made sure that Pontormo learnt to read and write, and also that he mastered the rudiments of Latin.\(^2\) It appears in fact that, despite the distance from the city of Florence, Monna Brigida wished to give her grandson a similar education to that received by the children of Florentine craftsmen and merchants.

*The Abbaco and the Learning of Latin*

As Paul Grendler has explained, young Italian children of the Renaissance, after having learnt to write and read, had the choice between two curricula: one in Latin, one in the vernacular. The Latin curriculum was aimed at future lawyers and university members and essentially implied studying literary and philosophic texts. The second curriculum, taught in the common tongue, was aimed at the sons of craftsmen and merchants and centred on mathematics adapted to commercial needs: this curriculum, as the schools in which it was taught, was known as the *abbaco* (abacus). Renaissance schools and teachers can also be classified according to who financed them: the Commune, the Church or rich and independent individuals. From the late thirteenth century onwards, many Italian communes (both small and large) financed and managed schools in which they chose the teachers, decided the salaries and had a say in the subjects composing the curricula. Church schools were in general organised and managed by church members, generally preachers or bishops, or by religious institutions, such as monasteries. Church schools had however all

but disappeared by the Renaissance and those remaining only educated young men and women destined for an ecclesiastic career. As for the independent schools, they were reserved for children from the upper classes: the parents employed the teacher directly and the classes, generally small, took place either in the home of one of the pupils or else in that of the master.³

The children of craftsmen and merchants, who, like Pontormo, didn’t belong to the elite and were not born in large cities were generally educated in two steps. First they went to primary school (la botteghuzza), where they would learn to read and write, and then to the abbaco. Besides the central subject of mathematics adapted to the needs of merchants, these schools gave the pupils religious and moral instruction through the reading and commenting of vernacular texts. These texts were both modern and medieval and tended to be on chivalrous subjects: this kind of literature was indeed a mainstay of popular culture in the fifteenth century. The pupils were also taught rudimentary Latin, but didn’t study any major humanist texts. Vasari mentions both Donato Bramante (1444–1514) and Leonardo da Vinci (1552–1519) as having received this two-step education: both went to the abbaco.⁴

In Pontormo’s little town, as in the neighbouring town of Empoli, it seems very likely that Pontormo learnt to read, write and master basic Latin in a communal school or else in a Church school run by a preacher. The education described by Vasari certainly corresponds to what was taught in the lower years of most communal schools.⁵ The biographer does not mention the painter’s passage from primary school to the abbaco, as he does for Bramante and Leonardo, but he does mention that his education was continued when his grandmother sent him, at the age of thirteen, to the orphanage of the Hospital of the Innocents in Florence. Did he find there an opportunity to improve his knowledge of Latin? Nothing proves it.
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⁵ Grendler, Schooling in Renaissance Italy 13–22.
Since in the *abbaco*, the lessons were all in vernacular, a large number of artists and craftsmen didn’t know Latin or only had an empirical knowledge of it. Lorenzo Ghiberti, for example, wrote his *Commentari* in a vaguely ‘latinised’ Italian and Piero della Francesca, while also giving his treatise a Latin title – *De prospectiva pingendi* –, wrote the actual treatise entirely in the vernacular.\(^6\) Many artists attempted to make amends for their shortcomings in Latin during their adult life, either by studying classical Latin alone or with the help of a friend. Leonardo frankly admitted his incompetence in Latin when he declared that he was not a man of letters.\(^7\) Nevertheless, as soon as he arrived in Milan, he tried to make amends. According to an inventory of 1505 (noted on the folios 2v and 3r of the Madrid manuscript), he possessed a hundred and sixteen books, half of which were on scientific and technical subjects, half on literature. Amongst the latter, sixteen are on the Latin language: grammar and vocabulary. The presence of these books shows that Leonardo tried to improve his Latin, but, as Augusto Marinoni rightly points out,\(^8\) we have no way of knowing if he succeeded.

Leonardo’s principal objective was probably to understand the major points of certain untranslated classical works on scientific topics. Mastering basic Latin grammar may also have helped him ascertain his place in the court of Milan, where scholar-courtiers and artist-courtiers competed fiercely to win the favour of the prince, Ludovico Sforza.\(^9\) Vasari tells us that the painter Rosso Fiorentino – an affable and not uncultivated fellow – learnt Latin before leaving for the court of the French King\(^10\) and, in the 1550 edition of the Lives, he is perfectly explicit about the aim of this undertaking:

> He had always had the idea of finishing his life in France, and of thus delivering himself from that misery and poverty […] And with a view to appear-
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\(^7\) Arasse, *Léonard de Vinci* 36.


\(^10\) Vasari, *Le vite* 753: ‘Con ciò fusse che il rosso era, oltre la pittura, dotato di bellissima presenza; il modo del parlar suo era molto grazioso e grave; era bonissimo musicò et avevva ottimi termini di filosofia […]’.
ing more competent in all matters, and to being ignorant of none, he had just learned the Latin tongue […]\(^{11}\)

Proficiency in Latin was evidently a necessary accomplishment for young men and women wishing to rise to higher levels of the social hierarchy, and thus an indispensable tool for artists wishing to move in the more or less learned circles of the European courts\(^{12}\). It would then seem that Pontormo’s grandmother, by assuring that her grandson learnt Latin, hoped to improve his chances of rising in society; perhaps she even dreamed of him mixing with the Florentine elite. In addition, Vasari’s mention of this aspect of the painter’s childhood shows a clear intention to distinguish Pontormo, the learned painter, from other artists and thus to explain his connections with the court of Cosimo I. Did Pontormo, like Leonardo, improve his knowledge of Latin as an adult?

The only Latin text known to have been written by Pontormo’s hand figures on the *Double Portrait* of the Cini collection in Venice [Fig. 1]: the painter reproduced here a passage from Cicero’s *De Amicitia*:

> Then, too, other objects of desire are, in general, adapted, each to some specific purpose, – wealth, that you may use it; power, that you may receive the homage of those around you; posts of honor, that you may obtain reputation; sensual gratification, that you may live in pleasure; health, that you may be free from pain, and may have full exercise of your bodily powers and faculties. But friendship combines the largest number of utilities. Wherever you turn, it is at hand. No place shuts it out. It is never unseasonable, never annoying. Thus, as the proverb says, “You cannot put water or fire to more uses than friendship serves”.\(^{13}\)
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Fig. 1. [Col. Pl. 4] Jacopo Pontormo, *Double Portrait*, 1523–1524. Venice, Conte Vittorio Cini’s Collection.
According to Vasari, the *Double portrait* represents two of Pontormo’s very good friends (*amicissimi*).\(^\text{14}\) Now, as we have recently shown,\(^\text{15}\) the Renaissance notion of ‘true friendship’ was based on a definition developed by classical philosophers according to whom perfect friendship (*amicitia perfecta*) or real friendship (*vera amicitia*) was a form of fusion, the two true friends (*amici veri*) being comparable to a single soul in two bodies.\(^\text{16}\) Cicero describes the friend as an alter ego: ‘For he, indeed, who looks into the face of a friend holds, as it were, a copy of himself’.\(^\text{17}\) He considers that true friendship is only possible between people who possess similar qualities, belong to the same social class and share a similar love of righteousness. In the fifteenth century, these ideas on friendship where generalised by Leon Battista Alberti, who referred to them in his treatise *I libri della famiglia*.\(^\text{18}\) It seems then likely that Pontormo, in choosing to portray his friends as perfectly equal and by playing on the notion of interchangeability – the friends are placed on a level, they are both hatted and dressed in black – was inspired by the classical definition of ‘true’ friendship. It also seems to follow that, since the two protagonists of the painting are very good friends of the painter, and therefore his equal, Pontormo was himself likely to have read and understood, at least superficially, Cicero’s *De amicitia* in Latin. Moreover, Pontormo’s pupil, Agnolo Bronzino, also seems to have possessed some notion of Latin, as testifies one of his books, recently unearthed by Elisabeth Cropper – namely an edition of the *Supplementum Chronicarum*, written by Giacomo Filippo Foresti da Bergamo (1434–1520) and conserved in the National Gallery of Art Library in Washington --, which is not only written in Latin, but also bears an ex-libris in Latin: “Angeli Bronzino Pictoris”.\(^\text{19}\) Perhaps Bronzino owed his knowledge of basic Latin to his master; in any case, his book offers us an indication of the type of very general reading material – the *Supplementum*...
Chronicarum is an illustrated encyclopedic chronicle of the world’s history – favoured by Pontormo’s circle.

From this survey of Pontormo’s case, it can be seen that the basic education of an artist was very similar to that of a craftsman and that knowledge of Latin was the only passport to the uppermost social circles, such as the court of the Medici.

**Pontormo’s Book**

Very little information has subsisted concerning the books which Pontormo owned. Neither his will nor the official inventory of his belongings has been found, though both are known to have existed. The inventory – established after the painter’s death by Alfonso Quistelli, one of Cosimo I’s tax officers – is mentioned in a letter from Quistelli to the duke as having listed all the painter’s paintings, drawings and furniture, as well as a sum of money. This letter was discovered and published by Elizabeth Pilliod, who likewise unearthed a brief inventory of the painter’s real estate property, including his house in the town of Pontormo. Precious as they are, these sources do not compare with those we have for other painters. In the case of Mantegna, for example, we have an inventory compiled by his son Ludovico in 1510; Ludovico also marked all the books contained in his library which had belonged to his father. We also have a – recently discovered – list of books owned by Rosso Fiorentino, one of Pontormo’s ex-workshop companions: these books, together with most of his personal belongings, were left by Rosso Fiorentino to the convent which had offered him shelter in Arezzo, when he left this town for France on the 12th March 1532; the books are listed randomly amongst the painter’s various possessions:


Though short, this list makes it apparent that the artist read recent works, like Baldassare Castiglione’s *Book of the Courtier*, and also classical authors, such as Pliny the Elder and Vitruvius, whose works (notably the 35th book of Pliny’s *Natural History*) were major references for Renaissance artists.

For Pontormo, the sole indications we have concerning the contents of his private library – supposing him to have possessed sufficient books to merit speaking of a library as such – are contained in his diary. In one entry, he mentions a bet made with Bronzino, his pupil turned friend: in the course of an evening spent at Bronzino’s lodgings, the two friends are led to quote one of Petrarch’s poems from memory; disagreeing on a verse, they bet on which one of them remembers it rightly and then depart for Pontormo’s place, where, it appears, a collection of Petrarch’s poems was to be found (Pontormo lost the bet and paid the wagered money):

On January 27 I had lunch and supper at Bronzino’s home, and after lunch Alessandra arrived and stayed until the evening and then she left. And it was that evening that Bronzino and I came back to my house to see the Petrarch [book], that is “fianchi, stomachi” etc., and I paid what had been wagered.24

This briefly evoked episode teaches us, first, that Pontormo owned at least one book, secondly, that he knew this work sufficiently well as to feel confident about betting on its content (Roberto Fedi has shown that the verses which were the object of the bet were from *The Triumph of Death*).25 Furthermore, in the Renaissance, familiarity with Petrarch generally implied familiarity with Dante and Boccaccio. Indeed, the works of Petrarch, Dante’s *Comedy* and Boccaccio’s *Decameron* were the most well known and widely read works by the Florentine population. These three major Tuscan authors, known as the ‘three crowns’, constituted in fact the
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basis of Florentine culture. Their works were found in the private libraries of the most modest Florentine merchant bankers. Some, among whom Giovanni d’Agnolo Capponi, went so far as to copy out the whole of the *Decameron* by hand so as to possess their own private version.\(^{26}\)

Paintings as well as libraries testify to the Florentine people’s keen admiration for the great Tuscan poet. In sixteenth-century portraits, the *Canzoniere* is the frequently represented and Andrea del Sarto’s *Young Girl with a Book* and Bronzino’s *Portrait of Laura Battiferri*, painted respectively around 1528 and 1558, both attest the poet’s importance in Florentine culture. As for paintings of Dante and Boccaccio, it is of note that a triple portrait of the ‘three crowns’ was commissioned by the banker Bartolomeo Bettini to decorate a room of his palace (only the portrait of Dante has survived).\(^{27}\) The artist chosen for this commission was Bronzino, but Pontormo collaborated on the décor: the *Venus and Cupido* (conserved in the Accademia of Florence and based on a Michaelangelo sketch) are by his hand. This cycle was probably ordered to celebrate the banker’s love of the Tuscan language.\(^{28}\)

As the bet between Pontormo and Bronzino shows, the works of the three major Tuscan authors were not only conveyed by books, but were often learnt by heart. This is confirmed by a letter that Benedetto Varchi, then exiled in Padua, addressed in May 1539 to Bronzino and the sculptor Tribolo. This letter pays homage to Bronzino for knowing by heart all Dante and most of Petrarch (BNCF, Magl., VII 730, fols. 15–16v):

> [...] you both enjoy and understand poetic matters, especially Bronzino, as is shown not only in his compositions, but also by the fact he has memorie the whole of Dante and a great part of Petrarch, far beyond what would perhaps seem credible to people who do not understand that just as poetry is nothing other than a speaking picture, so painting is nothing other than mute poetry.\(^{29}\)
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\(^{29}\) “[...] vi dilettate ambo duoi [Bronzino and Tribolo] e intendete nelle cose poetiche, e massimamente il Bronzino, come oltra suoi componimenti, dimostra l’aver tutte Dante, e grandissima parte del Petrarca nella memoria assai più oltre che non crederebbero per avventura quelli i quali non sanno che si come la poesia non è altro che una dipintura che favelli, così la pittura non è altro che una poesia mutola’. Cited after Parker, *Bronzino* 17.
Such a degree of cultivation in Bronzino suggests that Pontormo also knew by heart much of the work of Dante and Boccaccio and that he owned copies of both the *Comedy* and the *Decameron*.

In the diary, under the date of Tuesday 26th March, we find further information on Pontormo’s reading habits: ‘Martedì feci quella testa del putto che china e cenei on(ce) 10 di pane e ebi uno sonetto dal Varchi’.

According to Emilio Cecchi, the sonnet that Pontormo received from Varchi is that which starts:

Mentre io con penne oscura e basso inchiostro  
Tanti anni e tanti un vivo Lauro formo,  
Voi con chiaro pennello alto Puntormo  
fate pari all’antico il secol nostro [. . .].

This diary entry confirms both the painter’s interest in poetry and his personal correspondence with the scholar Benedetto Varchi, whom he frequently met at dinners given by Bronzino. It also suggests that the painter actually wrote poetry himself – a hardly surprising supposition, given that Pontormo was the master of Bronzino, one of the most productive painter-poets of the sixteenth century. The fact that both master and pupil found entertainment in quoting Petrarch suggests that they wished to keep Florentine culture alive and that they appreciated its playful character. Also, whatever Pontormo’s personal collection of books included, clearly he could have borrowed books from his friends and acquaintances. He could also have consulted books in public libraries.

Thanks to the numerous inventories of public and private libraries which have been discovered and studied, we have a quite precise idea of what Florentine people’s culture must have been like in the first half of the sixteenth century. The first public library in Florence was that of
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For the integral text, see ibid., Appendix I, 171–172. For the French translation, see Brock, *Bronzino* 11.

31 Pontormo, *Il Diario* 34.
the convent of San Marco. The idea came from Cosimo the Elder, who, in 1441, had the entire convent reconstructed by the architect Michelozzo. The library, finished in 1457, was conceived to house the manuscripts belonging to the convent and to various private collections, such as those of Niccolò Niccoli, Coluccio Salutati and Cosimo the Elder himself. Comprised of essentially non-Latin texts – in particular Greek works\(^{35}\) –, the San Marco library was then a consulting rather than a lending library. Other libraries, however, lent books from an early date. Among these was the Vatican Library, of which the first two lending registers were found and published by Maria Bertolà in 1942 (Vatican Apostolic Library, *Codici vaticani latini* 3964 & 3966).\(^{36}\) In Florence, Pontormo may well have had access to the San Marco library, as to that of the SS. Annunziata convent, a place he lived close to from the days of his apprenticeship onwards, and visited regularly throughout his life. While working on certain paintings, Pontormo may also have visited other libraries, notably those of the Carthusian monastery of Galluzzo and the convent of San Lorenzo, perhaps even that of the convent of San Francesco in Fiesole.\(^{37}\) The Carthusian monastery of Galluzzo housed a very good library\(^{38}\) which it is not improbable that Pontormo visited between 1522 and 1526, while working on the cycle of *The Passion of Christ*, commissioned by the prior Leonardo Buonafè. Buonafè was an important scholar and churchman in early sixteenth-century Florence, with a keen interest in the arts. Besides the Galluzzo cycle, he commissioned works from several of Pontormo’s collaborators and friends. In 1518, when executing Francesca Ripoli’s will, he commissioned Rosso Fiorentino to paint an altarpiece representing the *Virgin and child with John the Baptist, Anthony the Abbot, St. Stephen and St. Jerome*. Around 1545, he ordered his own sepulchre from the sculp-
tor Francesco da Sangallo, a friend of Pontormo. Few details are known about Buonafè and Pontormo's relationship, but it seems very likely that they became friends: Pontormo includes a portrait of Buonafè in his Pilgrims of Emmaus: their friendship would explain the painter's attachment to the Carthusian monastery.

One hundred and seventy seven inventories of private libraries are currently known to have been compiled in and around Florence in the first half of the sixteenth century. Among these is that of the famous library of Pierfrancesco Portinari, compiled in 1531, which included more than a hundred volumes. Certain scholars who Pontormo kept company with, such as Giovan Battista Gelli and Vincenzo Borghini, owned important libraries. According to two sources, Pontormo and Gelli seemed to have been on friendly terms. The painter mentions in his diary having visited Gelli's studio on the 14th January 1556: '[..] e così martedì vene a botega del Gello [...]'. And, Gelli, in his I Capricci del bottaio, mentions Pontormo.

Gelli was an unusual character. Cobbler by trade, he refused to give up his craft in order to become a member of the Accademia Fiorentina and liked to consider himself as a scholarly craftsman. This character trait inevitably brings to mind Pontormo, whose mother came from a family of cobblers and whose father was a painter. All his life, Pontormo maintained
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39 Franklin, Rosso in Italy 36; Costamagna, Pontormo 168–176; on the friendship of Francesco da Sangallo and Pontormo, see Beuzelin C., Des décors éphémères de fête à la fondation de l'Accademia Fiorentina: Jacopo Pontormo ou la culture des peintres florentins dans la première moitié du XVIe siècle, thèse de doctorat, Université François Rabelais de Tours/C.E.S.R. (Tours: 2007) 68–69.
41 Bec, Les livres des florentins 53–63. On the detailed inventory of the Pier Francesco Portinari library, see Perini, "Libri e lettori" 116.
44 Pontormo, Il Diario 65.
45 'Anima: [...] E impara un po' dal nostro Pontormo Jacopo, il quale, ancor che non abbia forse all'età nostra chi li ponga il piè innanzi nella pittura, non biasima mai cosa dell'arte sua, se gia non gli fusse forza, trovandosi a un termine che ne avesse a dar giudizio [...]'. Gelli Giovan Battista, I Capricci del Bottaio, in Tisoni R. (ed.), Giovan Battista Gelli; Dialoghi (Bari: 1967) 111.
46 Bragantini, “Poligrafi e umanisti volgari” 706–709.
close contact with craftsmen, as did his master Andrea del Sarto. He chose for example to give three paintings to the mason who built his house and to ask nothing but the money he needed to buy a cape for his portrait of the Duke Alexander de’ Medici.47 Like Gelli, Pontormo certainly considered himself closer to Florence’s artisanal circles than to the court of Cosimo I.

Judging by the list of belongings mentioned in his will, Gelli, even while living modestly, owned a library of some importance. Unfortunately, the learned cobbler did not complete this part of his will: after the sentence ‘i suoi libri de quali intende disporre come di sotto’ (‘his books, of which he wants to dispose as said below’), the rest of the page is left blank.48 In addition, Gelli’s cobbler’s shop, situated on the Piazza della Signoria, was frequently visited by members of the Accademia Fiorentina: Cosimo Bartoli, for example, relates that, on the 20th of February 1548, he went to Gelli’s shop to vote in favour of the publication, in the vernacular, of Alberti’s De architettura.49 In a word, Pontormo would have found in Gelli an ideal acquaintance from whom to borrow books.

Book lending was in fact a habitual activity amongst Renaissance scholars and artists. We find for example a list of lent books carefully noted in one of Leonardo da Vinci’s notebooks.50 The founder of the Accademia degli Umidi, Giovanni Mazzuoli, known as Lo Stradino, is also known to have lent books from his personal library. This library was not without a certain fame: the poet Antonio Francesco Grazzini, known as Il Lasca, described this library, dubbed the ‘armadiaccio’ (cabinet) in several of his verses.51 Stradino himself noted in each volume the names of those who it had been lent to, as well as the following warning to late returners: ‘a chi io presto questo libro se non me gli rendono sono schomunicati sino
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48 De Gaetano, Giambattista Gelli 13–16.
49 Firpo, Gli affreschi 184.
50 Arasse, Léonard de Vinci 37.
51 Grazzini Anton Francesco, Le rime burlesche, ed. C. Verzone (Florence: 1882) 467: ‘A Giovanni Mazzuoli, altramente lo Stradino, o il Consagrata, o il Crochia. […] Solo un difetto voi avete finalmente / (e questo credo sia per ignoranza)/ che lo vede e lo sa tutta la gente./ Ciò, che voi avete per usanza,/ cronache e storie antiche gir cercando,/ nè mai ne sete fornito abbastanza./ D’Ettor, d’Achille, di Buovo e d’Orlando/ tenete libri, libretti e libracci:/ poi de’moderni, io mi vi racommando./ Strambotti avete, stanze e sonettacci/ tanti, che ‘mbratton, senza dir bugia,/ più di dugentomila scartafacci. […] E’n cambio all’opre di carta e d’inchiostro,/ anticaglie, medaglie e cose strane,/ faranno ricco l’armadiaccio vostro […]’.
alla restituzione’. A great book lover, his library was rich in both printed works and manuscripts, most in the common tongue. Berta Maracchi Biagiarelli has published the inventory of a part of Stradino’s collection, which is included in the *Inventario Generale del Guardaroba Mediceo* compiled in 1553 (A.S.F., Guardaroba Mediceo, F. 28, fols. 81r-83r), that is to say, not long after his death in 1549. One work figuring in this inventory is of particular interest to us: relating the story of *Febusso e Breusso*, it confirms exchanges between the circle of artists close to Pontormo and the circle of scholars belonging to the Accademia degli Umidi. A note on the flyleaf informs us that Stradino lent the book to the painter Franciabigio (Francesco di Cristofano) in order for the latter to paint the story (BNCF, Ms B.R. 45). Given that Franciabigio collaborated with Pontormo on numerous cycles – the décor of the Cloister of the Vows in SS. Annunziata; the décor of the main salon of the Villa Medici in Poggio a Caiano; the décor of the antechamber of Giovan Maria Benintendi –, it is not in fact wholly impossible that Pontormo himself had access to Stradino’s library. We have however no positive proof of this.

* A ‘Painter-writer’

The principal sources that point to Pontormo’s writing on a regular basis are the two documents already mentioned: the letter to Benedetto Varchi and the painter’s diary. Since these two texts have been much studied, we shall simply recall that they are both written in the vernacular, without stylistic ambition, but with perfect spelling and grammar – a rare accomplishment for an artist of the time: the sculptor Niccolò Tribolo (1497–1550), for example, wrote phonetically and with no respect whatsoever for grammar, as can be seen in his letter to Cosimo I’s steward, Pierfrancesco Riccio,
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55 Maracchi Biagerelli, “L’armadiaccio” 51; 54.
dated the 8th April 1545. This first observation allows us to affirm that Pontormo was certainly in the habit of reading and writing.

In the letter to Benedetto Varchi, Pontormo alludes directly to his writing practise: ‘Sommi aveduto che l’ha ripreso vigore, e non le basterebbe isto quaderno di fogli, non che tutto questo, perché l’è ora nella beva sua’.[59] The mention of a notebook (quaderno) suggests that the painter reserved a notebook for writing in and, therefore, that he was in the habit of writing regularly. Similarly, in his diary, under the date of Saturday 25th May 1555, we find the following sentence: ‘Sabato sera cenai una insalata e dua huova – el di fece certe letere’. This entry – as the diary itself – shows that Pontormo wrote on a daily basis. The fact is confirmed by Vasari, who mentions, among the many means that Pontormo employed to bring Bronzino back to Florence from Pesaro, the numerous letters that he wrote to him. Unfortunately, none of these letters seems to have survived. Yet another indication is given by a preparatory sketch by Bronzino for a portrait of his master and friend: this sketch shows Pontormo holding a note, thus proving that writing was closely linked with Pontormo’s personality [Fig. 2].

The texts present in Pontormo’s paintings also provide an interesting clue to the painter’s possible reading material. In fact, only two paintings present visible texts: the Pala Pucci of the church of San Michele Visdomini in Florence and the Double Portrait of the Cini collection. Several other works represent letters or books, but without visible texts: the Portrait of a Bearded Man Reading; the supposed Portrait of Giovanni della Casa; the supposed Portrait of Cosimo de’ Medici in Spanish costume; The Virgin of the Lost Book; John the Evangelist; the Empoli altarpiece; The Virgin and Child with saints of SS. Annunziata. The absence of visible texts in these paintings is perhaps explained by the way Pontormo’s proceeded when painting such works.

---


59 Barocchi (ed.), Pittura e scultura nel Cinquecento 72.

60 Pontormo, Il Diario 42.

61 Vasari, “Vita di Jacopo Pontormo”, in idem, Le vite 1021: ‘iacopo dunque scrisse tante volte e tanti mezzi adoperò, che finalmente fece tornare il Bronzino […]’.
As we have said, the passage from Cicero’s *De amicitia* which figures in the famous double portrait of the Cini collection is the sole text in Latin which we have by the hand of Pontormo. Now, the preparatory sketch made for this portrait represents the letter as a simple sheet of white paper [Fig. 4]. This then confirms that the painter prepared and copied the text at the last moment: transcribing it onto the already finished painting. It seems, incidentally, that Bronzino proceeded in a similar way: the sketch that he made for the portrait of Pontormo [Fig. 3] represents his master holding a piece of blank paper.

As Elizabeth Cropper suggests, it is possible that Pontormo used a stylistic model for his lettering. The handwriting style favoured at the time for the Pope’s official correspondence and thus generally popular in the sixteenth century was the ‘cancelleresca’. Elizabeth Cropper cites two lettering manuals which appeared at the time: l’*Operina di Ludovico Vicentino, da imparare da scrivere littera cancellerescha* by Ludovico d’Arrighi (1522) and *La vera arte delo excellente scriverde diverse varie sorti de lite*re by Giovanni Antonio Tagliente (1532). The passage from the *De amicitia* which figures in the Cini double portrait is very close to the ‘cancellaresca’ style: the down-strokes of the letters ‘Q’ and ‘T’ notably serve to underline the words.\(^\text{62}\)

\(^{62}\) Cropper, “Pontormo and Bronzino” 16–17; 67–68; 69.
Fig. 3. Agnolo Bronzino, *Study for a Portrait of Pontormo*, c. 1530. Florence, Uffizi, Gabinetto Disegni e Stampe, n. 6698 F.
It is also thought that Pontormo could have copied the handwriting of one of the protagonists, or even of an absent person for whom the portrait was destined. We know, for example, that Bonifacius Amerbach, when he commissioned Hans Holbein to paint his portrait in 1519, wrote himself the text that he wished to appear in the painting. Similarly, in 1517, Quentin Metsys (1465/6–1530) imitated the handwriting of Thomas More for the double portrait of Pieter Gilles and Erasmus [Figs. 5 and 6]. The fact that the letter Pieter Gilles is holding in the portrait is from More is indicated in two of the latter’s poems. Furthermore, in another letter to Pieter Gilles, More praised Quentin Metsys for his counterfeiting skills:

Dear Pieter, marvellously as our Quentin has represented everything, what a wonderful forger above all else it looks like he would have been! He has imitated the address on my letter to you so well that I do not believe I could repeat it myself.

---

Fig. 5. Quentin Metsys, *Portrait of Erasmus*, c. 1517. Hampton Court, Royal Collection.
It seems sure then that the passage of the *De amicitia* was chosen and copied out either by one of the portrait’s two protagonists, or by Pontormo, or else by a third friend, for whom the painting was intended.

When we consider Pontormo’s diary in its historical and cultural context, rather than resulting from the whims and fancies of the painter, it appears to belong to a Florentine tradition of diary keeping and to the general interest in the human body and its workings which developed in the early sixteenth century. Indeed, the diary reveals the painter to be possessed of an almost scientific knowledge of the human body.
2. The Diario and Pontormo’s Interest in Natural Philosophy

In the evolution that marks Pontormo’s work, one can observe a progressive disappearance of perspective space in favour of the human body. This phenomenon reaches its height in the frescoes of the choir of San Lorenzo that he painted for the Grand Duke Cosimo I. In these frescoes, Pontormo accentuated the verticality of the space and installed groups of bodies without spatial bearings. The naked human body is in fact the principal subject of the cycle. As Pontormo’s diary shows, his interest in the body did not depend solely on his art, but pertained to deeper preoccupation, namely a desire to understand the inner workings of the human body.

Anatomic Study: Artistic Practice and Writings

In the sixteenth century, the artistic profession brought painters into contact with various branches of science – medicine, chemistry, anatomy, philosophy, alchemy, astrology, palmistry –, all then grouped together under the name of natural philosophy. Good anatomical knowledge of the human body was part of a painter’s training and, in the works of Pontormo, it occupied an important place. Several Florentine painters even illustrated treatises on anatomy: for example, Francesco Salviati and Rosso Fiorentino. Vasari informs us that Rosso Fiorentino – who excelled in anatomical drawings – worked on a book of anatomy that he hoped to publish in France. He was accompanied in this enterprise by Domenico Ricoveri del Barbiere (known as Domenico Fiorentino, c. 1506–c. 1570), another Florentine artist who emigrated to the court of François I, an engraving by Domenico Fiorentino, representing skeletons and skinless

---

66 Costamagna, Pontormo 252–260.
69 On Domenico del Barbiere and his collaboration at Fontainebleau and on Rosso’s book of anatomy, see Vasari, “Vita di Rosso Fiorentino”, in idem, Le vite 759–760: ‘Fece appresso un libro di notomie per farlo stampare in Francia, del quale sono alcuni pezzi di sua mano nel nostro libro de’ disegni’.
bodies, is notably associated with Rosso’s lost book on anatomy.\textsuperscript{70} Thanks to collaborations of this kind, artists acquired a scientific knowledge of the human body.

In one of his last remarks on Pontormo’s character, Vasari affirms that the painter refused all contact with the dead and even to speak of death.\textsuperscript{71} Several indications suggest however that Pontormo acquired his knowledge of the human body by studying corpses or skeletons. Of these indications, one in fact comes from Vasari himself: his description of The Resurrection of Lazarus (now lost), that Pontormo painted for François I around 1529, strongly suggests that painter had studied anatomy through corpses:\textsuperscript{72}

For, besides that the heads were most beautiful, the figure of Lazarus, whose spirit as he returned to life was re-entering his dead flesh, could not have been more marvellous, for about the eyes he still had the hue of corruption, and the flesh cold and dead at the extremities of the hands and feet, where the spirit had not yet come.\textsuperscript{73}

Only three anatomical sketches are attributed to Pontormo with certitude:\textsuperscript{74} one study of an entire skeleton and two of shoulder bones, all dating from the period when Pontormo was working on the choir of San Lorenzo. The skeleton study may have been done as a preparatory drawing for the souls rising up to heaven in The Last Judgement [Fig. 8]. The shoulder bone studies figure on a single sheet of paper (one on the front, one on the back) which also bears a study considered to have been made for the bodies in The Resurrection or The Flood [Fig. 9]. The two shoulder studies are in fact mirror-images of each other: the one on the back of the sheet – which otherwise shows a hatted man with a stick – is in fact simply traced over the outline of the study on the front, which shows through the paper;

\textsuperscript{71} Vasari, “Vita di Jacopo Pontormo”, in idem, \textit{Le vite} 1026: ‘ebbe il puntormo bellissimi tratti, e fu tanto pauroso della morte, che non voleva, non che altro, udire di morte, e fuggiva l’avere a incontrare morti’.
\textsuperscript{72} Costamagna, \textit{Pontormo} 206–207.
\textsuperscript{73} Vasari, \textit{Lives of the Painters} vol. II, 360. ‘E oltre che le teste erano bellissime, la figura di Lazzaro, il quale ritornando in vita ripigliava i spiriti nella carne morta, non poteva essere più meravigliosa, avendo anco il fradiccio intorno a gl’occhi e le carni morte affatto nell’estremità dei piedi e delle mani là dove non era ancora lo spirito arrivato’, see Vasari, “Vita di Jacopo Pontorno”, in idem, \textit{Le vite} 1020.
consequently, both studies represent the same detail of the articulation between shoulder and shoulder blade. We find a study of an entire shoulder in a sketch made for Moses Receiving the Ten Commandments. It is also of note that, in his diary, Pontormo mentions the St. Bartholomew painted by Bronzino in 1556 for Pisa’s cathedral [Fig. 10], as being an excellent example of a skinned body. From this it would seem that Pontormo’s anatomical knowledge was shared by members of his circle.

We can then conclude that Pontormo certainly attended, like all young painters, dissection sessions, but, as his diary indicates, it seems that with time his knowledge of the human body was gleaned from books quite as much as from superficial observation.

The Diario: Between a Book of Memory and a Treatise on Hygiene

While Pontormo’s diary has often been seen as an account of an old man, sick and near madness, recent studies have shown that it was not the result of freak behaviour. Personal diary keeping was in fact a Florentine custom and one particularly practised by merchants. Between the end of the thirteenth century and the beginning of the fourteenth century, one finds a great number of memoirs (ricordi) and diaries (diarìi) written by merchants and bankers belonging to the most influential Florentine families. For example, the merchant-banker Guido dell’Antella recorded, mostly in somewhat laconic annual entries, his marriage, the birth of his children – legitimate and illegitimate –, the most important moments of his career in terms of profit and his associates in Florence and elsewhere; his memoirs do not however mention one of the most important events of his life, namely his being forced into exile for his suspected sympathies with the Ghibellines.
We find the same absence of hierarchy in Pontormo’s diary: in the middle of a description of his meals or the weather, he refers, quite as laconically as Guido dell’Antella, to his work on the choir of San Lorenzo; what one would imagine as really importance in his life as a painter is thus relegated to the level of a banality:

lunedì disegnai./ martedì cominciai quella figura sotto la testa./ mercoledì el corpo sotto a le poppe./ giovedì tutta la gamba/ venerdì piove/ sabato fu sancto Matteo/ domenica.79

Mentions of work done during the day are often accompanied by little schematic drawings – a practise which is frequently found in workshop notebooks (libri di bottega) of the time: according to Daniel Arasse, Leonardo da Vinci used such notebooks – in which drawings and diagrams feature regularly – to list technical recipes, copy passages from books, jot down personal events or moral reflections and even as an account book and a personal diary.80 The use generally made of workshop notebooks thus appears very similar to the use Pontormo made of his diary. Pontormo’s diary is however particularly marked by his interest in matters of health, and this interest seems to be related not only to workshop practices, but to the humanist interest in the understanding of the body and its workings, which developed during the first half of the sixteenth century.

Recent studies have shown that two pages of Pontormo’s diary (fol. 74r, fol. 75r) were probably copied from a scientific text that Jean-Claude Lebensztejn calls a ‘prescription’.81 These two pages do indeed stand out with respect to the others, consisting as they do of a list of instructions on bodily hygiene aimed at maintaining good health. The handwriting of these pages is uniform and clear and the spaces between the lines are regular – which is not the case for the rest of the diary [Fig. 7]. Jean-Claude Lebensztejn has pointed out that certain passages seem to have been added between the lines of the copied out prescription. These passages are written in a closer and less careful hand than the prescription and one that notably resembles that of the rest of the diary: presumably they were added after reading through the copied pages – a conjecture which suggests that the prescription was referred to more than once.82

79 Pontormo, Il Diario 52.
80 Arasse, Léonard de Vinci 54.
81 Lebensztejn, Le Journal 70.
82 Lebensztejn, Le Journal 70.
Fig. 7a. Jacopo Pontormo, *Diary*, fol. 74r, Florence. Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Miscella Magliabecchiana, Cl. VIII, n. 1490.
Fig. 7b. Jacopo Pontormo, Diary, fol. 75r, Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Miscella Magliabechiana, Cl. VIII, n. 1490.
Fig. 8. Jacopo Pontormo, *Study of a Human Skeleton*. Florence, Uffizi, Gabinetto Disegni e Stampe, n. 6521 F r.
Fig. 9. Jacopo Pontormo, *Figure Studies for San Lorenzo*, Florence, Uffizi, Gabinetto Disegni e Stampe, n. 17411 F r.
Fig. 10. [COL. PL. 5] Agnolo Bronzino, *Saint Bartholomew*. 1554–1556, Rome, Accademia di San Luca.
As Roberto Fedi has observed, another factor which sets these two pages apart, is the use of a more scientific vocabulary than one finds elsewhere in the diary: ‘superfluità’ (superfluousness), ‘prudentia’ (prudence), ‘coito’ (coitus), ‘sudori’ (sweats).\(^83\) It may be noted that both the content and the vocabulary are very close to Hippocrates' humour theory.\(^84\) It is certainly not improbable that Pontormo had consulted one or several of the hygiene treatises which abounded in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Florence and which were read by citizens of all classes. Dario Trento considers it likely that Pontormo’s prescription was inspired by treatises like Tommaso del Garbo’s *Consiglio contro la pistolenza* and Taddeo da Firenze’s *Libello per conservare la sanità*.\(^85\) Another possible source is Marsilio Ficino’s treatise *De vita libri tres*, quorum primus de studiosorum sanitate tuenda, secundus de Vita producenda, tertius de vita coelitus comparanda tractat. First published in Florence in 1489, this treatise was widely appreciated and went on to be printed more than thirty times in the sixteenth century.\(^86\) Dario Trento also draws a parallel between Pontormo’s prescription and the eye-care precepts written by Michelangelo – apparently copied from two texts written in Italian by Pietro Spano: the *Trattato della cura degli occhi* and the *Tesoro dei poveri*.\(^87\)

Finally, Dario Trento has also revealed numerous similarities between Pontormo’s diary – and in particular the two pages containing the ‘prescription’ – and Giovan Battista Gelli’s *Capricci del Bottaio*.\(^88\) This is Gelli’s major work. It was published for the first time by Anton Francesco Doni in 1546, without the author’s consent, and a second time in 1551 by Lorenzo Torrentino. It is composed of several dialogues between Giusto, an old cooper (‘bottaio’) of the area of San Pier Maggiore, and his soul (Gelli). The *Capricci*, just like Pontormo’s diary, contains rules and diets for staying in good health. Moreover, as Dario Trento has observed,\(^89\) the passage where Gelli mentions Pontormo in the *Capricci* – referring to him as

---

\(^{83}\) Fedi, “La cultura del Pontormo” 35.

\(^{84}\) Lebensztejn, *Le Journal* 70; 72.

\(^{85}\) Pontormo; *Il diario* 19.


\(^{87}\) Pontormo; *Il diario* 19.

\(^{88}\) Trento, “Pontormo e la corte di Cosimo I” 142–143.

\(^{89}\) Trento, “Pontormo e la corte di Cosimo I” 143.
an example of wisdom and modesty – comes just after a passage where Giusto’s soul gives the cooper advice on his health.  

All the advice that Gelli gives in the *Capricci* seems in fact to find an echo in the diets and meals that Pontormo relates in his diary and in his attention to the seasons and the climate (heat, humidity, air, wind). The fact that Pontormo paraphrases Gelli suggests that they knew each other well enough to have exchanged points of views on diets. One can also imagine that, during one of their meetings, Pontormo copied the prescription out of a medical treatise belonging to Gelli. Gelli himself explicitly mentions several classical and medieval doctors – Dioscorides, Galen of Pergamon, Avicenna – in the *Capricci*, notably in the *Ragionamento settimo*. That he mentions Dioscorides is not surprising: the 1547 publication of Dioscorides’ *De Medica Materia* was contemporary with the first publication of the *Capricci*. The expression ‘che scrive’, employed systematically by Gelli suggests that he had read – and maybe even owned – these treatises, or else that he drew inspiration from contemporary health treatises, such as Marcilio Ficino’s *De vita*. Consequently, it may well have been from Gelli’s books that Pontormo copied the advice contained in the two pages of his diary.

To sum up, the texts of Gelli and Pontormo attest that an interest in science and, more particularly, in the human body and its workings, was shared by Florence’s intellectual elite and the city’s craftsmen and artists. Pontormo’s diary may therefore be seen as a practical application of the dietetic precepts current in Florentine society and in the court of Cosimo I.

Pontormo’s basic education endowed him with the type of Florentine culture (knowledge of the three crowns) then common for craftsmen and many artists. In addition, he had the advantage of knowing Latin and thus the possibility of mixing and debating with Florence’s intellectual elite. He maintained however distant relations with the court and did not become a member of the Accademia fiorentina. Like Gelli, he preferred to remain in close contact with the craftsman’s world. His everyday habit of writing, related to the tradition kept up by Florentine merchants, made of him a ‘painter-writer’ and placed him among what we shall call the ‘scholarly craftsmen’ of his time. Finally, Pontormo’s profession led him to become interested in several domains of natural philosophy, notably anatomy, medicine, astrology and alchemy. His particular interest in the human body, developed throughout his career, reached its optimal expression in the frescoes of San Lorenzo and in his diary.

---

90 Gelli, *I Capricci* 111.
91 Gelli, *I Capricci* 89; 90; 92.
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When prompted to comment on the art of the Bamboccianti, a group of Dutch painters active in mid-seventeenth century Rome, the Bolognese painter Francesco Albani compares the entertainment value of their art to reading burlesque literature. Simultaneously he differentiates two genres of literature – both of which offer ‘delight’ (‘diletto’) – according to the effect they have on their readers. When reading Torquato Tasso’s influential epic, La Gerusalemme Liberata, Albani is edified by the text’s educated language and heroic characters, but when reading Alessandro Tassoni’s mock epic La Secchia Rapita, he desires merely entertainment:

A sip that I take from the Tassoni’s Secchia refreshes and delights me; but when I enter into Tasso’s Gerusalemme, when will I ever be able to leave it without just regret for the delight and the profit it supplied?¹

Albani’s expectations as a reader not only differ according to the literary genre he is reading, but these two different approaches to literature also inform the way he reads: Albani’s fascination with Tasso’s poetry and his awareness of the moral and artistic profit that he could draw from it made him read the Gerusalemme on an everyday basis. If he did not peruse it himself, he had it read to him while painting so that he was able to ‘draw [from it] ideas that no one else has ever had’.² As a reader, Albani absorbs

---


² Malvasia, Felsina pittrice 156: ‘[…] cavarne que’ non più da nissun altro immaginati pensieri [...]’.
Tasso’s *Gerusalemme* in much the same way as it was intended by Tasso when writing it:

> I say that the heroic poem is an imitation of an action noble, great, and perfect, narrated in the loftiest verse, with the aim of giving profit through delight, so that the delight may get us to read more willingly and thus not lose the profit.³

Unfortunately, we have less precise information about the reading practices of the Florentine poet and painter Lorenzo Lippi (1606–1665), but we can reconstruct them through his paintings and his mock epic popular among contemporaries, *Il Malmantile Riacquistato*. Compared to Albani, Lorenzo Lippi’s reading practice is more complex and multifaceted. This can be demonstrated by two instances in which Lippi draws in a serious manner in his paintings on passages or motifs from Torquato Tasso’s *Gerusalemme Liberata* and Lodovico Ariosto’s *Orlando Furioso*. By contrast, in his mock epic *Il Malmantile Riacquistato* he parodies the same characters or stories from those works. In the process he demonstrates his mastery of *acutezza*, the sharpness of mind so highly prized by his Florentine contemporaries.

Lippi’s *Malmantile* is programmatically intertextual and thus the result of the artist’s literary culture and ample reading of vernacular literature. In addition, it draws much of its entertainment value from quoting, inverting and parodying its literary sources. Like the *Gerusalemme Liberata*, the plot of the *Malmantile* describes the conquest of the eponymous castle by Baldone’s troops, who try to reestablish the righteous reign of Queen Celidora by overthrowing its usurper Bertinella. The general similarity of plots, a complex set of intertextual references, and the resemblance of titles confirm Filippo Baldinucci’s statement that Lippi intended the *Malmantile* to be the reverse of Tasso’s *Gerusalemme*.⁴ Lippi was not the first author to parody the two famous epic poems by Tasso and Ariosto in the seventeenth century, since the influential mock epic *La Secchia Rapita* by the Modenese author Alessandro Tassoni appeared already in 1622. Therefore, Lippi’s *Malmantile* is often referred to as an imitation of Tassoni’s poem. However, there are significant differences between both texts: for example, while Tassoni describes his mock epic as skillfully combining two styles, the *stile grave* and the *stile burlesco*, whose unexpected changes of genre or tone entertain the reader, Lippi’s poem demonstrates an overall

stylistic coherence, and the style in which he writes it is unanimously defined as burlesque. A further significant distinction is that the painter chose as the language of his mock epic the Florentine spoken dialect of his day. There are no signs that Lippi intended to imitate the Secchia, but instead he intentionally harks back to a local tradition of mock epic such as Luigi Pulci’s Il Morgante and Francesco Berni’s Rifacimento.⁵

Yet, Lippi conceives the Malmantile not only as the ‘opposite’ of Tasso’s text, but even more so in opposition to Giambattista Marino’s L’Adone (Paris: 1623), which is the true polemical and satirical target of Lippi’s parody.⁶ Lippi countered Marino’s aesthetic of sensuality by ridiculing his favorite themes, such as the glorification of love and beauty. Much of the humorous effect of the Malmantile also relies on the technique of familiarization, which Gérard Genette has singled out as a main rhetorical device of parody. This means that Lippi rewrites Tasso’s ‘noble text by preserving its […] fundamental content and movement’, but instead of an historically removed setting and heroic protagonists he transposes it into a local, familiar locale.⁷ Thus Tasso’s heroic Christian knights are turned into lazy, cowardly soldiers who are thinly disguised caricatures of Lippi’s friends bearing anagrammatic names. By contrast, as a painter Lippi takes Ariosto’s Orlando Furioso and Tasso’s La Gerusalemme Liberata seriously, as can be demonstrated in his paintings Erminia and the Shepherds and Orlando in the Cave of the Thieves [Fig. 1 & 2].

Lippi’s ability to appropriate the same texts in a serious as well as a parodistic manner suggests that he is an extremely attentive reader, well aware of each author’s literary intentions, language, and rhetorical techniques. However, he is also able to keep a sufficiently critical distance from the text to simultaneously absorb and parody it.

---


⁶ The same association of Tasso’s epic with Marino’s L’Adone has also been pointed out for Nicolas Poussin’s visualization of scenes from the Gerusalemme Liberata, see Unglaub J., Poussin and the Poetics of Painting: Pictorial Narrative and the Legacy of Tasso (Cambridge: 2006) 75–77; 86–89; 133–146.

Visualizing the Text: Erminia and the Shepherds and Orlando in the Cave of the Thieves

Most likely at some point during the 1650s Lorenzo Lippi painted Erminia and the Shepherds [Fig. 1]. The textual source for Lippi’s painting is the encounter between the female warrior Erminia and a group of shepherds, which Tasso describes in his Gerusalemme Liberata (Canto VII, 6–7).  

8 Sricchia F., “Lorenzo Lippi nello svolgimento della pittura fiorentina della prima metà del’ 600”, Proporzioni 4 (1963) 256; D’Afflitto C., Lorenzo Lippi (Florence: 2002) 314–315. D’Afflitto suggests that Lippi painted his Erminia for Bati Rospigliosi from Pistoia, a nephew of Pope Clement IX. This is a likely hypothesis because of the painting’s provenance and the fact that it is still in the Collezione Pallavicini-Rospigliosi today.

9 Tasso Torquato, Jerusalem Delivered, ed. A.M. Esolen (Baltimore: 2000) 135. For fascinating analyses of this passage in Tasso and its representation in the arts, see also: Bàrberi Squarotti G., “La Morte dell’ Idillio”, in idem (ed.) Fine dell’ idillio da Dante a Marino (Genoa: 1978) 175–222; and Careri G., Gestes d’ amour et de guerre. La Jérusalem délivrée,
But while she wept, her sighs were broken by clear notes which seemed to her (and were indeed) singing of shepherds to accompany their rough-hewn music of the woodland reed. She rises, and in slow steps makes her way where an old graybeard in the pleasant shade sees his flocks graze and weaves a wicker tray, listening to three lads who sing and play.

At the sight of her armor suddenly they start – for arms were not so common there.

She sweetly reassured them to allay
their fears, and showed her eyes and golden hair.
‘Fortunate folk, favored of heaven on high,
continue your good work and have no care’, said she;
‘these arms bring war where war belongs,
not to your labors, not to your sweet songs’.

Lippi’s scrupulous reading of this passage as well as Tasso’s entire epic must have preceded his visualization of this scene. In his painting, Erminia enters onto a stage-like setting in which the old shepherd and his three sons are placed next to each other. Following Tasso’s text, the old shepherd has just been interrupted weaving a basket, while his three sons reveal their surprise about this unexpected appearance by their hand gestures. Lippi also represents the two settings united by Tasso’s two verses: the river Jordan where Erminia spent the night, and the shepherd’s habitation, to which she was drawn by their music. Closer to the spectator, three sheep indicate the pastoral context that Erminia is about to enter.

In contrast to the general iconographic tradition of this scene, Lippi’s Erminia has not taken off her helmet yet, but faithful to Tasso’s text, her eyes and blond hair are nevertheless visible. Her stature is androgynous. Her armor does not expose any physical aspects of her female body; only Erminia’s tender face and her elegant white hands reveal her gender. The young woman is represented in the act of softly – *dolcemente* – greeting the shepherds. With gentle precision Lippi represents the emotional turmoil that Erminia experienced the night before and during her precipitate flight from Jerusalem, which has imprinted itself onto her face. This dramatic action – as all of this character’s actions in Tasso’s epic – was motivated by her love for the Christian knight Tancred. The daughter of the King of Antioch, Erminia was captured by the Christian army in the taking of that city, but was treated with respect and courtesy by Tancred, causing her to fall in love with him.10 When leaving Jerusalem, however, Erminia was spotted and chased by a group of Christian knights. Her frantic escape made her lose her way and disappointed her hopes to join Tancred:

She fled all night long and all the day,
wandering without a plan, without a guide.
Her tears were all that she could ever see;
the only sound she heard was when she cried.

---

Lippi’s representation of Erminia reveals the painter’s comprehensive understanding of Tasso’s figure, as well as his intentions to represent this literary scene faithfully in his painting. He not only captures Erminia’s state of mind in her telling facial expression, but her decisively unheroic appearance also reveals her emotional dilemma, her unrequited love for Tancred. Lippi portrays Erminia as displaying the signs of a tender melancholy caused by her unfulfilled love. This emotional state undermines the heroic aspect often associated with Erminia’s character. Thus the dominant trait of Lippi’s humble Erminia derives not only from the specific passage that is the source for this painting, but also from Tasso’s description of the effect that Erminia’s love for Tancred has on her, since after she regained freedom from Christian captivity, she remained the prisoner of her love:

So if her body had liberty again,
servitude kept her spirit shackled tight.
Although to leave her dear Lord caused her pain –
for now her prison was her chief delight [...].

In this respect, Lippi’s conclusions about the figure of Erminia are similar to those arrived at by Paolo Beni, another seventeenth-century commentator on Tasso’s Gerusalemme. Like Lippi, Beni also does not consider Erminia the embodiment of a typically heroic character and sees her mostly informed by melancholy:

11 Tasso, Gerusalemme Liberata vol. I, 228 (C. VII, st. 3–4): ‘[…] errò senza consiglio e senza guida,/ non udendo o vedendo altro d’ intorno,/ che le lagrime sue, che le sue strida. […] Cibo non prende già, ché de’ suoi mali/ solo si pasce e sol di pianto ha sete […]’. The translation is from Tasso, Jerusalem Delivered 134.
13 Tasso, Jerusalem Delivered 122.
Erminia was one of those who kindled her stamina more through memories than through hopes. Therefore she always kept present in her mind past kindnesses that she had received from Tancred with which she nurtured her love for him; but there was little hope.  

Lippi’s second representation of a literary theme, *Orlando in the Cave of the Thieves*, is based on Ariosto’s *Orlando Furioso* (Canto XIII, 37–39) [Fig. 2]. On the basis of stylistic arguments, D’Afflitto suggests 1642 as a date, but the painting’s provenance and original patron remain unclear. In this episode Ariosto describes how the Christian knight liberates the beautiful Saracen Isabella who has been held captive by thieves in a cave. A main theme of this episode is the unequal confrontation between the heroic knight and a group of thieves. Although dramatically outnumbered, Orlando easily triumphs over them by burying them under the slab of their dining table; Ariosto emphasizes the fact that Orlando does not even use his sword. Although Lippi unites different narrative moments of Ariosto’s text within this picture, his painting visualizes verse 37 of Canto XIII:

> In the cave there was a slab, about two palms thick and in the form of a large square, balanced upon a roughly hewn and thick block. 
> The thief ate with all his family around it. 
> With the same lightness with which the Spaniard throws a light pole, Orlando hurled the heavy table slab, where the rascals are thronged together.

The central figure in the painting is Orlando who is lifting up the heavy and roughly hewn table top from its monumental pedestal in order to throw it down on the thieves who are frantically fleeing from the ‘stage’. The scene takes place in the thieves’ cave where the beautiful Saracen Isabella had been imprisoned. Isabella is shown at Orlando’s left side pointing down to the robbers stretched out on the ground. In the background in front of the fireplace is the old woman, mentioned by Ariosto in canto XII, 92 when Orlando enters the cave.

Let us take a closer look at Orlando: Ariosto describes the ease with which the hero lifts the heavy table and compares it to a Spanish game

---

15 Beni, *Goffredo* 826–827: *Erminia dunque era di quelle che di memoria nutriva il fuoco viè più che di speranza. Posciache ben’ havea in pronto i passati favori ricevuti da Tancred co’ quali nutriva il suo amore; ma la speranza era assai poca.


in which the participants on horse throw lightweight poles at each other. Lippi represents this movement through a complex *contrapposto*, in which Orlando’s torso elegantly bends backwards while he lifts the table plate to the left side. The knight’s blue gown and a barely visible but billowing cloak underscore the dynamism of his movement. Orlando’s left arm casts a dramatic shadow across his chest. Another aspect of Lippi’s representation of the scene suggests how carefully he read Ariosto’s passage. Although Lippi’s composition with Orlando is a less strict visualization of Ariosto’s text than his painting of Erminia based on Tasso’s poem, it too unites a representation of the immediate text with Lippi’s more synthetic understanding of the scene. In fact, he attempts not only to represent the action but also to visualize the poetic metaphors employed by Ariosto. In the poem, Orlando killed one thief with a charred log of wood before hurling the table at the others (Canto XIII, 35). In Lippi’s painting, however, two thieves are already lying on the ground, one of whom – the one turning the back to the beholder – seems to be still alive. In order to describe the effect and difference in status between the Christian knight Orlando and the thieves as well as the knight’s effortless triumph, Ariosto compares the mass of slain thieves to a nest of snakes which, having gathered in the first sun after the winter, are killed by throwing a large stone (Canto XIII, 38–39):

\[\ldots\] As when a heavy boulder on a bed of vipers crashes, leaving in poor shape their writhing bodies, lately preened and sunned, So were those cowering villains crushed and stunned.

Some of the vipers die; some, minus tails, Go sliding off; some cannot move at all Add no contortions of their coils avails; And one, on which the boulder did not fall, Its length through the grasses trails, Or slithers to the edge of ditch or wall \[\ldots\].

---

18 Ariosto, *Orlando Furioso* 435.
In Lippi’s painting one of the thieves who lies stretched on the ground with his back to the viewer entreats Orlando not to throw the table slab onto him. His twisted, winding torso actually resembles a snake. This would suggest that Lippi’s visualization of the scene is informed not only by the descriptive elements of Ariosto’s text but also by a sensitivity to the poetic images and metaphors used by the author.

The close interlinkage of language and artistic creation in Lippi’s oeuvre can be further exemplified by the figure of Orlando. It will be useful to remember that Ariosto compares the ease with which Orlando lifts up the table slab in order to throw it down on the scoundrels with an elegant Spaniard, participating in a playful courtly joust, who throws a lightweight pole.20 Remarkably, the elegant and dynamic contrapposto movement, which Lippi chooses in order to depict Orlando’s act, parallels a statuette by Giambologna Hercules with Club [Fig. 3], as well as a drawing based on this statue, done by Lippi’s father-in-law, the Florentine sculptor Giovanni Francesco Susini [Fig. 4].21 Susini draws on Giambologna’s Hercules to illustrate Leonardo’s famous instructions on how to depict a man ‘who wishes to throw a spear or a rock or other object with impetuous motion […]’, which he included in his autograph copy of passages of Leonardo’s treatise on art.22 There, Leonardo famously refers to the fact that an artist who wants to depict a man throwing a lance or a stone could represent him either while he prepares the act or after the act has been completed. Susini chooses the moment before the act. There are several factors that suggest that Lippi based his Orlando on Susini’s drawings rather than on Giambologna’s model. For example, Lippi’s Orlando bends back his torso in a way that does not become obvious from Giambologna’s statuette; at the basis of this posture seems to be Lippi’s original conflation of two drawings placed next to each other in Susini’s notebook, one of which shows a man walking swiftly to the left with a strongly bent back torso. The second element that suggests Lippi’s indebtedness to Susini’s drawings is that his Orlando is much slimmer and less muscular than

---

20 Ariosto, Orlando Furioso 435: Remo Cesarini and Sergio Zatti, the two editors of this Ariosto edition maintain that the author alludes to a courtly joust, which made its way from Spain to Italy and in which two teams throw lightweight ‘canes’ at each other.


Fig. 3. Giambologna, *Hercules with a Club*, c. 1580. Florence, Museo Nazionale del Bargello.
Giambologna’s Hercules. It is thus very likely that in the invention of his figure of Orlando, Lippi associated the verb ‘gittare’ in Ariosto’s passage with its synonym ‘tirare’ in the famous phrase ‘l’uomo il quale vuol tirare un dado’ that Susini has taken over in his notebook from Leonardo’s treatise. This would have stimulated him to turn to the illustrative drawings for this passage in the abridged version of this treatise by Susini. A further aspect that connects language and pictorial creation is the fact that by the sixteenth century, Orlando’s physical strength had gained proverbial status. While ‘orlando’ could be used as a denotation for a strong, sturdy, and brave man, Lippi employed the Florentine idiom ‘stomaco d’Orlando’ in his Malmantile, making fun of men who are better in eating than on the battlefield.\textsuperscript{23}

\textsuperscript{23} See the entry in the Grande Dizionario della Lingua Italiana 12, 16: ‘Orlando: uomo aitante, gagliardo, e coraggioso; campione capace di imprese eccezionali (e ha valore enfatico)’. ‘Stomaco d’Orlando’ means a man of great courage. In his Malmantile Lippi has Mars who deplores that there is not more war use it in an ironical way by saying that all ‘stomachi d’Orlando’ are now busy with filling their stomach in taverns instead of fighting.
Both paintings, *Erminia and the Shepherds* and *Orlando in the Cave of the Thieves*, are attentive recreations of their literary sources, painted in the same carefully descriptive, slightly dry style typical for Lippi’s art. From what has been said above, it appears that Lippi read Ariosto with closer attention to the author’s poetic style and metaphors. However, I do not think that his painting of Erminia should be considered as an attempt to correct ‘Tasso’s intricately woven, often recondite poetical imagery’ as has been suggested by Anthony Colantuono.24

*The Active Reader: Lippi as Reader and the Literary Culture at the Accademia Degli Apatisti*

Although Lippi must have been aware of the intense literary polemic that evolved around the respective merits of Ariosto’s *Orlando Furioso* and Tasso’s *Gerusalemme Liberata* soon after 1588 and up to the 1620s, by the 1640s taking either Ariosto’s or Tasso’s side must have been outdated.25 This is suggested by the theatrical activity of the *Accademia de’ Improvvisi*, which had been founded by the Neapolitan painter and poet Salvator Rosa while in Florence during the 1640s.26 Lippi was one of the members of this academy. Francesco Rovai’s *Capitolo nell’ Accademia degl’ Improvvisi* commemorates one of this academy’s improvised theatrical performances, in which Lippi and Rosa took part. The poem implies that the performances were parodies of the works of major Italian vernacular authors such as Tasso, Ariosto, and Marino. Comparing the academicians’ collective creativity to a raging torrent, Rovai writes:

> While in one instance the water appears to be Marino’s deep water in another moment Ariosto is the real Lodovico, the *Furioso* has the gout and Tasso coughs.27

---

24 Colantuono, “The Cup and the Shield” 408.
Lippi and his friends thus must have been so familiar with these texts that they were able to spontaneously draw on them as the material for their improvised theatrical performances.

In fact, Lippi’s literary education and his training as a writer owed much to the literary academies to which he belonged. Through his friendships with a number of Florentine poets such as Agostino Coltellini, Antonio Malatesti, and Francesco Rovai, Lippi was induced to join several literary academies, such as the Accademia degli Apastiti and probably also the Accademia de’ Percossi. The academy with the biggest impact on Lippi’s work was probably the Accademia degli Apastiti, one of the leading literary gatherings in seventeenth-century Florence, where both serious and satirical works were read and discussed. It was there that Lippi read the first Canto of the Malmantile in February 1649. Not only were many of the soldiers described in that work barely disguised caricatures of members of the Apastiti, but Lippi also gave them anagrammatic names – itself a common practice in that gathering. Founded by the Florentine poet and intellectual Agostino Coltellini (1613–1693) as a conversazione letteraria in 1631, this group of young educated men quickly expanded until it established itself as one of Florence’s leading literary gatherings around 1634. Coltellini was himself a multitalented writer, the author of sacred as well as burlesque poetry. His literary taste has been termed anti-secentesque, because he espoused an aesthetic that avoided pompous metaphors, and he favoured instead an aesthetic of purity and a predilection for Tuscan words. Coltellini also promoted the reading of Trecento authors such as Boccaccio, Petrarch, and Dante at the Accademia degli Apastiti. Despite the scarcity of information on the Apastiti’s literary activity, due to the fact that its records have only survived in an incomplete eighteenth-

29 Alterocca A., La Vita e l’Opera poetica e pittorica di Lorenzo Lippi (Catania: 1914) 23.
31 Benvenuti, Agostino Coltellini 228.
century copy, we know that it hosted a series of lectures on Boccaccio’s Decamerone in 1635 and on Petrarch and Horace in 1636. In addition, the Apatisti were strong promoters of Dante during the seventeenth century, a period when appreciation of that poet was relatively low. Benvenuti also claims that it was mainly in Florence, and particularly among the members of the Apatisti, that Dante was studied with the greatest zeal.

An important member of the Apatisti was the literary critic Benedetto Fioretti, who under the penname Udono Niesely published the Proginnasmi poetici from 1620 onwards, which offer instructions for writers in a series of chapters concerning different literary genres and styles. Niesely’s wide reading, which draws on Greek, Latin, and vernacular poetry, epitomizes the Apatisti’s interest in literature of the past, but such works were studied to determine their applicability in the present. This motivation, which leaves aside the specific cultural context of each text and instead turns to past literary works for their instructive value, becomes even more evident from the other literary activities of the Apatisti.

A case in point would be a cicalata (humorous speech) by Coltellini in which he analyses Francesco Berni’s sonnet Chiome d’ argento fino, irte e attorte. Berni’s famous sonnet is a mockery of the main theme of Petrarchan love poems, which focus on a description of the lover’s beauty. Coltellini presented his cicalata to a group of the academy’s members and their female dance partners on the occasion of a carnival festival held sometime before 1651. Coltellini interprets Berni’s poem as if he was not aware of the literary parody that motivated it, as if the author really had written it

---

32 Benvenuti, Agostino Coltellini 259. Only one of the Apatisti’s lectures on Petrarch has survived, which is by Antonio Malatesti. See Antonio Malatesti, “Antonio MALATESTI. Zibaldone di varie poesie”, in BNCF, Magl. cl. VII, 391 (Florence) 156–77.

33 During the English poet John Milton’s stay in Florence, his main informants on Dante were Benedetto Buommattei, Coltellini and Carlo Ruberto Dati, who were all members of the Accademia degli Apatisti. See Cinquemani A.M., Glad to go for a Feast. Milton, Buonmattei, and the Florentine Accademici, Studies in Italian Culture Literature in History 22 (New York: 1998). Uberto Limentani’s short but important study of Dante’s fortuna in seventeenth-century literature maintains that even in Florence few valued his works, see Limentani U., The Fortunes of Dante in Seventeenth Century Italy (Cambridge: 1965).

34 Benvenuti, Agostino Coltellini 213.

35 For general biographical information about Benedetto Fioretti, see Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani 48, 170–72.

36 For the sonnet and its anti-Petrarchan penchant, see Nigro R., Francesco Berni (Rome: 1999) 183.

37 Dati Carlo Roberto (ed.), Prose fiorentine raccolte dallo Smarrito Accademico della Crusca. Cose Giocose (Florence: 1722), vol. III, 1–2; 47–61. About Coltellini’s cicalata, see Benvenuti, Agostino Coltellini 101–2. Another of Coltellini’s cicalate on a sonnet by Berni, Un dirmi ch’io gli presti e ch’io gli dia, is documented for 1636, but lost today. Berni’s sonnet
as an encomium for his cross-eyed, white-haired, pale, and hunch-backed beloved. This enhances the poem’s entertainment factor tremendously. Thus, Coltellini ironically turns the poem into an exercise of gallantry by finding beauty in even the most unsightly lady, but in doing that he also makes fun of the blindness of lovers who uncritically adore their beloveds. This ingenious reading of Berni’s poem, which decontextualizes it from its original literary polemicism against the canon of Petrarch’s love poetry, makes use of it in order to throw a satirical light on moral weaknesses of contemporaries such as the ‘blindness of the lover’. Thus, Coltellini reads literature of the past with a practical, moral end in mind. This resembles the way in which according to Grafton the neo-stoic philosopher Justus Lipsius approached literature of the past by turning ‘philology into philosophy’ in the effort ‘to make classical studies serve practical ends’. While Lippi in his *Malmantile* takes the same liberty as Coltellini to intentionally misrepresent textual sources, it is fundamentally different since he clearly aims at the reader’s entertainment and not his education.

Parodying the Epic with Acutezza: From Text to Text

Lippi’s mode of reading the epic is thus informed by his membership in the *Accademia degli Apatisti* and its culture, but it also shows marked differences. Lippi combines the Apatisti’s presentist approach to reading literature with the ideal of acutezza, the intellectual brilliance, paradoxically surprising wit, and sharpness of spirit particularly celebrated during the seventeenth century. Baldinucci contended that acutezza played an important part in Lippi’s social self-fashioning, since the artist was famous among his contemporaries for his gift of leading sagaciously witty conversations. For these jokes, Lippi must have drawn on rhetorical techniques similar to those described by Matteo Peregrini in the first treatise devoted to acutezza: *Delle Acutezze, che altrimenti Spiriti, Vivezze e Concetti volgarmente si appellano* (1639). These include puns, enthimemes, and ironical inversions, all of which – as Peregrini specifies – display their

---

40 Baldinucci, *Notizie* 5, 269.
author's artful and increased awareness of the 'legamento artificioso', the correspondence between seemingly disparate objects or words, or the conceptually innovative juxtaposition or combination of words. Lippi's habitual employment of such rhetorical figures must have made him interested in expanding and twisting the meaning of words and idioms in order to delight and surprise his listeners. Seen from this angle, Peregrini's instruction on how to construct acutezze can also specifically be applied to reconstruct Lippi's model of reading, during which he simultaneously perceives several semantic fields of one word or understands a text in several metaphorical ways.

Lippi thus must have read texts with the eyes of a literary critic as well as with those of a linguist. This becomes obvious from the fact that the Malmantile was not only popular for its parody of the epic, but contemporaries also were aware of its rich display of the Florentine dialect, which Lippi had chosen as the language for his mock epic. The culture of ingenious inversion of literary models and spirited parodies is the backbone for Lippi's literary activity, and in particular his voluminous mock epic Il Malmantile Riacquistato. In fact, in the Malmantile Lippi parodies many of Ariosto's and Tasso's scenes and characters that he takes seriously in his paintings. Parodying the epic, however, presupposes a profound familiarity with the poetic rules and motifs of this genre. The Malmantile thus not only reveals Lippi's deep knowledge of the epic, but it also displays his virtuosity as a reader, in that he is able to invert the themes and motifs he has perused. For example, Lippi starts his Canto IV with a rebuttal of the famous Ovidian dictum ‘Omnia Vincit Amor’ by insisting that in reality, hunger more than love is the most powerful agent of human action:

42 The extent of Lippi's sophisticated, humorous play with words is suggested by his occasional use of lingua ionadattica. Lingua ionadattica, a word of unclear etymological roots, is based on Florentine spoken dialect. However, in a burlesque, enigmatic, allusive, and playful way it substitutes one word for another in a manner that phonetically recalls the original term. Most often the new term is presented in such a way that it also points to a new aspect of its original meaning and entertains by stretching the relationship between designated object and word. An example of lingua ionadattica used by Lippi is his description of the effect an enchanted armor has on Malmantile's dethroned queen Celidora. Due to this magic resource Celidora appears to go crazy with courage (esce affatto fuor del seminato). Paolo Minucci, in his commentary to the Malmantile, explains that this phrase is only meaningful if deciphered according to the rules of the lingua ionadattica: ‘seminato’ here stands for and evokes the word ‘senno’ (sense, judgment). See Zipoli Perlone, Il Malmantile Riacquistato, colle note di Puccio Lamoni (Florence: 1688) 25–26.
[...] Hunger is superior to love. And this is certain, and an idea shared by anyone who has a little bit of intelligence. Although Love is troublesome, in that all the small martyrs of its reign May say at every moment: oihme, I die, I perish It is never the case that this really happens.\textsuperscript{43}

Lippi satirizes one of the main themes of Tasso’s \textit{Gerusalemme} as well as Marino’s \textit{L’Adone} not only by stating that hunger is a more powerful agent informing the actions of human beings than love, but also by continuously playing down the theme of female beauty as source of love and power. This tendency also becomes obvious in Lippi’s character of Martinazza, a parody of Tasso’s powerful Armida in \textit{Gerusalemme Liberata}. Unlike Armida, who always appears in the guise of a beautiful and desirable woman, Martinazza is an unattractive witch. Another one of Tasso’s themes that is clearly inverted by Lippi is the figure of the heroic and courtly Christian knight. Lippi’s soldiers – contemporary friends and acquaintances identifiable by their anagrammatic names – are lazy cowards who prefer to flee than to fight. In accordance with Gérard Genette’s analysis of literary parody, Lippi satirizes the epic by rewriting ‘a noble text by preserving its “action”, meaning its fundamental content and movement, [...] but impressing it on an entirely different elocution, or style’.\textsuperscript{44}

Lippi’s techniques of burlesque recomposition include his switch from the style of ‘epic grandeur’ and ‘distant original tongue into a nearer idiom’: in particular, the epic plot’s transposition to the social circles of contemporary Florence. For example, Canto XI introduces the figure of Biancone, as the Florentines call the white marble figure of Neptune by Bartolommeo Ammanati. Biancone is sent by Pluto to support the witch Martinazza in her battle for Malmantile against the Florentines. Equipped with a long staff, the giant takes up position in the Salone of the castle of Malmantile. Since the hall in which the battle takes place does not allow him to maneuver the staff efficiently, he throws down first a worm-eaten beam from the hall’s ceiling, followed by the chandelier. Although the roles of good and bad are inverted, Lippi’s description of Biancone’s battle against the Florentines is thus a parody of Ariosto’s passage describing

\textsuperscript{43} Zipoli, \textit{Il Malmantile Riacquistato} 187: ‘[...] Fames amorem superat. E questo / è certo, e approva ognun c’ha un pò d’ingegno / Perchè quantunque Amor non sia molesto, / Che tutti i Martorelli del suo Regno / Dicano ogn’ora: Ahi lasso, io moro, io pero, / E non si trova mai, che ciò sia vero’.

\textsuperscript{44} Genette, \textit{Palimpsests} 58.
Orlando’s fight against the thieves in the cave. Lippi also employs the technique of humorous amplification, in that Biancone twice throws objects at his opponents – both times unintentionally and thus not as successfully as Orlando’s throwing of the table slab. Lippi, however, fully follows Ariosto’s model in contrasting an individualized person fighting against a mass of soldiers. While Ariosto, as we have mentioned before, compares the group of thieves to grass snakes onto which a stone is thrown, Lippi compares the attacking Florentine soldiers to a flock of poultry, who tightly gather around a heap of straw from which they pick (Canto XI, 18). Biancone, who gets annoyed with this collective onslaught, revenges himself by lifting up two Florentines and smashing their heads against each other. In order to express the ease of Biancone’s revenge, Lippi introduces the image of his servant, who breaks eggs by smashing them together in her hand when she has to prepare frittata in a hurry (Canto XI, 19). This suggests that Lippi not only parodied Tasso’s Gerusalemme, as has been recently maintained by Anthony Colantuono, but also Ariosto’s Orlando Furioso.\(^{45}\)

The multilayered volume of Lippi’s intertextual references also becomes obvious in the figure of Psyche that he introduces into the Malmantile in Canto IV. The motif of aimless wandering in order to rejoin the beloved is a theme shared between Psyche and Tasso’s Erminia. In Lippi’s Malmantile, Psyche meets Calagrillo, one of the soldiers fighting for the Florentine side in order to recapture the castle of Malmantile, and in true knightly fashion he offers to help her find her husband, Cupid:

\[
\text{Now I return to Callagrillo,} \\
\text{who marches while playing his instrument,} \\
\text{with the mourning Psyche always around him,} \\
\text{who sighs at every fourth step.}^{46}
\]

Lippi’s burlesque representation of Psyche’s melancholy caused by lovesickness, which makes her sigh at every four steps, contrasts drastically with Tasso’s description of Erminia. For example, in Canto VI and VII, where Tasso describes Erminia’s attempt to join Tancred, which results in her persecution by Christian knights and a wild flight, the author describes her emotional turmoil in an empathetic way that also draws in the reader. Tasso not only inserts monologues during which Erminia

---

\(^{45}\) Colantuono, “The Cup and the Shield” 397–417.

\(^{46}\) Zipoli, Il Malmantile 237: ‘Adesso a Calagrillo me ne torno, / Che va marciando al suon del suo strumento / con la dolente Psiche ognor d’attorno / Ch’ad ogni quattro passi fa un lamento’.
reveals her love for Tancred in an ‘authentic voice’ to the reader, but he also inserts descriptions of the effect her passions have on her exterior appearance, such as when she tells the old shepherd her adventures:

[...] At that, charming and pure as crystal, spilled
the tears of sorrow from her pretty eyes,
and so she told them part of her sad story –
her sorrow made the gentle shepherds sorry.47

Lippi by contrast treats Psyche burlesquely: while he briefly mentions her beauty, he delves much longer on the distortion of her face brought about by the constant pain she is in:

However, she who is desperate is also beautiful,
although she weeps without restraint,
and walks around as I said in a black vest
as a sign for her melancholy, and so her surly,
grim and ugly waxlike face resembles a Jew who lost the
article he pawned [...].48

However, Tasso’s literary canon is not the only one parodied by Lippi. His satirical representation of Psyche also parodies Giambattista Marino’s rendering of the same scene from Psyche’s life in Canto IV of *L’Adone*. In Marino’s description of Psyche’s search for her beloved, it is Cupid who empathetically describes his wife’s Odyssey:

But the wandering Psyche roams from here to there [...] passing her days with copious wailing, and using up her nights in tears. At times she falls down stricken by heavy fear, at other times she gets up with hope weighed down in her heart. She fears, hopes, loves, desires, and wears herself out [...] similar to a lost hind pierced with arrows.49

---

47 Tasso, *Gerusalemme Liberata* 233 (C. VII, st. 16): ‘[...] Quinci, versando da’ begli occhi fora /umor di doglia cristallino e vago, / parte narrò di sue fortune,/ e intanto il pietoso pastor pianse al suo pianto’.
48 Zipoli, *Il Malmantile* 204: ‘Poichè bella è colei che si dispera / Sempre piangendo senz’alcun ritegno, / E vanne, come io dissi, in cioppa nera / Per dimostrare di sua mestizia il segno, / Perciò con viso arcigno e brutta cera / Par un Ebreo ch’abbia perduto il pegno; / [...]’.
49 Marino, *L’Adone* 238: ‘Ma Psiche quinci e quindi errante e vaga [...] spendendo i giorni in gemiti dirotti, e consumando in lacrime le notti’. Marino, *L’Adone* 243: ‘[...] Or dal grave timor battuta cade, or le sorge nel cor la speme oppressa. / Teme, spera, ama, brama e si consuma [...]’.
By describing Psyche's plight through the eyes of her husband Cupid, Marino encourages the reader to feel compassion for Psyche through the description of her suffering, crying, and endless searching.

