

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I

Introduction

I. Drawing ‘from nature’: sixteenth century Netherlandish artistic theory and practice

I.1. Theory

I.2. Practice

II. Case studies

II.1. Jan Gossaert

II.2. Jan van Scorel

II.3. Maarten van Heemskerck

II.4. Hieronymus Cock

II.5. Tobias Verhaecht

Conclusion

Bibliography

PART II

List of illustrations

Illustrations

INTRODUCTION

During the sixteenth century, many Netherlandish artists¹ made a study trip to Italy, and more in particular to Rome, mainly as a completion of the artistic education they had started in their native country. Having arrived in the southern peninsula, they looked for prestigious commissions or employment in an Italian workshop. Many artists returned home after some years, others built up a life and career in the city and stayed.

It has been generally acknowledged that northern artists travelled to Italy to learn from Antiquity and their contemporary Italian masters and that in Rome in particular, they made drawings of all the things they admired in the city which they could use in their work. Nonetheless, it remains questionable to what extent and for which purposes northern artists have collected visual material in Rome. Furthermore, it is certainly not clear if the practice of drawing 'from nature' may be regarded as one of the main reasons for sixteenth century northern artists to set off for a journey southwards.²

We may assume that many sixteenth century 'Roman drawings' irrevocably have been lost in the course of the past centuries, which makes it impossible to gain a totally comprehensive view on sixteenth century northern artists' drawing activities in the city. The large group of drawings preserved in numerous drawing cabinets and private collections all over the world however make it possible to reach significant conclusions.

An important part of these Roman drawings consists of depictions of antique and contemporary architectural monuments and cityscapes, a group which can be covered with the term '*vedute*'.³

¹ With the indication 'Netherlandish' we mean both southern and northern Netherlandish artists. It is difficult to use 'Flemish' or 'Dutch' art in the context of sixteenth and seventeenth century art. Even after the Treaty of Münster in 1648, foreigners perceiving Netherlandish art apparently did not make clear distinctions between 'Flemish' or 'Dutch' art. We will further use the adjective 'northern' as a synonym for 'Netherlandish'. 'Flemish' and 'flamminghi' are terms that we prefer not to use. Although since the renaissance the terms referred to the culture and inhabitants of the whole of the Low Countries, including Westphalia and Liège, the names could be confused with present-day territory of the northern, Flemish part of Belgium, *Vlaanderen*. See Billen 1995; Vlieghe 1998b.

² The aspect of drawing 'from nature' (*naer het leven*) is rather complex within the context of sixteenth and seventeenth century art theory and practice. In the first chapter, we will examine this matter more deeply. We will further use the terms drawings 'from nature' and 'from life' as synonyms, as opposed to studio drawings.

³ We will use the Italian term *veduta* (plural: *vedute*) interpreted in the broadest sense, meaning 'a painting, drawing or print representing a landscape or town view that is largely topographical in conception, as opposed to the fantasy view or *capriccio*', though with the omission of the included possibilities of paintings and prints (see Wilton-Ely 1996, p. 110). The term in itself does not necessarily mean that a *veduta* is made entirely 'from nature'. Although the term interpreted in the strict sense refers to eighteenth century cityscape paintings of Venice and Rome, it is also used in the art historical literature to describe sixteenth and seventeenth century topographical drawings made in Rome (see for instance the titles of some reference works on the subject: *Römische Veduten. Handzeichnungen aus dem XV. bis XVIII. Jahrhundert zur Topographie der Stadt Rom* (see Egger 1911-1931), *Vedute Romane. Disegni dal XVI al XVIII secolo* (see Roma 1971),

It is known that several sixteenth century northern artists have drawn extensively 'on the spot' in the city and its surroundings, but many extant drawings were also based on other models. When a Roman *veduta* becomes an object of present-day research, a crucial question to be asked is therefore whether or not the drawing is a direct study 'from nature'. It could be argued that this is not always relevant to know, but it is certainly justified to ask how artists made use of drawings 'from nature' within the creative process. Although it is worthwhile to investigate the function of drawings 'from nature' within the work of a single artist, it becomes even more challenging when this particular aspect is studied within the broader context of a well-defined group of artists.

The questions We would like to address in the present study are to what extent drawing 'from nature' in Rome was part of the artistic practice of sixteenth century northern artists and how these artists made use of their Roman drawings. In other words, we will consider the origins of sixteenth century Netherlandish artists' Roman *vedute* as well as investigate the function of the drawings against the background of common artistic procedures and studio practices.

The time span of our research will be confined to the sixteenth century. Following pioneering artists such as Jan Gossaert (1478-1532) and Jan van Scorel (1495-1562), Netherlandish artists in this period frequently travelled to Rome. In the second half of the century, a sojourn in the Eternal City became even more common. The phenomenon of northern artists who drew 'from nature' in Rome however outstretches the limits of this period. In the first half of the seventeenth century drawing in the open air was still practiced by northern artists staying in Rome.⁴

State of research

Mainly since Hermann Egger's extensive study *Römische veduten: Handzeichnungen aus dem XV-XVIII Jahrhundert*,⁵ in which the author has brought to the attention a vast amount of topographical drawings made by artists originating from various regions, the scholarly interest for the representation of Rome in drawings has been aroused. It lasted until the sixties of the

Roma Veduta: Rome gezien door Nederlandse meesters uit de 16de en 17de eeuw. Tekeningen en aquarellen uit de collectie van de Farnesina te Rome (see 's-Hertogenbosch 1993), *Roma Veduta: disegni e stampe panoramiche della città dal XV al XIX secolo* (see Roma 2000-2001)). An exhibition held at the Department of Art of Brown University in the late 1970s further has drawn the attention to 'The origins of the Italian Veduta' (see Providence 1978). The historical use of the term has not yet been studied thoroughly. Matthias Winner has touched upon the use of the term in Italy since the early renaissance in his paper given in 1984 at a symposium about Netherlandish mannerism in Stockholm (see Winner 1985).

⁴ Peter Schatborn has pointed to the fact that Karel Dujardin (1626-1678) and Adam Pynacker (1620/21-1673), Netherlandish artists who stayed in Italy around the middle of the seventeenth century, no longer drew ruins and monuments from life (see Schatborn 2001, p. 14). Further research is certainly required to figure out until when the practice of drawing *vedute* 'from life' in Rome remained a significant phenomenon.

⁵ Egger 1911-1931.

twentieth century however until increasingly more publications were devoted to the artistic importance of northern artists Roman journey.⁶ Around the same time, the study of sixteenth and seventeenth century Netherlandish artists' Roman drawings received considerably more attention.⁷ The literature of the past forty years on the subject is enormous and scholarly attention has certainly not decreased in recent years.⁸

For a long time the traditional approach to the study of drawings was concentrated mainly on attribution and style. Since the sixties of the twentieth century, also other approaches have been advanced. Rather new, for instance, was the study of the role of drawings and their function within the process of artistic creation.⁹ The use Netherlandish artists made of their Roman *vedute* however has been mainly discussed in monographic studies and catalogue entries on specific drawings. Furthermore, the working methods concerned with drawing from different generations of Netherlandish artists who worked in Rome, have not been examined on a larger scale in the light of common artistic procedures and workshop practices.

The present study concentrates on the origins and function of sixteenth century northern artists' Roman drawings. Unlike the Roman drawings of seventeenth century northern Netherlandish artists,¹⁰ the *vedute* this group of artists made in Rome have never been investigated in their entirety. The main point of our survey will be concentrated on the analysis of the practice of drawing 'from nature' in the first half of the sixteenth century. In this period the number of artists we know of to have visited Rome is relatively confined and it is still possible to gain a comprehensive view on the drawings preserved. As we have mentioned before, increasingly more northern artists travelled to the Italian peninsula in the second half of the century. The amount of extant drawings is also considerably larger. Since the drawings have never been examined as a whole, it is less obvious to acquire an overview. Yet, quite recently the initial impetus was given to classify the Roman drawings of artists from the so-called 'Bril circle'.¹¹

⁶ See for instance: Vienna 1964-1965, Utrecht 1965 (see also Blankert 1978), Berlin 1967.

⁷ See for instance: Van Regteren Altena 1964, Florence 1966, Steland-Stief 1971, Roethlisberger 1969.

⁸ Important recent contributions to this particular field of study are a.o. Wood Ruby 1999 (*Paul Bril: The Drawings*), Amsterdam 2001 (*Tekenen van warmte. 17^{de} eeuwse Nederlandse tekenaars in Italië*), Steland 2001-2002 (*Studien zu Herman van Swanevelt – Zeichnungen zu Fresken und Gemälden*), Woerden 2007 (*Het zuiden tegemoet: de landschappen van Herman van Swanevelt (1603-1655)*).

⁹ Schreiber Jacoby 1996. The function of sixteenth century northern drawings has been discussed amongst others in two exposition catalogues dating from the last decades of the twentieth century: see Robinson & Wolff 1986-1987, Bevers 1992-1993.

¹⁰ See for instance the recent exhibition catalogue *Tekenen van Warmte: 17^{de} eeuwse Nederlandse tekenaars in Italië* (Amsterdam 2001).

¹¹ Wood Ruby 1999.

In addition to this, it is not unimportant to mention that a general survey of the relevance of the concept of drawing 'from life' in early Netherlandish artistic practice is still lacking.

Motivation

Through the investigation of the origins and the function of sixteenth century Netherlandish artists' Roman *vedute* within the context of common artistic procedures and studio practices, we would like to gain a better understanding of the significance of drawing 'from nature' in Rome for the conception and development of northern art. In this way our aim is to contribute to the more general debate on the use of drawings 'from nature' in sixteenth century artistic practice.

Outline

To obtain a sharp image of the subject matter of this survey, the concept of drawing 'from nature' will be examined in the context of sixteenth century Netherlandish artistic theory and practice in a first introductory chapter. In this way it will become clear which place Roman *vedute* made 'from nature' occupy within the tradition of drawing natural phenomena.

The second chapter will deal with five case studies. In these case studies the origin and function of the Roman *vedute* made 'from nature' of respectively Jan Gosseart, Jan van Scorel, Maarten van Heemskerck, Hieronymus Cock and Tobias Verhaecht will be investigated in relation to their oeuvre as it is known today and to personal or common artistic (workshop) practices.

I. Drawing ‘from nature’: sixteenth century Netherlandish artistic theory and practice

And then he went to Rome, which he had long very much wanted to do, so as to see the antiquities and the works of the great masters of Italy. When he got there he boarded with or stayed with a cardinal through one or other recommendation; and he neither slept away his time nor neglected it in the company of Netherlanders with boozing or whatever, but instead he copied many things, as much after antiquities as after the works of Michelangelo – also many ruins, ornaments and all kinds of subtleties of the ancients which are to be seen in abundance in this city, the painter’s academy. When the weather was good he usually went out sketching.¹²

This quotation from the life of Maarten van Heemskerck (1498-1574) in Karel van Mander’s *Schilder-boeck* (1604) is one of the rare and most explicit documentary sources about a sixteenth century Netherlandish artist’s drawing activities in Rome. In the fragment, Van Mander explains how Van Heemskerck during his stay in Rome regularly set out to copy the antique monuments, the works of Michelangelo and all kinds of other things to be admired in the city.¹³ Many other sixteenth century artists who stayed in Rome presumably drew the antique remains and modern art and architecture as Maarten van Heemskerck ‘from nature’. However, as we have mentioned in our introduction, the study of sixteenth century Roman *vedute* has shown that part of the preserved drawings were based on other models.

Because it is our intention to distinguish between direct observations ‘from nature’ and other categories of drawings, and investigate the function of these drawings within the context of contemporary pictorial practices, we would like to dwell on the artistic practice of drawing ‘from nature’ in the sixteenth century. Since the theoretical concept of drawing ‘from nature’ within the context of the sixteenth and seventeenth century artistic production is rather complex and has implications for a good understanding of the contemporary practice of drawing ‘from life’, we will first make some observations on the matter.

¹² Van Mander 1604, fol. 245v 20-29: *En is doe getrocken nae Room, waer naer hy lange grooten lust hadde gehad, om d’Antijcken, en die groote Meesters van Italien dingen te sien. Daer comende, hadde zijn onderhoudt oft onthouden by een Cardinael, door eenighe recommandatie: heeft oock zijnen tijdt niet verslapen noch versuymt by den Nederlanders, met suypen oft anders, maer heel veel dinghen geconterfeyt, soo nae d’Antijcken, als nae Michiel Agnolen wercken: Oock veel Ruwijnen, bywercken, alderley aerdicheden der Antijcken, die in dese Schilder-Academische Stadt overvloedich te sien zijn. Gemeenlijck alst moy weder was, gingh hy so conterfeyten.*

¹³ It has been generally acknowledged that Van Heemskerck’s sketchbook drawings preserved in Berlin bear testimony of the artist’s drawing practices in the open air in Rome (see § II.3). For the interpretation of *conterfeyten* in seventeenth century writings as ‘copying faithful in a drawing or a painting’ see De Pauw-De Veen 1969, p. 322-324. See for Hessel Miedema’s interpretation of *conterfeyten* in Van Mander’s *Schilder-boeck* Van Mander 1604 (ed. Miedema 1994-1999), vol. 5, p. 98.

I.1. Theory

The phrase *'ad vivum'*, which means 'to the life' or 'lifelike', and translations in different modern languages were already frequently used within the context of late renaissance imagery and illustrated natural history.¹⁴ *'Et scies bien qu'il fu contrefais al vif'*, the inscription on a drawing of a lion (ca. 1235) in the sketchbook of Villard d'Honnecourt, a thirteenth century French master builder, includes probably one of the first mentionings of the term.¹⁵

It was only in 1604 however that working *'naer het leven'* was introduced as an art theoretical concept in Karel van Mander's *Schilder-boeck*.¹⁶ In the chapter on landscape art in his didactic poem *Den Grondt der Edel Vry Schilder-const*, the first part of the book, Van Mander encouraged young artists to go into the countryside to admire the beautiful things to be seen to be able to 'create' landscapes.¹⁷ Besides, in the introductory part of the *Schilder-boeck* P.C. Ketel's laudatory poem urged young artists to go drawing in the open air for the purpose of making lifelike landscapes.¹⁸ Yet, back in the studio, nature impressions needed to be transformed through the artist's imagination. Van Mander in this way aimed at an idea which is also discussed in other parts of *Den Grondt* and the biographical section of his book, namely that artists should work *'uyt den gheest'* rather than *'naer het leven'*. In his opinion the aspect of invention, which is suggested by the expression *'uyt den gheest'*, is the most crucial within the process of artistic creation.

This particular reasoning can only be fully understood in the light of Van Mander's ideas about the *'Teyken-const'*, which should be defined as the Dutch variant of the Italian concept of *disegno* in the way it appears in the writings of Giorgio Vasari and Federico Zuccaro. This concept could both refer to the actual act of drawing as well as the more abstract and creative act of designing.¹⁹ It is particularly this second aspect of the concept of *'disegno'* which became crucial in sixteenth

¹⁴ Swan 1995, p. 354. See also Nuti 1994, p. 108, note 18 for the translation of the Latin term. The interpretation of the construction 'ad' with an accusative especially is crucial: it means 'toward' something, not 'from' something.

¹⁵ Swan 1995, p. 355.

¹⁶ Id., p. 354, with reference to Van Mander 1604.

¹⁷ Van Mander 1604, fol. 34r-v. See especially fol. 34v 3: *En comt, laet ons al vroech met t'Poort ontslyuten/T'samen wat tijdt corten, om s'gheests verlichten,/En gaen sien de schoonhey, die daer is buyten,/Daer ghebeckte wilde Musijckers fluyten,/Daer sullen wy bespieden veel ghesichten,/Die ons al dienen om Landtschap te stichten/Op vlas-waedt, oft Noorweeghsch' hard' eycke plancken,/Comt, ghy sult (hop' ick) de reys' u bedancken.* As Matthias Winner has shown, Leonardo da Vinci already wrote about admiring the beauty of natural things outside, just by 'looking': *Che ti muove, o homo, ad abbandonare le proprie tue abitazioni della città e lasciare li parenti et amici, ed andare in lochi campestri per monti e valli, se non la bellezza del mondo, la quale, se ben consideri, sol con senso del vedere fruisci* (Winner 1985, note 6, with reference to H. Ludwig (ed.), *Libro di pittura di M. Leonardo da Vinci*, Vienna 1882, vol. 1, p. 44).

¹⁸ Van Mander 1604, 7r: (...) *Neemt kool en krijt, pen, inckt, pampiere,/Om teeck'nen dat ghy siet, oft u de lust ghebiedt (...) Keert vveer naer Stadt, ghy jonghe spruyten,/Als t'lommer u begheeft, t'vvelck u beschaduvvt heeft,/Stelt t'huys al dat, ghy saeght hier buyten./T'geen ghy in't Boeck beschreeft, sulcx lantschaps doen aencleeft,/Met vervven die ghy vvreeft, maeckt dat het leeft (...).*

¹⁹ Van Mander 1604 (ed. Miedema 1973), vol. 2, p. 423; Miedema 1981, p. 144.

and seventeenth century artistic practice. Furthermore, the act of designing cannot be dissociated from other theoretical concepts such as *'inventio'*, *'dispositio'*, and *'memoria'*.²⁰

According to Van Mander impressions 'from life' within the creative process needed to be reworked by the *gheest* in order to become more significant compositions evidencing a lifelike effect.²¹ A frequently quoted fragment from the life of Pieter Bruegel the Elder in the *Schilder-boeck* illustrates the artistic procedure Van Mander aimed at: 'on his travels he drew many views from life so that it is said that when he was in the Alps he swallowed all the mountains and rocks which, upon returning home, he spat out again onto canvases and panels, so faithfully was he able, in this respect and others, to follow Nature'.²²

In the *Schilder-boeck*, the idea of working *'naer het leven'* is not only mentioned as opposed to creating *'uyt den gheest'*. The term also frequently appears in the biographical part of the book as it concerns the describing of specific artworks or working procedures (cf *infra*).²³ However, taking into account Van Mander's theoretical elaboration on the subject, the interpretation of the indication *'naer het leven'* however should be dealt with with caution.