By contrast, in the Malmantile Lippi introduces a counter-aesthetic not only against the emotional involvement of the reader in Marino's poetry, but also against his precious style. To emotionally distance the reader from the plot must have also been one of the motivations of another element that displays Lippi's originality as a reader/writer: his choice to write the Malmantile in the vernacular spoken by his Florentine contemporaries. Lippi's linguistic decisions seek to display the richness of the spoken Florentine vernacular, but also to employ a witty language that used humour to negate the reader's empathy. While most of Lippi's language is based on a colourful variety of proverbs, figures of speech, and modes of saying, he also inserts literary quotations.50 Lippi's intention to undermine any emotional or hypnotic effect his poetry might have on its reader not only informs the psychological and descriptive dimension of his poem, but also its vehement opposition to Marino's predictable fascination with the literary theme of the power of love and beauty. An aversion to hypnotize or lure the beholder into his art is also evident in Lippi's painting. For example, he avoids emphasizing the beauty of his female heroines Erminia and Isabella. Thus, he depicts Erminia as unheroic and androgynous, and also Isabella occupies a marginal role vis-à-vis the painting's protagonist Orlando.

Reading and Authorship in Painting and Poetry: A Paradox

Despite various modifications, Lippi in his paintings adheres closely to his textual sources, revealing a synthetic understanding of their literary characters and a great sensitivity to the poetic metaphors. Lippi's paintings were informed by strict artistic rules, such as complex ideals concerning the professional ethic of painters or ideas of technical perfection. For example, Lippi was opposed to painting that deceived the beholder. Painting for Lippi was the result of decisions based on intellect and prudence rather than on playful poetic fantasy, which informed the Malmantile. Thus Lippi's approach to painting parallels that of his contemporary,

50 On Lippi's linguistic choices in the Malmantile, see Struhal, La semplice imitazione del naturale 127–142.
the Lucchese etcher Pietro Testa, who in his writings outlined theories of a ‘moral art’.\textsuperscript{51}

While Lippi as a painter adopted an appreciative and respectful attitude towards his literary sources, Lippi the writer related to literature as a critic. As a writer, Lippi’s mode of reading, as evident from the \textit{Malmantile}, does not necessarily establish an empathetic relationship with the textual sources, but rather replaces authorial intentions with a more powerful commentator/reader. Lippi’s reading with the ‘lens of acutezza’ turns the act of reading into a display of his ingenious literary inventiveness and a creative act, an act of production and poetic transformation. This aspect of reading has been underscored in particular by Michel de Montaigne as an expression of literary individuality.\textsuperscript{52} In fact, Hans Robert Jauss considers Montaigne’s concept of a creative reader an early stage in a new relationship between literature and reader, in which reading turns into an act of self-expression.\textsuperscript{53} Hence it does not come as a surprise that the \textit{Malmantile} has been considered a unique expression of Lippi’s acutezza, which contemporaries recognized as having played an important role in the painter’s social self-fashioning: for example, Baldinucci underscores that the vivacity and bizarreness of Lippi’s character made him an entertaining and sought-after partner for conversations. The \textit{Malmantile} also is firmly embedded into a facetious (and often academic) pastime culture, which was the context for its composition and reception. Lippi’s friends would also have been able to enjoy literary sophistication and a parodistic rendering of high literature, thereby displaying their virtuosity as readers. Lippi, who never wanted to be considered a professional writer and opposed the publication of his \textit{Malmantile} during his lifetime, regarded his poem a playful creation of his freely wandering fantasy.
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GILLIS VAN CONINXLOO. DER KÜNSTLER ALS LERER

Martin Papenbrock

I. Das Bild vom Künstler als Leser


---


Fig. 1. Simon Frisius, Gillis van Coninxloo, 1610. Print from Hendrick Hondius, *Pictorum Aliquot Celebrium Praecipuae Germaniae Inferioris Effigies* (The Hague: 1610).
Intellektueller. Der lothringische Kupferstecher Pierre Woeiriot hat Calvin [Fig. 2] in dieser Weise dargestellt. Das Porträt erschien 1566 in einer Ausgabe von Calvins *Institutio Christianae Religionis* und hat damit möglicherweise orientierend für weitere Bildnisse dieser Art gewirkt.⁴ Hendrik Goltzius zeichnete den niederländischen Philosophen Justus Lipsius [Fig. 3] im Jahr 1587, als Lipsius Professor an der calvinistischen Universität in Leiden war, in eben dieser Weise.⁵ Später hat Schelte Adams Bolswert die Geste mit dem Finger im Buch für sein an van Dyck orientiertes Lipsius-Porträt übernommen.⁶ Auch im 17. Jahrhundert wurden calvinistische Professoren noch in dieser Weise dargestellt, unter ihnen der Leidener Theologe Franciscus Gomarus [Fig. 4] in einem Stich von Willem Isaaksz Swanenburgh.⁷

Es spricht einiges dafür, dass Coninxloo in dem Porträtstich von Hondius/Frisius durch das signifikant akzentuierte Motiv des Buches in der Hand als ein theologisch interessierter, calvinistischer Künstler dargestellt werden sollte. Karel van Mander schreibt in seinem *Schilder-Boeck* in den einleitenden Sätzen zu Coninxloo, dass er das beste Beispiel eines Malers sei, der ‘alles darstellt, was die Augen des Menschen zu umfassen vermögen’ (‘alles maect, wat de ooghe des Menschen met den ghesichte can begrijpen’).⁸ Dies ist nicht nur als ein Hinweis auf den Realismus und die Naturtreue in den Landschaftsbildern Coninxloos zu verstehen, sondern es ist auch ein verstecktes Zitat aus Calvins *Institutio* von 1536/59, wo es im Hinblick auf das biblische Bilderverbot heißt: ‘Es soll also nur das gemalt

---


Fig. 2. Pierre Woeiriot, Johannes Calvin. frontispiece from Calvini opuscula gallica, 1566.
Fig. 3. Hendrik Goltzius, Justus Lipsius, 1587. Print.
Fig. 4. Willem Isaaksz Swanenburgh, *Franciscus Gomarus*, 1608. Print.
oder gebildet werden, was unsere Augen fassen können’ [Hervorhebung M. P.].9 Und Calvin schließt erläuternd an: ‘Aber Gottes Majestät, die weit über die Wahrnehmung der Augen hinausgeht, darf nicht durch unwürdige Schaubilder entweiht werden’.10 Die Übernahme einer wörtlichen Formulierung aus der Bildtheorie Calvins ergänzt sich an dieser Stelle mit dem auffälligen Bildmotiv aus dem Porträtstich zu einer symbolisch codierten konfessionellen Zuschreibung.11

Coninxloo stammte in der Tat aus einem protestantischen, vermutlich sogar militant antispäthanischen Milieu.12 Van Mander berichtet, dass er am 24. Januar 1544 in Antwerpen geboren wurde, nach seiner Lehrzeit eine Reise nach Frankreich unternahm, anschließend die Absicht hatte, nach Italien zu gehen, aufgrund eines Heiratsangebotes aber in Antwerpen blieb. ‘In Antwerpen hat er sich dann auch ständig aufgehalten und alle Unruhen, welche die Stadt in Mitleidenschaft zogen, mit durchgemacht bis zur Belagerung’ (‘daer hy hem stadich heeft gehouden, en alle des stadts beroerten onderstaen, tot der tijt datse is beleghert gheworden’),13 heißt es mit Blick auf die spanische Besatzung in den Niederlanden, die katholische

---

10 Ibid.

Nach van Mander ging Coninxloo in die nördlichen Niederlande, nach Seeland, hatte die Absicht, von dort aus nach Frankreich weiterzureisen, um Vermögen auszulösen, das er dort besaß, entschied sich aber, vermutlich aus religiösen Gründen, ins kurpfälzische Frankenthal zu ziehen, wo seit den frühen 1560er Jahren eine reformierte niederländische Exilgemeinde bestand. Aus Frankenthaler Ratsprotokollen geht hervor, dass sich Coninxloo Anfang 1587 in der Stadt niedergelassen hat. Er scheint ein aktives Mitglied der reformierten Gemeinde gewesen zu sein, denn in den Kirchenbüchern wird er mehrfach als Tauf- und Trauzeuge genannt. Er zahlte Steuern, bemühte sich aber nicht um das Bürgerrecht. 1595 verließ er die Stadt, um nach Amsterdam weiterzuziehen, den späten Zielort der meisten niederländischen Glaubensflüchtlinge. Im April 1597 erwarb er das Poorterrecht, verheiratete sich im August 1603 neu, erlebte 1604 noch die erste Auflage von van Manders *Schilder-boeck*, das ihn als den besten Landschaftsmaler seiner Zeit feierte, und starb im Dezember.

1606. Die Hoffnung, in seine Heimatstadt Antwerpen zurückkehren zu können, hat er vermutlich bis zuletzt nicht aufgegeben. In seinem Nachlass befand sich ein Vertrag über den Verkauf zweier Bilder an den Frankfurter Juwelier Anton Mertens, geschlossen während eines Messeaufenthaltes in Frankfurt zu Ostern 1589, in dem festgelegt wird, dass die Bilder zu bezahlen seien, sobald in Antwerpen die freie Religionsausübung möglich sei (‘als men sal moghen in der stadt van Antwerpen vrye wooninge hebben ende exercitie van de gereformeerde religie’). Coninxloo glaubte offenbar daran, denn er bewahrte das Dokument bis zu seinem Tod auf.

II. Die Bücher des Künstlers


- eine mittelmatige bibel, daer bye en psalmboeck, een boecxken otte tsa-
  menspreeckinge van Anna ende Pelites.
- een aantal boeken, o. a.
  Een duytsse Josephes.
  Een boeck in duytsse taele wesende de Cronica Carionis.
  Een duyts boeck Calvini op de uytlegginge vande vyer Evangelisten.
  Een duyts boeck op de uitlegginge Calvini vande sentbrieven Pauli ende oock op de Sentbrieven totten Hebreen.
  Een duyts testament.
  Een duyts boeck door Luttherus gemaeckt, genaempt huyspostille op de
    Evangelien vande Sondaghen.
  Noch een luters boeck genaempt Somerdeel van de huyspostil.
  Nog een ouuyt duyts testament,
  Een duyts boeckyn genaempt die kleyne gesonde leere.
- het boeck van Alber Duyr

21 Zit. nach Wellensiek, Gillis van Coninxloo 301.
22 ‘Inventarisatie van de goederen, acten ende gerechtigheden, uytende inschulden
  bevonden ten sterfhuyse van Gilles van Coninxloo, den ouden, in zijn leven schilder,
  in voeghen hy die metter doodt ontruymp endt agtergelaeten heeft. Ende zyn deselve
  goederen by Geertgen van Eeden als boelhouwster getrouwelyck aangegeven. Actum den
  19 Januari 1607’. Zit. nach: Roever, “De Coninxloo’s” 40–44.
Een boeck van Ovidius Naso, Hoogduyts en latyn – Een duyts boecxken vande vernoeginge des menschelyken geest. – Een duyts boecxken van de O. I. vaert. – Een duyts boecxke de goede vermaeninge. – Een duyts boecxke van de vaststandigheyt van Lipsius.23


Seine literarischen Interessen sind dennoch eindeutig erkennbar. Es sind die Interessen eines protestantischen Glaubensflüchtlings, eines Künstlers im Exil, die sich in den hinterlassenen Büchern dokumentieren. Coninxloo besaß eine Bibel, das Alte und Neue Testament in verschiedenen Ausgaben, ein Psalmenbuch, exegetische Schriften von Calvin und Luther, protestantische Erbauungsliteratur und populäre Philosophie (die Constantia von Justus Lipsius). Er interessierte sich für alte und neue Geschichte, besaß die Chroniken von Flavius Josephus (‘een duytsse Josephes’) und Johannes Carion (‘Cronica Carionis’), las die Geschichten der antiken Mythologie (‘Een boeck van Ovidius Naso’) ebenso wie die

23 Ibid. 41–44.


Ebenso wichtig scheint für ihn das Werk von Justus Lipsius gewesen zu sein, insbesondere die 1584 erschienene Constantia,30 die im Nachlassverzeichnis als 'Een duyts boeckke van de vaststandigheyt van Lipsius' geführt wird. Wie sich auf der Grundlage der Bibliographie Lipsienne rekonstruieren lässt, hat Coninxloo wahrscheinlich die lateinische Constantia-Ausgabe des Frankfurter Verlegers Wechel von 1590 besessen, die er während einer seiner Messeaufenthalte erworben haben könnte.31 Die Constantia hatte Lipsius, der als niederländischer Glaubensflüchtling auf eigene Exilerfahrungen zurückblicken konnte, zu einer intellektuellen Leitfigur der liberal-protestantischen und interkonfessionell orientierten

Kreise in ganz Europa werden lassen.\(^\text{32}\) Noch zu seinen Lebzeiten erreichte das Buch mehr als 40 Auflagen in verschiedenen Ausgaben und Übersetzungen.\(^\text{33}\) Kritik erfuhr die *Constantia* von katholischer Seite. Die spanische Inquisition setzte im 17. Jahrhundert Teile der *Constantia* auf den *Index librorum prohibitorum et expurgandorum*.\(^\text{34}\) So fehlt in der spanischen Erstübersetzung unter anderem das Kapitel über die Kritik der Vaterlandsliebe (*Const.* I, XI).\(^\text{35}\)

In der *Constantia* versuchte Lipsius, den öffentlichen Unruhen (*publica mala*) seiner Zeit mit einer Ethik privater Festigkeit und innerer Gefasstheit (*constantia*) auf der Grundlage der römischen Stoa zu begegnen.\(^\text{36}\) Diese vordergründig antipolitische Haltung, die dem vom Krieg geschädigten und religiös verfolgten Individuum eine radikale, von der *recta ratio* (statt der *opinio*) geleitete Affektbeherrschung und Affektsublimierung abverlangte, entwickelte er in Form einer *Disputatio*, die ihm die Möglichkeit ließ, auch die Trauer und Wut der Kriegsgeschädigten und Exilierten zu artikulieren. In zwei Büchern über jeweils mehr als zwanzig Kapitel entfaltete er so neben dem stoischen Diskurs über die Kräfte und Gesetze des Schicksals (*fatum*) und der Vorsehung (*providentia*) und in Ableitung dessen über die Notwendigkeit von Beständigkeit (*constantia*), Geduld (*patiencia*) und Vernunft (*ratio*) eine ausführliche, auf die aktuellen politischen Verhältnisse Bezug nehmende Diskussion der Begriffe Vaterland (*patria*) und Welt (*universus orbis*), Reise (*peregrinatio*) und Flucht (*fuga*), Mitleid

---


\(^{34}\) Vgl. BL, Bd. I, 75.

\(^{35}\) Vgl. Oestreich, "Justus Lipsius" 309.

(miseratio) und Hilfe (misericordia), Fremder (peregrinus) und Vertriebener (exsulatus), die allesamt dem Exilkontext zuzurechnen waren.37


III. Intellektualität und Ästhetik

In welcher Weise die sehr spezifischen literarischen Interessen Coninxloos in seine Malerei eingeflossen sind und ihr ästhetisches Profil geprägt

37 Vgl. dazu ausführlich Papenbrock, Landschaften des Exils 79–93.
Fig. 5. Gillis van Coninxloo, *Waldlandschaft mit Verstoßung der Hagar*, c. 1590. Aschaffenburg, Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen.

Fig. 6. Gillis van Coninxloo, *Waldlandschaft mit Hagar, Ismael und dem Engel*, c. 1590. Aschaffenburg, Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen.
haben, zeigt exemplarisch der Blick auf zwei Landschaften, die dem Künstler zugeschrieben werden und vermutlich in den Frankenthaler Jahren (1587–1595) entstanden sind: die *Waldlandschaft mit Verstoßung der Hagar* [Fig. 5] und die *Waldlandschaft mit Hagar, Ismael und dem Engel* [Fig. 6], beide im Besitz der Bayerischen Staatsgemäldesammlungen in Aschaffenburg.\(^{39}\) Die Bilder zeigen jeweils in Nahsicht einen dichten, unzugänglichen Wald, durchzogen von sumpfigen Niederungen und versperrt durch abgestorbenes Geäst. Alte Bäume mit knorrigem Wurzelwerk und weit ausladenden Kronen überwölben kleine Lichtungen, in deren Nähe die biblischen Narrationen entwickelt werden. Die Figuren sind winzig im Vergleich zur Landschaft. Sie sind reduziert zu kaum wahrnehmbaren Licht- und Farbreflexen, die sich in der Landschaft zu verlieren scheinen.


Landschaftsbilder unter Protestanten und insbesondere Calvinisten einen weitaus höheren Stellenwert als unter Katholiken besaßen.41

Calvin, der in seiner *Institutio* die Künstler aufgefordert hatte, nur das zu malen, was mit dem Auge erfasst werden konnte, hatte einen durchaus hohen Begriff von den bildenden Künsten, nannte sie ein Gottesgeschenk, das bei richtigem Gebrauch Gott zur Ehre und dem Menschen zum Nutzen sei.42 Er empfahl die Darstellung von Historien (*historiae*) und Ereignissen (*res gestae*) und erlaubte auch Porträts. In der französischen Ausgabe der *Institutio* von 1560 bezog er zudem die Darstellung von Natur und Landschaft in seine Empfehlungen ein: ‘Quant à ce qui est licite de peindre ou engraver, il y a les histoires pour en avoir memorial: ou bien figures, ou medales de bestes, ou villes, ou pais’.43

Der Einfluss des Calvinismus auf die Landschaftsmalerei, der nach de Klijn in den Werken Coninxloos seinen Anfang fand,44 machte sich vor allem in einem neuen, ‘forschenden’ Blick auf die Natur bemerkbar.45 Der forschende Blick entsprach ‘protestantischem Modus’: Die detaillierte Naturaneignung der Künstler war vergleichbar mit der philologischen Aneignung der Heiligen Schrift durch die Theologen. Es ist kein Zufall, dass auch die wissenschaftliche Auseinandersetzung mit der Pflanzenwelt, die sich im Laufe des 16. Jahrhunderts zu einer eigenen universitären Disziplin entwickelte, innerhalb des calvinistischen Exilmilieus ihren Anfang nahm, denkt man etwa an das Leben und Werk des Botanikers Carolus Clusius (Charles de l’Écluse), der als protestantischer Glaubensflüchtling im Frankfurter Exil lebte und 1593 als erster Professor für Botanik an die calvinistische Universität Leiden berufen wurde.46 Die theologischen,


48 Vgl. Cicero, *De natura deorum* lib. II, § 120.


(1604), seiner Arbeit über die Naturlehren der Stoiker, prägte er dafür den Begriff der *Theologia Naturalis*. Die stoische Idee der Einheit von Gott und Natur klang bereits in der *Constantia* (1584) an, als Lipsius die ‘übersinnliche und überhimmlische Natur’ paraphrasierte mit: ‘ich meine Gott’ (ὑπερούσιον illam & ὑπερουράνιον φύσιν [Deum dico]).


Nicht zuletzt wegen einer vergleichbaren philologisch ausgerichteten Grunddisposition vertrug sich die (neu-)stoische Philosophie durchaus mit der calvinistischen Theologie. Die Bildungsschicht der protestantischen Niederlande, zu der auch Coninxloo gehörte, rezipierte offenbar beide Theorien. Für den reformierten Künstler war die stoische Naturlehre in ästhetischer Hinsicht eine Ergänzung der calvinistischen Bildtheorie. Das stoische Prinzip der *contemplatio et imitatio mundi* entsprach dem...

Gillis van Coninxloo. Der Künstler als Leser

aktuelles Thema, er hatte dabei wahrscheinlich auch eine mögliche Verwertung durch die Frankenthaler Teppichindustrie im Blick.


61 Vgl. Calvin, Römerbrief 77.
63 Für weitere Beispiele vgl. Papenbrock, Landschaften des Exils 140.
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Charakteristisch für Lastmans Œuvre sind seltene, vielfach erstmals in die Malerei eingeführte biblische Stoffe und Themen aus der antiken Mythologie und Historie. Am Beispiel seines Gemäldes Der Opferstreit zwischen Orestes und Pylades (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam) lässt sich Lastmans Zugriff auf die schriftlichen Quellen ebenso exemplarisch darstellen wie die Methodik der Rekonstruktion seiner Lektüre und seines Buchbesitzes.


Lastman zeigt das Geschehen auf einer querrechteckigen Tafel, im Zentrum steht der schräggestellte, mit Blumengirlanden geschmückte Blockaltar, auf dem bereits ein Feuer entzündet wurde. Der Altar und die aufsteigende Rauchsäule teilen die Bildfläche. Links stehen Orestes, in Weiß, und Pylades einander zugewandt, vor einer Volksmenge. Dahinter steigt ein bewachsener Hügel an, auf dem ein monumentaler Rundtempel steht. Dieser hat keine Cella, so dass der leere Sockel des Artemis-Standbildes sichtbar ist, das rechts gegen den Himmel erhöht in der Prozession mitgeführt wird. Vor den beiden Jünglingen, am linken Bildrand, hat sich ein Scherge aufgestellt; er hält schlagbereit eine Keule in den Händen. Hinter dem Altar schenkt ein Bekränzer aus einer Prunkkanne Weihwasser in eine dazugehörige Schale, die ein Knabe hält. Rechts vor dem Altar, an der Spitze eines Zuges, der sich vom Tempel herabwindet, tritt Iphigenie hinzu, von einer Dienerin mit Blumenkorb begleitet; sie hält den Brief in der rechten. Der Zug führt allerlei Trophäen auf Stäben und Musikinstrumente mit sich. Im weiteren Verlauf werden, nachdem Inhalt und Empfänger des Briefes genannt wurden, die Geschwister einander

---

erkennen und gemeinsam mit Pylades und dem durch List geraubten Artemis-Standbild fliehen.


**Fig. 1. [Col. Pl. 8]** Pieter Lastman, *Der Opferstreit zwischen Orestes und Pylades*, 1614. Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum.

---


Da die antiken Darstellungen in sein Werk offensichtlich nicht eingingen und eine dieser weiterführende oder umformende Bildtradition nicht nachweisbar ist, können wir seine Bildgestaltung unmittelbar verfolgen, ihm dabei gleichsam über die Schulter schauen und daraus auch seine Lektüre erschließen.


Sluijter hatte unter Hinweis auf die erst 1666 erschienene niederländische Übersetzung ausgeschlossen, dass Lastman Euripides' *Iphigenie bei den Taurern* kannte und verwendete. Lastman standen zwar keine volkssprachlichen, wohl aber verschiedene lateinische Übersetzungen der

---


7 Van Mander, *Wtlegghingh* fol. 102v., 103r.

pieter lastman als leser. eine künstlerbibliothek


---

14 Sluijter, Fabulen 41, 222, Anm. 25; vgl. Golahny, “Paired Poems” 161; Golahny, Rembrandt’s Reading 69–71. So ist nach Euripides Iphigenia abwesend, wenn Pylades ihre Wahl

Die hier zitierte Euripides-Ausgabe bot Lastman allerdings noch mehr. Sie enthält verschiedene Kommentartexte, darunter auch den separat paginierten von Caspar Stiblin.15 Dieser beginnt mit einem kurzen ‘Argumentum’ zur Iphigenie bei den Taurern, das die Handlung des Dramas zusammenfasst. Der dramatische Höhepunkt ist in wenigen Zeilen wiedergegeben:

Iphigenie, erkennend, dass die Jünglinge Griechen seien, [...] schickt sich an, den einen Jüngling freigelassen mit einem Brief nach Argos zu schicken. Darüber bricht ein Streit aus zwischen Orestes und Pylades, beide sind nämlich gewillt, für den anderen zu sterben. Endlich aber erreicht Orestes, dass Pylades frei nach Hause zurückkehrt und den Brief überbringt. Dieser enthüllt, während Iphigenie die Anweisungen erteilt, zugleich, wer und woher er sei [und] wem sie den Brief geben wolle: Man kommt heraus und erkennt [einander] sofort.16

---

15 Stiblin C., Euripidis Tragoedias praefationes et annotationes, in Euripides Tragoediae Bd. II; der Iphigenie bei den Taurern; Kommentar auf 134–145.

In dieser Essenz sind alle wesentlichen Informationen zum Verlauf der Geschichte enthalten. Doch damit nicht genug. Im Kommentar zum ersten Akt liefert Stiblin eine Erläuterung zu den Opferriten der Taurer, die Lastman ins Bild gesetzt hat:

Was die Taurer betrifft, schreibt Herodot, die Taurer pflegen alle Schiffbrüchigen der Iphigenie zu opfern und, nachdem die Opferweihe durchgeführt ist, den Kopf der Menschen mit einer Keule einzuschlagen, den Rumpf des Körpers ans Meeresufer hinabzuwerfen [und] den Kopf auf einen Pfahl zu stecken.\(^{17}\)

In diesen wenigen Sätzen, die Herodots *Historiae* (IV, 103) entnommen sind, finden sich aufschlussreiche Details, die Lastman in seinem Gemälde verarbeitet hat: Zum Töten des Opfers wird eine Keule (‘clava’) verwendet, anschließend wird dessen Kopf auf einem Pfahl befestigt.\(^{18}\) Der hell beleuchtete keulentragende und schlagbereite Scherge am linken Bildrand beweist Lastmans Kenntnis der Herodot-Passage. Keine andere Quelle erwähnt die Keule. Darüberhinaus ist die Keule in Darstellungen von Opferszenen (etwa Abraham und Isaak, Iphigenie, Polyxena) keineswegs gebräuchlich, so dass eine Übertragung des Motivs in Lastmans neues Bildthema wohl auszuschließen ist. Außerdem finden sich im *Opferstreit zwischen Orestes und Pylades* noch weitere Elemente aus Herodots *Historiae*. So sind deutlich die erwähnten aufgespießten Köpfe links der Artemisstatue erkennbar.\(^{19}\) Herodots *Historiae* waren für Lastman in verschiedenen Ausgaben verfügbar.\(^{20}\) In der öffentlich zugänglichen Amsterdamer Stadtbibliothek befanden sich 1612 sowohl eine griechische als auch eine lateinische Ausgabe.\(^{21}\) Rubens besaß diese beiden Ausgaben

---


\(^{18}\) Golahny, “Paired Poems” 162, wies auf Herodots *Historiae* als mögliche Quelle für Lastmans Gemälde hin, ohne jedoch zeitgenössische Ausgaben nachzuweisen.


\(^{21}\) *Catalogvs Bibliothecæ Amstelredamensis* (Leiden, Henricus ab Haestens: 1612; Reprint Amsterdam: 1881) 39 (Pluteo R, Nr. 1, 2). Zur Amsterdamer Stadtbibliothek, ihrem Bestand
in den Auflagen von 1595 und 1608. Es existierten darüberhinaus bereits
deutsche, französische und italienische Übersetzungen, während die niederländische von Olbert Dapper erst 1665 erschien. Die in Lastmans
Gemälde übernommenen Elemente, wie die Keule und die aufgespießten Köpfe, finden sich auch in den genannten Übersetzungen, so dass es offen bleiben muss, welche Ausgabe Lastman benutzt haben könnte.

Der Euripides-Kommentar Stiblins bot Lastman noch einen weiteren nützlichen Textauszug und den Hinweis auf Ovids *Epistulae ex Ponto* (III.2), in denen die Geschichte von Orestes und Pylades ebenfalls geschildert wird:


24 ‘Huc Ovidius respexit in 3. de Ponto./ Ire iubet Pylades charum moriturus Orestem:/ Hic negat, inque vicem pugnat uterque; mori./ Eexitit hoc unum quod non convenerit illis:/ Caetera pars concors et sine lite fuit’. Stiblin, *Euripidis* Bd. II, 140.
Diana-Statue, das auch auf Lastmans Gemälde im Tempel sichtbar ist. Die Jünglinge werden mit Weihwasser besprengt, ihre blonden Locken und Schläfen sind mit Bändern und Kränzen umwunden. Der Brief ist hier, wie bei Euripides, Träger des Wiedererkennens, wobei unklar bleibt, ob Iphigenie ihn in Gegenwart von Orestes und Pylades verfasst. Im Gegensatz zu Lastmans Gemälde beschreibt Ovid auch hier, dass die Jünglinge gefesselt sind und ein Schwert (‘ense’) die Opfer töten soll.27

Ausgehend von van Manders Wtlegghing als Handbuch und Nachschlagewerk erschlossen sich Lastman die für das Gemälde zentralen Quellentexte. Die hier zitierte Euripides-Ausgabe machte Lastman nicht nur mit der Iphigenie bei den Taurern bekannt. Zugleich bot der Kommentar von Caspar Stiblin ergänzende Quellenauszüge aus Herodots Historiae und Ovids Epistulae ex Ponto, die Lastman ins Bild setzte. Details wie der Scherge mit der Keule, der Streit zwischen Orestes und Pylades oder der Brief als Schlüssel des Wiedererkennens der Geschwister, können nur auf diese Quellen zurückgeführt werden. Diese Ausgabe, auf die wohl auch Rubens und der Amsterdammer Arzt und Dichter Samuel Coster zurückgriffen, war also als weiterführendes Kompendium verwendbar. Das Beispiel macht deutlich, wie nützlich die Kommentierungen klassischer Texte für Künstler sein konnten.28 Es liegt nahe, dass Lastman diese kommentierte Euripides-Ausgabe benutzt hat.29


Die genaue Betrachtung des Bildes und der antiken Texte macht klar, dass der von Lastman dargestellte Moment nicht in Euripides’ *Iphigenie bei den Taurern* vorkommt und auch nicht aus den anderen literarischen Quellen abgeleitet werden kann. Lastman war sich bewusst, dass das dramatische Moment der Peripetie (‘staetveranderingh’) − im Gegensatz zur Bühne − ein Nacheinander im Bild nicht kennt, Vorher und Nachher aus einem dargestellten Moment erschließbar werden müssen. Dabei verzichtet er auf die Simultandarstellung mehrerer, zeitlich aufeinanderfolgender Szenen in unterschiedlichen Ebenen desselben Bildes, die Cornelis Cornelisz van Haarlem oder Joachim Wtewael seinerzeit noch nutzten. Lastman gestaltet vielmehr ein sich aus dem dramatischen Höhepunkt erschließendes, erzählerisches Kontinuum, ohne die Einheit von Zeit und Raum in der Handlung und Darstellung zu zerstören.\(^{31}\) Darin geht er über Euripides hinaus, dessen Drama durch narrative Monologe und den Einsatz des Chores Zeitsprünge aufweist. Lastman verwirklicht in seinem Gemälde, was auch die zeitgenössischen Dramatiker anstrebten. Dichter wie Samuel Coster in seiner *Iphigenia* (1617) und andere waren zur selben Zeit in Amsterdam mit diesen aus der aristotelischen Poetik stammenden Fragen zur einheitlichen Darstellung von Zeit und Raum beschäftigt.\(^{32}\)

---


Wie aber kam Pieter Lastman dazu, das Thema des Opferstreits zwischen Orestes und Pylades zu malen? Kehren wir noch einmal zur
Euripides-Ausgabe von 1602 zurück, die Lastmans wichtigste Quelle war. In Stiblins Kommentar findet sich folgende Deutung:

Der Dichter aber stellt in diesem Drama in Pylades und Orestes ein berühmtes Beispiel einer durch nichts zu erschütternden Freundschaft vor: Wie sie nicht nur Gefahr und Mühen gemeinsam bestehen, sondern auch wünschen, einer für des andern Heil das Leben hinzugeben.33

Stiblin gibt damit die gängige antike Interpretation des Stoffes wieder. Ovid (Tristia IV, 4; Epistulae ex Ponto III, 2), Cicero (De amicitia VII, 24) und Martial (Epigrammata VI, 11) heben das Beispiel der wahren Liebe und treuen Freundschaft von Orestes und Pylades hervor.34 Lastmans Opferstreit zwischen Orestes und Pylades könnte demnach ein ‘Freundschaftsbild’ gewesen sein.


Ein anderer Ausgangspunkt für die Antikenrezeption ist erneut van Manders Witlegghingh. Sie bietet im Abschnitt über Agamemnon und

34 Golahny, “Paired Poems” 164.
36 Meter, Heinsius 189–216.
37 Heinsius Daniel, De tragoediae constitutione liber (Leiden, Elzevier: 1611) 47; Aristoteles, Poetik 11.16; vgl. Meter, Heinsius 196, 198–199.
38 Die erste niederländische Bearbeitung des Stoffes ist Matthias Bodes Orestes en Pylades (Amsterdam: 1702, 1710, 1729), eine Übertragung des gleichnamigen französischen Dramas von F.J. de Lagrange Chancel.


Im Umkreis des Tempels aber ist dasselbe, das auf dem Pfeiler [der Tafel] geschrieben wurde, auf Bildern der Alten dargestellt zu sehen: Orestes offenbar, als er mit seinem Freund segelt, dann, nachdem das Schiff an steilen Klippen zerschellt war, gefangen und als Opfer geschmückt. Schon weiht sie Iphigenie. Gegenüber, auf der anderen Wand, ist er schon mit abgelegten Fesseln dargestellt, wie er Thoas tötet und viele andere Skythen. Im Folgenden ist er gerettet und hat Iphigenia und die Göttin [das Standbild].

---

39 ‘Wat Lucianus voorts hier van beschrijft/ is ons niet dienstigh’. Van Mander, *Vtlegghingh* fol. 103r.


Lastman war in Italien gewesen und hatte dort nicht nur antike Kunst, sondern auch die künstlerische und kunsttheoretische Auseinandersetzung mit der Antike kennengelernt. Sollte es nicht eine Herausforderung für ihn gewesen sein, sich mit antiken Malern und Gemälden zu messen, ein völlig neues Thema aus der antiken Literatur zu malen und damit in einen Wettstreit mit der antiken Kunst zu treten? Dem in van Manders *Schilder-boeck* lesenden Künstler bot sich erneut ein fruchtbringender Verweis, zunächst auf antike Malerei, und dann auf die zugrundeliegenden antiken Texte. Vor diesem Hintergrund erscheint es mir plausibel, dass Lastman selbst das Thema fand und sich entschied, es in einem Gemälde darzustellen, das zugleich ein ‘Freundschaftsbild’ gewesen sein kann.


---

Pieter Lastman als Leser. Eine Künstlerbibliothek


---


49 Ovid, ex Ponto fol. 39v.

50 Nach dem Tod von van der Wolffs Ehefrau, Maria Dircxdr Pesser, wurden am 15. Mai 1676 Gemälde aus der Sammlung van der Wolff in Amsterdam versteigert; Jongkees J.H., “De verzameling oudbeden van Reinier van der Wolff (ca. 1660)”, Mededelingen van
Die Untersuchung des *Opferstreits zwischen Orestes und Pylades* hat deutlich gemacht, wie vielfältig Lastmans Lektüre war. Van Mander, Euripides und ein Euripides-Kommentar, Herodot, Lukian und Ovid bildeten die Grundlage für das Gemälde.\(^{51}\) Ist dies innerhalb seines Œuvres ungewöhnlich, oder hat Lastman regelmäßig antike und zeitgenössische Literatur benutzt?\(^ {52}\)

Lastmans beide Gemälde *Odysseus und Nausikaa* von 1609 [Fig. 2] (Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum, Braunschweig) und 1619 (Alte Pinakothek, München) sind die ersten niederländischen Gemälde dieses Themas, das in der europäischen Malerei selten dargestellt wurde (*Odyssee* VI, 76–164). Er griff daher für zahlreiche Details direkt auf Dirck Volkertsz Coornherts niederländische Übersetzung zurück, die seit 1561 in zahlreichen Auflagen verfügbar war.\(^ {53}\) Den lauschigen Ort an einer Flussmündung, den von

---


Maultieren gezogenen Wagen, Wäsche, Geschirr, Speisen und Getränke, ein Liedbuch, den nackten, nur von einem Zweig bedeckten Odysseus, die fliehenden Mägde und die standhafte Nausikaa hat Lastman direkt aus Homers Schilderung ins Bild gesetzt. Auch die Themenwahl mag durch ein antikes Bildwerk angeregt worden sein. Pausanias erwähnt ein Bild der Begegnung von Odysseus und Nausikaa von Polygnot, das sich in der Galerie der Propyläen in Athen befand:

Auf der Linken der Vorhalle [= Athen, Propyläen] ist ein Raum geschmückt mit vielen Bildern. [...] Diese hat alle wahrlich Polygnotus gemalt. Er hat auch hinzugefügt, wie Odysseus Nausikaa entgegentrat, die mit Hilfe ihrer Mädchens Wäsche wusch, so, wie es Homer ersonnen hat.

---


55 ‘Ad laeuam vestibuli [= Athen, Propyläen], cella quaedam est multis ornata picturis. [...] Hec vero omnia Polygnotus pinxit. Addidit Ulyssem Nausicae & lauantibus cum ea
Eine ungewöhnliche Quelle sind die Hippokrates-Briefe, die Lastman für *Hippokrates besucht Demokrit* [Fig. 3] (Palais des Beaux-Arts, Lille) verwendete. Das Thema wurde in Holland durch das 1603 in Alkmaar verlegte Schuldrama *De Reden-Vreucht der Wijsen* von Adolf de Jager (Adolphus Tectander Venator, um 1569–1618) populär, dem Lastman in seinem Gemälde weitgehend folgt. In der Vorrede erwähnt de Jager jedoch auch die antike literarische Quelle für sein Werk, die (heute als apokryph geltenden) Hippokrates-Briefe. Eine niederländische Übersetzung davon war 1573 erschienen. Verschiedene Details, die in de Jagers Drama nicht erwähnt werden – Demokrit sitzt unter einem Baum mit Büchern zu seinen Füßen, zu seiner Rechten fließt ein Bächlein, auf dem Hügel steht ein mit Weinlaub bewachsender Tempel – zeigen, dass Lastman dem Hinweis von de Jager gefolgt ist und die Hippokrates-Briefe gelesen hat. Ähnlich wie im Fall des Euripides-Kommentars hat Lastman einen Hinweis auf einen antiken Text aufgegriffen und diesen im Gemälde verarbeitet.


59 Geerebaert, *Lijst* 40, Nr. 3. Das Büchlein ist heute außerordentlich selten. Ich habe das Exemplar (TFH A 7802) der Theologische Fakultät der Katholieke Universiteit Brabant, Tilburg, benutzt. Der Maler Pieter Saenredam hatte ein Exemplar davon in seiner Bibliothek; *Catalogus 1667* 12, Nr. 65.

60 *Democritus* / die welcke sad onder een Platan boom leeghe ende dicht van bladeren/ […] een zijn rechter sijde was aldaer vlietende een smal beeckxen/ sachtokens ruyschen/- welcke sij no loop hadde wat die voersijde huyeuelt/waer op stont een cappelleken/ […] becringelt met wijngaerden van selfs gewassen: maer die man selfs hadde seer statelyck op zijn knien een boecx/ ende meer ander boecken laghen by hem aen beyde zijden'; Hippocrates, ‘Eenē brief van Hippocrates de Medecyn aen Demagetum een admirael van Rhodos, vvt den Griecxschen tonge inden duystschen ouergeset, na een oudt exemplaer,
Neben griechischen Autoren kannte Lastman auch die allgemein verbreiteteren Klassiker der römischen Antike. Kein anderes Buch dürfte der Bildenden Kunst so zahlreiche profane Themen geliefert haben wie Ovids *Metamorphosen*. Es verwundert daher nicht, dass auch Lastman daraus schöpfte, zumal das Werk seit der niederländischen Erstausgabe 1552 in

zahlreichen Auflagen vorlag, leicht zugänglich war und häufig im Besitz von Künstlern nachweisbar ist.61

Seltz bei Themen, die bereits eine reine Bildtradition hatten, fand Last-

man noch neue Elemente in den Texten. Der Eichenkranz auf dem Haupt von Tmolus, Apollos Geige und sein bodenlanger Purpurmantel im Midas-

urteil [Fig. 4] (1616 (?); Privatsammlung, Turin) sind Beispiele dafür (Metamor-

phosen XI, 154–179).62 Auch für Apollo und Coronis [Fig. 5] (1615 (?); Aufbewahrungsort unbekannt) hat er verschiedene Details direkt aus dem Text (Metamorphosen II, 533–549, 596–632) entnommen, von denen einige nicht zur traditionellen Ikonographie des Themas gehörten. So zeigt er Apollos Attribute, Lorbeerkrantz und Leier, den weißen Raben, der das Drama auslöste, die deutlich sichtbare Schwangerschaft der Coronis, ihre Wunde und den Pfeil sowie dahinter am Feuer auch den Centauren Chiron, dem Apollo den geretteten Knaben Äskulap in die Obhut geben wird.63 Auch Juno überrascht Jupiter mit Io [Fig. 6] (1618; National Gallery, London) geht auf die Metamorphosen (I, 605–614) zurück, doch hat Last-

man zwei allegorische Figuren hinzugefügt, die möglicherweise auf eine zeitgenössische Bearbeitung des Stoffes zurückgeführt werden können.64 Neben dem geflügelten Amor, der seinen Bogen abgelegt hat, ist es ein unbekleideter Jüngling mit Maske und Fuchsfell. Letzterer versinnbild-


61 Geerebaert, Lijst 138–139, Nr. 1.
62 Freise, Lastman 144; Tümpel, “Iconography” 133, 135; ders., “Ikonographie” 137; Sluij-

ter, Fabulen 43–44.

ter, Fabulen 41, 223, Anm. 33.
65 B. N., “Acquisitions” 286 (mit Hinweis auf Otto Kurz); van Mander Karel, Uytbeeldinge
Fig. 4. Pieter Lastman, *Das Midasurteil*, 1616(?). Turin, Privatsammlung.

Fig. 5. Pieter Lastman, *Apollo und Coronis*, 1615(?). Aufbewahrungsort unbekannt.
Fig. 6. Pieter Lastman, *Juno überrascht Jupiter mit Io*, 1618. London, National Gallery.

(‘Cracht van liefden’), die Jupiters Leidenschaften auf der Bühne verfolgen und kommentieren. Unmittelbar vor der Entdeckung treten Apollo und Discordia auf, ersterer Jupiter warnend, letztere Juno anfeuernd. Obgleich diese Figuren nicht mit Amor und Fraus zu identifizieren sind, mag Houwaerts moralisierendes Stück von Liebe und Betrug als Anregung zur Erweiterung der Szene gedient haben.

Sluijter hat gezeigt, wie genau Lastman bei der Gestaltung des Gemäldes *Paris und Oenone* [Fig. 7] (1610; High Museum of Art, Atlanta) Ovids *Heroides* (V, 13–52) folgte.67 Van Ghisteles 1553 zuerst aufgelegte, weitverbreitete niederländische Übersetzung hat Lastman teilweise wörtlich ins Bild gesetzt. Die Umarmung unter einem Baum, aber auch Schafe, Hunde und der Flusslauf werden von Ovid beschrieben. Die für Lastmans Werk ungewöhnlich deutliche erotische Konnotation der Szene dürfte ebenfalls auf diesen Text zurückgehen.

---

Grundlage für Lastmans Gemälde *Ariadne und Bacchus auf Naxos* [Fig. 8] (1628; Universitets Konstsamling, Stockholm) bildete Ovids *Ars amatoria* (I, 525–564), weniger ausführliche Schilderungen fand Lastman auch in den *Heroides* (X) und in Catulls *Carmina* (LXIV). Ariadnes blondes, offenes Haar und ihre bloßen Brüste, aber auch ihr zerwühltes Lager und die Begegnung mit Bacchus werden in der *Ars amatoria* detailreich geschil¬
dert. Im Jahr vor der Entstehung des Gemäldes, 1627, war eine niederlä¬
dische Übersetzung dieses Werkes erschienen, die erstmals auch diesen Textabschnitt enthielt. Lastman hat diese Neuerscheinung sogleich benutzt und das Thema in die niederländische Malerei eingeführt. Die Figur der Alten allerdings, die Amor mit der Fackel heranwinkt, kommt in den antiken Texten nicht vor und ist wohl einzigartig in den Darstellungen des Themas. Lastman wurde zu diesen Figuren durch das um 1602 entstandene und erstmals 1614 in Amsterdam im Druck erschienene

---

baert, *Lijst* 143, Nr. 9 I/II).


---


71 Hummelen, *Repertorium* 276.


75 Für die niederländischen Ausgaben vgl. Geerebaert, Lijst 177.
Detailreicher ist jedoch der lateinische Text, in dem etwa die weiße Kuh erwähnt wird, die Lastman prominent im Bild dargestellt hat.

Mehrmals hat Lastman Episoden aus der antiken römischen Geschichte dargestellt und sich dabei wesentlich auf Livius' *Ab urbe condita* gestützt, das seit 1541 in niederländischer Übersetzung vorlag und häufig von Künstlern besessen wurde.76

Für seine *Sophonisbe empfängt den Giftbecher*, die nur in Kopien [Fig. 9] (Kriegsverlust, ehemals Kunsthalle, Bremen) überliefert ist, war ebenfalls Livius (*Ab urbe condita* XXX, 15) die wichtigste Quelle.77 Golahnys Vermutung, die von Lastman dargestellt, aber von Livius nicht erwähnte Amme könne auf Appian von Alexandrias *Historia Romana* zurückgehen, ist kaum überzeugend, da sie in dessen Schilderung bei der Übergabe des Giftbechers nicht anwesend ist.78 Golahnys erwähnt auch zwei zeitgenössische niederländische Dramen, zu denen sie jedoch keine über die gemeinsame Thematik hinausreichenden Bezüge erkennen möchte.79

In Willem van Nieulandts *Sophonisba Aphricana* allerdings begleitet eine treue Amme die karthagische Prinzessin.80 Diese ist auch dabei, als der Bote den Becher mit Gift bringt, Sophonisbe ihn leert und auf ihrem Bett stirbt. Allerdings wird auch bei van Nieulandt die Botschaft in Form eines

---

76 Geerebaert, *Lijst* 131–132, Nr. 1. Lastmans *Coriolan und die römischen Frauen* (1625; Trinity College, Dublin) ist das erste holländische Gemälde dieses Themas und geht außer auf *Ab urbe condita* (II, 40) und Plutarchs *Vita Coriolani* in Komposition und einzelnen Motiven auf Giulio Romanos *Adlocutio Constantins* in der Sala di Costantino zurück, die Lastman bei seinem Romaufenthalt gesehen hatte; Broos, "Coriolanus" 199–200.


Fig. 9. François Venant (zugestanden, nach Pieter Lastman), *Sophonisbe empfängt den Giftbecher*, um 1625–1630. Kriegsverlust, ehemals Bremen, Kunsthalle.

Briefes übergeben, der auf Lastmans Darstellung fehlt. Vermutlich hat Lastman, ähnlich wie bei *Ariadne und Bacchus auf Naxos* die antike Quelle und das zeitgenössische Drama kombiniert. Livius bot ihm den dramatischen Moment der gesprochenen Todesbotschaft, van Nieulandt die von der Bildtradition abweichende, mitleidende Figur der Amme und das ikonographisch ungewöhnliche Motiv des Bettes.81 Van Nieulandts Drama wurde vermutlich 1625 in Antwerpen verfasst und dort im folgenden Jahr erstmals gedruckt.82 1629 kehrte er nach Amsterdam zurück. Dort wurde das Theaterstück 1635, also erst nach Lastmans Tod, wiederaufgelegt.83 Lastman mag den Dichter und Maler schon in Rom kennengelernt haben, wo Willem von 1601 bis 1605/06 tätig gewesen war. Mit seinem Bruder,

---

81 Letzteres wird jedoch auch in der niederländischen Livius-Übersetzung erwähnt, obgleich der lateinische Text keinen Hinweis darauf enthält.
82 Meeus, *Repertorium* 123, Nr. 171. Von der Erstausgabe hat sich kein Exemplar erhalten.
Adriaen van Nieulandt, stand Lastman in Amsterdam in engem Kontakt. Es ist also durchaus denkbar, dass Lastman auf das Stück und die Erstauflage aufmerksam wurde. Sein verlorenes Gemälde dürfte demzufolge um 1625 entstanden sein.\textsuperscript{84}

Cetto identifizierte zuerst das Thema von Lastmans Gemälde \emph{Der Triumphzug des Sesostris} [Fig. 10] (Fine Arts Museum, San Francisco) korrekt.\textsuperscript{85} Sie wies auch auf Johann Ludwig Gottfrieds \textit{Historische Cronica} hin, die 1630 erstmals aufgelegt wurde.\textsuperscript{86} Darin befindet sich eine Illustration von Matthäus Merian d. Ä., die die sinngebenden Elemente von Lastmans Gemälde zeigt: Vier Männer sind vor den Wagen eines Herrschers gespannt, einer von ihnen wendet sich zurück.\textsuperscript{87} Lastman griff also zu einer soeben erschienenen, von Matthäus Merian illustrierten Chronik und stellte das Thema erstmals in der holländischen Malerei dar. Zwei wesentliche Unterschiede zwischen dem Gemälde und Merians Illustration – die Bewegung des Triumphzuges in Leserichtung von links nach rechts und die kaum bekleideten Könige – erklären sich aus den \textit{Emblemata} von Florentius Schoonhovius (1594–1648), die 1618 in Gouda

\begin{footnotes}


\textsuperscript{87} Der zugehörige Text erläutert dies wie folgt: Die vier von den vberwundenen Koenigen an seinen von Goldt und Edelgesteinen zugerichteten Wagen gespannet, die ihn ziehen mussten. Auf ein Zeit sah einer dieser Gefangenen stetigs zu reuen, auff ein Rad am Wagen. Sesostris fragte die Ursache. Ich troste mich, sagt der Gefangene, deß Glückes, welches wie ein Rad von außen umherläuft, und das unterste bald oben wendet, also kann es auch mit uns gehen. Der König merkte, warum dieser Spruch gemeinyt, ging in sich selbst, und spannet hinfuor keine Koenigen mehr in seinen Wagen’.

\end{footnotes}
erschienen waren.88 Das Emblem Nr. LX [Fig. 11] zeigt unter der Inscription ‘Sis memor utriusque fortunae’. (‘Sich beider Schicksale [=Glücks und Unglücks] erinnernd’) einen von zwei Pferden gezogenen Wagen, vor dem nur mit Lendentüchern bekleidete Gefangene geführt werden.89 Der Triumphzug des Sesostris ist, nach dem erhaltenen Bestand zu urteilen, Lastmans letztes Gemälde. Der alternde, kranke Künstler brachte seine Signatur auf dem Rad an, auf das der Gefangene schaut. Sie steht voll ausgeschrieben am höchsten Punkt – und wird doch im Fortschreiten des Triumphzuges diesen nicht halten können: eine durchaus symbolische Platzierung auf Lastmans letztem Werk.90

Die Untersuchung der Werke mit Themen aus antiker Mythologie und Historie ergibt, dass Pieter Lastman folgende Texte kannte: aus der griechischen Antike die Iphigenie auf Tauris des Euripides nebst dem Kommentar des Caspar Stiblin (1602), die Historien Herodots, den seinerzeit Hippokrates

---

Fig. 11. Emblem Nr. LX, in Schoonhovius F., Emblemata (Gouda: 1618, Reprint Hildesheim et al. 1975).


Wie bereits oben erwähnt, wird Lastmans Buchbesitz im Inventar von 1632 nur summarisch, ohne Format- oder Titelangaben verzeichnet:


Lastman war, wie oben gezeigt, in der Lage, lateinische Texte zu lesen. Es ist anzunehmen, dass er diese Sprachkenntnis auf der amsterdamer Lateinschule erworben hat.99 Ein Blick auf die Schullektüre der Latein-}

---

94 ‘[. . .] omtrent hondert ende bij de vijftich boecken’ (Stadsarchief Amsterdam, Notar Laurens Lamberti, Notarieel Archief Amsterdam Nr. 568, S. 511–518 (Films 6548)); van Heel, “Lastman” 12–15, 14 (Zitat).
96 Zeichnungen und Alben werden im Inventar separat erfasst. Dies schließt nicht aus, dass sich auch unter den 150 Bänden weitere ‘kunstboeken’ befanden, doch halte ich die Mehrzahl für gedruckte Bücher.


---

104 ‘[...] de uitleggingen van den besten Schryver over het geval na te leezen, om niet tegens den rechten zin aan te gaan’; De Lairesse, *Schilderboek* 123.
108 Erschwert wird ein Vergleich allerdings dadurch, dass Bredius in seiner Publikation von Künstlerinventaren gerade bei größeren Buchbeständen auf deren genaue Wiedergabe verzichtete und lediglich summarisch auf weitere Bücher verwies. In diesen Fällen sind vielleicht ähnlich umfangreiche Bibliotheken wie die Lastmans zu erwarten, deren genaue Größe und Zusammensetzung aber nur durch Konsultation der Archivalien zu klären wäre.
In Amsterdam besaß 1607 Gilis van Coninxloo 17 Bücher,\textsuperscript{109} die Maler Barent Teunisz und Jan Jansz hinterließen dort sieben und zwölf Bücher.\textsuperscript{110} Im Nachlassinventar von Hans van Uffelen werden, ebenfalls in Amsterdam, elf Bücher genannt, doch besaß er noch ‘zahlreiche weitere’.\textsuperscript{111} Coenraet van Schilperoort verfügte 1632 in Leiden über eine ‘sehr reichhaltige Bibliothek’, doch Bredius gibt lediglich 49 Titel an.\textsuperscript{112} Im Jahr 1658 besaß Adriaen van Nieulandt 69 Bücher, von denen 19 näher bezeichnet sind und 50 ohne Titel \textit{en bloc} für 10 Gulden, das Stück also für den geringen Preis von vier Stuiver verkauft wurden.\textsuperscript{113} Van Nieulandt hatte 1621 drei Bücher aus dem Nachlass von Jan Jansz erworben. Auch Werner van den Valckert hatte dort vier Architekturtraktate erstanden; über seinen Buchbesitz ist weiter nichts bekannt.\textsuperscript{114} Claes Moyaert erwarb 1638 auf der Auktion Gommer Spranger in Amsterdam ebenfalls ein ‘Perspektivbuch’, also einen Architekturtraktat.\textsuperscript{115} In Antwerpen hinterließ der Historiener Henrick van Balen 78 Bücher.\textsuperscript{116}

Aus diesen wenigen Vergleichen wird bereits deutlich, dass Lastmans ungefähr 150 Bücher im ersten Drittel des 17. Jahrhunderts eine große Künstlerbibliothek darstellten. Sie ist selbst dann stattlich, wenn man Bibliotheken von zeitgenössischen Amsterdamer Literaten zum Vergleich heranzieht, denen gemeinhin eine größere Neigung zum gedruckten Wort unterstellt werden kann als bildenden Künstlern. Der Arzt und Dichter Samuel Coster hinterließ eine 437 Titel umfassende Bibliothek, die etwa zur Hälfte aus \textit{Medicinalia} bestand.\textsuperscript{117} Joost van den Vondel besaß 1665 ‘nur’ 246 Bücher.\textsuperscript{118}

---

\textsuperscript{110} Bredius, \textit{Künstler-Inventare} Bd. 1, 287–292, bes. 288–289 (Barent Teunisz), Bd. 5, 1494–1496 (Jan Jansz).
\textsuperscript{111} Bredius, \textit{Künstler-Inventare} Bd. II, 435–442, 440 (Zitat A. Bredius).
\textsuperscript{112} Bredius, \textit{Künstler-Inventare} Bd. II, 557–560, 558 (Zitat A. Bredius).
\textsuperscript{116} Duverger, \textit{Kunstinventarissen} Bd. IV, 200–211, Nr. 1025, bes. 205, 209–211.
\textsuperscript{117} Kleerkoper, “Catalogus”.
\textsuperscript{118} Van Selm, \textit{Boekhandelscatalogi} 101.


Lastmans Belesenheit und die aufgrund der Rekonstruktion zu vermutende Reichhaltigkeit seiner Bibliothek lassen sich wohl nur mit Rubens vergleichen.120 Der Vergleich mag gewagt vorkommen. Der Amsterdamer Historienmaler und der gelehrte flämische Malerfürst scheinen doch so wenig miteinander gemein zu haben. Zudem besaß Rubens beinahe viermal soviel wie Lastman. Doch gibt es durchaus Gemeinsamkeiten: Lastman und Rubens waren die bedeutendsten Historienmaler ihrer

119 Die Bibel und van Manders Schilder-boeck werden jeweils als ein Titel gezählt.

Auswahlbibliographie


Catalogus *Bibliotheca Amstelredamensis* (Leiden; Henricus ab Haestens: 1612; Reprint Amsterdam: 1881).


STIBLIN C., *In Euripidis Tragoedias præfationes et annotationes*, in *Euripides, Tragoediae quae extant*, 2 Bde (Genf, Paulus Stephanus: 1602) Bd. II.


Sir Joshua Reynolds (1723–1792) owned an extensive collection of books in his library. It is known to us today at least in part through the auction that took place after his death, and numerous volumes are now kept in Sir John Soane’s Museum. Furthermore, we can reconstruct which books Reynolds owned as well as what further literature he studied by the references in his Discourses on Art and the surviving manuscript notes he made while reading. Despite the comprehensive research on the important role books played in Reynolds’ life and despite this being a well-known fact, until now no one has focused their studies primarily on the role that reading ultimately played for this artist. Especially the value of reading in artists’ education is significant in this regard as well as how Reynolds made this a theoretical issue in his Discourses and, not to forget, how he put what he read into practice in his artistic work. Also the extent of Reynolds’ usage of books as instruments for acquiring knowledge within the framework of fashioning himself as an educated humanist artist, a pictor doctus, still remains to be explored.

Reynolds’ early career was definitely not that of a gifted child. His first attempts to illustrate objects from ‘the book of nature’ are modest. The study of a perch he made as a boy appears two-dimensional and, without any background context, seems arbitrarily transfixed on the sheet of paper like an arbitrary object [Fig. 1]. However, the minute detail with which

---


the young draftsman captured the form, texture, and proportions of the fish is surprising. The inscription added by Sir Joshua’s father, Reverend Samuel Reynolds, reveals high aspirations and also ennobles the drawing: ‘A Perch drawn not from another Picture, but from the Life’. During his career as a portrait painter, Reynolds often painted from life, but a shift became increasingly apparent from working ‘from the Life’ to ‘from another Picture’: He did not, however, copy, but instead enhanced his portraits by quoting motifs from other artworks. Predominantly in Reynolds’ later portraits of children and young ladies, his borrowing method reveals many insights into the idealizing concept in portraiture during his further career. As a portrait artist he was compelled to follow the aspirations of depicting his clients true to nature. They did not, however, remind him of a perch, but he humorously compared them to a piece of ham, as he

Fig. 1. Joshua Reynolds, Study of a Perch. Whereabouts unknown.

allegedly put it himself: The expression or attitude of a particularly highly praised male portrait by his hand was neither more nor less than ‘copying a ham or any object of still life’.

When we examine the young Reynolds, we find a youth who, in his erudition and interests, not only studied from the ‘book of nature’ but also consulted the books he had direct access to in his father’s library. Besides Jacob Cats’ book of emblems (1627), from which he copied the engravings, and the Bible, which he read under his father’s guidance, Reynolds also had access in Plympton, the hometown of his youth, to Dryden’s translation of Plutarch’s *Vitae*, which later probably found its way into his own library. I would like to especially point out, however, that already at the age of eight he gathered knowledge – presumably rather superficially – from Jean Dubreuil’s standard work on perspective for artists and dilettantes, the anonymously published *Perspectiva Practica*, presumably the English translation by Ephraim Chambers of the 1726 London edition.

We can deduce this from a drawing he illustrated as a youth on the back of a page containing a Latin exercise [Fig. 2]. The perspectival construction according to Dubreuil’s model – with its vanishing point marked as the ‘point of sight’ – shows a window in a wall in exact compliance with the vanishing lines. It can be described as a hand copy of folio 54 of the *Perspectiva Practica*, whose perspectival constructions in the first edition were adopted by all subsequent ones [Fig. 3]. His father also added a note to this illustration by Joshua Reynolds as a boy, giving us insight into the status of the drawing: ‘this is drawn by Joshua in school out of pure

---


5 Cats Jacob, *Proteus ofte minne-beelden verandert in Sinne-Beelden* (Rotterdam, Pieter van Waesberge: 1627). According to Timbs (Timbs, *Anecdote Lives* 103), Reynolds told Edmond Malone that Cats’ book, which belonged to his grandmother before it found its way into his father’s library, was an initiatory work and trigger for his later career.


7 [Dubreuil J.,] *The Practice of Perspective, or An Easy Method of representing Natural Objects According to the Rules of Art. Applied and Exemplified in all the Variety of Cases; as Landskips, Gardens, Buildings of divers Kinds [...] A Work highly necessary for Painters, Engravers, Architects [...] And others concerned in Designing, Written in French by a Jesuit of Paris [...]* (London, Thomas Bowles: 1726). Initially the book was published anonymously with the title *Perspective practique [...]* (Paris, Melchior Tavernier: 1642, with illustrations, which were also used for the German translation by Johann Christoph Rembold, *Perspectiva practica* (Augsburg, Jeremias Wolff: 1710) and the English translations by Robert Pricke, *Perspective practical* (London, Robert Pricke: 1698), as well as the many subsequent editions. Presumably Samuel Reynolds had the new English edition of 1726 in his library because his mother tongue was English and also because of the publication date.
idleness’. The assertion that Joshua illustrated a perspectival construction in school purely out of boredom highlights a technical proficiency and understanding far surpassing that of a mere boy not yet aged ten.\(^8\) The significance of perspectival illustration for the young Reynolds finds little echo in his later works, and it has only been possible to verify the existence of one treatise on perspective in his library: Thomas Malton’s rare volume *Compleat Treatise on Perspective* (London, Thomas Malton: 1776), which was printed for only 300 subscribers.\(^9\)

An overview of what Reynolds confirmedly read at an early date, to which we can include school textbooks and also several classics of antiquity and early modern times, sufficiently substantiates that since early

---

8 Timbs, *Anecdote Lives* 103, conjectured that Reynolds’ perspective illustration was based on Jonathan Richardson’s advice in his *Treatise on Painting* to ‘make private drawings rather than public exercises in school’.

9 The evidence for this was discovered by Hilles, *The Literary Career* 119.
Fig. 3. Jean Dubreuil, *Perspectival Construction*, in [Dubreuil J.,] *The Practice of Perspective, or An Easy Method of representing Natural Objects According to the Rules of Art. Applied and Exemplified in all the Variety of Cases; as Landskips, Gardens, Buildings of divers Kinds […] A Work highly necessary for Painters, Engravers, Architects […] And others concerned in Designing, Written in French by a Jesuit of Paris […]* (London, Thomas Bowles: 1726), fol. 54.
childhood reading and study played an important role in his life and that his interests inclined towards art and art theory. Additionally his selection of genres, such as illustrated books of emblems as well as treatises on painting and perspective, exemplifies his visual reception of complex works. The established fact that he studied these books is intriguing if considered in relation to his father’s inscriptions, in which he strived to evoke the image of Joshua as an exceptionally gifted child by adopting the topoi of unassuming early talent: His teacher was nature alone, and out of sheer boredom he conceived complicated spatial constructions.

Fifty years later, the meanwhile knighted Sir Joshua Reynolds presents himself in his Self-Portrait as President of the Royal Academy in the garments of a doctor of civil law of Oxford University [Fig. 4]. Leaning gently on his left hand in which he holds a roll of paper he stands self-confidently in front of a table on which we can view a version of Daniele da Volterra’s bust of Michelangelo. Executed shortly before or during 1780, the self-portrait was originally intended as a pendant to the portrait Reynolds painted of Sir William Chambers. Both paintings were to hang in the Assembly Room flanking the mantelpiece of the new Royal Academy quarters in Somerset House. Reynolds did not depict himself as a painter but in the pictorial tradition of the erudite collector and courtier. In contrast, he portrayed Chambers in the tradition of artists’ portraits as an architect working on the conception of a building, despite the fact that he was the author of several theoretical writings. The painting can be analyzed as a programmatic statement by the artist because of the representative function his self-portrait had within the academy quarters. Alluding to the debates and theoretical comments on artists’ intellectuality and social standing, Reynolds painted himself in his official role in the culturally and politically pivotal position of president of the Royal Academy, embodying the classically educated humanist painter. Significantly,


11 It was a matter of course that also Chambers’ most important work, A Treatise on Civil Architecture (London, Johann Christoph Haberkorn: 1759), was in Reynolds’ library (according to Hilles, The Literary Career 120).
Reynolds highlights the upper half of his face as well as the forehead of Michelangelo’s bust, thereby emphasizing the intellect – according to the academy president’s views – as the prerequisite for artistic creation. The lighting in the painting also underscores the artist’s hand, so that the gaze of the beholder is conveyed to the roll of paper that Reynolds holds. While this paper roll has not been written on and is therefore free for all kinds of associative speculation, he inscribed such a roll in another self-portrait,
which he executed only shortly beforehand for the Uffizi Gallery, with the words ‘Disegni del Divino Michelangelo’ [Fig. 5]. This not only suggests an analogous meaning for the roll in the academy portrait, but also suggests an interpretation of the portrait that embraces the wide range of notions linked to the term disegno – as illustration on the material level and as conception from an intellectual viewpoint. His interpretation of himself as a pictor doctus and doctor pictus gleams through in the highly compressed staging.

What we see visually represented in the painting we also find again in Reynolds’ written comments on the status of painting and its impact on the standing of the artist. In his Discourses on Art, which he originally delivered as the president to an audience of students and members of the Royal Academy and which were later published, Reynolds supported the view that the success of an artist is not dependent on the ‘industry of the hands, but of the mind’.12 With this comment he alluded to the centuries-old debate on the status of the pictorial arts by underscoring their intellectuality and intensifies this by opposing the motifs of hand and intellect. The strongest argument for the social advancement of painters accordingly involved linking artistic proficiency with intellectual capacity. Leonardo da Vinci’s emphasis on the power of the artist’s imagination was for Reynolds, as ‘industry of the mind’, the prerequisite for the creation of a demanding artwork. Reynolds, however, embedded it more solidly within the context of appropriation of knowledge13 through intensive study and excluded the authority of ingenious inspiration of antiquity and early modern times. The profoundly enlightened idea that the human intellect is fundamentally malleable and can be improved is in Reynolds’ eyes the condition and the actual reason for reading and study: ‘The great business of study is, to form a mind, […]’.14 The implications of Reynolds’ remarks on imagination and improving the intellectual faculty can best be judged in conjunction with his role as a disseminator of knowledge: he was responsible for the strategic goals of the Royal Academy as its president and also for the education of artists as an academic instructor.

For Reynolds, education in the Royal Academy meant forming the intellect because he seriously doubted that genius lacking erudition sufficed

---

12 Reynolds, Discourses on Art VII, 5.
13 This is also stated in Reynolds, Discourses on Art, VII, 540: ‘[…] the knowledge of these causes is acquired by a laborious and diligent investigation of nature, and by the same slow progress as wisdom or knowledge of every kind […]’.
Fig. 5. Frontispiece and title page of Delle arti del disegno discorsi del cav. Giosuè Reynolds. Trasportati dall'Inglese nel Toscano idioma (Florence: 1778).
in art. ‘As our art is not a divine gift, so neither it is a mechanical trade. Its foundations are laid in solid science [...]’.\(^{15}\) In his Discourses and in his writings in other documents – which will also be considered – Reynolds’ reflections on art and artists’ education revolve around art as being mechanical, a gift, or science. Reynolds remained skeptical in the Discourses towards the essential condition for artistic creation lying in the concept of Platonic furore, even if he was acquainted with the leading work on theory of imagination – at least as mediated through Franciscus Junius – that is, with Plato’s Timaios:\(^{16}\) ‘[...] labour is the only price of solid fame, and whatever their [i.e. the artists’, I.W.] force of genius may be, there is no easy method of becoming a good Painter’.\(^{17}\) As president of the Royal Academy, Reynolds was especially concerned with elevating the status of painting to the level of the artes liberales and, at the same time, to bring the innate artistic talents of his students to perfection.

Reynolds considered erudite conversation with kindred spirits to be a key element in forming the intellect of young artists. He recommended it in his Discourses with a reference to Michelangelo’s habit of keeping company with scholars:\(^{18}\)

> Reading, if it can be made the favourite recreation of his [the young artist’s, I.W.] leisure hours, will improve and enlarge his mind, without retarding his actual industry. What such a partial and desultory reading cannot afford, may be supplied by the conversation of learned and ingenious men, which is the best of all substitutes for those who have not the means or opportunities of deep study.\(^{19}\)

Even if Reynolds cultivated learned conversation with Edmund Burke and Samuel Johnson in the ‘Literary Club’, which he founded in 1764, Frederick Hilles rightly pointed out that Reynolds’ famous comment is not to be

\(^{15}\) Reynolds, Discourses on Art VII, 6; see also VI, 26.

\(^{16}\) Reynolds, Discourses on Art III, 41; on Junius see Hilles, The Literary Career 123–124. According to Reynolds, he acquired knowledge of Plato’s Timaios via Franciscus Junius.

\(^{17}\) Reynolds, Discourses on Art I, 151–153.

\(^{18}\) Reynolds’ allusion to Condivi’s biography of Michelangelo, in which this artist cultivated relationships to scholars, may also be traced back to sources other than the original (see Reynolds, Discourses on Art VII, 35). The significance of artists associating with poets and scholars as a substitute for learning develops into a literary topos in the eighteenth century. On Velázquez we can, for example, read in Palomino de Castro Antonio, El museo pictórico y escala óptica (Madrid, Lucas Antonio de Bedmar: 1715–1724): ‘He was also attached to, and friend of, poets and orators because from such minds he received great adornments for his compositions’. (Translation quoted from Bialostocki J., ‘Doctus Artifex and the Library of the Artist in XVIIth and XVIth Century’, in Horodisch A. (ed.), De arte et libris, Festschrift Erasmus 1934–1984 (Amsterdam: 1984) (11–22) 15).

\(^{19}\) Reynolds, Discourses on Art VII, 31–37; see Hilles, The Literary Career 113.
comprehended as lack of intellectual inclination on the author’s behalf.\textsuperscript{20} Quite the opposite was true: On the one hand, Reynolds made it clear that the actual work of artists is aesthetic production. For this reason he enhanced the value of leisure time as profitable and not wasted when utilized for reading in order to shape and improve the intellectual capacity of artists. On the other hand, it should not be forgotten that especially learned conversation played an important role in the Royal Society’s scholarly programme in connection with enlightened theories on sociability.\textsuperscript{21} Conversation with scholars and erudite men did not exclude ‘deep study’ as part of reading in Reynolds’ eyes. He found the necessary means for extensive study in his library with its multifarious range of volumes.

Reynolds presented himself as a productive reader and scholar in art-theoretical and philological matters in the annotations he wrote for the English edition of Charles-Alphonse Dufresnoy’s \textit{De arte graphica} (York, Ann Ward: 1783).\textsuperscript{22} Therein he vividly illustrated the meaning he attached to knowledge transmitted by books. In regard to the practical side of art, he voiced his skepticism toward learnable general rules for the conception of artworks, but generally he regarded an artist’s education to be of utmost importance:

> What relates to the mind or imagination, such as invention, character, expression, grace or grandeur, certainly cannot be taught by rules; little more can be done than pointing out where they are to be found; it is a part which belongs to general education and will operate in proportion to the cultivation of the mind of the artist.\textsuperscript{23}

In his \textit{Discourses on Art}, Reynolds undertook the duty of pointing out \textit{loci}, references where the key stocks of knowledge were to be found. In this epoch-making publication for English art theory he referred to sources...
directly as well as only alluded to them. Furthermore, in his handwritten footnotes references to the sources of quotes or content can be extracted from the Discourses.

Besides Francis Bacon’s “Of Beauty” in the Essays and his Advancement of Learning,24 the dominant sources of reference that Reynolds with certainty drew on and criticized for the Discourses are Horace, Leonardo da Vinci, Edmund Burke, and Roger de Piles. Additionally, Reynolds extensively consulted Pliny the Elder’s Historia Naturalis, Giorgio Vasari’s Vitæ,25 and especially Franciscus Junius’s De pictura veterum to support and substantiate his argumentation. He owned the latter in both the Latin (1637) and the English (1638) editions.26 Through Junius he was also acquainted with the standard literature of the ancients such as Quintilian’s Institutio oratoria and Cicero’s De oratore.27 In contrast, he appears to have read actual editions of Horace’s Ars Poetica as well as Vitruvius’ De architectura. It is even documented that Reynolds owned William Smith’s English translation of Longinus’ reflections On the Sublime (London, W. Innys: 1739). Additionally, Reynolds often referred to Pliny the Elder’s Historia Naturalis, which he seems to have owned in the French translation with annotations by Etienne Falconet, as we may deduce from the Discourses.28

Shakespeare played a special role, whose dramatic works Reynolds often quoted in his writings.29 In doing so he relied on the general fame of the author. The academy president often included a well-known quote from the poet as a moral or allegorical conclusory vignette to his reflections. From a mnemotechnical viewpoint, they either poignantly summarize an

24 See Reynolds Joshua, Discourses on Art III, 155; XII, 72–80; XII, 250–252; XII, 323–324. Bacon’s Essays were first published in 1597 in London. Reynolds used the edition Francis Lo. Verulam, The essayes or counsels, ciuill and morall (London, Iohn Haviland: 1625) for his studies, as he states himself in the Discourses III, 155. On Bacon’s Advancement of Learning see Reynolds, Discourses on Art XII, 242–244; XIII, 353. The Advancement of Learning was first published in London in 1605. Reynolds used either the London 1629 edition or the Oxford 1633 edition; see Hilles, The Literary Career 214, n. 3.

25 According to Hilles, The Literary Career 120, n. 2, Reynolds had the three-volume edition that was published in Bologna in 1647 in his library; he probably used this edition.

26 Hilles, The Literary Career 123–124.

27 Hilles, The Literary Career 125.

28 After 1772, Reynolds obviously used the translation Traduction du 34., 35. et 36. livres de Pline l’Ancien, annot. by Etienne Falconet (Amsterdam, Marc-Michel Rey: 1772) (cf. Reynolds, Discourses on Art VIII 619–620); prior to this (1769) he presumably acquired his knowledge of Pliny’s Historia Naturalis via Franciscus Junius, see Reynolds, Discourses on Art I, 231–232, n. and VIII, 619.

29 See Reynolds, Discourses on Art V, 393 (Henry IV, II.II.i.45); VII, 307–311; XIII, 298; XV, 130–131 (Hamlet, III.i.ii, III.i.ii.24, I.i.ii.65 und II.i.ii.465); VIII, 110; XIII, 224 (Macbeth, I.iv, I.v.57); XII, 418–419 (Othello, V.i.ii.345).
antecedent paragraph or provide an introductory link to a following one. The popularity of his quotes must be viewed in conjunction with the Shakespeare renaissance of the eighteenth century: Reynolds himself executed three paintings for the Shakespeare Gallery, an exhibition which was intended to document the national significance of the poet and the quality of English history painting. Very probably Reynolds owned the new edition of Shakespeare’s work that was published on the tide of the renewed interest in the poet.

Particularly valuable for evaluating Reynolds as a reader are his above-mentioned annotations, which have, in part, survived as manuscripts. For example, in this context it is relevant that Reynolds excerpted from William Melmoth’s translation of the younger Pliny’s letters, especially those passages focusing on the duties of the rhetorician or on the significance of rhetoric in general. In doing so he reflected his own profession as a Royal Academy lecturer and instructor in the field of art theory. On how significant background knowledge was for the attitude of an audience in reception he quoted: ‘Every man naturally favours his own discoveries, and when he hears an argument made use of which had before occurred to himself, will certainly embrace it as extremely convincing’. By asserting that the spoken word, compared to reading, had a greater impact on the recipient, Pliny the Younger was a fitting model for Reynolds in regard to delivering his lectures to academy members. ‘We are infinitely more affected with what we hear than what we read, Pliny. Let. 3d. B.2d’. But Reynolds promptly corrected Pliny and introduced his view of the hierarchy of the senses by adding the sense of sight, the one he valued most as a painter: ‘And what we see than what we hear! meus [= Reynolds, I.W.]’. After noting down his opinion spontaneously as it occurred to him, the last part of the comment – his insertion of ‘meus’ as the reading subject marking his own opinion – gives us an impression of Reynolds as a reader: He reads and comments according to his current

---

31 On this topic see Prochno R., Joshua Reynolds (Weinheim: 1990) 193.
32 Printed in Hilles, The Literary Career Appendix I.
33 ‘The pleasures of the senses are so far from wanting the oratorical arts to recommend them that we stand in need of all the powers of eloquence to moderate and restrain their influence. Lett. 8th’, quoted after Hilles, The Literary Career 202. The translation annotated by Melmoth has survived in many editions printed after 1747.
34 Quoted from Hilles, The Literary Career 202.
inclinations while searching for arguments he can utilize for his own literary productions. Even though he was and is accused of being eclectic in his work, he remains an independent intellect who sets his own course in cultural and political matters as well as in art theory. In another case in his exploits as a reader and commentator, he expanded the excerpts he had taken from his edition of Alexander Pope's translation of Homer. He added to Pope's footnotes in Homer's *Iliad* that carrying *varietas* (*variety*) to excess in the Georgian poet's sense would not only extinguish poetic fire but also quite the opposite: It could actually lead to recapturing the digressing attention of the beholder. When Pope wrote: 'Nothing so much cools the warmth of a piece, or puts out the poetical fire of poetry as that perpetual care to vary incessantly even in the smallest circumstances', Reynolds responded with: 'or recalls the spectators wandring enthusiastic senses – meus'.

At the same time, Reynolds' excerpts reveal that he was under no illusions in regard to the impact his lectures and writings had on their audience and readers, as we are given to understand in the following quote he took from La Bruyères *Caractères*: ‘Un auteur cherche vainement à se faire admirer par son ouvrage. Les sots admirent quelque fois, mais ce sont des sots. Les personnes d'esprit […] admirent peu; ils approuvent’.

The hopelessness of reaping admiration for one's own work from witty and clever personages, as discerned by La Bruyère, does not, however, hinder Reynolds from persevering in his literary pursuits and continuing to study books. One of the motivations behind his study and the excerpts he made was obviously to convey the contents of his reading material in his *Discourses on Art* to his readers. He articulated this, for example, in a note – added directly under the heading for his excerpts ‘From Bacon’s Essays. Study’ – stating 'used', indicating they had been taken up in the *Discourses*. As mentioned above, Bacon was one of the authors who Reynolds critically and intensively studied. He repeatedly quoted from Bacon's *Advancement of Learning* or from his “Of Beauty”, adapting the excerpts to his own notions by correcting and expanding their content. For example, Reynolds criticized Bacon's statement on the difficulties of representing the right moment, for which the latter could see no rules and attributed

---

35 Quoted from Hilles, *The Literary Career* 212, n. 2.
36 Quoted from Hilles, *The Literary Career* 211.
37 Quoted from Hilles *The Literary Career* 214, n. 2.
the fortunate choice of moment to ‘felicity’ alone.\textsuperscript{38} In Reynolds’s eyes, art certainly followed rules and, for the creation of beauty, artistic principles had to be complied with that were neither the result of arbitrary success nor the product of innate genius. In a similar context while discussing invention, Reynolds criticized Bacon’s comment that it could be found ‘much in experience but little in books’. The academy president argued that even Bacon could not have written his works blindly without learning from others:

\begin{quote}
[…] we may suspect that even the genius of Bacon, great as it was, would never have been enabled to have made those observations, if his mind had not been trained and disciplined by reading the observations of others. Nor could he without such reading have known that those opinions were not to be found in other books.\textsuperscript{39}
\end{quote}

Reynolds also studied the fundamental literature on art, many of the treatises were part of his library in the original language or in translation. To name a few, he owned Joachim von Sandrart’s \textit{Academia nobilissimae artis pictoriae} (Lat. edition of the \textit{Teutsche Academie}, Frankfurt/Nuremberg, Joachim von Sandrart: 1683), Charles Alphonse Dufresnoy’s \textit{De arte graphica} (transl. by John Dryden, London, William Taylor: 1716), Roger de Piles’ \textit{Cours de Peinture par Principes} (Engl. translation, London, J. Osborn: 1743), Jonathan Richardson’s \textit{Essay on the Theory of Painting} (London, John Churchill: 1715) and \textit{An Account of Some of the Statues, Bas-Reliefs, Drawings, and Pictures in Italy} (London, J. Knapton: 1722), as well as Alexander Cozens’ \textit{The Principles of Beauty} (London, James Dixwell: 1778) (Reynolds also subscribed for this edition).\textsuperscript{40}

Samuel Reynolds owned a copy of André Félibien’s description of the image of the Queen of Persia kneeling at the feet of Alexander in William Parson’s English translation. It is highly probable that Sir Joshua acquired this publication for his library from his father’s collection of books.\textsuperscript{41}

\textsuperscript{38} ‘It is not safe to question any opinion of so great a writer, and so profound a thinker, as undoubtedly Bacon was. […] If by felicity is meant any thing of chance or hazard, or something born with the man, and not earned, I cannot agree with this great philosopher’, Reynolds, \textit{Discourses on Art} III, 156.

\textsuperscript{39} Bacon’s comment stemmed from a dedication he wrote to Prince Henry in a volume of his \textit{Essays}. Although the dedication was never printed, knowledge of it became widespread through correspondence, see Reynolds, \textit{Discourses on Art} XII, 250–252; the quote is taken from Reynolds, \textit{Discourses on Art} XII, 253–257.

\textsuperscript{40} Hilles, \textit{The Literary Career} 120–121.

Félibien’s text is seen as a pivotal point of reference in Reynolds’s art-theoretical thought. He was quite critical, however, in his study of it. A comment he added to a passage in the Tent of Darius explain’d reveals his thorough examination of Félibien’s description: ‘Félibien is here certainly mistaken […]’.

Testimonies to Sir Joshua Reynolds’ intellectual profile as an important English painter, a leading art theoretician of the eighteenth century, and the first president of the Royal Academy can be found in both text and images. The texts he read were very diverse, and his study also comprised the reading and reception of artworks. Indeed, the distinctive character of this artist’s work can be best described as the productive appropriation of knowledge transmitted by artworks; this modus operandi is pivotal for his creative work as a theoretically reflected method of generating images by means of ‘borrowings’ or transposing a motif as a citation into a new context. As an example for his study of Italian art theory, I wish to scrutinize Reynolds’ personification of Theory a little closer. The work in question is his only ceiling painting, which he executed for the library of the Royal Academy’s new domicile in Somerset House [Fig. 6]. Theory dominates the key personifications from Cipriani’s invention, that is, Nature, History, Allegory, and Fable, which were likewise pivotal for an academy. Sitting on a cloud in a contemplative attitude and originally crowned with a pair of compasses, Reynolds’ female personification holds a scroll in her hands inscribed with the words: ‘THEORY is the knowledge of what is truly NATURE’. His representation of Theory essentially follows the image conceived by Cesare Ripa in his Iconologia and is thereby our first visual testimony to Reynolds’ art-theoretical studies. He did in fact own a copy of George Richardson’s revised English edition, Iconology, or A Collection of Emblematical Figures […] (London, G. Richardson: 1779). The importance Reynolds attached to the publication of an English edition can be seen in the fact that his name can be found among the subscribers.

---

42 Prochno, Joshua Reynolds 192–193.
44 Reynolds, Reynolds cat. 2168.
46 The legs of Theory formally resemble those of the angel that Raphael designed for the mosaic in the dome of the Cappella Chigi in S. Maria del Popolo in Rome; see Reynolds, Reynolds cat. 112.
for the edition. And he painted the ceiling fresco of Theory for Somerset House in the very year in which the Iconology with its exacting theoretical introduction was published. According to Richardson's outline:

Theory,
Is the study of any art or science, and is represented by the figure of a young woman, dressed in azure coloured drapery, in an attitude of contemplation, descending a staircase, with a pair of compasses on her head, having the points upwards. [...] The compasses are the most proper instrument for her operations, for measuring objects both linear and circular. The attitude, azure dress, and descending the staircase signify eminence, sublimity, and progressive motion [cf. Fig. 7].

Even if Reynolds faithfully follows Richardson's description, we can see that the artist incorporated several nuances from the Italian original, which he must have been acquainted with for the conception of his ceiling painting.
Fig. 7. George Richardson, *Theory, in idem, Iconology; or, A Collection of Emblematical Figures; containing four hundred and twenty-four remarkable Subjects, moral and instructive; in which are displayed the Beauty of Virtue and Deformity of Vice*, 4 vols. (London, G. Scott: 1779), vol. I.
Reynolds adopted Ripa’s description of _Teoria_ by painting the personification in a slightly rotating attitude that wavers between ‘contemplazione’ and ‘visione’. The figure’s gaze is directed towards loftier horizons (visione), emphasizing rationality or ratio and thereby the intellectual side of an artist’s education. The fact that _Theory_ focuses her perception upwards is mentioned only in the Italian original (‘Donna giovane che miri in alto’). Reynolds went beyond this viewpoint however by underscoring intellectual achievement through exertion by having _Theory_ actively twist out of the (creative) pose of melancholy (contemplazione) in order to peer upwards. In its cloud-like colour, her light-blue garment matches the blue apparel of Ripa’s _Teoria_ as well as that of Richardson’s _Theory_. It is significant that Reynolds did not include the staircase mentioned in both the Italian and the English texts, and that he has the personification seated on clouds as a reference in her presumed abode in lofty spheres. This detail happens to link the figure to Richardson’s description of the personification of _Idea_: ‘It is allegorically characterised by the figure of a very fine woman, elevated on the clouds, […]’. Through these details Reynolds disclosed that he had read Ripa and also revealed his artistic method: He created a new allegory by means of assemblage while intervening on a conceptional level in the way that was advised by art theoreticians, here specifically by George Richardson (‘ingenious modification’). Reynolds selected attributes from the varying personifications in the Italian and

---


49 Richardson George, _Iconology; or, A Collection of Emblematical Figures; containing four hundred and twenty-four remarkable Subjects, moral and instructive; in which are displayed the Beauty of Virtue and Deformity of Vice_, 4 vols. (London, G. Scott: 1779) vol. I, Preface (unpaginated): ‘The artists, whose genius leads them to the allegorical species of painting, would require a repertory, or work, in which all the sensible figures and symbols, under which, in different ages, abstract ideas and qualities have been poetically represented, were carefully collected. […] A collection of this nature, might be divided into various classes, and the artist might draw from this magazine, representations and symbols, which by an ingenious modification, he might happily apply to the subjects he should have occasion to treat’. 
English editions in order to find the appropriate form for his pictorial conception.

Cesare Ripa’s *Iconologia* in the English translation is by no means the only volume of Italian art literature read by Reynolds. Unlike his French, Reynolds spoke Italian fluently and was adept at reading it. He even had a copy of the *Vocabulario della Crusca* in his library. His own Italian translation of a section of *A Letter concerning Enthusiasm* (1707) by Anthony Ashley Cooper, 3rd Earl of Shaftesbury, irrefutably proves his proficiency in the Italian language. Reynolds had read Shaftesbury already in 1752 while staying in Italy. We have no idea what he ultimately aimed at by attempting this translation. Presumably it was an exercise for his personal pleasure only, even if no contemporary Italian translation of the essay existed at the time. However, we can also interpret it to be an unfulfilled desire to make Shaftesbury’s reflections, which were pivotal for the revaluation of English art, known in Italy and a manifestation of wanting to underscore the significance that English artistic reflection and aesthetics had for contemporaries. This would be very much in keeping with the culturo-political lines Reynolds outlined in his *Discourses*: that eighteenth-century English painting surpasses contemporary Italian art.

Among the Italian art literature that Reynolds studied particularly intensively was Carlo Cesare Malvasia’s *Felsina Pittrice* (1678) and his *Pitture di Bologna* (1686). This explains, to an extent, the importance Reynolds attached to Bolognese painting in his *Discourses*. Whereas we can only presume that Reynolds possessed a copy of the *Felsina pittrice* because he directly quoted from it in his *Discourses, Pitture di Bologna* was listed twice in the auction of his library at Phillips’. Francesco Algarotti’s *Essay on Painting Written in Italian* (1764) provided a rich fund of ideas for Reynolds in his critical observations on Italian art theory in the *Discourses*. Additionally he mentioned Raffaello Borghini’s *Il riposo*

---

50 For a detailed study on this topic see Perini, “Sir Joshua Reynolds”.
53 Hilles, *The Literary Career* 118.
54 Perini, “Sir Joshua Reynolds” 159.
Crucial for Reynolds’ reception of Italian art theory was his appraisal of Leonardo da Vinci’s treatise on painting, which was published in English language in 1721. However, he may have been acquainted with its contents through Roger de Piles. Reynolds took recourse to Leonardo’s famous passage on random patterns and images, where the Italian wrote on nature as a source for invention – even stained walls could be sources of inspiration. In his Discourse 8, delivered ten years later, Reynolds criticized Leonardo’s advice on producing contrasts by means of light and shade. But he also admitted that Leonardo would have come to the same conclusion himself if he had only lived longer and experienced the technical advances of painting. According to Reynolds, what is advisable for a student of painting does not necessarily apply for an experienced artist. ‘But when students are more advanced, they will find that the greatest beauties of character and expression are produced without contrast […]’.

Reading books was always a key point of reference in Reynolds’ reasoning because he considered it to be the basic condition for all artistic creation and every intellectual statement. In this belief, he placed himself in a tradition that he would have, at the very latest, become aware of during his study and annotations of Dufresnoy’s De arte graphica. Roger de Piles stated in his commentary on Dufresnoy, which Reynolds’ was intended to replace, the following: ‘[…] les lettres sont nécessaires pour échauffer le génie, et pour le perfectionner’. De Piles pithily recommends that artists read using terms related to the flame of the furor poetico: ‘qui par leur lecture rechauffent l’imagination’. Reynolds was so taken by this that he adopted this imagery from de Piles in his Discourses:

---

56 See his own footnote, in Reynolds, Discourses on Art X, 210, which, however, does not reveal if he used the Florence 1584 or 1730 edition.
57 Leonardo da Vinci, A treatise of painting, translated from the original Italian, and adorn’d with a great number of cuts, to which is prefix’d, the author’s life, done from the last edition of the (London, John Senex: 1721).
59 Reynolds, Discourses on Art VIII, 295–301: ‘If Lionardo had lived to see the superior splendour and effect which has been since produced by the exactly contrary conduct, – by joining light to light, and shadow to shadow, – though without doubt he would have admired it, yet, as it ought not, so probably it would not be the first rule with which he would have begun his instructions’.
60 Reynolds, Discourses on Art VIII, 314–315.
There is a nobleness of conception, [...]; there is an art of animating and dignifying the figures with intellectual grandeur, of impressing the appearance of philosophick wisdom, or heroic virtue. This can be acquired by him that enlarges the sphere of his understanding by a variety of knowledge, and warms his imagination with the best productions of ancient and modern poetry.\textsuperscript{62}

Reynolds was fundamentally convinced that the quality of an artwork lay in the intellectual force behind its creation as well as in the intellectual pleasure it brought because of this: ‘The value and rank of every art is in proportion to the mental labour employed in it, or the mental pleasure produced by it’.\textsuperscript{63}

Joshua Reynolds’ collection of books was obviously not a book collector’s library. In the hitherto most comprehensive study on Reynolds’s library, Frederick Hilles suspects that the academy president did not actually read all of the books he cited in the \textit{Discourses}; among the ones he did read were Jonathan Richardson, Vasari, and Félibien. Many of his books were on the subject of philosophy or literature and had nothing to do with painting.\textsuperscript{64} His library reflected the intellectual ambitions and academic plan of study that Reynolds expected of himself, his art students, and the members of the Royal Academy.\textsuperscript{65} In this sense Reynolds’s relationship to books was a utilitarian and not an aesthetic one. No comments on the beauty of a rare book have survived. Reynolds was much more interested in transmitting their contents to others. The academy president was not a bibliophile and by all appearances did not love books as objects in themselves. Instead he adopted the role of an intermediary, whose task it was to pass specific knowledge from sources on to the members of the Royal Academy, to educate them, and to stimulate their imaginations, even if he himself, at times, gained his erudition by reading superficially or compiled it from a variety of sources or obtained it second hand.

\textsuperscript{62} Reynolds, \textit{Discourses on Art} III, 274–280.

\textsuperscript{63} Reynolds, \textit{Discourses on Art} IV, 1–2.

\textsuperscript{64} Hilles, \textit{The Literary Career} 116. Reynolds displayed a preference for volumes on mythology: It has been established that he owned three copies of Ovid’s \textit{Metamorphoses}, one of which contained his annotations, as well as a sixteenth-century copy of Apuleius and Otto van Veen’s \textit{Emblemata Horatiana} (Hilles, \textit{The Literary Career} 115, 119–120).

\textsuperscript{65} As Reynolds put it in the \textit{Discourses}, his concern was, besides developing technical and practical art skills, to acquire knowledge, which especially meant attaining an intimate knowledge of natural and moral philosophy, the doctrine of affections, and anatomy: ‘Every man whose business is description, […] ought not to be wholly unacquainted with that part of philosophy which gives an insight into human nature, and relates to the manners, characters, passions, and affections. He ought to know \textit{something} concerning the mind, as well as a \textit{great deal} concerning the body of man’. (Reynolds, \textit{Discourses on Art} VII, 21–28).
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PART TWO

THE THEORISATION OF READING AND ITS IMPACT ON IMAGES
Venetian sixteenth-century painters have left hardly any trace of their reading behaviour.¹ With the exception of Paolo Pino (active 1534–1565), who was a painter but not a very prolific one, Venetian sixteenth-century painters did not express their ideas on painting in texts which could give us the chance to find out what their sources were; nor did they leave informative inventories that can tell us what they read.² Even Titian, who was in touch with rulers and scholars all over Europe and who left us the most extensive corpus of letters of any Renaissance artist, did not commit his thoughts about art to paper.³ This has proved highly frustrating for art historians, some of whom turned to the works of art themselves in search for an ‘art theory in paint’.

The question how literate Venetian sixteenth-century painters were has recently been picked up with fresh enthusiasm, especially with regard to Titian.⁴ The stream of varying reviews that emerged after the publication

¹ This paper was written during my time as Ph.D. candidate at Leiden University, where my project, part of the VICI-programme Art, Agency, and Living Presence in Early Modern Italy, was generously funded by the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO). I want to thank my supervisors Caroline van Eck and Lex Hermans and my colleagues, in particular Joris van Gastel, for their comments on earlier versions of this text. Another word of thanks to Jan de Jong, whose kind support stimulated me to submit my work on the Venetian Sala del Maggior Consiglio, started in his seminar on Italian art of 2005, for publication.

² In 1914 an inventory of descendants of Paolo Veronese was published, which mentions what was probably a whole cupboard filled with books about various topics; however, the titles of these books and their year of acquisition by the family remain unclear. See Gattinoni G., Inventario di una casa veneziana del secolo XVII, la casa degli eccellenti Caliari, eredi di Paolo Veronese (Mestre: 1914). A further problem is that inventories may offer only a glimpse of what people actually read (see Ginzburg C., Il formaggio e i vermi: il cosmo di un mugnaio del ‘500 (Turin: 1976)).


⁴ The debate has a long history. It goes at least back to Erwin Panofsky, whose iconological reading of Titian’s paintings presupposed the artist’s mastering of Latin. In the context of an article on sixteenth-century erotic imagery, Carlo Ginzburg argued against Panofsky and others stating that Titian did not know Latin. The question was then taken
of Thomas Puttfarken’s *Titian and Tragic Painting* (2005) serves to illustrate this point.\(^5\) Puttfarken not only argues that Titian knew about contemporary debates among humanists about Horace’s and Aristotle’s treatises, and about tragic poetry and genre theory,\(^6\) but also that he deliberately developed the ambition to become a tragic poet himself – a poet in paint. In *The Poetics of Titian’s Religious Paintings* (also 2005), Una Roman D’Elia states that Titian, although not an intellectual or learned man, did have intellectual pretensions and was regarded as ‘fit company for learned men’ by his contemporaries.\(^7\) She also found out that during his long life Titian was in touch with as many as sixty writers.\(^8\)

Yet, we do not know whether Titian ever read the books that his writer friends wrote, nor does he seem to have written anything himself that goes beyond mere practicalities. The same goes, almost without exception, for his fellow Venetian painters. Only at the very end of the sixteenth century did Venetian painters get more literary ambitions, but for a long time, especially in comparison to the situation elsewhere in Italy, the literacy of painters in Venice seems to have stayed behind.\(^9\)

Indeed, if one wants to know what Venetian sixteenth-century painters were reading, one is confronted with a simple lack of source material. This is problematic, for, studying sixteenth-century Venetian painting, it soon becomes clear that Venetian painters, as much as their colleagues elsewhere in Italy, did produce paintings for which more than everyday knowledge was needed. This paper will focus on the ways in which artists could acquire knowledge regardless of the question if they did or did not read any books.

Studying the sources from the period, one comes across two alternative strategies for obtaining knowledge: oral communication and the use of

\(^{5}\) See also the recent catalogue accompanying the exhibition in Belluno, which pays ample attention to the question of Titian’s literacy: Puppi L. (ed.), *Tiziano: l’ultimo atto, exhibition catalogue Belluno* (Milan: 2007), particularly the essays by Favilla M. – Rugolo R., Emiliani A., Collavo L., and Puppi L.


\(^{8}\) See her very useful “A Preliminary Catalogue of Writers with Connections to Titian”, in D’Elia, *The Poetics* 157–188.

the visual tradition. The Venetian painter is often presented, firstly, as discussing his art with other, usually more learned people, and, secondly, as incorporating elements of existent paintings in his own compositions. The notions that early modern painters cited the work of others, and that they talked to intellectuals, have of course many times been put to the fore, but to see these methods as strategies for the transfer of knowledge has not been done so often. It is the aim of the present article to do just this.

The question of the possibility of acquiring knowledge has received answers both in sixteenth-century theoretical writings and in painterly practice. In the first section of this article, the question will be answered how, in a sequence of art treatises from Alberti’s *De pictura* onwards, the concept of the painter as an ‘oral communicator’ was developed. How can a painting profit from discussions between the painter and his learned friends? The second section concentrates on historiographical theory of the time with the aim to look at the idea of the painter as a user of visual source material. When a painter constructs his *historia*, a depiction of a narrative scene with an edifying and affective aim, why should he use already existing paintings? In the third and last section, we will switch to painterly practice. Taking the most extensive pictorial project of the whole Venetian sixteenth century as a case study, the decorations of the Ducal Palace after the fire of 1577, we will see how the earlier mentioned theoretical ideas were related to the ways in which painters actually worked.

I

As Anthony Grafton has pointed out, according to Leon Battista Alberti the art of painting a *historia* was a collaborative one. ‘We will work out models on paper, now we comment on the whole *historia*, then on each of its parts, and we take advice on it with all our friends’. What is more, the

---


12 ‘Modulosque in chartis conicientes, tum totam historiam, tum singulas eiusdem historiae partes commentabimur, amicosque omnes in ea re consulemus’. Alberti Leon
painter should listen not only to his friends, but take everyone’s opinion into consideration: ‘So he should listen to everyone, and first reflect on the matter for himself and make amendments; then, when he has heard everybody, he should follow the advice of the more expert’. The painter should specifically look for the company of poets and rhetoricians, for these men have much with him in common, and they can help the painter with his invention and his composition. Alberti’s painted *historia* was truly the result of a joint effort.

*De pictura*’s plea for the intellectuality and dignity of the art of painting had not lost any of its actuality in the Venice of the sixteenth century. It was Venice where, in 1547, the first Italian edition of Alberti’s treatise was published. The *poligrafo* Lodovico Domenichi (1515–1564) translated the text into Italian and his edition of Alberti’s booklet was almost immediately followed by the publication of two Venetian art treatises: in 1548 appeared the *Dialogo di pittura* by Paolo Pino, in 1557 followed by *L’Aretino*, written by Lodovico Dolce (1508–1568). Several other texts on art were published in Venice around this time as well, but I have singled out these two because they are most relevant to Venetian art.

Both treatises in some way adapt Alberti’s idea of the *historia* as a collaborative enterprise. Alberti had already referred to an anecdote on Apelles to illustrate this point, a story originally recounted by Pliny, who told that the artist used to hide behind his paintings to hear the comments of passers-by. Like Alberti Paolo Pino tells this story, advising the painter to ‘accept the precept of the great Apelles, who, not to lack in integrity, placed his paintings in the public space, and, while hiding himself, listened to the diversity of opinions, which he then, having considered also the quality of the thing depicted, admitted or disapproved of, according to

---


16 Pliny, *Natural History* 35.84–86; Alberti, *De pictura* 3.62. The story was also narrated by Valerius Maximus; see Pino Paolo, *Dialogo di pittura*, ed. E. Camesasca (Milan: 1954) 98, no. 36.
his own judgment’. This passage is followed by the story of a shoemaker who not only commented on the way Apelles had painted shoes, but also on other aspects of his work – a story omitted perhaps significantly by Alberti. Pino adds a similar anecdote based on his own experience about a woman who objected to a painted shadow on Pino’s portrait of her daughter, failing to interpret the shadow as a shadow and instead mistaking it for a mere stain. While Pino clearly doubts the value of comments by less educated viewers, he concludes with a statement that again underlines the importance of an open attitude. The ancient painter Apelles, he writes, ‘wanted to hear more opinions, for the intellectual virtue, because of too much working, often remains obscured and blunt’.

Lodovico Dolce also refers to the Apelles story, and his version remains even closer to that of Alberti. In a section on the question whether a man who is not a painter himself is qualified to judge painting, Dolce writes:

Apelles would expose his figures to public opinion. I could also mention that the judging of the three goddesses was laid into the hands of a shepherd. My argument, however, does not turn generally on the masses, but specifically on certain men of fine intelligence, who have refined their powers of judgment with the aid of literature and practical experience. In this way they can reliably judge a variety of things, and most expressly painting.

It is clear that both theoreticians restate Alberti’s precept that the painter of the historia should be open to all critique, especially critique from viewers with an educated eye. Apart from that, Dolce’s lines quoted above can be considered as a justification for his own undertaking: unlike Paolo Pino, who was trained and worked as a painter himself, Lodovico Dolce had no such background and clearly wanted to show that he too was able to write a relevant piece on the art of painting. His lines have an apologetic

17 ‘Accetterà però l’ordine tenuto dal grande Apelle, il qual, per non mancar nell’integrità, poste le sue tavole in publico, di nascosto ascoltava la diversità dell’openioni, le quali poi, considerate da lui con la qualità della cosa dipinta, l’ammetteva o reprobava secondo il suo giudicio’. Pino, Dialogo ed. Falabella 130.
18 Grafton, Leon Battista Alberti 136–137.
19 He concludes the anecdote ironically: ‘La prontezza dell’arguzie è assai famigliar alle femine’.
21 ‘Et Apelle soleva metter le sue figure al giudicio comune. Potrei anco dire, che’l giudicio delle tre Dee fu rimesso a un Pastore. Ma io non intendo in generale della moltitudine, ma in particolare di alcuni belli ingegni: iquali havendo affinato il giudicio con le lettere e con la pratica, possono sicuramente giudicar di varie cose, e massimamente della Pittura […]’. Dolce, Dialogo 102.
character. In fact, or so the author seems to suggest, not only Dolce himself but all readers of his text will be able to judge painting and to help the painter with his work.

The resumption of Alberti’s idea of the *istoria* as a collaborative art by Pino and Dolce has another dimension. In the cover letter of the Italian version of his treatise, Alberti had famously invited the addressee, Filippo Brunelleschi, to make amendments to his text. ‘Please, read my work carefully, and if it seems to you that anything needs amendment, correct me. No writer was ever so well informed that learned friends were of no use to him’.22 It may be suggested that more than one hundred years later, Paolo Pino and Lodovico Dolce did accept Alberti’s invitation. Both their texts owe much to their Florentine predecessor, not only in the many anecdotes on antique artists they quote, but also in their rhetorical structure and terminology.23 Both authors explicitly mention Alberti, and Dolce even refers to Domenichi’s Venetian translation of the text of 1547.24 But the most salient way in which they take up the challenge formulated in *De pictura* is by the explicit openness of their treatises. Their texts share a feature which makes them different from Alberti’s, but which shows them at the same time, paradoxically, to be faithful students of the great Florentine humanist: the dialogue form.

Whereas in Alberti’s *De pictura* it is the author who is speaking to his readers, in Dolce’s and Pino’s dialogues the situation is different. Dolce has chosen as his interlocutors one Giovano Francesco Fabrini, a Florentine, and Pietro Aretino, the orator and art lover greatly admired by Dolce, who passed away a year before the dialogue’s publication (1556). One of the main questions of the dialogue is whether Michelangelo or Raphael is the superior artist, and it is highly significant that the interlocutors do not arrive at an agreement in the end. Discussing this and other topics seems

---

22 ‘Piacciati adunque leggermi con diligenza, e se cosa vi ti par da emendarla, correggimi. Niuno scrittore mai fu si dotto al quale non fussero utilissimi gli amici eruditi’. Alberti, *De pictura* 32.


to be more important then coming to an agreement; the discussion is an aim in itself. Valeska von Rosen characterized Dolce’s dialogue as ‘plural’; in her view it not only leads to an increase of knowledge but also reflects on the process of the acquisition of knowledge as such.25 The same may be said about Pino’s dialogue, with one addition, however. Pino’s interlocutors are a Venetian and a foreigner as well; the painter Lauro, and Fabio, respectively. Whereas in Dolce’s dialogue Fabrini and Aretino are both quite knowledgeable, Pino’s Lauro and Fabio are no equivalents. Fabio, the foreigner, is the teacher, and Lauro, the painter, the Venetian, takes the role of the listener, the one who asks and comments.26 In this way, Pino unambiguously shows the Venetian painter to be open, eager to learn, and willing to take advice of others into consideration.

In short, both Dolce and Pino not only repeat and reflect on, but actually enact the Albertian ideal of the painter’s ‘intellectual openness’ and ‘deliberate vulnerability’.27 In their treatises they recommend painters to seek the company of learned friends so that they may have conversations which improve their work.

It does hardly come as a surprise that the ideas found in art treatises such as those by Pino and Dolce are echoed in other sixteenth-century literary texts. In many treatises, letters, and biographies of the time Venetian painters are staged as interlocutors in learned discussions. To give one telling example: in a letter originally published in 1540 the Florentine humanist Francesco Priscianese records a dinner party he enjoyed at Titian’s house, where the present company ‘went to pass the time with the contemplation of the living images of the excellent paintings, with which the house was stocked’.28 He also mentions who were there: ‘With the said M. Titian had come together some of the most wandering talents that can nowadays be found in that city; M. Pietro Aretino and M. Iacopo Tatti called il Sansovino, and M. Iacopo Nardi and I, so that I was the fourth

---

26 On the division of roles between the two interlocutors see Pino, Dialogo 35; Puttfarken, “The Dispute” 77.
27 The quotations are from Grafton, Leon Battista Alberti 139.
28 ‘[S]’andò passando il tempo con la contemplatione delle uiue immagini delle eccellentissime piture, delle quali era piena la casa […].’ Priscianese Francesco, Della lingua latina libri sei (Venice, Vincenzo Valgrisi: 1550) 398.
among so much reason’.29 Many passages like these received attention in recent art historical literature, so I need not all repeat them here.30 What is important is that in many literary texts of the time, the theoretical ideal of the painter as a public man, who is open to the judgment of others, was repeated and elaborated upon. And there is more to it: despite the obvious literary character of many of our sources, which may make us a bit cautious, there seems to be little reason for not accepting them as at least partially true. More personal documents such as the letter by Priscianese indicate that, what seems to be a literary topos, was acted out in real life too.

II

Now, discussing their work with learned friends was not the only way for painters to obtain knowledge. Another way was through the visual tradition; by using their eyes, in other words. The importance of vision as a means to learn about the world found expression in many different texts throughout the period, among others in historiographical theory.31 Sometimes, authors of these texts even pointed to paintings as possible sources for the historian. A particular influential author who did so was Francesco Patrizi da Cherso (1529/30–1597), a Dalmatian anti-Aristotelian philosopher who studied with Francesco Robortello in Padua and later on in Venice, where he published his Della historia dieci dialoghi (1560).32

29 ‘Erano conuenuti co’l detto M. Titiano […] alcuni de piu pellegrini ingegni, che hoggi si trouino in questa città; […] M. Pietro Aretino […] & […] M. Iacopo Tatti detto il Sansouino, & M. Iacopo Nardi & io, si che io fui il quarto fra cotanto senno’. Priscianese, Della lingua latina 398.


31 For theories of vision in this period and the importance accorded to the eye, see Clark S., Vanities of the Eye: Vision in Early Modern European Culture (Oxford: 2007). According to theories of vision current in the period, all objects in the world gave off thin layers of themselves (species), replicas in a way, that travelled to the eyes and then into the various parts of the brain. Aristotle had already compared the species to a ‘picture painted on a panel’ and added that ‘there is in our memory something like an impression or picture’. See Clark, Vanities of the Eye 15.

32 Patrizi Francesco, Della historia dieci dialoghi (Venice, Andrea Arrivabene: 1560). Patrizi’s treatise is reprinted in Kessler E., Theoretiker humanistischer Geschichtsschreibung
Patrizi showed a general attention for the visual aspects of history, not only in his theoretical precepts but also in his own historical practice, in which visual evidence played an important role. As an influential antiquarian, he did pioneering work on the ancient Greeks’ and Romans’ military affairs. Patrizi stood for a mixed type of history, meaning a combination of historical narrative on the one hand and analytical or descriptive history as practised by antiquarians on the other. In his view, the sources of the historian do not necessarily have to be written; they can also be artefacts, made by smiths, carpenters, sculptors, or painters. Since Patrizi refers explicitly to the paintings in the Venetian Ducal Palace, his ideas are particularly relevant to us.

In the third of his ten dialogues on history, Patrizi writes that ‘[h]istory is the memory of human things’. This memory is not built passively; it is not about objects settling in human minds and in history books mechanically. Rather, memory is the capability of human beings to store images of things in their minds, to select them and recall them: ‘is memory, being a power of the soul, something else than the conservation of the phantasies? And the phantasies, what else are they than images of things from the senses or from elsewhere presented to the soul, and by her transformed in many ways? Do your philosophers not say so?’ Do your philosophers not say so: here, as in other passages, Patrizi shows himself as standing in a long philosophical tradition.

In the above quoted passage a certain emphasis on the visual can be detected: phantasies (fantasie), which constitute the materials of memory, are images. A comparable stress on the visual is apparent in an earlier passage, in which Patrizi explains the etymology of the word ‘historia’ (history):

One great Greek says that ‘oroo’ and ‘orao’ are in that language verbs that signify the same as ‘I see’ in ours. And the particle ‘is’, when it is placed

---


33 Grafton, What was History 130–4.

34 Patrizi, Della historia 18v.


36 For the concept of ‘fantasia’ in the Western philosophical tradition, and in particular in early modern thinking about art, see Summers D., Michelangelo and the Language of Art (Princeton: 1981) 103.
before those [verbs], makes ‘isoroo’ and ‘isorao’. So, with some addition and some transformation one can form ‘Istoreo’, which, together with the other two means this same thing: they signify ‘I look at the thing with my own eyes’. And from this history derives its name. Therefore one says, after a certain great and famous man, that history is that narration that another man tells about things that he has seen with his own eyes. But do you know that the eyes are instruments of knowledge, more than any other sense that mankind possesses? And only effects are seen with the eyes, and felt with the other senses. Therefore, the narration of effects that can be known by the senses, and foremost by the eyes, is reasonably called history.37

According to Patrizi, history is based on things that can be perceived by the senses, and primarily by sight.

What is more, the medium in which the historian expresses his findings, in which he lays down his narrative, may be non-textual as well. Patrizi is quite explicit about this. From again the third of his dialogues comes the following passage:

Until now we have seen what the objects of history are, but not yet, what it is. Do you not, Venetian gentlemen, have painted the history of Alexander III and Barbarossa in your room of the great council? And what else is that painting than a history? And what else are sculpted in Rome on the columns of Trajan and Antonine, and on the arches of Constantine and Severus, than the histories of their victories and triumphs? Not only, therefore, history is written, but it is also sculpted and also painted, and these are more properly called ‘Isorie’, for they are objects of sight.38

---

37 ‘Dice [alcuno gran Greco], che oroo, & orao, sono in quella lingua uerbi, che tanto suonano, quanto nella nostra, ueggo. & la particella, is, uuol dire, in laquale mettendosi auanti à quelli, ne fa, isoroo, & Isorao. Onde poi con qualche aggiunta, & con qualche mutatione Istoreo si forma, che con li altri due uale questo stesso: & suonano, io miro con gli occhi propri nella cosa. Et da questo trahe suo nome poi l’historia. Onde si disse anco da certo grande & riputato huomo, che l’historia è quel narramento, ch’altri fa delle cose, che egli ha con gli occhi proprij uedute. […] Ma sapete uoi, che gli occhi sono stromenti del sapere, piu ch’altro sentimento, che l’huom s’habbia? […] Et si ueggono con gli occhi, & si sentono con gli altri sentimenti, gli effetti soli soli. […] Il narramento adunque degli effetti, che caggiono sotto alla cognition de’ sentimenti, & degli occhi sopra tutto, ha ragioneuolmente nome historia’. Patrizi, Della historia fols. 8r–v.

38 ‘Noi habbiamo adunque […] infin hora ritrouato, di quali cose l’historia si faccia, ma non anchora, qual cosa ella sia. […] Non hauete uoi signori Vinitiani, soggiunsi io subito, nella sala del uostro maggior consiglio, dipinta la historia di Alessandro III. & di Barbarossa? […] Et che altro è quella dipintura, dissi io, che una historia? Et che altro è in Roma scolpito nella colonna de Traiano, & d’Antonino, & ne gli archi di Costantino, & di Seuero, che le historie, delle uittorie & de trionfi loro? […] Non solamente adunque, […] l’historia si scriue, ma & si scolpisce ella, & si dipinge, & saranno queste piu propriamente Isorie, per essere elleno oggetti della uista’. Patrizi, Della historia 14r.
The statements Patrizi makes for history count for painted history as well. In fact, being closer to the original meaning of the word ‘historia’, painted history may be even more successful than its written counterpart. As a contemporary of Patrizi remarked, ‘what is more delightful than to contemplate through history the deeds of our ancestors as in a picture placed before us’?39

The argument is twofold here: history can be painted, and the historian, be it a writer or a painter, should base his narrative primarily on sight, on that which he or another person has seen with his own eyes. It is probable that in the Venice of the second half of the sixteenth century ideas like those of Patrizi circulated widely among intellectuals. That painters did speak with these intellectuals we have already seen. As we will observe in the next section, Patrizi’s concept of the painter-historian as an eyewitness, who passes on what he has seen himself, would be of great importance in Venetian painterly practice.

III

Until now, two strategies for the acquisition of knowledge have been explored as they were discussed in literature and theory of the time. In the last section of this paper we will examine how painters put these two strategies into practice in the decorations of the great council hall of the Ducal Palace.40

39 ‘[..] quid autem suavius quam in historia velut in proposita subiectaque tabula res intueri maiorum’? Bodin J., Method for the Easy Comprehension of History, ed. B. Reynolds (New York: 1945) 12. Quoted after Grafton, What was History 181. The trust in the persuasive powers of visuality has its origins in antiquity, especially in texts on rhetoric such as those by Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian. Enargeia and its Latin equivalents evidentia and illustratio, vivid description that makes the audience believe they are actually seeing what is described, were considered as belonging to the most effective instruments of persuasion. See Eck C.A. van, Classical Rhetoric and the Visual Arts in Early Modern Europe (Cambridge: 2007) 7. See also Summers D., Vision, Reflection, and Desire in Western Painting (Chapel Hill: 2007) 2–3.

First, something needs to be said about the history of these decorations. They had a long history already when, in December 1577, a devastating fire destroyed them nearly completely. Preparations for renovation were begun almost immediately. A committee of three members was appointed to conceive a new iconographic programme, which would consist of some allegorical and religious, but mostly historical scenes. For inspiration they could draw on earlier decorations of the room, for this would already be the third time for the great council hall to be decorated anew. Apart from that, the main historical scenes, those related to the so-called ‘Peace of Venice’, had already been depicted in the palace’s Chapel of St. Nicholas early in the fourteenth century.\textsuperscript{41} In other words, there was an impressive pictorial tradition to start from.

On the basis of numerous visual sources, Patricia Fortini Brown has shown that there were great similarities between the historical scenes in the subsequent stages of the decorations. Comparing the extant paintings with drawings related to the earlier versions of the scenes and with descriptions of the paintings in the hall before the 1577 fire, she concludes that the narrative core of the scenes usually remained fairly consistent.\textsuperscript{42} This was especially so in comparison with versions of the same historical scenes outside the Venetian pictorial tradition, for example frescoes in the Palazzo Pubblico in Siena [Fig. 1].\textsuperscript{43} Wolfgang Wolters has arrived at the same conclusion, and even goes so far as to suppose that the painters after 1577 used copies in drawing of the earlier decorations.\textsuperscript{44}

If we consider, for example, the scene known as the \textit{Consignment of the Sword}, where the Pope offers the Doge a ceremonial sword, we can see that the most obvious changes in the successive scenes are related to the settings, not to the heart of the action. The oldest depiction [Fig. 2] is here substituted by a manuscript illustration which, in the absence of the original paintings, should give an impression of fourteenth-century Venetian tastes in pictorial narrative. We can see the Doge and some soldiers, all armoured, standing opposite the Pope and some other churchmen. The Doge is reaching for the sword that the Pope is about to give him, while the remainder of the scene is empty. In the second depiction [Fig. 3], represented here by a drawing after a painting by Gentile Bellini, which was part of the decorations that were started in the 1470s, the protagonists are
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Fig. 1. Spinello Aretino, *Consignment of the sword to the Doge*, c. 1408. Siena, Palazzo Pubblico.

Fig. 2. Venetian school, *Consignment of the sword to the Doge*, 1370, in MS I, 383 (= 1497). Venice, Museo Civico Correr.
depicted in almost the same way, only they have changed places: the Pope is now on the left and the Doge stands on the right. The movements of their bodies are still the same. The biggest change compared to the earlier scene is the addition of many bystanders, as well as some in the drawing difficult to distinguish architectural details. The third depiction [Fig. 4], the still extant painting by Francesco Bassano, shows exactly the same scene, only this time with even more bystanders, many of whom are going about on their daily business, and with the architecture of the Piazzetta San Marco. All in all, it is clear that costumes changed with the fashion of the time, architectural backgrounds were extended and brought up to date, and more and more bystanders were added; but the narrative core, the essence of the story, remained fairly constant.\textsuperscript{45} Examples like this make it plausible that, when designing their historical scenes, the painters of the great council hall relied to a large extent on the earlier paintings – still extant, albeit in a damaged state, or transmitted through drawings and their own memories.

\textsuperscript{45} For Brown’s observations on \textit{The Consignment of the Sword}, see “Painting and History” 276.
The reliance on the pictorial tradition has been given justification by a number of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Venetian historians, many of whom commented explicitly on the paintings. During the Cinquecento, the paintings had become the object of some debate among historians, because a growing number of people no longer deemed the events depicted in these paintings to be truthful. Their suspicions were largely focused on the earlier mentioned ‘Peace of Venice’-cycle, which shows an indeed partly legendary history about a conflict between the pope and the holy roman emperor, taking place in the second half of the twelfth century. The Venetian republic intervened in this conflict and offered...

---

46 On this legendary history and its depictions, see Pertusi A., “Quedam regalia insignia: ricerche sulle insegne del potere ducale a Venezia durante il medioevo”, Studi veneziani 7
its territory for peace making. In the course of the centuries, however, Venetian historiography shamelessly blew up the Republic's role, mainly at the cost of the papacy. No wonder that especially papal historians in the sixteenth century no longer accepted the Venetian version. Venetian historians, however, kept on trying to prove the accuracy of their tradition. Interestingly, they did this with reference not only to written sources, but also to visual ones.

Paintings, one after the other historian wrote, are as much testimonies of the past as any other source. This can be illustrated by certain remarks of Girolamo Bardi (c. 1544–1594), one of the three advisors on the new decorative programme:

One should not believe that, in a senate of grave men, who have reasonably cooled down their own vehemence because of their old age, when deliberating on public affairs, would have decided to show things to the world that would not have really happened.48

And they could have known, he continues, for many who originally voted for these paintings were alive when the depicted events had occurred. Bardi also declared to have seen with his own eyes very ancient versions of the same paintings, in maniera greca, emerging from the burnt down ruins of the council hall, and exactly matching the order of the more recent paintings.49

---


48 “[N]on è da credere, che deliberandosi le cose publiche in un Senato di huomini gravi, che per la molta età hanno ragionevolemente raffreddato i propri affetti, vi si fosse concluso, che si palessasse al mondo cosa che non fosse più che realmente successa’. Bardi Girolamo, *Vittoria navale ottenuta dalla Republica Venetiana, contra Othone, Figliuolo di Federico Primo Imperatore* (Venice, Francesco Ziletti: 1584) 60; quoted after Brown, “Painting and History” 291, no. 53.

49 The same point was made by Fortunato Olmo, another defender of the Venetian cause living slightly later than Bardi: the first paintings were ordered by the very men who lived through the depicted events, and even fought along in the painted battles. See Olmo F., *Historia della Venuta a Venezia occultamente nel 1177 di Papa Alessandro 3. e della Vittoria ottenuta da Sebastiano Ziani Doge* (Venice, Evangelista Deuchino: 1629) 16.
People like Girolamo Bardi stressed the visual tradition as the first source for painters to base their paintings on – as did Patrizi, so we have seen. More importantly, they explain why artists should work in this way: by faithfully adopting the central elements of already existing paintings, they secure the historical tradition; they maintain the historical evidence. Art historians have since long been interested in the transfer of pictorial motives; nowadays, this is still a major question in the field, also with regard to early modern art. Artists of this period who consciously quote their predecessors, or so it is often argued, do so because they want to openly place themselves in an artistic tradition. Our discussion indicates that artists had other reasons to study and quote the work of their forebears, reasons that were not strictly artistic. By basing their compositions on the earlier canvases, the painter-historians of the Ducal Palace were able to conserve the historical evidence and to thereby give their paintings credibility, historical trustworthiness.

Were visual sources alone enough for these painters to design the new decorations? Certainly not, if only because a number of scenes was added that had never been shown in the palace before. It has already been mentioned that after the 1577 fire a committee was appointed to develop a new iconographic programme. A text that may be identified with this programme has been discovered by Wolfgang Wolters. If one compares this text with the paintings, however, one encounters some problems. Firstly, the descriptions of the scenes are either too short or too much focused on the narrative; none of them contains pictorial instructions. They rather seem to elucidate the historical backgrounds of the scenes to be depicted than to offer practical information for the painter. Secondly, there are many discrepancies between the descriptions in the ‘programme’ and

50 It will be clear that there is hardly any room here for the artist’s licence, that which, in early modern thinking on art, made the artist an equivalent to the poet. Or, as it was formulated by Fortunato Olmo: ‘Perilche essendo queste state fatte per comandamento di molte persone illustri, a’quali era raddomandato il governo della Republica, e intolerabile l’udirsi dire da gli Avversari, che questo fosse un capriccio del pittore. Inducendosi da loro gli versi di Oratio, che Pictoribus atque Poetiis / Quidlibet audiendi semper fuit aequa potestas, quasi che in un palazzo publico possa darsi, che senza esser preceduto il fatto, vi fosse mano di pittore tanto ardita, che anzi esprimesse il falso a pieno arbitrio. […] Ma il fatto non ista, che la licenza de’pittori sia tanta’. Olmo, *Historia della Venuta a Venezia* 16–17.

the painted results. The painters left out certain elements that were explicitly mentioned in the programme, even in cases when that seems to undermine the painting’s ‘propagandist’ value. There is only one solution to this problem: in addition to the written programme text, the painters must have been instructed orally. In fact, this becomes even more probable if we take a more precise look at the programme text itself. In a section on the Sala dello Scrutinio, lying next to the great council hall, the authors prescribe: ‘between the one and the other painting mentioned above there are six ovals, which will have to be painted in chiaroscuro or in bronze imitation, as the painter will consider them to come off best’. Here, it is explicitly stated that the painters themselves may choose for the option that in their view will give the best result. A couple of lines below, when discussing the material that should be depicted in the six ovals, the authors make an even more interesting remark: ‘in the sixth [oval] harquebuses, trumpets, and other similar sort of things [will be painted], according to the judgment of him who will command’. In this case, there is an explicit reference to a supervisor, an inspector who controls and guides the painters through their work, who discusses with them the materials that need to be depicted. The paintings come into being not before there has been thorough discussion between painters and learned men. This brings us back to the first section of this article, where we discussed the historia as a joint effort.

To conclude, although Venetian sixteenth-century paintings show enough traces of specialized knowledge from the part of their makers, there are hardly any indications that the latter did indeed read. There were, however, other strategies for artists to come by knowledge. In this article, I have explored two alternatives that can be found in sources from

---

52 That this situation occurred more often in sixteenth-century decoration projects does not make the problem less urgent. See, for example, the Sala di Costantino in the Vatican Palace, started by Raphael and finished under the guidance of Giulio Romano: Fehl Ph.P., “Raphael as an Historian: Poetry and Historical Accuracy in the Sala di Costantino”, Artibus et Historiae 14, 28 (1993) 9–73. Divergence between paintings and so-called guidebooks, descriptions of the paintings’ content, occurred even more often. See, for instance, the villa Il Cataio, in the Veneto region near Padua, which was decorated at the end of the sixteenth century by Giambattista Zelotti: Kliemann J., Gesta dipinte: La grande decorazione nelle dimore italiane dal Quattrocento al Seicento (Cinisello Balsamo: 1993) 123.

53 Wolters, Der Bilderschmuck 164.


the period. The first section showed that, following Alberti’s *De pictura*, Venetian sixteenth-century writers on painting recommended that the *historia* should be a shared enterprise, the result of an open discussion between painters and men outside the profession. The second section paid attention to historiographical theory of the time, in which a plea can be traced for the importance of visual, painted sources for the historian, be it a writer or a painter. In the final section, these two strands were brought together in an exploration of the most extensive pictorial project of the Venetian sixteenth century, the post 1577 decorations of the Ducal Palace.

All this has shown, once again, that Venetian sixteenth-century painting was in many cases co-authored; and not only in the sense of being a product of the master and his workshop. Indeed, these paintings were made by both painters and their learned friends; by both painters and their fellow painters of the past. Apart from that, the sources used for designing them were certainly not only textual in character; we have seen that Venetian artists were expected to base their work also, if not especially, on visual material.

This leads us to reconsider our starting point: the Venetian sixteenth-century painter as reader. One might say that this idea is based on two premises, namely that the design of a painting comes into being in the head of a single person, the artist, and, secondly, that the principal source material for this artist is written. Sixteenth-century sources withstand these premises: many of the paintings were the product of discussions between artists and their learned acquaintances, and these ‘teams’ not only based their designs on texts, but also on images. Or, as one humanist remarked: ‘only in images is it possible to see everything the way it was at the very time it happened’.56

---
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Until he lost the sight of his eyes at the age of thirty-three, the Milanese painter Gian Paolo Lomazzo (1538–1592) had been an ardent reader. He was well acquainted with the works of Homer, Virgil, and Dante, and besides had acquired a thorough knowledge of Vitruvius and the ancient Roman orators. The harvest of some twenty years of reading he incorporated in his poetry and prose works, especially in the two interconnected treatises on the art of painting. In this article we will review the main rhetorical aspects of these treatises.

I

In the introduction to the Trattato dell’arte della pittura, scoltura et architettura (Treatise on the Art of Painting, Sculpture, and Architecture, 1584) Lomazzo provides a list of fields of knowledge which are indispensable to a painter. The range is wide, including geometry, architecture, arithmetic, perspective, history and anthropology, theology, anatomy, and of course reading and writing.1 In chapter eight of the Idea del tempio della pittura (Plan of the Temple of Painting,2 1590) the author added even more disciplines, such as astrology, music, poetry, and philosophy.3 By presenting the painter as an educated person with both theoretical

---

2 For the translation of the word ‘idea’ as ‘plan’, see Lomazzo Gian Paolo, Idea del tempio della pittura, ed. R. Klein, 2 vols. (Florence: 1974) vol. II, 475, who refers to Vitruvius’ ‘species dispositionis, quae graece dicuntur ideae’ (De architectura 1.2.2), meaning plan, elevation and perspective.
and practical knowledge, Lomazzo wanted to emphasize that the art of painting belonged to the liberal arts and that the painter was an artist, not a mere craftsman. Apparently, the point was dear to him, for he states it emphatically in the opening phrases of the Trattato’s dedication to Grand Duke Charles Emanuel of Savoy.\footnote{Lomazzo Gian Paolo, Scritti sulle arti vol. II, 9.} The idea of ennobling a discipline by presenting it as a liberal art was not a new one. The ancient Roman architect Vitruvius had done exactly this for architecture. In Italy, his treatise – the only extant ancient handbook of a visual art – had seen various editions and translations from the 1480s onward. Indeed, the best edition for centuries to come appeared in 1556, when Daniele Barbaro, the patriarch-elect of Aquileia, published an Italian translation with an extensive commentary.\footnote{Barbaro Daniele, I dieci libri dell’Architettura di M. Vitruvio tradutti et commentati (Venice, Francesco Marcolini: 1556).} No doubt, Lomazzo, who in the Trattato and the Idea often refers to Vitruvius, knew this edition. His list of required knowledge, especially the one in the Idea, closely follows that of the Augustean author.\footnote{See Vitruvius, De architectura I,1.}

Although for an artist writing a handbook on his art Vitruvius was the obvious model to choose, there were other options as well. To any educated person from the fifteenth and especially the sixteenth centuries the great manuals of rhetoric by Cicero and Quintilian would immediately have come to mind.\footnote{For the list of requirements, Cicero, De oratore I,16 and I,34; and Quintilian, Institutio oratoria X,1.27.} Since the rise of humanism in the early fifteenth century, interest in rhetoric had steadily intensified. This revival was linked to the literary origin of the humanist movement and the educational and administrative tasks the humanists assumed. The constantly promoted reading of the ancient Roman authors, and the admiration for their language gave rise to imitation. The humanists and their pupils not only imitated Roman syntax and rhetorical style but also absorbed the spirit and the skills that informed them. From the second quarter of the fifteenth century onward the anonymous Rhetorica ad Herennium (which at the time was considered as a work by Cicero), Cicero’s own De oratore, and Quintilian’s Institutio oratoria (The Orator’s Education) circulated widely in dependable manuscript editions. Their influence on style and manners cannot easily be underestimated. These treatises are far more than pure instruction manuals of how to compose and perform a good oration – or
any kind of written text, for that matter. To Romans of the late Republic and especially the Imperial period rhetoric was the individual’s source of general education. This was quite a logical development. Cicero and his contemporaries demanded that an orator be thoroughly bred and widely read. Quintilian devoted many paragraphs of his *Institutio oratoria* to the various disciplines an orator ought to be familiar with. As rhetorical training formed the basis of all higher education, the recommendations for reading and cultural knowledge proffered by the manuals served as guidelines for general education.

During the Renaissance, rhetoric was established as the model of the civilising process. In the sixteenth century, when humanist education had become the norm, the common view tended to be that without the art of eloquence human civilization could not possibly exist. The young Daniele Barbaro, who as a student repeated the accepted notions of his society, in *Della eloquenza* (written c.1535) equalled rhetoric and good manners: ‘Now you know in which form eloquence should abound, for the clearness, the truth, and what is called politeness are the principal forms of all civilized manner’. In 1557 Girolamo Ruscelli published Barbaro’s dialogue; in his introduction he is even more explicit than the author himself:

Nature and Art need come together to form a real and perfect gentleman, who by virtue of his speech and his knowledge is able to govern cities and to move the minds of the people in any direction, according to his intentions, which always have to be just and noble in order to be an excellent orator, a dignified gentleman, and a true Christian.

How near is this image to the ideal orator Quintilian had sketched in the first century A.D., thereby mainly elaborating on the lapidary definition by

---


Cato the Elder: ‘A good man well versed in speaking’. And how near, also, to the ideal painter, about whom Lomazzo writes in the *Idea*:

Finally, the true painter ought to be a complete philosopher, in order to penetrate in the nature of things and expertly give each of them the quantity of light it needs. For in this way all representations will look like real things, not represented or fake ones, and if the maker is such as I want him to be, he would be capable of accounting for it to everybody. Exactly herein consists the artistic authority of the painter, and besides he should make sure to be modest, worthy, and circumspect in all his actions.

Lomazzo's ideal painter is a transposition of Cato’s ideal orator; he is a civilized man well versed in painting – a ‘vir bonus pingendi peritus’.

**II**

In all probability, Lomazzo’s school years were not many. In his rimed autobiography he writes that he ‘went to a master till the age of ten, where [he] learned to read and to figure, and to work with books, and then to draw’. As boys began school at a tender age, Lomazzo received at most six years of formal education. Yet he was an avid reader with an encyclopaedic mind, who continued to read till he turned blind at the age of thirty-three. How he managed to expand his knowledge after the loss of his eyesight, he never revealed. Presumably his many learned friends in Milan kept him informed. In any case, he was well acquainted with the main

---


12 Lomazzo Gian Paolo, *Scritti sulle arti* vol. I, 276–277: ‘Finalmente il vero pittore dovrebbe essere tutto filosofo, per poter ben penetrare la nature delle cose e con ragione dare a ciascheduna la quantità dei lumi che gli si deve. Che in questo modo tutte le rappresentazioni parrebbero cose vere, non rappresentate né finte, et il facitore essendo tale, qual iò lo ricerco, ne saprebbe rendere poi la ragione a ciascuno. Nel che propriamente consiste l’autorità dell’arte nel pittore e verrebbe egli oltra ciò ad essere ad essere modesto, umano e circonspetto in tutte le sue azioni’ (*Idea* 8).


14 For his blindness, see e.g. Lomazzo Gian Paolo, *Scritti sulle arti*, vol. I, 244, 245 (Idea, Dedication and 1), and vol. II, 589 (*Trattato* 7.33). A summary of his reading is given by Ciardi R.P., ibid. vol. I, XX–XXIX. For Lomazzo’s penchant to encyclopaedism, see Ciardi R.P., “Struttura e significato delle opere teoriche del Lomazzo: 1”, * Critica d’arte* 12, 70 (1965) (20–30) 22.
sources and teachings of rhetoric, as several passages in his works betray.\textsuperscript{15} Roberto Paolo Ciardi, who in the 1960s and 1970s edited and commented Lomazzo’s writings on art, even opined that the author’s concept of art was essentially rhetorical. According to Ciardi, Lomazzo viewed painting as an \textit{ars}, a structured body of interrelated notions that could be taught and learned. This would explain why Lomazzo’s theoretical writings do not remind the reader of earlier treatises on the art of painting, but of Quintilian’s \textit{Institutio oratoria}.\textsuperscript{16}

By virtue of its clear organization, the rhetorical system was easy to teach and easy to learn, and thanks to its stress on logical structure and perspicuous argumentation it was easily used as a primer for other disciplines than eloquence. Leon Battista Alberti, who himself used rhetoric as a method to devise and develop his treatises, in his \textit{De pictura} (1436) incited painters to follow rhetorical precepts of composition.\textsuperscript{17} The Dalmatian humanist and philosopher Francesco Patrizi from Cherso used rhetoric as a strict and exact method to structure his \textit{Della poetica} (On Poetry, 1586) and eventually came to see it as a general poetics.\textsuperscript{18} And in the early 1530s another humanist from the Venetian territories, Giulio Camillo, had gone even further. In a speech called \textit{L’idea dell’eloquenza} (The Plan of Eloquence), he tried to show that rhetoric, painting, architecture, and ballistics all share the same basic structure.\textsuperscript{19} Not surprisingly, in the sixteenth century the methods and requirements of the \textit{ars oratoria} formed the model for all liberal arts and every discipline that aimed at


being counted as such.\textsuperscript{20} Lomazzo pretended that the art of painting was a liberal art. As this demanded that he fashioned his handbook after the model of rhetoric, we now will briefly review some elements Lomazzo evidently derived from the ancient orators: the five parts of rhetoric; the notion of \textit{decorum}; and the three tasks of rhetoric.

In the footprints of Cicero’s \textit{De oratore} the early humanists had paid much attention to the idea (\textit{inventio}), the organization (\textit{dispositio}), and the phrasing or final form (\textit{elocutio}) of a work of art, but scarcely a word to its memorizing (\textit{memoria}) or its public performance (\textit{actio}).\textsuperscript{21} This is a quite natural omission. The aspects of rhetoric relative to composition can be easily transposed to the design processes in the visual arts and architecture. Visual artists could easily adapt rhetorical construction rules, based as they are on common sense and accepted concepts. Anyone who is to create something, will first think out what exactly he wants to make, then gather the elements he needs for its construction, and finally make the object as resembling to his concept as he can. The two last parts of rhetoric are less adaptable. Memory is irrelevant for the artist who has completed his work, and performance is difficult to achieve by objects that cannot speak or move. Hence most art theorists focussed their attention on the first three parts of rhetoric, which can be considered as a general how-to course in design. Sixteenth-century authors used the concepts very loosely and freely, as two examples may illustrate. Lodovico Dolce wrote in his dialogue \textit{Aretino} (1557):

\begin{quote}
From a story the painter simply gets his subject matter. And from his genius, apart from order and convenience, spring forth the postures, variety, and (so to say) the energy of the figures.\textsuperscript{22}
\end{quote}

Dolce puts \textit{inventio}, \textit{ordinatio}, and \textit{elocutio} together in one simple sentence. And in 1584, the year when Lomazzo published his \textit{Trattato}, the Florentine connoisseur Raffaello Borghini states with conviction in his equally massive \textit{Riposo}:

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{21} See Kemp, \textit{Behind the Picture} 234.

\textsuperscript{22} Dolce Lodovico, \textit{Dialogo della pittura, intitolato L’Aretino} (Venice, Gabriel Giolito: 1557) fol. 28r: ‘Dalla historia egli [scil. il pittore] ha semplicemente la materia. E dall’ingegno oltre all’ordine e la convenevolezza, procedono l’attitudini, la varietà, e la (per così dire) energia delle figure’.
I would divide painting into five parts, in invention, disposition, postures, members, and colours; and sculpture into the first four [parts].

Borghini divides the rhetorical *elocutio* in postures, members, and colours; by doing so he can more easily point out what the part of ‘phrasing’ might be when translated into visual means. Lomazzo, too, used the parts of rhetoric as a general framework, without feeling obliged to follow its every step. The *Trattato*, for instance, consists of seven books, of which the first five are devoted to ‘theory’ and the last two to ‘practice’. Nonetheless, taken together these seven books follow in a way the rhetorical triad of invention, composition, and phrasing. Lomazzo himself states in the *Idea* that in the *Trattato* he had discussed the art of painting ‘according to the order in which the painter will need and use them’. The ‘theoretical’ books are about proportion, movement, colour, light, and perspective – all of them technical skills a good painter ought to command. The sixth book, called ‘On the practice of painting’, is really about composition and *decorum*. And the seventh book, titled ‘On the subjects of painting’, is in fact a compendium describing blueprints of images. In its way, Lomazzo’s *Trattato* as an *ars pingendi* is very similar to Quintilian’s classic *ars dicendi*, with the parts on memory and performance left out. The book is about design, necessary skills, and execution.

Oratory was not a frivolous art; it was serious and governed by moral values. Therefore, to ancient rhetoricians *decorum* was the most penetrating demand of oratory. The words should be fitting to the subject, to the occasion of the delivery, to the character of the orator, and to the audience. Remarkably enough the theorists have paid rather scant attention to this central concept; presumably it was too self-evident to need much explanation. Cicero cautions in *Orator*: ‘In an oration, as in life, nothing is harder than to determine what is appropriate’ and then goes on:

---


24 For an outline of the structure of the *Trattato* and the tortuous way its final version was composed, see Ackerman G.M., ‘Lomazzo’s Treatise on Painting’, *Art Bulletin* 49 (1967) 317–326.


26 For Lomazzo’s own summaries of the *Trattato*’s division, see idem, *Scritti sulle arti* vol. I, 247–8 (Idea 1), and vol. II, 23–24 (*Trattato Proemio*).

27 See Andersen, *Im Garten der Rhetorik* 67–69.
Much brilliant work has been done in laying down rules about this; the subject is in fact worth mastering. From ignorance of this mistakes are made not only in life but very frequently in writing, both in poetry and in prose. Moreover the orator must have an eye to propriety not only in thought but in language. For the same style and the same thoughts must not be used in portraying every condition in life, or every rank, position or age, and in fact a similar distinction must be made in respect of place, time and audience. The universal rule, in oratory as in life, is to consider propriety. This depends on the subject under discussion, and on the character of both the speaker and the audience.\textsuperscript{28}

Quintilian, too, observes that it is next to impossible to give general rules for \textit{decorum}. According to him, common sense, good taste, and – above all – a sense of measures and proportions will suggest good cues. He considered anything that goes too far as a breach of \textit{decorum}: ‘and this is why even what is naturally suitable enough to the situation loses its appeal if it is not also measured and restrained’.\textsuperscript{29}

Typically, both Cicero and Quintilian assumed that there was virtually no difference between what was appropriate in daily life and what in eloquence. Likewise, Lomazzo made no distinction between \textit{decorum} in art and \textit{decorum} in life. In the dedication of the \textit{Trattato} he not only calls Charles Emanuel ‘the most liberal protector of all liberal arts’, but also praises him as a ruler who ‘in all his actions always is very attentive to every situation of place, time, and person’. This behaviour he considers ‘the ornament (\textit{decoro}) that above all other things, like a celestial frieze, adorns human actions’.\textsuperscript{30} It is remarkable that Lomazzo here uses the word ‘decoro’ while he evidently means ‘ornament’. When we compare

\textsuperscript{28} Cicero, \textit{Orator} 21.70–71: ‘[…] De quo praecclare et multa praecipiantur et res est cognitione dignissima. Huius ignorantia non modo in vita, sed saepissime et in poematis et in oratione peccatur. Est autem, quid deceit, oratori videndum non in sententiis solum, sed etiam in verbis. non enim omnis fortuna, non omnis honos, non omnis auctoritas, non omnis actas nec vero locus aut tempus aut auditor omnis eodem aut verborum genere tractandus est aut sententiarum, semperque in omni parte orationis ut vitae, qui deceit, est considerandum; quod et in re, de qua agitur, positum est et in personis, et eorum, qui dicunt, et eorum, qui auditur’ (Translation: H.M. Hubbell, Loeb Classical Library 342, ed. 2001). Cf. Cicero, \textit{Orator}, 29.100.


this passage with some remarks on decorum in the Idea, it turns out that the author is consistent in his view. Indeed, he makes decorum – or discre­zione, as he then calls it – the ruler of beauty. Everything that is not made with a view to appropriateness cannot be beautiful or praiseworthy.31

There was yet another reason for Lomazzo to pay close attention to decorum. Sixteenth-century Italians were preoccupied by the appropriateness of art in respect to religion. Pre- and post-Tridentine authors, laymen and ecclesiastics alike, continually demanded that religious art should be decorous and ‘truthful’.32 The decrees promulgated by the Council of Trent sharpened the observance of decorum in everything that related to religion. Religious art and its makers were closely supervised. The sharpest expression of counter-reformatory mentality and supervision was found in the city of Milan, see of the zealous archbishop Carlo Borromeo. No wonder, then, that Lomazzo in the Trattato dedicates several chapters to decorum and gives many examples of which kind of work is appropriate to what kind of place.33 The church had adopted the already familiar concept of decorum for its own purposes, refined it accordingly, declared her version the one and only, and successfully enforced its general use.

In the view of art theorists and theologians alike, art ought to be functional: it had to perform a task. Giovanni Battista Armenini, a convinced counter-reformist who published a treatise on painting in 1587, noted that painting can be used in several ways: ‘someone makes use of this art for pleasure, another for embellishment, and yet another to move the souls, according to the subject painted’.34 In this enumeration we recognize the threefold task of rhetoric expounded by Cicero and Quintilian. They taught that oratory should docere, movere, and delectare – teach, move, and entertain.35 The same triad we encounter in the Discourse on Images (1582) by Gabriele Paleotti, the archbishop of Bologna. The prelate was

31 Lomazzo, Scritti sulle arti vol. I, 254 (Idea 3); cf. ibid. 294 (Idea 18).
32 Here one may think of such various authors as Lancelotto Politi, Lodovico Dolce, Giovanni Battista Armenini, or Gabriele Paleotti, who all wrote extensively about the rules applying to the making of (sacred) images.
35 Cicero, De optimo genere oratorum 1.3; Quintilian, Institutio oratoria III.5.4–2, XI.3.154.
convinced of the rhetorical function of sacred art. The twenty-first chapter of Book I of his treatise bears the title ‘The task and aim of the Christian painter, to the likeness of the orators’. In the first paragraph the author announces:

Apart from the things said above, there is another effect which originates from Christian paintings, a most considerable and major one, which like the orators aims at persuading people and drawing them by means of painting to embrace anything belonging to religion.36

At the end of the short chapter he explicitly compares the task given to a painter of religious art to writers,

who by their art are charged to entertain, teach and move. Likewise the duty of the painter is to use the same means in his work, striving to fashion it in such a way that it is fit to entertain, teach, and move the feelings of the one who is observing it.37

Though Lomazzo never explicitly refers to the rhetorical triad of tasks, he evidently agreed with his contemporaries. In the sixth and seventh chapters of the Idea we find several remarks to this effect. By making beautiful art, he writes, the artist

[…] produces at the same time another most useful effect, inasmuch he prods and incites the mind of the observer to the contemplation of the represented things.38

This contemplation can be viewed as the first step towards learning. Attracted by the beauty of a painting, which as such performs the task of

---

36 Paleotti G., Discorso intorno alle imagini sacre e profane, in Barocchi, Trattati d’arte vol. II, 214: ‘Dell’officio e fine del pittore cristiano, a similitudine degli oratori’ book 1 ch. 21: ‘Oltre le cose dette di sopra, vi è un altro effetto che deriva dalle cristiane pitture, molto notabile e principale, il qual a guisa degli oratori è dirizzato al persuadere il popolo e tirarlo col mezzo della pittura ad abbracciare alcuna cosa pertinente alla religione’.

37 Ibid. 215–216: ‘a’ quali per ufficio dell’arte è imposto che debbano dilettare, insegnare e movere. Parimente dunque ufficio del pittore sarà usare li stessi mezzi nella sua opera, faticandosi per formarla di maniera, che ella sia atta a dare dilettato, ad insegnare e movere l’affetto di chi la guarderà’ (1.21). For a comment on Paleotti’s de facto rhetorical treatment of the public (the people that go to church) that can be be seen in the Immagini as well as in the preaching instructions for his archdiocese, see Jones P.M., “Art Theory as Ideology: Gabriele Paleotti’s Hierarchical Notion of Painting’s Universality and Reception”, in Farago C. (ed.), Reframing the Renaissance: Visual Culture in Europe and Latin America, 1450–1650 (New Haven-London: 1995) (126–139) 132.

*delectatio* (providing entertainment or enjoyment), people start to look at ‘what it is all about’, and in due time will get the ‘message’. In another passage Lomazzo points out that this enjoyment caused by the beauty of art should appeal to everybody, educated and uneducated people alike.39

About the task of *movere* Lomazzo felt less sure. Like many of his contemporaries he distrusted the power of images to arouse the feelings of the viewers. Indeed, he recognized that noble and virtuous images would lead the observers to noble and virtuous behaviour, yet he feared the effects of nudes and ‘lascivious’ paintings.40 A painting should certainly move the viewer, but the affect had to remain within the boundaries of *decorum*.

### III

Although Lomazzo was a reader for as long as he had the sight of his eyes and a writer till the end of his days, he was in the first place a painter. His main interest was images; to him a story was but ‘the shadow of the painting’, which could not exist without the body of the painting.41 This preoccupation with images may account for his claim in the first chapter of the *Idea* that he in ‘these pages’ – meaning the voluminous *Trattato*, not the slim *Idea* – presents the noble art of painting ‘as in a temple in which all its parts will be distinctly and orderly exposed’.42 In another passage he calls his treatise ‘a painting of painting’.43 In other words, the pages of the *Trattato* visualize the whole of the art painting.

Equating words and images was standard Renaissance practice since Leon Battista Alberti had remarked in *De re aedificatoria* that he looked at a good painting with as much pleasure as he read a good story. ‘Both are the works of painters,’ he judged, ‘one paints with words, the other

---

39 Ibid.


42 Lomazzo, *Scritti sulle arti* vol. I, 245 (*Idea* 1). For the interconnection of *Idea* and *Trattato*, and the origin of the various chapters of the *Idea*, see the commentary of Klein in Lomazzo, *Idea del tempio* vol. II (for this specific ch., ibid. 531), and Ackerman G.M., “Lomazzo’s Treatise on Painting”.

tells the story with his brush'. This painting with words so as to give the hearer or reader an image instead of a story had it roots in rhetoric. In the Poetica Aristotle used the concept of visualization, which he called πρὸ ὀμμάτων τιθέμενον (‘put before the eyes’). Latin rhetoricians such as the author of the anonymous Rhetorica ad Herennium and Cicero also used the idea of speaking in such a way that people would imagine they saw the story happening before their very eyes. Quintilian refers to the ‘enargeia’, what Cicero calls illustratio and evidentia, a quality which makes us seem not so much to be talking about something as exhibiting it. Quintilian also gives the best definition:

As for what Cicero calls ‘putting something before our eyes’, this happens when, instead of stating that an event took place, we show how it took place, and that not as a whole, but in detail.

It was this preoccupation with images and making things visible that prompted Lomazzo to push the project of his treatise further and present it as a temple of painting. This imaginary temple would be an image of the art of painting, a visual summary of the Trattato in which the visitor

---


45 Aristotle, Poetica 17, 1455a.

46 Rhetorica ad Herennium IV,34.45 states that metaphors are used ‘rei ante oculos ponendae causa’; cf. ibid. IV,55.68: ‘Demonstratio est cum ita verbis res exprimitur ut geri negotium et res ante oculos videatur’; Cicero, De oratore III,53.202: ‘illustris expleivatio rerumque quasi gerantur sub aspectum paene subiectio’; Cicero, Orator 40.139: ‘saepe etiam rem dicendo subicet oculis’.


48 Quintilian, Institutio oratoria IX,2.40: ‘illa vero, ut ait Cicero, sub oculos subiectio tum fieri solet, cum res non gesta indicatur, sed ut sit gesta ostenditur, nec universa, sed per partis: quem locum proximo libro subiecmus evidentia’ (Translation: Russell 2001).

will see with delight, without any effort, what I not than with never interrupted observation over a very long stretch of time […] have been able to collect and to represent in this temple to other men’s eyes.⁵⁰

In the *Idea* Lomazzo describes his temple of painting as a *rotonda*, a round building topped by a dome with an *oculus* at its summit. The walls are divided into seven parts by engaged columns or pilasters, which bear the cornice on which rests the dome. Every pilaster bears the image or statue of one of the seven ‘governors’ (governatori) of painting, who represents a style of painting. The governors are Michelangelo, Gaudenzio Ferrari, Polidoro da Caravaggio, Leonardo, Raphael, Mantegna, and Titian. On the bases of their columns there are reliefs representing painters who worked in their manner. So every column is the image of a school and a style of painting. The walls between the pilasters are covered with images that represent, from the floor to the cornice, the five ‘theoretical’ parts of painting as practiced by the seven governors, that is to say: proportion, movement, colour, light, and perspective. Lomazzo does not say whether these representations are at the left, the right, or at either side of the governors. Given the propensities at the time, we may assume that each governor stood at the centre of his style. In the dome, which is divided by seven ribs that sprout from the pilasters, there are representations of the two ‘practical’ parts of painting: composition and form. The pavement of the building represents the ‘discrezione’ or decorum, the ‘first and principal part of painting’, which is indispensable to composition and makes it possible to give every painting a recognizable entity without deformations or errors.⁵¹ In the final paragraph of the seventeenth chapter of the *Idea* Lomazzo describes the light that falls into the temple through the *oculus* of the dome, which makes the whole painted surface visible to the visitor. In the dome the visitors ‘that are born to be painters’, that is to say

⁵⁰ Lomazzo, *Scritti sulle arti* vol. I, 248: ‘E vedrà con diletto, senza alcuna fatica sua, quello che io, se non con lunghissimo tempo e con faticosa, né mai intermessa osservazione […] ho potuto raccolgere e rappresentare in questo tempio a gli occhi altrui’ (*Idea* 1).