It has been assumed that Karel van Mander's treatise on painting in the course of the seventeenth century has passed out of use.²⁴ However, this does not alter the fact that *Den Grondt* gives a good impression of contemporary views on artistic creation. Van Mander's ideas about the 'imaginative landscape' or the depiction of the landscape from the artist's memory of observations *'naer het leven'* also occur in art theoretical writings from the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.²⁵ Samuel van Hoogstraten on the occasion of the description of a competition between three landscape painters in his *Inleyding tot de Hooge Schoole der Schilderkonst* (1678) took the opportunity to emphasise the importance of *'keurlijker natuerlijckheyt'* or 'selective naturalness'.²⁶ With this term the author aimed at the indispensable ability of the artist to bend the observed reality to his own views and depict it as it was done directly 'from nature'.²⁷ The

²⁰ Van Mander 1604 (ed. Miedema 1973), vol. 2, pp. 423-424, 437-438.

²¹ Swan 1995, p. 354. See in this respect also Peter Schatborn's definition of works *'uyt den gheest'*: 'works *uit de geest* are in a way partially memorised visual impressions, which have been moulded finally by the mind according to certain artistic standards, rules and ideas, including a kind of selectivity' (Schatborn 1993, p. 156).

²² Van Mander 1604, fol. 233 r 25-29: *In zijn reysen heeft hy veel ghesichten nae t'leven gheconterfeyt, soo datter gheseyt wort, dat hy in d'Alpes wesende, al die berghen en rotsen had in gheswolghen, en t'huys ghecomen op doecken en Penneelen uytghespogen hadde, soo eyghentlijck con hy te desen en ander deelen de Natuere nae volghen.*

²³ Swan 1995, p. 355.

²⁴ Van Mander 1604 (ed. Miedema 1973), vol. 2, p. 537; Brennkinkmeyer-de Rooij 1984, p. 63; Meijer 2004, p. 117.

²⁵ Brown 1986, p. 31.

²⁶ Van Hoogstraten 1678, pp. 237-238.

²⁷ Buijsen 1993, p. 48.

same story is told again by Houbraken in *De Grootte Schonburgh der Nederlandsche konstschilders en schilderessen* (1718-1721).²⁸ By repeating the story, Houbraken endorses the same viewpoint.

Hoogstraten's text in many places reveals the study of Van Mander's *Schilder-Boeck*. Some passages are even freely paraphrased.²⁹ His advice for young painters is to draw in the open air and to work afterwards in their studio from their memory.³⁰ Before Hoogstraten, the German artist Joachim von Sandrart in the chapter on landscape painting of his *Teutsche Academie der Edlen Bau-, Bild- und Mahlerey-Künste* (1675-1680) has also copied freely the same passage from Van Mander.³¹ The entire chapter leans on very closely to Van Mander's ideas on landscape painting formulated in *Den Grondt* and includes references to Sandrart's own experiences with the depiction of the Roman *campagna* during his stay in the Eternal City from 1628 till 1635.³²

To what extent Karel van Mander's disapproval of the mere observation 'from life' as expressed in the *Schilder-boeck* was based on earlier ideas on the creative process and artistic practices is certainly more difficult to assess. Nonetheless, it has been generally acknowledged that his view had a long precedent in artistic practice. To prove this assumption, the role of drawing 'from life' in sixteenth century and earlier northern pictorial practices certainly needs further investigation.

Already in the sixteenth century, it was common and widespread to draw 'from nature' to analyse all sorts of natural phenomena. The practice followed contemporary academic interest in nature in all its forms. Not only universities, but also rulers and early collectors commissioned artists to

²⁸ Houbraken 1718-1721 (ed. Swillens & Vogelsang 1943-1953), vol. 1, pp. 131-132.

²⁹ Brenninkmeyer-de Rooij 1984, p. 63.

³⁰ Van Hoogstraten 1678, p. 139: *Tre dan, ô Schilderjeucht! en boschwaert in, of langs de heuvelen op, om verre verschieten, of boomrijke gezichten af te malen; of met pen en krijt de rijke natuer in uw tekenboek op te gaeren. Val aen, en betracht met stadich opletten u te gewennen noit vergeefs op te zien; maer, zoo veel de tijdt, of uw gereetschap, toelaet, alles op te schrijven, en in uwe gedachten den aert der dingen te prenten, om daer na uit te geeft, wanneer u 't natuerlijk voorbeeld ontbreekt, u met een vooraet, in uwe geheugnis opgedaen, te behelpen.* See also Hoogstraten 1678, p. 231: *Ontzie de schoonheit, die de natuer heeft, niet te volgen, maer geloof vry dat het geen in 't leeven zoo vermaeklijk is, uw werk ook zal doen beminnen.* Hoogstraten enforces his arguments further by paraphrasing the opening lines of the chapter on landscape in Van Mander's 'Grondt' (pp. 231-232, see also note 17). These fragments show that Brown's remark that Hoogstraten does not examine the role of drawings 'from nature' is not correct. See Brown 1986, pp. 32-33.

³¹ Von Sandrart 1675-1680, vol. 1, book 3, p. 70: *Wann der junge Mahler/ durch langes sitzen über den Bildereyen/ starksichtig und müde worden/ so sollen sie davon etwas aussetzen/ und das Gemüte wieder erfrischen: weil auch ein starker Bogen/ wann er stäts gespannt ist/ zu zerspringen pflieget. Demnach/ wann er von weitem sihet/ daß Hesperus dem Träume-Vatter Morpheo den schwarzen Mantel umleget/ kan er seine Augen zur Stunde mit Lethes naß besprengen/ und sein Abendmal in den Blumen Reichen des kurz nächtigen Sommers mäßiglich einnehmen: damit er/ nach sanftem Schlaf/ bey aufgehender Morgenröte/sich frisch und aufgeraumt befinde. Alsdann wann er die Vögel in der Luft den Morgen ansingen höret/soll er mit einem oder mehr kunstliebenden Gefärten/ bey Eröffnung der Stadt-Thore/ sich ausmachen/ in den Schauplatz der Natur spaziren/ und/ zu Erleuchtung des Geistes/ seine Augen in den Feldern/ Bäumen und Bächlein/ in Bergen und Thälern/ in den Wiesen und Auen/weiden und zur Lehre senden. Alda nun wird er finden viel schöne Vorstellungen/ sich daraus zu künstlicher Ausbildung der Landschaften zu unterrichten.* See also Winner 1985, p. 85, note 6.

³² Meijer 2004, p. 15. See also p. 13.

draw all sorts of natural objects, such as animals and plants. We will concentrate in our introduction on the practice of drawing 'from life' in the sixteenth century on topographical drawings made by Netherlandish artists.

I.2. Practice

Drawing ‘from nature’ in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries probably formed an important part of the common artistic education in the Netherlands. In the second chapter *Van het teyckenen, oft Teycken-const* in *Den Grondt*, the first fragment on the training in drawing in Netherlandish artistic theory,³³ Karel van Mander wrote that artists under instruction should learn to draw ‘*naer het leven*’. He also emphasised the importance of drawing after the human figure.³⁴ Furthermore, Van Mander also advised experienced artists to keep on drawing ‘from life’.³⁵ In Willem Goeree’s *Teycken-Konst* (1668), the most important book on the theory and practice of the drawing education in the seventeenth century, drawing ‘from life’ and especially ‘*het na Teyckenen van dat heerlijcke Schepsel, het Menschen Beeldt*’ is mentioned as the last and most significant step in the teaching programme of young artists, after the copying of respectively prints, drawings, paintings and models in clay or plaster.³⁶

Although drawing ‘from life’ was certainly propagated in the art theoretical writings of Van Mander and Goeree, it remains largely unclear to what extent their advice corresponded to sixteenth century artistic practices. With the exception of Van Mander’s rather scarce notes on artists who worked ‘from life’, we do not know of contemporary writings about the drawing habits of individual artists.

In the biographical part of his *Schilder-boeck*, Karel van Mander mentioned several artists who made landscape observations ‘from nature’,³⁷ among which Lucas van Leyden (1494-1533),³⁸ Jan van Scorel (1495-1562),³⁹ Jacob Grimmer (ca. 1525-after 1589),⁴⁰ Lucas de Heere (1534-1584),⁴¹

³³ Goeree 1668 (ed. Kwakkelstein 1998), p. 121.

³⁴ Van Mander 1604, fol. 8v: *Desen Vader dan van t'Schilderen, wercklijck (Wat het teyckenen, oft Teycken-const eygentlijck is)/ Is om verborghen meeninghe t'ontdecken/ Een uydrucksel, en Verclaringhe mercklijck,/ lae t'voornemens ghetuyghe, welcken stercklijck/ Bestaet in trecken, betrecken, omtrecken,/ Van alles watter binnen de bestecken/ Des ghesichts ter Weereit mach zijn begrepen,/ Bysonder t'Menschen beeldt heerlijckst ghescheppen.*

³⁵ Miedema 1981, p. 21.

³⁶ Goeree 1668 (ed. Kwakkelstein 1998), p. 98 [16].

³⁷ Antwerp 1999, p. 49.

³⁸ Van Mander 1604, fol. 211v 30-32: *Nemmermeer en liet hy af van alle dinghen nae t'leven te conterfeyten, tronien, handen, voeten, huysen, Landtschappen, en alderley stoffen van laken, in welck hy sonderlingh behaghen hadde.*

³⁹ Id., fol. 234v 29-32: *Des Sondaeghs en Heylighdaeghs nae middaeghs gingh Schoorel gemeenlijck buyten Haerlem, daer doe een lustigh bosch lagh, en bootste t'gheboomt nae met den verwen, seer aerdigh en cluchtich, buyten de gemeen wijse van ander Schilders.*

⁴⁰ Id., fol. 256v 12-13: *Hy dede veel ghesichten van Landtschappen nae t'leven, ontrent Antwerpen en elder.*

⁴¹ Id., fol. 255r 41-255v 2: *Hy heeft van jonghs aenghevanghen de Teycken-const by zijnen Vader (...) hy t'somtijden reysde nae Namen, en Dinant, Marmoren te halen, nemende den jonghen veel tijt mede, die verscheyden ghesichten op de Mase, vervallen Casteelen, en Steden over al conterfeytte nae t'leven, alles op een vaste, nette, en aerdighe maniere met der Pen.*

Lucas (1535 or later-1597) and Marten van Valckenborch (1535-1612)⁴² and Abraham Bloemaert (1564-1651).⁴³ Van Mander also referred to the practice of drawing city views and landscapes during travels abroad in the lives of Jan van Scorel,⁴⁴ Pieter Bruegel the Elder (ca. 1525-1569),⁴⁵ Hendrick van Cleve (ca. 1524-1589),⁴⁶ Pieter Balten (ca. 1527-1584)⁴⁷ and Joris Hoefnagel (1542-1601).⁴⁸ As it concerns drawing practices of northern artists in Rome, Van Mander mentioned the copying (*'conterfeyten'* or *'teyckenen'*) of classical remains and modern monuments, for instance in his biographical notes on Jan van Scorel,⁴⁹ Pieter Coecke van Aelst (1502-1550),⁵⁰ Maarten van Heemskerck (1498-1574),⁵¹ Michiel Gast (ca. 1515- after 1577)⁵² and Pieter Vlerick (1539-1581).⁵³

Van Mander's accounts on sixteenth century northern artists who drew 'from life' make us believe that drawing *vedute* in the open air was a habit several artists had acquired. From the rather scarce mentionings of the activity of drawing the landscape 'from life', we cannot conclude however to what extent it concerned a common practice. Apparently Van Mander thought it was worth mentioning that some of his forerunners had drawn the landscape 'from life'. His appreciation for the activity however is probably based on how it was valued around the time

⁴² Van Mander 1604, fol. 260r 4-6: *Doe trocken sy, met oock Hans de Vries, nae Aken en Luyck, alwaer sy doe veel nae t'leven deden, ghelijck langs de Maes en daer ontrent Luyck veel fraey ghesichten van Landschap zijn.*

⁴³ Id., fol. 298r 1-5: *By den Const-beminders zijn oock van hem seer aerdighe Landschappen, met eenighe aerdighe en drollighe Boeren huysen, Boerigh ghereetschap, boomen, en gronden, dinghen die daer om Wtrecht seer veel en verscheyden te sien, en van hem gheconterfeyt zijn: want hy seer veel nae t'leven doet (...).*

⁴⁴ Id. 1604, fol. 235v – 236r: *(...) hy mede trock nae Hierusalem, zijns ouderdoms ontrent 25. Iaren, mede ghenomen hebbende alle Schilder ghereetschap, was te schepe ondertusschen doende, conterfeytende eenighe personagien nae t'leven, teyckende in een Boecxken zijn dagh-vaerden, oock onder weghe in Candien, Cipers, en elder, eenighe Landschappen, ghesichten, Stedekens, Casteelen, en geberghten nae t'leven, seer aerdigh om sien. (...) reysde hy door al dat omliggende Landt, oock op de Iordaen, conterfeytende met der Pen nae t'leven t'Landschap en de gheleghenthey der selver (...) Hy hadde oock gheconterfeyt de stadt Hierusalem, die hy somtijts in zijn wercken heeft te pas ghebracht als daer Christus den Olijf-bergh af rijdt nae der Stadt, en daer hy op desen bergh predickt, en dergelijcke Historien. Oock conterfeytte hy het heyligh graf, en in't Landt ghecomen wesende, hy naemaels hem selven conterfeytte (...).*

⁴⁵ See note 22.

⁴⁶ Van Mander 1604, fol. 230r 44-230v 2: *Hendrick begaf hem tot Lantschap, en is ghereyst in Italien, en ander Landen, veel dinghen en ghesichten nae t'leven doende, en conterfeytende, die hy naemaels dickwils in zijn wercken te pas bracht.*

⁴⁷ Id., fol. 257r 7-8: *(...) had oock verscheyden Landen besocht, en verscheyden ghesichten nae t'leven gedaen.*

⁴⁸ Id., fol. 262v 16-21: *Doe hy nu hem begaf tot reysen, en Landen te besoecken (...) hy was over al doende, hy teyckende alle Steden, en Casteelen nae t'leven (...).*

⁴⁹ Id., fol. 236v 18-22: *(...) oock te Room ghecomen, alwaer hy vlijtigh practiseerde, conterfeytende nae alle Antijcke dinghen, so beelden, ruwijnen, als de constige schilderijen van Raphael, en Michael Agnolo, die doe begon gheruchtigh worden, en nae meer ander Meesters wercken.*

⁵⁰ Id., fol. 218r 34-36: *Hy hadde Italien, en de gemeen Schilder-school Room besocht, grooten vlijt toebrengende met teyckenen en leeren, so van beelden als Metselrije.*

⁵¹ See note 12.

⁵² Van Mander 1604, fol. 205r 41-43: *Hy schilderde veel ruinen, en Room na t'leven, welcke dingen hy ooc veel teyckende, met ander zijn inventien, en teeckende zijn dinghen, met een zijn marc daer op druckende.*

⁵³ Id., fol. 250r 38-39: *Te Room conterfeytte hy veel fraey gesichten van der Stadt op den Tyber, oock het Casteel S. Agnolo, en veel Ruwijnen (...).*

the *Schilder-boeck* was published (cf infra). In any case, Van Mander's view does not necessarily reflect how working 'from life' was perceived in the early sixteenth century.

It is further remarkable that Van Mander did mention that several sixteenth century artists drew 'from life', but omitted to inform his readers on how the drawings were actually used. Only in the lives of Jan van Scorel and Hendrick van Cleve did he add that the artists 'introduced' (*te pas brengen*) their views 'from life' in their works.⁵⁴ How we are supposed to interpret Van Mander's words here may become clear from Van Scorel's use of the *veduta* of Jerusalem that Van Mander referred to. We will examine this matter further in our case study about the artist.⁵⁵ Interestingly, Van Mander noted in his description of Hendrick van Cleve's activity of drawing 'from nature' that the painter had not actually visited all the places he had depicted in his drawings and that he relied also on Melchior Lorck's (1526/27-1583) drawings.⁵⁶

To our knowledge, it has escaped notice so far that Van Mander mentioned that Jan van Scorel copied trees outside in colours (*'bootste 't gheboomt nae met den verwen*) and that Michiel Gast had painted Rome 'from life' (*'schilderde Room na t'leven*).⁵⁷ Painting 'from life' is an artistic practice which has not been attributed to the sixteenth and even seventeenth centuries.⁵⁸ As it concerns painting outside in the seventeenth century, we can refer to a well-known passage from Sandrart's *Teutsche Academie*. In the fragment, Sandrart described how Nicolas Poussin (1594-1665), Claude Lorrain (1600-1682), Pieter van Laer (1599- after 1642) and he himself were drawing and painting together 'from nature' in Tivoli, near Rome.⁵⁹ In the theoretical part of his treatise Sandrart also mentioned explicitly that he preferred painting 'from life' in Rome and its surroundings rather than drawing, a technique which he acquainted Claude Lorrain with.⁶⁰

⁵⁴ See notes 44, 46.

⁵⁵ See § II.2.

⁵⁶ Van Mander 1604, fol. 230v 2-5: *Hy hadde doch al de plaetsen niet besocht, waer van hy eenige Steden, Ruwijnen, en Antiquiteyten hadde in teyckeninghe, die ten deele in Print uyt comen: maer hadde veel dingen gehadt van een Oosterlingh, geheeten Melchior Lorck, die langen tijdt te Constantinopel hadde gewoont.* See with respect to Melchior Lorck (1526/27 – 1583) also Van Mander 1604 (ed. Miedema 1994-1999), vol. 3, p. 216.

⁵⁷ See notes 39, 52.

⁵⁸ Prof. Dr. Em. Meijer quite recently has argued that there must have been no clear distinction between the tools and materials used to 'work' in the open air and in the studio. See Meijer 2006, p. 175.

⁵⁹ Von Sandrart 1675-1680, vol. 2, book 3, p. 311: *Ein andermal sind wir/ Pousin, Claudi Lorennes, und ich/ Landschaften nach dem Leben zu mahlen oder zu zeichnen/ auf Tivoli geritten/ da dann auf der Rückreise/ aus Sorge eines einbrechenden Regens/ Bambatio, unwißend unser/ von uns heim geritten (...).*

⁶⁰ Id., vol. 1, book 3, p. 71: *Die Landschaft-Mahler/ haben hierinn/indem sie viel nach dem Leben gezeichnet/ sich wol-erfahren gemacht: maßen sie solcher Handriße sich nachmals überall bedienen können. Ich selbst thäte solches/ etliche Jahre lang. Endlich aber/ als mein nächster Nachbar und Hausgenoß zu Rom/ der berühmte Claudius Gilli, sonst Loraines genannt/ immer mit ins Feld wolte/ um nach dem Leben zu zeichnen/ aber hierzu von der Natur gar nicht begünstet war/ hingegen zum Nachmahlen eine sonderbare Fähigkeit hatte: als haben wir ursach genommen/(an statt des Zeichnens oder Tuschens mit schwarzer Kreide und dem Pense) in offnem Feld/zu Tivoli, Frescada, Subiaca, und anderer Orten/ auch al S. Benedetto, die Berge/ Grotten/ Thäler und Einöden/ die abscheuliche Wasserfälle der Tyber/ den Tempel der*

Furthermore, Houbraken described how Abraham Genoels (1640-1723) ‘every autumn left Rome for two or three months to live in villages or in the mountains, to paint or draw beautiful views of landscapes from nature’.⁶¹ Since these notes concern only scarce mentionings of painting in the open air in seventeenth century writings, it has been generally assumed that this was a rather uncommon practice at the time. However, drawings from Jan Lievens (1607-1674)⁶² and (the circle of) Jan Asselijn (1610/14-1652)⁶³ secure a visual proof of the practice of painting outside (figs. I.1-2).

Much more extant sixteenth and seventeenth century drawings however represent draughtsmen working outdoors. This particular fact is the perfect tangible proof that it concerned a common and not only northern practice.⁶⁴ Numerous examples have been preserved also of Netherlandish artists’ drawings of Roman ruins and views that show artists busy drawing.⁶⁵ The motive occurred already in the work of Maarten van Heemskerck (fig. II.48r) and remained popular in later sixteenth century Roman drawings.⁶⁶ Although a suchlike drawing may suggest that it was made in the open air and represents other draughtsmen working in the immediate vicinity of the author of the drawing, it does not necessarily mean that the drawing was made ‘from nature’.

Yet, another element indicates that drawing *vedute* ‘from life’ must have been part of the early Netherlandish artistic practice. The use of introducing topographical details in a fanciful urban or rural setting certainly goes back to the Flemish Primitives. It is almost unthinkable therefore that the northern artists did not rely on drawings made on the spot for their depictions of actual places and architecture.

The picture of drawing *vedute* ‘from nature’ as a more or less common sixteenth century northern artistic practice however does not correspond to the rather scarcely remaining topographical drawings which may qualify to have been made on the site. The reasons for which so few

Sibylla , und dergleichen/ mit Farben/ auf gegründt Papier und Tücher völlig nach dem Leben auszumahlen. Dieses ist/ meines darfürhaltens/ die beste Manier/ dem Verstande die Warheit eigentlich einzudrücken: weil gleichsam dadurch Leib und Seele zusammen gebracht wird. In den Zeichnungen wird hingegen alzuweit zurück gegangen/ da die wahre Gestalt der Sachen nimmermehr also pur eigentlich heraus kommet. See also Meijer 2006, p. 176.

⁶¹ Meijer 2006, p. 176.

⁶² *Wooded area with a painter behind his easel*, Frankfurt am Mein, Städel Museum. Pen and brown ink, light brown wash, 325 x 460 mm, ca. 1655-1665. Van de Wetering 1998, pp. 12-14, fig. 9; Rubenstein 2008-2009, pp. 73-74, fig. 7.

⁶³ *Painter and draughtsman at work in the open air*, Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Kupferstichkabinett, inv. KdZ 144. Blankert 1978, cat. 70 (as Jan Asselijn). See also Steland 1989, cat. 32 (as probably from Jan Asselijn’s workshop), Verberne 2001, p. 22, fig. 1 (as attributed to Jan Asselijn).

⁶⁴ Weber 1977, Winner 1985, Van den Boogert 1998, figs. 2-6; Berlin 2007-2008, pp. 164-187, cats. 46-56.

⁶⁵ Weber 1977, pp. 45-46.

⁶⁶ *Forum Romanum seen from the Capitol, (verso) Details from the arch of Septimus Severus*, Berlin, Staatliche Museum, Kupferstichkabinett, inv. KdZ 6696. Pen and brown ink, washed with bistre, 216 x 555 mm, signed and dated: *Martijn hemskerck 1535*. An earlier drawing attributed to the Good Samaritan Master, an assistant in Jan van Scorel’s workshop around 1537/38-1545/46, represents a draughtsman among (Roman?) ruins (see fig. II.41). See also § II.2.

drawings have been preserved may be various and raise questions about a selection process which already started in the artist's workshop.

Early examples of northern topographical drawings are the views of rural villages in the so-called *Berlin sketchbook*, which probably originates from the workshop of Herri met de Bles (ca. 1510-1533/66),⁶⁷ and the *Errera album*, which was compiled by one or more anonymous artists.⁶⁸ Both series of drawings date from around 1530-1540. The drawings of the still unknown Master of the Small Landscapes, which were issued first by Hieronymus Cock in two series of prints respectively in 1551 and 1561,⁶⁹ belong to the same tradition of faithfully rendered rural towns and farmhouses.⁷⁰ Around the same time the increasing interest in cartographic representations definitely contributed to the development of topographical townscape drawings.⁷¹ An example of this tendency is Georg Braun and Franz Hogenberg's *Civitates Orbis Terrarum* (1572-1618), an atlas with views and plans of the world's cities which has been considered as the most extensive from the period. The townscapes depicted in the atlas were based on drawn views made by contemporary artists and earlier visual sources.⁷²

A higher interest in topographical representations in the northern Netherlands is perceived only at the turn of the century. A frequently cited and studied passage from Van Mander's biography written by an anonymous author describes how Karel van Mander, together with Hendrik Goltzius (1558-1617) and Cornelis Cornelisz. van Haarlem (1562-1638) 'formed an academy for studying from life'.⁷³ The phrase '*nae 't leven studeeren*' has been commonly interpreted as 'drawing after the nude model'.⁷⁴ Nonetheless, it has been argued that the three artists were not only interested in drawing after the nude, but must have made drawings also of clothed models and other natural things. The theory that drawing 'from nature' became an important concept in early

⁶⁷ Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Kupferstichkabinett, inv. 79 C2, fol. 75v – 83r, ca. 190 x 260 mm. See Berlin 1975, cat. 180; Bevers 1998.

⁶⁸ Brussels, Koninklijke Musea voor Schone Kunsten van België, Tekeningen kabinet, inv. 4630, ca. 135 x 210 mm. See Berlin 1975, cat. 181. See Brussels 2000, cat. 36.

⁶⁹ Riggs 1977, p. 370, nos. 231-232.

⁷⁰ Hautekeete 2000, pp. 49-51. See for the extant drawings for the two series of prints Riggs 1977, cat. I.C.R-16, pp. 252-254.

⁷¹ Hautekeete 2000, p. 55. See in this respect also Alpers 1983, § 4.

⁷² Gerszi 1992, p. 374.

⁷³ Van Mander 1604 (ed. Miedema 1994-1999), vol. 1, S2r a 38-42: *en [Karel van Mander] quam korts daer nae aen kenisse van Goltzius, en Mr. Kornelis, hielden en maeckten onder haer dryen een Akademie, om nae 't leven te studeeren*. See also Id., vol. 2, pp. 70-72; Van Thiel 1999, pp. 59-90.

⁷⁴ Van Mander 1604 (ed. Miedema 1973), vol. 2, p. 303. Suchlike drawings are not known from Van Mander himself (Van Mander 1604 (ed. Miedema 1994-1999), vol. 2, p. 72). The first studies from Goltzius widely assumed being done from nude models, date from the 1590s (Amsterdam/New York/Toledo 2003-2004, cat. 89). Cornelis Cornelisz' figure studies in a lost bundle of red-chalk drawings, from which the survived drawing *Man Undressing, Seen from the back* has been previously regarded as drawn from a live model, are now considered as documentary drawings from the artist's most successful painted figures (Van Thiel 1999, pp. 162, 445).

seventeenth century northern Netherlandish artistic practice was developed on the basis of the existence of the so-called ‘Academy’ and preserved drawings made ‘from nature’.⁷⁵ This evolution furthermore has been associated in particular with the sixteenth century southern Netherlandish tradition of the depiction of the landscape ‘from life’. Hendrick Goltzius’ panoramic landscape drawings dating from 1603 and made in the vicinity of Haarlem rank among the earliest preserved realistic impressions of the Dutch landscape (figs. I.3-4).⁷⁶ Jacob de Gheyn’s (ca. 1565-1629) *Landscape with a young man* is another example (figs. I.5)⁷⁷ and several of Claes Jansz Visscher’s (1587-1652) drawings of the landscape near Haarlem for the print series *Plaisante Plaetsen* (ca. 1612-1613)⁷⁸ have survived (figs. I.6r-v, I.7r-v, I.8, I.9).⁷⁹ Besides, in 1612 Visscher made copies of several prints from the series of the Master of the Small Landscapes.⁸⁰

As it concerns sixteenth century artists travelling to Italy with the explicit intention to become acquainted with the remains of the antiques and to practice drawing ‘from life’ in the city and its surroundings, Van Mander’s note on Maarten van Heemskerck’s stay in Rome is an exception.⁸¹ To explain the purpose of earlier and later northern artists travels southwards, we have to rely on the remaining drawings.

We will now turn to some aspects inherent in drawings ‘from nature’ itself. In the first place we will consider the format of sixteenth century landscape drawings presumably made in the open air. Since the early sixteenth century northern artists made use of mostly oblong shaped sketchbooks for the copying of compositions from other artists and for their own inventions. Not many complete sixteenth century sketchbooks have survived, but this has been deduced from the more numerous loose sketchbook-sheets preserved in different collections. Early examples of (partly) disassembled sketchbooks with drawings ‘from nature’ are the previously

⁷⁵ Schatborn 1991-1992, Schatborn 1994.

⁷⁶ Rotterdam, Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, inv. H 253. Pen and brown ink, 87 x 153 mm, signed (monogram) and dated: *HG 1603* (Amsterdam 1993-1994, cat. 314); Paris, Institut Néerlandais, Fondation Custodia (Coll. F. Lugt), inv. 2628. Pen and some point of brush in two different colours of brown ink, 75 x 195 mm, signed (monogram) and dated: *HG 1603* (Plomp 2003-2004, cats. 74.1, 74.2).

⁷⁷ Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Kupferstichkabinett, inv. KdZ 5204. Pen and brown ink, 155 x 202 mm. See Amsterdam 1993-1994, cat. 315.

⁷⁸ Hollstein, vol. 38, pp. 84-86, nos. 149-160. See Amsterdam 1993-1994, cat. 327.

⁷⁹ Five design drawings dating from 1607 are preserved: Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, Rijksprentenkabinet, inv. PR-T-1902 A 4701-e. Pen and brown ink, 125 x 189 mm, inscribed: *Buyte Haerlem aen de wech na Leyden, 1607* (recto), *Vier baken tot Santvoort* (verso) (Amsterdam 1993-1994, cat. 324); Rotterdam, Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, inv. MB 1941/T13. Pen and brown ink over traces of graphite, 171 x 121 mm, inscribed: *1607 Lasarij tot Haerlem* (recto), *1608 naet Leeven [?] aen de buijten cant/haech bos na grave* (verso) (Antwerp 1999, cat. 30); Haarlem, Noord-Hollands Archief, inv. 53-004302 K. Pen and black ink, 127 x 189 mm, inscribed: *blekerij buyten haerlem aen duyn 1607*; Id., inv. 53-003340 K. Pen and black ink, 128 x 189 mm, inscribed: *buyten haerlem door den hooft genaemt pottadies huys 1607* (on-line image archive of the *Noord-Hollands archief*: see <http://www.beeldbank.noord-hollandsarchief.nl/>, last consulted August 2009).

⁸⁰ Schatborn 1991-1992, p. 8, with reference to M. Simon, *Claes Jansz. Visscher* (thesis), typescript, Freiburg im Breisgau 1958, cats. 43-65.

⁸¹ See note 12.

mentioned *Berlin sketchbook* and the *Errera album*.⁸² It is a remarkable fact that several sixteenth century single sheets of which we know that they belonged to sketchbooks, have approximately the same dimensions (ca. 135 x 210 mm).⁸³ This seems to indicate that as early as the sixteenth century, little sketchbooks were already produced according to certain standards.

It has been generally believed that part of Maarten van Heemskerck's Roman drawings preserved in Berlin originate from a little sketchbook the artist used during his stay in Rome between 1532 and 1536/37.⁸⁴ Besides, Van Heemskerck in the city made drawings 'from nature' on larger sheets of paper probably held on a drawing tablet.⁸⁵ In general, the remaining Roman drawings of sixteenth century northern artists were made on larger sheets of paper. It is not always possible to determine if several larger sheets on the same paper originally were bound in a real sketchbook or were used separately.

More disassembled sketchbooks have been preserved of northern artists who travelled to Rome in the seventeenth century. A former sketchbook which consists of forty-four red chalk drawings made in Rome and Tivoli was previously attributed to Cornelis Poelenburch (1594/95-1667)⁸⁶ but it has recently been discovered that the sketches must date from after 1627-1628, when the artist had already returned back home to Utrecht.⁸⁷ Other sketchbooks with Roman *vedute* could be reconstructed from Gerard I ter Borch (1582/83-1662)⁸⁸ and Bartholomeus Breenbergh

⁸² Bevers 1998, p. 39. The *Berlin sketchbook* has a parchment cover which may be the original one. The binding is loose and some pages of the album have been removed. The *Errera album* has been rebound in the nineteenth century (Brussels 2000, cat. 36.). See also notes 67-68.

⁸³ The earliest examples are the drawings originating from Albrecht Dürer's sketchbook of his journey to the Netherlands (1520-1521). The dimensions of the sketchbook-pages were probably around 140 x 200 mm (Troutman 1971, p. 13) The drawings from the *Errera album* (ca. 1530-1540) measure approximately 135 x 210 mm (see note 68). Maarten van Heemskerck's Roman sketchbook drawings (1532-1536/37) as well as the drawings attributed to Michiel Gast (1538-1543) preserved in the *Berlin album* have approximately the same dimensions: respectively 135 x 210 mm and ca. 130 x 200 mm (see also § II.3). The extant drawings of the Master of the Small Landscapes are all approximately of the same size (130 x 200 mm) and may therefore originate from a little sketchbook (Riggs 1977, cat. I.C.R-16, pp. 252-254). A last example is the so-called Maarten de Vos sketchbook (tentatively dated ca. 1560) which consists of twelve folios measuring 145 x 225 mm (Netto-Bol 1976, p. 7; see also § II.3).

⁸⁴ The first of two eighteenth albums preserved in the Berlin Kupferstichkabinett consists largely of Van Heemskerck's sketchbook drawings: Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Kupferstichkabinett, inv. 79 D2. See Hülsen & Egger 1913-1916, Veldman 1977a, Veldman 2008.

⁸⁵ See § II.3.

⁸⁶ Chong 1987, pp. 10-11, cat. 59.

⁸⁷ Florence, Gabinetto Disegni e Stampe degli Uffizi, inv. 770P-813P. Red chalk, ca. 160 x 270 mm. Florence 2008, cats. 66-68.

⁸⁸ A great part of Ter Borch's loose Roman drawings preserved in the Rijksprentenkabinet in Amsterdam according to Alison McNeil Kettering must have been part of a sketchbook or a loose series of drawings on the same paper: Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, Rijksprentenkabinet, inv. RP-T-A 865, RP-T-A 877, RP-T-A 875, RP-T-A 867, RP-T-A 866, RP-T-A 868, RP-T-A 870, RP-T-A 874, RP-T-A 869, RP-T-A 873, RP-T-A 872, RP-T-A 871, RP-T-A 876, RP-T-A 745, RP-T-A 737, RP-T-A 878, RP-T-A 880, RP-T-A 879. The drawings are executed on Italian paper of different dimensions. See Kettering 1988, vol. 1, pp. 5-6, cats. GSr 4, 5, 7-17, 19-23.