⁵¹ Lomazzo, *Scritti sulle arti* vol. I, 248 (*Idea* 1), 278–280 (*Idea* 9), 281 (*Idea* 10), and 294 (*Idea* 17), where Lomazzo maintains that the ‘disegno’ or ‘euritmia’ – which is nothing else than the ‘discrezione’ – the ‘prima e principal parte della pittura, la quale è collocata nel pavimento del tempio, insegna l’arte di disporre nel più bello e ragionevol modo tutti gli altri generi […] et, insomma, dà il modo e l’ammaestramento universale di componerli insieme e rendergli uniti si che paiano tutto un corpo, senza che restrebbe ogni opera scatenata’. For commentary on Camillo as source of inspiration, see especially Klein in Lomazzo, *Idea del tempio* vol. II, 474–475.
'those who by nature are gifted with the faculties that are necessary to practice such an art', will see 'the true form of painting'. For they are the only ones that will completely understand the whole art and put it to practice. Here Lomazzo shows himself rather exclusivist – not a very rhetorical attitude – but that has to do with his views on inborn talent, which lay outside the scope of this article.

Lomazzo writes that Giulio Camillo inspired him to devise his temple. In the 1530s this orator had the ambition to design a universal topica (a collection of loci) in which visual references to the complete works of Cicero would be lodged. In order to make his idea visible and tangible, he actually designed a memory theatre, laid out according to Vitruvian rules. The main difference with an ancient theatre was that the user would not be seated on one of the semicircular rows in the cavea, but stand on the stage in order to grant him perfect sight lines all around; so he would be able to get a complete overview of all loci. Camillo managed to get his theatre built as a collapsible wooden structure. It got famous. Many contemporaries visited the travelling memory theatre. In a letter from 1537 Vigilius Zwichen wrote to his friend Erasmus: ‘And because of this bodily looking he has called it a theatre.’ Zwichen alludes to the basic meaning of the Greek verb theasthai: ‘to look at’. And much there was to look at indeed, for Camillo’s theatre contained forty-nine loci.

---

52 Lomazzo, *Scritti sulle arti* vol. I, 294: ‘Ma ritornando al mio primo proponimento, questa forma così colorata di sopra nel cielo del tempio si potrà, per il foro che alluma tutto il tempio e le sue parti discernere, e vedere quale sia la vera forma della pittura, da quelli i quali saranno nati pittori, cioè dotati naturalmente di quelle parti che sono necessarie per essercitar cotal arte. Percioché a questi soli, e non ad altri, sarà concesso nel contemplar questa idea del mio tempio l’intendere perfettamente tutta l’arte e lodevolmente metterla in partica’ (Idea 17).


55 Deswarte-Rosa, “Idea et le Temple de la Peinture II” 47, draws attention to the fact that Titian has illustrated the loci of Camillo’s theatre on 201 sheets of vellum for a Spanish (?) edition of Camillo’s *L’idea del teatro* (according to an inventory from 1576 in the Escorial library). This would mean four sheets per locus (so 196 drawings) plus five drawings of respectively the title page, a portrait of Camillo, and three aspects of the theatre (plan, orthogonal elevation and perspective view).
Camillo’s theatre was a three-dimensional version of the mental memory ‘theatres’ the ancient orators had devised as visualizations of their speeches. The art of memory was the orator’s tool to perform the fourth task of oratory: memorizing his speech (memoria). The art consisted of a virtual walk through a virtual building, in which in prominent places were set up significant statues or pictures. The building was a simile for the orator’s speech; the walk stood for its course and the images were there to remind the speaker of the topic he had to broach at that junction. The author of *Rhetorica ad Herennium* explains how these memory images had to be designed:

> We ought, then, to set up images of a kind that can adhere longest in the memory. And we shall do so […] if we set up images that are not many or vague, but doing something […] The things we easily remember when they are real we likewise remember without difficulty when they are figments, if they have been carefully delineated.

Humanist writing on memory was modelled after ancient memory techniques. In the second half of the sixteenth century Giovanbattista della Porta in *The Art of Recollection* (1566) recommended to his readers to collocate exclusively human images in the *loci* of their mental structures and look at them very intently:

> […] now as we have put them up in the places, we need to contemplate them with the eyes of the mind as if they were alive, and often pass them by on close quarters, and touch them with our hand, and call them in every possible way.

In *The Idea of the Temple of Painting* (1590) Lomazzo incorporated everything that the ancient orators and their Renaissance followers advised.

---


57 *Rhetorica ad Herennium* III,22.37: ‘imagines igitur nos in eo genere constituere opportebit quod genus in memoria diutissime potest haerere. Id accidet […] si non multas nec vagas, sed aliquid agentes imagines ponemus […] Nam quas res veras facile memorinimus, easdem fictas et diligenter notatas meminisse non difficile est’ (Translation: Caplan 1999).

He proposed a temple of painting that, much like Camillo’s theatre, would offer a *topica* of all aspects of the arts of design. The paintings on its walls, the statues of the seven ‘governors’ and the reliefs on their basements are human images that represent certain styles and skills. The images served as a memory aid; the well-informed onlooker would by the images immediately be reminded of the corresponding part of the *Trattato*. The organisation of the temple was easy to understand: it represented the structure of the *Trattato*, and hence the structure of the art of painting.

Unlike Camillo’s theatre, Lomazzo’s temple was never built. Yet it does exist on paper. In the early seventeenth century the Florentine patrician Bartolomeo del Bene published a plan and an interior view of a ‘temple of art’ in *Civitas veri sive morum* (*Community of Truth or Morals*, 1609). He envisaged a Pantheon-like structure, where images between the columns and on the cornice recall to the observers the constituent parts of the visual arts.59 In all likelihood, it comes very close to what Lomazzo had imagined.

**IV**

A last aspect to review is Lomazzo’s organization of his art in seven styles or manners, represented by the seven ‘governors’ and their schools. Although this division has attracted much comment from art historians, from the point of view of rhetoric it is not a surprising move. Lomazzo consequently calls these manners of painting ‘generi’ (types or styles). In fact, the various manners can be seen as the equivalent of the rhetorical *genera dicendi* or ‘styles of speech’. Classical rhetoric distinguished three *genera* or styles of speaking: plain, florid, and grand (in Latin *subtile*, *medium* or *floridum*, and *grande*; in Greek ἰσχυρόν, ἀνθηρόν, and ἁδρόν).60 The rules of *decorum* formed the guideline for deciding which style was suitable to which subject. But in practice the dividing lines were not maintained so strictly as theory would have it. Indeed, great practitioners of the art of oratory cautioned against a too narrow reading of the rule. Quintilian, for one, opined:

---

59 See Deswarte-Rosa, “Idea et le Temple de la Peinture II” 49, for an illustration; ibid. she also reproduces from Del Bene’s volume a similar illustration of a *templum scientiae*, which evidently should fulfill the same function.

60 See e.g. Cicero, *Orator* 29.100–101.
But eloquence is not limited to these three patterns, as we may call them. Just as a third type was inserted between the slender and the strong, so also there are intervals between the three, and in these intervals is found a style which is a blend of those on either side. Thus we find something or plainer than the plain, more relaxed or more vehement than the vehement, while the smooth style may either rise to greater strength or decline towards the slighter extreme. So an almost infinite number of species can be found, all differing from one another in some respect.61

Lomazzo’s choice for seven manners can be seen as an expansion of the classical triad of genera in order to increase the possibilities of painterly expression without loosing the coherence of the ars pingendi or committing the much abhorred error of mixing up styles. By distinguishing seven genera pingendi he provided the art of painting with a set of styles that was even larger than the set of five ‘orders’ which architects at the time used as their genera dicendi. As Lomazzo was always striving to prove that painting was the superior art, no doubt this achievement has filled him with deep satisfaction.

61 Quintilian, Institutio oratoria XII,10.66–67: ‘Sed neque his tribus quisi formis inclusa eloquentia est. nam ut inter gracile validumque tertium aliquid constitutum est, ita horum inter se valla sunt atque inter haec ipsa mixtum quiddam ex duobus medium est, quoniam et subtii plenius aliquid atque subtiius et vehementi remissius atque vehementius invenitur, ut illud lene aut ascendet ad fortiora aut ad tenuiora summittitur. ac sic prope innumerabiles species reperiuntur, quae utique aliquo momento inter se differant’. For the three genera dicendi, cf. ibid. XII,10.58–62. See also Kennedy G.A., A New History of Classical Rhetoric (Princeton: 1994).
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HONDIUS MEETS VAN MANDER: THE CULTURAL APPROPRIATION OF THE FIRST NETHERLANDISH BOOK ON THE VISUAL ARTS SYSTEM OF KNOWLEDGE IN A SERIES OF ARTISTS’ PORTRAITS*

Annette de Vries

This essay addresses a paradox. It explores the way in which an early seventeenth-century Netherlandish book on the art of painting communicated notions of a visual arts system of knowledge in which bookish wisdom played only a minor role. The book is Karel van Mander’s Schilder-boeck, published in Haarlem in 1604 and republished in Amsterdam in 1618.1 It is generally considered to be the first Netherlandish art theoretical text of a kind, very much inspired by its Italian counterpart, Giorgio Vasari’s Vite of 1550 (reprinted 1568). Although scholars still disagree on the true nature of the book, its canonical impact is beyond doubt.2 Every author after Van Mander (1548–1606) responds one way or the other on the Schilder-boeck. Even today the book is still a Fundgrube for art historical research.

Until now the focus of research has been predominantly on the text of the book. Hessel Miedema’s editing and translating endeavours have opened up the Schilder-boeck to international scholarship, but interpretative contextual studies of the impact of the book on contemporary

---

* I am very grateful to E. Haverkamp-Begemann (New York University), Alison Kettering (Carleton College, Minnesota) and Marjolein Leesberg (New Hollstein) for their comments on an earlier version of this essay. I thank Zweder von Martels (University of Groningen) for his help in translating the Latin captions used in this article.


(artistic) readership are remarkably scarce. Walter Melion's *Shaping the Netherlandish canon*, the only interpretative monograph so far that adds up to Miedema's scholarship, focuses more on the underlying philosophy and strategy of the *Schilder-boeck*, than on its reception by northern artists in terms of their professional self-perception.

The present essay starts from the presupposition that Van Mander's *Schilder-boeck* represented and communicated, however implicitly, notions of a visual arts system of knowledge that were pivotal to the artistic professional identity of the early modern northern artist. This system of knowledge encompassed an interesting blend of innate talent on the one hand and propositional and tacit types of knowledge on the other hand. Propositional knowledge or descriptive knowledge is practical as well as theoretical, logical and explicit, and can be learned from written sources. Tacit knowledge, on the other hand, is implicit and embodied and can only be transferred from person to person and by lifelong experience. In this visual arts system of knowledge, that of course was grounded in artistic practices of the time and was not as such ‘invented’ by Van Mander, *mind* and *hand* – being metaphors of the human intellect and skill – were perceived to be very much interrelated.

This essay will address the issue of artistic readership of Van Mander's *Schilder-boeck* (more precisely the parts *Den Grondt der Edel vry Schilder-const* and *Het Leven der Doorluchtighe Nederlandtsche en Hooghduytsche Schilders*) by exploring how the aforementioned visual arts system of knowledge embedded in this book resonated with Hendrick Hondius' popular series of 68 artists' portraits. This series was published half a decade after the first edition of Van Mander's book and was entitled *Pictorum Aliquot Celebrium Praecipuae Germaniae Inferioris Effigies* (The Hague, 1610 and republished in 1618). The existence of actual copies of the second

---


4 Melion, *Shaping the Netherlandish Canon*.


edition of the *Schilder-boeck* of 1618, bound with portraits from the series of artists’ portraits by Hondius, makes such an interrelated textual and pictorial approach all the more interesting and relevant [Fig. 1]. In the seventeenth-century books were usually bound on command. Copies of the *Schilder-boeck* bound with portraits by Hondius, therefore, were likely the result of a decision by future owners and testify to their notion of a certain interrelatedness between both endeavours. The fact that Hondius included a portrait of Karel van Mander in his series and, moreover, acknowledged him in his role of ‘critic of painters’ in the accompanying Latin caption, is a clear indication of his familiarity with Van Mander’s *Schilder-boeck*.8

The essay will argue that the cultural appropriation of Van Mander’s book by Hondius’ series of artists’ portraits – as far as the issue of the visual arts system of knowledge is concerned – can be traced especially in the focus of the series on the artist’s hand, on his painterly implements – whether palette, brushes, maulstick, or easel – and on the ‘fruits’ of his hands (specialisation, specific works of art). The term ‘cultural appropriation’ clearly must be understood here in a dynamic sense, as is current in the scholarly field of cultural history. Processes of cultural transmission, whether of ideas, morals or textual/visual formulas or iconography, are perceived as being part of a continuous and complex interplay of reception and transformation.9 Cultural appropriation is not a process of imitation, but rather one of elaboration and transformation. The present essay’s focus on the relationship of Van Mander’s *Schilder-boeck* and Hondius’ *Pictorum Aliquot*, therefore, by no means wants to suggest an unequivocal or exclusive character of this relationship. The book nor the print series

---


7 See the paragraph ‘Hondius’ of this article.

8 ‘CAROLUS VERMANDERUS, PICTÆR ET POETA. / Peniculo vivunt Pictores ingeniisoi,/ Et vivant calamo, Carole docte, tuo,/ Pictor, Pictorum Censor tu candidus idem,/ Pulchrum est Artificis pingere judicio’. (‘Carel Van Mander, Painter and poet. Talented painters earn a living by painting, and live on through your pen, learned Karel. You, painter and critic of painters. It is good to paint after the judgement of a skilled craftsman.’) See for a reference to Van Mander also the Latin caption that belongs to the portrait of Crispijn van de Broeck (note 67).

can be seen apart from other relevant textual and iconographic traditions and contexts.

After a concise description of the underlying conceptual framework of my argument, I will firstly address the question of seventeenth-century ownership/readership of Van Mander’s *Schilder-boeck* in general (something that so far has not been addressed systematically). The larger part of the essay, however, will be on Hondius meeting Van Mander in the field of professional knowledge and (self) identity.

**Conceptual Framework**

Since the origin of art historical discipline scholars have been intrigued by the *longue durée* development of the artist from anonymous craftsman in medieval times to autonomous intellectual in modern times, with
the Renaissance period starring as the essential turning point. Although scholars acknowledge that this process was far from straightforward, most authors still basically adhere to a rather linear and Italian-dominated model of professionalization. In this line of reasoning the artist was gradually raised from the ranks of the low status mechanical arts into that of the high status liberal arts, facilitated by the equation of painting and poetry in humanistic theory. From this perspective the story of the professionalization of the artist was essentially about the artist’s mind taking the lead over the artist’s hand, even to the point of leaving the artisanal origins and character of the artist’s profession behind altogether. Yet, however attractive this assumption may be, this perception of the artist as an intellectual, is at least one sided. It applies not only to a small part of the artistic community, but it was also less straightforward than is often suggested. This perception even clouds our understanding of the particular and – to some extent – non-Italianate character of professional self-fashioning of the northern artist in the early modern period. After all, for the northern artist the notion of the artist’s hand continued to be an important aspect of the artist’s professional identity, especially in the field of artistic self representation (the motif of St. Luke painting the Virgin, (self-)portraits of artists at work, artists’ studios etc.).

14 The literature on those topics is large. See for St. Luke painting the Virgin for example Kraut G., Lukas malt die Madonna. Zeugnisse zum künstlerischen Selbstverständnis in der Malerei (Worms: 1986); Marrow J.H., “Artistic Identity in Early Netherlandish Painting:
artists seemed to have elaborated a new concept of professional identity in which the original opposition between the artist’s mind and his hand was replaced by one in which the artist’s mind was supposed to be present in his hand. Essential to this concept of, what I would like to call, a Vergeistigung of the hand is the acknowledgement that this process was not about surpassing or downplaying the artisanal aspects of the profession. It was more about their incorporation into the domain of knowledge, reflection and appreciation. And that is exactly what in Karel van Mander’s Schilder-boeck seemed to have struck a chord in the artistic community of his time.

My Vermander

One of the rare testimonies of actual seventeenth-century readership of Van Mander’s Schilder-boeck is the diary of David Beck, a schoolmaster and art lover from The Hague from 1624. More than once he refers to reading or talking about this book. On the night of February 29th he reads ‘just about an hour in Van Mander’s Schilder-boeck’. And on July 6th he ‘speculated a while in my [his] Vermander’. The only other documented personal comment on cherished ownership of the Schilder-boeck, to my knowledge, is from the Amsterdam art collector Jan Pietersz. Zoomer (1641–1724). In the inventory of his library only Van Mander’s book deserved the proud qualification ‘my loved’ (‘mijn geliefde Vermander’).

David Beck was well-informed about the artistic community of the Hague


17 ‘[…] ende speculeerden een wijle in mijnen Vermander’. Beck, Spiegel van mijn leven 128.
18 I want to thank Prof. E. Haverkamp-Begemann (New York) for this information. See for Zoomer’s copy of Van Mander also note 39.
and surroundings and knew for example the engraver Simon Frisius (who was responsible for most of the engravings in Hondius’ series of artists portraits) and the Delft notary and art lover William de Langue (who worked professionally for the family of Johannes Vermeer). Beck was also friends with the glass painter Herman Jansz. Breckerveld, to whom he even lent his Van Mander; the painter returned it on 12 February of that year.19

From what we know of inventories, Van Mander’s Schilder-boeck was indeed widely known in the seventeenth century and beyond, not surprisingly above all in the world of artists and art lovers, Van Mander’s intended public (see Appendix 1).20 In general, however, seventeenth-century artists did not possess many books. In a sample of 170 seventeenth-century inventories of artists from the northern and southern Low Countries only 36 inventories (one out of five) included books.21 However, artists that did possess books sometimes owned quite a lot of them.22 Favourable books were (contemporary editions of) classical authors, religious books, literary works and treatises on architecture and perspective (both very frequently and often reducible to title or author) and art. The dictum ‘show me what you read, and I will tell you who you are’ wonderfully seems to apply to artists’ inventories.23 But, of course other items in those inventories – the


20 This indicative list is fragmentary and still in progress. It is likely that at least some of the authors of the laudatory poems that were added to the Schilder-boeck or some of the persons to which the book was dedicated did have a copy of the book. Some of the laudatory poems suggest foreknowledge of (parts) of the book. Waterschoot, “Het boek en de man” 115–123. Although the documentary sources are biased towards ownership of artists and art collectors, this seems to reflect the actual situation. In Marika Keblusek’s study of seventeenth-century book culture in The Hague, for example, no reference to Van Mander’s Schilder-boeck can be found. Keblusek M., Boeken in de hofstand. Haagse boekcultuur in de Gouden Eeuw (Hilversum: 1997).

21 Kleinert, Atelierdarstellungen in der niederländischen Genremalerei des 17. Jahrhunderts 71. Kleinert has based her conclusion on published inventories. This may have influenced the percentage a little downward, because published inventories are known to be sometimes selective in their choice of references and do not necessarily include all references from the original document.

22 Kleinert lists various examples of artists libraries that consist of hundreds of books (Peter Paul Rubens, Pieter Saenredam, Jan van der Heyden, Cornelis Dusart etc.). Kleinert, Atelierdarstellungen in der niederländischen Genremalerei des 17. Jahrhunderts 71.

23 The seventeenth-century inventories from Bredius’ Künstler-Inventare that included Van Mander’s Schilder-boeck – see further on – are very informative of the diverging character of artists’ libraries. While the Amsterdam painter Bartholomeus van de Helst (1671), for example, especially favoured books on architecture (Serlio, Vitruvius, Palladio, Schamozzi, Vignola), the Delft painter Jacob Jansz. van Velsen owned (1656) – apart from
abundantly present paintings, print(models), painter's implements and materials – probably told more.24

Bredius' Künstler-Inventare includes ten seventeenth-century artists' inventories that explicitly mention the presence of Van Mander’s Schilder-boeck. According to an inventory of 25 January 1629, the landscape painter Barent Teunisz. Drent had a copy of it in his ‘comptoir’ or study.25 A usual place for keeping such a book, because the Delft genre painter Jacob Jansz. van Velsen also kept his copy (of 1604) in his study in 1656.26 Although the Schilder-boeck focuses on painters, the book also seemed to have interested other artists such as sculptors. According to an ex libris dated 1612 the sculptor François van Loo from Mechelen owned a copy of the first edition of the Schilder-boeck.27 The Amsterdam sculptor Albert Vinckenbrinck had a copy of the Schilder-boeck when he died in 1665.28 In 1621, Gerrit Lambertsz., another Amsterdam sculptor, bought a copy from the estate of the painter Jans Jansz. for two guilders and fourteen five-cent pieces.29 It is noteworthy that of all the buyers at that sale, among them many painters, a sculptor bought Van Mander’s book. Were the painters perhaps already provided with a copy, as in the case of two of them can be documented?30

Without exception all the owners of the Schilder-boeck, documented in the appendix of this essay, came from the cultural centres of Holland, Zeeland and (to a lesser extent) the Southern Netherlands: Amsterdam, Leiden, Delft, Den Haag, Middelburg and Antwerp. According to the preface of the second edition of 1618 the first edition of 1604 was sold out


25 Bredius, Künstler-Inventare 292.
26 Bredius, Künstler-Inventare 879.
28 Database Getty Provenance Index, inventory of Albert Vinckenbrinck and Gertruyd Collaert, Amsterdam, 12–18 February 1665.
29 Bredius, Künstler-Inventare 1495 (inventory Amsterdam, 13 April 1621).
30 The painters present at the sale were: David Vinckeboons, Paulus Buijs, Werner van de Valckert (copy 1618, see Appendix), Adriaen van de Bogaert, Jacques de Ville, Adriaen van Nieuwland (copy, see Appendix), Dirck Pietersz. Bonetapaert and Barent van Someren. Bredius, Künstler-Inventare 1495.
almost immediately. The re-edition was organized by the Amsterdam painter Werner van den Valckert and circle, a clear indicator of the book's popularity in the artistic field. Various copies of the *Schilder-boeck*, especially those of art collectors and art lovers, contain written annotations that testify to actual use of Van Mander's book. They used the book, among other things, as a kind of dictionary to verify attributions, to record provenances, and to explain standards of pictorial excellence. Famous examples are the copies that were owned by the Antwerp art collector Pieter Steevens and by the painter and collector Peter Paul Rubens. But, also Hendrik Houmes, lawyer and art lover from Medemblik in the north of the province of Holland, used his first edition of the *Schilder-boeck* around the 1670s to write down his own observations.

If we look more closely into our sample of seventeenth-century ownership of Van Mander's *Schilder-boeck*, one intriguing observation, however, seems inescapable. The book can be found far more often in the northern Netherlands than in the southern Netherlands. For what it is worth, the present-day distribution of copies of the *Schilder-boeck* shows a similar prevalence of the north over the south. Apart from the ownership of François van Loo, Pieter Steevens, Peter Paul Rubens, Erasmus Quellinus II and Cornelis de Bie (likely), southern artists' inventories keep remarkably silent about ownership of the *Schilder-boeck*.

In 44 Antwerp artists' inventories from the period 1611–1660 no explicit reference to the *Schilder-boeck* can be found. Even in the period after 1660, as a quick scan of additional

---

31 Melion, *Shaping the Netherlandish Canon* xviii (note 4).
33 Melion, *Shaping the Netherlandish Canon* xviii.
Antwerp artists’ inventories indicates, explicit references to ownership are very few. Some references to ‘painters books’ or ‘a book with some artists’ portraits’ is as close as we can get to possible ownership of Van Mander’s *Schilder-boeck*. Since various copies of both the 1604 and 1618 edition of the *Schilder-boeck* had portrait prints bound into them, the last reference could very well testify to such a copy of the *Schilder-boeck*, but we cannot tell for sure. It is true that research into southern inventories has been limited to Antwerp (and inventories are often less explicit than scholars would like them to be), but one would have expected Van Mander’s *Schilder-boeck* to figure more frequently there.

Possibly, the inevitable setback in artistic contacts between the southern and northern Netherlands due to political and religious turmoil at the turn of the century, might explain why Van Mander’s *Schilder-boeck* was not widely disseminated in the south. Although recently new emphasis has been put upon the continuity of artistic contacts and influences between south and north in the first half of the seventeenth century, these contacts – at least for genre painting – are documented especially from the second quarter of the seventeenth-century onward, when the momentum of the (re-)publishing of the *Schilder-boeck* had already passed away. It is possible, therefore, that Van Mander’s *Schilder-boeck*, despite the Flemish origin of its author, indeed had a special northern Netherlandish

---

38 The quotations in Dutch are ‘sekere schildereboecken’ respective ‘Een boeck daerinne staende eenige Contrefeytsels van schilders’. The quotations are respectively taken from the testament of the painter Hans Daep (26 October 1622; Duverger, *Antwerpse kunstinventarissen* vol. II, 230) and the inventory of the painter Jan van Balen (1 April 1654; Duverger, *Antwerpse kunstinventarissen* vol. VII, 31). The last quotation, however, might also refer to one of the popular books with print of artists, whether of Domenicus Lampsonius, Hendrick Hondius or Anthony van Dyck to which I will turn later. Van Dyck’s series, by the way, is the only one of those three that is literally mentioned in one of the inventories (‘Den Contrefeytselboeck van Van Dyck’). Inventory of the painter Philips Fruijtiers (19 June and 8 July 1666; Duverger, *Antwerpse kunstinventarissen* vol. VIII, 487).


emphasis as far as ownership is concerned. But probably even beyond that, if we focus on its reception in a broader sense.

The *Schilder-boeck*’s contemporary and later reputation as a book that tried to elevate the status of northern art and artists in general is undisputed in scholarship. Walter Melion, moreover, argued that Van Mander’s *Schilder-boeck* created the critical categories for appreciation of the typical northern genres of art that were to blossom in Dutch art of the seventeenth-century, thus competing with Vasari’s model.\(^{42}\) Whether Van Mander consciously tried to trespass the monopoly of history painting or merely tried to stretch its limits to break ground for the particular characteristics of northern art is still undecided, but that is not the point here. For our purpose it is important to establish that in his elaboration of the particularities of northern artists and art (landscapes, cityscapes, portraits, still lifes and genre) Van Mander reached beyond the artistic accomplishments of Italian and Flemish (Antwerp) art, thus unintentionally paving the way – from an art theoretical perspective – for the rise of these genres in the near future.\(^{43}\) The print publisher Hondius (1573–1650) seemed to have sensed this change of perspective. He was himself to some extent an incarnation of it. Born in Duffel, a small town near Antwerp, his name turns up in northern Netherlandish records from 1597 onwards. Apart from a short detour to Amsterdam and Leiden in 1603–1604 he mainly lived in The Hague, the city which conferred to him the first print privilege from the States General of the United Provinces.\(^{44}\) Although no documentary evidence exists that Hondius owned Van Mander’s *Schilder-boeck*, it is likely that he came across one or had a copy of it. He definitively seems to have been inspired by it and directly or indirectly refers to it at various places in his series. Which, of course, does not imply that other sources of inspiration, such as for example the series of artists’ portraits of Domenicus Lampsonius (1572), were absent.

---

\(^{42}\) Melion, *Shaping the Netherlandish Canon*.

\(^{43}\) Recently Marten Jan Bok has summarized the results of research into the development and diversification of painterly genres in seventeenth-century inventories from seven cities in the Republic in Bok M.J., “‘Schilderien te coop’. Nieuwe marketingtechnieken op de Nederlandse kunstmarkt van de Gouden Eeuw”, in Gosselink M. – Goede J. de (eds.), *Thuis in de Gouden Eeuw. Kleine meesterwerken uit de SØR Rusche collectie* (Rotterdam-Zwolle: 2008) 9–29, especially 20. It reveals a sharp decline in especially history painting (and to some extent portrait painting) and a steady growth in (most prominently) landscape painting, still life and genre painting.

In comparison to the omnipresence of Van Mander’s *Schilder-boeck* in art historical scholarship till the present day, Hondius’ *Pictorum Aliquot Celebrium Praecipuue Germaniae Inferioris Effigies* [Fig. 2] is less well known and studied. Although scholars acknowledge some pictorial influence of the series on the iconography of seventeenth-century artists’ portraiture, the series is generally considered to be a typological ‘in-between’ and even a bit old-fashioned. According to this view, the series of Hondius did not set a trend for artists’ portraiture as it blossomed in the seventeenth century: portraits that depict artists as representatives of aristocratic virtue, as for example in Van Dyck’s *Iconography* of 1645 of which prints already circulated from 1632 onwards [Fig. 3]. Van Dyck’s series of eighty portraits not only included artists (fifty-two), but also princes, politicians and soldiers (sixteen) and statesmen and scholars (twelve). The artists’ portraits were predominantly of individuals from the Southern Netherlands (only fifteen out of fifty-two portraits are of non-Flemish painters, among them eleven from the Dutch Republic). In general, in these artists’ portraits no references to professional implements can be found.

Hondius’ *Pictorum Aliquot* was very much inspired by a famous earlier series of artists’ portraits by the engraver Hieronymous Cock and the humanist Domenicus Lampsonius, entitled *Pictorum Aliquot Celebrium Germaniae Inferioris Effigies* and first published in Antwerp in 1572. It consisted of 23 waist-length portraits of deceased artists, engraved by Jan Wierix, Cornelis Cort and Hieronymus Cock. The portraits were

---


46 This conclusion merits reconsideration because it passes too easily over one of the most eye catching and influential features of those portraits: the prominent presence of the artist’s hand, and palette and brushes as an extension of it, a point I will return to later. H.-J. Raupp, for example, devotes to Van Dyck’s *Iconography* more than hundred pages as opposed to less than ten pages in the case of Hondius. Raupp, *Untersuchungen zu Künstlerbildnis und Künstlerdarstellung in den Niederlanden im 17. Jahrhundert* 45–163 respective 23–31.

47 Luijten, “The *Iconography*”.


Fig. 2. Titlepage of Hendrick Hondius, *Pictorum Aliquot Celebrium Praecipuæ Germaniae Inferioris Effigies*, 1610. Amsterdam, Rijksprentenkabinet.
Fig. 3. Portrait of Jacob Jordaens, print from Anthonie van Dyck, *Iconographie*, 1645. Amsterdam, Rijksprentenkabinet.
mainly derived from existing (self-)portraits of artists and provided with Latin laudatory verses. The series fitted in with the humanist tradition of series of great scholars and famous men in Renaissance Europe. It seems especially to have been inspired by Giorgio Vasari, who incorporated portraits of artists – all bust portraits – in the second edition of his Vite in 1568 (just four years before the series of Lampsonius). The series was a great success and was republished at least four times before 1600. Van Mander included some of the Latin captions of the artists' portraits of Lampsonius in his Schilder-boeck; a clear indication of its influence. In a 1604 copy of the Schilder-boeck, now in New York, the whole series of prints by Lampsonius was bound into the book.

Hendrick Hondius' series of artists' portraits of 1610 included copies of all but one of the portraits of the series of Lampsonius (although reversed and slightly adapted, a point I will return to later). In the introductory poem Hondius refers to Lampsonius as the person who made some painters famous. But the ambitions of Hondius reached further than duplicating Lampsonius. He added another 45 portraits of late sixteenth-century and contemporary artists to his series, engraved by Simon Frisius (mainly), Andries Stock and Robert de Baudous. In total the series consists of 68 artists' portraits. Just like its forerunner, the series was frequently republished. As mentioned earlier, the portrait prints also found their way into several 1618 copies of the Schilder-boeck [see Fig. 1], an indication of an affinity of both endeavours. In the foreword of the edited reprint of Van Mander’s Netherlandish Lives of 1764 by Jacobus de Jongh, the editor in fact reminds the reader of the simultaneous publication of the second

51 See Meiers, “Portraits in print” esp. 6–11.
54 Luijten, “The Iconography” 81, fig. 20.
55 The portrait of Hieronymus Cock was not reprinted after the second edition of the Lampsonius’ series. Meiers, “Portraits in print” 5–7, 13.
57 In addition there are copies bound with Hondius' portraits in the Royal Library in Brussels and in a sale catalogue from The Hague, 1891. Around 1720 the English engraver George Vertue had a 1618 copy of the Schilder-boeck with bound portraits from Hondius' series which he used in writing his history of English painting. Miedema H., “George Vertue leest Van Mander”, in Vander Auwera J. (ed.), Liber Amicorum Raphaël De Smedt (Leuven: 2001) 377–394, esp. 381–382. There are also copies that include portraits from other sources. Miedema, Het bio-bibliografisch materiaal 25–26.
edition of Van Mander’s *Schilder-boeck* and Hondius’ series of artists’ portraits, and explicitly refers to the existence of copies bound with portraits (as his own copy was). De Jongh’s book was illustrated with compilations of artists’ portraits derived from both the series of Lampsonius and Hondius [Fig. 4].

The series of Hondius is smaller than the ca. 100 lives of Van Mander’s *Schilder-boeck*, and apart from the 22 artists from Lampsonius, Hondius favoured the still living artists figuring in the *Schilder-boeck*. Only 35% of the deceased artists as opposed to 69% of the living artists figuring in Van Mander’s book found their way into the series of Hondius. Moreover, Hondius also included various artists that are not honoured with a ‘life’ in the *Schilder-boeck*, such as the earlier mentioned floral painter Floris van Dijck. Coincidental circumstances, no doubt, may have played a role in compiling the series (for example, the availability of model portraits), but Hondius, inevitably, left his mark on the series’ character as a whole. Hondius seems to have especially favoured artists from or related to the cities and regions where he had been living: The Hague (Cornelis Visscher I, Adriaen de Vries [Fig. 5]), Antwerp (Crispijn van den Broeck [see Fig. 10], Christian Queborn, Joos de Momper) and Germany (Adam Elsheimer, Jacob Binck, Johannes de Water).

In scope and pictorial elaboration, Hondius’ series sets itself apart from its well-known forerunner (Lampsonius) and successor (Van Dyck). First of all, it is interesting to note the difference between the reversed Lampsonius-copies in the series of Hondius and their originals. In the copies from Hondius’ series, the artists are individualized in a rather ‘modern’ way: by including characteristic works of art on the wall behind the artist or by referring to his art in the spatial surroundings. While the wall in the portrait of Hieronymus Bosch from the Lampsonius series, for example, is blank [Fig. 6], the one from the Hondius series shows a depiction of a typical Boschian scene of hell [Fig. 7]. Other examples are the depiction

---


59 The portraits of Quinten Massys and Hieronymus Bosch are after Jan Wierix (Lampsonius series). The inclusion of references to painterly attributes is clearly derived from Hondius’ series. See the paragraph ‘the artist’s hand’ of this essay.

60 Although he seems to have been in general a publisher who was lenient to the stylistic variety of the artists he employed. Orenstein, *Hendrick Hondius* 9.

61 Who according to an inventory from 1635 did not possess any books at all. Duverger, *Antwerpse kunstinventarissen* vol. III, 429–431.

Fig. 4. Portraits of Quinten Massys, Hieronymous Bosch and Aertgen van Leyden, print from Jac. De Jongh, *Het leven der doorluchtige Nederlandse en eenige Hoog-duitsche schilders [...]*, 1764. Amsterdam, Rijksprentenkabinet.
Fig. 5. Portrait of Adriaen de Vries, print no. 63 from Hendrick Hondius, Pictorum Aliquot Celebrium Praecipuæ Germaniae Inferioris Effigies, 1610. Amsterdam, Rijksprentenkabinet.
Fig. 6. *Portrait of Hieronymus Bosch*, print from Domenicus Lampsonius, *Pictorum Aliquot Celebrium Germaniae Inferioris Effigies*, Antwerp 1572. Amsterdam, Rijksprentenkabinet.
Fig. 7. Portrait of Hieronymus Bosch, print no. 4 from Hendrick Hondius, Pictorum Aliquot Celebrum Praecipuæ Germaniae Inferioris Effigies, 1610. Amsterdam, Rijksprentenkabinet.
of life-sized figures of farmers in Bruegel’s portrait and a Dance of death in Holbein’s portrait. This stress on diversity of skills and talents is textually underscored in the opening poem of the Hondius series: ‘Not all have the same talent. Some please by their colours and shadows, some others by their pleasant flowers and trees. Some skilfully paint fields, rolling seas and farmlands, rocks, some others are renowned for cityscapes and portraits’.

The inclination to characterize artists by their work is even more pronounced in the 45 newly added portraits. The portrait of Joachim Beuckelaer, for example, includes an elaborate depiction of a kitchen and market scene. The portrait of the flower painter Floris van Dijck shows him painting a still life of flowers [Fig. 8] and the one of marine painter Hendrick Vroom depicts him standing before a marine scene. This pictorial elaboration of northern specialism echoes and, to some extent, even surpasses Van Mander’s praise of ‘verscheydenheyd’ or variety (from emotions to clothing and other ‘bywerck’) as one of the major aspects of a good work of art. While Van Mander, however, feels the need to explain a painter’s deviation from the main road of art (history painting) to a side road (portrait painting, as in the case of the portrait painter Michiel van Mierevelt), Hondius seems to rejoice in the painter’s speciality [Fig. 9]. Van Mander was conscious of the fact that developments on the art market, especially in the northern Netherlands, were not favourable to history painting. And, indeed, there were diverging trends on the seventeenth-century art markets of the southern and northern Netherlands. While history painting (religion, mythology) still predominated in private collections from Antwerp of the first two decades of the seventeenth century (60%), this percentage was only 47% in extant inventories of seven cities of the Dutch Republic.

65 Van Mierevelt, by the way, was one of the few northern Netherlandish artists that figured in Van Dyck’s Iconography and, moreover, with a reference to his professional imple-ments. Turner – Depauw, The new Hollstein: Van Dyck no. 74. It is one of the few portraits in Van Dyck’s series in which a palette and brushes are included.
Fig. 8. Portrait of Floris van Diick, print no. 65 from Hendrick Hondius, Pictorum Aliquot Celebrium Praecipuae Germaniae Inferioris Effigies, 1610. Amsterdam, Rijksprentenkabinet.
Fig. 9. Portrait of Michiel van Mierevelt, print no. 55 from Hendrick Hondius, Pictorium Aliquot Celebrium Praecipuae Germaniae Inferioris Effigies, 1610. Amsterdam, Rijksprentenkabinet.
was lowered to 49% in Antwerp private collections as opposed to 27% in Dutch inventories. The emphasis on portrait, landscape, floral and genre painting in Hondius’ series of artists’ portraits – absent in the Lampsonius series – therefore, in a way, seems to have been an early indication of the future development on the Dutch art market.

A second remarkable difference between the series of Lampsonius and Hondius concerns the frequency of references to the artist’s profession. Although not absent, although subdued, in the series of Lampsonius (see the portraits of Dieric Bouts, Jan Cornelis Vermeyen, Pieter Coecke van Aelst, Willem Key, Lucas van Gassel, Frans Floris and Hieronymous Cock, in total seven out of twenty-three), in three-quarters of the newly added portraits in the Hondius series, painters’ implements (palette, brushes, maulstick, easel) are included. A good example is the engraved portrait of the Antwerp painter and printmaker Crispijn van den Broeck, the only portrait of the series that includes a view into an artist’s studio [Fig. 10]. The Latin caption almost literally follows Van Mander’s concise description of the life of this painter (as part of Van Mander’s life of Frans Floris, his teacher).67 Noteworthy is also the portrait of Cornelis Cornelisz. van Haarlem, the only one that depicts a grinder [see Fig. 1]. Eight portraits of the series of Hondius, moreover, contain additional references to the painter’s profession, such as a shield of the guild of St. Luke. Only in five of the 45 newly added portraits no reference at all is made to the profession of the sitter. The professional touch of the depicted artists in the Hondius series is even more notable if we compare the series with two other portrait series by the same publisher – Religious reformers and Pacificators of the Netherlands –, published in 1599 respective 1608.68 Both series consisted of waist-length portraits in which the depicted persons are primarily distinguished by physiognomic characteristics and clothing; no hands

---

67 ‘CRISPIANUS BROEKIUS, ANTWERP<ENSIS>, PICTOR./ Inventor felix habitus, pictorque peritus/ Tectonices: laudas quem ingeniose faber./ Corpora pingebat magnis expressa figuris/ Ad vivum, quorum tegmina nulla vides’. (‘Painter Crispijn van den Broeck, from Antwerp, generally known as a good inventor and skilled painter. Who is praised by you, ingenius craftsman [again a reference to Van Mander]. He painted after life naked bodies with big figures’). The text of Mander runs as follows: ‘Crispien van den Broecke van Antwerpen, is oock geweest een goet Inventeur, en fraey van groote naeckten, desghelijcx een goet Architect: zijn wercken zijn noch in veel plaetsen by den liefhebbers gesien. Hy is gestorven in Hollandt. Geen ander bescheyt weet ick veel meer van hem, door dat mijn begeert aen die’t wisten niet is behertight geworden’.

Fig. 10. Portrait of Crispijn van den Broeck, print no. 38 from Hendrick Hondius, *Pictorum Aliquot Celebrium Praecipuae Germaniae Inferioris Effigies*, 1610. Amsterdam, Rijksprentenkabinet.
or other attributes are visible. In liveliness, Hondius’ series of artists’ portraits of 1610 surpasses these earlier portrait series by far.

*The Artist’s Hand*

What most attracts the attention of the viewer in the Hondius series is the omnipresence of the artist’s hand, whether the active hand that applies the brush, the spare hand that holds the palette or the depiction of works of art by the painter’s hand. The hands are depicted as relatively large, even muscled, and in the act of painting or of making a meaningful gesture. They systematically focus the attention of the viewer on what the artist is professionally doing or accomplishing. Since classical times gesture has been intimately linked to speech and rhetorical qualities. This tradition definitively influenced Renaissance portraiture. Hans-Joachim Raupp has argued that artists’ portraiture was no exception to this rule. He places the artists’ portraits of Van Dyck’s *Iconography* (1645) at the centre of this development. Raupp’s stylistically-centred observation, however, that the hands of the depicted artists in the series of Hondius have – in comparison to that of his forerunner Lampsonius (not to mention his successor Van Dyck) – lost their power of gesticulation and have become merely decorative, seems unsustainable.69 As far as the representation of the hand in artists’ portraiture is concerned, the series of Hondius, although building on an earlier iconographic tradition (Lampsonius), was undoubtedly trendy. After all, no matter how much Van Dyck eschews the inclusion of painterly attributes in his portraits of artists, he undoubtedly emphasizes the hands of the ones he depicts. With or without implements the conspicuous presence of the artist’s hand in the mainstream of artists’ portraiture underscores the importance of the hand as a creative force that surpasses matter and competes with the mind, without, however, denying the instrumentality and skill embedded in that same hand.

Why did the artist’s hand and its attributes (palette, brushes, maulstick, easel, works of art) became such a vital part of painters’ portraits? It could be argued that the presence of artist’s implements in portraits was merely the result of a longstanding tradition in literature and art to identify a

---

person, whether a saint, a king or a craftsman, by his attributes.\textsuperscript{70} Just as the tailor or weaver were recognizable by their scissors and shuttle, the painter was identified by his palette and brush. And these were, by the way, originally very humble attributes. In Middle-Dutch the words ‘palet’ (palette) and ‘pinceel’ (brush) were related to rather coarse activities.\textsuperscript{71} A palette was a board or a chopping-board. A brush was used for the application of chalk on a wall or even for the pointing of the brickwork of a wall. Even in a more refined state brushes and palette were as a whole no more than workmen’s utensils.

Van Mander also testifies to this functionalism of the painter’s implements when he observes that nature provides for everyone an instrument to make a living: ‘Her gifts and jewels are varied: here she gives ploughs, there hammers, there axes, Here trowels, there books and over there brushes’.\textsuperscript{72} This instrumental view, however, only tells part of the story. If we look more precise at the last words of the aforementioned quote from the \textit{Schilder-boeck} (‘there books and over there brushes’), it seems as if books and brushes are distinguished (different instruments), but at the same time equated as being on the same level. They are perceived as being interchangeable, but nevertheless nature equips the painter with brushes and not with books. Van Mander, therefore, does not seem to value a book above a brush, or a hammer as a matter of fact. And that is rather characteristic of his perception of the artist’s profession throughout the \textit{Schilder-boeck}. The art of painting is a profession and not a craft, albeit a profession grounded in craftsmanship.\textsuperscript{73} This brings in all the connotations embedded in trained craftsmanship: talent, written knowledge (whether theoretical or practical), and skill. These three, accompanied by


\textsuperscript{72} ‘En de milde Natuere gheeft hier elcken Eenich bysonder Instrument in handen, Om zijn broodt te winnen in s’ Weerelts landen. Verscheyden zijn haer giften en liuelen, Hier gheeftse Ploeghen, daer Hamers, daer Bijlen, Hier Truffels, daer Boecken, ginder Pinceelen’. Mander, \textit{Den Grondt} fol. iv.

the general virtue of diligence, constitute the main components of the visual arts system of knowledge communicated by Van Mander’s Schilderboeck and fully resonating in Hondius’ series.

The Talented Hand

In the historiography of the concept of ingenium the line between art, talent and genius, representing various layers of mimetic and creative qualities, seems to shift restlessly. Authors disagree on the issue whether in the Renaissance the notion of talent already included elements of genius in a modern sense and thus can be distinguished from or even opposed to the notion of art or skill. Recently, Patricia Emison tried to open up the discourse by suggesting an approach that presupposes a perpetual fluidity in the relation between those notions in the Renaissance period. Her plea very much makes sense in the case of Van Mander’s Schilder-boeck, where notions of art, talent and genius seemed to be engaged fraternally. ‘One cannot become a painter without talent’ argues Van Mander throughout the Schilder-boeck, but his perception of it seems rather matter of fact. As he remarks in an earlier quoted passage from Den Grondt, nature will give everybody an instrument to make a living. If it isn’t a brush, you better stay away from it. Phrased in modern terminology, Van Mander considers talent to be a gift and not a right; moreover it is a gift that has to be cherished and developed during long years of practice and learning. Van Mander excels in eloquent descriptions of the innate talent of ‘his’ artists, such as for example in the case of Bartholomeus Spranger, a Flemish mannerist-painter (1546–1611). From childhood on Spranger was smiled upon by paint, brushes and Pictura, the latter eventually married him. Yet, that was no guarantee for an easy success, as his life, initially full of setbacks, amply testifies. Although Van Mander did perceive innate talent as a prerequisite for the art of painting, he focussed his attention mainly

75 ‘If (...) ingegno could encompass intelligence without distinguishing native versus learned components, dexterity whether verbal or manual, talent (...) or simply a canni-
ness about knowing what will work in given circumstances, then the interaction of the concepts of arte and ingegno is a topic rather than a formula’. Ibid. 345.
76 ‘[...] want Natuere hem van in zijn vroeghe leught verwe en Pinceelen, jae de schoon Pictura self met vriendlijck toelacchen stadich aengheboden en toeghelangt, heeft, welcke Pictura hem oock geern heeft aenghenomen [...]’. Mander, Levens fol. 268v.
on actual performances of artists, thus trespassing the line between talent and artistic skills. This focus on actual artistic performances arising from skilled talent is elaborated by Hondius in his series of artists’ portraits. As in the case of, for example, Maarten van Heemskerck (1498–1594) [Fig. 11]. He is praised in the Latin caption for the works of art he made with talent and skill: ‘In praise of his cities, towers, ruins one would say that they were composed by Daedalus’.77 Daedalus was the representative of talented skill or ingenium par excellence. In the Renaissance he was one of the rhetorical exempla for artists – for being talented, and for being a moral warning against pride.78 Talent, therefore, is not perceived as some vague or abstract concept, but as something that materializes in actual artistic performances. Artists’ talents are widely varied, as the earlier-cited opening poem of the series of Hondius remarks.79 The depicted portraits and Latin captions cherish these talents, whether in the field of landscape, still life, cityscape or portraits. Our knowledge of seventeenth-century ownership of Van Mander’s Schilder-boeck is only fragmentary, but can it be a coincidence that especially painters of typically northern genres owned a copy? Possibly they were as much attracted to Van Mander’s focus on the specific character and talents of northern Netherlandish artists as Hondius and the (intended) public of his series of artists’ portraits were.

The Erudite Hand

Humanist learned culture was widespread in the early modern period, but apart from artists such as Rubens, few artists seemed to have been well-versed in humanist learning. In 1984, Jan Białostocki successfully modified the Renaissance notion of the learned artist or pictor doctus.80 He argued that it might have been the ideal, but that it did not correspond to reality. Taking his argument a step further, we could ask ourselves if our understanding of the notion of the learned artist, in which learnedness is

77 ‘Quae regio Hemskerki Batavi non plena laboris?/ Tot pinxit, finxit qui ingenio tabulas/ Vrbes admirans, turrets, tristesque ruinas,/ Dices Daedaleas composuis se Manus’. (‘Which part of the Bataafse Heemskerk is not full of his efforts?/ He painted so many paintings with his talent./ In praise of his cities, towers, ruins one would say that they were composed [by hand] by Daedalus’).
78 Puttfarken, Titian 19 and 28.
79 See note 63.
Fig. 11. Portrait of Maarten van Heemskerck, print no. 30 from Hendrick Hondius, *Pictorum Aliquot Celebrium Praecipuæ Germaniae Inferioris Effigies*, 1610. Amsterdam, Rijksprentenkabinet.
equated with erudition and bookish knowledge, hasn’t been too narrow. It is true that the artist was frequently praised for his *docta manus*, but this referred more to his hand being skilled rather than being scholarly. The erudition of a *docta manus* was not primarily based on a corpus of texts, but more on the non-textual, non-verbal and artisanal corpus of experience that it encompassed. This broader, less intellectually focussed perception of the learned hand of the artist can be traced back to Cennino Cennini’s *Libro dell’Arte* (c. 1400) and would have a longstanding life in subsequent art treatises, no matter how scholarly these were to become.

In his *The Painting of the Ancients* (1638) Franciscus Junius, one of the most erudite art theoretical authors of the period, fully acknowledges that an artist does not have ‘to buckle himself wholly to his study [...] for it sufficeth that he doe but learne by a daily observation [...] To a learned and wise imitator every man is a book’.

It is therefore no surprise that Van Mander’s *Schilder-boeck* is remarkably silent on the theoretical aspects of the artist’s education. In *Den Grondt*, the most theoretical part of the *Schilder-boeck*, Van Mander seldom refers to books or textual sources as being necessary to the artist’s education; an impression that is further enhanced by his relative silence on his own array of textual sources. At first, Van Mander seems to make an exception for his own book: ‘But for you, painter’s youth, there was nothing reliable in your native tongue to impart you, as new barrels, with instructive substance which might leave you with a strong scent’. Van Mander’s *Wytlegghingh*, a commentary on Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, and

---

81 See also Mander, *The lives* vol. IV, fols. 237v07 and 239v46 and the there documented references to *Den Grondt*.

82 See for this distinction: Smith P.H., *The body of the artisan. Art and experience in the Scientific Revolution* (Chicago-London: 2004). This connotation of ‘knowing how to do things’ was widespread. In, for example, the emblem *Laedit ineptos* from Jacob Cats *Sinne en minnebeelden* of 1627 the notion of *docta manus* is used in such general terms *Effuge piscator ni tibi docta manus*.


84 Quoted from Bialostocki, “Doctus Artifex” 19.


87 ‘Doch voor u Schilder-jeught wasser niet sekers/ In onse spraeck, om u als nieuwe Bekers,/ Nutte leersaem stoffe maken deelachtigh,/ Daer ghy van mocht houden den roke crachtigh’. Mander, *Den Grondt* fol. 9r.
Witbeeldinge, a dictionary for the depiction of figures, probably indeed functioned as such an inspirational and educational manual for history painters.\textsuperscript{88} It was one of the most popular parts of the Schilder-boeck.\textsuperscript{89} After all, ‘negligence in reading’ was, as Philips Angel said, especially to be shunned by history painters, because ignorance of historia could easily lead to inadequate representations.\textsuperscript{90} Van Mander’s lingering on the importance of his own book, however, is short lived. He stresses that painters have to look for other sources of learning. Unlike young men at school, Van Mander remarks, who learn the liberal arts from books, and unlike apothecaries and doctors, who are kept from professional missteps thanks to books, painters can only partially profit from that kind of learning. He admits, to be sure, that it can be useful to study books on architecture, perspective and (to a lesser extent) poetry, but knowledge is particularly to be found in real life.\textsuperscript{91} In fact, Van Mander replaces bookish knowledge by two other pivotal sources of learning for a (young) painter: a qualified master and nature. The first teaches you the rules of art (that is as far as Van Mander’s recognition of theoretical knowledge seems to go); the second teaches you art itself. Van Mander frequently uses, as other authors have done, the metaphor of the book to equate nature with bookish knowledge, such as when he qualifies the male and female nude as ‘the most learned books to study from’.\textsuperscript{92} Or when he remarks in the sixth chapter of Den Grondt (on human emotions) that ‘nature tells more than anyone can describe’.\textsuperscript{93} Further on in Den Grondt Van Mander argues that painters – rather than following his [Van Mander’s] book – should follow

\textsuperscript{88} A reprint of those parts of the Schilder-boeck was already finished in 1616 and probably meant to be published in advance, although no copies have survived. Mander, Den Grondt fol. 19r.

\textsuperscript{89} Mander, Den Grondt fol. 20r.

\textsuperscript{90} ‘nalatende slofficheyt van niet te lesen’. Angel Philips, Lof der Schilderkonst (Leiden: 1642; 1969) 44.

\textsuperscript{91} Books of poetry can be a source of inspiration, but Van Mander warns painters at some place to resist the appeal of poetry and the art of rhetoric, because it consumes time better spent at pictorial imitation. Mander, Den Grondt fol. 5r; See also Melion, Shaping the Netherlandish Canon 27.

\textsuperscript{92} ‘Gheenen beteren Text is t’allegeren,/ Schoonder, noch vaster voorbeeldt om betrouwen,/ Als volcomen naecten van Mans, en Vrouwen,/ De gheeleerste Boecken om in studeren,/ Zijn dit, als een oneyndigh practiseren’ (‘No better text can be found, / Fine and trustful example, / As perfect male and female nudes, / The most learned books to study from, / are these, like endless practicing’). Mander, Den Grondt fol. 9v.

\textsuperscript{93} ‘Want al wat d’affecten moghen bedryven,/ Wijst Natuer al meer, dan men kan beschryven’ (‘Concerning the impact of emotions, Nature tells more than anyone can describe’). Mander, Den Grondt fol. 23r.
the advice of the Greek painter Eupompus to Lisippum, to pursue nature rather than any master.94

Van Mander’s limited emphasis on bookish knowledge clearly resonates in Hondius’ series of artists’ portraits, especially in the remarkable absence of references to books and bookish knowledge in those portraits. The only ‘books’ that are depicted are print books or sketchbooks (as for example in the portraits of Jan Vermeyen and Crispijn van den Broeck) [see Fig. 10]. This impression is confirmed by extant painters’ inventories. These inventories testify to the omnipresence of prints and drawings – whether bound, enrolled or stored in a chest – in the artist’s workplace, while books on the other hand were relatively scarce.95 The absence of books in artists’ (self-)portraits in general, as opposed to portraits of architects, physicians or scholars, also testifies to a rather limited interest in bookish knowledge as part of the artist’s professional self-image.96 Both Van Mander’s Schilder-boeck and Hondius’ series of artists’ portraits underscore that being a good painter has less to do with theoretical, bookish knowledge than with knowledge gained by experience and practice. There is nothing wrong with books, but the professional knowledge of the artist has primarily to be imbedded in the artist’s mind (memory) as well as in his body, as the anecdote of Michiel Coxie’s encounter with a sculptor who literally carried a load of models from Italy so strikingly depicts.97

94 ‘Want boven t’onderwijs, dat u mocht binnen Mijn schrijven eenich voordeel doen ghwinnen, Soo wijs’ ick u te volghen de patroonen, die wele Eupompus Lisippum ginch toonen’.

95 Kleinert, Atelierdarstellungen in der niederländischen Genremalerei 66–70. In most cases those bound or enrolled prints or drawings had a functional aim as, for example, is clearly stated in the inventory of the Antwerp painter Antonio I de Succa from 1620: ‘Een plat kistken met diverse tueckeninghen mette hant gedan dienende voor patroonen’ (‘A flat chest containing various drawings by hand and serving as models’). Duverger, Antwerpse kunstinventarissen vol. II, 143.


97 According to this story Michiel Coxie’s replies to a sculptor who complains about the weight of the sculptures he took with him from Rome, that he better had carried them in his bosom than on his shoulders. Mander, Schilder-boeck fol. 259r.
One of the most intriguing captions of the Hondius series is the one that belongs to the Antwerp landscape painter Jan van Amstel, whose portrait and caption already figures in Lampsonius’ series of 1572. It states that ‘the Italian has his brain in his head […] the Dutchman [has] his ingenuity [‘vernuft’] in his hand’ [Fig. 12]. The verse continues with the remark that Jan loved his hand to paint well more than his mind to paint badly. Although this passage was, obviously, a commentary on Italian utterances on the character of northern painting, it can also be considered programmatic in its focus on the instrumentality of the hand for the artistic process, and therefore for the artist’s profession. It implies an instrumentality of the hand in the broadest sense imaginable: from the grinding of paint or applying it on panel to mediating artistic inventions [see Fig. 1]. Such an all-encompassing notion is totally in line with the notion of the hand in early modern thought and culture.98 A quick glance at dictionaries of late medieval and early modern Dutch language reveals a lot of variety in the use and cultural connotations of the hand. The hand is not just a part of the body, but seems to be an extension or even a substitute for the person to which it belongs. The hand represents power and fierceness (God, Justice) and can be embedded with various human qualities or shortcomings: it can be lazy, diligent, deceitful, skilful, quick etc. There is probably no part of the human body that figures so prominently in proverbs – a popular field of scholarship in the early modern period. Apart from speech, it was a vital part of patterns of verbal and nonverbal communication and, one of the main instruments for humans to make a living. Against this associative cultural background, the idea that Dutch painters have their brains in their hand is more than a word play; it refers to a professional ideal and reality. Not surprisingly, artists were fascinated by depicting their own (as for example in the case of Albrecht Dürer or Hendrick Goltzius) or other artists’ hands.99 The depiction of the artist’s hand was not only a professional challenge (it is difficult to get its anatomy right), but also related to notions of artistic identity. The hand was the artist’s ‘signature’ and bearer of both the intellectual and artisanal skills that made him

Fig. 12. Portrait of Jan van Amstel (Jan de Hollander), print no. 11 from Hendrick Hondius, *Pictorum Aliquot Celebrium Praecipuæ Germaniae Inferioris Effigies*, 1610, Amsterdam, Rijksprentenkabinet.
a good painter. Goltzius’ deformed right hand, according to Van Mander due to an burning accident at childhood, was legendary during is lifetime and long thereafter.100

Both intellectual and artisanal skills, however, were ultimately rooted in the artistic workplace: a place Van Mander wonderfully evokes throughout his book.101 He sketches an environment in which the beginning artist learns the ins and outs of the craft by practicing over and over again, by paying attention to the work of others and by being susceptible to the master’s instructions. If a painter doesn’t want to be a ‘bungler’ (‘brodder’) all his life, Van Mander argues, he is well advised to see to a ‘well practising of the hand’ from early youth onward.102 The proverb ‘practice makes perfect’ (the Dutch ‘oefening baart kunst’ is even more pointed) sums up the core of Van Mander’s educational ‘programme’ for the northern artist.103 Although he does not conceptualize the hand of the artist as such, it is ever present in his narratives of artists’ lives.104 He lavishly praises each artist for the art he creates by his hand. This focus on the accomplishments of the artist’s skills visually resonated in the series of artists’ portraits by Hondius. Building on and elaborating the pictorial tradition of the Lampsonius series, and inspired by Van Mander’s Schilder-boeck, the portrait series of Hondius brings the talented, erudite and skilled hand into the full light. While in the series of Lampsonius visual references to the artist’s work and the instrumentality of his hands (though present in the Latin captions) are relatively scarce, in the 45 additional portraits of Hondius’ series a visual – even textual – abundance of both confronts the viewer/reader.

Talent, erudition and skill, however, could only flourish if grounded on the virtue of diligence. Diligence is one of the recurring notions in Van

100 Mander, Het schilder-boeck fol. 282r.
102 ‘De goed oeffeninghe der handt ghedaden/Van joncx te bevlijten oock niet t’ontraden/ Om al zijn leven niet te zijn een brodder […].’ Mander, Den Grondt fol. 6r.
103 As Van Mander remarks in the opening page of Den Grondt: ‘T ‘is hier niet te doen met maenden ofte Weken, maer volcomen laren hier toe behoeven, aeler dat ghy eenich ghieniet sult proeven’ (It will not take months or weeks, but years before one has a taste of success). Mander, Den Grondt fol. 1r.
104 The sparse attention for the notion of the hand (and its interrelatedness to mind/spirit) in the indices of Hessel Miedema’s editions of Den Grondt (1973) and The Lives (1994–1999) can in my view not be considered indicative for van Mander’s lack of awareness of the multifarious connotations of the early modern notion of the hand in his Schilder-boeck.
Mander's *Schilder-boeck* that already had a long pictorial and textual tradition in the Low Countries. In general, but particularly in relation to the arts. One of the artists figuring in Hondius' portrait series, although not honoured by a separate ‘life’ in Van Mander’s book, was the Amsterdam history and portrait painter Gerrit Pietersz. Sweelink (1566–1628). According to Van Mander it is rare to find someone in the Netherlands displaying such a steady industriousness and dedication to his work. Sweelink was believed to have said that he ‘didn’t value the staff of the King of Spain as he did his brush’; the Latin caption below the portrait clearly is based on Van Mander’s text. In Van Mander’s view diligence is the cornerstone of every painter's professional life, however talented he may be. ‘Between painter and painter there lies a high mountain risen’ is one of the opening lines of *Den Ground* and it tells all. The obstacles you will meet on your way, the perseverance you will need and the time necessary to reach your goal. Hondius incorporates this emphasis on diligence in the title print of his series [see Fig. 2]. In the print *Fama* (fame) is accompanied by *Assiduus* (diligence) on the pillar left and by *Labor* on the pillar right. The head of an ox – a traditional symbol of labour [Fig. 13], but also referring to St. Luke, the patron saint of the St. Luke guilds – is at her feet. On the pedestals *Pictura* and *Optica* and their respective attributes are depicted. The emphasis on diligence, however, is not limited to this titlepage. Hondius’ series as a whole glorifies abundantly

---


106 His remark is part of the ‘life’ of Cornelis Cornelisz. van Haarlem, who’s pupil Gerrit Pietersz. was. Also Cornelis Cornelisz. van Van Haarlem was qualified by Van Mander as diligent (‘Soo dat ick wel ghetyuyghen can, dat de Const Cornelis niet al slapende aen is ghecomen: maer heeftse vercregen en betaelt met grooten arbeyd’t’). Mander, *Schilder-boeck* fol. 292v.

107 ‘GERARDUS PETRI, AMSTELRED<ANUS> PICTOR / Pictorum nulli Picturae cessit amore:/ Tractavit tanto peniculum studio./ Dicere qui solitus, Non tanti ducere Sceptrum/ Se Hesperium, quanti Peniculum faceret’.

108 ‘Te zijn een Schilder, t’woort is licht te spreken/, maer Schilder, en Schilder, siet, tusschen desen/ Leyt soo hooch eenen grooten Bergh ghere森’. Mander, *Den Grondt* fol. 1r.

109 ‘Op t'gheluyende bedde moet ghy niet achtren,/ De slaperighe treachteyt moet ghy swichten,/ Ook Bacchi cruyck en Cupidinis schichten’ (‘Do not fancy a soft bed, flee sleepy slowness and stay away from the jar of Bacchus and the arrows of Cupid’). Mander, *Den Grondt* fol. 2r.

110 ‘Door veel doen, en herdoen, met langhe tijden’ (‘To do it often, again and during many hours’). Mander, *Den Grondt* fol. 9v.

111 And the subsequent search for time: ‘Gheeft tijdt u tijdt, wilt tijdtso tijdt niet verspelen, Weygert tijdt u tijdt, wilt tijstds tijdt ontstelen’. Mander, *Den Grondt* fol. 2r.
Fig. 13. Philips Galle, Labor, print no. 20 from the series Prosopographia, 1585–1590. Amsterdam, Rijksprentenkabinet.
the diligence of the depicted artists. They are depicted as being ‘at work’ or holding the implements of their profession. The fruits of their labour are lavishly praised, but always paired with an awareness, especially formulated in the Latin captions, that they were only achieved by effort. This interrelatedness of effort and artistic reward is frequently addressed in Netherlandish visual allegories of the arts – as for example in the engraving Labor and Diligence of Hendrick Goltzius from the series The reward of labour, diligence, practice and art (1582).\textsuperscript{112} In the print the personifications Labour and Diligence are embracing each other intimately [Fig. 14]. The accompanying text is very clear on the reason why their embrace is relevant to the arts: ‘When labour and diligence are not shunned, the arts will bring forth many artistic inventions’\textsuperscript{113} It sums up the visual arts system of knowledge in a nutshell.

\textbf{Concluding Remarks}

The Italian painter Annibale Carracci (1560–1609) is well-known for his aphorism ‘We painters must speak with our hands’, uttered to crown the success of his quickly drawn Laocoon over his brother’s erudite description of this antique sculpture. Carracci also painted some very un-Italian self-portraits, in which he depicts himself as merely a painter. In her study on Renaissance artistic self-portraiture Joanna Woods-Marsden considers Carracci’s artisanal way of artistic self-reflection as an indication that artistic emancipation was at its height.\textsuperscript{114} In her view a painter like Carracci no longer felt the need to hide the artisanal implements of his profession in order to count as socially accepted and honoured. However plausible this viewpoint for the Italian artist may be, Hondius’ series of artists’ portraits shows that another interpretation, at least for the northern artist, seems more likely.\textsuperscript{115} Its emphasis on the artist’s hand, its painterly

\textsuperscript{112} Leeflang – Luijten, Hendrick Goltzius cat.no. 10.
\textsuperscript{113} ‘Daer men geen Arbeit spaert noch gheen Diligentie/ Siet men dat const baert diversche Inventie’.
\textsuperscript{114} She argues that artists’ self-portraits bear visual witness to the struggle for social acceptance of artists because there can be traced an ‘inverse relationship between the extent of self-revelation as practicing artist, and the degree to which the case for the intellectual foundations of art had been won’. Woods-Marsden, Renaissance self-portraiture 5.
Fig. 14. Hendrick Goltzius, *Labour and diligence*, engraving from the series *The reward of labour, diligence, practice and art*, 1582. Amsterdam, Rijksprentenkabinet.
implements and its accomplishments was embedded in a far from intellectual visual arts system of knowledge that was formative to the development of professional identity of the early modern northern artist. This essay shows that Van Mander’s *Schilder-boeck* played a role in the dissemination of this system of knowledge in which talent, books and artisanal skill were interrelated in a way that allowed the artist’s hand become a metonym of the artist’s professional abilities.

---

in late medieval and early Renaissance Italy as visual mediators*, in Vries A. de, Cultural Mediators. Artists and writers at the crossroads of tradition, innovation and reception in the Low Countries and Italy 1450–1650 (Louvain: 2008) 53–64.
## Appendix 1: Indicative List of Ownership of Carel van Mander’s Schilder-boeck 1604–1750

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1605</td>
<td>City council of Haarlem</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>Haarlem</td>
<td><em>Passchier van Westbussche bouckvercoper voort gesenck aen dese stadt gedaen van acht boucken, In druck vuytgegeven by Caerl vermandere ende begrypende de const van schilderen (...) I. pond.</em></td>
<td>Mander ed. 1973, I, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1606</td>
<td>City council of Maaseyck</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>Maaseyck</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hendrickx; Melion, xviii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1612</td>
<td>Francois van Loo</td>
<td>Sculptor</td>
<td>Mechelen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Miedema 1972, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1613</td>
<td>Hans van Uffelen</td>
<td>Merchant, amateur painter and collector</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td><em>‘t Schilderboeck in rijn van Carel van Manderen</em></td>
<td>Inventory Bredius, 440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1618</td>
<td>Werner van den Valckert</td>
<td>Painter</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>Re-edition Schilder-boeck</td>
<td>Miedema</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1621a</td>
<td>Jan Jansz. (seller)</td>
<td>Painter</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td><em>Schilderboeck C. van Mander</em></td>
<td>Sale (seller) Bredius, 1495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1621b</td>
<td>Gerrit Lambertsz. (buyer)</td>
<td>Sculptor</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td><em>Schilderboeck C. van Mander</em></td>
<td>Sale (buyer) Bredius, 1495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1624a</td>
<td>David Beck</td>
<td>Schoolmaster</td>
<td>The Hague</td>
<td><em>Van Manders Schilder-boeck Mijnen Vermander</em></td>
<td>Diary Beck, 54 and 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1624b</td>
<td>Herman Jansz. Breckerfelt</td>
<td>Glass painter</td>
<td>The Hague</td>
<td><em>Wedere brengende mijne Vermander</em></td>
<td>Diary Beck, 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1625</td>
<td>Peeter Stevens</td>
<td>Art collector</td>
<td>Antwerp</td>
<td>Schilder-boeck (1618)</td>
<td>Briels, 166–167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1629</td>
<td>Barent Teunisz. Drent</td>
<td>Landscape painter</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>‘t Schilderboek van Karel Vermander</em></td>
<td>Inventory Bredius, 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1632</td>
<td>Coenraet Adriaensz. Van Schilpéroort</td>
<td>Landscape and figure painter</td>
<td>Leiden</td>
<td><em>‘t Schilderboeck van C. Vermander</em></td>
<td>Inventory (divorce) Bredius, 559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1634</td>
<td>Albert Tiason</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td><em>Het schilderboeck Carel van Mander, in quarto (in een witte boekcasse)</em></td>
<td>Inventory GPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From c. 1650</td>
<td>Cornelis de Bie</td>
<td>Notary and art lover</td>
<td>Lier/ Antwerp</td>
<td>Quotes from Van Mander’s Schilder-boeck in <em>Het Gulden Cabinet</em> (1662)</td>
<td>Bie ed. 1971, 1–15, esp. 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1656</td>
<td>Jacob Jansz. van Velsen</td>
<td>Genre painter</td>
<td>Delft</td>
<td><em>Op ‘t comptoircken boven de gangh: ‘t Schilderboouck (...) gedruct tot Haerlem 1604</em></td>
<td>Inventory Bredius, 879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657</td>
<td>Peter Paul Rubens (Albert Rubens)</td>
<td>History painter</td>
<td>Antwerp</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sale catalogue Arents – Thijs, 351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1658</td>
<td>Adriaen van Nieulant, Printmaker and painter (various genres)</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td><em>Het leven der schilders door Carel van Mander</em></td>
<td>Inventory Bredius 176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 1660a</td>
<td>Johan Mijtens</td>
<td>Portrait painter</td>
<td>The Hague</td>
<td><em>Schilderboek van Carel Vermander</em></td>
<td>Gift to the <em>Haechsche Schilders Broederschap</em> Obreen, IV 121–122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 1660b</td>
<td>Haechse Schilders Broederschap</td>
<td>Painters</td>
<td>The Hague</td>
<td><em>Schilderboek van Carel Vermander</em></td>
<td>Idem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1665</td>
<td>Albert Vinckenbrinck</td>
<td>Sculptor</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td><em>Het schilderboek, van Carel van Mander</em></td>
<td>Inventory GPI, 12–18/02/1665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1667</td>
<td>Adriaen Arentsz. Gouda</td>
<td>History Painter</td>
<td>Delft</td>
<td><em>Schilderboek van Carel van Mander</em></td>
<td>Inventory Bredius, 686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1667</td>
<td>Pieter Saenredam</td>
<td>Painter of church interiors</td>
<td>Haarlem</td>
<td><em>Schilder-boeck</em></td>
<td>Sale catalogue Ruurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 1670</td>
<td>Hendrix Houmes</td>
<td>Lawyer and art lover</td>
<td>Medemblik</td>
<td><em>Schilder-boeck</em> (annotated)</td>
<td>Moes, 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671</td>
<td>Bartholomeus van der Helst</td>
<td>Portrait painter</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td><em>Een schilderboek van Carel van Mander</em></td>
<td>Inventory Bredius, 410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1676</td>
<td>Laurens Bernards</td>
<td>Painter</td>
<td>Middelburg</td>
<td><em>t Schilderboek van Carel Vermandel</em></td>
<td>Inventory Bredius, 1043; Miedema 1972, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 1679</td>
<td>Mathias Scheits</td>
<td>Genre painter</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td><em>Schilder-boeck</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1678</td>
<td>Erasmus Quellinus II</td>
<td>History painter</td>
<td>Antwerp</td>
<td><em>Schilderboek van Carel van Mander</em></td>
<td>Inventory Denucé, 293; Duverger X, 370.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1683</td>
<td>Johannes de Vos II</td>
<td>Painter of landscapes and cityscapes</td>
<td>Leiden</td>
<td><em>Het Schildersboek van Carel van Mander</em></td>
<td>Inventory (marriage) Bredius, 2107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1704</td>
<td>Cornelis Dusart</td>
<td>Genre and landscape painter</td>
<td>Haarlem</td>
<td><em>Carel van Mander's Schilderboek</em></td>
<td>Inventory Bredius 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1720</td>
<td>Jan Pietersz. Zoomer</td>
<td>Art collector</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td><em>Schilder-boeck</em> (with bound portraits from Lampsonius)</td>
<td>Luijten, 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 1720</td>
<td>George Vertue</td>
<td>Engraver and antiquary</td>
<td>London</td>
<td><em>Schilder-boeck</em> (1618; with bound portraits from Hondius)</td>
<td>Miedema 2001, 381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1734</td>
<td>Hendrik Patijn</td>
<td>Painter of portraits, landscape and genre</td>
<td>Maassluis</td>
<td><em>Schilder-boeck</em></td>
<td>Dibbits, 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1754</td>
<td>Jacob de Wit</td>
<td>Decoration painter</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td><em>Het schilderboek van Carel van Mander</em></td>
<td>Inventory Bredius</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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HONDIUS MEETS VAN MANDER


SOMEREN J.F. van, Beschryvende catalogus van gegraveerde portretten van Nederlanders (Amsterdam: 1888).
Two pieces of red drapery have been lifted or pushed apart [Fig. 1]. Just as in a theatrical setting, where the drawing of the curtain marks the beginning of a play, the viewers are introduced to a small but well prepared stage. Originating from an undisclosed source in the upper left, strong light falls onto the bedstall of a bearded man with curly black, slightly greyish hair. The man’s nude upper torso is resting on a blank sheet; his energetic bodily features are aptly defined by a strong chiaroscuro. The head has slid down from a cushion, the eyes are closed. His right hand is placed on the page of an open book whose lines are illegible. The man appears to have fallen asleep while reading in his bed.

After just a short while, however, other visual clues reveal the actual state of affairs: the man’s left arm is stretched out in a manner quite unusual for sleepers, the colour of his skin is irritatingly pale, the white sheets are bloodstained. The blade of a sword or dagger, likewise covered with blood, is positioned next to the open book in the foreground. Rather than sleeping peacefully, this man is mortally wounded. The shadow of
his right arm hides almost all traces of the wound in his stomach that (as is implied by the position of the dagger) was self-inflicted. In a dark background space defined by the bedpost behind the man’s head, two further persons can be made out whose reactions to what they see are divided between deep grief and hectic attempts at the man’s rescue. In terms of composition, the artist has carefully focused the beholder’s attention on the head of the man by combining the painting’s oblong format with the almost indiscreet close-up effects of the lifted curtain, the theatrical lighting and the various diagonals indicated by the blade, the open book, and the movements of the two persons in the dark background.

According to his earliest biographers, Charles Le Brun (1619–1690) painted this picture in Lyon, where he spent some time on his return from a three year stay in Italy. Nothing is known about the person who com-

---

missioned or first owned it. The paintings' subject is the Suicide of Cato Minor (95–46 b. C.), also known as Cato Uticensis, an important exemplum virtutis of stoic philosophy during the days of the Roman Empire. Especially in Seneca’s Epistulae morales ad Lucilium, Cato is frequently cited and referred to as a role model for the student who is advancing in Stoic philosophy, i.e. the proficiens or προκόπτων. Such didactic functions, however, had the side effect of simplifying or blurring the historic truth.