(1598/1600-1657),⁸⁹ among others. Several seventeenth century Netherlandish artists also made drawings ‘from nature’ in Rome on large sheets of paper with a fold in the middle, mostly used on both sides. In contemporary artistic practice these sizes were mainly reserved for larger topographical drawings.⁹⁰

Quite recently, Ernst van de Wetering has proposed that erasable tablets (*tafeletten*) have been used extensively by young as well as experienced artists in sixteenth and seventeenth century artistic practice.⁹¹ Several sixteenth-century bound, wooden drawing tablets which had not previously been recognised as erasable sketchbooks have been preserved.⁹² The oldest of very few surviving *tafeletten* or *tafelboekjes*, a little handy-sized booklet intended to be carried about to sketch according to one’s needs, has been preserved in the *Rijksmuseum* without its actual function and nature being known. The booklet dates from around 1590 and is bound in brown leather and bolted with a pointed metal needle, which also served as a stylus for drawing and writing.⁹³ The *tafelet* was probably owned by a painter’s apprentice and contains among other drawings a *Sketch of a ruin* made after an unidentified print (figs. I.10-11).⁹⁴ Van de Wetering’s ‘rediscovery’ of the *tafelet* prompts us to reconsider our view on the artistic practice in general. With regard to the present study, it is certainly not inconceivable that similar booklets or single drawing tablets also belonged to the equipment of sixteenth century northern artists who drew ‘from life’ in Rome and elsewhere. The use of erasable drawing tablets may possibly explain why so few drawings made ‘from nature’ have been preserved.

Like the small format of sixteenth century sketchbook drawings, other elements visible in the drawings themselves may indicate that it concerns a direct study ‘from nature’.⁹⁵

An inscription on a drawing in the own handwriting of the artist referring to the place where it was made, as for instance ‘Rome’ or ‘Tivoli’ or to the fact that it was made ‘naer het leven’ may be possible indications that it was done ‘from nature’. With respect to the autographic annotation

⁸⁹ The drawings from Bartholomeus Breenbergh’s former sketchbook did not remain together. The series consists of drawings dating from 1626 till 1629 with the same dimensions (ca. 90 x 150 mm) and the same type of numeration (highest number 35). Although Roethlisberger was inclined to assume that it concerned a sketchbook used by Breenbergh in Rome, he did not exclude that the drawings were compiled at a later date. See Roethlisberger 1969, p. 9.

⁹⁰ Peter Schatborn refers to drawings from Poelenburch, Breenbergh, Du Gardijn and Collaert. See Amsterdam 2001, pp. 17, 60 (figs. E, F), 61, 67 (fig. C), 68 (fig. E), 69 (fig. F), 72 (fig. H), 75 (fig. C), 76 (fig. D), 138 (fig. A).

⁹¹ Van de Wetering 1997, § 3.

⁹² Id., p. 65, note 29.

⁹³ Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, Rijksprentenkabinet, inv. RP-T-1939-78, 105 x 78 mm. See Boon 1978, vol. 2, cat. 616; Van de Wetering 1997, pp. 66-67.

⁹⁴ Van de Wetering 1997, pp. 66-67.

⁹⁵ See in this respect also Peter Schatborn’s introduction in the exhibition catalogue *Tekenen van warmte. 17de-eeuwse Nederlandse tekenaars in Italië*, in which he deals with the problematic interpretation of seventeenth century Netherlandish artists’ Roman *vedute* made ‘from nature’ (Schatborn 2001).

'*naer het leven*', on early seventeenth century drawings it has been remarked that it may have been related to the expectations of possible clients.⁹⁶ The appreciation for more sketchily conceived landscape drawings, however, seems to have existed already in the seventeenth century.⁹⁷

Within the production of sixteenth and seventeenth century northern Roman *vedute*, examples of authentic signatures have been found in the oeuvre of Maarten van Heemskerck, Jan I Brueghel (1568-1625), Gerard I ter Borch, Bartholomeus Breenbergh and Guiliam du Gardijn (1595/96- after 1647). Non-autographic attributions and annotations however occur more frequently. Whether the presence of an autograph signature relates to the function of a drawing made 'from nature' is an aspect that requires further research.⁹⁸

Drawings made in the open air in general are assumed to have an unfinished, sketchy character, while studio drawings may give a more elaborated impression. This rather strict division however cannot be taken for granted. Drawings made outside may also have been finished in the studio. A lot of sketches done 'from nature' therefore are thus supposedly hidden behind more finished drawings. Another indication for the identification of a view made in the open air is a blank foreground, which could be filled up at a later stage or was meant to leave space for staffage in derived compositions, possibly in other media. The representation at middle distance is another typical peculiarity of drawings done 'from nature'.

Within the large production of Roman *vedute*, many drawings represent the same motifs and locations. Two or more drawings done by one single artist showing the same monument or view from different angles may be a proof of artistic activity on the spot. Drawings of a certain location seen from one single vantage point ascribed to different artists may be considered as copies, or possibly were made by draughtsmen who worked together in the open air. Documentary research has shown that at least several seventeenth century northern artists lived together or in close proximity to each other in the Eternal City,⁹⁹ and as we have seen, set out together for drawing and painting in the Roman *campagna*.

⁹⁶ See for instance Alison Mc Neil Kettering on the occasion of the annotation '*naet leven*' on a Roman view by Gerard I ter Borch: *Ruins of the Frontispizio di Nerone on the Quirinal*, Rotterdam, Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, inv. H 24. Pen and brush in brown, brush in grey, 158 x 125 mm, 1610 (Kettering 1988, vol. 1, p. 6; vol. 2, Appendix 1, cat. 7).

⁹⁷ Schatborn 1991-1992, pp. 10-11. In contrast with what has been supposed at times (see for instance Robinson & Wolff 1986-1987, p. 25; Wood Ruby 1999, p. 27), already in the sixteenth century signs of interest can be traced not only in the collection of finished drawings, but also of rough sketches (see for instance Bevers 1992-1993, p. 223). With respect to the study of early collections of drawings, see also Julius Held's invariably relevant contribution 'The early appreciation of Drawings' (Held 1963).

⁹⁸ See also § II.4.

⁹⁹ Verberne 2001, pp. 24-25; Brown 2002, p. 34.

As we have mentioned before, we must be aware of the fact that a lot of drawings, even sketchbook drawings,¹⁰⁰ giving the impression of being truthful images made ‘from nature’, were completed or even entirely carried out in the studio. In connection with the existence of ‘*tafeletten*’, we may also ask if drawings assumably made ‘from nature’ did not originate from silverpoint sketches on erasable tablets which have been lost in the meantime.¹⁰¹ Within the production of Roman *vedute*, several categories of drawings erroneously interpreted as done ‘from life’ can be distinguished.¹⁰²

A first category consists of second versions, variations and copies from other drawings, prints or paintings.¹⁰³ It is a well-known fact that also sixteenth century northern artists who never set off for a trip to the south or of which a stay in Italy is not documented, made Roman *vedute* based on other representations.¹⁰⁴ Besides, studies made ‘from nature’ for instance were apparently meticulously copied in the studio.¹⁰⁵

Drawings or other versions of drawings made outside and directly ‘from nature’ may include elements that, even unwittingly, do not correspond with or alter to a certain extent the real situation.¹⁰⁶ Gombrich already argued that even when an artist intends to give a truthful impression of reality, it will be prevented by mental concepts and ideas originating in his artistic education and background.¹⁰⁷ Sixteenth century topographical landscape drawings not uncommonly show a tendency towards the use of certain schemata. The addition of a *repoussoir*-element for instance, gives proof of the artist’s ‘will-to-make-conform’.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁰ See in this respect for instance Bevers 1998, pp. 44-45.

¹⁰¹ Van de Wetering 1997, p. 72.

¹⁰² By way of introduction to the drawings Egger assembled for his publication *Römische Veduten. Handzeichnungen aus dem XV. bis XVIII. Jahrhundert zur Topographie der Stadt Rom*, he has defined different categories of drawings according to their usefulness and dependability for topographical research. His classification forms an excellent reference for the distinction between Roman *vedute* done ‘from nature’ and other categories of drawings which they may be confused with (Egger 1911-1931, vol. 1, pp. 9-11).

¹⁰³ Egger 1911-1931, vol. 1, pp. 9-11, categories E & H.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., categories C & D.

¹⁰⁵ Bartholomeus Breenbergh for instance is believed to have made second versions of several of his Roman drawings made ‘from nature’. See Roethlisberger 1969, p. 9.

¹⁰⁶ Egger 1911-1931, vol. 1, pp. 9-11, category B.

¹⁰⁷ See in this respect Gombrich’s influential article ‘Truth and stereotype’ in his publication *Art and Illusion. A study in the psychology of pictorial representation*, first published in 1960 (see Gombrich 2002, § 2). Also in his article ‘The Renaissance Theory of Art and the Rise of Landscape’, first published in 1966, Gombrich touched upon the matter (Gombrich 1978, p. 117, note 47): ‘And to the painter (...) nothing can become a ‘motif’ except what he can assimilate into a vocabulary he has already learned’, with reference to Friedrich Nietzsche, *Fröhliche Wissenschaft (Scherz, List, und Rache*, 55), in: *Werke*, V (1900), p. 28: ‘All Nature faithfully – But by what feint can Nature be subdued to art’s constraint? Her smallest fragment is still infinite! And so he paints but what he likes in it. What does he like? He likes what he can paint’.

¹⁰⁸ Gombrich defined the ‘will-to-make-conform’ as ‘the assimilation of any new shape to the schemata and patterns an artist had learned to handle’ (Gombrich 2002, p. 65). See in this respect also Meder’s concept of ‘conscious alteration’: ‘to involuntary departure from the original the artist adds conscious alteration: dimensions are reduced, proportions

Finally, the category of drawings ‘*van onthout*’ or ‘from memory’ needs our attention. The expression was used in seventeenth century artistic practice and refers to a ‘remembered’ image rather than to the ‘invented’ image created ‘*uyt den gheest*’. A drawing ‘*van onthout*’ can either derive from another representation or from an direct observation ‘from nature’.¹⁰⁹ The category of drawings ‘*van onthout*’ has been investigated in seventeenth century artistic practice and more in particular in the drawn oeuvre of Rembrandt.¹¹⁰ Working ‘*van onthout*’ however is a notion which already can be found in Van Mander’s *Schilders-boeck*.¹¹¹ It has not been studied to what extent it could be related to sixteenth century artistic practices concerned with drawing.

broadened or lengthened, details omitted or added, nature “corrected” at the artist’s pleasure’ (Meder 1919 (ed. Ames 1978), vol. 1, p. 17).

¹⁰⁹ The term occurs in Gerard I ter Borch’s annotation on one of his son Harmon’s drawings. See Kettering 1988, vol. 1, p. 220, cat. H 51; Berlin/Amsterdam/London 1991-1992, cat. 9, pp. 46-47. In his biography of Pieter van Laer, Houbraken refers to what seems like the artist’s exceptional talent for working ‘*van onthout*’: (...) *had hy het geluk van zig een vast denkbeeld te kunnen inprinten van alle voorwerpen, of verschynselen die hem voorkwamen. Ja ‘t was hem genoeg die maar eens gezien te hebben, om daar na die op zyn tyd te pas te brengen. Waarom ook de Italianen die met hem verkeert en ommevang met hem gehad hadden, naarmaals getuigden dat hy meer in zyn vernuft als op papier geschetst heeft, ja dat hy de menigvuldige schilderagtige veranderingen, die in Velden, Valeyen, Bergen, Boomen enz. door min en meerder Zonnelicht veroorzaakt worden, zoo natuurlyk in agt nam even of hy diergelyk voorwerp ten model voor zig gehad hadde. (...) Hy was, wanneer hy aan zyne bezigheden was, stil, en zat heel opgetogen van gedachten. De reden daar van was, gelyk ik al heb begonnen te zeggen, omdat hy onder ‘t schilderen geen gebruik van ‘t leven maakte, zelf niet ontrent zyn beeltjes, maar zig van het denkbeeld dat hy daar van gevormt had bediende.* See Houbraken 1718-1721 (ed. Swillens & Vogelsang 1943-1953), vol. 1, pp. 283-284; Konst & Sellinck 1995, pp. 10-16.

¹¹⁰ See for instance Schatborn 1993.

¹¹¹ Id., p. 156, with reference to Miedema 1981, pp. 126-127. Miedema mentions the passage in the life of Pieter Brueghel the Elder in Van Mander’s *Schilder-boeck* in which is described how the painter frequented country weddings and other feasts to be able to depict peasants in their natural habitat. The making of portraits ‘from memory’ (*‘by onthout*) in other lives according to Miedema may be interpreted as ‘evidence of an important ability of the painter’ (see also Van Mander 1604 (ed. Miedema 1994-1999), vol. 3, p. 200).

II. Case studies

In the following case studies we will examine the reasons for which sixteenth century Netherlandish artists made *vedute* 'from nature' in Rome and its *campagna*, as well as the possible purposes the drawings served. We will focus on the function of Roman *vedute* in the oeuvre of five northern artists and link it to the artistic practices of other sixteenth century northern artists who made drawings 'from nature' in Rome.

The research will be mainly concerned with the extant drawings of the artists under discussion. However, we must take into account that the preserved drawings may not provide us with a complete picture of the use northern artists made of their Roman *vedute*. Attention will also be paid to other artistic work in different media that may indicate the artists relied on their own drawings made 'from nature'.

II.1. Jan Gossaert

We start our survey with Jan Gossaert (Maubeuge (?) ca. 1478 - Antwerp 1532), the first Netherlandish artist we know of who made drawings of the antique monuments in Rome.¹¹² Jan Gossaert travelled to the Eternal City in the retinue of the court diplomat Philip of Burgundy (1465-1524) in October 1508, where according to Gerard Geldenhauer's note in his *Vita clarissimi principis Philippi a Burgundia* (1529) he was commissioned to depict the antique monuments: 'Nothing pleased him [Philip of Burgundy] more when he was in Rome than those sacred monuments of antiquity which he commissioned the distinguished artist John Gossart of Maubeuge to paint for him'.¹¹³

It is generally assumed that Gossaert's four drawings of the '*mirabilia Romae*' which are known to have survived, are the testimony of his activity as a recorder of the antique remains in the city. Among the drawings, the only *veduta* concerns a *View of the Colosseum* (fig. II.1).¹¹⁴ In a highly detailed style, the drawing gives a most accurate representation of the state of the monument at the time. The viewpoint of the draughtsman for instance could be reconstructed in a conscientious way. Since the Colosseum is drawn in at least two various shades of brown ink, Gossaert seems to have worked at the sketch in different stages. Furthermore, traces of an underdrawing in black chalk can still be observed.¹¹⁵ The drawing is inscribed with a different ink in a contemporary hand at the right top: *Jennin Mabusen eghenen/ handt Contrafetet in Roma/ Coloseus*'. The three other drawings represent antique bronze sculptures, which have been preserved to date in different Italian collections: the *Spinario* (fig. II.2.), and statues of *Hercules* and *Apollo* (see respectively figs. II.4 and II.6).¹¹⁶ These drawings also are executed in pen and brown ink and give the same well thought-out and elaborated impression as the *Colosseum* drawing. Like the

¹¹² Also earlier northern painters must have travelled to Italy. Yet, it remains vague what could have been the exact artistic or other purposes of earlier Netherlandish artists' sojourn in the city. It is known for instance that Rogier van der Weyden visited Rome in the Holy Year 1450. See for instance Plagemann 2002, p. 45 ff.

¹¹³ Herzog 1968a, pp. 40-41, note 12. Herzog cited the fragment from Geldenhauer's Latin text and gave a translation: *Nihil magis eum Romae delectabat quam sacra illa vetustatis monumenta, quae per clarissimum pictorem Joannem Gossardum Malbodium depingenda sibi curavit (...)*. 'Depingenda' is translated as 'to paint', but it can also be interpreted in a broader sense as 'to depict', 'portray', or 'draw' (cf *A Latin dictionary, founded on Andrews' edition of Freund's Latin dictionary, rev., enlarged and in great part rewritten by Charlton T. Lewis and Charles Short*, 1879, last consulted on-line August 2009: see <http://clt.brepolis.net.proxy.library.uu.nl/dld/Default.aspx>). In the literature on Gossaert the latter interpretation has been generally acknowledged.

¹¹⁴ Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Kupferstichkabinett, inv. KdZ 12918. Pen and brown ink, 201 x 264 mm, inscribed: see text. See Van Gelder 1942, pp. 4-5; Herzog 1968a, cat. I.D7; Brussels/Rome 1995, cat. 109.

¹¹⁵ For this information, I owe debt to Mr Stijn Alsteens, Associate Curator at the Department of Drawings and Prints of the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York (e-mail correspondence, 10 June 2009).

¹¹⁶ *Spinario*, boots, helmets and lion's heads, (verso) *Helmet*, Leiden, Rijksuniversiteit, Prentenkabinet, inv. PK-T-AW 1041. Pen and grey-brown ink, 260 x 202 mm; *Hercules*, London, private collection. Pen and brown ink, 226 x 107 mm; *Apollo*, Venice, Gallerie dell' Accademia. Pen and brown ink, 305 x 178 mm. See Herzog 1968a, respectively cats. I.D5, I.D4, I.D6.

drawing of the *Colosseum*, the *Apollo* drawing shows traces of black chalk.¹¹⁷ The use of crosshatching which can be encountered in all the drawings calls forth associations with the technique of engraving. Remarkably, the bronze sculptures in three of the sketches are rendered as if they were living beings. Drawing them in this particular way, Gossaert seemed to have already formed an idea of how he could make use of his sketches at a later stage (cf *infra*).

Although it has since long been believed that the drawings were made in front of the monuments on the spot, it remains difficult to identify the works as drawings made in Rome ‘from life’ as referred to by Geldenhauer and suggested by the inscription on the *Colosseum* drawing, or as later, autographic reworkings. The traces of an underdrawing in two of the drawings may indicate that Gossaert sketched the real objects in black chalk ‘from nature’, and finished the drawings in ink at a later stage, or that he roughly recorded the proportions in black chalk and traced the details in ink at about the same time. Recently, it has been argued on the basis of the detailed and sophisticated engraving-like style and careful composition of the different elements that the Leiden drawing most likely was made shortly after Gossaert’s return to the Netherlands by using sketches made on the spot.¹¹⁸ The high degree of finishing indeed does not convey a fresh impression. The combination of different drawings on a single sheet in the *Spinario* drawing on the other hand does not necessarily exclude that they were made ‘from life’. Many drawings from Maarten van Heemskerck’s Roman sketchbook, which originated certainly for the greater part on the spot, for instance show compilations of motifs in the same way.¹¹⁹ In Van Heemskerck’s case, this rather suggests the economical use of precious paper, while Gossaert seems to have considered well stylistically a combination of various motifs to be used at a later time (cf *infra*). Since the *Colosseum* drawing and the one with the antique *Spinario* have more or less the same dimensions, several authors also have expressed the thought that they may have formed part of the same sketchbook the artist used in Rome.¹²⁰ The small sketch of a helmet on the verso of the latter drawing could be an element to support this hypothesis. In any case, the sketchbook Gossaert may have used was of a different nature than the little travel sketchbook Maarten van Heemskerck filled with drawings ‘from nature’ during his stay in Rome. We could add to this that the larger format of Gossaert’s drawings as well as the elaborated style likely suited the commission more.

¹¹⁷ Cf e-mail correspondence with Mr Alsteens, 10 June 2009. The traces of black chalk in the pen drawing have been observed previously by Annalisa Perissa Torrini in the exhibition catalogue *Da Leonardo a Canaletto. Disegni delle Gallerie dell’Accademia*, Venice (Gallerie dell’Accademia) 1999, no. 53 (*‘traccia a matita nera’*).

¹¹⁸ Nieuwenhuizen 2001, p. 21.

¹¹⁹ See § II.3.

¹²⁰ See for instance Rotterdam/Bruges 1965, cat. 46, p. 247; Washington/New York 1986-1987, cat. 63, p. 177; Brussels/Rome 1995, cat. 110, p. 215. Herzog proposed that the larger drawing of *Apollo* may have formed part of a second sketchbook (see Rotterdam/Bruges 1965, cat. 46, p. 247; Herzog 1968a, p. 52). The drawing preserved in London is cut on all sides.

Leaving aside now whether the drawings were done ‘from nature’ or are autographic reworkings, they can be regarded as autonomous documentation. In this specific case this means that Gossaert presumably did not make the drawings with a particular artistic purpose in mind, which does not alter the fact that they seem to have served him well at a later stage. In fact, reminiscences of all three the figure drawings can be encountered in drawings and paintings which originated back in the Netherlands. The *Spinario* for instance is represented from a different angle and in reverse as a female figure in Gossaert’s drawing *A woman’s bath* in the British Museum (fig. II.3).¹²¹ Although the spontaneous positions of the women depicted may suggest that Gossaert was inspired by women in his environment, he almost surprisingly appears to have adopted the pose of an antique sculpture. It is striking also that the drawing, a preparatory stage for transfer in print, is far less elaborate than the *Spinario* drawing. Reminiscences of Gossaert’s drawings of *Hercules* and *Apollo* have been found respectively in the statue of Hercules in *St. Luke drawing the Madonna* in Prague (ca. 1515) and the figure of Hermaphroditus in *Hermaphroditus and Salmacis changed into a hermaphrodite* (ca. 1517) in Rotterdam (see respectively figs. II.5 and II.7).¹²² Furthermore, the antique boots and the helmets drawn round the *Spinario* reappear in similar forms on respectively a painting and a drawing.¹²³ The *Colosseum* study at last may have been a source of inspiration for the superposed colonnades in the invented architecture of two drawn versions of the *Adoration of the Magi* preserved in Paris and New York (figs. II.8-9).¹²⁴ The first drawing is considered an authentic work, the latter is more likely a copy after a lost original by Gossaert.¹²⁵

From the study of Jan Gossaert’s other drawings and paintings, we also may assume that he has made more sketches of antique sculpture during his stay in Rome than those which have come down to us. This appears for instance from the other sculptures depicted in the painting *St. Luke*

¹²¹ London, British Museum, Department of Prints and Drawings, inv. 1924, 0512.1. Pen and brown ink over black chalk, squared for transfer, 380 x 305 mm. Herzog classified the drawing as by Gossaert’s ‘atelier’ (see Herzog 1968a, cat. D 26), but the drawing is now considered to have been made by Jan Gossaert himself (see the on-line database of the British Museum: http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/search_the_collection_database.aspx, last consulted August 2009).

¹²² *St. Luke drawing the Madonna*, Prague, Národní Galerie, inv. O-8765. Oil on panel, 230 x 205 cm, ca. 1515 (Herzog 1968a, cat. 7); *Hermaphroditus and Salmacis changed into a hermaphrodite*, Rotterdam, Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, inv. 2451, ca. 1517 (Herzog 1968a, cat. 58). See Herzog 1968a, cat. I.D 6 and Rotterdam/Bruges 1965, cat. 47.

¹²³ Rotterdam/Bruges 1965, cat. 45. The boot on the right leg of the drawing appears on the cut off statue above the St. Luke in the before mentioned painting *St. Luke drawing the Madonna*. A variant of the drawn helmets on the other hand can be recognised in a drawing preserved in Edinburgh (Rotterdam/Bruges 1965, cat. 56).

¹²⁴ New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, The Robert Lehman Collection, inv. 1975.I.832. Pen and light brown and greyish brown ink over traces of black chalk, 280 x 202 mm (Haverkamp-Begemann *et al.* 1999, cat. 26); Paris, Musée du Louvre, Cabinet des Arts Graphiques, inv. 20000. Pen on vellum, 270 x 194 mm (Lugt 1968, cat. 75). See Herzog 1968a, cat. I.D 19, p. 414.

¹²⁵ Cf e-mail correspondence with Mr Alsteens, 10 June 2009.

drawing the Madonna.¹²⁶ In the same painting, the statue of Hercules is represented from the front and not like in his Roman drawing from the back. Therefore, Gossaert must have relied on another example. Furthermore, several paintings and drawings bear witness of Gossaert's knowledge of classical and Italian renaissance architecture.

As Sadjia Herzog has demonstrated, several details of the architectural setting in two paintings with mythological subjects, *Neptunus and Amphitrite* (1516) and *Danae* (1527) (figs. II.10-11), show that Gossaert could have relied on now lost drawings of antique monuments he may have seen in Rome.¹²⁷ Although she did not find a specific source for the architecture of the temple cella in the first painting, she could refer to some examples of classical Roman architecture in the city that show the same (combination of) motifs. The bucrania on the frieze for instance appeared also in the form of metopes on the *Basilica Aemilia* on the *Forum Romanum* and the Roman variants of Doric columns with bases and ornamental capitals bear resemblance in various aspects to the column of Trajan (capital), the columns of the *Basilica Aemilia* and the *Arcus Augusti* on the *Forum Romanum*, and the temple of Hercules Victor on the *Forum Boarium*. The architecture in the painting of *Danae* on the other hand, with Composite columns set upon high stylobates, recalls to mind the remains of the *Aedes Vesta* or the circular Temple of Vesta also on the *Forum Romanum*.¹²⁸

Another source Gossaert could have consulted for the architecture in the paintings is Vitruvius' *De Architectura*.¹²⁹ This seems plausible, since Geldenhauer's memoir recorded that Gossaert's patron Philip was familiar with his writings.¹³⁰ Moreover, as the inscription with his motto and name '+A+/+PLUS+SERA+/+pbe+bourgne+' in the right upper corner of the painting *Neptunus and Amphitrite* suggest, Philip made an active contribution to the design of the painting.¹³¹ In fact, Jos Sterk has pointed out that Gossaert more likely had based himself on Fra Giocondo's illustrated Vitruvius edition of 1511 than on his own Roman drawings. This he has deduced from the correspondence of different architectural elements with the woodcuts in the edition and the adoption of Vitruvius' rules of proportion.¹³² Yet, hardly any points of similarity have been found between Vitruvius' writings and the architectural setting of the *Danae*, which originated after

¹²⁶ Rotterdam/Bruges 1965, cat. 9, pp. 87-89, cat. 46, p. 247; Herzog 1968a, pp. 42-44.

¹²⁷ *Neptunus and Amphitrite*, Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Gemäldegalerie, inv. 648. Oil on panel, 188 x 124 cm, signed and dated: +IOANNES+MALBODIVS+PINGEBAT+1516+ (Herzog 1968a, cat. 13); *Danae*, Munich, Alte Pinakothek. Oil on panel, 113,5 x 95 cm, signed and dated: IOANNES, MALBODIVS, PINGEBAT, 1527 (Herzog 1968a, cat. 41).

¹²⁸ Herzog 1968b; Mensger 2002, § 10.2.

¹²⁹ Herzog 1968b; Sterk 1980, pp. 117-122; Mensger 2002, § 5.1, 5.2.

¹³⁰ Herzog 1968a, pp. 40-41, note 12; Herzog 1968b; Sterk 1980, p. 21.

¹³¹ Sterk 1980, § II.10 for Philip's role as an 'inventor'.

¹³² Id., pp. 118-122.

Philip's death in 1524.¹³³ The columns of the oriel-like structure in which *Danae* is represented also have capitals of the Composite order, a variant which was not mentioned in Vitruvius but was frequently adopted in Roman and renaissance architecture.¹³⁴

It is beyond doubt that the painting with *Neptunus and Amphitrite* originated in the highly humanistic atmosphere of Philip of Burgundy's court. Besides, we know from the humanist writer Gerrit Geldenhauer's ode to the art of painting dedicated to his patron Philip that the latter was a great admirer of this specific branch of art.¹³⁵ Since it was also argued that the painting not only refers to Vitruvius, but also shows similarities with descriptions of paintings in Plinius' *Historia Naturalis* and may have been inspired by Pausanias' *Description of Greece*, it is not totally inconceivable that Gossaert, having been in Rome and having drawn the antique monuments himself, did not rely on his own drawings for the architectural setting of the painting but followed his patron in his humanistic aspirations to emulate antique art.¹³⁶ The architecture of *Danae's* enclosure conversely seems to have been based on another source than Vitruvius. Although the painting could be regarded as a mythological allegory, like Gossaert's works commissioned by Philip of Burgundy, it lacks the literary painterly translation of humanistic literature.¹³⁷ Because the architecture in the painting bears resemblance to antique Roman temples he may have seen in the city, he probably based himself on now lost sketches made in Rome. However, since Gossaert used to work from secondary sources, it is not inconceivable that he has relied on other literary or visual material also after his patron's death.

We can conclude that the function of Jan Gossaert's Roman drawings undoubtedly can be considered unique. No other examples of commissioned Roman *vedute* by northern painters are known so far for the entire sixteenth century. Therefore, this aspect of the Philip of Burgundy's patronage is an isolated incident. Since there is no evidence of other drawings in his vast artistic and scientific collections, Philip was apparently interested in the documentary character of the drawings more than in their artistic value.¹³⁸ This assumption is also confirmed by the use of literary sources for the architectural setting of the *Neptunus and Amphitrite* painting. The highly elaborated character of Gossaert's Roman drawings compared with other of his drawings may be explained by the effort he may have made to convince Philip of his artistic craftsmanship.

¹³³ Herzog 1968b; Sterk 1980, pp. 142-143.

¹³⁴ Haslinghuis & Janse 1997, p. 128.

¹³⁵ Sterk 1980, § II.10.

¹³⁶ Herzog 1968b, pp. 34-35; Sterk 1980, p. 122. Although Sterk thought of the possibility of Gossaert's use of Pausanias' work as rather far-fetched, Herzog had demonstrated that the text may have come to the attention of Philip as a copied manuscript before it was printed for the first time in Venice in 1516.

¹³⁷ Sterk 1980, pp. 142-143.

¹³⁸ Plomp 2002, vol. 1, p. 42.

As it concerns the use of his Roman drawings in Gossaert's other drawn and painted work, the use of artistic schemata derived from antique (literary) sources presumably was, partly due to his patron's instructions, subordinate to his own observation. Furthermore, it remains an unanswered question whether Gossaert's extant Roman drawings came in the possession of Philip of Burgundy or were available in Gossaert's studio. Since Gossaert seems to have relied on his Roman drawings in various ways in the course of his further career, it is likely that in some way the artist had access to the original drawings or copied versions.

Jan Gossaert's sojourn in Rome was a rather short one in the end. He probably returned to the north in July 1509, only a few months after his patron.¹³⁹ This could mean that he did not have the explicit aim to take artistic advantage of his stay in the city. In any case, it seems likely that he was expected at the home front for other commissions.¹⁴⁰

¹³⁹ Washington/New York 1986-1987, p. 176.

¹⁴⁰ See for Gossaert's commissions after his return to the Netherlands for instance Sterk 1980, § II.9.

II.2. Jan van Scorel

In the early 1520s Jan van Scorel (Scoorl 1495 - Utrecht 1562), who according to Van Mander had finished his artistic training under the southern Netherlandish painter Jan Gossaert,¹⁴¹ travelled to Venice and the Holy Land. In his biography of the painter, Van Mander further recorded that he took his painting materials and sketchbook with him and that he drew landscapes and views 'from nature' on his way to and travelling through Palestine.¹⁴² To date only one of the drawings he must have made in the Holy Land is preserved. In his *View of Bethlehem*, inscribed '*betleem*' and '*ecclesia nicolai*', Van Scorel gives a topographically faithful impression of a piece of the town (fig. II.12).¹⁴³

Back in Venice, Van Scorel continued his journey to Rome, where in January 1522 his fellow-countryman Adriaan Florisz. Boeyens was elected the new pope. Soon thereafter Adrianus VI would appoint the northern artist as the new curator of the papal collections in the Belvedere. The prompt death of the pope however must have speeded up Van Scorel's journey back home. Before the end of 1524 he was documented again in the Netherlands.¹⁴⁴ Since Van Scorel was profoundly influenced by the many new impressions he had encountered, his stays in Rome, Venice and the Holy Land may be considered as a continuation of his training in the northern Netherlands.

According to Van Mander Van Scorel drew *vedute* also in Rome. When he described Van Scorel's activities in the city as a draughtsman, he referred among other things to the copying of antique sculptures and ruins.¹⁴⁵ Until recently various authors stated that no work dating from Van Scorel's Roman period is extant.¹⁴⁶ Nonetheless, a second topographical view, generally assumed to have been made during the painter's journey to Italy, is preserved in the *British Museum*. On the verso side of a *Fantastic mountain landscape with a bridge*, Van Scorel depicted a castle, which according to Molly Faries represents an existing place (figs. II.13r-v).¹⁴⁷ Another drawing of *The*

¹⁴¹ Van Mander 1604, fol. 235r 1-4: *Ter selver tijt was lannijn de Mabuse in den dienst van Philippus van Burgundien, Bisschop van Wtrecht: en also Mabuse seer geruchtigh was, is Schoorel by hem t'Wtrecht comen wonen om wat te leeren: doch gheduerde niet langhe (...)*. Van Mander is the only source for Van Scorel's contact with Jan Gossaert. The artists most probably met in Utrecht shortly after May 1517. See Van Mander (ed. Miedema 1994-1999), vol. 3, p. 276; Utrecht 2009, Introduction, Part II (without pages).

¹⁴² Van Mander 1604, fol. 235v -236r. See note 44.

¹⁴³ London, British Museum, Department of Prints and Drawings, inv. 1928-3-10-100. Pen and brown ink, 172 x 299 mm, inscribed: see text. See Brussels/Rome 1995, cat. 181, p. 323.

¹⁴⁴ Utrecht 1955; Brussels/Rome 1995, p. 318.

¹⁴⁵ Van Mander 1604, fol. 236r. See note 44.

¹⁴⁶ See for instance Van Mander (ed. Miedema 1994-1999), vol. 3, p. 280; Amsterdam 2001, p. 11.

¹⁴⁷ *Fantastic mountain landscape with a bridge*, (verso) *A castle among rocky crags*, London, British Museum, Department of Prints and Drawings, inv. 1909.0109.7. Pen and brown ink, 205 x 153 mm. See Brussels/Rome 1995, cat. 181, p. 323;

new St. Peter's basilica under construction formerly ascribed to Etienne du Pérac and Van Scorel, has recently been attributed to Pieter Coecke van Aelst (1502-1550) and gives a unique representation of the construction of the building before the *Sacco di Roma* in 1527 (fig. II.14).¹⁴⁸ Furthermore, the catalogue accompanying the Van Scorel exhibition in Utrecht in 1955 included several drawings of fantastic landscapes with ruins.¹⁴⁹ Since the attribution of these drawings remains unclear to date, unfortunately we cannot draw further conclusions from the series.¹⁵⁰

Molly Faries has also expressed the belief that Jan van Scorel's experience with depicting views 'from nature' on his journey through the Holy Land inspired him to draw the antique ruins in the Eternal City in a now-lost Roman sketchbook.¹⁵¹ If this is indeed the case, the artist's sketchbook possibly included drawings 'from nature' which he reworked in paintings after his return to the Netherlands. This at least could be deduced from two of Van Scorel's paintings from around 1540 in which authentic Roman ruins can be distinguished.