The last years of Cato’s life were famously overshadowed by the agony of the Roman Republic. Defining his political agenda from a mixture of republican ideals and stoic convictions, Cato Minor acted as leader of the optimates in the Senate. Unimpressed by all threats, he advocated for the traditional order of the Roman state and strict obedience to the constitution at a time when civic values were undermined by the personal ambitions of Pompeius, Crassus and Caesar. When the Civil War broke out, Cato decided to become an ally of Pompeius and accepted military tasks in the latter's campaign. After the defeat of Pompeius at Pharsalos in 48 b. C., Cato (who had not been involved in the battle) managed to evacuate his own soldiers and the remaining parts of the republican army to Utica in Northern Africa. When Caesar threatened to besiege the town and no hope of a successful defence remained, Cato organised the disembarkation of his troops, but stayed in situ and strictly refused to beg for Caesar’s mercy, because he denied the latter's legitimation to officially grant it.

The most important source for Cato’s career and death is his vita in Plutarch’s Parallel Lifes (ca. 100 a. C.). The Greek author describes at great length the last hours of a man who had come to the conclusion that only suicide could secure his personal integrity and freedom. Plutarch’s

---

Georges G. de, Mémoires inédits sur la vie et les ouvrages des membres de l’Académie royale de peinture et de sculpture (Paris: 1854), vol. I, 7, and compares the picture with Le Brun’s lost ‘Pietà Séguier’ (painted in Rome in 1645) that is partly documented in a drawing by or after the artist in the Art Institute of Chicago.


account betrays sympathy with the Roman, but he does not omit (rather on the contrary: he stresses) the many difficulties Cato was facing after he had told his friends that he was contemplating suicide. In the evening of the same day, his sword that previously used to hang next to his bed was missing, and when he insisted to have it back, his servants would not obey his order. Cato’s son tearfully implored him not to carry out his plan, and his philosophical companions brought forward all kinds of arguments against self-inflicted death. Cato, however, could not be talked out of it. He regained his sword by pointing out that, should he really wish to kill himself, he could easily hold his breath or bang his head against the wall.

For most of the same night, Cato’s behaviour gave no cause for further anxieties: he read Plato’s *Phaidon* (on the soul’s immortality),\(^5\) at times inquiring about the state of the disembarkation (which was almost finished) or falling asleep. When the next day was dawning and the *familia* felt almost sure that the immediate danger was over, Cato seized his sword and cast it into his stomach. As he fell to the floor, he overturned a large tablet serving for arithmetic calculations (ἀβάκιον) that was leaning against the bed, thus alarming the servants: His attempted suicide was discovered, and a doctor saved his life by bandaging the wound. A little later, however, Cato tore open the bandage, pulled out his guts with his own hands and thus managed to finally kill himself.

Before long, the historic personality of the late Cato Uticensis was reduced to a few memorable deeds and philosophical convictions.\(^6\) The rhetoric teachers of the imperial age went so far as to turn his death into a standard motif for young students who had to learn by heart and declamate *ad nauseam* pompous ‘farewell speeches of the dying Cato’.\(^7\) But in spite of the fact that the heroic end of the Uticensis had long since been banalised by literary routine and didactic exercises, major authors such as Seneca continued to praise Cato as the first and foremost Roman personification of the Stoic ideal. Seneca’s 24th *Letter to Lucilius*, as a matter of fact, contains the most important evocation of Cato’s suicide in ancient literature next to that of Plutarch.

---

\(^5\) Plato’s *Phaidon* had a certain fame as the ideal book for the preparation of a suicide, e.g. in the 23th Epigram of Kallimachos.

\(^6\) Fehrle, *Cato Uticensis* 22.

\(^7\) Fehrle, *Cato Uticensis* 25, who cites Persius, Sat. 111,44–47: ‘Saepe oculos, memini, tangebam parvus olivo/ grandia si nollem morituri verba Catonis/discere, non sano multum laudanda magistro/ quae pater adductis sudans audiret amics’.
In his 24th Letter, Seneca reacts to the situation of his pupil Lucilius, who is worried about the results of a lawsuit that has been forced onto him (Seneca, Epistulae 24.1). Seneca has already given advice for similar cases (cf. Seneca, Epistulae morales ad Lucilium 13 and 14): one should always remain full of hope and refrain from unnecessarily anticipating future suffering (ibid. 24.2). In the present circumstances, however, Seneca announces to lead Lucilius on a different way to ‘securitas’.\(^8\) Avoiding anxiety (‘solicitude’) requires to prepare oneself for the moment in which one’s fear eventually becomes reality and to analyse both the feared object and the nature of one’s fear.\(^9\) Such calculations will invariably demonstrate that the reality of whatever can be feared is less impressive than one’s previous fear of it. In order to deal with particular objects of fear, one should look out for role models (‘exempla’) and proceed as follows: imagine the worst kinds of harm that can be done to you and then find one of the many famous despisers (‘contemptores’) of each scenario (ibid. 24.3–11). Citing several examples of this technique, Seneca draws the conclusion that even the biggest object of fear, death, is hardly worth the trouble – on the contrary, death is a benefit because it can always be brought about on your own initiative and thus diminishes fear of all harm in life (ibid. 24.11/12). Lucilius should therefore feel ‘securus’ in the face of his adversary’s threats. Summarising his position, Seneca adhorts his pupil: Expect the best (‘aequissimum’) outcome of your lawsuit, but be always prepared for the worst (‘inaequissimum’!)

In the remaining part of the 24th Letter, Seneca further elaborates on particular aspects\(^10\) of his previous general suggestion to always analyse both the fearful object and the nature of one’s own fear. According to him, fear of pain or death can arise in us because we are looking at the outward appearance (‘pompa’) rather than at the essence of things (ibid. 24.13/14). Lucilius, as a student of stoic philosophy, may already have realised this, but such knowledge needs to be translated into action whenever this should become necessary (ibid. 24.15). A heavy blow such as illness, poverty, exile or imprisonment can be endured if you are prepared for it, and death, purportedly the worst of all blows, is also the end of all harm

\(^8\) There is no reason to conclude that Seneca herewith declared that his previous suggestions were entirely wrong – cf. Cancik H., Untersuchungen zu Senecas epistulae morales (Hildesheim: 1967) 74.

\(^9\) Seneca’s term ‘solicitude’ appears to have had exactly the opposite meaning of ‘securitas’ (Epistulae 92.3: ‘Quid est beata vita? securitas et perpetua tranquillitas’); cf. Hadot I., Seneca und die griechisch-römische Tradition der Seelenleitung (Berlin: 1969) 128.

Epicurus has revealed the terrors of Hades to be old wives’ tales. Death is either the ultimate limit or the beginning of something better – not to mention the fact that we are always dying: not only in the last hour, but in every hour of our life.

Summing up the intentions of Seneca’s strategy against fear of exile, imprisonment, pain, death and other forms of suffering, two important aspects can be distinguished:

1. A life previously burdened with fear will be liberated from ‘sollicitudo’ as soon as all possible reasons for fear have been analysed or rationalised, whereby ‘securitas’ is achieved.
2. Whenever exile, imprisonment, pain or death are imminent, premeditation has prepared one to cope with them and to prove the seriousness of one’s stoic attitude (‘effectu probare’, ibid. 24,15).

Only the sum of both aspects is enough to fully characterise Seneca’s philosophical struggle against fear. This applies especially to the worst reason of fear, death, the suppression of which requires combining elements of ‘ars vivendi’ with ‘ars moriendi’. ‘Exempla’ were at the heart of his concept, as they demonstrate how easily fear, especially fear of death, can be overcome. In addition to that, the continuous study of personified examples of manly suffering, i.e. of famous despisers (‘contemptores’) of imprisonment, pain, death etc., was intended to provide preparatory training for the case of need.

Seneca’s panorama of despisers (Epistulae 24, 3–8) is arranged in a kind of literary crescendo. Starting with a small section devoted to ‘exile’, in which P. Rutilius Rufus and Caecilius Metellus Numidicus are cited, he proceeds to deal with the more serious reasons for fear, ‘imprisonment’ and ‘pain’:

---

11 Sentences such as this demonstrate that Seneca was not really interested in speculations about the soul’s life after death. Cf. Eckert H.H., Weltanschauung und Selbstmord bei Seneca und den Stoikern (PhD Thesis, Tübingen: 1951) 97.
12 Regarding fear of death, both aspects are treated with varying intensity in the Letters to Lucilius, and ‘ars vivendi’ and ‘ars moriendi’ are discussed separately, cf. e.g., Seneca, Epistulae 54 (life made easier by meditation of death, first aspect prevailing) and Epistulae 77 (= suicide as a means to secure or achieve ‘libertas’, second aspect prevailing).
13 Cf. Seneca, Epistula 6,5: ‘longum iter est per praecepta, breve et efficax per exempla’. Seneca tended to combine particular examples of suffering with particular despisers, cf. e.g. Seneca, Epistula 67,7 and De providentia 3,4.
14 ‘Singula ista constitute et contemptores eorum cita, qui non quaerendi sed eligendi sunt’, Seneca, Epistula 24,3.
Socrates led philosophical discussions in his prison cell and refused to leave even when he was guaranteed a secure escape; he stayed on because he wished to free people from the two gravest reasons for fear: imprisonment and death. Mucius [Scaevola] put his hand into the fire. It is painful to be burned; but how much more painful must it be if you suffer this out of your own free will! Here you see a man who is neither intellectual nor prepared by any kind of philosophical training against pain and death, who punished himself for having failed [sc. to kill Porsenna] just out of his own military prowess. Watching the flesh of his right hand dissolve and drop down into the hearth of the enemy, he stood firm and did not withdraw the almost nude bone of the hand until the enemy himself withdrew the fire. He could have ated luckier in this camp, but could hardly have been more courageous. Behold, how much more intensely virtue copes with danger than cruelty can impose it: Porsenna more easily forgave Mucius for having intended to kill him than Mucius forgave himself for having failed to do so.

In Seneca’s 24th Letter, the scope of examples grows in proportion with the intensity of suffering. The philosophical attitude of the imprisoned Socrates is characterised at greater length than that of the two exiled politicians mentioned above. His example, moreover, is special among all ‘contemptores’ in Epistulae 24 in the sense that Socrates is the only despiser who, according to Seneca, explicitly regarded his actions in relation to their didactic effect on others. This element of reflexion marks an important contrast to the next example, the heroic self-mutilation of Scaevola (‘Mucius ignibus manum imposuit’), whose action was motivated by ‘robur militare’ rather than by any kind of philosophical attitude. The account of Scaevola’s spontaneous action in the face of the enemy with all its unsavoury details opposes the ‘natural’ bravery of the Romans to the philosophical nature of the Greek as represented by Socrates.

Having cited these examples, Seneca anticipates an objection of Lucilius: ‘These fairy-tales have been told over and over again in all rhetoric schools. If it comes to despising death, you will probably fall back on the old story of Cato [“Catonem narrare”]! Seneca, apparently unimpressed, continues by doing just that: he begins to narrate the old story of Cato:

Why shouldn’t I tell how he [= Cato] read Plato’s book in that last night, his head placed next to the sword? In his desperate situation, he made use of these two instruments, the first for wanting to die, the latter for being able to. Therefore, having put in order his personal affairs (as much as this could be done under such circumstances), he took this action to be inevitable, as he did not wish to allow anybody either to kill or to save him; and he drew

the sword that until then he had spared from all blood, and said: ‘Nothing, o fate, did you achieve by obstructing all my plans. I did not fight for my personal freedom but, rather, for that of my country, and I did not do politics with such tenacity to live myself as a free man but, rather, as a free man among free men. Now that all hope for mankind is lost, Cato will be safe’. Having said this, he inflicted the deadly wound to his body. When it was bandaged by the doctors, he had less blood and less strength, but still the same amount of courage, and he dug – not so much angry with Caesar anymore but angry with himself – his naked hands in the wound, thus releasing, or rather: throwing out his noble soul that despised all power.16

Why did Seneca insist on the somewhat worn example of Cato Uticensis? The answer is easy: he could not do without him. Only in the ‘exemplum Catonis’, the perfect Roman citizen was combined with the ideal Greek sage, i.e. Scaevola and Socrates had a single persona. In Cato, old-style virtue combined with a reflected Stoicism created a hero who was totally unafraid of being put to the test in extremis. He, if anybody, passed the test of the ‘effectu probare’ by combining ‘arma’ and ‘litterae’ in the most elementary sense. In addition to that, Cato’s suicide succeeded only after a second attempt – a fact that secured this master of suffering an almost unique position (only to be surpassed by Seneca himself, who, when committing suicide, needed even more attempts).17 The story of Cato, moreover, especially suited the author’s Stoic pedagogy in the sense that it had a strong ‘visual’ quality permitting to illustrate an inner attitude by means of historic or physical events. It comes as no surprise that the relation of the proficiens to his Stoic role model has been described as that of a self-assimilation by means of mimicry, i.e. the imitation of and identification with an image.18

In Seneca’s philosophical system, the example of Cato was above all intended to teach the art of dying (discere mori), which means that it had to be impressive enough to successfully support the long and difficult process of losing one’s fear of death.19 This function of the Uticensis is

16 Seneca, Epistulae 24,6–8.
17 Cf. Seneca, De providentia 2,12: ‘Non fuit dis immortalibus satis spectare Catonem semel; retenta ac revocata virtus est, ut in difficiliora parte se ostenderet, non enim tam magnop animo mors incitatur quam repetitur’.
especially clear in *Epistulae* 24, where Seneca struggles to re-propose and re-establish the personality of someone he considered to be the perfect despiser of death. In his Cato passage, the author employed an almost provocative wealth of rhetorical means because he wished to lay bare the essential message of a historic event that had suffered from trivialisation in recent years. Even though Seneca had no other means at his disposal than the rhetoric schools, he accepted the challenge and created an unusually intense version of the *novissima verba Catonis*. Seneca’s double intention to break up the rhetoricised routine of Cato’s suicide and to create an updated version of his hero’s story makes itself felt in a fact already mentioned above: the account of *Epistulae* 24 omits all reactions of others. Directing the reader’s full attention to the protagonist, he progresses from certain allusions (such as the ‘yet’ pure sword) to an ultimate, affectional part in which drastic brutality prevails (‘nudas in vulnus manus egit’). Both Cato’s monologue and the omitted reactions of others create an impression of heroic isolation, implying that even during the physical hardships of his self-inflicted death, Cato kept his personal dignity. In trying to achieve this – almost impossible – double effect, Seneca went as far as his literary means permitted.20

When painting his picture today in Arras, Charles Le Brun appears to have aimed at creating a similar intensity in the representation of the Stoic hero. In this work, the ‘exemplum Catonis’ is literally brought within the spectator’s reach. In order to achieve this close-up effect, the French artist took recourse to painterly devices of the Caravaggist School that was then – in the mid-1640s – well-established and offered valid stylistic options, even though it began to look slightly old-fashioned. There can be little doubt, however, that Le Brun intended to produce more than just a curious piece of history painting. Instead, he used the physical drama as defined by the oblong format, the suggestive *chiaroscuro* and the system of diagonals leading up to the hero’s head to convey a philosophical attitude or inner conviction. In doing so, Charles Le Brun (or his advisor) must have consulted a literary source with a closely related approach.

---

20 Seneca himself realised that his rhetoric talent threatened to interfere with the intended ‘updating’ of his stoic hero. He therefore pointed out (Seneca, *Epistulae* 24.9) that he did not intend ‘ut ingenium exerceam’ (in this sense, ‘ingenium’ was a negative expression; cf. Seneca, *Epistulae* 108.23: ‘qui propositum adferunt ad praeceptores non animum excolendi sed ingenium’). As far as the despising of death was concerned, other examples were at hand. Seneca pointed to Scipio, who had led a less successful life than Cato but who died heroically, and he then mentions that in his own days a lot of persons ‘qui mala sua morte praeciderint’.
Even though he had several ancient and Renaissance texts dealing with the death of Cato Uticensis at his disposal, the basic choice remained that between Plutarch’s *Vita* of Cato and Seneca’s 24th *Letter to Lucilius*. The latter is the likelier model, as Plutarch’s detailed account and the sources depending on him focus not so much on the hero himself but on the events leading to the self-killing and on the various reactions of Cato’s family and friends.

Any confrontation of the Arras painting with the textual and visual traditions of the theme has to begin with defining the exact moment chosen by the artist for the representation of Cato’s death. As far as we can tell, Le Brun’s painting depicts the phase immediately after Cato’s first, unsuccessful suicide attempt. He has already lost a lot of blood and appears to be unconscious; two agitated persons, probably members of his household, have just found him. The man represented further to the right touches Cato’s head, only the thumb of his hand is visible. He must be the doctor who will bandage the wound. Surprisingly, any attempt to identify this moment in Seneca’s *Epistulae* 24 is bound to fail. In this text, the discovery of the wounded Cato, of all events, is unmentioned. Seneca’s short sentence ‘Impressit deinde mortiferum corpori vulnus’ is followed by the ablativeus absolutus ‘Quo obligato a medicis’ that establishes a syntactical connection but bridges a considerable chronological gap.21 Employing similar brevity, Seneca has previously started his literary digression: ‘Quidni ego narrem ultima illa nocte Platonis librum legentem posito ad caput gladio’?22 In just one sentence, he says it all: echoing the last words of Lucilius’ objection (‘narrabis’ – ‘narrem’), he mentions the precise time (‘ultima illa nocte’), his hero’s name and current occupation (‘Platonis librum legentem’), the fatal instrument and its place (‘posito ad caput gladio’). As soon as this exposition is complete, the reader has taken, so to speak, his seat in front of Cato’s bed. Seneca’s object is a maximum immediacy of the ‘exemplum Catonis’, and Le Brun may well have attempted to achieve something similar.

Seneca’s text, moreover, is the only written source in which the book and the sword are paralleled as two equally important instruments of the stoic hero’s suicide.23 In Le Brun’s painting, the same parataxis serves as a kind of introduction to the entire picture: starting at these two objects,

---

23 Le Brun’s interest in Seneca is also documented in his ‘Le tombeau de Sénèque’ (Musée du Louvre, Paris, R.F. 1998-2), that served as a model for an engraving by Gilles
the beholder directs his attention to the body and face of Cato. The sharp contrast of the white linen and the blood stains (with the blood metonymically representing the wound) is likewise closely related to Seneca’s narrative who mentions that Cato had kept his sword ‘until then free of all blood’ (‘usque in illum diem ab omni caede purum’), thus evoking the contrary of such aseptic purity: before long, the shining blade will be covered with blood. Although Le Brun could hardly invent a direct equivalent to Cato’s dramatic monologue in *Epistulae* 24 stemming from Seneca’s experience as an author of tragedies (‘Nihil egisti, fortuna, […]’), there is a theatrical atmosphere in the picture as well: it is enough to mention the red curtains and the *chiaroscuro*.

Not surprisingly, the inventory of Charles Le Brun’s library drafted after the artist’s death in 1690 mentions French translations of both the *Vitae Parallaeae* of Plutarch and Seneca’s *Letters to Lucilius*, the first by Jacques Amyot, the latter by Mathieu de Chalvet.24 Although more research on the libraries of French 17th century artists is needed, the presence of such titles in Le Brun’s inventory – along with translations or partial editions of Thukydides, Virgil, Ovid, Livy, Flavius Josephus, Quintus Curtius, Pliny the Younger, Philostrate and Tacitus – indicates that his library contained more than just the usual reference on art history, iconography and architecture owned by other painters.25 These books clearly point to the artist’s


extensive activities in the field of history painting and his interest in its theoretical foundations.26

It can be safely assumed that Le Brun developed a taste for subjects from ancient literature, history and philosophy at an early stage of his career. If nobody else, his mentor Poussin must have directed his attention to ‘erudite’ themes. The young Le Brun, therefore, when preparing the Arras picture, almost certainly knew some of the previous painted versions of the Death of Cato (see below), but he hardly conceived his own painterly solution without being aware of the two most important literary versions of the event. Confronting the detailed account in Plutarch with Seneca’s condensed and intensified version in Epistulae 24, Le Brun decided to adopt the latter. This explanation remains valid even though the artist decided to add two figures unmentioned by Seneca in the dark background of his painting, intending either to further indicate the exact moment depicted or to stress the contrast between Cato’s heroic suffering and the servants’ ‘unphilosophical’ attitude of agitation or despair.27

A comparison of the Arras picture with other 17th century representations of Cato’s death helps to clarify the artistic means of Le Brun’s invention. Leaving aside a few examples from the Cinquecento and by neo-classicist painters active around 1800,28 the Cato theme in art was a typical phenomenon of the Baroque period.29 An etching by Pietro Testa [Fig. 2], dated 1648 (i.e. two years before the artist’s suicide), is a good case in point. Certain details such as the tablet covered with geometrical calculations and the large number of bystanders point to the influence of Plutarch’s narrative, but the wording of the print’s legend demonstrates that Testa or his advisor must have been familiar with Seneca’s Epistulae 24.

---

26 In 1690, Le Brun’s library consisted of several hundred volumes. Apart from works of literature (Tasso, Montaigne), geography, philosophy and theology, he also owned the kind of books usually associated with an artist’s library of the period. Among others, his inventory lists editions of Vitruvius and Palladio, Juan Bautista Villalpando’s In Ezechielem Explanationes, the Anatomia by Andreas Vesalius, Joachim von Sandrart’s Academia todesca, Otto van Veen’s Emblemata Horatiana, Claude Perrault’s Ordonnances de cinq espèces de colonnes and Roland Fréart’s Traité de la peinture de Léonard de Vinci.


28 Cf. Oberreuter-Kronabel, Der Tod des Philosophen 110.

as well. In Testa’s etching, the Uticensis has already successfully carried out his second attempt. By positioning Cato’s dead body on the bed amid a large group of bystanders and mourners, the artist represented the Stoic hero in the manner of an ancient tragedy that would have been incomplete without the strong emotions displayed by his friends and family.

Several other ‘Death of Cato’ paintings were made prior to Le Brun’s picture and Testa’s etching, e.g. those by Joachim von Sandrart, Matthias Stomer and Gioacchino Assereto [Fig. 3]. All three artists were

---

Fig. 2. Pietro Testa, Death of Cato, 1648. Radierung. © Trustees of the British Museum.

---


32 On Stomer’s ‘Death of Cato’ (‘Catania’) see Fischbacher F., Matthias Stomer. Die sizilianischen Nachtstücke (Frankfurt: 1993) 90.

attracted by the dramatic possibilities of the theme, and they may also have looked for an iconographic variant of the ‘Death of Seneca’ whose fortuna in painting had been established a few years earlier by Peter Paul Rubens.34 Following Sandrart’s installation of the Stanza dei Filosofi in the Palazzo Giustiniani in Rome (1635), a room hung with large pictures representing the deaths of famous ancient philosophers such as Socrates, Cicero and Seneca, such paintings were en vogue all over Italy and in the rest of Europe. Sandrart’s own ‘Death of Cato’ of ca. 1630/1631, today in Padova, is an elaboration of a ‘Death of Seneca’ by the painter’s Dutch teacher Gerrit van Honthorst whose restrained Caravaggist manner it echoes.35 Assereto’s ‘Death of Cato’, by contrast, in which the Stoic hero is

---

surrounded by a bunch of wildly gesticulating companions and servants, resembles a turbulent genre scene created in the most intense version of Caravaggism. In spite of such differences in attitude, the literary model of both paintings, just as was the case with Testa, appears to have been Plutarch. Following Sandrart, Stomer and Assereto, artists as Giovanni Battista Langetti,36 Luca Giordano37 and others painted similar pictures in which Cato is usually still alive, but doing all he can to kill himself by tearing open the wound. These compositions responded to the period's taste for drama and emotional intensity in history painting, but they may not have been based on a close reading of ancient textual sources nor were they intended to serve as an ‘exemplum virtutis’.

It goes without saying that, as far as visual models for the depiction of the ‘Death of Cato’ are concerned, even the first Seicento painters representing the scene did not limit themselves to consulting Plutarch or Seneca – rather, they looked for inspiration from existing visual schemes. It comes as no surprise, therefore, that several Baroque representations of dying philosophers closely resemble images of the ‘Death of the Virgin’, for example the famous altarpiece by Caravaggio for Santa Maria della Scala, today in the Louvre.38 The Apostles assembled around the deathbed of Mary and depicted in various states of despair appear to have set the example for most of the period’s pictures representing the Suicide of Cato amid expressions of grief and bewilderment of friends and family.

This observation does not imply, however, that the Caravaggisti were incapable of consulting textual sources. For example, at least one key element in Assereto’s painting [Fig. 3], the ‘still life’ in front of Cato’s feet consisting of the open book and the sword placed upon it (‘arma et litterae’), must have been derived from Seneca’s Epistula 24. Le Brun,
therefore, was not the only artist who, before painting his own work, read the relevant textual sources instead of just repeating already existing compositions or iconographic schemes. What makes Le Brun’s picture special, in any case, is the fact that he moved away from representing the ‘Death of Cato’ within a large crowd of bystanders in full figure. In doing so, he appears to have been inspired by his life-long idol Nicolas Poussin. No painting by Poussin representing the suicide of Cato is known, but the artist experimented with the theme in a drawing today at Windsor Castle. In this undated sheet, all attention is focused on Cato, who has just stabbed himself in his bed with a large sword whose point can be seen protruding from his back [Fig. 4]. The open volume of the *Phaidon* lies next to him; there are no other figures.39

Poussin could easily have painted the ‘Death of Cato’ as a kind of classicist adaptation of the existing images of the event created by the Caravaggisti. Such a picture might have resembled the ‘Death of Germanicus’ that Poussin painted for Cardinal Francesco Barberini in 1628, in which the heroic death of a nephew of Emperor Tiberius in the presence of his wife

---

Agrippina, his children and several companions is shown. The composition of Testa’s ‘Death of Cato’ clearly stemmed from this work of Poussin, and Le Brun himself, if he had wished to, could have adapted the scheme of the ‘Germanicus’ to his own Cato painting.

However, as the cited examples of the ‘Death of Cato’ demonstrate, there were two basic options for the representation of such heroic deaths or self-killings in the first half of the Seicento: (1) life-size images with staffage figures or (2) half-length close-ups. The fact that both schemes existed side by side at the same time can be attributed to the taste for variation or simply to the different financial means of patrons and buyers, but such compositional variants must also have been regarded as expressions of different artistic attitudes toward the theme. In this context, it is tempting to assume that the two basic variants of ‘Death of Cato’ paintings were motivated by different analogies from literature, with the close-ups primarily addressing the emotional value of the event (analogy or inspiration: Seneca) and the full-figures providing a more complete or ‘objective’ rendering of the narrative (analogy: Plutarch). As far as visualisations of Seneca’s approach to the story of Cato’s death are concerned, Le Brun’s picture turns out to be the most adequate and successful of all.

Leaving aside these elements, what else is special about Le Brun’s painterly treatment of the Cato theme? One of the most characteristic aspects of the Arras picture is the fact that the Stoic hero is not represented in the act of committing suicide but as a ‘sleeping’ person. While the face of Le Brun’s Cato appears to be a hybrid of Laocoon and Poussin’s ‘Saint Erasmus’, the pose of his body closely resembles contemporary representations of the dead Christ, e.g. in the ‘Lamentation’ by Nicolas Poussin.

---

40 Rosenberg, Nicolas Poussin 156–159, cat. no. 18.
42 A “Death of Cato” by Johann Heinrich Schönfeld shows the scene with mourners and bystanders represented in half-length figures (Pée H., Johann Heinrich Schönfeld. Die Gemälde (Berlin: 1971) 149–150, cat. no. 81). This picture can be interpreted as the result of the artist’s deliberate attempt to combine emotional ‘close-up’ value with the broad narrative of a mass scene.
43 Guercino has represented Cato’s suicide in a half-length close-up (Genoa, Palazzo Rosso) – Salerno L., I dipinti del Guercino (Rome: 1988) cat. no. 165, a preparatory study is in Dijon, Musée des Beaux-Arts. Cf. also Guercino’s ‘Suicide of Cleopatra’ in the Palazzo Rosso, cat. no. 117.
44 Poussin’s ‘Martyrdom of Saint Erasmus’ has already been suggested as the model of Schönfeld’s ‘Cato’ by Pée, Johann Heinrich Schönfeld 149, who argued that, in addition to the physiognomic similarities, both men died from intestinal injuries.
today in Munich45 and Annibale Carracci’s ‘Pietà Farnese’46 – Le Brun himself has made such paintings.47 By introducing this Christian typus, he obviously tried to further increase the dignity and authority of Cato’s example.48 One should keep in mind, however, that the Christian doctrine condemns suicide. Saint Augustine specifically mentioned and criticised the suicide of Cato as an invalid option for good Christians.49 Therefore, in spite of Neo-Stoicism being fashionable with artists in the seventeenth century, Le Brun can hardly have intended to glorify suicide in general.

The Baroque age, while sympathising with the Stoic doctrine, knew where to draw the line. A famous contemporary description of the last hours of Justus Lipsius (1547–1606), the protagonist of Neo-Stoicism, is a case in point. According to his vita published in 1613, the dying Lipsius, when asked where he had left his Stoic ‘constantia’, replied: ‘These are vane ideas’ – and, pointing with his finger to the image of the crucified Christ next to his bed, he added most truly: ‘This Is True Patience’.50 Although it is far from certain that Lipsius ever uttered these words, such an interpretatio Christiana enabled his contemporaries to understand an image of Cato as a reference to the most eminent of all ‘exempla doloris’, i.e. as a figure of the passion of the Son of God mirrored in the – outstanding – suffering of a human being.51

45 Rosenberg (ed.), Nicolas Poussin 144, cat. no. 12.
46 Cf. Le Brun’s ‘Pietà’ and ‘Cato’ illustrated on the same page in Chomer, “Charles Le Brun avant 1646” 99.
47 See esp. Le Brun’s ‘Pietà’ in the Musée du Louvre (Exposition Charles Le Brun 20, cat. no. 8).
48 In connection with Le Brun’s ‘Cato’, one detail in Carracci’s ‘Pietà Farnese’ (today in the Museo di Capodimonte, Naples) deserves special attention: the angel in the right foreground who is looking at the spectator while touching the Crown of Thorns with an expression of grief and suffering, signifies both the brutality of Christ’s passion and suggests the preferred mode of reception, i.e. ‘compassio’: ‘per indurre lo spettatore a partecipare al dolore infinitamente maggiore sofferto da Cristo durante la Passione – una sofferenza ormai conclusa, ma che occorre far rivivere nell’animo di chi guarda per fargli cogliere il pieno significato del Sacrificio di Cristo e del dolore della Vergine’, Carel van Tuyll, in Benati D. – Riccòmini E. (eds.), Annibale Carracci, exhibition catalogue (Rome: 2006) 376. Although Le Brun decided to leave out such a figure, he moved the body of Cato so close to the picture plane that the spectator inevitably feels concerned.
In the seventeenth century, Le Brun’s painting could also be understood without these specific religious allusions if one subscribed to the maxim of Aristotle that looking at images of pain and fear increases the viewer’s capability to suffer such pain and fear himself. In addition to that, Le Brun (thus aligning himself with stoic psychagogy) employed and subtly redefined a central element of Cato’s story: the open book in the foreground is not just an attribute needed for the identification of the painting’s subject, but, rather, an important means employed for the work’s appellative function. Looking at this book, the beholder realises that he is supposed to ‘read’ this picture as a magistral stoic text – in a way not unlike which, according to Tacitus (Annales XV,62), the dying Seneca announced to his friends that, as he was not allowed to write down his last will, he would leave them the image of his life (‘imaginem vitae’). Regarding the Arras painting, one can even assume that the blood on the sheets between the book and Cato’s wound was intended to visually connect the philosophical text with the (yet) living personification of ‘applied philosophy’.

It comes as no surprise that images of the deaths of Cato and Seneca were often created or combined as pendants in the Baroque age (regardless of the fact that Cato at the time of his death was much younger than Seneca). However, Le Brun must have been aware of the fact that such


54 Cf., among others, pendants by Luca Giordano (Ferrari – Scavizzi, Luca Giordano 822), Sebastiano Conca (Oberreuter-Kronabel, Der Tod des Philosophen, Figs. 52 and 57) and Giambattista Cignaroli (Geiger, “Giambettino Cignaroli’s Death of Cato and of Socrates”).
analogy of text and image could not be carried too far: a long time before Lessing, he realised that images, in which the narrative flux has been halted and synthesised to represent the essence of a story, own a stronger, more persistent power to convince and impress their message on the beholder than written or printed texts that are being consulted for mere information or entertainment. Stoic authors as Seneca argued on a rational level, but they knew that their struggle against fear had to address human faculties other than the intellect. In this sense, Seneca’s ‘exempla quibus confirmiris’ (Seneca, Epistulae 24,3) were meant to provide long-term support for the emotional faculties of human nature that need to be convinced or persuaded over and over again. It is significant, therefore, that Le Brun, who in his later career represented and theorised the Passions de l’âme like no other artist of his era, decided to depict a moment of Cato’s story not chosen by any of his colleagues, a moment in which what little there is of narrative has been relegated to the dark background and all traces of emotional expression on the hero’s face are absent. This lack of expression guaranteed the image’s functioning as a reflecting space on which the beholder could project his acquaintance with the stories of Cato’s suffering and find constant encouragement for his personal Stoic convictions and aspirations. In combination with the open book, it also served as a constant reminder to study the writings of ancient philosophy in order to fully understand the intellectual basis of Cato’s political and moral virtue. As such, Le Brun’s picture represented to its unknown first owner – as Michel de Montaigne put it – a ‘patron chosen by nature to demonstrate the heights that human virtue and steadfastness can reach’ (‘patron que nature choisit pour montrer jusques où l’humaine vertu et fermeté pouvoit atteindre’).


55 Cf. Seneca, Epistulae 24,2: ‘Intelleges profecto aut non magnum aut non longum esse quod metuis’.
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Two considerations regarding the creation of works of art in Early Modern Italy can both be formulated as being perspectives on the role of the artist’s ‘free invention’ in relation to other factors. In other words, both concern pictorial authorship, though not always have these considerations been formulated in those terms, or put into relation with one another. The first is that of the relation between a work of art and other works of art, and the ways in which artists allowed works by predecessors and contemporaries to play a part in their own inventions. Studies on the role of imitation, a theme first thoroughly explored for Renaissance poetics, have subsequently also informed work on these concepts (beyond mere source hunting) in other fields of artistic production of that period, such as music and the visual arts. More recently, the same concepts have been explored for the seventeenth century, much refining our knowledge of with what critical concepts of imitation, originality, and invention artists and connoisseurs considered artistic creation.1

The second consideration has centred on the role of patrons and ‘learned advisers’ in prescribing the content and form of a work of art. As Michael Baxandall stated in the opening line of his *Painting and Experience in Fifteenth-Century Italy*, ‘a painting is the deposit of a social relationship’ between a patron and an artist, and assumptions regarding the respective roles of patrons, artists, and learned advisers underlie our considerations of a painting’s creation and meaning. Arguments have been made for patrons’ general lack of interest in endowing works of art with complex significations or in intervening with detailed pictorial specifics, while others have argued precisely that such a strong authorial role of the patron did exist, and that a broader array of interpretative and allegorising strategies was practised by artists, patrons, and audiences. Written decoration programmes that outline precise pictorial details are rare. In their absence, scholars have often turned their attention to the books painters and patrons owned in order to form an idea of the level of learning and, by extension, their ability to devise the outline and/or details of a painting or a decoration cycle.

One of the effects of the enormous expansion of the printing and publishing business during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was its impact on how visual and verbal information was dealt with. The sheer quantity of information that became available, in combination with the continued (genuine or perceived) need to absorb and manage this overabundance, required ways to deal with information overload. One of the most common ways to do this was with the help of personally compiled, or ready-made printed collections of facts, commonplaces, sayings, etc. The practice itself was not new, but it gained new importance as the technique was applied beyond the traditional disciplines of interest to


humanist scholars, and moved into fields of non-verbal knowledge, such as images. For instance, both Nicholas Poussin and Pietro Testa made their own compilations of extracts from art treatises, and according to Joachim von Sandrart, Poussin ‘hatte stets ein Büchlein worein er alles nöhtige so wol mit dem Umriß als auch Buchstaben aufgezeichnet bey sich’. Likewise, Gian Paolo Lomazzo declared that he added the seventh book of his Trattato dell’arte de la pittura, the one which ‘speaks of History necessary for a painter’, ‘in order to relieve the painter of the burden of having to keep turning the pages of various books’.

Similarly, with the development of new printing techniques, the reproduction and circulation of images soared, and it allowed artists to compile collections of visual ‘extracts’, ordered along subject like their written counterparts. For the invention of subjects and compositional details, artists relied on both textual and visual sources. The works of great masters served as visual examples, and Armenini recommended that painters also have a collection of books, which ‘for his inventions and for the subjects to be painted will be of great use’. Just how artists subsequently used and combined these written and visual sources in their own works, and especially how this related to other visual prescriptions or requirements in the case a written decoration programme existed, remains in many cases to be explored. This is where the two considerations mentioned above intersect. In this article, these questions will be addressed in relation to the Lombard painter Stefano Maria Legnani (1661–1713).

---


6 Lomazzo Gian Paolo, Trattato dell’arte de la pittura (Milan, Paolo Gottardo Pontio: 1584) 16: ‘considerando io che l’accidente che più necessariamente accompagna la pittura è l’istoria, per sapere prudentemente praticare, hò voluto per levare al pittore questa fatica di volgere & rivolgere diversi libri, aggiungervi un altro libro che è il settimo nel qual si tratta de l’istoria necessaria al pititore’.

7 See in particular Trottmann H., “La circolazione delle stampe come veicolo culturale nella produzione figurativa del XVII e XVIII secolo”, Arte Lombarda 98/99 (1991) 9–18. At the same time, artists’ sketch books kept their function as repositories of first-hand copies of works of art.

8 Armenini Giovanni Battista, De’ veri precetti della pittura (Ravenna, Francesco Tebaldini: 1587) 209: ‘per l’invenzioni, & per i soggetti del far le pitture, li giovaranno grandemente’.

9 Some examples are given by Trottmann, “La circolazione” 16, who also explicitly posed the question on ‘il rapporto che si veniva a stabilire tra citazione e invenzione’.
Fortunately, a *post mortem* inventory of Legnani’s library is known, and it reflects much of what has been said so far. With over 70 titles, he owned a substantial collection of books, and the inventory also lists several bundles of prints, apparently ordered along subject matter, amounting to well over a 1000 pieces.\(^\text{10}\) His collection of books is sizeable, but in content on the whole much like those of other artists. As with all *post mortem* library inventories, some caveats apply. Not all books in a library may have been actually read, not all books that someone read may have been in his possession, and books may have left a library before an inventory was made.\(^\text{11}\)

Also, caution is needed in attributing an inventory in the first place. The anonymous inventory once believed to be of Pietro da Cortona’s library, and the way the library of Gian Lorenzo Bernini’s brother has been presented and used as *de facto* representing Bernini’s own books are telling examples.\(^\text{12}\) In Legnani’s case it is probable that some of his books were inherited from his father Ambrogio (some volumes actually explicitly state so [nr. 25, 75]), and some may have been shared with or co-owned by his brother Tommaso, who was also a painter.

Yet, if these caveats are taken into account, the library inventory does allow for some conclusions. There is a considerable number of books printed in Milan and Turin, the two cities where Legnani lived and executed some of his most important works. Some have explicitly Milanese or Torinese subjects (e.g. its nobility, or wars [nr. 58, 14]), and others were written by Lombard authors, such as the three books by the Arcadian poet Francesco De Lemene (1634–1704) from Lodi [nr. 46, 48, 51]. This suggests


that besides his professional interests, Legnani bought books in and about the places where he lived and worked. To some extent this is even true for his professional library; Legnani owned two copies of Lomazzo’s treatise (who was from Milan) [nr. 34], and he may have acquired Malvasia’s Felsina pittrice while he studied with Carlo Cignani in Bologna [nr. 31]. Apparently, Legnani continued to buy books throughout his life, as is suggested by the termini post quem provided by some items in his collection, such as a biography of St. Catherine of Genoa that was published in 1712, a year before his death [nr. 59]. Given their wide appeal, it is also not surprising to find such devotional classics as Thomas à Kempis’ Imitation of Christ and Francis of Sales’ Introduction to the Devout Life [nr. 66, 70]. Both were highly popular devotional works found in many libraries.\footnote{Given their popularity, I do not think, as Dell’Omo, Stefano Maria Legnani 5, has said, that the presence of these books are an ‘indubbio segnale’ of Legnani’s connections to a Milanese lay confraternity. They were also owned (or at least recommended) by Bernini, see McPhee, “Bernini’s books” 442, who quotes Bernini himself as reported in Chantelou’s journal.}

Before turning to some specific connections that link Legnani’s books and prints to his paintings, it is worth pointing out that his library agrees with some of the recommendations made by Armenini as to what books were useful for a painter. His library contained works of religious history, episodes from the Old and New Testaments, and a life of the Virgin, as well as books on Roman history, such as Plutarch’s Parallel Lives [nr. 19] and Appian’s Civil Wars [nr. 30]. He also owned Boccaccio’s Famous Women [nr. 12], Cartari’s Imagini degli dei [nr. 11], and Ovid’s Metamorphoses [nr. 35], all of which were among the works listed by Armenini.\footnote{Armenini, De’ veri precetti 209.} These works appear also in the libraries of other seventeenth-century artists, both famous masters and minor figures. Andrea Sacchi’s substantial library also included Plutarch and Appian, while works such as Cartari and Boccaccio are found both among Sacchi’s books and in the library of the otherwise unknown Roman painter Francesco Raspantini, who died in 1667. Also Pietro Testa owned or had access to some of the same books Legnani owned, such as Cartari, Lomazzo, Ripa, and a vernacular edition of Euclid’s Elements.\footnote{For Sacchi’s books see Sutherland Harris A., Andrea Sacchi: Complete Edition of the Paintings with a Critical Catalogue (Oxford: 1977) 122–125. Raspantini’s library formed part of Ago’s study conducted on a large number of seventeenth-century Roman inventories, and is analysed in Ago, Il gusto delle cose 198–201. For Testa see Cropper, The Ideal of Painting 273.} This last title, as well as some other books perhaps more readily associated with an architect (such as Vignola’s Cinque ordini
and an unidentified ‘booklet with some prints of the five orders of architecture’ [nr. 73]) may represent Legnani’s occupation with ceiling decorations and the related quadratura painting. Besides, as Lomazzo had rhetorically asked: ‘how will [a painter] be able to depict houses, palaces, temples, and other buildings before our eyes with his brush, without knowledge of architecture’?17

Another element that characterises Legnani’s library as that of an artist are the many illustrated books; often this must have been one of the reasons he bought them. For instance, the inventory lists two copies of Tasso’s Gerusalemme liberata. [nr. 49] It is tempting to conjecture that Legnani (or his father?) bought the edition with the engravings by Bernardo Castello as a second copy because of these illustrations. After all, artists used not only prints but also illustrated books for their own inventions. The illustrations in the Figure de la Biblia of which Legnani owned a copy were for example used by the Flemish artist Peeter de Kempenneer, and Poussin appears to have known and used the book too [nr. 15].18

Another book whose primary appeal must have been its illustrations is the German translation of Vegetius’ De re militari with well over a 100 large, full-page woodcuts of military equipment [nr. 5].19 More obvious is the case of Girolamo Teti’s Aedes Barberinae with its fold-out illustrations of the ceiling decorations by Andrea Sacchi and Pietro da Cortona at Palazzo Barberini [nr. 7].20 The same is probably true for those titles that follow the format of an emblem book or that were in effect sets of prints. Examples of these are Dürer’s and Adriaen Collaert’s sets of prints of the life of Christ [nr. 1, 75], the emblem-like Icones historiarum Veteris Testamenti with engravings by Hans Holbein of the main Old Testament scenes, the similar Figure de la Biblia [nr. 43, 15], or the ‘emblem biogra-

---

16 Though some of the quadratura work was surely done by collaborators, Dell’Omo has argued that part of it was done by Legnani himself. See Dell’Omo, Stefano Maria Legnani i84–i90.
17 Lomazzo, Trattato dell’arte 11: ‘senza cognizione de l’architettura; come potrà co’l pennello rappresentare à gl’occhi case, palazzi, tempij, & altri edificij?’
19 That is, if the ‘large book with images of soldiers and military art with explanation in German’ is indeed, as I propose here, the Vier Bücher der Ritterschaft. I have seen the Augsburg 1534 edition at Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale, Magl.12.1.69.
phy’ of St. Catherine of Siena with engravings by Cornelius Galle based on designs by Jan van der Straet (called Stradanus) [nr. 71].

Legnani’s library and his artistic production still await a full cross-scrutiny in order to understand the extent to which he made use of his library and print collection, but a few examples make clear that he did use prints to ‘enrich’ his own inventions, as this practice has been called. In one of four friezes with stories of Bacchus and Ariadne, painted for a palace in Milan, a girl carrying a basket on her head is directly derived from a detail in Annibale Carracci’s *Triumph of Bacchus* that forms the centre of the Farnese gallery ceiling [Fig. 1a–b]. Although it is well possible that Legnani saw the actual gallery in Rome, he doubtless relied on Carlo Cesio’s set of prints published in 1657 when he introduced the motive in his own work. Another visual borrowing can be found in a *Preaching of St. John the Baptist* painted for S. Angelo ai Frati Minori in Milan. The group of the woman-and-child with the second woman bending towards her, appears to be adapted from a similar group in one of the lateral scenes of Pietro da Cortona’s *Allegory of Divine Providence* ceiling at Palazzo Barberini [Fig. 2a–b]. Again, by means of the prints in the *Aedes Barberinae*, of which he owned a copy, Legnani had easy access to Cortona’s work. There is, however, a difference between Legnani’s two borrowings. Whereas he adapted a group of figures from Cortona’s *Divine Providence* ceiling for a *Preaching of St. John the Baptist*, he borrowed the girl with the basket from Carracci’s *Triumph of Bacchus* for his own frieze with the same subject. This suggests that in this last case Legnani deliberately aimed at being discovered. In other words, his quotation of Carracci’s girl-with-basket in his own *Triumph of Bacchus* is a small example of Annibale Carracci becoming to some degree a co-author of Legnani’s work. Such ‘explicitly allusive imitation’ not only required, as Cropper has written,

21 I have seen the *Icones historiarum Veteris Testamenti* (Lyons, Jean Frellon: 1547) at Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, St. 8675 and the *Figure de la Biblia* (Lyons, Guillaume Rouillé: 1564) at Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale, Landau Finaly 394. The Catherine of Siena biography was published in facsimile as *D. Catherinae Senensis […] vita ac miracula*, ed. L. Bianchi (Rome: 1940).

22 Trottmann, “La circolazione” 16.

23 *Dell’Omo, Stefano Maria Legnani* 120–121, and 206–208 for pictures. The four friezes are now owned by the town of Saronno.

24 Ibid., 201–202 and 109 for a picture.

25 For other examples of such deliberate imitations and/or borrowings see Cropper, *The Domenichino Affair* and Loh, “New and Improved”. The matter is related to the *active* role of he who is influenced, see e.g. the pages on “influence” in Baxandall M., *Patterns of Intention: On the Historical Explanation of Pictures* (New Haven: 1985) 58–61.
knowledgeable readers cognizant of the sources imitated’, but also a conception of authorship and artistic creation that favours referentiality and collaborative authorship.  

As said, these considerations become more complex when multiple sources and multiple actors are involved. Not only can artists use both textual and visual sources for (details of) their pictorial inventions, these can also overlap, and are at times deliberately made to overlap. Apart from leading to theorising on the parallel workings of poetry and painting, Horace’s *ut pictura poesis* also simply meant, as Armenini writes, that ‘the one uses that which belongs to the other’, with descriptions being turned

---


27 For just one example of the parallel use of texts and images see the considerations in Ginzburg C., “Tiziano, Ovidio e i codici della figurazione erotica nel Cinquecento”, in ibid., *Miti emblemi spie: Morfologia e storia* (Turin: 1986) 133–157.
into images and vice versa. Secondly, besides the authors evoked by the artist through allusion or imitation, the authorship of the patron and, in some cases, a learned adviser, are to be taken into account as well.

The Painter: Legnani’s Hercules Ceiling at Palazzo Carignano

We find evidence of the interaction of such a web of actors and sources in relation to the series of ceiling decorations that Legnani and his collaborators executed at Palazzo Carignano in Turin in 1695–1698 and 1699–1703. The palace was the last great project on which the Modenese architect

---


Guarino Guarini worked before he died in 1683. It was built for Emanuele Filiberto of Savoy-Carignano, who was born in 1628 as the first son of Tommaso of Savoy-Carignano (1596–1656), the first to hold the title of prince of Carignano, and Marie Anne de Bourbon Soissons. In the 1680’s the Carignano line of the Savoy and the prince himself had become possible heirs to the ducal title, and although this never materialised, Palazzo Carignano is an expression of the family’s aspirations.30

The rooms are decorated with personifications and various scenes from Ancient history and mythology, including episodes from the life of Scipio, triumphs of Psyche and of Diana, and a triumph of Hercules, on which I will focus here. The Hercules room was decorated during the second decoration phase with an Apotheosis of Hercules on the ceiling, and two lunettes with Hercules on the funeral pyre and Hercules and Iole, all within a decorative quadratura setting that comprised small cartouches with some of the hero’s labours [Figs. 3, 4, 5].31 So far there has been some speculation on, but no concrete evidence of, who was responsible for the iconographic programme for the fresco decorations. The names of some courtiers at Emanuele Filiberto’s court have been suggested, and given his interest in architecture and the arts also the prince’s own close involvement has been argued.32 However, the examples given above make clear that Legnani did indeed use his library for his work as a painter, and the books he owned show that he would have been more than able to assemble literary and visual material in order to come up with a room painted with the labours and apotheosis of Hercules. He could have used reference works such as Cartari’s Imagini degli dei [nr. 11], who himself had written that Hercules’ labours ‘give material for making several images’, Boccaccio’s Genealogia de gli Dei [nr. 18], and the chapbook with stanzas and illustrations of


31 Dell’Omo, Stefano Maria Legnani 187, cat. 55a–55e. The original use of the room is not clear. Mirrors and elaborate gilded woodcut work were added to the walls some decades later. A view of the room is in Dardanello G. (ed.), Sperimentare l’architettura: Guarini, Juvarra, Alfieri, Borra e Vittone, (Turin: 2001) 71, plate 23.

Fig. 3. [COL. PL. 13] Stefano Maria Legnani, *Apotheosis of Hercules*, 1699–1703. Turin, Palazzo Carignano (photo: Soprintendenza per i Beni storici, artistici ed etnoantropologici del Piemonte).
Fig. 4. Stefano Maria Legnani, Hercules and Iole, 1699–1703. Turin, Palazzo Carignano (photo: Soprintendenza per i Beni storici, artistici ed etnoantropologici del Piemonte).

Fig. 5. Stefano Maria Legnani, Hercules at the Funeral Pyre, 1699–1703. Turin, Palazzo Carignano (photo: Soprintendenza per i Beni storici, artistici ed etnoantropologici del Piemonte).
Hercules’ labours [nr. 62]. Also his large collection of prints could well have provided him with visual models of Hercules scenes.

In fact, some of the details in the two lunettes, which Dell’Omo attributes to Legnani’s brother and co-operator Tommaso, can be shown to derive from books that Legnani owned. A small clue in the lunette depicting Hercules on the funeral pyre suggests that Legnani consulted Anguillara’s verse paraphrase of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, of which his inventory lists two copies [nr. 63]. After having given his bow and arrows to Philoctetes, Hercules, dressed in the poison-drenched shirt sent to him by Deianira, directs his lament to the heavens, steps onto the pyre, and asks his friend to set it afire. All this is in Ovid and other sources, but Anguillara adds a line that tentatively allows us to identify it as Legnani’s source: Hercules, he writes, ‘kisses his friend, *who, weeping, watches him*, and then he mounts the pyre with an encouraged heart’. This corresponds to what Legnani has depicted. The reliance on vernacular versions of Latin classics is in line with what we know from other artists: also Titian and Poussin had used Anguillara’s popular verse paraphrase of Ovid.

This is not where Legnani stopped browsing his library. The other lunette depicts Hercules’ submission to Iole (or Omphale in another version), to whom the hero had been sold as a slave by Mercury. This was a popular anecdote, and it is found in many sources. Hercules was made to wear women’s clothes, had his hair perfumed, and was spinning wool while Iole took his lion skin and club. Perhaps the most easily accessible of the sources were Boccaccio’s *Delle donne illustri* and *Genealogia de gli dei*, although the primary classical source is Ovid’s *Heroides*. Legnani owned both Boccaccio titles in Italian translation [nr. 12, 18].

---


34 Dell’Omo, *Stefano Maria Legnani* 188. Legnani was probably responsible for the composition, though Tommaso must have had access to his brother’s library as well.


the detail of the cupid that points to the effeminate hero, gloating over his situation, derives from a later source, either visual or textual. The same motive also appears in Annibale Carracci’s fresco with the same subject in the Farnese gallery. In the description of the gallery that Giovanni Pietro Bellori gives in his life of Carracci in the Vite, he points out that this detail derives from Tasso’s Gerusalemme liberata. Some years earlier, he had already provided the reference to Tasso and a less extensive description of Carracci’s image in the texts that accompanied Cesio’s set of prints of the Farnese gallery; a set that, as we saw earlier, Legnani probably owned.

As Bellori writes, Carracci follows Tasso’s description of a sculpted relief at the entrance of Armida’s enchanted palace:

Mirasi qui fra le meonie ancelle  
Favoleggiar con la conocchia Alcide.  
Se l’inferno espugnò, resse le stelle,  
Or torce il fuso; Amor se ’l guarda, e ride.  
Mirasi Iole con la destra imbelle  
Per ischerno trattar l’armi omicide;  
E indosso ha il cuoio del leon, che sembra  
Ruvido troppo a si tenere membra.

This is an instance of the intricate web between texts and images that Bellori weaves, for in his description in the Vite, Bellori draws some of his descriptions directly from Tasso. He too speaks of Iole’s ‘destra imbelle’ and the ‘cuoio del leone’ that seems ‘ruvido troppo alle sue delicate membra’. Thus, both Carracci and Bellori imitated Tasso’s example, each in their own medium. The cross-references between Tasso, Carracci,
and Bellori constitute precisely the taste for referentiality and the intertwining of visual and textual sources that were mentioned earlier. With regard to Legnani’s *Hercules and Iole*, the question is then: did he follow Tasso, Carracci or Bellori? He did not imitate Carracci’s composition, but adopts only that element which derives directly from Tasso. He owned two copies of the *Gerusalemme liberata*, but it is unlikely that he turned directly to Tasso when pondering the details the lunette with *Hercules and Iole*. Rather, Legnani may have been leafing through his print collection for ideas or looking up Carracci’s *Hercules and Iole* purposely, when Bellori’s reference to Tasso inspired him to include the detail of the mocking Cupid, as a nod to the informed viewer.

As Dell’Omo has remarked, the main scene with the *Apotheosis of Hercules* on the ceiling of the room can be related to two other decorations with the same subject that Legnani had painted in private palaces in Turin and Bergamo. In 1694, a year before he started work at Palazzo Carignano, he had decorated the ceiling of a room in the Torinese residence of count Ottavio Provana di Druent with Hercules who is received on Olympus by Jove and Juno [Fig. 6].

A very similar idea appears on the ceiling he painted at Palazzo Carignano. In this version, Jove receives Hercules without Juno, but both the posture of Hercules and the figure of Mercury who points to him clearly recall the slightly earlier ceiling. The version in Bergamo, which Dell’Omo tentatively dates to the early years of the eighteenth century, shows Hercules in a position similar to the two other versions. The scene of Hercules’ apotheosis was recounted in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, where we read that the hero ‘kept traces now only of Jove, and as a snake will slough age with its skin and revel in fresh life, so Hercules, his mortal frame removed, through all his finer parts gained force and vigour’. The metaphor of Hercules ‘disrobing’ his mortality thus comes from Ovid’s original text, but an iconographical detail in the ceiling in Palazzo Carignano allows us, again, to connect it

---


45 Dell’Omo, *Stefano Maria Legnani* 170, cat. 27.

Fig. 6. Stefano Maria Legnani, *Apotheosis of Hercules*, 1694. Turin, Palazzo Falletti Barolo, formerly Provana Druent (photo: Soprintendenza per i Beni storici, artistici ed etnoantropologici del Piemonte).
to Anguillara’s vernacular paraphrase. As opposed to the two versions in Turin and Bergamo, the scene in Palazzo Carignano shows Jove putting a mantle of stars on Hercules’ shoulders. This idea appears to derive from Anguillara, who writes: ‘since the ruler of heaven saw his son deprived of his terrestrial dress, […] he dressed him with stars’. These connections to books in Legnani’s library suggest that he himself was responsible for the details of the invention.

*The Adviser: A Decoration Programme and Its Use*

However, a detailed programme that lays out a decoration project for the main oval hall on the piano nobile of Palazzo Carignano has turned up in the papers of a Bolognese aristocratic family. It was written by count Ercole Agostino Berò, a nobleman from Bologna who was known in the city’s academic and artistic circles, and who had served at the court of the Savoy. Malvasia mentions Berò at several points in his *Felsina pittrice*, remarking among other things that he practised ‘the exercise of the brush, which he handles rather well’, and among his notes for the preparation of the book is an anecdote that took place when Berò visited the studio of Alessandro Tiarini, recounted to Malvasia by Berò himself. The interior of the great oval hall of Palazzo Carignano, including its vault, has

---

47 These stars were still visible on a pre-1935 photo published in Dell’Omo, *Stefano Maria Legnani* 89. A photo from 1935 shows heavy damage to the frescoes, and the mantle’s present state with the faintly discernible lighter spots is likely the result of a restoration from the second half of the 1930’s (as deduced by dr. Guerrini, e-mail dd. 8 March 2010).

48 Ovid – Anguillara, *Le metamorfosi* fol. 158v, ‘Come restar de la terrena veste vede il rettor del cielo il figliuol privo, […] di stelle il veste’.

49 The manuscript was found in the papers of the Ranuzzi family, now partly in Austin: *Ercole deificato favola da rappresentarsi in pittura nel palazzo del serenissimo principe Filiberto di Savoia detto il prencipe di Carignano in Torrino pensiero del sig’ co: Ercole Agostino Berò*, University of Texas at Austin, Harry Ransom Center, Ranuzzi Papers, Ph. 12884, fols. 168r–189v. On the Ranuzzi papers see Zevelechi Wells M.X., *The Ranuzzi Manuscripts* (Austin: 1980). An article with a transcription of the complete document is planned for publication elsewhere.

changed several times between the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, but it appears Berò’s programme was never executed in the first place.\(^{51}\)

However, Legnani’s *Apotheosis of Hercules* ceiling in the room on the ground floor matches the central scene of Berò’s proposal to some degree. This partial correspondence makes it unlikely that the same scene had originally appeared on both ceilings, but it also shows that Berò’s decoration programme did reach Legnani, and that he made use of it. Berò describes the central scene thus:

In the middle of the aforementioned azure-blue sky a Hercules shall be painted on a triumphal cart, in the guise of a young man, robust but of a noble idea, and with a beautiful tone of skin, because he should be considered as having disrobed his mortality, as well as having received a divine form from Jove, of whom he was considered to be a son. With his left foot he will press the head of a dragon, while holding a lion with one hand and grabbing his club with the other. These signs are appropriate to him for reason of his being placed among the stars out of regard for his labours, and because he is in fact represented in that way by Ovid when he describes him as ascended into heaven.\(^{52}\)

A comparison with Legnani’s painted ceiling shows that the painter did not adopt the triumphal cart and the vanquished dragon that Berò had suggested, but he did represent the hero as a young man, with a lion skin and in one hand a club. A closer correspondence between the programme and Legnani’s ceiling is the case for Berò’s further detailed descriptions of the scene:

In the part that is most in sight of the eye, Juno can be placed as goddess of the air, and close to her Pallas, and the circle can be continued with Diana, Minerva, and Mercury, and then Apollo, Mars, and Saturn. And in order to confer a certain expressivity in each of the said figures, so that they do not seem to be there just to arrive at a certain number, it will be good to oper-

---


\(^{52}\) Berò, *Ercole deificato* fols. 185v–186r, ‘Si dipingerà nel bel mezzo dell’aria celeste sudetta un Ercole su carro di trionfo in sembianza di giovonotto robusto; ma di nobile idea, e di carnagione bella; perché deve considerarsi come svestito della mortalità, oltre l’haver contratto forma divina da Giove di cui fu finto figliuolo; col piē sinistro dovrà premere il capo ad un drago tenendo per mano un leone, e con l’altro impugnando la clava, segni a lui convenienti, per essere in riguardo delle di lui fattiche stati trasferiti fra le stelle, e perché in tal guisa appunto è rappresentato da Ovidio, quando lo descrive asceso in cielo’. 

ate in such a way that Juno, with a noble attitude, is depicted in conversation with Pallas, but that while doing this she shows an attitude of irritation towards Jove, as an indication of the envy or rancour she has because of that ceremony, in order to adhere to the Poet, who imagined that, because of the hate she felt towards Hercules, there was no other god but Juno who disliked his assumption into heaven, and who grieved about Jove. Besides this, it will be good to show within a small distance of the others Mercury, Minerva, and Apollo, they too in the act of reciprocal jubilation amongst each other, but with their gaze and action directed towards Jove.53

The group on the bottom right-hand corner (‘most in sight of the eye’) of Legnani’s ceiling represents indeed Juno ‘in conversation with Pallas’, both with their customary attributes, while showing Juno’s ‘irritation towards Jove’. Diana with her bow is depicted to their right. The two gods on the upper-left side of the scene are Mercury and Apollo, ‘with their gaze and action directed towards Jove’. For some reason Apollo holds a staff with vine-tendrils, but his physique and the lyre that sits on a cloud below him identify him. Minerva, who is often confounded with Pallas, is not present in Legnani’s scene, unless she is the goddess leaning on Apollo’s lyre. In a final note on the disposition of the gods, Berò writes that Mercury, Minerva and Apollo are in this state of ‘reciprocal jubilation’, because Apollodorus writes that after Hercules had learned how to use the Eurytian bow and arrow, he then received the arrows from Apollo, the sword from Mercury, and from Minerva his mantle, so that, since one can deduce from this that these deities were favourable to him, the painter will be right in having them express an act of jubilation that is different from those of the other ones, and which is very appropriate in contrast to Juno, because paintings result much more enjoyable with such variety, and they render the painter’s talent more praiseworthy.54

53 Ibid. fols. 186v–187r, ‘Nella parte più in vista dell’occhio si potrà collocare Giunone come Dea dell’aria, e vicina ad essa Pallade, e seguitar il giro con Diana, Minerva, e Mercurio; indi con Apollo, Marte, Saturnoque. E per conferire una certa espressiva [sic] in cadauna di dette figure; onde non sembrino intradotte per far numero converà operare in maniera, che Giunone sia figurata in attitudine nobile sì a confabulare con Pallade, ma che mostrì con essa un atto dispettoso diretto a Giove, indicante l’invidia, o il rancore che ha per tal funzione, e ciò per aderir al poeta che finge non esservi stata altra deità che Giunone per l’ odio che portava ad Ercole che havesse a male la di lui esaltatione in Cielo, e mormorarasse di Giove. Oltre di ciò sarà bene far vedere in poca distanza dall’altrè Mercurio, Minerva et Appoline in atto anch’essi d’un reciproco giubilo fra di loro, rivolgendo però il guardo, e l’attione verso Giove’.

54 Ibid. fol. 187v, ‘perché scrive Apollodoro, che doppo haver Ercole imparato di tirar l’arco eurito consegui dappoi gli strali da Apollo la spada da Mercurio, e da Minerva il manto, si che dovendosi di ciò argomentare che queste deità fossero di lui partiali a ragione potrà il pittore far loro esprimere un’atto di giubilo differente dall’altrè, e cade
Interesting for the present argument is that many of these learned references can be traced with certainty to standard iconographical handbooks. At several points, including the passage where he refers to Apollodorus, Berò actually quotes from Cartari’s *Imagini de i dei de gli antichi*. Another example is when he explains why the poplar was sacred to Hercules, and also the two lists of Hercules’ labours, for two different parts of the oval hall, were partly gleaned from Cartari. It would be too reductive to call Berò’s programme ‘a routine compilation from secondary sources’, as Dwight Miller characterised Giacomo Castelvetro’s programme for an early seventeenth-century decoration cycle in Modena, but the basic principle and the types of books both men used are the same. This goes to show that, at least in this case, the erudition of the ‘learned adviser’ relied to some extent on the same books the artist himself had at his disposal.

Another case in point is the detail of the mantle of stars that Jove puts on Hercules’ shoulders. As said above, this idea appears to derive from Anguillara’s paraphrase of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*. The fact that Legnani owned this book seemed a clear indication that he himself came up with the idea of including this element in his composition. However, this detail is also given in Berò’s decoration programme:

In the vicinity of him [Hercules], Jove shall be depicted in such a place and position that he stands quite a bit higher than the other one, and he is in the act of putting an all-resplendent mantle of stars on his shoulders, an
act which he should perform with majesty and great abandon, with a grave but joyful face, in order that the satisfaction that this deity feels in performing this task may be clearly understood from his outward appearance. And these will be the two principal figures of the fable, and they will be positioned with a view *di sotto in su* with much study and skill, in order that they appear without the slightest cause for criticism.59

This suggests that Berò used Anguillara’s text too. In fact, besides the detail of the mantle of stars, Berò also writes that his description of Hercules’ club and lion skin, and his position to the dragon (a reference to the constellation of Hercules in relation to that of Draco) was ‘represented in that way by Ovid’, even though these details cannot be found in the *Metamorphoses*. They are recounted in astronomical works such as Hyginus’ *Poetica astronomica*, a text which Berò may have known, considering that he was interested in astrology.60 But they appear also in a verse from Anguillara’s paraphrase of Ovid, together with the mantle of stars and the triumphal cart that Berò mentions, and this explains why Berò attributes these details to Ovid as well:

```
Come restar de la terrena veste
Vede il rettor del cielo il figliuol privo,
Ver Borea il chiama al regno alto, e celeste
Su'l carro trionfal pomposo, e divo.
A la Lira vicin di stelle il veste;
Secondo andò, mentre qua giù fu vivo.
Col piè sinistro il capo al drago aggrava,
Tien l’un pugno il leon, l’altro la clava.61
```

59 Berò, *Ercole deificato* fol. 186r, ‘In vicinanza di esso si dovrà esprimer Giove in sito, e positura tale, che sopravanzi alquanto l’altro, e che stia in atto di porgli alle spalle un manto di stelle tutto luminoso, il qual atto dovrà esercitar con maestà, e disinvoltura grande, con volto grave si, ma però lieto, acciò si comprenda nell’esterno del nume la sodisfattione ch’ei sente nell’adempire tale attione, e queste saranno le due figure principali della favola che dovranno essere situate alla veduta di sotto in su con molto studio, ed arte acciò che appariscano senza nota di reprensione’.


61 Ovid – Anguillara, *Le metamorfosi* fol. 158v. ‘Since the ruler of heaven saw his son deprived of his terrestrial dress, he called him northward to the high and celestial realm on a magnificent and divine triumphal cart. Near Lyra he dressed him with stars; he went there just as he had been while he was alive: with his left foot he tramples the dragon’s
It is important to distinguish between prescriptive programmes in the true sense and descriptive *ex post facto* explanations. Berò’s programme belongs to the former category, but it adopts the language and rhetorical means often associated with the latter type. Decoration programmes that are meant to just give the necessary information to the artist (and patron) are usually not this elaborate. For instance, the programme for Sacchi’s *Divine Wisdom* ceiling in Palazzo Barberini ‘wastes no words and avoids rhetorical circumlocutions’, as Scott has written. Berò’s programme, on the other hand, is a conscious rhetorical exercise. His text is more formal and more public. The ekphrasis of the architecture of the oval hall and the prolix displays of (borrowed) erudition would not have been of much practical use to the painter. The document must be seen not as a strictly private exchange between patron and adviser, but as a semi-public service of a courtier to a prince. That a copy of Berò’s programme was found in the papers of a Bolognese noble family suggests in itself already that the document had some degree of circulation, and was of interest beyond its ostensible goal of merely informing the prince and the artist.

While the text was addressed to and written for Emanuele Filiberto, some of its elements show that Berò was not reluctant to show his own identity and pride as a citizen of Bologna. When he writes that Hercules and Jove should be depicted with a skilful *di sotto in su*, he may have been alluding to Ludovico Carracci’s *Hercules received on Olympus by Jove*, which formed part of a decoration cycle around Hercules in Palazzo Sampieri [Fig. 7]. When writing on the *quadratura* that was to encircle the main scene with the *Apotheosis of Hercules*, he suggests (as followed by Legnani) that it be ‘of the colour of gilded bronze, similar to the one that one admires painted in the first vault of the chapel of the Rosary in San Domenico in Bologna’. And in his ‘notes to the painter’

head, one fist holds the lion, the other the club’. Note that whereas Hyginus tells which hand holds what, Berò, like Anguillara, does not.

65 Berò, *Ercole deificato* fol. 177r, ‘un ornato in quadratura di color bronzo dorato alla similitudine di quello che dipinto s’ammira nel catino primo della capella del rosario in San Domenico di Bologna’. The ceiling decorations (1655–1657) are one of the masterpieces of Agostino Mitelli and Angelo Michele Colonna, see Lademann C., *Agostino Mitelli 1609–1660: Die bolognesische Quadraturmalerei in der Sicht zeitgenössischer Autoren* (Frankfurt
on the importance of variation, he writes that ‘the fame of Guido Reni, the famous painter of our time, will never become less, for he was unique in expressing ideas that were heavenly and completely different’. There is perhaps also a touch of family pride in these remarks, because the casa Berò had been the location of the Carracci academy, and Ercole Agostino

Fig. 7. Ludovico Carracci, Hercules Received on Olympus by Jove, 1593–1594. Bologna, Palazzo Sampieri (photo: Soprintendenza per i beni storici, artistici ed etnoantropologici per le province di Bologna, Ferrara, Forlì-Cesena, Ravenna e Rimini).

---

66 Ibid. fol. 188v, ‘mai non verrà meno la fama di Guido Rheni pittor famoso de’ nostri tempi per esser stato unico nell’esprimere idee celesti, e tottalmente diverse’.

---

was a descendent of one of the two cousins that had commissioned Reni’s *Massacre of the Innocents* for the Berò family chapel in S. Domenico. Moreover, these phrases show that, like Legnani, also Berò relied on both textual and visual sources for his invention, and by citing visual examples in his text, he invites the readers of his programme in their capacity as (possible) future viewers of the ceiling in Palazzo Carignano to read that work in a referential mode, in relation to its Bolognese models.

The implications of all this are twofold. Firstly, it complicates the question of invention and pictorial authorship from the point of view of the collaboration between the painter and the adviser. Berò’s detailed prescriptions and the degree to which Legnani followed them in his composition are a clear case of collaborative authorship. That Berò was aware of the cooperative nature of the invention and was sensible to the artist’s stake and interests appears from phrases such as the one cited above on rendering the ‘painter’s talent more praiseworthy’, or his remark on the dragon under Hercules’ foot (which Legnani indeed left out): he does not intend ‘to deny the painter a degree of freedom in positioning these accessory signs in order to add more *brille* to the invention’. It seems clear that Legnani knew and used Berò’s text, but many of the details, as well as the two lateral scenes discussed earlier, are probably his own inventions. Another look at the two other *Apotheoses of Hercules* that Legnani painted provides some more suggestions as to which elements derive from Berò and which were Legnani’s. Like in Palazzo Carignano, the other two versions also have a young Hercules received by a slightly higher placed Jove as the main group, surrounded by groups of other gods, but the ceiling in Palazzo Carignano is the only version that has the mantle of stars, and it is the only version that does not have a welcoming Juno alongside her husband Jove, two choices clearly motivated by Berò’s programme. Also, except for the pointing Mercury who appears in all three versions (though the one in Bergamo points away from the main scene), the precise identities of the gods in Palazzo Carignano, as opposed to their more generic counterparts in the other versions, appear to be prompted by Berò’s text too.

The second element that complicates the question of pictorial authorship is the fact that Legnani and Berò relied at least in part on the same sources:

---

67 Berò, *Ercole deificato* fol. 186r, ‘[…] non intendendomi però di limitare al pittoire una tal qual libertà nel disponere questi segni accessorij in caso di aggiungere maggior brio all’inventione’.
both used books such as Cartari, or Anguillara's vernacular *Metamorphoses*, and in this case they also may have shared some of their visual reference points. Legnani, after all, had studied in Bologna with Carlo Cignani, and the Bolognese artists and works that Berò cites in his programme must also have been known to Legnani. As a further and final step, the collaborative authorship and this web of parallel sources and cross-connections between the painter and the adviser needs to be expanded to include the requirements and involvement of the patron in the process.

*The Patron: Hercules and Dynastic Identity*

In the first few lines of the programme we read that, at the request of Emanuele Filiberto, Berò had proposed several ‘poetic inventions’ to decorate the ‘most noble hall of his palace in Turin’, and that out of these the prince had chosen that of *Hercules Deified* (*Ercole Deificato*). The programme that Berò wrote is, then, a detailed version of one of several propositions, and the decision to depict the apotheosis of Hercules on the ceiling of the main salon was made by the prince himself. Hercules had always been associated with rulers. They could either depict themselves as a new Hercules, or have Hercules and his labours presented as moral *exempla*. In general, there were two ways in which Hercules’ life and labours were exemplary. The more straightforward one was Hercules as an example of physical, military prowess, based on his slaying of monsters and giants. The other, parallel tradition, that also goes back to antiquity, saw Hercules, his labours, and his apotheosis as allegories of virtue conquering vice, and of the triumph of man’s spiritual being over his carnal part. In the seventeenth century both Louis XIV and the Spanish Habsburgs associated themselves with Hercules. Louis XIV consciously styled himself as the Hercules Gallicus, whereas Philip IV had commissioned a

---

68 Ibid. fol. 168r, ‘Conforme a i riveriti comandamenti del serenissimo prencipe di Savoia, ecco fra le poetiche inventioni da me proposte per ornare la nobilissima sala del suo palazzo di Torrino scelta dall’Altezza Sua quella d’Ercole Deificato’.


large cycle of paintings of the twelve labours of Hercules from Francisco de Zurbarán for the great hall of the Buen Retiro, an exceptionally complete representation of the theme.

On their part, the house of Savoy too made prominent use of Herculean imagery in public festivals, gardens, villas, etc. One of the features of the gardens of the ducal hunting lodge, the Venaria Reale, was a prominent Hercules fountain encircled by grotto pavilions. MacDougall has pointed out that its design appears already in one of the stage designs for a ballet performed during the wedding festivities of Margarita of Savoy and Ranuccio Farnese in 1660. Berò must have known at least some of this Savoyen Herculean imagery. He probably knew the Hercules fountain, and he may also have been present at the wedding celebrations of 1660 and seen the ballet being performed, for he had an encomiastic poem printed in celebration of the wedding. Years earlier, in 1645, he had already implicitly linked Emanuele Filiberto’s cousin Carlo Emanuele II with Hercules when he contributed an ode to the celebrations mounted at the occasion of the return to Turin of the eleven-year old heir apparent. This and other Herculean imagery that was used to celebrate the house of Savoy was the general background that prompted the choice for the ceiling of the oval salone.

The programme that Berò devised at the instigation of Emanuele Filiberto taps explicitly into both the allegorical and the military tradition devised around Hercules. In the opening paragraph we read:

the heroic actions that will be seen expressed life-like on the ceilings and upper-ceilings and in other lateral spaces of the hall will make an appropriate object for the eyes of the prince who is its master, because they all regard

---


valorous enterprises, the conquered spoils of victims, or friezes of honour and triumphs of glory. And not by chance the result will in fact be even better, because besides the various allegorico-moral meanings of which the said fable is replete, which are very worthy of the reflections of each modest person, the most serene prince will be able to express in it, as in a mirror no longer feigned but real, the most glorious deeds of his royal forebears, and the most memorable deeds of his great father, who, because of the many encounters with fierce fate that he overcame in leading his armies while he was alive, because of the many fortresses that he either defended or destroyed, and because of the many powerful enemies that were either restrained or defeated by his powerful right hand, was genuinely considered the true Italic Hercules of our age.75

The great exploits of Emanuele Filiberto’s father that Berò extols here were not merely an instance of empty flattery. Tommaso of Savoy-Carignano, the youngest son of duke Carlo Emanuele I, had led armies in battles in Piedmont fighting the French, and in the Low Countries, where he fought the Dutch rebellion. Tommaso was known throughout Europe for his military feats and for defying France and Louis XIV.