One of the three altarpieces commissioned by the Benedictine abbey of Marchiennes and representing the *Martyrdom of St. Laurence*, a work which is known only through copies, in the background includes a view of the arch of Constantine. A fragment that remained from the original painting has been lost since the First World War (fig. II.15),¹⁵² but a copy of the entire work is preserved in Poznan (fig. II.16).¹⁵³ Furthermore, two drawings made after a drawn design or after the original work by Van Scorel are extant (figs. II.17-18).¹⁵⁴ As has been argued, the general disposition of the main scene derives from a print of the same subject by Marcantonio Raimondi after Baccio Bandinelli (fig. II.19).¹⁵⁵ The second painting showing the *Raising of Lazarus* is held in a private collection in Geneva and has been tentatively attributed to Van Scorel (fig. II.21).¹⁵⁶ In the background the ruin of the Roman temple of Serapis with the *Frontispizio di*

Faries & Wolff 1996, p. 730. Popham already in 1932 expressed the view that the drawing on the *verso* may well be 'an actual study of a real place'. See Washington/New York 1986-1987, cat.104, p. 269, note 6 with reference to Popham 1932, p. 39, cat. 1.

¹⁴⁸ *The New St. Peter's basilica under construction, seen from the southwest, (verso) The ruins of the Palatine hill seen from the Circus Maximus*, Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, collection Ashby, inv. 329. Pen and brown ink, (verso) red chalk, 198 x 408 mm. See Vatican City 1988, cat. 2, p. 61 (as attributed to Jan van Scorel); Brussels/Rome 1995, cat. 67 (as attributed to Pieter Coecke).

¹⁴⁹ Utrecht 1955. See also Boon 1955, in which the author deals with the attribution of the drawings exhibited in Utrecht.

¹⁵⁰ Veldman 2008, p. 54.

¹⁵¹ Brussels/Rome 1995, cat. 181, p. 323; Faries 1998, p. 122.

¹⁵² The fragment of the panel (176 x 48 cm) was preserved in Valenciennes and published in 1918. See Utrecht/Douai 1977, p. 97.

¹⁵³ *Martyrdom of St. Laurence*, Poznan, Muzeum Narodowe, inv. 138, ca. 1540. See Van Gelder 1966-1967, pp. 23-25; Utrecht/Douai 1977, cat. 34, pp. 97-99.

¹⁵⁴ Paris, Institut Néerlandais, Fondation Custodia (Coll. F. Lugt), inv. 1971-T.33A. Pen and black ink on brownish paper, 180 x 213 mm (Utrecht/Douai 1977, cat. 34); Boston, Museum of Fine Arts (Utrecht/Douai 1977, p. 98, fig. 63).

¹⁵⁵ Faries 1975, p. 151. See for the print Oberhuber 1978, 104 I-II (89).

¹⁵⁶ Geneva, private collection, ca. 1540. Oil on panel, 89 x 159 cm. See Utrecht/Douai 1977, cat. 35.

Nerone is depicted. The temple became also known as the *Veteres aedes Columnensium* when it was renovated by the Colonna family in the fifteenth century. The *Centraal Museum* in Utrecht preserves an exact copy of the work, made after the painting in Geneva, or after the lost drawn model by Van Scorel.¹⁵⁷ An engraving of the same composition in reverse attributed to a follower of Primaticcio probably goes back to the same preparatory drawing (fig. II.22).¹⁵⁸

From what we can deduce from the comparison of the depiction of the arch of Constantine in the different versions of the *Martyrdom of St. Laurence* and an earlier sketch of the monument from the Italian Master of the Escorialensis Codex (active in Rome 1489-1493) (fig. II.20),¹⁵⁹ it seems that the monument is rendered faithfully to a great extent. The ruin of the temple of Serapis in the *Raising of Lazarus* is clearly distinguishable, but the representation is not entirely correct. When we compare it to a drawing of the same site from the same viewpoint attributed to Maarten van Heemskerck (1498-1574), it becomes clear that the ruin depicted by Van Scorel differs in various aspects from his contemporary view and that it is represented isolated from the walls around it (fig. II.23).¹⁶⁰ It strikes the eye for instance that all the visible columns of the central *loggia* are replaced by caryatids, which in the drawing only appear on both angles of the row of columns. Van Heemskerck's drawing seems to be unique, since it shows the two caryatids which indeed formed part of the *loggia* but apparently were removed soon after he depicted them.¹⁶¹ Later drawings such as a drawing recently attributed to Pieter Vlerick (1539-1581) dated before 1568 (fig. II.24)¹⁶², show the colonnade without the statues.

Interestingly, the motif of the arch of Constantine in the painting of the *Martyrdom of St. Laurence* seems to have been chosen deliberately. It most probably refers anachronistically to the emperor Constantine the Great, who erected the Roman basilica *San Lorenzo* outside the city walls on the tomb of St. Laurence long after the death of the Saint.¹⁶³ A similar example can be found in the *Stoning of St. Stephen*, the middle panel of the second set of interior wings of a polyptych painted

¹⁵⁷ Utrecht, Centraal Museum, inv. 7646. Oil on panel, 95 x 163 cm, ca. 1540 (?). See Utrecht/Douai 1977, cat. 36.

¹⁵⁸ Utrecht/Douai 1977, p. 101, pp. 101-102; Zerner 1979, p. 297, no. 20.

¹⁵⁹ *View on the Colosseum and the Arch of Constantine* Spain, El Escorial, inv. 28-II-12, fol. 28v. See Egger 1905-1906, vol. 2, 28v.

¹⁶⁰ Düsseldorf, Kunstakademie. See Egger 1911-1931, vol. 2, pl. 86 (as anonymous, sixteenth century). See Van Gelder 1966-1967, pp. 8-9 (as anonymous, third decade of the sixteenth century) for a detailed description of the architectural elements Van Scorel changed. Faries recently published the drawing as attributed to Maarten van Heemskerck (see Faries 1998, p. 122, fig. 12).

¹⁶¹ Hülsen 1927, p. 91, fig. 3.

¹⁶² New York, Metropolitan Museum, Rogers Fund, inv. 1959 (59.73). Pen and brown ink, pale red wash, 220 x 334 mm (Egger 1905-1906, vol. 2, plate 87). See for the attribution to Pieter Vlerick: Brussels/Rome 1995, cat. 232; Meijer 1999, pp. 7-14.

¹⁶³ Van Gelder 1966-1967, p. 25.

for Marchiennes, which is now preserved in Douai (fig. II.25).¹⁶⁴ Although they are represented more topographically correct in the underdrawing than in the painted version, the buildings in the landscape background evoke the Stephen's Gate and the Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem. The painted Dome of the Rock rather seems to refer to the Roman circular church commemorating St. Stephen, the *Santo Stefano Rotondo*, or to the Lateran Baptistery. In the first case, the building again appears as an anachronism, since the church was built only four centuries after the Saint's death. Van Scorel certainly knew the church from his time in Rome. Plans for the restoration of the Lateran Baptistery were further made when the painter stayed in the city.¹⁶⁵

These examples clearly show Van Scorel's interest in recording actual classical buildings as imagery in his painted work. As becomes clear from the obelisks, pyramids and other buildings in the backgrounds of other paintings, the artist recalled his travels south and eastward also in other ways. The middle panel altar of the first set of interior wings of the Marchiennes polyptych showing the *Judgement of St. James and St. James healing a paralytic* (fig. II.26)¹⁶⁶ and the *Landscape with Bathsheba* from the *Rijksmuseum* (fig. II.27, ca. 1540-45)¹⁶⁷ could serve as examples. Several architectural motifs are even repeated in both works. Yet, the 'hybrid' architecture in the paintings does not relate to known classical examples.¹⁶⁸

In other cases however, Van Scorel's (antique) models have been retraced. The buildings on the second plan of his *Lamentation of Christ with a donor* (fig. II.28, ca. 1530-1535) from the collection of the *Centraal Museum* in Utrecht for instance, have since long been considered as inspired by the Vatican palace.¹⁶⁹ It seems evident Van Scorel based the design on his own observations of the palace during his curatorship of the papal collections in the Vatican. Since both the architectural complex and the portrait of the donor were changed in paint without revisions in the different underdrawing, Moly Faries has suggested that the building may refer to an actual site which may

¹⁶⁴ Douai, Musée de la Chartreuse, inv. Dépot 1974/1. Oil on panel, 219 x 151 cm, ca. 1540. See Utrecht/Douai 1977, cat. 30 h.

¹⁶⁵ Faries 1975, pp. 138-140.

¹⁶⁶ Douai, Musée de la Chartreuse, inv. 2771. Oil on two panels, both 234 x 83 cm, ca. 1540. See Utrecht/Douai 1977, cat. 30 e.

¹⁶⁷ Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. SK-A-670. Oil on panel, 100,4 x 203,9 cm, ca. 1540-1545. See the on-line publication *Early Netherlandish paintings in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam. Volume I – Artists born before 1500*: <http://www.rijksmuseum.nl/collectie/zoeken/asset.jsp?id=SK-A-670&lang=nl>, last consulted August 2009.

¹⁶⁸ Amsterdam 1986, cat. 115; on-line publication *Early Netherlandish paintings in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam. Volume I – Artists born before 1500*: <http://www.rijksmuseum.nl/collectie/zoeken/asset.jsp?id=SK-A-670&lang=nl>, last consulted August 2009.

¹⁶⁹ Utrecht, Centraal Museum, inv. 6450. Oil on panel, 167,5 x 136,5 cm, ca. 1530-1535. See Hoogewerff 1929, p. 210; Utrecht 1952, cat. 261, p. 120; on-line prepublication of the forthcoming *Catalogue of Paintings 1450-1600* of the Centraal Museum in Utrecht: http://www.centraalmuseum.nl/ContentFiles/24_Scorel_bewening.pdf, last consulted August 2009.

provide new information about the donor's identity.¹⁷⁰ A borrowing of a different nature has been recognised in the middle panel of the altarpiece with *The finding of the True Cross* in the Church of Our Lady in Breda (fig. II.29, ca. 1540).¹⁷¹ In this case a connection has been demonstrated with a chiaroscuro drawing with the same subject formerly attributed to Baldassare Peruzzi (1481-1536), the artist who when Antonio da Sangallo the Younger succeeded Raphael in 1520 as architect of the St. Peter's basilica acted as his assistant (fig. II.30).¹⁷² Since Van Scorel had copied a part of the figures and architectural background in the painting in reverse, he most probably relied on a print made after the drawing. The arch-like building Van Scorel copied from Peruzzi has not been associated with a Roman example. A preserved preparatory drawing for the middle panel of the altar by Van Scorel shows an earlier design of the painting with a different architectural background (fig. II.31).¹⁷³ We may conclude that Van Scorel probably was not satisfied with the background architecture in his drawing and found a better solution in a print by Peruzzi. Both examples show that the painter apparently was not interested in the (symbolical) insertion of well-chosen Roman buildings, like he did in the altarpieces for the Marchiennes abbey or the painting with the *Raising of Lazarus*. In the case of the altarpiece of Breda, he seems to have contented himself with another artist's invention.

As an employee at the pope's court Van Scorel certainly must also have had knowledge of the construction of the new St. Peter's. In fact, as Friedländer has demonstrated through the comparison with a drawing from Maarten van Heemskerck's Roman sketchbook, Van Scorel introduced a fragment of the new church in the interior of his painting *The presentation in the temple* (fig. II.32).¹⁷⁴ Van Heemskerck's drawing of the fragment of the southern transept of the

¹⁷⁰ Faries 1975, p. 199, note 162; on-line prepublication of the forthcoming *Catalogue of Paintings 1450-1600* of the Centraal Museum in Utrecht: http://www.centraalmuseum.nl/ContentFiles/24_Scorel_bewening.pdf, last consulted August 2009.

¹⁷¹ *The discovery of the True Cross* (middle panel), Breda, Church of Our Lady, oil on panel, 232 x 262,5 cm.

¹⁷² *The discovery of the True Cross*, London, British Museum, inv. 1895, 0915.581. Pen and brown ink, with brown wash, heightened with white (mostly oxidised) on light brown prepared paper. The drawing was mentioned by Faries as autograph but is now regarded as a copy after Peruzzi (see the on-line database of the British Museum: http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/search_the_collection_database.aspx, last consulted August 2009). See Faries 1975, pp. 185-188. Pouncey and Gere dated the drawing between 1515 and 1520 on the basis of the stylistic affinity of the composition with the late Raphael. See Pouncey & Gere 1962, vol. 1, cat. 251 (as Baldassare Peruzzi, assisted?).

¹⁷³ *The discovery of the True Cross*, private collection. Pen and brown ink with grey wash, 216 x 302 mm, ca. 1540. See Amsterdam 1986, cat. 112.

¹⁷⁴ Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, inv. 6161. Oil on panel, 114 x 85 cm, ca. 1530-1540. The painting may be the one Karel van Mander saw in the home of Geert Willemsz. Schoterbosch in Haarlem, which he described in his biography of Van Scorel. See Van Mander 1604, fol. 236v 10-15: *Ick can niet verswijghen, dat te Haerlem by d'Heer Geert Willemsz. Schoterbosch, is van hem een uytnemende stucxken, daer Maria Christum in den Tempel den Simeoni offert, waer te sien is een heerlijcke Metselrije met een cierlijck verwelf, daer veel vergulds oft gulden vercieringhen met der verwe zijn gedaen, dat wonder heerlijck staet, en is daer beneffens seer aerdigh van beeldeken, die seer bevallijck te sien zijn.* Friedländer referred to Van Heemskerck's drawing on the back of a photograph of the painting now in the collection of the RKD in The Hague (see the note in the on-line database RKD Images:

St. Peter's where later the altar of St. Peter and St. Paul was erected, indeed seems to correspond in detail with a part of the interior depicted by Van Scorel (fig. II.33).¹⁷⁵ Since Van Heemskerck's drawing represents the state of the building between 1527 and 1543,¹⁷⁶ Van Scorel however cannot have relied on his own observations for the architecture in the painting.

From the examples quoted it becomes clear that the depiction of antique monuments and buildings reminiscent of southern architecture in Van Scorel's paintings may have originated in preliminary drawn representations. Except for Van Scorel's borrowing from Peruzzi in the Breda triptych, however, it is not possible to indicate his exact sources. Since none of his Roman *vedute* are known to have survived, it remains a question if the painter indeed relied on his own drawings as models for the monuments in his paintings or he more often based himself on other examples.

As we have mentioned before, Van Mander stated that the artist was in the habit of making topographical drawings on his travels.¹⁷⁷ When he described Van Scorel's drawing activity (*'conterfeyten'*) in Jerusalem, Van Mander even explicitly mentioned that the artist used the sketches in his paintings (*'wercken'*)¹⁷⁸ and gave the example of 'a picture in which Christ rides down from the Mount of Olives to the city'. This can be read as a reference to the central panel of the painter's *Lockhorst triptych* in the collection of the *Centraal Museum* in Utrecht (fig. II.34).¹⁷⁹ Undoubtedly, Van Scorel must have relied on a model drawing for the representation of the city view of Jerusalem in the background of the painting. All the important buildings are recognisable and faithfully rendered.¹⁸⁰ The preliminary drawing does not survive, but was mentioned for its

[http://www.rkd.nl/rkddb/\(vlhrv1b3imsgb555bpcwlgne\)/detail.aspx?parentprifef=](http://www.rkd.nl/rkddb/(vlhrv1b3imsgb555bpcwlgne)/detail.aspx?parentprifef=), last consulted August 2009). See also Friedländer 1975, pp. 75-76; Faries 1998, note 76.

¹⁷⁵ Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Kupferstichkabinett, inv. 79 D2 fol. 8r. Pen and brown ink, 134 x 208 mm. Hülsen & Egger 1913-1916 (ed. 1975), p. 6, fol. 8 (*Erster Band*).

¹⁷⁶ Wolff-Metternich 1987, Excursus D, p. 198.

¹⁷⁷ See § 1.2., note 44.

¹⁷⁸ Van Mander 1604, fol. 235v 7-10: *Hy hadde oock gheconterfeyt de stadt Hierusalem, die hy somtijts in zijn wercken heeft te pas ghebracht, als daer Christus den Olijf-bergh af rijdt nae der Stadt, en daer hy op desen bergh predickt, en derghehijcke Historien*. A little further in his biography of Van Scorel, Van Mander refers again to the triptych and repeats that the view of Jerusalem was depicted 'from nature' (see fol. 236v 33-40: (...) *des bleef hy t'Wtrecht by een Deken van Oudemunster, gheheeten Lochorst, een Hoofs Heer, en groot Const-beminder. Voor desen maeckte hy verscheyden stucken van Water en Oly-verwe: onder ander, daer voor van verhaelt is, eenen Palmsondagh, te weten, daer Christus op den Esel rijdt nae Ierusalem: hier was de Stadt in nae t'leven: daer waren kinderen en Ioden, die boom-tacken en cleederen spreiden, en anderen omstandt. Dit was een stuck met deuren, en was als een gedenck-tafel, van den Dekens vrienden ghestelt t'Wtrecht in de Dom-kerck*.

¹⁷⁹ *Entrance of Christ into Jerusalem* (middle panel) *with Saints* (interior wings) *and members of the Lockhorst family* (exterior wings), Utrecht, Centraal Museum, inv. 6078a and 7991. Oil on panel, 79 x 147 cm (middle panel), 1526-1527. See the on-line prepublication of the forthcoming *Catalogue of Paintings 1450-1600* of the Centraal Museum in Utrecht: http://www.centraalmuseum.nl/ContentFiles/21_Scorel_Lokhorst.pdf, last consulted August 2009.

¹⁸⁰ See the on-line prepublication of the forthcoming *Catalogue of Paintings 1450-1600* of the Centraal Museum in Utrecht: http://www.centraalmuseum.nl/ContentFiles/21_Scorel_Lokhorst.pdf, last consulted August 2009.

documentary value by Georg Braun, who referred to it together with a print by Herman Borculo as a source for the representation of Jerusalem in the *Civitatis orbis terrarum* (1574), and by Christian van Adrichem in his description of the same city (1584). We may even assume that the design for the woodcut of Jerusalem, printed in Utrecht in 1538 by Herman van Borculo (fig. II.36), was based on Van Scorel's lost panorama of the city. The representation of the city corresponds in every detail to the painted version of the city in the background of the Utrecht panel. Even the figures in the foreground of the print evoke the Entry of Christ in Jerusalem and other of the painter's famous compositions.¹⁸¹ It is likely that Van Scorel used his drawings made 'from nature' to create a model drawing for the view on the city in the painting. Furthermore, the absence of an elaborate underdrawing of the city of Jerusalem (fig. II.35) confirms that he must have disposed of a more detailed design drawing.¹⁸²

We may conclude that Jan van Scorel at least has used different sources for the architectural backgrounds in his paintings reminiscent of antique and contemporary Rome. It seems most plausible that he relied on *vedute* he himself had made in Rome in the case of the insertion of clearly recognisable antique monuments in the Marchiennes altar piece the *Martyrdom of St. Laurence* and the painting with the *Raising of Lazarus*, both dated around 1540. Not only Karel van Mander's notes on Van Scorel's drawing habits in Rome and on his travels to the Holy Land point in this direction. The fact that he based his view on Jerusalem in the *Lockhorst triptych* on his own drawings made on the spot also indicates that he had already earlier reworked his own topographical drawings in paintings. This would imply that Jan van Scorel was the first Northern artist who integrated complete Roman *vedute* based on his own drawings made 'from nature' in this painted work. On the other hand, Van Scorel certainly also relied on other sources for the architectural staffage in his paintings.

Like Jan Gossaert, whose Roman sketches Van Scorel may have seen in Utrecht before he left for Italy and the Holy Land, he presumably used his now lost drawings of Roman classical monuments after his return to his home country also as a fund of useful motifs to be adopted in his paintings. As we have seen, several buildings in Van Scorel's painted work are clearly reminiscent of classical and contemporary Roman examples. Therefore we can agree with Friedländer, who stated already that Van Scorel 'stuck to actual buildings, recording rather than

¹⁸¹ *Panorama of Jerusalem*, Utrecht, Centraal Museum, inv. 6869. Woodcut, 390 x 731 mm, dated: 1538. See Utrecht/Douai 1977, cat. 29, p. 85; Faries 1998, p. 126.

¹⁸² Faries 1998, p. 125; on-line prepublication of the forthcoming *Catalogue of Paintings 1450-1600* of the Centraal Museum in Utrecht: http://www.centraalmuseum.nl/ContentFiles/21_Scorel_Lokhorst.pdf, last consulted August 2009.

inventing them?¹⁸³ Other architectural backgrounds, which have not been identified, undoubtedly reveal what he had seen abroad.

Finally, it deserves our attention that a Roman motif in Van Scorel's work has been adopted in other paintings from his workshop. It concerns the combination of the obelisk known as Caesar's needle, the remaining columns of the Temple of Saturn on the *Forum Romanum* and the pyramid of Caius Sextus as it appears in the background of the *Good Samaritan* (fig. II.37) by an anonymous master called after the painting Master of the Good Samaritan (active 1537/38-1545/46).¹⁸⁴ Fragments or mutual combinations of this 'workshop pattern' have been recognised in Van Scorel's *Madonna with Child* preserved in Tambov, in the middle panel of the *Vischer van der Gheer triptych* in Utrecht from the painter's workshop and in *The family of Ivo Fritema (?)* in Groningen, which has been attributed among others to the Good Samaritan Master (figs. II.38-40).¹⁸⁵ In these devotional images and portraits, the landscape scattered with ruins and sepulchral monuments, such as the pyramid and the obelisk, point to the vanity of earthly life.¹⁸⁶ An interesting drawing representing a draughtsman among (Roman?) ruins also associated with this anonymous master has been mentioned as one of the reasons for possible travels abroad (fig. II.41).¹⁸⁷ However, from the corpus of drawings and paintings from the 'Scorel group' Faries meant to conclude that a repertoire existed based on Jan van Scorel's lost travel sketchbooks.¹⁸⁸

Although it still remains questionable if visiting Rome has been a principal aim of the painter's journey southwards,¹⁸⁹ it is clear that Van Scorel has taken advantage of his stay in the Eternal City to draw the antique remains 'from life' for his personal documentation. The trip to Rome of his pupil Maarten van Heemskerck one decade later surely was a more deliberate choice, which resulted in a vast amount of topographical drawings.

¹⁸³ Friedländer 1975, p. 75.

¹⁸⁴ Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. SK-A-3468. Oil on panel, 74,7 x 86 cm, dated: 1537. See Brussels/Roma 1995, cat. 253; on-line publication *Early Netherlandish paintings in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam. Volume I – Artists born before 1500*: <http://www.rijksmuseum.nl/collectie/zoeken/asset.jsp?id=SK-A-670&lang=nl>, last consulted August 2009.

¹⁸⁵ Tambov, Kartinaja Galeria, inv. 13. Oil on panel, 66 x 44 cm; Utrecht, Centraal Museum, inv. 2375. Oil on panel, 99,2 x 73,2 cm (middle panel), ca. 1555; Groningen, Groninger Museum, inv. 0000.1081. Oil on panel, 163 x 201 cm, 1530. See the on-line publication *Early Netherlandish paintings in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam. Volume I – Artists born before 1500*: <http://www.rijksmuseum.nl/collectie/zoeken/asset.jsp?id=SK-A-3468&lang=nl>, last consulted August 2009.

¹⁸⁶ Bruyn 1988.

¹⁸⁷ *Draughtsman among ruins*, (verso) *Donkeys*, Oxford, Christ Church, inv. 0297. Pen and brown ink, (verso) black chalk (with rubbing of red chalk from another sheet), 202 x 127 mm. See Washington/New York 1986-1987, cat. 5 (as Anonymous Dutch).

¹⁸⁸ Brussels/Rome 1995, p. 429.

¹⁸⁹ Utrecht 1955, p. 13. See also the recent biography of Van Scorel in the on-line publication *Early Netherlandish paintings in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam. Volume I – Artists born before 1500*: <http://www.rijksmuseum.nl/early-netherlandish-paintings?lang=nl>, last consulted August 2009.

II.3. Maarten van Heemskerck

The first Roman *vedute* from a Netherlandish artist of which we can say with fair confidence to have been drawn for the greater part ‘from nature’ are those of Maarten van Heemskerck (Heemskerck 1498 - Haarlem 1574). Undoubtedly his master Jan van Scorel’s example has played a part in Van Heemskerck’s decision to set off for a journey southwards in 1532. At that time, he was already a well- established painter, and certainly not a pupil who came to Rome to complete his apprenticeship like lots of later northern artists would do. He certainly stayed in the city until 1536, and maybe even until the beginning of the following year.¹⁹⁰ We have opened our first chapter with a passage from Van Mander’s biography of the artist, in which he states that during his stay in the city Van Heemskerck spent a lot of time in the open air to draw the antique remains.¹⁹¹ This artistic activity must have been a major reason for his long-awaited sojourn in the Eternal City.¹⁹²

A considerable group of Maarten van Heemskerck’s Roman drawings is preserved to date and consists of accurate sketches of classical sculpture and architecture and topographical city and landscape views. The Berlin *Kupferstichkabinett* owns an important part of these drawings, which are preserved in two eighteenth century albums containing a total of 172 randomly fixed folios of sixteenth century drawings.¹⁹³ Only a part of these drawings is now attributed to Maarten van Heemskerck, among which a series of 66 folios originating from a small sketchbook the painter must have used in Rome. The drawings were recognised as sketchbook pages by Hülsen and Egger on the basis of their format, the type of paper, the grey colour of the page edges and the rounding of the same corner of each folio. Originally, the sketchbook was bound and had an oblong format. The folios mostly have drawings on both sides, which are executed in different techniques: pen and brown ink, eventually washed in various shades, and red and black chalk. In some cases, an underdrawing in metal point is still visible.¹⁹⁴ The sketchbook pages are fixed randomly in the first album together with ten other folios also attributed to Van Heemskerck by Hülsen and Egger, and two other folios of which his authorship was rejected.¹⁹⁵ Most of the

¹⁹⁰ Veldman 1977b, § 1, p. 12; Van Mander 1604 (ed. Miedema 1994-1999), vol. 4, pp. 78-81; Brussels/Rome 1995, p. 216.

¹⁹¹ See p. 6.

¹⁹² Van Mander 1604 (ed. Miedema 1994-1999), vol. 4, p. 78.

¹⁹³ Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Kupferstichkabinett, inv. 79 D2 and 79 D3. See also the facsimile editions from the albums: Hülsen & Egger 1913-1916 and Hülsen & Egger 1913-1916 (ed. 1975).

¹⁹⁴ Some drawings executed in red chalk left an impression on the original previous page of the sketchbook. From the fact that in some cases the associated drawing is absent it has been deduced that the sketchbook is no longer complete. See Veldman 1977a.

¹⁹⁵ Hülsen & Egger 1913-1916 (ed. 1975), vol. 1, p. IV (*Erster Band*). Hülsen and Egger considered fols. 4, 5, 62, 10, 14, 15, 66 and 77 as autographic drawings and rejected fols. 76 and 78. Previous authors rejected the same folios, as well as fol. 77. See Veldman 1977a, p. 106, note 3.

folios in the first album are numbered in a later hand. The pagination begins only at 15 and ends at 83, which means that 14 folios are certainly lost.

Until their first publication in the early 1890s, the 94 folios in the second album were considered autographic drawings by Van Heemskerck. Later scholarship has demonstrated that the greater part of them was done by different other sixteenth century artists. Preibisz in 1911 excluded 37 folios with drawings of ornamental and architectural elements originally belonging to another sketchbook from a group of 27 drawings he attributed to Van Heemskerck.¹⁹⁶ Hülsen and Egger soon thereafter called their slightly different combination of 36 sketchbook-drawings made mainly in Mantua around 1540 the *Mantuaner Skizzenbuch* by 'Anonymus A' and attributed 20 more folios to the same anonymous draughtsman, among which three drawings copied after Van Heemskerck. Furthermore, they reduced the number of Van Heemskerck's drawings in the second album to 20.¹⁹⁷ Another group of four drawings from both albums was later excluded from Maarten van Heemskerck's Roman drawn oeuvre by Ilja Veldman, who called the author of these drawings 'Anonymus B'.¹⁹⁸ Meanwhile, Nicole Dacos has identified the Anonymus A as Herman Posthumus (1512/13-1566/88)¹⁹⁹ and Anonymus B as Michiel Gast (ca. 1515- after 1577).²⁰⁰ Except for one drawing in red chalk and another partly done in black chalk,²⁰¹ all the *vedute* attributed to Van Heemskerck in both albums are executed in pen and brown ink. Unlike some of the drawings in the first album, none of the sketches in the second album are washed.

Maarten van Heemskerck's sketchbook drawings from the first *Berlin album* differ in format and also in character from the other drawings attributed to him present in both albums. The folios of the pocket-sized sketchbook measure approximately 135 x 210 mm. From the small size of the sketchbook, Ilja Veldman has recently concluded that it may be regarded as a unique relic of sixteenth century artistic travelling to Rome and of sixteenth century artistic practice *tout court*.²⁰² In general, Netherlandish draughtsmen in Rome seem to have preferred paper of larger formats. However, as we have demonstrated in the first chapter, much more preserved sixteenth century

¹⁹⁶ Preibisz 1911, pp. 81-82. See Veldman 1977a, p. 107.

¹⁹⁷ Hülsen & Egger 1913-1916 (ed. 1975), vol. 1, pp. III-XIX (*Zweiter Band*). See also Dacos 1989, p. 65, note 9. Hülsen and Egger's schematic overview on p. 74 of the attribution of the drawings in the second album differs in some aspects to the attributions given in the introductory text on pp. III-XIX.

¹⁹⁸ Veldman 1987. Veldman excluded fols. 10r and fol. 15r from the first album and fols. 2r and 7r from the second album. The same author pointed already earlier to the stylistic similarities between these Berlin drawings and two drawings in the collection of the Duke of Devonshire and the Trustees of the Chatsworth Settlement formerly attributed to Van Heemskerck. See Veldman 1977a, p. 113.

¹⁹⁹ Dacos 1985, Dacos 1989.

²⁰⁰ Dacos 1995, pp. 43-51. Nicole Dacos' attribution of the drawings to Michiel Gast is not entirely convincing. See in this respect our master thesis (Ghent University, 2007) '*Alla ricerca di Michiel Gast (ca. 1515- na 1577) & het Vlaamse landschap in Rome*'.

²⁰¹ Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Kupferstichkabinett, inv. 79 D2 fols. 55v, 70r.

²⁰² Veldman 2008, p. 54.

single sheets which belonged to sketchbooks have approximately the same dimensions as Van Heemskerck's Roman sketchbook drawings.²⁰³

The more detailed character of the sketchbook drawings of singular motifs in comparison with the larger, more sketchy drawings representing antique monuments and Roman buildings in their urban context and giving an almost 'finished' impression, according to Veldman argue for the assumption that Van Heemskerck made his first drawings in Rome in the new, locally acquired sketchbook.²⁰⁴ At a later stage, as she continued the line of reasoning convincingly, he seems to have switched over to the loose sheets of paper of a larger format, which probably suited the character of his drawings more.²⁰⁵ In fact, on Maarten van Heemskerck's painted self-portrait preserved in Cambridge (fig. II.42, 1553)²⁰⁶ and the preliminary drawing for the title print of the series *Inventiones Heemskerckianae ex utroque testamento* engraved by Philips Galle in 1569 (figs. II.43-44),²⁰⁷ a draughtsman is represented with a drawing tablet onto which he holds a sheet of paper. Since none of Van Heemskerck's drawings preserved in the *Berlin albums* is dated and the drawings give no evidence of a distinct stylistic evolution, it seems impossible to clear their chronology.²⁰⁸ Furthermore, the quasi unchanged ruinous state of the antique monuments and new St. Peter's basilica almost provide no further clue for the dating. From 1527 on, when the *Sacco di Roma* took place, the construction of the new church was almost closed down, and it was only after Van Heemskerck's return that the work was resumed under the direction of Antonio da Sangallo the Younger (1484-1546).²⁰⁹ In the literature, the state of the new basilica was therefore described as a *Neubauruine*.²¹⁰ Although the documentary research and topographical study of Van Heemskerck's drawings by Franz Graf Wolff Metternich resulted in a dating of several drawings at the end of 1542, Christof Thoenes on the basis of the same archival records

²⁰³ See § 1.2.

²⁰⁴ Veldman 2008, pp. 50-51. Hülsen and Egger have studied the watermarks in the drawings from the *Berlin albums* and concluded that the paper of the sketchbook drawings may well have been made in Italy. The two different watermarks in the sketchbook drawings appear in Briquet as 'Pistoie 1511' (Briquet 6289) and 'Rome 1505' (Briquet 748). See Hülsen & Egger 1913-1916 (ed. 1975), vol. 1, p. V (*Erster Band*).

²⁰⁵ Hülsen and Egger from their thorough topographical study of the sketchbook drawings tentatively concluded that they most probably date from the second half of his Roman stay. See Hülsen & Egger 1913-1916 (ed. 1975), vol. 1, p. IX (*Erster Band*).

²⁰⁶ *Self-portrait*, Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, inv. 103. Oil on panel, 42,2 x 54 cm, signed and dated on the painted cartouche: *Martijn Van he[e]msker/Ao AEtatis sua LV/1553*. See Brussels/Rome 1995, cat. 113.

²⁰⁷ The preliminary drawing and the print are pasted in the first *Berlin album*: Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Kupferstichkabinett, inv. 79 D2 fols. 1r (print); 2r (drawing): pen and brown ink, 153 x 200 mm, signed (in full and monogram) and dated: *M. Heemskerck inventor; 1568*. See Veldman 2008, p. 50.

²⁰⁸ Hülsen and Egger's study of the watermarks in the drawings do not provide a further clue. Among the three different types of identifiable watermarks in Van Heemskerck's loose drawings originating from both albums, two are very similar to the watermarks in the sketchbook (Briquet 6292 and 749) and are referred to as 'Florence 1509-10' and 'Lucques 1548' respectively. The third watermark appears in Briquet as 'Rome 1535' (Briquet 50). See Hülsen & Egger 1913-1916 (ed. 1975), vol. 1.

²⁰⁹ Thoenes 1986.

²¹⁰ *Id.*, p. 483.

has demonstrated that almost all the drawings attributed to Maarten van Heemskerck indeed originated between 1532 and 1536, the period of his stay in Rome.²¹¹

Among the sketchbook folios six drawings have been reassembled as three panoramic views over the city originally covering two pages of the sketchbook (figs. II.45-47).²¹² This way of rendering Rome can be considered absolutely unique in early sixteenth century artistic drawing practice.²¹³ The two large landscape views also seem to prefigure Van Heemskerck's extremely roughly sketched landscapes on the verso of several larger sheets and the contemporary panoramic views attributed to Herman Posthumus in the second *Berlin album*. Remarkably, the sketchbook folios include mainly drawings of (fragments of) antique sculpture, whereas the loose sheets represent almost only antique and contemporary Roman architecture and city and landscape views.