For a prince to depict the great deeds of his father in his palace is in line with the advice art treatises had been giving for over a century. Armenini had written for instance:

with regard to loggias that have been painted for lay persons, such as they have in their palaces, some have deemed it appropriate to represent there the memorable deeds of their forebears, such as we can see in ancient times done by Antonius Caracalla, who depicted the triumphs of his father there, and the same is said of emperor Severus.76

---

75 Berò, Ercole deificato fols. 168v–169r, ‘l’eroiche attioni che si vedranno espresse al vivo nelle volte, e sopravolte e in altri spatij laterali di essa formeranno adeguato oggetto a gl’occi del principe che n’è il padrone, per essere tutte spettanti a valorose imprese, a conquistate spoglie d’uccisi, o regi d’honore, e a trionfi di gloria. Anzi che accidentalmente, rissulterà ancora in miglior proposito, perché oltre i varij sensi allegorici morali, de’ quali la detta favola è ferace, molto degli preziosi e riflessioni d’ogni morigerato personaggio potranno il serenissimo principe raffigurare in essa, come in specchio non più finto ma reale le attioni più gloriose de’ suoi regij antenati, e le più memorabili del suo gran genitore, il quale per tanti incontri di fiera sorte da lui superati nelle condotte de’ suoi eserciti mentre viveva, per tante piazze, o diffese, o abbatte, per tanti nemici potenti dalla sua destra forte, o frenati, o sconfitti fu realmente stimato il vero Ercole Italic del nostro secolo’.

76 Armenini, De’ veri precetti i81, ‘Ma delle loggie, che sono state dipinte per i secolari, com’è ne’ loro Palagi, è parso bene ad alcuni di farci i gesti memorabili de’ suoi antecesori, si come si vede che anticamente fece Antonio Caracalla, il quale vi figúrò i trionfi del Padre, & del medesimo si dice de Severo Imperatore’. This passage appears to derive from Alberti, who in the Italian version of De re aedificatoria writes the same thing. Alberti Leon Battista, L’architettura […] tradotta in lingua fiorentina da Cosimo Bartoli (Florence,
But even if this was a standard subject for princely palaces, it would seem that Emanuele Filiberto was publicly seen as ‘a son of his father’, and that he himself was much concerned with his father’s reputation. As Berò wrote, the prince’s choice for an *Apotheosis of Hercules* was at least in part motivated as a tribute to his father. At the same time, Emanuele Filiberto’s appropriation of Hercules was perhaps also a reaction to the two major European powers with whom he and the rest of Europe had to deal, and their adoption of Herculean imagery. It is noteworthy, for example, that Zurbarán’s Hercules cycle at the Buen Retiro was executed around 1634, shortly before the young prince and his mother and siblings arrived at the Spanish court, where they would remain for six years. In 1640, when the prince was 12 years old, the family was prevented from leaving and returning to Turin. Emanuele Filiberto’s mother declared ‘that her sons the princes had so much advanced in age that they needed their father’s assistance’, but despite repeated promises and requests the departure was again and again delayed by the king’s ministers.

Seen in this light (that of the intrigue of court life and of the fickleness of fate), Emanuele Filiberto’s later preoccupation with his father’s reputation and the adoption of Hercules as a symbol for his father can be read as both an affirmation of belonging to the league of the great kingdoms of Europe and a moral *exemplum* of stoic resilience. Louis XIV and Philip IV had styled themselves as the French and Spanish Hercules, but Tommaso, as Berò states unambiguously, was ‘the true Italic Hercules’.

---


77 See e.g. an inscription by Emanuele Tesauro for the gardens of the palace of Racconigi, Emanuele Filiberto’s suburban villa, Tesauro E., *Inscriptiones quotquot reperiri potuerunt* (Cologne, Georg Schultz: 1671) 254, ‘Hortorum Raconisiorum Inscriptio exterior. Digniorem hanc aedium formam / quam Thomas princeps a Sabaudia, / bellis implicitus, animo tantum conceperat; / Emmanuel Philibertus Amedeus, / paterni principatus, atque animi successor, / tranquilliore tempestate perfecit’. See also Tesauro E., *Origine delle guerre civili del Piemonte. In seguimento de’ campeggiamenti del principe Tomaso di Savoia […] che serve per apologia contra Henrico Spondano* (Cologne, Giacomo Pindo: 1673) for the prince’s dismay at the criticism on his father in Spondanus’ *Annales ecclesiastici*.


79 Relazione delli trattamenti fatti dalla ministri del rè catolico alla principessa di Carignano moglie del signor principe Tomaso di Savoia per impedirgli la partenza da Spagna e tenerla separata dal principe suo marito, London, British Library, Add. 8316, fols. 192r-245r (199v), ‘che i principi suoi figliuoli erano tanto avanzati nell’età, che necessitavano dell’assistenza del Padre’.
If Emanuele Filiberto’s library is anything to go by, he seems to have leaned towards a stoic attitude to politics. Among many other books of political and military interest, his *post mortem* library inventory lists Seneca’s *De beneficiis*, Tacitus, and multiple editions of Justus Lipsius’ works, including an Italian and a Latin edition of the *Politica*. Berò’s programme follows Cartari’s explanations of the allegorical meanings of Hercules’ labours and his attributes, and their statement that Hercules was a ‘great admirer of prudence and virtue’ must have struck a chord. Also the fact that Ovid describes Hercules as placidly lying down on the funeral pyre reinforces this stoic interpretation.

As said, also for Emanuele Filiberto visual examples may have played a part in his choice of subject for the ceiling of the main hall of his new palace, though they were probably not all as far away as Zurbarán’s Hercules cycle at the Buen Retiro which he last saw more than thirty years before the construction of Palazzo Carignano started. In fact, like Legnani and Berò, he too had an interest in painting, as well as first-hand knowledge of Bolognese art. From 13 December 1684 till the end of May 1685 Emanuele Filiberto lived in exile in Bologna in order to placate a furious Louis XIV, whom he had defied by secretly marrying Caterina d’Este. His interest in art and in Bologna are testified by his library, in which we find Baglione, Bellori, and Vasari, as well as illustrated books on princely art galleries, but also Malvasia’s *Vite*, Masini’s *Bologna perlustrata* (an important guide to the city), and books on Cospi’s natural history museum and the Blessed Catherine of Bologna. Dell’Omo has rightly connected Legnani’s ceilings with Emanuele Filiberto’s library and choice of subject for the ceiling of the main hall of his new palace.
in Palazzo Carignano to Domenico Maria Canuti’s impressive *Apotheosis of Hercules* ceiling in the main hall of Palazzo Pepoli in Bologna. But Canuti’s masterpiece, which he finished in 1670, was in all likelihood not only a precedent for Legnani, but also for Berò and Emanuele Filiberto. In fact, all three men were in Bologna at the same time, and perhaps some contacts were made there that ten years later connected them again in relation to the decoration project for Palazzo Carignano.

**Conclusion**

Why was Berò’s proposal for the oval hall never executed in the space for which it was intended? Was he also involved with the inventions for the other rooms in the palace, or did the prince request a detailed programme only for the important main hall? These and other questions remain unanswered for now, but the survival of the library inventories and the decoration programme, together with a study of the various relations between texts and images, have allowed a less straightforward process of pictorial invention to emerge, one that bears the mark of changing circumstances and of three men’s ideas. Each brought his own interests and expertise to its realisation, and the cooperation results in various allusions, (self-) quotations, and traces of both visual and textual sources: Emanuele Filiberto appears to have had his father’s reputation and French and Spanish appropriations of Hercules in mind, Berò showed pride of his own Bolognese roots, and Legnani could rely on his own earlier depiction of the theme and his library of books and images.

We have seen how not only the artist, but all three men took inspiration from both textual and visual sources. In fact, it has become clear that the complexity of the collaborative process lies not only in a differentiation and extension of the number of sources, but also in their overlapping. Besides examples such as Canuti’s Hercules ceiling that were likely an inspiration to patron, adviser, and artist alike, Berò and Legnani also relied in part on the same books. One reason for this was the wide dissemination

---

of various types of reference books, which made detailed information on various topics easily available also to non-specialists. Berò’s programme is important precisely because the connections between pictorial details and Legnani’s own books appear to speak against such a document. Some degree of collaborative authorship is true for all artistic creation. Although we often lack the sources to document the process to the extent that was possible here, the unexpectedly complex case of the *Apotheosis of Hercules* at Palazzo Carignano has, with a fair amount of detail, brought to the fore to what degree the realisation of such a work of art and its pictorial invention could be the result of the collaborative authorship of the patron, adviser, and artist.
Selective Bibliography


ARMENINI GIOVANNI BATTISTA, *De’ veri precetti della pittura* (Ravenna, Francesco Tebal-dini: 1587).


BOCCACCIO GIOVANNI, *Delle donne illustri tradotto di Latino in volgare per M. Giuseppe Betussi* (Florence, Filippo Giunti: 1596).


Lomazzo G.P., Trattato dell’arte de la pittura (Milan, Paolo Gottardo Pontio: 1584).


Panofsky E., Hercules am Scheidewege und andere antike Bildstoffe in der neueren Kunst (Berlin: 1930).
Sandrart Joachim von, L’Academia todesca della Architecture, Scultura & Pittura, oder Teutsche Academie (Nuremberg, Johann-Philipp Miltenberger: 1675).
Tesauro Emanuele, Inscriptiones quotquot reperiri potuerunt (Cologne, Georg Schultz: 1671).
———, Origine delle guerre civili del Piemonte. In seguimento de’ campeggiamenti del principe Tomaso di Savoia […] che serve per apologia contra Henrico Spondano (Cologne, Giacomino Pindo: 1673).
Appendix
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Milan, Archivio di Stato, Notarile, Atti, Filza 38359.

Nella sala grande al primo piano superiore e verso strada […] Nel cantara di noce in detta sala vi sono le infrascritte cose del fu sig. Steffano Legnani

[1] Libro figurato la passione del Nostro Signore Giesù Cristo di Alberto Dürer
One of Albrecht Dürer’s two engraved Passion series. For some reason, this title was crossed out.


[3] Libro figurato d’architettura del Vignola
Giacomo Vignola, cinque ordini d’architettura. Many editions.

[4] L’entrata in Milano della serenissima Maria Anna austriaca figurato
La pompa della solenne entrata fatta dalla serenissima Maria Anna austriaca […] nella città di Milano. Con la descrizione de gli apparati, & feste (Milan: 1651).

[5] Libro grande con figure de soldati e arte militare con spiegazione in tedesco
Likely a German translation of Vegetius, De re militari, published as the Vier Bücher der Ritterschaft (Augsburg: 1529 and 1534).


[7] Una cartella grande con entro un libro sfogliato figurato, con frontespizio Aedes Barberini

[…] Nella stanza superiore alla sala in faccia la corte dove vi è un arcova […] Nella scanzia sopra il tavolino alla romana nella stanza dell’arcova vi sono li infrascritti libri

[8] Un libro de discorsi claustrali
Prospero da San Giuseppe, Discorsi claustrali sopra la regola del G.P.S. Agostino (Milan: 1704 and 1711).

[9] Altro libro del Brandigi
Clemente Pucciariini, Brandigi del capitan Clemente Pucciariini, aretino (Venice: 1569 and 1602).

[10] Specchio di guera di fra’ Francesco Panigarola
Francesco Panigarola, Specchio di guerra (Bergamo: 1595; Milan: 1604).

Vincenzo Cartari, Imagini dellii dei de gl’antichi. Perhaps the Venice 1674 edition, which is the only one to have ‘delli dei’ rather than ‘degli dei’.

[12] Libro di maestro Giovanni Boccaccio delle done illustri tradotto per messer Giuseppe Bettussi

[14] Altro libro raguaglio istorico opera di Francesco Antonio Tarizzo Torinese

[15] Libro figure della Bibbia illustrate da stanze toscani [sic] per Gabriel Simeoni

[16] Libro delle glorie della Vergine al sagro monte sopra Varrese diocesi di Milano

[17] Libro delle regole per acordar la chitara manoscritto

[18] Libro delle vite di Plutarco cheroneo delli homini illustri greci et romani – duplicato

[19] Libro delle guere civili de Romani d’Apiani Alessandrino


[21] Vocabolario italiano e tedesco scritto secondo la lezione italiana (Vienna: 1692). Also other editions exist, but these two correspond best to the title listed here.

[22] Tomi n. 2 di Felsina pitrice
[32] **Vita del beato** Felice da Cantalice capucino
Several different works carry this title.

[33] **Libro d’Italia travagliata – di Monsignor Vescovo di Bagnara**
Umberto Locati, *Italia travagliata* [...] nella qual si contengono tutte le guerre, sedizioni, pestilenze, & altri travagli, liquali nell’Italia sono stati dalla venuta d’Enea Troiano in quella, infina alli nostri tempi [...] Per il reverendis mo monsig r vescovo di Bagnarea (Venice: 1576).

[34] **Libro del trattato dell’arte della Pittura del Lomazzo – duplicato**

[35] **Libro d’Ovidio Nasone Metamorphosi**
Numerous editions exist.

[36] **Libro della celeste phisonomia di Giovanni Battista della Porta**

[37] **Altro delle guere successe in Italia di Luca Assarino**

[38] **Libro di 2 trattati uno intorno alle otto principali arti dell’orificeria di Benvenuto Cellini**
Benvenuto Cellini, *Due trattati uno intorno alle otto principali arti dell’oreficeria. L’altro in materia dell’arte della scultura* (Florence: 1568).

[39] **Libro della vita del picaro**

[40] **Memorie di alcune virtù del sig. conte Francesco delle Mene**
Memorie d’alcune virtù del signor conte Francesco de Lemene con alcune riflessioni su le sue poesie (Milan: 1706 and 1718).

[41] **Libro dell’Apuleo dell’asino d’oro**

[42] **Pratica d’alcuni esercitij spirituali di s. Ignatio del padre Sebastiano Izchierdo**

[43] **Libro icones istoriarum Veteris Testamenti**
*Icones historiae Veteris Testamenti, ad vivum expressae* (Leyden: 1547).

[44] **Il Giobbe del padre Sinagra**

[45] **Libro dell’ingegna sopra la ingegna di Massimiliano**
Andrea Alciato, *Diverse imprese accommodate a diverse moralità* (Lyons: 1551 or later edition). Legnani’s copy apparently lacked the titlepage and preliminaries. The title was taken from the first *impresa*, on p. 5: ‘Insegna sopra la ingegna di Massimiliano duca di Melano’.

[46] **Altro di regij seculo immortali**
‘Regi seculorum immortali’ is the incipit of a biblical formula (1 Tim 1:17) used in the liturgy of both the Roman and Ambrosian rites. Perhaps this is a book with texts for Corpus Domini for which this was the opening chant in the Ambrosian liturgy.

[47] **Libro d’Orlando furioso dell’Ariosto**
Very many editions exist.

[48] **Poesie diverse del sig. Conte Francesco delle Mene**

[49] **La Gerusalemme liberata di Torquato Tasso con le figure di Bernardo Castello et altro più picolo del medesimo con la vita di lui**
Torquato Tasso, La Gierusalemme liberata di Torquato Tasso con le figure di Bernardo Castello (Genoa: 1590) and La Gierusalemme liberata di Torquato Tasso con la vita di lui e con gli argomenti dell’opera del cav. Guido Casoni (Venice: 1625 and [1665–1667]).

L’Adamo sacra rappresentazione di Giovanni Battista Andreini

Dio. Sonetti ed hinni consagrati al vice dio di Francesco delle Mene

Libro antico coperto con carta pecora vecchia delle medaglie

Libro della breve notizia istorica dello speron doro di Pietro Francesco Bergamaschi
Pietro Francesco Bergamaschi, Breve notizia istorica del pontificio, & imperial Ordine de’ cavalieri aureati à sia dello sperone d’oro (Turin: 1695).

Un libro legato coperto di corame con filetti d’oro, con sopra le lettere D.B.C.G. – con figure in Tedesco

Un libro che descrive gli abiti antichi e moderni di tutto il mondo di Cesare Vecellio
Cesare Vecellio, Habiti antichi et moderni di tutto il mondo (Venice: 1598). The title as listed is closest to this edition, rather than the 1590 or 1664 editions.

Un picol libro delle genesi figurato, legato in corame e suoi bindelli per serarlo

Libro intitolato la penina interprete del penello legato in cartone bianco
Demetrio Suppensio, La penna interprete del pennello è vero la pittura dell’insigne tempio di S. Alessandro in Milano (Milan: 1706).

Libro intitolato la nobiltà di Milano del Moriggia – legato in carta pecora
Paolo Morigia, La nobiltà di Milano (Milan: 1595 and 1619).

Libro intitolato vita mirabilia e dottrina santa della Beata Cattarina da Genova
Cattaneo Marabotto, Vita mirabile e dottrina santa della b. Caterina da Genova Fiesca Adorna scritta dal suo confessore (Milan: 1712).

Libro intitolato il passatempo di Eugenio Raimondi bressiano

Libro intitolato la fonte del diporto, dialogo del sig. Gherardo Borgogni

Libretto senza coperto intitolato le dodeci fatiche d’Ercole figurato
Le dodici fatiche di Hercole tratte da diversi autori con il suo lamento & morte (Florence: post 1550 and Venice: 1603).

Libro intitolato le metamorphosi d'Ovidio dell'Anguilara – duplicato

Libretto intitolato Iliade giocosa del Loredano

Libro intitolato l'Istoria di D. Ferdinando Cortes Marchese della Valle – con coperto di carta pecora, e quattro bindelli verdi
Francisco Lopez de Gomara, Historia di don Ferdinando Cortes marchese della Valle. Four 16th-century Venetian editions.

Un picol libro di divotione intitolato l'imitatione di Christo di Tommas a Chempis in versi, coperto di corame

Libro di poesie [sic] del Petrarcha, e Madona Lauora [sic]
Likely Petrarch’s Canzoniere, but the orthography is puzzling.

Libretto del Pastor fido
[69] Libro intitolato li primi sei libri di Euclide
Euclid, I primi sei libri d’Euclide tratti in volgare (Milan: 1671 and 1701).

[70] Libro intitolato le introdutioni alla vita divota di S. Francesco di Sales, legato alla francese
St. Francis of Sales’s Introduction to the devout life. Very many editions.

[71] Libro figurato col titolo divæ Cattarinæ Senensis
Michel van Ophovens, D. Catharinae senensis virginis SS.mae ord. praedicatorum vita ac miracula selectiora (Antwerp: 1603 or Bassano: 17th–18th century).

[72] Libretto Semiramide del conte Nicolò Maria Corbelli
Nicolò Maria Corbelli, La Semiramide (Venice: 1667).

[73] Libretto con alcune stampe delli 5 ordini d’architettura legato in carta pecora

[74] Libro intitolato della dama di Giovanni Soranzo
Giovanni Soranzo, Dell’Adamo di Gio. Soranzo (Genoa: 1604).

[75] Scritture ritrovate nel tavolino alla romana […]

[75] Un picol libretto col titolo vita Jesus salvatoris varijs iconibus ab Adriano Colard expressa, figurato in stampa di rame con picole stampine, con sopra manuscritto D. Ambrosius Legnanus.
PART THREE

BEYOND THE STUDIO
The richly equipped library of the Augustinian canonry at the Badia Fiesolana by no means aimed primarily at educating the canons, despite the claim of the celebrated Renaissance bookseller Vespasiano da Bisticci in his Vite dei uomini illustri. Instead its benefactors, Cosimo (1389–1464) and Lorenzo de’ Medici (1449–1492), wanted, by means of a thoughtfully-stocked library to encourage decent and educated people to frequent the place [Fig. 1].

From the start of the rebuilding of the canonry (from 1456) and of the library (from 1462) until Cosimo’s death in 1464 it seems that he spent most of the last years of his life in the Badia, where he had his own private cell. He provided housing for his friends near the canonry, and also his intellectual acquaintances, probably the ‘uomini da bene et literati’ as Vespasiano described them. These were Angelo Poliziano (1454–1494), Giovanni Pico della Mirandola (1463–1494) and Roberto Salviati (1459–1523), all of whom lived there for at least a year. Particularly during the period 1490–1491 when both Poliziano and Pico were resident at the Badia, the convent became a popular meeting-place for intellectual discussions. That Cosimo’s wish took root, and was pursued by his grandson Lorenzo is confirmed by Angelo Poliziano’s eulogy on Lorenzo, printed as preface to a text by the abbot, Matteo Bossi. According to Poliziano, the extremely erudite abbot soon became the highest possible model for Pico and himself, Poliziano, a hitherto unprecedented development for the two

---


2 Ademollo Agostino, Marietta de’ Ricci ovvero Firenze al tempo dell’assedio IV (Florence: 1845) 1381, 1384; Raspini G., I monasteri nella diocesi di Fiesole (Fiesole: 1982) 48; Viti V., La Badia Fiesolana (Florence: 1926) 27, note 1.
philosophers, who felt deeply both insufficient. Bossi also described the situation at the Badia, when Pico was his guest. As the abbot testifies, Pico spent the year, at Lorenzo’s invitation profiting from the fruitful *ocium* and stimulus of sacred literary studies, in peaceful furtherance of his own Hebrew and Patristic studies. Utilizing the library on both summer days and during the winter nights he developed into an exceptionally erudite scholar.
Matteo Bossi (1484–1492), pupil of the founding abbot, Timoteo Maffei (ca. 1440–1464), had probably been acquainted with the Medici since 1462, the year in which the library was begun. Bossi benefited personally through this familiarity with the Florentine intelligentsia. Like many of the Florentine intellectual circle he did not align himself openly either with Platonists or Peripatetics; he rather saw himself as primarily a theologian studying Christian philosophy. The neo-Platonist Poliziano’s case is similar. Like many Florentine humanist he was interested in both Platonist and Aristotelian texts. His early scholarly enthusiasms, at the beginning of the 1480s, have already been associated with his friendship with the Dominican Francesco di Tommaso.5 His return to Aristotle at the beginning of the 1490s seems to be due however to his stay at the Badia Fiesolana, where he spent 1490–91 studying together with Pico at the Badia library on Lorenzo de’ Medici’s invitation.

Like some of the other convents in Florence, the Badia had both a library and a school. Both abbots, Timoteo Maffei and Matteo Bossi, were skilled teachers, of monastic novices and lay youths. The Badia school must have focused closely on its library holdings, which remained astonishingly scholastic in outlook, as is shown by an inventory compiled in 1464 shortly before Cosimo’s death. Vespasiano, the bookseller in charge of collection building, testifies to the success of that collection policy. It was completed in that same year, carefully following the literary canon compiled by Tommaso Parentucelli (Pope Nicholas V, 1397–1455). This had been modified to reflect the passage of a generation, correcting it towards more ‘modern’ classical authors and new translations where necessary. To attain the ambition of a library housing every appropriate, all the titles necessary were purposively copied.

If the inventory is followed, reading in this library implied intensive study of patristics and also medieval scholastic texts, with Anselm of Canterbury, Peter Lombard, Hugh of St. Victor, Albertus Magnus, Thomas

Aquinas and Bonaventure all represented, together with an extensive list of texts by Aristotle, and his most important translators and commentators. There followed a classical section with a major emphasis on Cicero, Seneca and some antique historians and grammarians like Valerius Maximus, Suetonius, Varro, Priscian and Servius. The contrast to medieval libraries is to be seen in the extensive patristic section, with its major emphasis on Augustine, together with some non-scholastic medieval authors like Richard of St. Victor and Bernard of Clairvaux, and a weighty commentary section with some new translations of Aristotle and patristic writers by Ambrogio Traversari, Giovanni Argyropolo and Leonardo Bruni. Contemporary scholarship was however largely neglected. Plato himself was virtually absent, approached only by means of Augustine’s Christian Platonism.6

How education worked for the humanists can be demonstrated through the careers of Ficino, Poliziano and Pico della Mirandola. As clerics they had received a scholastic education from a conventual or cathedral school. Scholastic teaching was unavoidable for anyone undertaking the university curriculum, and it was regarded as an important source of knowledge. Later, in the 1480s, both Ficino and Poliziano belonged to the teaching body at the Florentine University, but continued also to give lessons as private teachers [Fig. 2].

As Poliziano wished to further his knowledge in Aristotle and confessed his ignorance, he took private lessons in the 1480s with a close friend, the Dominican Francesco di Tommaso, who taught students the Bible at the conventual school of Santa Maria Novella, and the Sentences and Logic within the framework of its studia generalia. As Francesco himself stated, he intended his commentary on Aristotelian Logic as a compilation for Poliziano.7 This coincides with his stay at the Badia. The fact demonstrates the necessity of scholastic techniques and methodologies for even a humanist professor, and also explains the huge scholastic collection at the Badia. While Poliziano began to teach poetry and rhetoric at the Florentine studio in 1479, using Quintillian and Statius as well as

---

6 Plato was also approached through Early Christian writers such as Boethius and Pseudo-Dionysus. However the more important late antique writers on Plato like Ammonios Sakkas, Plotinus and Porphyry were not present. Texts in the vernacular, novels, courtly literature and moralizations like Petrarch and Boccaccio did not usually belong in a monastic library, nor did literature on the fine arts. Even Alberti, a close friend of Parentucelli, the compiler of the literary canon, was absent from the Badia’s inventory.

7 Hunt, Politian and Scholastic Logic 3–46.
history, he switched to Aristotelian lessons at the beginning of the 1490s, initiating with his philosophy and then in 1490–1491 his Ethics and Physics. In 1491–1493 Poliziano taught two cycles of the Organon.8 He saw the need to present difficult texts to the public in easily accessible and comprehensible versions, as he explains in his foreword to the Lamia, an introduction to Aristotle’s Priora. The difference however in Poliziano’s Aristotelian studies is however, that he approached the ancient philosopher both through the original Greek texts as well as through scholastic translations and commentaries in his desire to present the ‘original’ Aristotle [Fig. 3].

The Badia possessed Suetonius’s Lives of the Caesars and Quintilian’s Istututio oratoria from Poliziano’s 1490/91 teaching cycle. It is very likely that Poliziano’s interest in Aristotle’s Logic influenced the book collection in the Badia, since the strength of the library’s original holdings strong point had been in his Ethics and philosophy. The inventory mentions a donation by Lorenzo of parts of the Organon, including the Metaphysica in two volumes, previously only available in the interpretations of Albert

8 On the teaching cycle see del Lungo I., Angelo Poliziano, Le Selve e la Strega (Florence: 1925) 232–241; Branca V., Poliziano e l’umanesimo della parola (Turin: 1983) 86, note 22.
Fig. 3. Anonymous, *A portrait of a young clergyman* (Sotheby’s New York, 9-1-1980. Lot. 140).
Magnus and Petrus Hispanus. Unlike Poliziano’s last work, the *Centuria secunda*, written in 1493 at Fiesole, it must have been influenced by the Badia’s holdings. In contrast to his first volume the *Centuria prima*, which focuses on classical authors, the *Secunda*’s strengths lies in the writings of the Church Fathers. For Patristic studies he now refers to Greek and Latin authors, such as Athanasius, Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, John Damascene, Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, Isidore, Hugh of St. Victor, Nicholas of Lyra, Thomas Aquinas and others, almost all present in the Badia. Moreover, Poliziano developed in both the classical authors as in the Patristics, the importance of *auctoritates*. Both were commented and annotated, and their important testimonial character was thoroughly discussed. Another revealing improvement in the *Centuria secunda*, which occupies about a fifth of the chapters, is the decisive shift away from Plato and toward Aristotle, and Aristotle’s later followers such as Thomas Aquinas.

Though scholars have suggested that Lorenzo’s private library was responsible for Poliziano’s awakening interest in Patristics, it actually coincides with his stay at the Badia. It is true that he also frequented the private Medici palace library in 1491 and travelled with Pico to northern Italy in the same year to search for Greek and Latin books. Though the Greek books could only have been for Lorenzo’s private library or Poliziano himself, the other volumes instead might have been added to the Badia’s Latin collection. The inventory of the Badia registers new volumes

---

9 The note in the inventory runs as follows: ‘Questiones super sex primos libros philosophiae divinae. Aristotelis et est volumen coopertum corio uiridi positum in capite banchi ante primum librum. Secunda pars questionum super sex libros aristotelis et est volumen coopertum corio rubeo prope librum coopertum de corio uiridi – Que duo preciosa volu-
mina donavit Magnus Laurentius Mediceus Petri filius.’ (Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana, Fiesole 227). Moreover, a new translation of Aristotle’s *De anima* by Johannes Argiropolis was obtained. This occurred some time after the first version of the inventory. The *Ethics* in the Argiropolis translation was at some unknown time removed from the stock, possibly for the purpose of private study.

10 Branca V. – Pastore Stocchi M., *Angelo Poliziano. Miscellaneorum Centuria Secunda* (Florence: 1978) 12–14; Branca, “Poliziano e la libreria Medicea di San Marco”, *Medioevo e umanesimo* 44–45 (1981) 167–187, see 177. In his *Centuria Secunda* Poliziano turns even into juridical studies. It needs checking to see if they depend on the Badia’s law section, or the works of the Fiesolan abbots. On Poliziano’s juridical borrowings in the *Secunda* see: Branca V., “I nuovi studi del Poliziano sulle Pandette nella Centuria Secunda dei Miscel-


in the years of Bossi’s and Poliziano’s involvement with the collection. Since Poliziano’s written discussion of Aristotle began with his stay at the Badia, it is unlikely that it reflects Savonarola’s anti-Platonist views, but rather represents a new scholarly approach to understanding the authentic Aristotle. The same applies to Poliziano’s patristic studies.

Pico della Mirandola, unlike Ficino, Poliziano and like-minded persons, never abandoned his interest in Aristotle, though contemporaneously declaring his interest in Plato. This is why Pico, in a letter to Ficino around 1482, can write quite frankly that after three years in the Peripatetic academy (academia Peripatetica) the Platonica disciplina now really interests him, because both enrich each other. A knowledge of both is thus indispensable. For Pico Aristotle and Plato were equal forerunners of a Christian philosophy. He tried therefore to produce a synthesis of the two philosophers in his work De ente et uno (1491) written during his stay at the Badia in 1490–1491. There he discussed his hypothesis with both Poliziano and Lorenzo. Pico argued there they simply represented

---

13 Even if there are no writings by Poliziano himself represented in the Badia (assuming that the Organon donated through Lorenzo did not come from him), there is an untitled item by Pico della Mirandola. This may have been the Heptaplus which Salviani had printed in 1489 in Florence, and given a copy to Matteo Bossi. Bossi thanked Salviani in a letter printed in the Recuperationes Faesulana (part 1, epistola LXXXIV); see also Perosa A., “Un codice della Badia Fiesolana con postille del Poliziano”, Rinascimento 21 (1981) 29–51, esp. 45. Some other additions included Bossi’s Epistles and his two dialogues, the Catena aurora of Thomas Aquinas, two new translations of Aristotle, Phisicorum and De anima, the Logic of Peter of Spain, Diogenes Laertius and Orosius.

14 Branca, Angelo Poliziano 13 holds the opposite opinion.

15 In Pico della Mirandola Giovanni, Opera omnia (Turin: 1971) 373; Torre A. della, Storia dell’Accademia Platonica di Firenze (Florence: 1902) 753.


different methodologies, but not fundamentally differing opinions. Since late antiquity such a synthesis had often been attempted (Oratio de hominis dignitate). And it is not coincidental that Saint Augustine also spoke positively of such attempts in his work Contra Academicos, a book also present in the Badia library.

Pico’s œuvre in these years was equally dependent on library holdings like the Badia’s, where he claimed to have written the Heptaplus (1489):

Lorenzo dei Medici, emulation of your studies moved me to review the secret books of Moses; since last winter I observed that in whatever leisure was allowed by the republic you enjoyed no other work more often and with more pleasure than in that reading. […] These works of mine, such as they are, the first attempt of my youth so far, are offered to you, most noble Lorenzo, because they are mine and I dedicated and devoted myself to you a long time ago, and because you offered me the retreat in Fiesole, where they were born. This retreat which has also been enlivened by the frequent, I should say continuous, visits of your friend Angelo Poliziano, whose pleasant and fertile mind, I think, now promises a fruit of philosophy as important and mature as, in the past, his literary flowers were varied. […] Most timely, therefore, my work of nocturnal study comes to you […]21

His friend and advisor Roberto Salviati – under whose guidance Pico seemed to have lived for several years at the Badia – was responsible for editing and also distributing the Heptaplus among scholars, as is confirmed by Pico’s personal letter of thanks.22 His tutor at Fiesole Salviati, praises Pico highly in the foreword of the book dedicated to Lorenzo de’ Medici:

[…] he recently dedicated to you a book about the seven-fold account of the six days of Genesis, which is the first fruits of his studies, a work most excellent not only in my judgment but in the judgment of all, I wanted to take pains that this book might be published in a faultless edition at my expense.23

19 ‘Nullum est quaesitum naturale aut divinum in quo Aristoteles et Plato sensu et re non conveniant, quamvis verbis dissidere videantur.’ Pico della Mirandola, Conclusiones paradoxae numero XVII, secundum proprium opinionem, dicta primum Aristotelis et Platonis, see Blum, Giovanni Pico della Mirandola XIII.
20 Pico della Mirandola, De hominis dignitate 49; Blum, Giovanni Pico della Mirandola XIII–XIV.
23 Pico della Mirandola, Heptaplus or Discourse 11.
Like his *Conclusiones* (1486) and *De ente et uno* (1491), the Heptaplus likewise demanded fundamental comparative literary study of patristic and scholastic texts. Pico names a group of *auctoritates* whose writings and approaches are familiar to him, even when he wants methodologically to distance himself from them. The names are for the most part known from the Badia: Ambrose, Augustine, (Strabo), Bede, Remigius, Aegidius Romanus, and Albertus among the Latin writers, (Philo), Origen, Basil, Theodoret, (Apollinarius), Didymus, (Diodorus), (Severus), Eusebius, Josephus, (Gennadius), Chrysostom among the Greeks.24 The principal structural source for the Heptaplus, has been convincingly identified as the *Cantica Canticorum* by Gersonides,25 which was available through several commentaries (Origen, Ambrose, Gregory the Great, Bernard of Clairvaux, Nicholas of Lyra and Thomas Aquinas).

Pico’s narrative of the Biblical Creation required a well-equipped patristic library for a comprehensive investigation of the topic and also numerous commentaries.26 However as Pico explains, he did not wish

---

24 For Pico’s names of auctoritates see: Black, *Pico’s Heptaplus* 70; Pico della Mirandola, *Heptaplus or Discourse* 19. Names given in parenthesis in the text above are missing in the Fiesole inventory.

25 Black, *Pico’s Heptaplus* 70.

to follow well-known exegeses, but to devise his own interpretation of the Creation. It has been argued that for literary studies Pico relied on his own extensive library, and that of the Vatican, where however since 1487 he no longer had access. But some texts were still unavailable in both libraries.\(^{27}\) Instead, the Badia library could clearly supply many of the desired authors, such as Didymus the Blind, Eusebius, and Josephus. It is therefore debatable whether Pico had to rely on the Greek *catena* (*Graecorum patrum catena*) – a compilation of scriptural glosses present in the Vatican for an introduction to their works.\(^{28}\) The Badia provided a large thoughtfully designed overview of Patristic texts, even if a very small number might still be absent. Furthermore the Badia held over half the authors of the Greek *catena*.\(^{29}\)

Apart from the year 1490/91, when he was with Pico, Poliziano spend several summer months in Fiesole, apparently between 1479 and 1494. This period between 1489 and 1492 includes meetings with several friends from the Medici circle, notably Pico, Ficino, Bossi and Roberto Salviati,\(^{30}\) who had fruitful scholarly exchanges and discussed problems of Patristic and Aristotelian studies, the role Cosimo had wished for his Badia – to be frequented by ‘uomini da bene et literati’.

Later, under Lorenzo, this circle of scholars became known as a literary academy, often named the ‘Platonic academy’\(^{31}\). However both Cosimo and Lorenzo sustained literary studies of both, Plato and Aristotle. The

\(^{27}\) Black, *Pico’s Heptaplus and biblical hermeneutics* 70–82. Black gives the names of Latin and Greek authors Pico refers to and argues about their availability in Pico’s own library or the Vatican.

\(^{28}\) Black, *Pico’s Heptaplus and biblical hermeneutics* 73–75 holds the opposite opinion.

\(^{29}\) For a list of author names given in the *catena* see: Black, *Pico’s Heptaplus and biblical hermeneutics* 76–77, note 88; Bandini A.M., *Dei principi e progressi della real biblioteca mediceo laurenziana*, ed. R. Pintaudi (Florence: 1990) 278 (according to Bandini this tenth century *catena* reached the Laurenziana only under Ferdinando III. Ms. Acq. e Doni 44).


heterogeneous and eclectic background of the Florentine humanists can probably best be represented by the three luminaries themselves: Pico’s Aristotle studies go alongside with a criticism of the Peripatetics; Pico’s Platonism however contrasts his criticism of Ficino with a contemporary enthusiasm for the Peripatetics. These examples indicate the extent to which both ancient schools were important for a humanistic education. They could offer different approaches that all needed to be taken into account, in order to attain an elevated understanding.32

Augustine played an important role in this tense relationship also, as both humanists and scholastics regarded him as an authority. He was the first protagonist of Christian Platonism and was praised for his ability to make Platonic ideas acceptable to Christianity.33 On this basis Augustinian studies acquired a new direction, distinct from the scholastic one and appropriate for the revival of Platonism.34 Thus also in Ficino’s oeuvre we find a persisting combination of philosophy following Plato, scholastic theology relying on the *Summa* of Thomas Aquinas and Patristic studies following mainly Augustine. The synthesis of philosophical and religious authorities and approaches helped to position the man in his religious existence.35 Ficino took advantage of the eminent church father Augustine to explain why Plato was the ancient wise closest to Christian religion. The Neo-Platonist also had to rely on Augustinian studies as a key to explain his hermetic interpretations; at the same time he used citations from Augustine to give his platonic explanations the right theological fundament.36 In this way, Augustine holds his own


33 Thus Ficino and Pico della Mirandola were influenced by the Augustinian concept of the ‘immortal soul’ and the ‘divine origin of the soul’, as often argued. See Kristeller P.O., *The Philosophy of Marsilio Ficino* (New York: 1943) 14–15; 204; Allen M.J.B., “Marsilio Ficino on Plato, the Neoplatonists and the Christian Doctrine of the Trinity”, *Renaissance Quarterly* 37 (1984) 581–583; Bergvall A., *Augustinian Perspectives in the Renaissance* (Uppsala: 2001) 78. Thus one should not see Savolarola’s influence here: Christian Platonism was substantially earlier and should be understood differently from Savonarola’s interpretation. For a contrary view, see Bervall.


36 Bastano queste citazioni per comprendere come Agostino, interpretato con molta libertà, divenga, addirittura, il suggeritore dell’incontro provvidenziale tra le rivelazioni
place among neo-platonic, Patristic and scholastic studies and thus manifested an eminent role in the library of the Augustinian canons.

The *Academia Laurentii* or *Literatorum Achademia* of Lorenzo de’ Medici had a very wide spectrum of interests, spanning both literature and science. Unsurprisingly it had an overlapping membership with the so-called ‘Platonic academy’, including Poliziano, Pico, Ficino, Bossi, and the Greek philosopher and Aristotelian Giovanni Argyropolo. These overlapping interests made it possible to acquire an introduction to the different inclinations of Ficino’s Platonic and Argyropolo’s Aristotelian school respectively. Ficino, like many of his humanist fellows, did not deny Aristotelianism in general, but his medieval interpretation distanced him from its original meaning [Fig. 4].

According to Ficino and Pico, Lorenzo’s academy had become an *Academia peripatetica*. It provided a fertile ground for heterogeneous studies, where Ficino devoted himself to translate Plato and comment on his writings, Poliziano benefited from comparative literary studies and introduced himself to the literary sciences; Pico examined Bible exegesis and developed his significant unificatory approach to Plato and Aristotle.

This second generation of scholars at the Badia seemed to have put in motion what Cosimo originally wished for his Badia, the furtherance of Christian Platonism and of Aristotelianism in its original form. His commission to Ficino to translate Plato’s writings (from 1459) in the most...
authentic form possible and in a pure style is only one piece of a complex mosaic. In keeping with the new times therefore, the Badia made the work of Aristotle and his commentators available, in a well-selected quantity, for an interested and educated public. The richly-stocked library in the Fiesole Badia, of university level thanks to a concentrated and incomparable acquisition policy, its documented and illustrious public, accord the Badia the significance justifiable for an Academia peripatetica with regulated instruction and eloquent discussions.

The Badia library occupied a vital position in Florentine intellectual society. Its collection served multifarious interests, providing the foundation for training of the Florentine youth, and also an otium litterarum for the philosophers and their intellectual exchanges. It was firmly based on patristics, a re-considered scholasticism, new translations of Aristotle and a thorough section on Augustine as Christian Platonist. The illustrious frequenters of the Badia provide evidence in their writings of the dual nature of Medici interests. This is confirmed by the prompt and constant support of the library from 1462 onwards – contemporaneous with the commissioning of Ficino to translate Plato’s complete works – proving Cosimo peripatetico pariter & platonico a supporter of both philosophical methods.
The importance of the foundations that Cosimo had been laying for scholars of all interests cannot be overestimated. In many ways he served as a referee, a benefactor and also as an intellectual stimulus to many of the Florentine humanists. It seems thus no longer hazardous to identify the Young clergyman standing in front of his oeuvre [Fig. 3] as well as Botticelli’s Portrait of a Youth in obvious admiration of Cosimo, commemorating him by displaying a medal all’antica [Fig. 5], as the approximately twenty-year old Poliziano, who had benefited extensively from the libraries of his benefactor’s grandfather. Commemoration of library founders was common in antiquity, and continues in Renaissance Florence. Poggio Bracciolini for example suggested a marble statue of Niccolò Niccoli, the donor of the main bequest, for the library of San Marco. However, when the volumes were accommodated in San Marco a memorial plaque naming the donor was set in the wall. Several other portraits of the philosopher, for instance some ten years later in the Cappella Tornabuoni in Santa Maria Novella, and again in the company of Lorenzo’s sons in the Cappella Sassetti at Santa Trinità, Firenze [Fig. 2], reveal strongly similar facial features. The date of this portrait would thus coincide with the engagement of Poliziano as private tutor for Lorenzo’s sons Piero and Giovanni; five years later he took over the chair of Francesco Filelfo at the University of Florence. Poliziano’s correspondence reveals his repeated summer sojourns in Fiesole from 1472/1473 onwards. In 1479 he thanked Lorenzo enthusiastically for the inspiring otium of the place. The results of these early productive summers in Fiesole were the Epitetto of 1479, the Nutricia of 1486, and the Nonno of 1485. In 1479 also Poliziano was praised by Aldo Manuzio for his own learning, which gave his contemporaries the impression of a man brought up and educated in ancient Athens. Thus Poliziano’s all’antica gesture is very plausibly to be understood as a homage to the man, who enthusiastically laid the foundations of the private and public educational system in Florence.

40 I am extremely grateful to Heiko Damm to have pointed out this painting to me with the possible identification of Poliziano.
41 Quotation in Garin E., La biblioteca di San Marco (Florence: 1999) 21.
42 For a summary of earlier proposed identifications (self-portrait of Botticelli, the medal-caster, Lorenzo de’ Medici or other family member) and the previous literature see Zöllner F., Sandro Botticelli (Munich: 2005) 197.
46 On this, see Dressen, The Library of the Badia Fiesolana [2012/2013].
Fig. 5. Botticelli, Youth holding a medal of Cosimo de’ Medici, ca. 1474–1475. Florence, Uffizi.
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Francisco de Holanda (Lisbon, c. 1517–1584), the famous Portuguese artist and humanist, is far better known for his writings – especially the so-called *Dialogues in Rome* – than for his art works. The *Dialogues* are the second part of the *Pintura Antigua*, an art treatise divided into 44 chapters which, as Francisco himself points out in his preface to king Dom João III, is the first work on painting written in Portuguese.¹ In the book, Holanda centralizes the humanistic *topos* of the *antiqua novitas*, emphasizing the practice of imitation of ancient paradigms and stressing the need of increasing the fundamentals of art theory in Portugal. His discourses, varied as they are, insist on Portugal’s backwardness and the low esteem in which Portuguese artists are held in their homeland, as compared to their Italian counterparts.

The relevance of Holanda’s works is most commonly associated to their quality of being considered a direct source for studies on Michelangelo, who appears as one of the central figures of the three first dialogues; perhaps of even greater transcendence, though, is the fact that both his literary and his artistic production project direct light on tensions and contradictions which were only hinted at by his contemporaries.

¹ The book was begun during Francisco’s Roman sojourn and finished in the second half of 1548. The original manuscript was lost; we know it through an eighteenth-century copy presently kept at the Academia das Ciências in Lisbon. In 1563, the Portuguese painter Manuel Denis finished a Spanish translation of the manuscript, which would be published in 1921. The *Dialogues in Rome* were published separately much more often than the *Pintura Antigua* as a whole: in the nineteenth century there were several editions and translations of it, including among others an edition in French in 1846 (August Roquemont), German in 1860 (Herman Grimm), and Italian in 1875 (Aurelio Gotti). The *Pintura Antigua* was published for the first time as a whole in 1918 by Joaquim de Vasconcellos.
The most emphatic discourse on the sixteenth-century Flemish-Italian artistic confrontation, for example, is probably the one attributed to Michelangelo in the first book of the *Dialogues in Rome*:

In Flanders, they paint to fool the exterior eye, or things that would cheer you or of which you could not speak ill, as for example saints and prophets. They paint stuffs, masonry, green fields, the shadow of trees, and rivers, and bridges, which they call landscapes, with many people here and many there. And all this, though it could please some eyes, is in fact done without reason or art, without symmetry or proportion, without skilful choice or clarity, and finally, without any substance or nerve [...]. Only the works produced in Italy can we really name true painting, and that is why we call good painting Italian [...]. I do affirm that no nation or people (except for one or two Spaniards) can perfectly attain or imitate the Italian way of painting (which is itself the ancient Greek) without being easily discovered, no matter how much they strive and work.²

Francisco openly constructs an extreme comparison between Flemish and Italian art, associating to each one particular concepts and characteristics; the former is manual and made to ‘fool the exterior eye’, limited as it is to landscapes and representing an excessive amount of particular elements, while the latter is intellectual and essential. Although Francisco’s discourse is certainly part of a long dualistic tradition which has been developed at least since the beginning of the sixteenth century,³ the confrontation of principles associated to the Italian and Flemish art had never before been expressed so emphatically. This confrontation, manifest as it was in the visual arts themselves, was approached only indirectly by contemporary

---

² ‘Pintam em Flandres propriamente para enganar a vista exterior, ou cousas que vos alegrem ou de que não possaes dizer mal, assim como santos e profetas. O seu pintar é trapos, maçaricas, verduras de campos, sombras de árvores, e rios e pontes, a que chamam paisagens, e muitas figuras para cá e muitas para acolá. E tudo isto, ainda que pareça bem a alguns olhos, na verdade é feito sem razão nem arte, sem simetria nem proporção, sem advertência do escolher nem despejo, e finalmente sem nenhuma substância nem nervo [...]. Somente às obras que se fazem em Itália podemos chamar quase verdadeira pintura, e por isso à boa chamamos italiana [...] nenhuma nação nem gente (deixo estar um ou dois espanhóis) pode perfeitamente fartar, nem imitar o modo de pintar de Itália, que é o grego antigo, que logo não seja conhecido facilmente por alheio, por mais que se nisso esforce e trabalhe’. Holanda Francisco de, *Da Pintura Antigua*, ed. A. González Garcia (Lisbon: 1983) 235–237.

art theorists in Italy and the Low Countries; Holanda, on the contrary, built a structured discourse addressing this issue straightly. His text is repeatedly quoted by scholars not because it reveals anything unknown, but because it summarizes one of the most important sixteenth-century theoretical debates with maximum clarity. He touches upon all relevant points: the irreconcilable opposition between landscape and ‘optical superficiality’, on the one hand, and figure and metaphysical depth, on the other; *mimesis* and *disegno*; what he considers the naive religiosity of Flemish paintings versus the profound and complex spirituality of the nude, conceived as the maximum expression of divine proportion.

Holanda is a *unicum* in many senses: firstly, as far as we know, he is the only Portuguese *artiste-philosophe* of his times; the only one with a contemporary literary and artistic oeuvre – not to mention a nationalist project of cultural *renovatio* based on Tuscan paradigms. His father, Antonio, was a book illustrator of Northern origin – an origin, which is made clear by Francisco’s surname. Holanda must have been in touch

---

4 Coincidentally or not, the controversy over the manual and cerebral painting associated, respectively, to Flanders and Italy, is openly dealt with, many years later, by another non-Italian author, namely Domenicus Lampsonius. In his verses in honour of Jan van Amstel (Jan Hollander), in the *Pictorum Aliquot Celebrium Germaniae Inferioris Effigies* (1572), Lamsonius says: ‘The proper glory of Belgians is to paint well fields; that of the Italians, men and gods; this is why one says, with reason, that the Italian has his brain in his head, and the Belgian, in his skilful hands’. This confrontation between Italian and Flemish paintings, which had a mainly conciliatory nature until the beginning of the sixteenth century, was more and more transformed into open strife, with the landscape being linked to ‘manual’ art, and human figure to the ‘mental’ art. While commenting on the frescoes from the Paoline Chapel, for example, Vasari says that ‘Michelangelo sought nothing but perfection, for neither landscapes, nor trees, nor houses, nor the several seductions of art are admitted in this painting, because he never gave them attention, perhaps because he was conscious that he did not needed to lower his genius to such things’. In his verses, Lampsonius participates in the debate seeking to reestablish a sense of equality between the Flemish painting of landscapes and the Italian painting of figures (and by extension, *istorie*); both have their *laus*, which is comparable and inborn. In the *Schilder-boeck*, Van Mander would return several times to the defence of landscape painting in relation to historical painting, establishing comparisons between them and suggesting analogies that anatomise the landscape; as Lampsonius, the writer sought to balance landscape and history, giving to the former the dignity of a specific and autonomous pictorial genre. In Italy, the opposition hand/brain seems to have become very common since the middle of the Cinquecento; we could recall for instance a passage of Doni’s *Disegno*: ‘Perche in queste cose di leggier disegno gl’oltramontani ci applicano piu l’ingegno & la pratica, che gli Italiani non fanno; onde si dice in proverbio, che g’hanno il cervello nelle mani’, quoted from Anton Francesco Doni, *Disegno del Doni* (Venice, Gabriel Giolito de Ferrari: 1549) 16v, or even Michelangelo’s famous affirmation in a 1542 letter: ‘Si dipinge col cervello et non con le mani’, quoted from Milanesi F. (ed.), *Le lettere di Michelangelo Buonarroti* (Florence: 1874) 489.
with books from his earliest childhood. Certainly, he seems to have been a voracious reader. His *Dialogues in Rome* are clearly indebted to Castiglione, and in many passages of his writings he reveals a sound knowledge of contemporary Italian artistic literature. He must have had an important collection of books, but we can only speculate about which books he actually read by accessing his own writings and illustrations.\(^5\)

Although he was a well established artist, in order to pursue his agenda Francisco utilised mainly literary – not visual – tools. In this sense, he is the exact opposite of his role model, Michelangelo, who never hid his impatience when pressed to write about art. Although an avid reader – his profound knowledge of Dante is well known – Michelangelo is not a producer of discourses. In the first of Holanda’s *Dialogues* themselves, Vittoria Colonna acknowledges what must have been a common fact about the great master: ‘Because I know Michelangelo, she said […] I don’t know how we can induce him to talk of painting’.\(^6\) His artistic statements are made through his art itself, his ‘profession’, as he so insistently puts it in many of his letters. Francisco, on the other hand, wrote lengthy treatises on art, whose purpose was clearly to transplant into Portuguese soil artistic precepts derived from the classical tradition and some aspects of contemporary Italian art.

The main object of the present article is to examine two books Francisco left us next to his art treatises:\(^7\) the so-called *Antigualhas*, a collection of drawings produced during and directly after his Italian sojourn,\(^8\) and the *De Aetatibus Mundi Imagines*, a bi-medial world chronicle written and illustrated by him. Which readings were subjacent to the production of these books? His readings are well mirrored in his treatises,\(^9\) but how

\(^5\) Very little is known about private (or public, as a matter of fact) libraries in Portugal during the Renaissance.

\(^6\) ‘Porque eu conheço mestre Micael Ângelo, tornou ela […] não sei de que maneira nos hajamos com ele para que o possamos enganar a que fale em pintura’. Holanda, *Da Pintura Antiqua* 227.

\(^7\) As explained below, Francisco refers to these two works, visual as they are, as ‘books’ (cf. footnote 11).

\(^8\) Francisco was in Rome between 1538 and 1540. His trip was subsidized by the king, Dom João III.

\(^9\) Francisco returns repeatedly in his writings to Vitruvius’ *De Architectura*, Pliny’s *Natural History*, Gauricus’ *De sculptura*, as well as many Latin poets (Sylvie Deswarte considers Holanda’s knowledge of Roman epigraphy in her paper “Contribution à la connaissance de Francisco de Hollanda”, *Arquivos do Centro Cultural Português* 7 (1974) 421–429). He quotes only six authors who wrote in Greek (Hermes Trismegistus, Plutarch, Flavius Josephus, Alcinous, Dionysius the Areopagite and the Tablet of Cebes), which he probably knew through Latin translations. Many of his references, still, are clearly borrowed from
do they reveal themselves in his drawings and book illustrations? Was there a (solid) correspondence between his literary and artistic production? To what extent did his visual works correspond to the precepts he himself formulates in his treatises?

II. The Antigualhas

The *Escorial Album*, as the Book of the *Antigualhas* is also known, was produced, as said above, during Francisco’s Italian sojourn, i.e. between 1538 and 1540. In 54 carefully numbered folios, Holanda draws, almost always with black pencil, around 200 paintings, sculptures, monuments and fortresses that he saw in Italy and on his way back home. Apollo Belvedere, the Laocoon, Marcus Aurelius; the Coliseum, the Pantheon, the Trajan column; medallions with the effigies of Michelangelo and Paulus III, all are included in the corpus of ancient and contemporary monuments which he judged worthy of inclusion in the Portuguese visual repertoire.

Holanda conceived the *Antigualhas* as a book, and as such he refers to it in the first of his *Dialogues*. As pointed out by González Garcia, editor

---

Latin writers (for some examples cf. González Garcia’s introduction to his aforementioned edition of the *Pintura Antigua*, Holanda, *Da Pintura Antiqua* 23). Holanda cites Alberti, directly or indirectly, throughout the *Pintura Antiqua*, and seems equally familiarized with other important Quattrocento authors such as Flavio Biondo (the fourth chapter of the *Pintura Antiqua* mentioned below, for example, reveals a careful reading of Biondo’s *Historiarum ab inclinatione Romanorum*).

10 He probably finished the book in 1541, after returning home.

11 ‘Dezia eu: que fortalezas, ou cidades strangeiras não tenho inda no meu livro? i.e. ‘I used to say: which fortresses, or foreign cities, do I still not have in my book?’ This was noticed by Sylvie Deswarte in “Francisco de Holanda et le Cortile di Belvedere”, in Andreae B. – Pietrangeli C. – Winner M. (eds.), *Il Cortile delle Statue* (Mainz: 1998) 389.

One has the tendency to think of books in terms of recorded forms of written media, when for example illustrations have of course often played a very important – sometimes even predominant – role in certain book productions. Books may in fact include all forms of ‘texts’ (be it verbal, visual, numerical, etc.) understood in its etymological sense, i.e. *texere*, to weave, referring to the woven state of a given material. As stated by Deswarte, ‘le livre de dessins Antigualhas n’est ainsi ni un taccuino, ni un “album”, comme on l’a souvent dénommé. Disons qu’à la base, il y a un taccuino de dessins qui ont été ensuite réorganisés, sélectionnés, mis de côté pour certains, découpés, et présentés en un livre d’apparat par l’artiste lui-même’. Deswarte, “Francisco de Holanda” 389–390. She quotes, still, the terminology established by Arnold Nesselrath, according to which the term ‘album’ is generally used for a reunion of miscellaneous drawings by different artists organised *a posteriori* by a collector, while the *taccuino* is assembled by the artist himself. See Nesselrath A., “I libri di disegni di antichità. Tentativo di una tipologia”, in Settis S. (ed.), *Memoria dell’antico*.
Fig. 1. Francisco de Holanda, *Laocoon*, in idem, *Antigualhas* (1538–1541) fol. 9v. San Lorenzo de El Escorial, Library of the Escorial.
of the *Pintura Antigua*, the *Antigualhas* ‘exceed the normal dominion of sixteenth-century *taccuini* – the recompilation of artistically operative models or of erudite archaeological materials – in order to become a rhetorical paradigm of the new art [proposed by Holanda].

For Sylvie Deswarte, similarly, the *Antigualhas* have a fundamentally theoretical nature as its main purpose is to establish a taxonomy of ancient figures. According to her, the sculptures are meant to form a collection of exemplary types, analogous to the models of doors, windows or columns, which are also represented in the book. Holanda’s *corpus* seeks to unite the classical tradition and Italian contemporary production in a plastic canon which he hoped would contribute towards the renewal of arts in Portugal. The book, however, does not form a concrete programme, nor does it offer formulae for artists; it is not a manual, in the sense it does not have practical or technical implications. The images Francisco selected correlate to *Da Pintura Antigua* not in the sense that they were meant as literal illustrations for the practical guidelines he formulates in the treatise, but that they express visually the same normative principles and theoretical discourse – the *antiqua novitas* – postulated by the book.

Another interesting example of this correspondence is the couple of allegorical representations of Rome among the initial drawings of the Album; the first one triumphant, and the second one in ruins [Fig. 2]. The latter corresponds plainly to the humanistic *topos* of melancholy in face

---

12 His excellent edition was published in Lisbon (1983) by the Imprensa Nacional – Casa da Moeda. See Holanda, *Da Pintura Antigua*.


14 Deswarte, “Francisco de Holanda” 410. In this sense, she argues, the *Antigualhas* anticipates some aspects of Antoine Lafréry’s *Speculum Antiquae Urbis*, Giovan Battista Cavalleri’s *Antiquae Statuae Urbis Romae*, and François Perrier’s *Segmenta nobelium signorum et statuarum*.

15 Especially in the first folios, the artist sought to carefully reproduce the most emblematic sculptures and buildings of Rome. Deswarte demonstrates that, contrary to what had been assumed by its first editor, Elias Tormo, the organization of the *Antigualhas* is not chronological, but topical, constituting what she calls a ‘visual treatise’ (‘um tratado em imagens’). Cf. Deswarte S., *Idéias e imagens em Portugal na época dos descobrimentos. Francisco de Holanda e a teoria da arte* (Lisbon: 1992) 59. Topical divisions in antiquarian books go back to Biondo’s *Roma instaurata* and were followed by many others, including Albertini.
Fig. 2. Francisco de Holanda, *Rome in ruins*, in idem, *Antiqualhas* (1538–1541) fol. 4r. San Lorenzo de El Escorial, Library of the Escorial.
of the decadence of Rome – which *topos* goes back to Dante and Petrarch and appears many times in iconography. Holanda himself, in the fourth book of the *Dialogues*, regrets the destruction not only of Rome, but of all ancient wonders, while in the fifth chapter of the *Pintura Antigua* he articulates the opposition between *Roma victrix* (prior to Constantine) and *Roma victa* – a tradition which, of course, found a new significance after the sack of 1527. In this tradition, the glory of the past is always contrasted with the misery of the present. Rome, understood as the quintessential allegory of the classical world, is represented as a partially naked young woman wearing a crown in the form of a ruined city; her arms fall strenghtlessly to the ground, still holding a mirror. In the background, one sees the great wonders of her past: the Coliseum, the Trajan column, the Vatican obelisk. The sentence ‘*non similis sum mihi*, ‘I am not similar to myself’, which appears in the inferior part of the drawing, seems to correspond to the inscription ‘*Cognosce Te*’, in the sepulchre slab carried by two winged genii – a clear reference to the Greek famous aphorism. The inscription responds to the sentence ‘*non similis sum mihi*’ positively, as if implying that (self) knowledge would have the power to restore the grandeur of the Roman past. The same hope for rebirth based on knowledge of oneself and of one’s own past appears in the aforementioned fifth book of Francisco’s treatise on painting, in which, going back to the humanist *topos* of the barbaric invasions at the beginning of the ‘dark ages’, he reaffirms the lightning power of self knowledge and knowledge of the Antiquity: ‘The world (and especially Italy, being the one who lost the more), debilitated by the losses and wounds imposed by time, slowly began to look at itself and see the relics of antiquity and the admirable monuments in which dead sciences were buried’. In his drawing this

---

16 Deswarte suggested that Francisco was also alluding to the celebrated epistle in which Petrarch regrets the instability of all earthly things and the indifference of Romans to the greatness of their own past. Deswarte, *Idéias e imagens* 74. ‘For today who are more ignorant about Roman affairs than the Roman citizens? Sadly do I say that nowhere is Rome less known than in Rome. I do not deplore only the ignorance involved (although what is worse than ignorance?) but the disappearance and exile of many virtues. For who can doubt that Rome would rise again instantly if she began to know herself?’ (Fam. VI, 2). Cited from Petrarca Francesco, *Rerum familiarum libri I–VIII*, transl. A.S. Bernardo (New York: 1975) 293. Also in other passages of his writings, Petrarch manifests his fear that contemporary ignorance and vandalism could destroy what had been spared by time.

17 ‘Onde o mundo (e principalmente Itália, como aquela que mais tinha perdido) ressentindo-se das perdas e feridas que tinha do tempo recebido, começou a um pouco olhar por si e a ver as reliquias da antiguidade e os monumentos admiráveis onde as mortas ciências enterradas jaziam [...]’. Holanda, *Da Pintura Antigua* 39–40.
feeling of hope, certainly endorsed by Rome’s youth, is strengthened perhaps by the quotation from the Aeneid (IV, 651) carved at the column on which she rests: ‘Dulces exuviae, dum fata Deusque sinebant’, i.e. ‘Sweet relics, while fate and god were kind’, the first verse of Dido’s final speech before committing suicide, in the Aeneid’s fourth book. Those verses were pronounced, as is well known, in a moment of personal despair for Dido, but at the dawn of Rome. The ‘dulces exuviae’ refer of course to the sweet relics of the ancient Rome, which one could still wonder and rejoice at, but it does not seem impossible that they may also allude to the concept of *Renovatio Romae* and therefore to the rebirth of the Eternal City after its oblivion during the ‘middle ages’ and, more recently, its destruction as a result from the sack. The engraving – as well as the *Antigualhas* in its entirety – acknowledges Francisco’s profound familiarisation with antiquarian (sketch-)books both from the Biondian tradition of the previous century and those produced by his contemporaries, some of which showed a greater interest in inscriptions and other literary remains; he was surely acquainted, for example, with Albertini’s *Septem Mirabilia* (1510), which had been dedicated to the Portuguese king Dom Manuel, and with the *Epigrammata Antiquae Urbis* (1521).18

**“De Aetatibus Mundi Imagines”**

The book *De Aetatibus Mundi Imagines* was identified in 1953, in Madrid’s National Library.19 A facsimile edition was published – with no more than 150 copies – by Jorge Segurado in 1983.20 Francisco conceived it, as he himself explains in the book’s second folio, in 1545 – therefore five years after returning to Portugal. At that time, he lived in Evora. Sometime between 1551 and 1555, he submitted the first 30 illustrations to the approval of the king, Dom João III; Dona Catarina, his wife; Dom Luis, Dom João’s brother, and 3 Dominican theologians. After that, Holanda interrupted his work for many years; as late as 1573 he would produce the rest of the illustrations and complete the project.

18 Francisco’s copy of this book has been identified with the one presently kept at Lisbon’s Biblioteca Nacional. See Deswarte S., “Par-dessus l’épaule de l’artiste. Les livres annotés de Francisco de Holanda”, *Arquivos do centro cultural Calouste Gulbenkian* 39 (2000) 231–264.
19 The book was immediately attributed to Holanda by Dr. Francisco Cordeiro Blanco. Cf. Cordeiro Blanco F., “Identificación de una obra desconocida de Francisco de Holanda”, *Archivo Español de Arte* 28 (1955) 1–37.
The book is conceived as a world chronicle in images, according to the model established by Eusebius in the fourth century (as Francisco himself indicates) and later resumed by Paulus Orosius and Isidore of Seville. According to this model, the world history, based on the divine organization of time, is divided into six ages, from the world’s creation to apocalypse.\textsuperscript{21} The correspondence between the \textit{Antigualhas} and the \textit{Pintura Antigua}, though not literal, is clear: both books share the same premises, goals and theoretical programmes. As for the \textit{Imagines}, though, the nonconformity between the illustrations, the theoretical paradigms, and Holanda’s discourses themselves, is evident at the very first sight. The images representing the Creation week [Fig. 3], dated by Francisco himself between 1545 and 1547, could not be further away not only from the Sistine Ceiling\textsuperscript{22} – which Holanda studied during his Roman sojourn, and which paintings are considered by Vittoria Colonna, in the second of the Roman Dialogues, ‘the fountain-head from which they [famous paintings] all spring and have their being’\textsuperscript{23} – but of a long miniaturist tradition firmly established by artists such as Giulio Clovio and Vincent Raymond, both of them mentioned and openly admired by the Portuguese.\textsuperscript{24} He distances

\textsuperscript{21} The first age begins with Creation and ends with the Flood; the second, with Abraham; the third, with King David; the fourth, with the migration of Babylon; the fifth, with the birth of Jesus, and the sixth goes to the end of time. This model is identical with that of Orosius and Isidore, except for the sixth age, which in case of the Latin writers finishes in their contemporary times.

\textsuperscript{22} The Ceiling is at the very peak of a humanist tradition which regarded the human figure – and by extension, the nude – as not only the highest and most noble achievement of artistic activity, but also a religious, moral and metaphysical expression. According to this tradition, the human figure is the most perfect image of a \textit{concinnitas}, in the Pythagorean/Albertian sense; Holanda, again in Michelangelo’s pro-Italian discourse quoted above, places himself in the heart of this tradition when he says that ‘the good painting is nothing but a copy of the perfections of God and a recollection of His painting; it is, finally, a music and a melody which only the intellect can feel – with great difficulty’. Holanda, \textit{Da Pintura Antigua} 236. In the third dialogue, and once more through the authority of Michelangelo, Francisco states: ‘I do declare that divine and excellent painting is that which most resembles and best copies any work of the immortal God, whether it be a human figure or a wild and strange beast or a simple and easy fish, or a bird in the sky, or any other creature’. Holanda, \textit{Da Pintura Antigua} 302. All things are worthy of being pictured as they were created by God; among them the human body, though, is understood as the most noble image of divine proportion, and its imitation, as did Michelangelo in the Sistine Ceiling, emulates positively the Creation itself. With the anti-figurative, highly symbolic geometrical drawings of the \textit{Imagines}, Francisco seems to almost consciously contradict the tradition which he himself so ardently defends in \textit{Da Pintura Antigua}.

\textsuperscript{23} ‘[…] a fonte d’onde ellas [as pinturas famosas] se derivam e procedem’. Holanda, \textit{Da Pintura Antigua} 254.

\textsuperscript{24} Both of them followed the tradition in which the figure of God the Father is the absolute protagonist. Clovio appears in Holanda’s fourth dialogue, while Raymond is
Fig. 3. [Col. Pl. 14] Francisco de Holanda, *Chaos and the creation of light*, in idem, *De aetatibus mundi imagines* (c.1545–1573) fol. 3r. Madrid, National Library.
himself, also, from the precepts he emphasizes in his treatise, such as the prevalence of figure over landscape in his famous discourse quoted above. The absolute lack of correspondence between the first illustrations of the *Imagines* and the *Pintura Antigua* – its declared paradigms included – has led a scholar to suggest that Francisco did not actually conceive the book, but only executed the images.\(^{25}\)

The first images of the Creation week are fundamentally based upon geometric forms. Holanda represents God anthropomorphically only once: in the last day, and even then, partially covered with clouds and stars. In the other images, Francisco does not represent God the Father, but the second person, the Logos. That does not mean that he shows any interest in landscape; on the contrary, these first images are embedded with an almost aniconic sense and a literary descriptive tendency which leads him to inscribe sentences or explanatory concepts on certain parts of the drawings. In the first image of the Holandian cycle, the Trinity, light, darkness, the incipient world, are all represented as geometrical forms. The earthly globe, still in formation, seems to rotate; above, against a bright disk, an equilateral triangle contains the letters alpha and omega – the beginning and the end. The side corresponding to the letter alpha is also the base of two other isosceles triangles, the first of which injects light into the chasm at the world’s centre, while the second one traverses the globe. In the XXIX chapter of the *Pintura Antigua*, Holanda’s conflicts regarding the ways of representing God and the Trinity are clearly manifested:

I do call upon the Holy Trinity and say that, although Divinity has no shape nor figure that could be drawn from it, still, in order to make it intelligible and for it to be drawn and contemplated many times [...] it was necessary to give it an image, or likeness, through which recollection it could be desired and adored. The image of a triangle could be used to represent Divinity, as well as the square and the circle, which is the most suited and therefore more perfect.\(^{26}\)

---

\(^{25}\) Bury, “Francisco de Holanda”.

\(^{26}\) ‘E assim invoco e chamo a santíssima Trindade e digo que ainda que a Divindade não tenha fama nem alquanta figura que dar-se-lhe possa, todavia para a darmos a entender e para ser pintada e contemplada muitas vezes [...], necessário foi dar-lhe alguma imagem, ou semelhança, pela lembrança da qual possa ser mui desejada e adorada. A figura do triângulo cabe na semelhança da Divindade, e assim a quadrada e a redonda, que é a mais capaz e perfeita’. Holanda, *Da Pintura Antigua* 145.
Shortly afterwards, though, he retrocedes:

But the discreet painter shall leave those [figures] to the crowns ['diademas'] of the Holy Trinity. To the Principle and Father they shall give the image and age of a very mild and handsome old man. To the Son and Logos the image of a most benign and peaceable Saviour, and to the paraclete Holy Spirit the image of flame and fire, and also the purity of the dove.  

In the third day of Creation [Fig. 4], Francisco repeats the inverted triangle, but this time he lightly drafts the figure of God in one of the superior angles and that of the crucified Christ – the incarnated verbum – in the inferior angle. In the second day [Fig. 5], seven concentrical spheres surround the globe, above which Christ/Logos floats within three other circles. An inverted light cone travels across all spheres. On the chest, thorax and arms of Christ the words pietas, ratio, mansuetudo, etc., are to be read. From his hands emanate light rays with the letters alpha and omega. John Bury called the attention to the fact that, although the square is cited as a symbol of divinity in the *Pintura Antigua*, Francisco represents only the circle and the triangle in the illustrations. According to him, Holanda would have been influenced by a nordic source in this respect, i.e. the writings of the fifteenth-century German theologian and mathematician Nicolaus Cusanus, who rejected all polygons other than the triangle as symbols of divinity because figures with four or more sides ultimately derive from triangles and are therefore not fundamental. There can not be fourness, fiveness, etc., in God. The scholar identifies

---

27 ‘Mas essas deixará o discreto pintor para as diademas da santíssima Trindade. Ao Princípio e ao Padre darão a imagem e antiguidade de um quietíssimo e formoso velho. Ao Filho e Verbo a imagem de um benigníssimo e pacífico Salvador, e ao Espírito Santo paracleto a imagem de flamma e de fogo, e também a pureza da pomba […]’. Holanda, *Da Pintura Antigua* 146.

28 Bury, “Francisco de Holanda” 37.

29 Cusanus Nicolaus, *De docta ignorantia*, transl. J. Hopkins (Minneapolis: 2001) 33 (I,20): ‘However, you might like to note, regarding this ever-blessed Trinity, that the Maximum is three and not four or five or more. This point is surely noteworthy. For [fourness or fiveness, etc.] would be inconsistent with the simplicity and the perfection of the Maximum. For example, every polygonal figure has a triangular figure as its simplest element; moreover, a triangular figure is the minimal polygonal figure – than which there cannot be a smaller figure. Now, we proved that the unqualifiedly minimum coincides with the maximum. Therefore, just as one is to numbers, so a triangle is to polygonal figures. Therefore, just as every number is reducible to oneness, so [all] polygons are [reducible] to a triangle. Therefore, the maximum triangle, with which the minimum triangle coincides, encompasses all polygonal figures. For just as maximum oneness is to every number, so the maximum triangle is to every polygon. But, as is obvious, a quadrangular figure is not the minimum figure, because a triangular figure is smaller than it. Therefore, a quadrangular figure – which cannot be devoid of composition, since it is greater than the minimum –
Fig. 4. Francisco de Holanda, *Creation of land and seas*, in idem, *De aetatibus mundi imagines* (c. 1545–1573) fol. 5r. Madrid, National Library.
Fig. 5. Francisco de Holanda, *Creation of the firmament*, in idem, *De aetatibus mundi imagines* (c. 1545–1573) fol. 4r. Madrid, National Library.
other points of contact between the Portuguese and Cusanus, especially the latter’s geometrical diagram showing two interpenetrating cones symbolizing the inter-relationship between God and Nothingness, Being and non-Being, Light and Darkness.\textsuperscript{30} The fourth image [Fig. 6] represents the creation of the sun and the moon, and the consequent division of night and day. Francisco uses, again, triangles and spheres.

The first four images of the Creation are striking not only because they are very distant from the models Francisco himself proclaims in his writings – especially the Sistine Ceiling – but also because they seem to be alien to any pictorial tradition.\textsuperscript{31} As for the concentric circles, it is possible, as noticed by Sylvie Deswarte, that Francisco had used as models the geometrical forms in the first images of the Nuremberg chronicle – a book that would also influence the macabre images to be examined further.\textsuperscript{32} However one sees this, with the exception of the above-mentioned passage on the diadems, there is no explanation, in the entire corpus of Holanda’s writings, for his impressive Creation iconography.

The monochromatic illustrations following the Creation, still in the first age (until the Flood), were probably produced some years after the first illustrations. In the successive ages, though, Francisco joins a figurative tradition which goes back not to Italian models – as we would expect from someone who had canonically organized them, in the Antigualhas – but Flemish and German. The same John Bury has called the attention, for

\begin{quote}
cannot at all be congruent with the most simple maximum, which can coincide only with the minimum. Indeed, “to be maximum and to be quadrangular” involves a contradiction. For [a quadrangle] could not be a congruent measure of triangular figures, because it would always exceed them. Hence, how could that which would not be the measure of all things be the maximum? Indeed, how could that which would derive from another and would be composite, and hence finite, be the maximum?
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{30} Bury, “Francisco de Holanda” 38–39.

\textsuperscript{31} Among the medieval representations of the Trinity studied by Adelheid Heimann, for example, there is none in which it assumes a geometrical or even non-anthropomorphical form. Cf. Heimann A., “Trinitas Creator Mundi”, Journal of the Warburg Institute 2, 1 (1938) 42–52.

\textsuperscript{32} The Nuremberg chronicle was published by Anton Koberger, in Latin and German, in 1493. The illustrations – around 1,800, made after 645 woodcuts – were produced in the atelier of Michael Wolgemut and Wilhelm Pleydenwurff; the text and general conception are from the humanist, physician and bibliophile Hartmann Schedel. The illustrations which could most clearly be connected to Holanda’s iconographical schemes are, of course, those of the Creation, from which Francisco could have borrowed the concentric circles, God’s hand, the Hebrew characters in the Sacrifice of Noah, or the \textit{imago mortis} at the book’s closing. Cf. Deswarte S., \textit{As imagens das idades do mundo Francisco de Holanda} (Lisbon: 1987) 47.
Fig. 6. [Col. Pl. 15] Francisco de Holanda, *Creation of the sun, the moon and the stars*, in idem, *De aetatibus mundi imagines* (c. 1545–1573) 6r. Madrid, National Library.
instance, to the similarities between some of the illustrations and contemporary Antwerp engravings, especially Gerard de Jode’s illustrated Bible.

Holanda closes his Imagines with a representation of Eros and Aphrodite [Fig. 7] which was conceived, according to his own notes, sometime between 1545 and 1547 – i.e. together with the first images of the Creation and the Pintura Antigua. Francisco pictures Eros and Aphrodite as corpses in a nocturnal setting and surrounded by Latin inscriptions reproducing celebrated erotic verses by Ovid, Vergil, Propertius and Tibullus (‘now I know what Love is’;33 ‘Long love has diminished my body for such practice’,34 among others). Here Francisco is not interested in chromatic variety nor in space; he builds an absolutely dark background from which the corpses and the rocks emerge united in a sandy monochrome. The same artist who collects drawings from the most celebrated ancient monuments and sculptures, here represents a macabre, nocturne, nihilist image of Eros and Aphrodite – at the same time allusion and negation of the same Venus Felix Francisco saw, but did not picture, in the Belvedere. More than characters of a danse macabre or of a triumph of death, where skeletons and semi-putrefied corpses dance, horse ride, interact with the living, in Holanda’s creation Eros and Aphrodite are clearly conceived as a static, isolated, frontal ancient group, in a way analogous to contemporary anatomical stamps – which frequently used as their models paradigmatic works of classical statuary.35

Holanda’s interest for the macabre equally appears in a drawing – produced shortly before the Imagines’ Eros and Aphrodite – of the lost reliquary containing the head of St. Mary Magdalene in St Maximin, Provence, where Francisco had been during his journey back to Portugal [Fig. 8].36 Although there is a long tradition of representing Mary Magdalene in conjunction with a skull, the reliquary actually superimposes one on the

33 Vergil, Eclogues VIII.
34 Ovid, Amores I, 6.5.
35 However Holanda’s Aphrodite, covered with a ruined shroud, is definitely not an anatomical stamp. Not only ancient statuary, but also contemporary German painting surely inspired Holanda (e.g. Cranach or Baldung Grien). The distance between this image and Francisco’s contemporary literary production is so significant that one would almost instinctively tend to give it a later date. In the original manuscript of the Pintura Antigua, though, there were two drawings, described by the author of the treatises’ only copy (Monsenhor Gordo, in 1790) as ‘dois esqueletos, um grande e a inscrição Venus; outro pequeno e a letra Amor’. Quoted from the introduction by González in Holanda, Da Pintura Antigua 108, note 249.
36 The reliquary drawn by Holanda was lost; the one exposed in the present day is a nineteenth-century copy.
Fig. 7. Francisco de Holanda, *Eros and Aphrodite*, in idem, *De aetatibus mundi imaginés* (c. 1545–1573) fol. 88r. Madrid, National Library.
other, generating a hybrid figure which might very well have inspired him for the conception of *Eros and Aphrodite*.

### III. The Macabre Tradition

The allegorical confrontation between eroticism and death is an old literary and artistic *topos* which was re-elaborated and amply divulged, during the Renaissance, by Dürer’s engravings. Baldung Grien, his disciple, was undoubtedly inspired by these engravings when producing his celebrated oils representing Death and the Maiden, Death and Venus, or Death and Eve. Clearly in the tradition of the *memento mori*, these engravings and oils associate love, sex, time and death – which was personified, from the beginning of the sixteenth century onwards, by a skeleton holding or pointing at an hourglass.\(^{37}\) Departing from Dürer’s inventions – the

\(^{37}\) As noticed by Van Marle, *l'idée de représenter la Mort par un squelette paraît tellement logique qu'on s'est demandé quelle peut être la raison pour laquelle on n'en
encounter of death and the knight, death and the couple – Baldung Grien goes back to the ancient iconography of the encounter between death and the maiden fusing it, sometimes, with the theme of the three ages of men. In fantastic drawings and oils, the classical confrontation of Eros and Thanatos creates in Baldung chords of eroticism and terror, irony and classical beauty. Contrary to Dürer, Grien’s nudes combine elements both from Eve’s traditional iconography and from the Renaissance *vanitas*, generating images in which death and eroticism are counterpoised in unstable equilibrium. Hans Sebald Beham, another artist from Nuremberg who was profoundly influenced by Dürer, produced iconographically similar engravings, such as for instance two versions of Death and the Maiden with the inscription ‘omnem in homine venustatem mors abolet’, i.e. ‘death destroys all human beauty’.

Those images were made only a few years before those of Holanda, and the Portuguese is likely to have seen them. What Francisco does, though, is even more radical in the sense that he actually fuses both personifications by figuring Venus and Death conjunctly, as one single character. Further still: from the mother’s empty womb, which is emphasized by the torn shroud, no one can be born. As far as we know, this image – i.e. of Venus as Death – is one of a kind in Francisco’s times. Anticipating in centuries Bonomini’s macabre genre scenes, death is not the spectre of what will be, but what is already there; Venus is dead, and light, space, even time, no longer exist. Francisco does not represent beauty and transitoriness, the brutal contrast between the present and the inescapable future, the threat of time and death. Somewhere between melancholy and an almost sarcastic pathetic tone, the final drawing of the *Imagines* constitutes, more than a *memento mori*, a plain confirmation of death.

Until at least the decade of 1550 a strong current of macabre art deeply marks the artistic production of several European regions. This tendency is surely related to the diffusion of anatomical stamps, as alluded above, in which beauty, conceived according to classical canons, is associated both to moral and medical dimensions of death. As noticed by André Chastel, the extraordinary stamps accompanying Vesalius’ *Fabrica* invite simultaneously to the study and meditation on the human organism, perfect in

rencontre les premiers exemples qu’à une époque assez tardive’ – i.e., the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Not until the first half of the sixteenth century would the representation of death as a skeleton and of putrefied corpses become frequent, especially in France, Germany and northern Italy. Marle R. van, *Iconographie de l’art profane au Moyen-Age et à la Renaissance* (The Hague: 1932), vol. II, 361.
the transitoriness of its triumph: ‘The skeleton – at one time structural scheme and moral emblem – assumes a double function’,\(^{38}\) which perhaps in no other moment was so perfectly synthesised as in one of the most famous engravings of the treatise [Fig. 9]: a magnificent skeleton melancholically rests his head on one of his hands, as he seems to soliloquize by placing his other hand on a skull resting on a sepulchre with the inscription: ‘vivitur ingenio, caetera mortis erunt’.

In other artists, such as Beham, the macabre vein is connected to classical literature, as in the engraving of a little child sleeping next to skulls on a table with the inscription ‘mors omnia aequat’ – a very ancient sentence which, as is well known, was initially related to love. In these images, the ancient visual and rhetoric apparatus universalises considerations of different nuances about the transitoriness of life and the ineluctability of death; if the *danse macabre* equals members of different classes who must all confront the implacable end, images such as Beham’s and those of the Vesalian *Fabrica* equal men who lived in all times – but present the *ingenium* as a means of overcoming death.

Holanda’s engraving representing Eros and Aphrodite bears some resemblance, surely, to the above-mentioned allegory of Rome from the *Antigualhas*. In both cases, images related to the passage of time and the transitoriness of all things are constructed after a system of references to the classical past. If in the *Antigualhas*, though, these references are clearly connected to the long humanistic tradition of the *Roma quanta fuit*, and the lamentation before the ruins connotes more the longing for past greatness and hope – through knowledge – in its rebirth, *Eros and Aphrodite* seem to be more clearly connected to the anti-mythological vein predominating in pre-Tridentine Iberia.\(^{40}\) In the *Antigualhas*, the classical past was a wonder that could be reborn; in the *Imagines*, it was a vain, stillborn human pretension.

Among the last drawings of the *Imagines* – immediately before the apocalypse series – there is a group which sheds even more light on the


\(^{39}\) This sentence is obviously related to the Horatian *topos* of art conceived as the only way of continuing life after death (*non omnis moriar*).

\(^{40}\) After the half of the century – and especially after 1560 – Portuguese intellectuals with an European humanistic formation started to feel definitely uneasy on Portuguese soil. Portuguese inquisitorial censorship of books was probably the most severe of Europe; in fact, Spanish censors often reused the indices produced by their Lusitanian counterparts. Cf. Silva Dias J.S. da, *A política cultural da época de D. João III* (Coimbra: 1969), vol. I, 2, 469.
Fig. 9. Illustration of the *De humani corporis fabrica* by Andreas Vesalius (Basel, Johannes Oporini: 1543) 164.
actual protagonist of the book: time, or ‘spiteful time’ (‘malícia do tempo’), as Francisco writes it. In the *Victory of Faith* (‘vitória da fé’) [Fig. 10], Faith hits, with a cross, an allegory of Paganism clearly inspired by the *Laocoon* and bound by the zodiacal belt to the earthly globe. Below, in the medallions, one sees the decapitated Rome and Greece. In the next folio Francisco represented the *Death of Ages* (‘morte das idades’) [Fig. 11]. An original personification of Death with arrow wings marches over the five ages, all completely naked. To the left, one sees the sixth age, still unharmed but about to be struck. Afterwards comes the *End of Times* (‘fim dos tempos’) [Fig. 12]: Time, mythologically represented, can no longer walk, and must lean on crutches. In front of him, death is itself dead. Holanda’s inspiration is clearly Petrarchan, particularly if one thinks of Nordic visual representations of triumphs, such as for instance Georg Pencz’ engravings.

The book’s final composition [Fig. 13] – the one immediately following *Eros and Aphrodite* – pictures, in Francisco’s words, ‘the author, with this book of images. And spiteful time eating it’. The inevitable end of his own work surely, as of all things, but also the indifference of his contemporaries towards his artistic production: Dom João III, famous for being a generous art patron, was succeeded by the belligerent Dom Sebastião, to whom Francisco in more than one occasion complains about his own unemployment and the pitiful state of arts in Portugal.

Francisco died alone, probably in debt, in his villa close to Sintra. None of his books were ever published, and only one of his architectonic projects was carried out. Although he offered his services several times both to the Portuguese and the Spanish crown, he was jobless at the time of his death and for many years before. One of his main declared objectives – the higher appreciation of arts in his homeland and the consequent better wages of artists – was not achieved. One century after his death, another Portuguese painter and writer, Felix Da Costa, would write a treatise lamenting Portuguese indifference to arts, and, one century after Da Costa, the sculptor Joaquim Machado de Castro would write the same.

---

41 The titles are in the index written by Francisco.
42 ‘[. . .] o autor com o Livro das Idades, que é este. E a malícia do tempo lho come’. Holanda, *De Aetatibus Mundi Imagines* 467. Deswarte suggests that the 3 feminine figures represent the theological virtues – Faith, Hope and Charity. See Deswarte, *As imagens das idades* fig. 58. For Segurado they represent Justice, Faith and Love. See Segurado in Holanda, *De Aetatibus Mundi Imagines* 468.
43 In June 19, 1584.
44 The fortress of Mazagão, in the Maroccan coast.
Fig. 10. Francisco de Holanda, *Victory of Faith*, in idem, *De aetatibus mundi imagines* (c. 1545–1573) fol. 67v. Madrid, National Library, Madrid.
Fig. 11. Francisco de Holanda, *Death of Ages*, in idem, *De aetatibus mundi imaginum* (c. 1545–1573) fol. 68r. Madrid, National Library.
Fig. 12. Francisco de Holanda, *End of Times* in idem, *De aetatibus mundi imagines* (c. 1545–1573) 69r. Madrid, National Library.
Fig. 13. Francisco de Holanda, Self-portrait presenting the Imagines to spiteful time, in idem, Dea aetatibus mundi imagines (c. 1545–1573) fol. 89r. Madrid, National Library.
Conclusion

The religious and philosophical European landscape in the mid-sixteenth century was not divided in static blocks, but permeated by a web of spiritual, artistic and philosophical currents carrying traces of sometimes antagonistic traditions. To the first images of Creation, Holanda could assimilate neo-platonic, hermetical, perhaps cabalistic elements. The reluctance to represent God anthropomorphically – which he expresses verbally in the *Pintura Antigua* – is possibly related to Nordic influences, and the prevalence of astronomy and geometry certainly reflects – maybe in spite of him – the impact of navigation sciences on humanistic contemporary production.

There does not seem to be any coherence between Francisco’s images of the Creation or *Eros and Aphrodite* and his writings, but, in the Lusitanian context, this did not seem to be demanded from him. Generally speaking, the disarticulation between literary and artistic production in Portugal during the Renaissance became a true topos of art historical investigations produced in that field. In the first decades of the sixteenth century, while in exclusive literary circles a humanistic culture of double ascendance – Italian and Erasmian – took root, artistic production seemed strongly attached to late gothic forms and to a Flemish naturalism marked by oriental and maritime motives (typical of the so-called ‘Manueline style’). These discrepancies were often evidenced in Portuguese printed books, in which a highly sophisticated neo-Latin prose often coexisted with archaic engravings.

One of the more intriguing aspects of Holanda’s production is the lack of correspondence between Holanda as reader (and writer), and Holanda as artist, particularly in the *Imagines*. He had the will, the agenda, and certainly the skills, but he still did not coherently respond to the project he himself elaborated in the *Pintura Antigua*. Francisco’s readings seem to be mirrored differently in his artistic and literary production. Literally, he reacted to his readings canonically, i.e., his treatise responds in a relatively conservative way to classical and contemporary Italian art literature. His drawings in the *Imagines*, on the other hand, mirror completely different

---

45 For the (possible) presence of cabalistic elements in the *Imagines* cf. Deswarte, *As imagens das idades* 54.

46 Also nationalistic imagery was mainly linked to Portugal’s medieval past, and not, as one would perhaps expect, the classical tradition; see for example the illustrations in the *Ordenações d’El Rei D. Manuel* (Pietro da Cremona: 1514).
literary sources, much less ‘homogeneous’ at first sight. We do not know much about other works of art produced by Francisco. He must have produced portraits, but they have not been identified – at least not with certainty.\(^{47}\) His artistic production, as is known to us, is mainly comprised in books.\(^{48}\) Even more interesting is the fact that, in spite of his Italian sojourn, when producing his illustrations for the *Imagines* Holanda was mainly influenced by other (bi-medial) books (predominantly of northern origin), not independent art works. The main visual references for the drawings, independently of their different phases, are book illustrations and literary descriptions – such as for instance Cusanus’ passages quoted above.

From his villa in Sintra, Holanda could absorb and re-elaborate literary and visual elements connected to apparently conflicting traditions. More than when he proposed canons which, in the eyes of his Italian counterparts, could have seem archaic and provincial, it is in these passages and drawings that Francisco demonstrates his capacity of assimilating contemporary tendencies of European art, even when – or perhaps especially when – these tendencies reveal signs of disarticulation between aesthetic reflection and artistic production.

It is possible that his *Eros and Aphrodite* dialogues with different traditions of the *vanitas*, from the *memento mori* to anatomical stamps or even contemporary Italian examples of macabre art, such as those produced by Rosso Fiorentino. The presence of eroticism in the iconographical dominion of *vanitas*, as previously reminded, precedes Baldung Grien and other masters of the Nordic Renaissance. It is revived, though differently, in seventeenth-century Arcadian representations and other historical moments. Francisco’s macabre image, however, does not confront the delights of eroticism – conceived as the maximum expression of the splendour but also the fragility of life – to the horror of death, but nullifies

\(^{47}\) Francisco himself speaks of a portrait of Dom João III which was sent to the King’s daughter (*Do tirar polo natural*, II). Other royal portraits by him mentioned in contracts and inventories – namely those of Dona Catarina, Infanta Dona Maria and Dom Sebastião – are presumed lost. Cf. Bury J., *Two notes on Francisco de Holanda* (London: 1981) 40.

\(^{48}\) J. Bury attributes to Holanda an oil painting presently in the Museu de Arte Antiga at Lisbon (n. 1181) representing the adoration of Our Lady of Bethlehem, but he bases his attribution solely on stylistical grounds. For a complete annotated catalogue of Holanda’s works (visual and literary, including attributions) cf. Bury, *Two notes on Francisco de Holanda* 30.
it; the erotic becomes in itself necrotic.\textsuperscript{49} For Holanda, the point is no longer the confrontation between the brightness of life and the horror of death, nor the threat of death, nor the perils of love and seduction; Venus, a pathetic spectre of what no longer exists, does not seduce nor provoke the former terror, when, confronted with death, she formed an intolerably painful visual oxymoron. In Holanda, as later in the nineteenth century, even love becomes nothing; the world is much too old.

\textsuperscript{49} One would have to wait centuries – perhaps until the emergence of the decadent movement in the nineteenth century – to see a conjunction of love and death with connotations similar to Holanda’s \textit{Eros and Aphrodite}. 
Selective Bibliography

DESWARTÉ S., As imagens das idades do mundo de Francisco de Holanda (Lisbon: 1987).
———, Da Pintura Antigua, ed. A. González Garcia (Lisbon: 1983).
Recent work on the history of technology has drawn attention to the importance of manuscripts and, in particular, drawings for the design, construction, comprehension, and use of machines in the Renaissance and Early Modern period.1 Documents such as the workshop drawings of Antonio da Sangallo or the extensive extant papers of Heinrich Schickhardt are now finding a place alongside better-known printed works, such as the ‘theatres of machines’ by Ramelli, Besson, and Bachot.2 Yet comparatively little is known about the book ownership and reading habits of those artisans involved in the processes of machine design, construction, and implementation. The present essay seeks to shed new light on these subjects, through an examination of an important – but somewhat neglected – manuscript compilation of text and images on technical topics (ranging from practical mathematics to building), made in the early seventeenth century by the French architect-engineer Jacques Gentillâtre (1578–c. 1623).3 To date, this manuscript has been discussed exclusively within the context of the theory and practice of architecture, yet the diversity of subjects with which it is concerned (notably the numerous uses to which machines may be put) demands that the document be

---

3 Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Manuscript Français 14727, currently (and incorrectly) catalogued as an anonymous ‘Manuel d’un ingénieur-architecte de la première motié du XVIIe siècle’.
scrutinized from a wide range of alternative angles. In particular, evidence internal to the manuscript suggests that it should be considered within three key Early Modern contexts: the reception and circulation of technical knowledge via printed books; copying practices; and the adaptation and application of the commonplace method by technical practitioners. Gentillâtre’s manuscript is thus an ideal vehicle for the examination of how and to what ends a particular type of artist read printed books in the Early Modern period.

The importance of fifteenth-century technical treatises in manuscript (such as those by Mariano Taccola and Francesco di Giorgio Martini) has long been established, yet relatively little work has been undertaken on later manuscripts, such as Gentillâtre’s, concerned with the practice and materials of engineering. In particular, manuscript compilations of copied extracts from printed books on technical subjects, which I will refer to here as ‘copybooks’, have been almost entirely neglected, despite the fact that a host of such manuscripts survive from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. To take just one early seventeenth-century Italian example, drawn from the domain of military engineering, the Biblioteca Oliveriana in Pesaro contains several copybooks on fortification and ballistics compiled by the Pesarese Captain Valerio Pompei, containing extracts from Gabriello Busca’s Della architettura militare (1601), Luigi (Luis) Collado’s Pratica manuale di artiglieria (1586), and Bonaiuto Lorini’s Le Fortificazioni (1597). Copybooks such as Pompei’s, which are frequently an admixture

4 The variety evident in the manuscript is of fundamental importance for the understanding of machines and those individuals involved with their design, manufacture, and implementation in the Early Modern period. While it is true that the professions of architect, fortifications expert, instrumentalist, and machine designer are defined with increasing clarity throughout the course of the sixteenth century, there are many examples of professionals practising all of these disciplines. Gentillâtre’s manuscript shows clearly that all four were part of the same set of practices; in this document, models for machines, architecture, instruments, and fortifications are placed side by side, grouped together as interconnected mathematical arts.


6 Biblioteca Oliveriana, Pesaro (BOP hereafter), MS 966, “Della Pratica manuale di Arteglieria del […] Sig[nor]e Luigi Collado”; MS 997, Pompei V., “Fortificazioni”; MS 1097,
of text and images, tend to be written in a legible script and carefully ordered so as to facilitate their use as reference works. They share certain affinities with the so-called ‘model books’ executed and/or compiled by artists, architects and their assistants from the Middle Ages onwards.⁷ Although not entirely cohesive as a group, model books may generally be described as collections of drawings, sometimes accompanied by text, that served as models for architectural or artistic projects and that seem to have been used by a wide range of individuals, from practitioners to patrons. However, where model books appear to have been employed primarily for the purposes of communication (such as, for example, sharing designs amongst practitioners or between architect and patron), copybooks were essentially private in nature. They were often compiled as an aide memoire for one individual or as a convenient and cost-effective way of storing the information contained in printed books, to which the copyist might have only limited access or be unable (or unwilling) to purchase. In this regard, copybooks are related to the practice, widespread amongst lettered members of Early Modern European society, of using commonplaces.⁸ It is notable that Valerio Pompei kept a commonplace book (comprising notes on governing the military forces of Pesaro, philosophical aphorisms, guides to virtuous behaviour, and so on), indicating that he, like many of his literate peers, was certainly familiar with this method of reading and recording.⁹

It has long been established that humanists used commonplace books as a means of storing and ordering various types of knowledge. Ann Blair

---


⁹ BOP, MS 1134, “Copybook of Valerio Pompei” [my title].
succinctly describes the humanist use of commonplaces as a method of reading, whereby ‘one selects passages of interest for rhetorical turns of phrase, the dialectical arguments, or the factual information they contain; one then copies them out into a notebook, the commonplace book, kept handy for the purpose, grouping them under appropriate headings to facilitate later retrieval and use’. Recent work has shown that the method of commonplaces extended well beyond the conventional parameters of humanist study. For example, Ann Blair and Elaine Leong have demonstrated the extent to which the method of commonplaces was used in, respectively, natural philosophy and medicine. However, the keeping of commonplace books and the application of the method of commonplaces to copybooks by individuals that practiced the technical arts, such as architects, engineers, and instrumentalists, has received little attention. It is unsurprising that such figures employed copying and compiling practices similar in kind to their scholarly peers. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries architect-engineers were faced with a glut of new information relevant to their professional activities. Methods of fortification were multiplying at a dizzying rate, new theories of ballistics were regularly being proposed (and equally swiftly refuted), new and ingenious devices were appearing across Europe in the form of printed ‘theatres of machines’ and as a myriad artefacts demonstrated at court and/or employed in enterprising engineering ventures. A rapid rise in the number of publications on technical subjects exacerbated what might legitimately be called ‘information overload’. Indeed, as Blair notes, the ‘“multitude of books” was a subject of wonder and anxiety for those authors who reflected on the scholarly condition in the sixteenth through


the eighteenth century'. There is no reason to suppose that technical practitioners were not afflicted by similar anxieties. The catalogues of the annual Frankfurt Book Fair indicate that a wide and ever increasing variety of publications on instruments, practical mathematics, architecture, and military engineering were regularly offered for sale, while modern bibliographies have established that a huge number of printed books on technical subjects poured from the European presses throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Significantly, evidence from extant library lists suggests that these publications were by no means solely the preserve of scholars and interested amateurs; they also ended up in the hands of practitioners. To take just one example, of the 117 volumes listed in the inventory of the French architect and master locksmith Mathurin Jousse, at least 48 were works of practical mathematics, architecture, fortification, or instrumentation.

It must be remembered, however, that technical practitioners had to contend not only with a rapidly growing corpus of printed works, but also with a substantial amount of manuscript material on the disciplines with which they were concerned. For example, at the beginning of one of his many manuscripts on the military arts, Valerio Pompei compiled a list of


14 On the role of the Frankfurt Book Fair in the book trade, with particular reference to the importance of the printed catalogues, see Ziehen J. (ed.), Der Frankfurter Markt oder die Frankfurter Messe von Henricus Stephanus (Frankfurt: 1919). As Pamela Long notes, 'The complex reasons for this expansion of authorship in the mechanical arts include what historians of technology have called technological enthusiasm, a delight in the technology of machines in itself, regardless of economic or practical information'. Long P.O., "Picturing the Machine: Francesco di Giorgio and Leonardo da Vinci", in Lefèvre, Picturing Machines 117–141, at 120. For Renaissance and Early Modern authorship on technical arts in general, see e.g. Long P.O., Openness, Secrecy, Authorship: Technical Arts and the Culture of Knowledge from the Renaissance to the Enlightenment (Baltimore-London: 2001).

authors who had written on fortification with which he was (presumably) familiar:


While many of these authors had appeared in print by the time this list was composed (c. 1620s), the writings of a significant proportion were circulated only in manuscript, such as those by Paciotti and Serbelloni. To make matters even more complicated, it is clear that knowledge about technical subjects could be gleaned not only from written or drawn sources but also from artefacts encountered whilst travelling and from conversations with fellow practitioners. Factors such as the search for patronage, war, and religious confession greatly encouraged the geographical mobility of technical practitioners and, by extension, the dissemination of technical knowledge throughout Europe. However, while it is difficult to retrieve the exact particulars of orally-transmitted technical knowledge in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, there is some evidence to suggest that practitioners made records of what they saw, if not always what they heard.

II

Jacques Gentillâtre’s manuscript is just one example of evidence demonstrating that Early Modern technical practitioners were familiar with, and made records of, a wide range of printed material, machines, buildings, and (possibly) manuscripts. The 594-folio document, bound in vellum as a small booklet measuring just 13.1cm by 8.1cm consists of extensive extracts (both text and images) from sixteenth- and seventeenth-century printed works on mathematics, instrumentation, architecture, and engineering, including long sections on fortification, construction techniques, and machinery. In addition to these extracts from printed books (which

16 BOP, MS 1097, fol. 1r.
make up the majority of the document) the manuscript records a number of machines and structures encountered by the compiler during his career, as well as short passages of original text on a variety of broadly technical subjects. As such, Gentillâtre’s manuscript clearly relates to contemporary practices of amassing and maintaining an archive of useful material on the variety of instruments and machines employed in Early Modern Europe. It is not clear when the manuscript was begun, but the date 1621, inscribed next to a drawing of ‘the hall made at Courmartin in the year 1621 by Monsieur Philibert […] for the Marquis d’Uxelles’, shows that it was certainly still being added to in the early 1620s.

To date, the only substantial discussion of the manuscript in scholarly literature is a 1988 article by Liliane Châtelet-Lange, who convincingly attributed it to Gentillâtre on the basis of two factors: first, the similarity of several of the drawings in the manuscript to a collection of some 300 loose architectural drawings by Gentillâtre (preserved in the Library of the Royal Institute of British Architects, London); second, the fact that several place names inscribed throughout the manuscript, next to particular machines or buildings, correspond to locations that Gentillâtre had either visited or worked at, notably Geneva, Chalon, Sedan, Montbéliard, and Fontainebleau.

Before proceeding to an analysis of the manuscript, it is first necessary to outline briefly Gentillâtre’s biography, as the locations in which he worked and the activities he undertook strongly affected the contents of his manuscript. Gentillâtre seems to have begun his career in the studio


18 ‘Desain de la halle failct a courmatin lan 1621 par m[onsieur] Philibert nettement[?] pour monsieur le marquis d’Uxelles’. MS Fr. 14727, fol. 470r.


Fig. 1. ‘The hall made at Courtmartin in the year 1621, by Monsieur Philibert’. From the copybook of Jacques Gentillâtre, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Fr 14727, fol. 470r.
of Jacques II Androuet de Cerceau, in Paris. In 1602 he departed for Troyes and Sedan and he remained from c. 1603 to 1610 in Lorraine. His principal patron at this time was Jean II Du Châtelet, Baron de Thons, for whom he built an important château at Petit-Thon. After staying in Montbéliard and Geneva he went to Chalon-sur-Saône in 1612, where he was to remain for the next ten years. During his time in Chalon he designed several major buildings, the Hôtel Virey (1612) and the Palais du Baillage (begun 1613, destroyed 1825). From 1613 he worked at the château of the barons of Blé d’Uxelles at Cormatin, adding two wings and an impressive staircase. The last known records of Gentillâtre’s movements place him, in 1622, in Lyon, where he constructed the façade of the Hospice de la Charité. Gentillâtre was clearly a successful, if provincial, architect. While his architectural style is redolent of the decorative late Mannerism practised by his former master, Du Cerceau, his designs (described by Châtelet-Lange as ‘original’ and ‘unusual’) employed a variety of novel forms and layouts. This fondness for variety in architecture is readily apparent in his copybook. He was evidently at ease with the execution of major architectural projects, for which he would have required extensive technical knowledge of precisely the kind contained within his manuscript.

Gentillâtre’s copybook is composed entirely in French and in a single, somewhat unpolished hand. It is divided into sixteen sections, some of which have been given titles by the compiler (a list of contents is provided in Appendix 1). It should be noted that the manuscript features many blank pages, suggesting that Gentillâtre may well have intended adding additional material to the compilation at a later date (indeed, it is highly probable that he continued adding to the manuscript up to his death in 1626). There is no title page, preface, or introduction to the manuscript, which launches straight into a discussion of regular geometric solids and the manner of their construction, moving on to a definition of

---


22 Gentillâtre’s name does not appear anywhere in the document. Apart from the occasional inscription of the names of authors or architects whose work has been copied, and the names of patrons such as the Marquis d’Uxelles, the only personal names featured in the document are ‘Monsieur De L’estoille’ (inscribed four times in succession) and ‘Monsieur de (?) Chabanne’. These appear at the beginning of the manuscript (fol. 6r) accompanied by calligraphic marks indicating that they were probably inscribed simply to assist ink flow. The first name – De L’Estoille – probably refers to the diarist Pierre de L’Estoile (1546–1611), suggesting that the copybook may have been compiled around the time when his *Journal des choses mémorables* was first published (1621). This is consistent with the dates of other works featured throughout the copybook.
Fig. 2. Measuring instruments from the copybook of Jacques Gentillâtre. Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Fr 14727, fol. 188r.
the four elements and their properties, extracted from Salomon de Caus' *Les raisons des forces mouvantes*. This is followed by six, individually-numbered sections on geometry, including a full introduction to arithmetic, the measurement of solid bodies, moving forces, the measurement of straight lines, and surveying, much of which derives from Abel Foullon's *Usage et description de l'holometre* and Jean Bullant's *La geometrie et horlogiographie*. The next two sections, 'De la fabrique des forteresses' and 'demonstration de l'architecture des forteresses', cover all aspects of contemporary fortification design, including bastions, earthworks, and mines, culled from diverse sources including Dürrer, Errard, Marolois, Pasino, and Alghisi. The eighth book, on 'plusieur machines seruant a l'art militaire' is a remarkably complete repertoire of Early Modern *machines de guerre*, while the next section, on civil architecture, includes most aspects of the architect's art, from the proper site of a château to the layout of rooms and gardens, the construction of effective fireplaces, and the orders of architecture. Throughout this section Gentillâtre has drawn on the works of Alberti, Serlio, Vignola, De L'Orme, and Viruvius in Jean Martin's French translation. This is followed by a section on the mason's art.

---

23 This, in and of itself, is striking, as this is the only evidence (to the best of my knowledge) for the contemporary reception of the text, rather than just the images, of de Caus' book by a fellow architect-engineer. It is not clear from which edition of de Caus' *Les raisons* the extract (fols. 10r–13r) has been taken, although it corresponds to pp. 1–2 in the first, 1615 edition.

24 See Foullon Abel, *Usage et description de l'holometre* (Paris: 1555, 1567) and Bullant Jean, *La geometrie et horlogiographie* (Paris: 1561; Paris: 1608). The high mathematical content of the manuscript underscores the fact that many of the professional architect-engineer's activities were rooted in mathematics, on which see Vérin, *Gloire des ingénieurs*.


26 Valturio Roberto, *De re militari* (Verona: 1472 and numerous subsequent. eds.) is a prominent source.

('de la demonstration des traict des masongnerie'), including the geometry required to construct sound arches, vaults, and spiral stairs, and a survey of supporting wooden structures used to construct bridges. The fourteenth, untitled section is on perspective, followed by a brief survey of dialling and its associated instruments, some of which feature *volvelles*. The manuscript concludes with a compendium of machines for lifting weights and raising water, including a brief discussion of hydraulics.²⁸

A number of factors strongly indicate that the manuscript was compiled by and for a practitioner rather than a non-practising enthusiast, supporting Châtelet-Lange’s attribution of the document to Gentillâtre. First, the range of subjects covered is entirely consistent with the various fields in which Early Modern technical practitioners worked, as well as the type of books that they owned and read. Indeed, a large proportion of the extracts in the manuscript are on technical subjects (methods for constructing vaults, machines for lifting masonry, instruments for surveying building sites, etc.), demonstrating a deep concern for practical solutions to everyday architectural and engineering problems. Second, the quality of the drawings suggests that the compiler had received at least some training in draughtsmanship. Although the vast majority are clearly copies, the drawings (many of which are coloured) are of a consistently high quality, although it should be noted that the drawings are not sufficiently polished as to suggest that the manuscript was intended for formal presentation, that it was a commissioned display piece, or that it was intended to serve as a fair copy for the cutting of engravings or woodblocks. Third, the careful arrangement of the extracts into organised sections suggests that easy, swift reference was an important factor when compiling the manuscript. Indeed, the compact size of the document renders it eminently portable, suitable for quick reference in a working environment such as a building site.²⁹

---


²⁹ The possibility that the manuscript was used for displaying the range of the compiler’s abilities to prospective patrons should not be ruled out. On the transmission of ideas between architect and patron, see e.g. Rosenfeld, “From Drawn to Printed Model Book”.

Fig. 3. Architectural features after Philibert de L’Orme. From the copybook of Jacques Gentillâtre, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Fr 14727, fol. 338r.
Fig. 4. Volvelles. From the copybook of Jacques Gentillâtre, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Fr 14727, fol. 510r.
In her extended assessment of Gentillâtre’s manuscript, Châtelet-Lange suggests that the manuscript was intended for publication as a ‘manual for architects and engineers’, while in the *Grove Dictionary of Art* she describes it as a ‘theoretical treatise on architecture’. Both these statements are problematic. There is no unequivocal evidence, either in the manuscript itself or from other sources, that the document was conceived as an original invention intended for publication. Châtelet-Lange’s assumption that Gentillâtre composed the manuscript with publication in mind privileges the notion that publication was necessarily the aim of all Early Modern architect-engineers and like-minded professionals. Yet while it is clear that publication was an important aim for many technical practitioners, the majority, as David Buisseret’s recent study of architect-engineers in France has shown, never made it into print and may well not have wished to.\(^\text{30}\)

Châtelet-Lange’s suggestion that the manuscript was intended for publication rests partly on the observation that several passages of text and drawings in the manuscript appear to be of Gentillâtre’s own devising. However, while it is certainly the case that several sections of the manuscript do appear to be Gentillâtre’s own creation, the majority of the manuscript is either copied directly from printed sources or records structures that Gentillâtre encountered throughout his career. In fact, Châtelet-Lange erroneously cites several sections of the manuscript as Gentillâtre’s inventions, when in fact they were copied from printed material. To take just one example, she ascribes a horse-drawn ‘odometre’ to Gentillâtre when it is actually copied from Jacques Besson’s well-known *Le Cosmolabe* (1567). Thus, although Châtelet-Lange correctly identified the manuscript as a compilation that included both original and copied material, she nevertheless accorded greater weight to Gentillâtre’s creative contribution to the contents than the available evidence properly allows. Research thus far indicates that at least 50% of the manuscript (and probably significantly more) was copied from printed matter (a working list of titles is provided in Appendix 2) and as such it is perhaps best described as a copybook, notebook, or (given its small size) a pocketbook rather than

a manual or treatise. Although some attempt has been made to divide the manuscript into sections, some of which are provided with titles and called ‘books’ (‘livres’), this is not inconsistent with the arrangement of other contemporary compilations of copied materials and should not be taken as proof that publication was Gentillâtre’s intention. Furthermore, the small size and portability of the manuscript, although by no means a decisive factor, lends some weight to the suggestion that the document was a pragmatic personal compendium rather than a draft treatise intended for publication.

Châtelet-Lange’s assertion that the manuscript is a ‘theoretical treatise on architecture’ is also questionable. First, and perhaps most importantly, the material the manuscript contains is decidedly practical in nature, geared decisively towards use rather than contemplation. Second, the contents of the manuscript extend well beyond the standard remit of architectural practice in the early seventeenth century (the manuscript includes, for instance, designs for diving suits). Third, the manuscript does not explicitly address the nature of architectural practice, or the profession of the architect, in the Early Modern period (though there is a great deal of implicit information about these topics embedded in the document). Furthermore, although Gentillâtre does organise the materials at his disposal in a quasi-systematic fashion, he does not theorise architecture in a consistent or substantial manner.

None of this entirely rules out the possibility that publication of some sort was Gentillâtre’s ultimate intention. Unless further evidence comes to light, all claims regarding the manuscript must remain, at least in part, speculative. However, regardless of whether or not publication was intended, the manuscript provides important insights into the ways in which Early Modern technical practitioners consumed and appropriated the materials at their disposal, be they printed books, manuscripts, machines, or buildings. As such, it engages with some of the key questions raised by recent studies of Early Modern technology, including the role of ‘models’, the relationship between object, print, and manuscript, and the fundamental question recently posed by Marcus Popplow, ‘Why draw pictures of machines’? In particular, the manuscript provides us with

---

31 Châtelet-Lange is perhaps closer to the mark when stating that the manuscript is ‘an adaptation of the Vitruvian model to the more practical demands of his [Gentillâtre’s] time’. Châtelet-Lange, “Gentillâtre, Jacques” 310.
Fig. 5. 'Odometre', after Jacques Besson. From the copybook of Jacques Gentillâtre, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Fr 14727, fol. 192v.
valuable information about both the range and type of books read by a practicing architect-engineer and, somewhat unusually, evidence for the sections of those books that he deemed useful enough to copy, as well as the way in which he organised the material at his disposal. Thus, Gentillâtre’s compilation takes us beyond the confines of library lists and probate records, greatly augmenting the slim evidence provided by the rare, surviving copies of printed books annotated by architect-engineers, and suggests that technical practitioners adapted and employed the humanist method of commonplaces for their own particular needs.

IV

The suggestion that Gentillâtre adapted the method of commonplaces for the compilation of his manuscript rests essentially on two observations. First, the extent of direct copying evident in the manuscript; second, the manner in which the compiler has divided up the material at his disposal into discreet sections of text and images with similar content. Copying was, of course, common not only to humanist reading practices but also to workshop practices. In professions related to the visual arts, copying formed a crucial part of an apprentice’s learning, its repetitive nature helping to fix in the mind and in the hand the subjects and procedures necessary for a prosperous career. Gentillâtre, who would almost certainly have worked as a copyist during his time in Du Cerceau’s workshop, was clearly adept at this art. In some parts of the manuscript, entire sections of a book are copied directly, replicating precisely the sequence of the printed original. This is the case, for example, with the extracts from Jean Errard’s La fortification reduit en art and the sections of the manuscript concerned with the orders of architecture. More frequently, however, individual images and/or sections of text and images from different places in a printed book have been carefully selected and copied into different places in the manuscript. For example, the text and images copied from Bullant’s Geometrie are dispersed throughout the manuscript: a poem celebrating arithmetic and geometry is at the beginning of the manuscript, while a ‘Figure de l’Horloge Hydraulique’ of Oronce Fine and

a pair of spherical sundials appear towards the end (fols. 509r and 511v). Often, images from a variety of different sources are clustered together on a single sheet, which seems to be the case for the folio (490v) presenting perspectival devices and optical games. Thus, it appears that Gentillâtre was not merely mechanically copying the material at his disposal. When consulting printed books he digested what he read and saw, condensing, separating, and ordering the images and passages of text he deemed useful and interesting.

Gentillâtre rarely indicates the printed sources of his manuscript compilation. The names of just five authors – Dürer, Serlio, Pasino, Alghisi, and Marolois – are given in the document. For example, the name ‘Albert Dure’, is inscribed above a copy of figure 8.4 from Dürer’s *Underweysung*. The range of books used, however, is far more extensive than these named sources suggest. As the working list of printed sources provided in Appendix 2 shows, Gentillâtre clearly had access to (even if he did not own) a substantial selection of printed books that range widely in terms of both subject and format. It is especially notable, for instance, that lavish folio publications such as de Caus’ *Les raisons* and Besson’s *Théâtre* have been used alongside Foullon’s more modest *Usage et description de l’holometre* or Bullant’s *Geometrie*.

This raises two important points. First, it provides further evidence that treatises on architecture and engineering, on mathematics, instruments and machines, composed by architect-engineers were read and put to use by members of their own community of practitioners. Second, it suggests that while elaborately illustrated, expensive folios clearly found a market amongst elites, their contents also reached a practitioner audience.


34 This manner of selecting and arranging materials suggests that Gentillâtre did not simply copy sections from printed books as he happened upon them. It seems more likely that he had access to the books from which material is taken over some time, and that the copybook may have been a carefully planned enterprise.

35 It remains unclear whether only ‘well-off’ engineers could afford such books. The cases usually cited (Leonardo, Schickhardt, Aleotti) certainly fall into this category (Popplow, “Why Draw Pictures of Machines?” 40). Evidence for the cost of this type of publication is scarce though it seems likely that illustrated treatises on fortification were less expensive than the extremely lavish theatres of machines. A note on the fly-leaf-r of the BOP copy of Lorini’s *Le Fortificationi*, (K XIII e 17) states that the book cost just over 2 scudi in 1625 (‘Comprare a di 16 Luglio in Roma alla Fontana per scudi 2 [?] 25’).
Fig. 6. Oronce Fine’s waterclock (bottom left), after Jean Bullant. From the copybook of Jacques Gentillâtre, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Fr 14727, fol. 509r.
Fig. 7. Perspective devices and optical games, after various authors. From the copybook of Jacques Gentillâtre, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Fr 14727, fol. 490v.
Concluding Remarks

If it is accepted that Gentillâtre’s manuscript provides evidence for the ways in which an early seventeenth-century architect-engineer recorded information for regular, professional use, this document brings into question the notion that machine books, such as those by de Caus or Besson, played only a marginal role for engineers’ everyday practice. While it is certainly the case that the precise particulars of technology (measurements of parts, materials to be used, etc.) are frequently sidelined in these so-called ‘presentational treatises’, it seems likely that the numerous images of machines and buildings from printed books featured throughout Gentillâtre’s manuscript were intended as models that could be adapted according to the demands of particular projects.36 While it is highly improbable that Gentillâtre’s manuscript would have been used to provide detailed information for the artisans working on a specific project it may well have ‘helped the engineer to bridge the different locations of decision processes and the actual realisation of a project – the court or the town hall and building site’.37 By studying documents such as copybooks, of which Gentillâtre’s is but one (admittedly rich) example, we gain important insights into the intellectual and professional world of the Early Modern technical practitioner. The present essay is but a brief foray into the rich sources available for studying the reading and copying practices undertaken by such individuals. It is to be hoped that a systematic assessment of similar documents will be undertaken.

36 It should be noted that in the period concerned ‘models’ could be both three- and two-dimensional. As Henninger-Voss explains, ‘The words ‘model’ and ‘design’ were employed interchangeably in both published architectural treatises on fortification and in documents pertaining to government administration of fortification works. The substitution of one for another cannot always be counted on since models were made of different media – either a two-dimensional representation on paper, or a three-dimensional construction made of wood, gesso, or some other material’. Henninger-Voss, “Measures of Success” 146 and 146–155 for the uses to which fortifications models were put. See also Timothy Wilks’ note of caution over the use of the terms ‘model’ and ‘module’ at Prince Henry’s court. Wilks T., The Court Culture of Prince Henry and his Circle, 2 vols (unpublished DPhil., Oxford: 1987) vol. I, 201. For the use of models in civil architecture, see Millon H.A., “Models in Renaissance Architecture”, in idem (ed.), Renaissance Architecture from Brunelleschi to Michelangelo (London: 1996) 19–73.

Appendix 1

Composition of BNF, MS Fr. 14727

The sections listed below follow Gentillâtre’s rough division of the material in the copybook. The titles are those provided by Gentillâtre, for which I have preserved the original orthography. Where a section has not been given a title I have supplied an indication (in italics) of its contents. Folio numbers at the end of each title record the folio on which each section begins. The manuscript’s numerous blank pages have been omitted.

- **Introduction** (geometric solids, the elements, and basic mathematics) [fol. 1v]
- Premier liure de geometri [fol. 65v]
- second liure de geometry pour former tous corps superficielle [fol. 78r]
- Troisieme liure de geometry des superfici plaine [fol. 110r]
- Quatrieme liure de geometri de la mesure des corps solides [fol. 146r]
- Cinquieme liure de geometry des proportions des force mouuante [fol. 163r]
- Vi liure de geomettri de la mesure des ligne droit [fol. 175r]
- DE LA FABRIQVE DES FORTERESSES [fol. 208r]
- Septieme liure de la demonstration de larchitecture des fortifications [fol. 238r]
- Huitieme liure demonstrantes plusieur machine seruant a lart militaire [fol. 278r]
- Untitled section on civil architecture and engineering [fol. 263v]
- Dixieme liure de la demonstration de larchitecture des batiments [fol. 304r]
- Onzieme liure de la demonstration des trait de masongerie [fol. 406r]
- Untitled section on perspective [fol. 409v]
- Untitled section on dialling [fol. 509r]
- Untitled section on various types of machine for lifting weights, raising water, etc. [fol. 549v]
Working List of Printed Sources for BNF, MS Fr. 14727 (in chronological order according to first edition)

1. Valturio Roberto, *De re militari* (Verona, Johannes Nicolai: 1472 and numerous subsequent eds.).
13. Instrumentorum et machinarum . . . liber primus, Orleans, s.d., French trans. *Théâtre des instruments mathématiques* (Lyon, Barthélemy Vincent: 1578); numerous subsequent editions up to 1596.
17. Marolois Samuel, *Fortification ou architecture militaire* (The Hague, Hendrik Hondius: 1614/15; Amsterdam, Jan Janssen: 1617; as part of the *Opera Mathematica*).
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Das kompositorische Werk der beiden Musiker ist in signifikanter Weise unterschiedlich. Bach war und blieb zeitlebens Organist und Kirchenmusiker. Seine Kunst lässt sich mehr oder weniger durchgehend aus dem Tasteninstrument einerseits und der gottesdienstlichen Kantatenpraxis andererseits verstehen. Mattheson hingegen erlangte seinen Durchbruch als Komponist und Interpret mit einer Oper: Die Plejadades wurden 1699 an der Hamburger Gänsemarktoper gespielt, Mattheson selbst sang eine Hauptrolle. Seine musikalische Kunst, namentlich die zahlreichen geistlichen Oratorien, lässt sich aus der Gattung Oper heraus verstehen, eine Gattung, die Bach bezeichnenderweise gänzlich mied, obwohl er sich, wenn er gewollt hätte, Gelegenheit dazu hätte verschaffen können. Ich werde die These vertreten, dass diese jeweilige kompositorischen Grundausrichtung an der gottesdienstlichen Kirchenmusik einerseits und an der Oper andererseits eine genaue Entsprechung in den Lektüren hat.

Welche Bücher die Regale der beiden Komponisten füllten und was sie darüber hinaus an Büchern lasen, die sich nicht in ihrem Besitz befanden, ist in je unterschiedlicher Weise rekonstruierbar. Bachs Bibliothek ist uns aus einem Inventar seines Nachlasses bekannt, das nach Titeln aufgeschlüsselt ist: Specificatio der Verlassenschaft des am 28. July seel. verstorbenen Herrn Johann Sebastian Bachs weyl. Cantoris an der Schule


I. *Bach*

Zum Zeitpunkt seines Todes im Jahr 1750 besaß Bach die im Anhang aufgelisteten Bücher – ganze 51 Titel. In dieser Liste fehlen die Musikalien und einige wenige Musiktheoretika, die Bach wahrscheinlich kurz vor seinem Tod am Nachlassverwalter vorbei gezielt an bestimmte Erben

---

3 Der Nachlass Matthesons wird in der Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Hamburg unter der Signatur 18: Cod. hans. IV: 38–42 aufbewahrt.
weitergereicht hat. Der Bestand an musikalischen Lehrwerken, der bei
Mattheson, wie ich zeigen werde, die abendländische Geschichte des
musikalischen Wissens mehr oder weniger vollständig abbildet, hat sich
bei Bach vermutlich auf sehr wenige Werke konzentriert. So weiß man
aus einem der jüngsten Bach-Funde, dass Bach für den Kompositionsun-
terricht, den er als Kantor an St. Thomas zu geben hatte, Kontrapunkt-
beispiele aus Calvisius' Melopoiäa von 1592 exzerpiert hat.5 Bach hätte
auf zahlreiche neuere, weit verbreitete Kompositionslehrer zurückgreifen
cönnen. So kannte er zum Beispiel mit Sicherheit das Lehrbuch seines
Amtsvorgängers im Thomaskantorat Johann Theile.6 Auch die Kompo-
sitionslehre Christoph Bernhards von ca. 1650, ebenfalls gängiges Lehr-
material im Musikunterricht an den Lateinschulen, scheint ihm vertraut
gewesen zu sein.7 Aber Aktualität war kein Kriterium von Bachs Lektüre.
Während Mattheson sich mit Calvisius beschäftigte, um den Stand des
musikalischen Wissens vor rund einhundert Jahren zu studieren, hatten
Bücher für Bach eine unhistorische Dauerpräsenz. Bach interessierte sich
in Calvisius' Buch für bestimmte kontrapunktische Techniken, die er im
Unterricht anwenden konnte und an denen er sich vielleicht auch selbst
perfektierte. Sie stammen nicht einmal von Calvisius selbst; Calvisius
etlehnte sie seinerseits aus den weit verbreiteten Istitutioni von Gioseffo
Zarlino.8 Auch dieses Buch muss Bach gekannt, vielleicht sogar besessen
haben, wie sein Sohn Carl Philipp Emanuel bezeugt, der einmal zu Proto-
koll gab, das Komponieren von seinem Vater und aus dem Zarlino gelernt
tzu haben – und letzteren wird ihm ebenfalls sein Vater in die Hand gege-
ben haben. Für alle diese historischen Schichten interessierte sich Bach
nicht. Die strengen Kontrapunkttechniken des 16. Jahrhunderts galten um
1730 als in keiner Weise mehr zeitgenössisch. Bach war sich zwar des sti-
listischen Unterschieds zwischen dem strengen Satz und dem kantablen,
flüssigen Stil der zeitgenössischen Vokalmusik bewusst und setzte die Stile,
wie etwa die h-Moll-Messe mit ihren Gegensätzen von altem und neuem

4 Calvisius Sethus, ΜΕΛΟΠΟΙΑ sive melodiae contentae ratio, quam vulgò musicam poe-
ticam vocant […] (Erfurt, Baumanns: 1592).
5 Siehe Werbeck W., „Bach und der Kontrapunkt. Neue Manuskript-Funde“, Bach-
6 Theile Johann, Opus musicalis compositionis noviter elaboratum […] (Merseburg,
Gottschickius: 1708). Vgl. Oechsle S., „J. S. Bachs Auseinandersetzung mit dem stylus anti-
quus und die musikalisch-liturgischen Traditionen in Leipzig“, in Leisinger U. (Hrsg.), Bach
7 Das kann aus den jüngsten Theoriefunden geschlossen werden; siehe Werbeck, „Bach
und der Kontrapunkt“.
8 Zarlino Gioseffo, Le istitutioni harmoniche (Venedig, Francesco Senese: 1558).

Bildet sich im Buchbestand der Lateinlehrer Bach ab? Auch der war Bach in seiner Stellung als Kantor. Mit ‚Kantor‘ ist nicht nur der Musiklehrer an der Schule und der Verantwortliche für die vokale Kirchenmusik bezeichnet, sondern ein bestimmter Dienstgrad an der Lateinschule, der auch den Unterricht in Latein und anderen trivialen Fächern einschloss. Die Frage lässt sich mit einem klaren nein beantworten. Die humanistischen Klassiker, die im Lateinunterricht der höheren Klassen auf dem Lehrplan standen, fehlen völlig, mit Ausnahme von Flavius Josephus – und den las Bach offenkundig auf deutsch. Obwohl Bach selbst humanistische Bildung an einer Lateinschule genossen hatte, konnte er wahrscheinlich schlecht Latein, was mit ein Grund gewesen sein dürfte, sich der Unterrichtspflichten des Thomaskantorats in den 1730er Jahren allmählich gänzlich zu entledigen, ein für einen bestallten Kantor ungewöhnlicher Vorgang, der von Bach nur mit Mühe durchgesetzt werden konnte. Bach ging mit seiner humanistischen Bildung, die er nicht weniger als andere deutsche Musiker seines Stands hatte, auf in Deutschland ziemlich einzigartige Weise um. Mattheson war in seinen Kompositionen und seinen späteren Kompositionslehrbüchern9 bestrebt, die theologischen, literarischen, nationalen, stilgeschichtlichen und philosophischen Einflüsse auf die Musik transparent zu halten. Bach hingegen amalgamierte diese Einflüsse völlig seinem Komponieren, er saugte sie auf, bis sie als solche nicht mehr kenntlich blieben, er setzte sie restlos um in unbegriffliche reine Musik.10

---


Während man bei Mattheson zeigen kann, dass er die französische, englische und deutsche Novellistik las, fehlt in Bachs Bibliothek die schöne Literatur völlig. Wahrscheinlich war sie ihm ein Graus. Der Klatsch an den europäischen Höfen, der in die Romanliteratur einging, und die akademischen Fehden, die in den Gelehrtenperiodika verarbeitet wurden, gingen an ihm vorbei. Man kann überspitzt sagen, dass Bach von der Welt aller-hand mitbekam und nichts behielt. Er war spätestens ab der Leipziger Zeit in einer Weise auf das musikalische Schaffen an sich fixiert, die in ihrer Zeit singulär ist und die sehr viel von der Zeitunabhängigkeit seiner Musik bis heute erklärt. Und sie erklärt meines Erachtens, warum Bach nie eine
Oper schrieb. Oper ist, wie Mattheson sagte, ein 'Confluxum aller Musikalischen Schönheiten', also eine eklektische und damit par excellence 'galante' Gattung. Eine Oper war die literarisch-musikalische Umsetzung des je aktuellen Lifestyle und der neuesten Art zu denken, zu fühlen und zu lieben. Auf der Höhe solchen Wissens konnte man nur sein, wenn man die entsprechende Literatur las und sich in den Kreisen bewegte, in denen sie diskutiert wurde. Solche Kreise gab es in Leipzig genügend; in keinem von ihnen hat sich Bach bewegt. Sich in die Theaterwelt mit ihren Primadonnen und Kastraten, mit der Gier ihres Publikums nach schönen Stimmen und tiefen Dekolletés zu begeben war für Bach ausgeschlossen.


II. *Mattheson*

Der Leser und der Akteur der *Respublica literaria* Mattheson tritt in Erscheinung, als der Opernkomponist Mattheson die Bühne verlässt. Im Jahr 1711, gerade dreißigjährig, schrieb Mattheson seine letzte Oper; seine sängерische Tätigkeit hatte er schon länger ruhen lassen. Im Jahr 1713 wurde in Hamburg sein erstes Buch gedruckt, das *Neu-Eröffnete Orchestre*. Es war

---

13 Vollständiger Titel: Mattheson Johann, *Das Neu-Eröffnete Orchestre, Oder Universalische und gründliche Anleitung / Wie ein GalantHomme einen vollkommenen Begriff von der...

Man kann davon ausgehen, dass Mattheson schon vor der Aufnahme der Arbeit am Buch ein vielseitig interessierter Leser war. Die Ausrichtung des Buchs am Wissensstand musikalischer Laien, die nichts weiter im Sinn hatten, als sich über das jeweilige Wissensgebiet eine oberflächliche Kenntnis anzueignen, um im galanten Smalltalk mitreden zu können, zwang ihn jedoch dazu, die musikalische Materie, die dem durchschnittlichen Bildungsbürger – nicht anders als heute – abstrakt, voller unbekannter Termini und undurchschaubarer Zusammenhänge und selbst unter ihren Gelehrten bis ins Grundsätzliche strittig vorkam, darzustellen, ohne abstrakt zu sein, ohne mit Fachbegriffen zu jonglieren, ohne von komplizierten harmonischen und rhythmischen Verhältnissen zu raunen und ohne sich ins Gezänk der Gelehrten zu begeben.

Aus dieser Not machte Mattheson eine Tugend, und sie führte ihn zu einer epochalen Neuformulierung des musikalischen Wissens überhaupt. Mattheson muss im Lauf der Arbeit erkannt haben, dass das seit den Zeiten des Pythagoras angehäufte musikalische Fachwissen ein Ballast war, der die Musikwissenschaft systematisch daran hinderte, die einfachsten musikalischen Phänomene zu erklären: warum die eine Musik als schön empfunden wird, die andere als unzugänglich, warum die eine Musik die heißesten Emotionen weckt und die andere kalt lässt, warum die eine Musik Erfolg hat und die andere beim zahlenden Publikum durchfällt (dass dieses Problem der Musikwissenschaft eine longue durée bis heute hat, ist unschwer zu erkennen). Er entschloss sich, gegen seine eigene Zunft anzuschreiben. Am Paradigma des „Galanten“ entwarf er den Grundriss eines musikalischen Wissens, das nach und nach bisher

\[\text{Hoheit und Würde der edlen Music erlangen / seinen Gout darnach formiren / die Terminos technicos verstehen und geschicklich von dieser vortrefflichen Wissenschaft raisonnieren möge […] (Hamburg, Schiller: 1713).}\]

\[\text{14 Der Rahmenband der Reihe war: Der geöffnete Ritter-Blatz / Worinnen Die vornehmste Ritterliche Wissenschaften und Übungen / Sonderlich was bey der Fortification, Civil-Bau-Kunst / Schiff-Farth / Reit-Kunst / jägerey / Antiquen und Modernen Münzten / Wie auch Modern Medaillen, Hauptsächliches und Merckwürdiges Zu beobachten / In erörterung der nothwendigsten und gewöhnlichsten Kunst-Wörter […] (Hamburg, Schiller: 1700).}\]

Damit provozierte Mattheson absehbar den Protest der Traditionalisten. Es protestierte Johann Heinrich Buttstedt, ein wenig bekannter Kirchenmusiker aus Erfurt, mit einer Streitschrift, die direkt gegen das Neu-eröffnete Orchestre gerichtet war. Buttstedt äußerte die Befürchtung, wenn Matthesons Konzept sich durchsetze, gehe der gesamte riesige musikalische Wissensbestand verloren, der in Europa seit der antiken Musiktheorie aufgebaut worden sei. Vor allem gehe das Wissen um das höchste Geheimnis der Musik, ihre Verbindung zur universalen Weltharmonie, verloren, das doch das eigentliche Fundament aller Faszination der Musik und allen musikalischen Spezialwissens sei.

Mattheson musste antworten. Aber in der populärwissenschaftlichen Reihe waren Antworten auf Gegenschriften nicht vorgesehen; es war wahrscheinlich überhaupt nicht vorgesehen, mit einer populärwissenschaftlichen Einführungsschrift eine Fachkontroverse auszulösen. Mit

15 Mattheson, Das Neu-eröffnete Orchestre 5.


\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{17} Mattheson Johann, *Das Beschützte Orchestre, oder desselben Zweyte Eröffnung / Worinn Nicht nur einem würklichen galant-homme, der eben kein Profeßions-Verwandter / sondern auch manchem Musico selbst die alleraufrichtigste und deutlichste Vorstellung musicalischer Wissenschafften / wie sich dieselbe vom Schulstaub tüchtig gesäubert / eigentlich und wahrhaftig verhalten / ertheilet […]* (Hamburg, Schiller: 1717).

\end{flushright}
nicht kategorisch zu unterscheiden waren. Aber dieses Wissen erhob den Anspruch, ‚forschenden‘ Charakter zu haben, also den Dingen von der Oberfläche aus auf den Grund zu gehen. Der methodische Schlüssel dazu war der Sensualismus, wie er von John Locke entwickelt worden war, und eine wissenschaftliche Pragmatik, wie sie in Deutschland namentlich von Christian Thomasius vertreten wurde. Mattheson zitiert Locke wörtlich auf Englisch, wenn auch nicht nachgewiesen:

So viel kan die Vernunft thun / daß / wenn sie eine Ideam vom Sinne geboret / sie dieselbe multipliciren oder diminuire mag / und das nennet Lock […] Operation of the mind; complex Ideas, das ist: Die Würckungen der Vernunft / zusamnen-gezogene Bilder / mit einem Worte: Reflexion, oder Nachdencken; weiter gehen die Kräffte nicht.19

Diesen Entwicklungsstand des Lesers, Schreibers und Komponisten Mattheson bis 1721 werde ich im Folgenden analysieren. In den drei Orchestre-Schriften werden insgesamt 379 Titel genannt.20 Davon entfallen auf das Neu-Eröffnete Orchestre 37 Titel, auf das Beschützte Orchestre 129 und auf das Forschende Orchestre 295 Titel. Die Zuwachsrate beträgt von der ersten zur zweiten Schrift 349%, von der zweiten zur dritten Schrift 229%. Von der ersten zur dritten Schrift wuchs die Titelzahl um 797%, also das knapp achtfache an.

„Das Neu-Eröffnete Orchestre“ (1713)

Bereits in der Einleitung, als Mattheson Agrippa und Kircher ironisch erwähnt – die Lektüre dieser Autoren führe dazu, überall Geister zu vermuten21 –, soll der Leser ahnen, dass Mattheson die gesamte quadriviale und triviale Literatur zur Musik kennt. Gegen Ende der Schrift wiederholt er:

Man könte sonst noch leicht […] einen catalogum von mehr als 1000. Autoren, die von der Music in Griechischer / Lateinischer und andern Sprachen geschrieben haben / anhängen.22

Er könnte, will aus besagten Gründen aber nicht, so wird hier jedenfalls großspurig behauptet. Die tausend Autoren, die auch im Forschenden Orchestre zahlenmäßig noch nicht erreicht sind, wird er auch 1721 kaum alle im Detail gelesen haben. Er spielt nur auf das Verweisverfahren an, das

19 Mattheson, Das Forschende Orchestre 148.
20 Siehe eine Liste aller zitierten Titel im Anhang.
21 Mattheson, Das Neu-eröffnete Orchestre 5.
22 Ibid. 289.
im Humanismus und dann in der Respublica literaria üblich war, Stellen und nicht Argumente oder gar Systematiken von Argumenten zu zitieren. Im Beschützten Orchester wird ihm klarer zu Bewusstsein kommen, dass die Zeit vorbei ist, in der musikalischen Wissenschaft zu triftigem Wissen zu kommen, wenn nur fleißig kompiliert wird. Musikalische Wissenschaft erfordert, wie Mattheson allmählich aufgeht, eine Tabula rasa, frei von Büchern, wie auch das praktische Musizieren freie Bahn für musikalische Intuition und musikalischen Instinkt erfordert. In aller Klarheit wird das im Forschenden Orchester dann zum Programm gemacht:

Es haben bishero die Theoretici (wie sie genannt werden) gut Schreibens gehabt / und mit ihrem eigenen Schatten / nicht für die lange Weile / gefoch- ten. Ihnen hat kein Practicus, ich weiß nicht / ob ich soll sagen: antworten wollen / antworten dürfen / oder antworten können.23

Von dieser Grundhaltung aus gesehen erfordert das Lesen jedes Buchs zugleich die Vertilgung dieser Lektüreerfahrung. Man könnte tausend Bücher anführen, aber man müsste, wenn das musikalische Wissen tatsächlich von der Praxis ausgehen und wieder in die Praxis zurückfließen soll, dann auch tausend Standpunkte durchdenken und sie sich wieder vom Schreibtisch schaffen. Im Neu-Eröffneten Orchester deutet Mattheson diesen unabdingbaren Weg der Destruktion von Lektüreerfahrung nur an, in den beiden Folgeschriften versucht er ihn dann zu gehen. Man kann das an den bloßen Zahlen nachverfolgen. Im Neu-Eröffneten Orchester werden zehn antike Titel (vor Augustin gerechnet) zitiert. Im Beschützten Orchester steigt die Zahl auf 16, eine Steigerung um 60%. Im Forschenden Orchester schnellt sie um 343% auf 55 Titel hoch.

Sich das, was man liest, für die künstlerische und wissenschaftliche Produktion wieder vom Schreibtisch zu schaffen, mündet in ein bestimmtes Verfahren, das den Kern von Matthesons intellektuellem Handeln insgesamt ausmacht. Der Sinn der Mühe, sich durch tausend Bücher zu quälen, kann ja nicht darin bestehen, sie als falsch zu erkennen und ins Bücherregal zurückzustellen. Irgendein Gewinn muss damit verbunden sein, sonst wäre es unredlich, mit tausend Büchern zu winken. Dieses Verfahren nennt Mattheson in allen drei Orchester-Schriften „galant“. Galant mit der ungeheure Masse des abendländischen Wissens umzugehen, heißt für Mattheson, es geschmeidig in einen common sense einzuspeisen, der vom Grund der Tiefenstrukturen eines Wissensgebiets wieder an

23 Mattheson, Das Forschende Orchester Vorrede, unpag.


\(^{24}\) Z.B. Mattheson, *Das Forschende Orchestre* 156.
\(^{25}\) Ibid. 222.

Diese Konstellation erklärt, warum Mattheson ein Opernkomponist war und Bach keiner. Für Mattheson war die Oper die galante Gattung par excellence, nicht nur, weil ihre Sujets obligatorisch von Galanterien, also von Liebesdingen handeln,26 sondern ‚weil man in selbigen gleichsam einen Confluxum aller Musicalischen Schönheiten antreffen kan‘.27 Damit meinte er die gesamte Bandbreite zeitgenössischer musikalischer Ausdrucksmöglichkeiten. Die darf in der Oper aber nicht enzyklopädisch behandelt werden. Vielmehr muss der gesamte Wissensstoff auf die Ebene des leichten gesellschaftlichen Umgangs geholt werden, der sich dadurch auszeichnet, dass nicht pedantisch ein einziges Thema traktiert wird, sondern Wissen und Erfahrung aus vielen Wissensgebieten zusammenfließen. Diese Leichtigkeit ging Bach ab, und Bach wusste das offenkundig auch selbst.


auf deutsch oder latein greifbar gewesen, Mattheson aber zitiert sie in der englischen Übersetzung von Roger L’Estrange. Am Fall von John Wallis lässt sich ablesen, was Mattheson mit diesen Autoren außer intellektuellem Prestige vermutlich verband. Bei den Engländern zeigte sich ein alternatives wissenschaftliches Denken. Sie waren humanistisch ebenso sattelfest wie die Kontinentaleuropäer, aber sie gingen mit dem Berg an Schulwissen pragmatischer um. John Wallis kannte die pythagoreische Musikarithmetik genau, aber trotzdem verfiel er nicht welthermonikalnen Spekulationen, sondern schritt von der antiken Arithmetik weiter zu einer hochentwickelten mathematischen Analysis, die nicht mehr die sinnliche Oberfläche und die mathematische Struktur von Phänomenen primitiv miteinander verwechselte.


Autoritätenverweis. Zudem schien ihm zu behagen, wie Brossard ohne Scheu und ohne übervorsichtiges Historisieren alte Zöpfe abschnitt.29

„Das Beschützte Orchestre“ (1717)


Das gesamte Buch ist eine polemische Auseinandersetzung mit Buttstedts Streitschrift gegen das Neu-Eröffnete Orchestre. Um Buttstedt zu überführen, sah sich Mattheson offensichtlich gezwungen, einerseits die historische Genese der Theorie zu rekonstruieren und darzustellen, als dessen letzten und hoffnungslos verspäteten Vertreter er Buttstedt präsentieren wollte, andererseits Gewährsmänner in der musikalischen Theoriegeschichte ausfindig zu machen, die das Unsinnige einer arithmetisch-quadrivialen Musiktheorie bereits erkannt oder erahnt hatten. Um das zu leisten, muss sich Mattheson zwischen 1713 und 1717 extensiv in die theoretiker des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts hineingeleisen haben: Gafurius, Rhau, Listenius, Glarean, Faber, Beurhaus, Roggius, Burmeister, Calvisius, Hubmeyer, Vulpius, Lippius, Praetorius, Baryphonus, Fludd, Kepler, Grimm, Profe, Herbst, Bernhard, Descartes, Matthaei, Gibelius, Kircher,

29 Vgl. zum Beispiel die Zitation von Brossards Stellungnahmen gegen die Methode der Solmisation im Beschützten Orchestre 369–370.


\(^{30}\) Ibid. 402–403.


„Das Forschende Orchestre“ (1721)

Im Forschenden Orchestre schlägt sich die wohl umfassende Lektüre eines Genres nieder, das in den ersten beiden Orchestre-Schriften noch nicht publizistisch umgesetzt wurde, die wissenschaftlichen und populären Periodika. Es gehörte zu Matthesons Aufgaben als Gesandtschafts sekretär, Dossiers der deutschsprachigen Periodika anzufertigen und die englische Krone von den Neuigkeiten Norddeutschlands in Kenntnis zu setzen. Umgekehrt kannte er die englische Zeitschriftenlandschaft, namentlich den Tatler und den Spectator. Das hatte ihn dazu angeregt, mit dem Vernünftler (Hamburg: 1713–14) das Genre der Wochenschrift in Deutschland einzuführen. Der Vernünftler enthielt neben Matthesons

Details im *Forschenden Orchestre* verraten, wie man sich den Leser Mattheson im Alltag vorzustellen hatte. Der Bücherverkauf gegen Lebensende zugunsten eines Orgelbaus indiziert, dass seine Privatbibliothek von Größe und Wert gewesen sein muss. Dennoch wird er nicht alles selbst besessen haben, was er zitiert. Eine Bemerkung lässt erkennen, dass Mattheson die Bibliothek des Hamburger Gelehrten Johann Albert Fabricius, Professor für Rhetorik und Ethik an der Universität Kiel, frequentierte. Ebenso wird es mit anderen Hamburger Gelehrten gewesen sein, etwa mit Barthold Hinrich Brockes, Michael Richey oder anderen belebten Mitgliedern der Patriotischen Gesellschaft. Auch die Schulbibliothek des Johanneums wird er benutzt haben. Zweifellos entwickelte er, der Nichtakademiker, der Musikus, der es weder zu einer Organistenlaufbahn noch zu einem Sänger gebracht hatte, im Lauf der drei *Orchestre*-Schriften

---

32 Mattheson, *Das Forschende Orchestre* 410.
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0 Flavius Josephus, Geschichte des jüdischen Krieges (wahrscheinlich die deutsche Ausgabe Tübingen, Cotta: 1735–36).
1350 (ca.) Tauber Johann, Predigten, wahrscheinlich die Ausgabe: Johannis Tauleris des heiligen lerers Predig, fast fruchtbar zu eim recht christlichen leben […] (Basel, Petri: 1521).
1521 Luther Martin, Deutsche Postille (Wittenberg, s.n.: 1521), in zwei Exemplaren.
1530 (ca.) Luther Martin, Der Dritte Teil der bücher des Ehrwürdigen Herrn Doctoris Martinis Lutheri, darin zusammen gebracht sind christliche und tröstlicher Erklerung und auslegung der furnemsten Psalmen […] (Wittenberg, H. Lufft: 1550) (oder eine spätere Ausgabe).
1539 (ca.) Luther Martin, Tischreden (welche der zahlreichen Ausgaben, kann nicht bestimmt werden).
1539 Luther Martin, Werksggabe in 10 Teilen und 7 Bden. (Altenburg, s.n.: 1661–1664).
1555 Luther Martin, Werksggabe in 8 Bden. (Jena, s.n.: 1555–1558) (oder eines Nachdrucks bis Mitte des 17. Jahrhunderts).
1581 Bünting Heinrich, Itinerarium sacrae scripturae, Das ist: Ein Reisebuch über die gantze Heilige Schrift (Helmstedt, Jacobus Lucius: 1581).
1634 Müller Johann, Lutherus defensus, das ist Gründliche Wiederlegung dessen, was die Bäpster D. Lutheri Persohn fürwerffen […] (Hamburg, Jacob Rebenlein: 1634).
1636 Meyfart Johann Matthäus, Christliche Erinnerung von der aus den evangelischen Hohen Schulen in Teutschlandt an manchem Ort entwicthen ordnungen und erbaren Sitten (Schlesingen, Birckner: 1636) (mehrere Ausgaben 1636 mit abweichenden Titeln).
1657 Müller Heinrich, Menschlich Getichte von Verstoßung des grösten Theils der Menschen zur ewigen Verdammiß ohne ansehen des Unglaubens aufs blossem Rathschluß

Gottes (Hamburg: 1657) (eine einzelne Pfingstpredigt, 8 S., sehr selten, heute nicht nachweisbar, nach Preuß, „Bachs Bibliothek“ 14).

1661 Stenger Nicolaus, Credendorum et faciendorum Postilla (Erfurt: 1661) oder Postilla evangelica (beide nicht nachweisbar).


1664 Scheibler Christoph, Aurifodina theologica oder Theologische und geistliche Goldgrube, Das ist, Deutsche Theologia Practica [...] (Frankfurt a.M., Wust: 1664).


1668 Olearius Johann, Bibliche Erklärung darinnen, nechst dem allgemeinen Haupt- Schlüssel der gantzen heiligen Schrift (Leipzig, Tarnov: 1678).

1669 Pfeiffer August, Kürzlich-gewiesenes Luthertum vor Luthero oder das alte evangeli- sche durch Luthertum erneuerte Christentum [...] (Dresden, Hübner: 1769) oder: Ders., Verus Christianismus, d.i. das wahre Christenthum nach den 5 Haupt- ücken des Cate- chismi in 8 Predigten deutlich fürgestellet [...] (Lübeck, Böckmann: 1709) (im Inventar: „Ej. Christenthum“).


1675 Heunisch Caspar, Haupt-Schlüssel über die hohe Offenbahrung S. Johannis [...] (Schlesningen, S. Göbel: 1684).

1675 Pfeiffer August, Der wohlbevohrene Evangelische Aug-Apffel oder schriftmäßige Erklä- rung aller Articul der Augspurgischen Confession (Leipzig, Kloß: 1685).

1676 Pfeiffer August, Gazophylacion evangelicum, oder Evangelische Schatzkammer (Nürnberg, C. S. Froberg: 1686).

1678 Pfeiffer August, Evangelische Christen-Schule oder Systema theologiae (Leipzig, Frommann: 1688).

1693 Clinge Franz, Errette deine Seele, das ist Treuehertze Warnung für Abfall von der Lutherischen zur Papistischen Lehre [...] (Merseburg, Forbergerus: 1693).

1695 Pfeiffer August, Apostolische Christen-Schule (Lübeck, Krüger: 1695).

1697 Wagner Paul (Hg.), Andächtiger Seelen geistliches Brand- und Gantz-Opfer, 8 Bde. (Leipzig, Zeidler: 1697).

1699 Pfeiffer August, Anti-Calvinismus, das ist kurzer, deutlicher, aufrichtiger und beschei- dentlicher Bericht und Unterricht von der reformirten Religion [...] (Lübeck, Böckmann: 1699).
1700 (ca.) „Froberi Psalm“ (nicht nachweisbar).
1702 PFEIFFER August, Nuptialia oder Haus- und Ehe-Schul (Nürnberg, Hoffmann: 1702).
1708 ADAMI Johann Christian, Güteldne Äpffel in silbernen Schalen, oder Gottgeheiligte Betrachtungen des Hohen Liedes Salomonis [...] (Leipzig, s.n.: 1708).
1716 FRANCKE August Hermann, Kurtze Sonn- und Fest-Tags-Predigten [...] (Halle, Verlag d. Waysenhauses: 1716) (Vermutung von Spitta\(^{34}\); im Inventar der nicht nachweisbare Titel „Franckens Haus Postilla“).
1718 PFEIFFER August, Kern und Safft der Bibel, 2 Teile in 1 Bd., Dresden 1718, hg. von Gabriel Hanitsch als Auszug aus Pfeiffers deutschen Schriften.
1725 RAMBACH Johann Jacob, Betrachtung über die Thränen und Seufzer Jesu Christi (Halle, Verlag d. Waysenhauses: 1725).
1730 RAMBACH Johann Jacob, Evangelische Betrachtungen über die Sonn- und Fest-Tags-Evangelia des gantzen Jahres (Halle, Verlag d. Waysenhauses: 1730).
1731 NEUMEISTER Erdmann, Das Wasserbad im Worte oder die Lehre von der heil. Taufe, so in LII. Predigten [...] (Hamburg, Kisner: 1731).

2. Bücher, die Johann Mattheson in den drei Orchestre-Schriften nennt\(^{35}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entstehung</th>
<th>Titel</th>
<th>Zitiert in (Seitzenzahlen)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>800 Homer</td>
<td>Ilias</td>
<td>Neo(^{36})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 Antisthenes, unspez.</td>
<td>303</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{34}\) Spitta, Johann Sebastian Bach 749.


\(^{36}\) Mattheson Johann, Das Neu-Eröffnete Orchestre (Hamburg: 1713).

\(^{37}\) Mattheson Johann, Das Beschützte Orchestre (Hamburg: 1717).

\(^{38}\) Mattheson Johann, Das Forschende Orchestre (Hamburg: 1721).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entstehung</th>
<th>Titel</th>
<th>Zitiert in (Seitenzahlen)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–400</td>
<td>Aristoteles, Analytica posteriora</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–400</td>
<td>Aristoteles, De anima</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–400</td>
<td>Aristoteles, De caelo</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–400</td>
<td>(Pseudo-)Aristoteles, De mundo</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–400</td>
<td>Aristoteles, Nikomachische Ethik</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–400</td>
<td>Aristoteles, Physik</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–400</td>
<td>Aristoteles, Physik</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–400</td>
<td>Aristoteles, unspez.</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–400</td>
<td>Plato, Gesetze</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–400</td>
<td>Plato, Phaedon</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–400</td>
<td>Plato, Staat</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–400</td>
<td>Plato, Timaios</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–300</td>
<td>Aristozen, Elementa harmonica und Elementa rhythmica</td>
<td>44, 411, 168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–300</td>
<td>Euclides, Elementa</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–300</td>
<td>Euclides, Sectio canonis</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–250</td>
<td>Athenaeus, Deipnosophistae</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–200</td>
<td>Plautus, Truculentus</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–150</td>
<td>Terenz, unspez.</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–50</td>
<td>Didymus, unspez.</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–50</td>
<td>Sallust, De bello Iugurthino</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Aristides Quintilianus, De Musica</td>
<td>39, 57, 752–753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Calpurnius Siculus, Eclogae</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Cicero, De amicitia</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Cicero, De civitate</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Cicero, De legibus</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Cicero, De oratore</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Cicero, Tusculanae disputationes</td>
<td>52, 194, 364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Cicero, unspez.</td>
<td>23–24, 47, V39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Flavius Josephus, Geschichte des jüdischen Krieges</td>
<td>7, 238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Horaz, Ars poetica</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Horaz, Carmina</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Horaz, Epistulae</td>
<td>8, W40, 527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Horaz, Gedicht (unspez.)</td>
<td>315 u.ó.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Marcus Valerius Probus, De notis iuris</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Martial, Epigrammata</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Ovid, Epistulae ex Ponto</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Ovid, Metamorphosen</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Ovid, Gedicht (unspez.)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Philo von Alexandrien, unspez.</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Philo von Alexandrien, De opificio mundi</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Plinius d.J., Panegyricus</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Plutarch, De placitis philosophorum</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39 „V“: In der unpaginierten Vorrede.
40 „W“: In der unpaginierten Widmung.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entstehung</th>
<th>Titel</th>
<th>Zitiert in (Seitenzahlen)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Plutarch, <em>De profectibus in virtute</em></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Plutarch, <em>Vitae parallelae</em></td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Properz, <em>Elegien</em></td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Ptolemaios, <em>Harmonik</em></td>
<td>53, 162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Quintilian, <em>Institutio oratoria</em></td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Seneca, <em>Epistola</em></td>
<td>48, 214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Seneca, unspez.</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Statius, <em>Thebais</em></td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Tacitus, <em>Annales</em></td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Tacitus, <em>Germania</em></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Valerius Maximus, unspez.</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Vergil, <em>Eclogae</em></td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Vergil, Gedicht (unspez.)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Vergil, <em>Georgica</em></td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Epiktet, unspez.</td>
<td>761–762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Aulus Gellius, <em>Noctes Atticae</em></td>
<td>211 u.ö.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Nikomachos von Gerasa, <em>Enchiridion</em></td>
<td>380, 320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Tertullian, <em>De anima</em></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Ulpian, <em>De haered. petit.</em></td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>Diogenes Laertius, <em>De vitis et dogmatibus clarorum philosophorum</em></td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Iamblichos, <em>De mysteriis Aegyptiorum</em></td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Iamblichos, <em>Leben des Pythagoras</em></td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Porphyrios, <em>Isagoge</em></td>
<td>30, 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Porphyrios, Kommentar zu Ptolemaios: <em>Harmonik</em></td>
<td>21–22, 162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Porphyrios, <em>Vita Pythagorae</em></td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Tryphiodorus, <em>Der Raub von Ilios</em></td>
<td>448–449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>Alypios, <em>Eisagoge mousike</em></td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>Gregor von Nazianz, <em>Orationes theologicae</em></td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>Augustinus, <em>Meditationes ad Pandectas</em></td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>Augustinus, <em>De civitate dei</em></td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>Augustinus, <em>Confessiones</em></td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>Augustinus, <em>De musica</em></td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>Hieronymus Sophronius Eusebius, Hiob-Übersetzung und -kommentar</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>Proclus, <em>In primum Euclidis elementorum librum commentarii</em> (Ed. Basel: 1533)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440</td>
<td>Macrobius, <em>Somnia Scipionis</em></td>
<td>114, 235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>Boethius, <em>De arithmeticca</em></td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>Boethius, <em>De consolatione philosophiae</em></td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>Boethius, <em>De musica</em></td>
<td>44, 314, 401, 12 u.ö.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>Martianus Capella, <em>De nuptiis philosophiae et mercurii philologiae et saecularium litterarum</em></td>
<td>162, 313 u.ö.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550</td>
<td>Cassiodorus, <em>Institutiones divinarum et saecularium litterarum</em></td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>Isidor von Sevilla, <em>Isidori Hispalensis episcopi Etymologiarum sive originum libri XX</em></td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>Beda Venerabilis, unspez.</td>
<td>323 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1025</td>
<td>Guido von Arezzo, Micrologus</td>
<td>45 88, 261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1050</td>
<td>Psellus Michael, Perspicuus liber de quatuor mathematicis scientiis,</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arithmetica, Musica, Geometria &amp; Astronomia (Basel: 1556) (orig. 11. Jhd.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td>Anselm von Canterbury, unspez.</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300</td>
<td>Thomas von Aquin, Quaestiones disputatae de veritate</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1330</td>
<td>Johannes de Muris, Musica speculativa</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1477</td>
<td>Tinctorius Johannes, Liber de arte contrapuncti (1477)</td>
<td>659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1496</td>
<td>Gafurius Franchinus, Practica musicae (Mailand: 1496)</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>109, 221, 230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>Gafurius Franchinus, unspez.</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>Mantuanus Baptista, Opera (ca. 1500)</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501</td>
<td>Tartaretus Petrus, De modo cacandi</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1511</td>
<td>Virdung Sebastian, Musica getutscht (Basel, Furter: 1511)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1517</td>
<td>Ornithoparch Andreas, Musice active micrologus [...] (Leipzig, s.n.: 1517)</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1517</td>
<td>Rhodiginus Caelius, Lectiones antiquae (Basel, Badius: 1517)</td>
<td>235, 575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1518</td>
<td>Gafurius Franchinus, De harmonia musicorum instrumentorum opus</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1519</td>
<td>Eck Johannes – Luther Martin, Leipziger Disputation von 1519</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1521</td>
<td>Polydorus Vergilius, De rerum inventoribus libri 8 (Basel, Frobenius: 1521)</td>
<td>296 41 238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1529</td>
<td>Fogliano Lodovico, Musica theorica (Venedig, s.n.: 1529)</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1530</td>
<td>Agrippa von Nettesheim Heinrich Cornelius, Briefe in einer unspez. Ed. (ca. 1530)</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1530</td>
<td>Agrippa von Nettesheim Heinrich Cornelius, unspez.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1530</td>
<td>Luther Martin, 8-bändige Werkausgabe</td>
<td>18, 26 14 258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1531</td>
<td>Agrippa von Nettesheim Heinrich Cornelius, De incertitudine et vanitate scientiarum declamatio inventiva [...] (Köln, s.n.: 1531)</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1531</td>
<td>Rhau Georg, Enchiridion utriusque musicae practicae (Wittenberg, Rhau: 1531)</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1532</td>
<td>Rabelais François, Gargantua und Pantagruel (1532ff.)</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1533</td>
<td>Listenius Nikolaus, Rudimenta musicae planae (Wittenberg, Rhau: 1533)</td>
<td>102 205, 337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>1534</td>
<td>Philomates Wenceslaus, <em>De nova domo Musicorum libri quatuor; compendioso carmine elucubrati</em> (Wittenberg, Rhau: 1534)</td>
<td>NEO: 102, BO: 580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1535</td>
<td>Frosch Johann, <em>Rerum musicarum opusculum rarum ac insigne</em> (Straßburg, Schöffer: 1535)</td>
<td>BO: 469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1541</td>
<td>Heresbach Conrad, <em>De laudibis Graecarum literarum oratio</em> (Straßburg 1541)</td>
<td>BO: 266–267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1548</td>
<td>Faber Heinrich, <em>Compendiolum</em> (1548) (Leipzig, Montanus (?): 1624)</td>
<td>BO: 402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550</td>
<td>Cardano Geronimo, <em>De subtilitate libri XXI</em> (Paris, s.n.: 1550)</td>
<td>FO: 68, 430–431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550</td>
<td>Cardano Geronimo, <em>Liber de uno</em>, in ders.: <em>Opera omnia</em> (Lyon, Huguetan &amp; Ravaud: 1663)</td>
<td>BO: 619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550</td>
<td>Cardano Geronimo, <em>Lebensbeschreibung</em>, in ders.: <em>Opera omnia</em> (Lyon, Huguetan &amp; Ravaud: 1663)</td>
<td>BO: 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550</td>
<td>Cardano Geronimo, <em>Opera omnia</em> (Lyon, Huguetan &amp; Ravaud: 1663)</td>
<td>BO: 39, 51 u.ö.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550</td>
<td>Corvinus Laurentius, unspez.</td>
<td>BO: 102, 240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550</td>
<td>Muret Marc Antoine, <em>Epistola</em></td>
<td>BO: 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550</td>
<td>Ringelberg Joachim Sterck van, <em>De ratione studii liber</em> (ca. 1550), (Leiden, Maire: 1622)</td>
<td>BO: 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1551</td>
<td>Faber Stapulensis, <em>Musica libris quatuor demonstrata</em> (Paris, s.n.: 1551)</td>
<td>BO: 604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1556</td>
<td>Biesius Nicolaus, <em>De universitate libri tres</em> (Antwerpen, Nutrius: 1556)</td>
<td>BO: 155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1571</td>
<td>Selneck Nikolaus, <em>Der Psalter</em> (Leipzig, Jacob Berwaldts Erben: 1571)</td>
<td>BO: 275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1577</td>
<td>Salinas Francisco de, <em>De musica libri septem</em>, Salamanca (Gastius: 1577)</td>
<td>BO: 278 u.ö.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581</td>
<td>Anon., <em>De saltationibus et choreis</em> (1581)</td>
<td>BO: 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581</td>
<td>Beurhaus Friedrich, <em>Musicae rudimenta</em> (Dortmund, s.n.: 1581)</td>
<td>BO: 154, 402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581</td>
<td>Galilei Vincenzo, <em>Dialogo di Vincentio</em> Galilei nobile Fiorentino della musica antica et della moderna* (Florenz, Marescotti: 1581)</td>
<td>348 741–742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1584</td>
<td>Bruno Giordano, <em>Della causa, principio ed uno</em> (1584)</td>
<td>617 u.ö.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1584</td>
<td>Renner Johann, <em>Chronicon, Der löfflichen Olden adt Bremen</em> (Bremen, s.n.: 1584)</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>Hilden Wilhelm Fabricius, <em>Quaestiones et commentarii in Organon Aristotelis</em> (Berlin, s.n.: 1585)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1586</td>
<td>Roggius Nicolaius, <em>Musicae practicae sive artis canendi elementa</em> (Wittenberg, Neuber &amp; Gerlach: 1586)</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590</td>
<td>Dedekind Henning, <em>Precuror Metricus Musicae Artis</em> (Erfurt, s.n.: 1590)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1591</td>
<td>Schneeggass Cyriacus, <em>Isagoces musicae libri duo</em>, Erfurt (Baumannus: 1591)</td>
<td>110, 401 59, 655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592</td>
<td>Calvisius Sethus, <em>MEΛOΠΟΙΙΑ sive melodiae contendae ratio, quam vulgò musicam poeticam vocant</em> [...] (Erfurt, Baumannus: 1592)</td>
<td>472 u.ö.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593</td>
<td>Pancirol Giuido, <em>Notitia utraque dignitatum cum orientis tum occidentis ultra Arcadii Honorique tempora</em> (Venedig, de Francisis: 1593)</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1598</td>
<td>Artusi Giovanni Maria, <em>L'Arte del Contraponto</em> (Venedig, Vincenti: 1598)</td>
<td>603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599</td>
<td>Burmeister Joachim, <em>Hypomnematum Musicae Poeticae a M. Joachimo Burmeistero ex Isagoge [...]</em> (Rostock, s.n.: 1599)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>Jonson Ben, Gedicht (ohne Nachweis)</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>Puteanus Erycius, <em>Musica Pleias, sive septem notae canendi</em> (Venedig, s.n.: 1600)</td>
<td>325, 349. 374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>Viadana Ludivico, Vorrede zu den Generalbässen, in <em>Cento concerti ecclesiatici</em> (1600)</td>
<td>71–72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603</td>
<td>Calvisius Sethus, <em>Enchiridion lexici latino-germanici</em> (Quedlinburg, Calvisius: 1603)</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603</td>
<td>Herberger Valerius, <em>Magnalia Dei, De Jesu, scripturae [...]</em> (Leipzig, T. Schürer: 1603)</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603</td>
<td>Hubmeyer Hippolyt, <em>Disputationes quaestionum illustris philosophicarum ex universa philosophia depromptarum, mehrere Bde.</em> (Jena, Steinmannus: 1603)</td>
<td>350 u.ö.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1605</td>
<td>Hoffmann Eucharius, <em>Brevis synopsis de modis seu locis ex ipsis fundamenta exstructa</em> (Rostock, Augustin d. Ä.: 1605)</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1605</td>
<td>Stevin Simon, <em>Hypomnemata mathematica</em> (Leiden, Patius: 1605/08)</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1606</td>
<td>Burmeister Joachim, <em>Musica poetica: Definitionibus et divisionibus breviter delineata [...]</em> (Rostock, s.n.: 1606)</td>
<td>100, 402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1609</td>
<td>Gesius Bartholomäus, <em>Hymni patrum cum cantis sacris,latinis et germanicis, de praecipuis festis anniversariis, quibus additi sunt et hymni scholastici ad duodecem modos musicos [...]</em> (Frankfurt, Hartmann: 1609)</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1610</td>
<td>Béroalde de Verville François, <em>Le moyen de parvenir</em> (ca. 1610)</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1610</td>
<td>Gerhard Johann, <em>Loci theologici</em> (Jena, Steinmann: 1610)</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1610</td>
<td>Kornmann Heinrich, <em>De miraculis mortuorum</em> (Frankfurt a.M., Porsius: 1610)</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1610</td>
<td>Lippius Johannes, <em>Disputatio Musica tertia [...]</em> (Wittenberg, Gormann: 1610)</td>
<td>610–611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1610</td>
<td>Vulpius Melchior, <em>Tractatus de modis</em>, überliefert in Faber Heinrich, <em>Musicae Compendium Latino Germanicum M. Heinrici Fabri, pro tyronibus hujus ad majorem discentium, aliquantum variatum ad dispositum, cum facili brevique de modis tractatu per Melchiorem Vulpium Vinariensum cantorem</em> (Erfurt, Birnstiel: 1610)</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1612</td>
<td>Boccalini Traiano, <em>Relationen aus Parnasso</em> (orig. <em>De’ragguagli di Parnasso</em>) (Venedig, Farri: 1612)</td>
<td>494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1612</td>
<td>Lippius Johannes, <em>Synopsis Musicae novae omnino verae atque Methodicae Universae, in omnis sophiae praegustum παρέργως inventae disputatae &amp; propositae omnibus philomusi [...]</em> (Straßburg, Carolus: 1612)</td>
<td>329, 296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1614</td>
<td>Bartolus Abraham, <em>Musica mathematica</em> (Leipzig, s.n.: 1614)</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>1617</td>
<td>FLUDD Robert, <em>Utriusque Cosmi Maioris Scilicet et Minoris Metaphysica, Physica Atque Technica Historia</em> (Oppenheim, de Bry: 1617)</td>
<td>NEO BO FO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1617</td>
<td>ROGGIUS Nicolaus, <em>Tractatus de intervallis et modis musicis</em>, überliefert in Demantius Christoph, <em>Isagoge artis musicae ad incipientum captum maxime accommodata</em> (Goslar, Vogtius: 1617)</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1618</td>
<td>MEURS Johannes van, <em>Orchestræ sive de saltationibus veterum</em> (Leiden, Basson: 1618)</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1619</td>
<td>KEPLER Johannes, <em>Harmonices mundi libri V [...]</em> (Linz, Tampachius: 1619)</td>
<td>332, 694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1620</td>
<td>BACON Francis, unspez. Werkausgabe</td>
<td>2, 9 u.ö.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1620</td>
<td>BACON Francis, <em>Historia naturalis</em> (ca. 1620)</td>
<td>110 u.ö.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1620</td>
<td>CALVISIUS Sethus, <em>Opus chronologicum</em> (Frankfurt a.d.O., Thymius: 1620)</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1621</td>
<td>DONALDSON Walter, <em>Synopsis philosophiae moralis</em> (Sedan. Lamring, 1621)</td>
<td>57, 76, 373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1622</td>
<td>SARTORIUS Erasmus, <em>Belligeramus, id est Historia Belli Exorti in regno Musico: in qua, Liberalis, &amp; non tetrici Ingenii lector inveniet quod tam prodesse, quam delectare possit</em> (Hamburg, Carstens: 1622)</td>
<td>62, 199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1622</td>
<td>BACON Francis, <em>De dignitate et augmentis scientiarum Libri IX</em> (1622)</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1622</td>
<td>FLUDD Robert, <em>Monochordium Mundi symphoniacum J. Keplero oppositum</em> (Frankfurt a.M., de Bry: 1622)</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1622</td>
<td>FLUDD Robert, unspez.</td>
<td>38–39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1624</td>
<td>GRIMM Heinrich, <em>Unterricht, wie ein Knabe nach der alten Guidonischen Art zu solmisieren leicht angeführt werden kann</em> (1624)</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1624</td>
<td>OPITZ Martin, <em>Buch von der deutschen Poeterey</em> (Breslau, Müller: 1624)</td>
<td>288, 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1627</td>
<td>BACON Francis, <em>Sylla Sybarum: or a Natural History</em> (London, Chriswell: 1627)</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>1630</td>
<td>Alsted Johann Heinrich, <em>Johannis Henrici Alstedii Encyclopaedia septem tomis distincta, [...]</em> (Herborn, Corrinus: 1630)</td>
<td>NEO 350, BO 219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1630</td>
<td>Severino Marco Aurelio, <em>Philosophia ludis scacchorum</em> (Titel nicht nachweisbar)</td>
<td>BO 254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1631</td>
<td>Meurs Johannes van, <em>Denarius Pythagoricus</em> (Leiden, Maire: 1631)</td>
<td>FO 61 u.ö.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1636</td>
<td>Alard Lambert, <em>De veterum musica liber singularis</em> (Leipzig, s.n.: 1636)</td>
<td>BO 401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1636</td>
<td>Ban [Bannus] Jan Albert, <em>Disputatio epistolica de musicae natura</em> (Leiden, Commelinus: 1637)</td>
<td>BO 281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1643</td>
<td>Herbst Johann Andreas, <em>Musica Poetica [...]</em> (Nürnberg, Dümler: 1643)</td>
<td>BO 245, 403, 709–710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1643</td>
<td>Nymann Hieronymus Aegidius, <em>Disputatio Physica de aere et igne</em> (Wittenberg, s.n.: 1643)</td>
<td>BO 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1643</td>
<td>Scacchi Marco, <em>Cribrum musicum ad triticum Syferticum</em> (Venedig, Vinventius: 1643)</td>
<td>BO 641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1645</td>
<td>Moscherosch Johann Michael, <em>Visiones de Don Quevedo</em> (Frankfurt a.M., Schönwetter: 1645)</td>
<td>BO 277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1646</td>
<td>Corvinus Johann Michael, <em>Heptachordum danicum seu nova solsisatio in qua musicae practicae usus</em> (Kopenhagen, s.n.: 1646)</td>
<td>BO 333, 344, 545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1646</td>
<td>Fabri Honoré, <em>Tractatus physicus de motu locali</em> (Lyon, Champion: 1646)</td>
<td>BO 397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1647</td>
<td>Doni Giovanni Battista, <em>De praestantia musicae veteris libri tres</em> (Florenz, Massa: 1647)</td>
<td>BO V, 233 u.ö.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>Bernhard Christoph, <em>Ausführlicher Bericht vom Gebrauche der Con- und Dissonantien</em> (Hs., ca. 1650)</td>
<td>BO 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>Bernhard Christoph, <em>Tractatus compositionis augmentatus</em> (Hs.)</td>
<td>BO 148, 160, 656 u.ö.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>Descartes René, <em>Compendium Musicae</em> (Hs., posthum Utrecht, Zijl: 1650)</td>
<td>BO 468, 172, 462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>Itter Anton, <em>Synopsis Philosophiae Moralis, seu Praecepta Ethica</em> (Frankfurt a.M., Roetel: 1650)</td>
<td>BO 97, 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entstehung</td>
<td>Titel</td>
<td>Zitiert in (Seitenzahlen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650 Montagne, <em>Dissertations sur la dance</em> (Hamburg (nicht nachweisbar))</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650 Vossius Gerhard Johannes, <em>De quatuor artibus popularibus, grammaticistice, gymnastice, musice et graphice</em> (Amsterdam, Blaeu: 1650)</td>
<td>195, 212</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654 Crüger Johann, <em>Synopsis Musica</em> (Berlin, Runge: 1654)</td>
<td>81, 107 295, 524</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657 Treu Abdias, <em>Directorium Mathematicum</em> (Nürnberg, Hagen: 1657)</td>
<td>90 u.ö.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657 Schupp Johann Balthasar, <em>Der Freund in der Not</em> (Hamburg, Dose: 1657)</td>
<td>402</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1657 Walther Michael, <em>De immortalitate animae rationalis</em> (Wittenberg, s.n.: 1657)</td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1658 Vossius Gerhard Johannes, <em>De studiis bene instituendis</em> (Amsterdam, Blaev: 1658)</td>
<td>18 u.ö.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1658 Schupp Johann Balthasar: <em>Salomo oder Regenten-Spiegel [...]</em> (o.O.: 1658)</td>
<td>402</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1659 Gibelius Otto, <em>Kurtzer, jedoch gründlicher Bericht von den Vocibus musicalibus, Darin gehandelt wird von der Musicalischen Syllabication oder (wie man gemeinglich redet) von der Solmisation [...]</em> (Bremen, Köhler: 1659)</td>
<td>84, 323, 345–346 630</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1659 Müller Johann, <em>Defensio Lutheri defensi</em>, Hamburg 1659, orig. Lutherus defensus, das ist Gründliche Wiederlegung dessen, was die Bäpstler D. Lutheri Persohn fürwerffen [...] (Hamburg, J. Rebenlein: 1634)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1660 Bontempi Giovanni Andrea, <em>Quatuor vocibus componenti methodus</em> (Dresden, Seyffert: 1660)</td>
<td>271</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1660 Wheare Degory, <em>Relationes hyemales</em> (Nürnberg, Endter: 1660)</td>
<td>577</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entstehung</td>
<td>Titel</td>
<td>Zitiert in (Seitenzahlen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1662</td>
<td>Kircher Athanasius, [...] Philosophischer Extract und Auszug aus deß Weltberühmten Teutschen Athanasii Kircheri von Fulda / MUSURGIA UNIVERSALL, / in Sechs Bücher verfasset [...] Ausgezogen und verfertigt [...] von Andrea Hirschen (Schwäbisch Hall, Gräte in Komm.: 1662)</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1662</td>
<td>Königsmann Robert, De oculis ad vitia patranda inque mentem introducenta ex sensibus haud minimum operis conferentibus oratio (Straßburg, Dolhopf: 1662)</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1662</td>
<td>Treu Abdias, Disputatio musica de divisione monochordi [...] (Altdorf, s.n.: 1662)</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1662</td>
<td>Voss Isaak, De lucis natura et proprietate (Amsterdam: 1662)</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1663</td>
<td>Rango Conrad Tiburtius, Dissertatio physica de sensibus externis (Berlin, Lipper: 1663)</td>
<td>770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1665</td>
<td>Wowern Johann von, De polymathia tractatio (Leipzig, s.n.: 1665)</td>
<td>713, 750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1666</td>
<td>Gibelius Otto, Propositiones mathematico-musicae, musicalische Aufgaben aus der Mathesis (Minden, Görner: 1666)</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1667</td>
<td>Vivers Guillaume Gabriel, Traité de la composition de musique (Leiden, s.n.: 1667)</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1667</td>
<td>Sprat Thomas, History of the Royal Society (London, Martyn: 1667)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1670</td>
<td>La Mothe le Vayer François de, unspez. Werksgabe in mehreren Bden.</td>
<td>V u. ö.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671</td>
<td>Rohault Jacques, Traité de physique (Paris, Savreux: 1671)</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671</td>
<td>Sorel Charles, De bon connoissance des bons livres (Paris, Pralard: 1671)</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1672</td>
<td>Dodart Denis, Memoires pour servir a l’histoire des plantes (Paris, s.n.: 1676)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1672</td>
<td>Weigel Erhard, Tetractyn tetracty Pythagorae correspondentem (Jena, s.n.: 1672)</td>
<td>158, 616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1673</td>
<td>Bononcini Giovanni Maria, Musico pratico (Bologna: 1673; dt. Stuttgart, Monti: 1701)</td>
<td>287, 334, 372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1676</td>
<td>Printz Wolfgang Caspar, Phrynis mitilenaeus, oder satyrischer Componist [...] (Dresden-Leipzig, Mieth u. Zimmermann: 1696 (1676))</td>
<td>1, 138 u. ö.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1676</td>
<td>Morhof Daniel Georg, Dissertatio de paradoxis sensuum (Köln, Reumannus: 1676)</td>
<td>770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entstehung</td>
<td>Titel</td>
<td>Zitiert in (Seitenzahlen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1680</td>
<td>Buliowski Mihály, <em>De emendatione organi musici tractatio</em> (Straßburg, s.n.: 1680)</td>
<td>NEO 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1680</td>
<td>Morhof Daniel Georg, unspez.</td>
<td>FO 322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1683</td>
<td>Morhof Daniel Georg, <em>Dissertatio qua soni natura non parum illustratur</em> (Kiel, Reumannus: 1683)</td>
<td>FO 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1684</td>
<td>Pasch Georg, <em>Disputatio physica de pluralitate mundorum contra Cartesianos</em> (Wittenberg, C. Finelli: 1684)</td>
<td>FO 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1684</td>
<td>Lana Terzi Francesco, <em>Magisterium naturae et artis</em> (Brixen, Riccardus: 1684–1692)</td>
<td>FO 396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1685</td>
<td>Furetière Antoine, <em>Dictionnaire universel</em> (Amsterdam, Desbordes 1685)</td>
<td>FO 225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1686</td>
<td>Rousseau Jean, <em>Méthode claire, certaine et facile pour apprendre à chanter la musique</em> (Paris, s.n.: 1686)</td>
<td>FO 368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1687</td>
<td>Berardi Angelo, <em>Documenti armonici</em> (Bologna, s.n.: 1687)</td>
<td>FO 139, 135, 660, 720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1688</td>
<td>Falck Georg, <em>Idea boni cantoris, das ist: Getreu und gründliche Anleitung Wie ein Music-Scholar so wol im Singen als auch auf andern instrumentis musicalibus in kurzer Zeit so weit gebracht werden kann daß er ein ick mit-zusingen oder zu spielen sich wird unterfangen dörffen</em> (Nürnberg, Endter: 1688)</td>
<td>FO 360, 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1688</td>
<td>Fontenelle Bernard le Bovier de, <em>Poésies pastorales</em> (Paris, s.n.: 1688)</td>
<td>FO 26, 131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1688</td>
<td>Malebranche Nicolas, <em>De la recherche de la vérité</em> (Amsterdam, Desbordes: 1688)</td>
<td>FO 100, 119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1688</td>
<td>Morhof Daniel Georg, <em>Polyhistor, sive de notitia auctorum et rerum commentarii, 7 Bde.</em> (Lübeck, Böckmann: 1688)</td>
<td>FO 294, 354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1688</td>
<td>Thomasius Christian, <em>Introductio ad philosophiam aulicam</em> (Leipzig, s.n.: 1688)</td>
<td>FO 353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entstehung</td>
<td>Titel</td>
<td>Zitiert in (Seitenzahlen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1689</td>
<td>Printz Wolfgang Caspar, <em>Compendium musicae signatoriae &amp; modulatoriae vocalis, das ist: Kurzter Begriff aller derjenigen Sachen / so einem / der die Vocal-Music lernen will / zu wissen von nōthen seyn […]</em> (Dresden, Mieth: 1689)</td>
<td>BO 101, FO 362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1690</td>
<td>Printz Wolfgang Caspar, <em>Historische Beschreibung der Edelen Sing- und Kling-Kunst […]</em> (Dresden, Mieth: 1690)</td>
<td>BO 272, FO 14, 374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1690</td>
<td>Régis Pierre Sylvain, <em>Système de philosophie</em> (Paris, s.n.: 1690)</td>
<td>BO 244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1691</td>
<td>Histoire des ouvrages des savans (1691)</td>
<td>BO 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1691</td>
<td>Ozanam Jacques, <em>Dictionnaire mathématique ou idée generale des mathématiques</em> (Amsterdam, Huguetan: 1691)</td>
<td>BO 207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1691</td>
<td>Weihenmeyer Johann Heinrich, <em>Geistliche Fest-Posaune [...]</em> (Ulm, Hoffmann: 1691)</td>
<td>BO 271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1692</td>
<td>Gebhard Georg Christoph, <em>De harmonia coelorum</em> (Greifswald, Starcke: 1692)</td>
<td>BO 331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1692</td>
<td>Histoire des ouvrages des savans (1692)</td>
<td>BO 187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1692</td>
<td>Poiret Petrus, <em>De eruditione solida</em> (Amsterdam, Petrus: 1692)</td>
<td>BO 70–71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1692</td>
<td>Thomasius Christian, <em>Dissertatio ad Petri Poiret libros de eruditione solida</em> (Halle o.J., s.n.: ca. 1692)</td>
<td>BO 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entstehung</td>
<td>Titel</td>
<td>Zitiert in (Seitenzahlen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1694</td>
<td>Winckler Johann, <em>Die wahrhaftig vom Teuffel erduldet Versuchung Christi</em> (Hamburg, Neumann: 1694)</td>
<td>770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1695</td>
<td>Bontempi Giovanni Andrea, <em>Historia musica</em> (Perugia, s.n.: 1695)</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1695</td>
<td>Steffani Agostino, <em>Quanta certezza habbia da suoi principii la musica</em> … (Amsterdam, s.n.: 1695)</td>
<td>44, 161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1695</td>
<td>Roth Albrecht Christian, <em>Wiederholter und ferner ausgeführter Unterricht von Mittel-Dingen</em> … (Leipzig, Lanckisch: 1695)</td>
<td>46, 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1697</td>
<td>Moller Johann, <em>Homonymoscopia historico-philologico critica</em> (Hamburg, s.n.: 1697)</td>
<td>765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1697</td>
<td>Werkmeister Andreas, <em>Hypomnemata musica</em> (Quedlinburg, s.n.: 1697)</td>
<td>85, 90, 444, 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1698</td>
<td>Anon., <em>La triomphe de la deesse monas</em> (Amsterdam, s.n.: 1698)</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entstehung</td>
<td>Titel</td>
<td>Zitiert in (Seitenzahlen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1698</td>
<td>Huygens Christiaan, <em>Cosmotheoros, sive de terris coelestibus</em> (Den Haag, s.n.: 1698)</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1698</td>
<td>Kuhnau Johann, <em>Des klugen und thörichten Gebrauchs der fünf Sinnen</em> (1698)</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1698</td>
<td>Werckmeister Andreas, <em>Die nothwendigsten Anmerckungen und Regeln, wie der Bassus continuus oder General-Baß wol könne tractiret werden</em> (Aschersleben, s.n.: 1698)</td>
<td>103, 248, 363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1699</td>
<td>Vöckrodt Gottfried, <em>Erleuterte Auffdeckung des Betrugs und Aegernisses, so mit denen vorgegebenen Mitteldingen und vergönneten Lust in der Christenheit angerichtet worden [...]</em> (Halle, Verlag des Weyesenhauses: 1699)</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>Acta Eruditorum</td>
<td>99, 147, 139 u.ö.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>Acta philosophorum</td>
<td>139 u.ö.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>Baker Vorname nicht nachweisbar, <em>The insufficiency of human learning</em> (nicht nachweisbar)</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>Boivin Jean, unspez.</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>Feuillet Raoul-Auger, <em>Choréographie ou l’art de décrire la danse [...]</em> (Paris: 1700)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>Histoire de l’Académie royale (Paris, Panecoucke: 1700)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>Histoire des ouvrages des savans (Rotterdam, Leers: 1700)</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>Jan (Vorname nicht eruierbar), <em>De principiis innatis contra Lockium</em> (nicht nachweisbar)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>Kuhnau Johann, <em>Der Musicalische Quack-Salber</em> (Dresden, s.n.: 1700)</td>
<td>18, 171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>Niedt Friedrich Erhard, <em>Musicalische Handleitung [...]</em> (Hamburg, Schiller: 1700, ‘1710)</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>Nouvelles de la Republiques des lettres (August 1700)</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>Scott Pater, „Organ. Mathem.“ (nicht nachweisbar)</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>Von Seelen CL., „In Principe musicō* (nicht nachweisbar)</td>
<td>200, 210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entstehung</td>
<td>Titel</td>
<td>Zitiert in (Seitenzahlen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>Werckmeister Andreas, <em>Cribrum Musicum Oder Musicalisches Sieb</em> / Darinn einige Mängel eines halb Gelehrten Componisten vorgestellet / und das Böse von dem Guten gleichsam ausgesiebet und abgesondert worden / in einem Sendschreiben an einen guten Freund dargestellet [...] (Quedlinburg-Leipzig, Calvisius: 1700)</td>
<td>NEO 201 BO 517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701</td>
<td>Masius Hector Gottfried, <em>Vaterliche Erinnerung an seine Kinder von der Seelen Unsterblichkeit und der seligen Seelen Zustande nach dem Tode</em> (Ratzeburg, s.n.: 1701)</td>
<td>NEO 488 BO 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701</td>
<td>Fontenelle Bernard le Bovier de, <em>Discours sur la nature de l'eglogue</em> (Amsterdam, Pierre Mortier: 1701)</td>
<td>NEO 76, 131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701</td>
<td>Mémoires de Trévoux (Jg. 1701), Jean Boudot</td>
<td>NEO 139, 146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1702</td>
<td>Reimmann Jacob Friedrich, <em>Historia literaria de fatis studii genealogici apud Hebraeos, Graecos, Romanos, Germanos</em> (Quedlinburg, G.E. Struntz: 1702)</td>
<td>NEO 265 BO 412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1703</td>
<td>Motz Georg, <em>Die vertheidigte Kirchen-Music</em> (o.O.: 1703)</td>
<td>NEO 199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1704</td>
<td>Struve Burkhard Gottshelf, <em>Introductio ad notitiam rei litterariae et usum bibliothecarum</em> (Jena, Bailliar: 1704)</td>
<td>NEO 295 BO 306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entstehung</td>
<td>Titel</td>
<td>Zitiert in (Seitenzahlen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1705</td>
<td>BONNEFOND Hugues, <em>Abregé des Principes de la dance</em> (Braunschweig: 1705 (nicht nachweisbar))</td>
<td>NEO 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1705</td>
<td>LEIBNIZ Gottfried Wilhelm, <em>Nouveaux essais sur l'entendement humain</em> (1705)</td>
<td>BO 139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1706</td>
<td>GUNDLING Nicolaus Hieronymus, <em>Historia philosophiae moralis</em> (Halle, Renger: 1706)</td>
<td>BO 295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1706</td>
<td>MAYER Johann Friedrich, <em>Erbauliche und gottgeheiligte Frühstunden</em> (Leipzig, s.n.: 1706)</td>
<td>BO 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1706</td>
<td>VAN Til Salomon, <em>Dicht- Sing- und Spiel-Kunst, sowohl der Alten als auch der Hebreeer</em> (Frankfurt a.M., Cramer: 1706)</td>
<td>BO 302, 309 FO 403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1706</td>
<td>TEVO Zaccaria, <em>Il musico testore</em> (Venedig, Bortoli: 1706)</td>
<td>BO 741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1707</td>
<td>PASCH Johann, <em>Beschreibung wahrer Tantz-Kunst</em> (Frankfurt, Michaelles: 1707)</td>
<td>BO 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1707</td>
<td>WERCKMEISTER Andreas, <em>Musicalische Paradoxal-Discourse, oder ungemeine Vorstellungen, wie die Musica einen Hohen und Göttlichen Ursprung habe, und wie hingegen dieselbe so sehr gemäßbrauchet wird […]</em> (Quedlinburg, Calvisius: 1707)</td>
<td>BO 335, 363, 382 u.ö. FO 145, 366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1707</td>
<td>GÖTZE Johann Melchior, <em>Der weitberühmte Musicus und Organista wurde bey trauriger Leichbestellung des […] Andreae Werckmeisteri in einer andrede dargestellt</em> (Quedlinburg: 1707 ?)</td>
<td>BO 238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1707</td>
<td>MIRUS Adam Erdmann, <em>Kurtze Fragen aus der Musica sacra […]</em> (Görlitz, Rohrlach: 1707)</td>
<td>BO 582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1709</td>
<td>BARBEYRAC Jean, <em>Traité du jeu</em> (Amsterdam, Humbert: 1709)</td>
<td>BO 184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1709</td>
<td>MOLYNEUX William, <em>Dioptrica nova</em> (London, Tooke: 1709)</td>
<td>BO 139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1709</td>
<td>STAHL Georg Ernst, <em>Observationes physico-chymico-medicae curiosae […]</em> (Halle, s.n.: 1709)</td>
<td>BO 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1710</td>
<td>GUNDLING Nicolaus Hieronymus, <em>Praeliminar-Discours</em> (Halle, Henckel: 1710)</td>
<td>BO 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entstehung</td>
<td>Autor</td>
<td>Titel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1711</td>
<td>Heinichen Johann David,</td>
<td>Neu erfundene und Gründliche Anweisung / Wie Ein Music-liebender auff gewisse vortreilhaftige Arth könne Zu vollkommener Erlermung des General-Basses, Entweder Durch eigenen Fleiß selbst gelangen / oder durch andere kurz und glücklich dahin angeführt werden [...].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1712</td>
<td>Bonin Louis,</td>
<td>Die neueste Art zur Galanten und Theatralischen Tantz-Kunst (Frankfurt a.M., Lochner: 1712)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1712</td>
<td>Crousaz Jean-Pierre de,</td>
<td>La logique, ou système de reflexions (Amsterdam, L'Honoré: 1712)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1713</td>
<td>Berkeley George,</td>
<td>Three dialogues between Hylas and Philonous (London, Guardian: 1713)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1713</td>
<td>Collier Arthur,</td>
<td>Clavis universalis (London, Gosling: 1713)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1713</td>
<td>Gundling Nicolaus Hieronymus,</td>
<td>Via ad veritatem moralem (Halle, Renger: 1713–1715)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1713</td>
<td>Larrey Isaac de,</td>
<td>Histoire de sept sages (Rotterdam, Fritsch &amp; Böhm: 1713)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1713</td>
<td>Le Clerc Jean,</td>
<td>Bibliothèque ancienne et moderne (Amsterdam, Mortier: 1713)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1713</td>
<td>Starcarius Victor Franciscus,</td>
<td>Schedae mathematicae (Bologna, s.d.: 1713)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1713</td>
<td>Wolff Christian,</td>
<td>Vernünfftige Gedancken von den Kräffen des menschlichen Verstandes und ihrem richtigen Gebrauche in Erkännis der Wahrheit (Halle, Renger: 1713)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1714</td>
<td>Barbeyrac Jean,</td>
<td>Discours sur l'utilité des lettres et des sciences [...] (Genf, Fabri &amp; Barrilot: 1714)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1714</td>
<td>Bayle Pierre,</td>
<td>Lettres choisies (Rotterdam, Fritsch &amp; Böhm: 1714)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1714</td>
<td>Heumann Christoph August,</td>
<td>Der politische Philosophus (Frankfurt a.M.-Leipzig, Renger: 1714)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1714</td>
<td>Simon Richard,</td>
<td>Nouvelle bibliothèque choisie (Amsterdam, Mortier: 1714)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1715</td>
<td>Bonnet Jacques – Bourdelot Jacques,</td>
<td>Histoire de la musique (Paris, Cochart: 1715)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1715</td>
<td>Borch Ole,</td>
<td>Dissertatio de deperditis Pancirolli (Kopenhagen: 1715)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entstehung</td>
<td>Titel</td>
<td>Zitiert in (Seitenzahlen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1715</td>
<td>Kraus Johann Gottlob, <em>Umständliche Bücher-Historie</em> (Leipzig, s.n.: 1715/16)</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1715</td>
<td>Mencke Johann Burkhard, <em>De charlataneria eruditorum declamationes duae</em> (Leipzig, Gleditsch: 1715)</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1715</td>
<td>Müller August Friedrich, <em>Balthasar Gracians Oracul</em> (Leipzig, Eysseln: 1715)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1715</td>
<td>Weissbach Christian, <em>Wahrhaftige und gründliche Cur aller dem menschlichen Leibe zustossenden Krankheiten</em> (Straßburg, Dulsöcker: 1715)</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1716</td>
<td>Buttstett Johann Heinrich, <em>Ut, Mi, Sol, Re, Fa, La, Tota Musica et Harmonia Aeterna Oder Neu-eröffnetes, altes, wahres, eintziges und ewiges Fundamentum Musices, entgegen gesetzt Dem neu-eröffneten Orchestre [...]</em> (Erfurt-Leipzig, Werther: o.J. (1716))</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1716</td>
<td>Muzell Friedrich, <em>Tractatus metaphysico-physici [...]</em> (Frankfurt a.M., Conradi: 1716)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1716</td>
<td>Neue Zeitungen von gelehrtten Sachen (Leipzig, Gross: 1715)</td>
<td>127 u.ö.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1716</td>
<td>Poleni Giovanni, <em>De physics in rebus mathematicis utilitate</em> (Padua, s.n.: 1716)</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1716</td>
<td>Suites de Nouvelles (Amsterdam: 1716)</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1717</td>
<td>Taubert Gottfried, <em>Rechtschaffener Tantzmeister oder gründliche Erklärung der Frantzösischen Tantz-Kunst</em> (Leipzig, s.n.: 1717)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entstehung</td>
<td>Titel</td>
<td>Zitiert in (Seitenzahlen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1718</td>
<td>Arnauld Antoine, <em>Logica, sive Ars cogitandi</em>, hg. von Franz Buddeus (Halle, s.n.: 1718)</td>
<td>619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1718</td>
<td>Clüver Detlev, <em>Observationes philosophicae oder historische Anmerkungen über die nüzlichsten Dinge der Welt</em> (Bremen, s.n.: 1718)</td>
<td>263–264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1719</td>
<td>Beer Johann, <em>Musicalische Discurse, durch die Principia der Philosophie deducirt</em> (Nürnberg, Monath: 1719)</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1719</td>
<td>Le Grand Marc-Antoine, <em>Le Roi de Cocagne</em> (Komödie) (1719)</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1719</td>
<td>Till Johann Hermann, <em>Auffrichtig und vernunfft-gründlich beantwortete Musicalische Fragen</em> (Jüterbog: 1719, nicht nachweisbar)</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1720</td>
<td>Richter Samuel Gottlieb, <em>Der studierende Philosophus […]</em> (Dresden, s.n.: 1720)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1720</td>
<td>Bentley Richard, Sermons (unspez. Ausgabe, wahrscheinlich London um 1720)</td>
<td>35–36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721</td>
<td>Bussy de Rabutin Roger de, <em>Oeuvres melées</em> (Amsterdam, Chatelain: 1721)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721</td>
<td>Fuhrmann Martin Heinrich, <em>Musicalische Striegel</em> (Leipzig, s.n.: o.J. (1727))⁴¹</td>
<td>764</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁴¹ Die erste Ausgabe mit Druckort Leipzig erschien um 1727. Mattheson kennt aber bereits 1721 den genauen Titel; das Werk scheint somit in einer vorläufigen Form bereits 1721 vorgelegen zu haben.
Three years after the Spanish conquest of the Aztecs, Fray Pedro de Gante’s school at the chapel of San José de los Naturales in Mexico City formally introduced European artistic practices and tastes to the Indians of New Spain. As the missionary and his companions taught native artists to render forms according to Renaissance pictorial principles, they understood their actions to promote successful religious and social conversion, not just the alteration of artistic style. The transformation the indigenous artists supposedly underwent as they abandoned native pictorial practices and adopted European ways embodied their epistemological conversion; they were said to have adopted a European worldview and to have become good subjects of the Spanish Empire.¹ These neophytes then traveled to outlying mission complexes where the images they painted on the walls of newly-built churches were just as important to the evangelical effort – or perhaps even more so – as the catechisms and sermons the missionaries delivered.

Just over two hundred fifty years later, in 1778, the Spanish academician Jerónimo Antonio Gil [Fig. 1] crossed the Atlantic from Spain on a similar mission. His official purpose as the new principal engraver of the Royal Mint in Mexico City was to found a drawing school to reform coin production, correcting the defects in image-making that plagued the institution. Within five years, Gil’s drawing classes became the Royal Academy of the Three Noble Arts of San Carlos with a teaching faculty soon hired from Spain.² Its students were Gil’s neophytes, drawn this time not exclusively

¹ The reality, of course, was much more complicated as native peoples negotiated the new colonial context. An excellent study of this process is Peterson J., The Paradise Gardens at Malinalco (Austin: 1993).

² Gil initially staffed the school with Mexican artists but quickly added artists from Spain to serve as the institution’s senior faculty. The local artists, including Francisco Clapera, Mariano Vázquez, and Andrés López, remained at the institution, serving in lesser roles.
Fig. 1. Tomás Suria, *Portrait of Jerónimo Antonio Gil*, ca. 1780. Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional.
from the Indian communities that Gante served – although several scholarships were reserved for native students – but also from New Spain’s Spanish (known as Creole) and mixed race or mestizo populations. These latter colonists were those the state felt the most urgent need to draw into its bosom in the late colonial era. The survival of the colonial enterprise depended to a great extent upon a close, paternal relationship between the monarch in Madrid and his subjects across the Atlantic. Like the native artists who converted to Christianity and used their art to spread European practices to their local communities two centuries earlier, the Creole and mestizo academy students were to leave the institution to spread the new official artistic style and the loyalty to the state that it implied. Although Mexican art had certainly not rejected European influence since the days of Gante’s school, local tastes had developed independently and sometimes in manners unappealing to Spanish academicians and imperial authorities. Rather than replace Pre-Columbian forms with Renaissance principles, these new artistic missionaries were to dislodge the late-baroque style of eighteenth-century New Spain in favor of the classical forms of contemporary European buen gusto or ‘good taste’ as promoted by the state and its institutions.

The academy’s role in the imposition of new tastes and the ‘improvement’ of local art and craft for economic and political ends is well known. In 1783, Jerónimo Antonio Gil wrote that in Mexico City there were:

more than forty workshops belonging to various people working in the areas of painting, sculpture, gilding, and altarscreen assemblage […] who, without possessing the slightest knowledge of drawing, produce myriad imperfect

---

3 In colonial New Spain, ‘Creole’ referred to people of supposedly pure Spanish blood who were born in the Americas; mestizos were the product of mixing Spanish and Indian blood. A social hierarchy based on race known as the society of castes – sociedad de castas – was firmly entrenched in eighteenth-century New Spain.

4 This was particularly true as resentment grew in the eighteenth century over Bourbon centralizing reforms that limited local authority in favor of greater imperial control and the expulsion of the Jesuit Order in 1767 that alienated the New Spanish Creole population that had been educated by Society members.


6 It is important to note that Mexican artists formed a short-lived academy several decades before Gil’s arrival and classicizing tastes were not new in the region. But the Mexicans’ vision of their work differed radially from the Spanish academicians’. On the first Mexican academy and other academic efforts, see Moyssen X., “La primera academia de pintura en México”, *Anales del Instituto de Investigaciones Estéticas* 9, 34 (1965) 15–30 and Ramírez Montes M., “En defensa de la pintura: Ciudad de México 1753”, *Anales del Instituto de Investigaciones Estéticas* 23, 78 (2001) 103–112.
works that horrify those who see them, and they receive in their homes various youths who with the pretext of being apprentices only help them with domestic chores.\textsuperscript{7}

To remedy the problem, Gil recommended that all young fine and mechanical artists be required to study at his new academy. Similarly, in 1795, the recently-arrived Spanish faculty at the Mexican academy submitted a petition to the Vice-Regal government describing the ‘confused horror and unpleasant mix of the three [architectural] orders […] [and the] general monstrosity of the buildings that disfigure the streets of this beautiful capital, and which are ridiculous to the eyes of all intelligent men’.\textsuperscript{8} They demanded that the academy faculty control the design of future buildings. Colonial officials agreed and from that point forward only academicians could direct the construction of buildings in New Spain.\textsuperscript{9} While this influence over public works would eventually alter Mexico City’s appearance, the monumental equestrian portrait of Charles IV and the renovated main plaza it occupied [Fig. 2], designed and executed by faculty of the Academy of San Carlos in 1796, made an immediate declaration of the new approach to image- and taste-making in the viceroyalty. The sculpture and square, commissioned by Viceroy Miguel de la Grúa Talamanca y Branciforte, Marquis of Branciforte, likewise illustrated the political purpose of the academy itself: to centralize authority in the age of the Bourbon reforms and to draw Mexicans closer to their distant sovereign.

The present study is a social history of Gil’s personal collection of books and considers how his library operated, like Gil did himself at the Royal Mint and the Academy of San Carlos, as a tool for the transformation of Mexican tastes and the creation of the man of taste and good Spanish citizen. In addition to addressing the impact of selected titles on Gil’s art

\textsuperscript{7} ‘[…] más de quarenta obradores de varios Sugetos que comerciando con los Ramos de Pintura, Escultura Dorado y Ensambilado, se llaman generalmente tratantes quienes sin poseer la más ligera luz del Dibujo expenden multitud de obras imperfectas, que horroriza el verlas, y reciben en sus casas varios Jovenes, que con el especioso pretexto de Discípulos solo se dedicen a servirlos en asuntos domésticos […]’, Cited in Carrillo y Gariel A.,\textit{ Datos sobre la Academia de San Carlos de Nueva España} (Mexico City: 1939) 21–22. All translations mine unless otherwise noted.

\textsuperscript{8} ‘[…] se ve con horror una confusa y desagradable mezcla de los Tres Ordenes […] general monstruosidad de las fabricas que desfiguran las calles de esta Hermosa Capital y de ridículo asunto a los ojos de todo hombre inteligente’. Cited in Carrillo y Gariel,\textit{ Datos sobre la Academia de San Carlos de Nueva España} 34–35.

\textsuperscript{9} Fuentes Rojas, \textit{Academia de San Carlos} 25. It should be noted that the academy attempted to secure the same privilege for painting and sculpture in 1799, but failed when colonial authorities feared the impoverishment of native craftsmen.
and his students’, the essay illustrates how Gil deployed his collection in light of his position as the principal proponent of academic tastes and principles in the Mexican capital. I argue that Gil consciously constructed and exploited his library as part of his larger agenda as the evangelist of good taste in late colonial Mexico City.

Jerónimo Antonio Gil was born in 1731 in Zamora, Spain. As a young man, Gil traveled to Madrid where, in 1754, he became one of the first pensioned students at the newly founded Royal Academy of Fine Arts of San Fernando. Working with engraver Tomás Francisco Prieto, Gil learned the arts of coin, medal, and copperplate engraving, but also completed courses in drawing before finishing his studies in 1758. Named ‘Academic of Merit’ by the Academy of San Fernando, Gil worked independently before applying unsuccessfully for the position of Director of Copperplate Engraving at San Fernando following the 1777 death of Juan Bernabé Palomino. Within one year, however, Gil received King Charles III’s order to travel to Mexico City to lead the engraving office at New Spain’s principal mint. Arriving on Mexican shores soon after, Gil worked at the Royal

---

10 Gil’s biography is found in Báez Macías E., Jerónimo Antonio Gil y su traducción de Gérard Audran (Mexico City: 2001) 13.
Mint for the remainder of his life, ascending to the senior administrative rank of Fiel administrador in 1788, in addition to establishing the Royal Academy of the Three Noble Arts of San Carlos in 1783 and serving as its Director General with a lifetime appointment. Gil died in Mexico City on April 17, 1798.

Gil’s library as described in his probate inventory was substantial, with 298 titles and 659 volumes. The majority of the academicians books – 101 titles or 34% of the total – addressed religious themes including devotional and liturgical books, bibles, and a few theological treatises. Notable among these are the 19 volumes of the writings of Fray Luis de Granada (1504–1588) and 45 volumes of the complete writings of Fray Luis de la Puente (1554–1624), both prolific ascetic authors of Spain’s Golden Age. Most religious titles in Gil’s library, however, were smaller, devotional texts addressing daily prayers and pious exercises. Among these were José Barcia y Zambrana’s Despertador eucharístico and El hombre interior en la agonía y últimos momentos de la vida by Vicente de el Seyxo.

Another 79 titles or 26.5% of Gil’s library fall under the general rubric of history. The academicians owned many texts on the history of Spain and the Americas in addition to chronicles of more distant locales and eras including Rome, Poland, Algeria, Sweden, and Turkey, and from antiquity to the present. Among this group, notable works include Father Juan de Mariana’s Historia general de España, a Spanish translation of Laurence Echard’s Roman history from Julius Caesar through Constantine, the Inca Garcilaso de la Vega’s chronicle of Peru, and Alonso de Ercilla y Zúñiga’s La Araucana on Chilean history. In light of the library owner’s vocation, it seems likely that many of the historical titles appear in Gil’s collection as much for their illustrations as for their texts. For example, Juan de Pineda y Salazar’s three volume chronicle of the Order of the Golden Fleece may have appealed to Gil’s interest in history, but was likely also attractive to the engraver and numismatist for its many illustrations of medals. Similarly, the texts narrating the installation of Spanish King Charles IV and the funeral of Archduke Albert II undoubtedly held allure for their engraved plates as well as for their historical records.

Not surprisingly, art, including bound volumes of images, treatises, and manuals, was the subject of another 52 titles (17%) in Gil’s collection.

---

11 The inventory of books appears in AGN, Intestados, t. 178, exp. 16, fols. 381v–392. Unfortunately, the list’s compilers employed a shorthand that does not permit every text to be conclusively identified.

12 This number does not include Gil’s 58 print portfolios containing over 1,200 prints.
Gil's bound collections of printed illustrations included the *Nouveau livre de dessin de Nicolas Poussin* published by the widow of Parisian publisher François de Poilly between 1693 and 1712; two volumes of Claude Lorrain's *Liber veritatis* published by John Boydell; and *A collection of 150 select views, in England, Scotland, and Ireland* published in 1781 by Paul Sandby. The other authors represented in his library included Vitruvius, Vignola, Leonardo da Vinci, and Giorgio Vasari as well as more recent writings by Spanish court artist Anton Rafael Mengs and the aesthetcian Antonio Ponz. Gil additionally owned Juan Antonio Palomino's *Museo pictórico y escala óptica*, Felipe Guevara's *Comentarios sobre la pintura*, Manuel de Rueda's engraving manual, an edition of José de Ribera's *Cartilla para aprender a dibujar*, and Juan de Arfe y Villafañe's *Varia commensuración para la escultura y arquitectura*.13

Fiction, poetry, science, education, mathematics, and philosophy rounded out the library. Literary texts accounted for 9% of the academician's collection. Gil possessed 26 novels and books of poetry, from Cervantes' *Don Quijote* to the latest edition of *Robinson Crusoe*. Other literary titles to be found on his library shelves included the *Fábulas* of Félix María Samaniego, published in Madrid in 1797. Among the science and education titles, with fifteen and thirteen examples respectively, Gil owned Antoine Lavoisier's treatise on chemistry, José Cortés' *Fisionomía y varios secretos de naturaleza*, and two copies of the 1795 mineralogy text, *Elementos de orictognosia* by Andrés Manuel del Río. The remaining categories, including mathematics and philosophy, numbered no more than three titles each.

Amassing this collection was no small undertaking, considering that when Gil and his wife married neither had any belongings and his wife had no dowry.14 When he crossed the Atlantic to assume his position at the Royal Mint, he and his sons brought with them only three boxes of clothes and tools.15 Other items were sent separately for the support of the new engraving school. Gil received the first mint shipment of 24 crates of goods he ordered for his new drawing classes in 1779; additional objects,
tools, and books arrived later for the Royal Academy of San Carlos. But Gil was keen to distinguish his belongings from those collected for the institutions. His 1792 will is emphatic in its insistence that everything in his chambers at the Royal Mint belonged to him and not to that institution or to the Academy of San Carlos. Similarly, an 1801 letter in the archival record of Gil’s probate explains that during his time in Mexico, Gil collected everything found in the inventory and that when he left Spain, he had only his tools and clothing. Therefore, it seems clear that the items in Gil’s probate inventory are distinct from the goods he ordered from Spain to stock the mint and academy. Had it been otherwise, surely the institutions’ administrators would not have permitted their eventual sale.

Turning to the library collection itself, the titles reveal much about Gil’s approach to art and its teaching. The texts range from the practical, such as manuals, instructional pamphlets, and sample books of costumes and hairstyles, to more theoretical writings. Among the latter, the most significant text Gil possessed may have been *Reflexiones sobre la belleza y gusto en la Pintura* by German painter Anton Raphael Mengs, the court artist in Madrid with whom Gil shared an affinity for antiquity and the paintings of Raphael, Correggio, and Titian.

More specifically, the inventory’s entry ‘Obras de Mengs por Azara’ reveals that Gil owned the 1780 edition of Mengs’ writings compiled by José Nicolás de Azara, a Spanish bureaucrat based in Rome for much of his career. Following Mengs’ death in 1779, Azara immediately began gathering and translating the painter’s writings into Spanish as an homage to his colleague and to promote his aesthetic theories. These included

---

16 AGN, *Intestados* fol. 402v. Additional support for this position may be found in the fact that the goods sent to the mint and the academy included many examples of drawing and sculpture; neither appears in Gil’s inventory.


18 The confusion seems to rest in early scholarship that identified books and other items as brought to Mexico City by or for Gil, and assumed that these ended up in his inventory. The lists of books that Gil ordered for his drawing students as cited by Diego Angulo Iníguez and Eduardo Báez Macías, for example, include many authors and titles not in Gil’s probate inventory. See Angulo Iníguez D., *La academia de bellas artes de Méjico y sus pinturas españolas* (Sevilla: 1935) 20; and Báez Macías, *Jerónimo Antonio Gil* 15.

19 Gil possessed copies of paintings by all three as well as printed reproductions of their works.

20 Since the text was likely published at the end of 1780, Gil purchased his copy while already on Mexican soil. A second edition appeared in 1797, but would not have made it across the Atlantic in time to be included in Gil’s April 1798 inventory. On the 1780 edition, see Mengs A.R., *Reflexiones sobre la belleza y gusto en la pintura por Antonio Rafael Mengs*, introducción de Mercedes Agueda (Madrid: 1989).
Mengs’ celebration of Greek art as closest to perfection, his dedication to study of selected ancient and Renaissance models, and his belief in art’s superiority to nature in the quest for beauty. In these ideas, Mengs paralleled his friend and mentor, Johann Joachim Winckelmann. In fact, the first essay in Azara’s edition, Reflexiones de D. Antonio Rafael Mengs sobre la Belleza y Gusto en la Pintura was likely written while Mengs and Winckelmann were engaged in a two-year dialogue that also resulted in the latter’s 1764 History of Ancient Art. The 1780 edition also included Azara’s commentary on the Reflexiones; Pensamientos de D. Antonio Rafael Mengs sobre los grandes pintores: Rafael, Correggio, Tiziano y los antiguos; Mengs’ letters to several colleagues, including Spanish aesthete Antonio Ponz; his lessons on painting; and his recommendations on the formation of a fine arts academy.

Gil’s affinity for Mengs’ ideas is clearly seen in such works as the medal he engraved to commemorate the 1796 renovation of Mexico City’s Plaza Mayor with its equestrian sculpture of Charles IV [Fig. 3]. Evoking the medals of antiquity, the obverse busts of King Charles and Queen María Luisa rest side by side in profile. Both preserve the nature of their robust and mature physical forms, yet embody Mengs’ assertion that the artist can make visual the body’s perfection through ‘the precise drawing, the grandeur of the figure, the graceful attitude, the proportion of the members, the strength of the chest […] the sincerity of the forehead and brows, the prudence in the eyes, the health [visible] in the cheeks, and loving grace of the mouth’. With these qualities, the work of art can exceed the accidents of nature. The equestrian monument on the medal’s reverse similarly presents the clarity and order Mengs championed over the extravagance, caprice, and ‘ridiculous and vulgar contours’ he saw in baroque structures. Gil’s reproduction of the yet-to-be installed monument likewise eschewed ornament for classical restraint.

Mengs’ influence may be just as clearly illustrated in Gil’s magnum opus: the Royal Academy of the Three Nobles Arts of San Carlos, its governing
laws, and its curriculum. The statutes of the Academy of San Carlos, listed on Gil’s probate inventory and seen below his hand in his portrait by Rafael Ximeno y Planes [Fig. 4], mirror Mengs’ recommendations in the “Carta a un Amigo de D. Antonio Rafael Mengs sobre la constitución de una Academia de las Bellas Artes” from the 1780 edition. Likely written while Mengs was in Spain, the letter promotes the teaching role of the academy faculty, day classes for theoretical learning, and evening drawing sessions for students from all trades. It similarly recommends the development of an academic collection of exemplary art and texts, places all decisions on aesthetic matters firmly in the hands of the academy faculty, and declares that instruction should not take place in private workshops, but should instead occur in the academy’s halls.²⁵ The Mexican academy’s statutes, like the plan de estudios (plan of study or curriculum) written in 1790, similarly require that all students begin their studies in the drawing room learning ‘rules and solid principles’ by copying exemplary works and receiving correction by their faculty.²⁶ Only upon successfully completing their education in the fundaments of drawing could students ascend to other courses of instruction within the institution. While not addressed in the statutes, on the issue of where instruction was to take place, Gil sided with Mengs, as discussed below.

But the book collection reveals still more about Jerónimo Antonio Gil and additional analysis requires locating the library within its own social and physical context. Gil’s collection was more than an aesthetic exercise or a statement of social standing due to the reasons for which he was in

²⁵ Mengs, Reflexiones 391–404.
Fig. 4. [COL. PL. 16] Rafael Ximeno y Planes, Portrait of Jerónimo Antonio Gil, 1795. Mexico City, Museo Nacional de Arte.
Mexico in the first place. The library was part and parcel of his life’s work: to transform the artistic tastes of colonists in New Spain and to develop good taste in the colony. Rather than the private collection designed to demonstrate the collector’s taste or an academically-trained artist’s library intended to support his own art making, Gil’s was a quasi public collection cultivated for evangelical purposes. I base this argument in part on his role as founder of the Royal Academy of San Carlos, which would have immediately given his collection a certain authority. He was, after all, the representative of the king’s tastes, and lacking a physically present king and royal library, Gil’s books and his collecting efforts modeled good taste and learning.

The books’ usefulness therefore extended beyond the artist himself as Gil’s collection had a broader audience than most personal libraries. This is borne out by its location and its viewership. Gil did not live in a private home, and his books were not seen only by those invited to elegant parties and private audiences. He lived instead in rather ample rooms within the Royal Mint itself, a building fraught with potency within the colonial context. It was a royal building located beside the Vice-Regal palace, a symbol of the wealth of the Spanish Empire, a newly rebuilt structure – companion to the new Palace of Mining – reaffirming the central authority of Spain, and it was the source of coins that rested in virtually every Mexican’s purse as ubiquitous reminders of Spanish imperial power. At the same time, the building represented Mexico’s key role in propping up what little wealth the empire had left. Its silver coins reminded their viewers that places like Zacatecas in New Spain and Potosí in Peru kept Spain afloat. The building thus embodied both Spanish imperial authority and Mexican national pride; Gil’s collection within could therefore not have existed as neutral furnishings or a private man’s whim, and the library shared the aura of the place.

Moreover, from the moment that he arrived in Mexico City, Gil used his quarters within the mint to conduct classes. From his writing, we know that 300 or more students from all walks of life attended his evening drawing sessions in these rooms before the foundation of the academy. The architecture of the mint was even renovated soon after his arrival by Gil according to his specifications and the new didactic purpose of his space.27

---

27 The renovation is discussed in the “Proyecto para el establecimiento en México de una academia de las tres nobles artes” by mint administrator Martín de Mayorga. In Proyecto, estatutos y demás documentos relacionados al establecimiento de la Real Academia
Even after the Academy of San Carlos opened its doors, Gil continued to conduct these classes and additionally trained the academy’s engravers in his quarters. The objects that he selected for display on the walls of his chambers and the books he selected for his library shelves must consequently have been carefully chosen with an eye towards this audience. His neophytes needed to be surrounded by works that would cultivate proper tastes and reinforce the artistic and social lessons they learned from their master.

That Gil thought of his chambers and his library as more than a living space and a private collection is made clear in his writings. In 1788, Gil responded to the protests of his Spanish faculty over a recent mandate that professors teach morning, afternoon, and evening hours at the academy rather than in private homes. The faculty complained that so many teaching hours did not allow for the completion of private commissions. Gil’s response, based on Mengs’ guidelines, included a justification for precluding faculty from teaching in their homes that offers insight into his perception of his own living situation. The professors’ homes, Gil explained, did not provide students access to the works of art, tools, and, most importantly for the present study, books. Their homes did not preserve ‘the being and essence of a Public School’. The 1798 probate inventory reveals that the academy founder’s quarters, on the other hand, had precisely these objects. Clearly, therefore, Gil’s rooms within the Royal Mint were distinct, in his mind at least. Here students did have access to exemplary works of art and an ample library; their public education was furthered here.

Yet Gil’s audience did not end with his students. The Royal Mint was an obligatory stop for every touring dignitary, every civic and religious procession, and every entering viceroy and archbishop. It was listed in the annual Visitor’s Guide (Guía de forasteros) as a tourist attraction for foreigners. Alexander von Humboldt, for example, visited it five years after Gil died, and Fanny Calderón de la Barca and her husband even resided in Gil’s former quarters during their diplomatic stay in 1841. While we of course cannot tell if all parties who visited the Royal Mint entered Gil’s

---


chambers, it stands to reason that they did, perhaps precisely because of its collection and its celebrity owner. While the streets may have been filled with baroque monstrosities that horrified tasteful and intelligent viewers – according to the newly-arrived Spanish academicians, although most foreigners celebrated the city’s beauty – Gil’s person and his book collection testified to the efforts underway to remedy the situation; they showed taste in New Spain and a tasteful collection acquired entirely from this distance. No doubt Gil anticipated that there would be many collections like his soon to be found in the viceroyalty; he had forged the way and his model of selecting and acquiring works would soon be followed.30

Another text in Gil’s collection demonstrates how his dedication to his evangelical purpose exceeded merely making books available to his students and visitors. Here I refer to his Spanish translation of Audran’s *Le proportions du corps humain*, which was written while still in Spain, but published in 1780.31 Although Gil’s decision to translate Audran has been interpreted as an easy compromise, a text that was ‘a most useful instrument, halfway between a pamphlet and a treatise, between a theoretical and cultured text and simple instructions given to those learning to read’,32 it is clear that the text profoundly reflected its translator’s ideas and interests as an artist and an academic administrator. Working apparently without patron or commission, Gil undoubtedly found something so important in Audran that he wanted to translate and endorse

---

30 Jeremy Wood’s discussion of English galleries of copies of Raphael and others bears this out, arguing that the copy galleries were created to instruct and reflected the ‘belief that British history painting should be improved, while, at the same time, paying an elegant compliment to royal taste and collecting’. Wood J., “Raphael Copies and Exemplary Picture Galleries in Mid-Eighteenth-Century London”, *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 62, 3 (1999) 399–400. Likewise, Gil is an example of a print collector attempting to reorient his people toward Europe, like Portuguese King John V, by ordering images from Europe. See Griffiths A., “Print Collecting in Rome, Paris, and London in the Early Eighteenth Century”, *Harvard University Art Museums Bulletin* 2 (1994) 37.

31 Báez Macías, in his preliminary study of Gil’s translation of Audran’s text, wonders why Gil did not order copies of his book for the Royal Mint or for the Academy of San Carlos. He additionally says that the book was not in Gil’s personal library. Here Báez is in error because four copies of Gil’s Audran translation were found in his home, two bound and two unbound. See AGN, *Intestados* fol. 38iv. Academician Manuel Tolsá also possessed a copy. See Armella de Aspe, “Noticias” 224.

32 ‘[…] un utilísimo instrumento, a medio camino entre el tratado y la cartilla, entre texto teórico, culto y la sencilla instrucción que se da para aprender a dibujar’. Baez Macías, *Jerónimo Antonio Gil* 57.
this text above others in his role as academician and representative of the king's taste.\footnote{While it is unclear when Gil had the idea to translate the text from French to Spanish, the book appeared in print in 1780, two years after the engraver was appointed to Mexico City's Royal Mint and one year after he arrived in New Spain. While the text was undoubtedly written while Gil remained in Spain, its printed title page clearly identifies him as Principal Engraver of the Royal Mint in Mexico and Academic of Merit of the Royal Academy of San Fernando. The text appears to have been produced at Gil's initiative, as no patron is identified in the book.}

Gil's words elucidate what he saw in Audran's text. In the editor's note he placed before the translation, Gil wrote:

One need only ponder what the author [Audran] writes in his Prologue, the great advantages that the use of said work may have for draftsmen. I only beg the professors of such noble arts, and in particular the students, for whose benefit I have engraved the figures, and have translated into Castilian their explanation, gaze continuously upon this work, and reflect upon the models presented here, because I judge them to be of the utmost importance for perfecting drawing.\footnote{‘No es necesario ponderar más de lo que el mismo autor hace en su Prólogo, las grandes ventajas que del uso de dicha obra pueden resultar a los dibujantes. Yo sólo suplico a los profesores de tan nobles artes, y en particular a los discípulos, para cuyo beneficio he grabado las figuras, y se ha puesto en castellano su explicación, que pasen la vista continuamente, y con reflexión por los modelos que aquí se les presentan, pues lo juzgo por de suma importancia para perfeccionarse en el dibujo’. Cited in Báez Macías, \textit{Jerónimo Antonio Gil} 66.}

This passage reveals that Gil, like Audran, promoted an art that was based on rules, order, symmetry, and balance.

Heeding Gil's advice and turning to Audran's Prologue reveals much about his motive for translating this text. Here Audran wrote of the diverse notions of beauty in different nations, influenced by such things as familiar surroundings and the natural climate. He concluded that in the face of this stylistic heterogeneity and competing visions of beauty, the only recourse for artists in all parts of the world was to return to the models of antiquity. Recall that Gil directed readers specifically to the prologue, noting that this was all that was necessary for the perfection of drawing. While Audran himself, writing in Paris in the late 1680s may not have thought of Spanish American artists when he made this recommendation for the homogenization of good taste in the face of regional diversity, Gil, making his translation either just before or soon after hearing of his reassignment to the New World, could certainly not have missed the implication. Faced with reforming the tasteless (even horrifying) approach
to image-making in the Mexican mint, Gil may have found a ready solution in Audran’s confidence in the universal beauty and unifying potential of drawing based on ancient models. Audran wrote that the Greeks and Romans did not let their passions control them and overcame nature to arrive at perfect beauty. Similarly, for eighteenth-century Spaniards and Spanish Americans familiar with Georges-Louis Leclerc Buffon’s assertions of the physical and moral degradation of those living in the Americas, salvation rested in turning away from local tastes and passions and turning towards the universal beacon of European ancient models. Redemption for the Mexican artists Gil was sent to train, according to Spanish imperial and academic authorities, lay only in rejecting the local in favor of the classical. Likewise, when Audran noted that like the ancient Greeks living under Alexander, his reader also lived in a glorious era (the age of Louis XIV, although Audran does not mention the French king by name), Gil may have seen a useful parallel with the reforming, enlightened Bourbon despot Charles III. Idealistic to be sure, Gil’s attempt to use classical models and drawing to unify the diversity of tastes within the Spanish empire and bring its subjects closer to their king was entirely in keeping with his mission on American soil. The antidote to these hybrid tastes was the art of antiquity.

Comparing engravings by Gil and one of his Mexican students reveals precisely the homogenization the Audran text promised. The sobriety and restraint of Gil’s 1782 engraving of Saint Philip of Neri [Fig. 5] is matched by the unornamented style and precise drawing found in the 1811 engraving of Faith [Fig. 6] by his pupil, José María Montes de Oca (1772–c.1825). Both employ a classicizing architectural framework and idealized forms drawn according to a classical canon of proportion. Neither of the engravings has any note of idiosyncrasy or any unique cultural manifestation despite the fact that one was the effort of a transplanted Spaniard educated on the peninsula and the other was made by a Mexican, raised among the baroque constructions, that horrified Gil and the academy faculty. That such diverse artists should now draw virtually identical images undoubtedly proved to Gil the truth of Audran’s words. Moreover, Montes de Oca’s

35 For a brilliant analysis of writing about the Americas, specifically its histories and people, as well as a discussion of the Spanish response to European writings on American history, see Cañizares-Esguerra J., How to Write the History of the New World (Stanford: 2001).

Fig. 5. Jerónimo Antonio Gil, *Saint Philip of Neri*, 1782. Austin, Nettie Lee Benson Latin American Collection, University of Texas.
Fig. 6. José María Montes de Oca, *Faith*, 1811. Austin, Nettie Lee Benson Latin American Collection, University of Texas.
adoption of ancient typologies demonstrated to Gil that his pedagogy of cultural immersion – instructing Montes de Oca within his chambers, surrounded by his didactic library and tasteful art collection – bore precisely the edifying fruit he pursued with his evangelical zeal; Montes de Oca had become an hombre de gusto, a man of taste.

The epilogue to this essay briefly chronicles what happened during the sale of Gil’s book collection. Many of the texts were purchased by the probate inventory’s assessor, José Azcárate del Corral, who undoubtedly re-sold them in his Mexico City shop. Another bookseller, José Gómez did likewise. Gil’s colleagues at the Academy of San Carlos also purchased some of the books, including academy architect Luis Martín, engraver José Joaquín Fabregat, affiliated artist José Luis Rodríguez Alconedo, and students José María Picazo, Manuel López López, and Francisco Lindo. The academy library purchased nearly one dozen books. Mint employees Ignacio Carrillo, Luis Osorio, Bruno Gómez, Joaquín Casarín, and Manuel Mestre y Pardo bought books as well. Gil’s probate sale also attracted buyers from New Spain’s social elite including Antonio Recarey y Camaño, a Mexico City silver baron; Rafael Larrañaga, the representative of wealthy miner Antonio Otero of Guanajuato; José Antonio Cervantes y Cevallos, Marquis of Guardiola; and Juan Felipe Moradillos, the owner of Hacienda La Patera in nearby Tlalnepantla.

The sale of Gil’s books thus demonstrates the efficacy of his mission. As students from humble families and common mint employees stood beside merchants, titled nobility, newly-rich miners, and hacienda owners, Gil’s evangelical effort came to fruition. The diverse and heterogeneous population of New Spain purchased and disseminated the texts and teachings of the king’s representative of taste and loyalty, carrying on his collecting habits and the good taste and learning he promoted. While of course it is difficult to know whether these consumers felt the devotion to the crown for which the academy founder and his king hoped, they certainly had every opportunity to do so thanks to this evangelist of taste and his library.
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