Also in other European drawing cabinets Roman *vedute* from Maarten van Heemskerck are preserved. From the information at our disposal it turns out that they are all executed in pen and brown ink, possibly washed, on larger sheets of paper. Unlike the drawings preserved in the *Berlin albums*,²¹⁴ some of them bear a monogram or (part of) an inscription with his name. In most cases, however, it concerns later additions.²¹⁵ An interesting exception can be found in a large signed and dated drawing representing the *Forum Romanum* (figs. II.48r-v, cf infra).²¹⁶

As mentioned before, Van Heemskerck's Roman drawings for the greater part may be considered as direct sketches made 'from nature'. It seems that he, at least in his sketchbook,

²¹¹ Veldman 1987, pp. 370-371, with reference to Wolff Metternich 1987, Excursus D. Alberto Carlo Carpiceci's 'graphical analysis' (1987) of Van Heemskerck's drawings of the new St. Peter's resulting in a dating ca. 1538 included also drawings which were excluded from his oeuvre by Veldman in the same year. The results of his analysis were not incorporated in later studies on the drawings. See Carpiceci 1987.

²¹² Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Kupferstichkabinett, inv. 79 D2 fols. 6r and 9r, 72v and 18v, 18r and 55r.

²¹³ Veldman 2008, p. 51.

²¹⁴ Except for two drawings from the *Berlin albums* with the same monogram, which Preibisz considered as non autographic. See Preibisz 1911, p. 81; Veldman 1977a, p. 106, note 2.

²¹⁵ See for instance: (1) *Transept of the St. Peter's Church under construction*, Stockholm, Nationalmuseum, Collection Anckarvärd, inv. 637. Pen and brown ink, washed, 200 x 275 mm, signed (monogram) in a later hand: *MHK* (see fig. II.145). The monogram is the same as the one which appears on two drawings attributed to Van Heemskerck in the *Berlin albums* (see note 214). See Krautheimer 1949; Thoenes 1986, fig. 26.

(2) *Ruins of the Septizonium di Severo*, (verso) *Two sketches of landscapes with ruins*, Rome, Gabinetto dei Disegni e delle Stampe, inv. FN 491. Pen and brown ink, (verso) pen and brown ink, 293 x 170 mm, signed on the architrave with brush and brown ink by a later hand (probably on a rubbed out autograph signature): *MARTIN_HEMSKERCK DEH* [= de Haarlem]. See Brussels/Rome 1995, cat. 115.

(3) A last drawing from the collection of late Prof. Dr. Van Regteren Altena shows the inscription 'M' by way of signature on a memorial stone: *Study drawing with Roman sculpture*, (verso) *Fantastic mountainous landscape*, private collection. Pen and brown ink, 204 x 260 mm. See Amsterdam 1995, cat. 1.

²¹⁶ *Forum Romanum seen from the Capitol*, (verso) *Details from the arch of Septimus Severus*, Berlin, Staatliche Museum, Kupferstichkabinett, inv. KdZ 6696. Pen and brown ink, washed with bistre, 216 x 555 mm, signed and dated: *Martijn hemskerck 1535*. See Hülsen & Egger 1913-1916 (ed. 1975), vol. 1, Appendix I-II, vol. 2, plates 125-126.

used a metal point before he executed the actual drawings in pen and brown ink.²¹⁷ Since none of the traces of metal point are visible on the reproductions and we did not have the chance to study the original drawings, it cannot be argued whether the metal point was applied only to set up the drawings in broad outline, or to create a more detailed preliminary drawing. Nonetheless, Van Heemskerck's drawings give such a fresh impression of what could be admired in the city at the time, that it is hard to imagine he may have touched them again in his studio.

Although Maarten van Heemskerck's Roman *vedute* are unanimously regarded as topographically highly accurate and form an important source for our understanding of sixteenth century Rome, Hülsen and Egger have demonstrated that for instance in his view on the *Forum Romanum* from the Palatine hill, he has omitted several modern elements, such as houses, a church built in the Temple of Faustina and the bell towers of the *Ss. Sergio e Bacco* and the *S. Adriano* (fig. II.45).²¹⁸ Also the original distance between the different architectural elements is not always respected. Similarly, on his drawing of the large antique sculptures before the *Palazzo dei Conservatori*, the *Castel Sant' Angelo* and the *Pantheon* in the background seem to be represented too close to each other and isolated from surrounded buildings (fig. II.49).²¹⁹ Van Heemskerck's drawn *vedute* in general give proof also of well-chosen viewpoints and balanced compositions. Two sheets clearly show additional *repoussoir*-elements on the left side of the drawing (figs. II.45, 50).²²⁰ Several other *vedute* of single monuments are characterised by a larger sculptural form in the foreground (figs. II.51-53).²²¹ Remarkably, Van Heemskerck represented the Forum of Nerva (fig. II.54)²²² from a similar angle as the Italian Master of the Escorialensis Codex (fig. II.55), but with the omission of the medieval *Torre dei Conti*. The same viewpoint was later adopted by numerous other northern draughtsman.²²³ Also in the case of two of his drawings of the *Colosseum* (figs. II.56-57)²²⁴ the viewpoint was already chosen by the same anonymous master (fig. II.58),²²⁵ and remained popular with later artists. From this we may deduce that already in Rome an interchange of motifs had taken place. We will further see that also artists in Van Heemskerck's circle adopted the same vantage points.

²¹⁷ Veldman 1977a, p. 107.

²¹⁸ Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Kupferstichkabinett, inv. 79 D2 fols. 6r and 9r. See Hülsen & Egger 1913-1916 (ed. 1975), vol. 1, pp. 5-6 (*Erster Band*); Veldman 2008, p. 52.

²¹⁹ Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Kupferstichkabinett, inv. 79 D2 fol. 45r.

²²⁰ Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Kupferstichkabinett, inv. 79 D2 fol. 6r; inv. 79 D3 fol. 14r.

²²¹ See for instance Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Kupferstichkabinett, inv. 79 D2 fols. 28v, 32r, 36r.

²²² Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Kupferstichkabinett, inv. 79 D3 fol. 37r.

²²³ *Forum of Nerva*, Spain, El Escorial, inv. 28-II-12, fol. 57v (Egger 1905-1906, vol. 2, fol. 57v). See also Horster 1984; Wood Ruby 1999, p. 9.

²²⁴ Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Kupferstichkabinett, inv. 79 D2 fol. 70r; inv. 79 D3 fol. 56v.

²²⁵ *Colosseum*, Spain, El Escorial, inv. 28-II-12, fol. 24v (Egger 1905-1906, vol. 2, fol. 24v). See also Hülsen & Egger 1913-1916 (ed. 1975), vol. 1, p. 36 (*Erster Band*).

When we rely on Preibisz' *catalogue raisonné* of Van Heemskerck's drawings – the artist's drawings in their entirety have not been studied thoroughly since – his Roman sketches appear to occupy an extraordinary place in his drawn oeuvre. In fact, all the extant drawings dating from after his stay in Rome are preparatory designs for prints and to a smaller extent for paintings. Most of them are fully signed and some are dated.²²⁶ In this case, the function of the drawings is abundantly clear. As we have seen, Van Heemskerck's Roman drawings are of a totally different character. The interpretation of this group also has raised more questions. It was considered by Veldman that they could have been commissioned, like Jan Gossaert's Roman drawings. The only possible patron she could associate with the painter's Roman sojourn is cardinal Willem van Enckevoirt from Utrecht (1464-1534), who is possibly the same cardinal whom Van Mander reported Van Heemskerck lodged with in Rome.²²⁷ However, it seems most unlikely that Van Heemskerck's sketches were created on commission. Not only the sketchy character, but also the random selection and arrangement of the drawings counter the hypothesis. The singularity of the little sketchbook drawings, originally bound, also rather argue for personal use. It further has been supposed that Van Heemskerck's Roman *vedute* were intended for sale. The possibility was put forward for instance that he had in mind the preparation of a series of topographical prints.²²⁸ Again good arguments are lacking to prove this hypothesis.

However, since Maarten van Heemskerck's Roman drawings seem to have formed a constant source of inspiration for the setting of his paintings and prints in the course of his further artistic career Veldman assumed that he made the drawings for his own use. There are also other arguments to suppose that Maarten van Heemskerck always preserved his Roman drawings as precious goods. Already in Rome, he had possibly stored his sketches made during his drawing sessions in the city with great care. Van Mander wrote that during his stay in the city an Italian once had stolen his artworks (*'zijn Const'*) out of a chest in his room, which made him 'very upset'. Fortunately, he could recover his possessions.²²⁹ According to Hessel Miedema, we may understand '*Const*' in general as the visual material artists collected as a source of inspiration for

²²⁶ Preibisz 1911, pp. 80-100; Veldman 1977a, p. 110.

²²⁷ Van Mander 1604s, fol. 245v 20-24: *En is doe getrocken nae Room, waer naer hy lange grooten lust hadde gehad, om d'Antijcken, en die groote Meesters van Italien dingen te sien. Daer comende, hadde zijn onderhoudt oft onthouden by een Cardinael, door eenighe recomandatie (...)*. See also Van Mander 1604 (ed. Miedema 1994-1999), vol. 4, p. 78.

²²⁸ Veldman 1977a, p. 110; Van Mander 1604 (ed. Miedema 1994-1999), vol. 4, p. 79.

²²⁹ Van Mander 1604, fol. 245v 28-34: *Gemeenlijck alst moy weder was, gingh hy so conterfeyten. En het is geschiet, doe hy eenmael was tot sulcke gewoone oeffeninghen uytghegaen, dat een Italiaen van zijn kennis gingh sonder Heemskerckens weten op zijn Camer, daer hy in wist te comen, sneedt twee doecken van de ramen, die hy mede nam, oock zijn Const uyt de kisten. Marten t'huys comende was seer bedroeft: maer also men vermoeden op den selven hadde, is Marten daer ghegaen, en creegh meest al zijn dinghen weder (...)*.

their inventions.²³⁰ We cannot decide from the fragment however if the 'Const' concerned work of Van Heemskerck himself alone, let alone if his Roman drawings were stored in the chest.

After his return to the Netherlands, Maarten van Heemskerck most probably kept the drawings with him until his death. It has been assumed that Van Heemskerck's small Roman sketchbook after his death came in the possession of his friend and former pupil Jacob Rauwaert. We know from Van Mander's *Schilder-boeck* that he owned many of Van Heemskerck's works and that he was one of the trustees of the painter's estate. The art dealer and collector Rauwaert also was one of Van Mander's sources for his description of the life of Van Heemskerck, which may be considered most reliable.²³¹ Cornelis Cornelisz. van Haarlem (1562-1638) later must have acquired the sketchbook from Rauwaert. In his will of 1636 the following was noted: 'The excellently drawn little book of Mr. Maertyn Heemskerck, after all the finest antiquities of Rome'.²³² The next owner of the sketchbook and at least part of the other drawings from the *Berlin albums* was Pieter Saenredam (1597-1665). Saenredam included several motifs from Van Heemskerck's and other drawings now in the Berlin albums in his paintings from 1629 on.²³³ We know further from an advertisement of the auction of his estate from 1667 that he likely kept the drawings till his death: 'many drawings by Maarten Heemskerck and J.J. Guldewagen and others, done from life, in Italy and elsewhere'.²³⁴

Other elements inherent to the drawings support the assumption that Van Heemskerck had preserved the drawings for own artistic purposes. Veldman has mentioned the brief annotations which appear on several drawings and the recurrence of different motifs in various techniques on the same pages.²³⁵ To this we could add that in contrast with Van Heemskerck's other drawings, he seems to have signed his Roman drawings only exceptionally. Apparently he did not feel the need to affirm his authorship. As we have mentioned before, his use of a small sketchbook also rather indicates that the drawings were intended for personal use.

Since Maarten van Heemskerck returned back from Italy, he quasi invariably used his Roman *vedute* as a source of inspiration for the staffage in numerous paintings and prints. The work which in this respect stands out most is the already mentioned self-portrait of 1553, on which the

²³⁰ Miedema 1988, pp. 73-74; Van Mander 1604 (ed. Miedema 1994-1999), vol. 4, p. 79.

²³¹ Veldman 1977b, p. 11. See for the figure of Jacob Rauwaert also Van Mander 1604 (ed. Miedema 1994-1999), vol. 1, pp. 69-70.

²³² Veldman 1977a, p. 111, note 34: *Het treffelyck getekent boeckie van Mr. Maertyn Heemskerck nae alle de fraiste antique van Roma.*

²³³ Ibid.

²³⁴ Veldman 1977a, pp. 111-112, note 40: (...) *vele teekeningen van Marten Heemskerck en J.J. Guldewagen en andere van haar, na 't leven, in Italien als anders gedaen.*

²³⁵ Id., p. 110.

artist represented himself before a ‘painting’ of the *Colosseum* (fig. II.42).²³⁶ In the second ‘painting’, Van Heemskerck depicted an artist unambiguously drawing the pre-eminently antique monument ‘from life’, like he used to do twenty years earlier. In this way he seemed to express his pride about the privilege he had enjoyed of drawing the antique remains in Rome. Van Heemskerck during his years in Rome drew the *Colosseum* several times.²³⁷ The drawings which come close to the monument depicted in the self-portrait are to be found in a sketchbook drawing from the first *Berlin album* and another preserved in the second album (figs. II.56-57).²³⁸ Like the second drawing shows, the *Colosseum* is faithfully depicted as it could be seen from ‘inside’ the nearby Arch of Constantine. Unlike Gossaert’s drawing, which rather gives proof of his patron’s archaeological interest, Van Heemskerck’s sketches do not represent the monument in every detail. Although his painted version noticeably follows the drawings referred to, the *Colosseum* appears as a compact volume stripped of unnecessary gear.

As has been demonstrated, Van Heemskerck also on other occasions depicted the *Colosseum*. In the painting *St Jerome in a landscape with ruins* (1547)²³⁹ of which Hieronymus Cock made a print in 1552 (figs. II.59-60),²⁴⁰ it appears in a fantastic landscape between other ruins derived from Roman examples. Another painting shows the *Colosseum* as a setting for a bullfight (1552).²⁴¹ A print of the same composition was made by Jan or Lucas van Duetecum (figs. II.61-62).²⁴² Remarkably, Van Heemskerck represented the *Colosseum* in these paintings and prints in a more ruinous state than it was at the time he stayed in Rome and even more than today. This is also the case in other prints, as in the series with the *Wonders of the world* engraved by Philips Galle in 1572, in which Van Heemskerck included the *Colosseum* as the eight Wonder of the World.²⁴³

²³⁶ See note 206. See also Grosshans 1980, cat. 79. We did not have the chance to consult J.C. Harrison’s more recent dissertation on Van Heemskerck’s painted work (cf J.C. Harrison, *The paintings of Maerten van Heemskerck. A catalogue raisonné* (diss. University of Virginia 1992), 2 vols., Ann Arbor 1988).

²³⁷ One of Van Heemskerck’s drawings of the Colosseum is preserved in the *Landesmuseum* in Darmstadt and shows the inner side of the monument (see Hülsen 1927, pp. 84-85, fig. 1). Other drawings can be found in the two *Berlin albums*: Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Kupferstichkabinett, inv. 79 D2 fols. 3r, 11r, 28v, 69r, 69v, 70r; inv. 79 D3 fols. 55r, 56v.

²³⁸ Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Kupferstichkabinett, inv. 79 D2 fol. 70r; inv. 79 D3 fol. 56v.

²³⁹ Vienna and Vaduz, Sammlungen des Fürsten von und zu Liechtenstein, inv. GE 2404. Oil on panel, 105 x 161 cm, signed and dated: *Martinus Heemskerck fecit 1547*. See Grosshans 1980, cat. 57 (as Vienna, Sammlung Graf Schönborn-Buchheim, nr. 115); Vienna 2007-2008, cat. 1.

²⁴⁰ Veldman 1993-1994, vol. 2, no. 588.

²⁴¹ *Bullfight in the ruins of an amphitheatre*, Lille, Palais des Beaux-Arts, inv. P 819. Oil on panel, 75 x 121 cm, signed and dated: *1552 Martinus va(n) Heemskerck*. See Grosshans 1980, cat. 78; Vienna 2007-2008, cat. 2.

²⁴² Veldman 1993-1994, vol. 2, no. 590.

²⁴³ Id., vol. 2, no. 520. Buildings reminiscent of the Colosseum appear also in other prints designed by Maerten van Heemskerck. See Veldman 1993-1994, vol. 1, no. 138 (*Elisha receiving Elijah’s mantle*, engraved by Philips Galle, 1571); vol. 2, no. 455 (*The dangers of human ambition*, engraved by Dirck Volkertsz. Coornhert, 1549), no. 494 (*The triumph of fame* from the series *The triumph of Petrarch*, engraved by Philips Galle, ca. 1565).

The preliminary drawing for the print is preserved in the *Louvre* and shows the outside of the monument as in the print with the three superposed orders of architecture (figs. II.63-64).²⁴⁴

Also in numerous other paintings and prints Maarten van Heemskerck reworked in a highly imaginative way what he had seen and drawn in Rome. The most extraordinary example is surely his large painting of a *Landscape with the abduction of Helena* which was made during his stay in Rome and was most probably commissioned by an Italian patron (fig. II.65, 1535-1536).²⁴⁵ Although the coastal city depicted is a figment of the painter's imagination, several ruins and buildings were inspired by Roman monuments, such as the pyramid of Caius Sextus, the *Ponte Sant' Angelo* and the columns of Trajan and Marcus Aurelius. In two other paintings a recognisable, but fanciful view of Rome is used as a setting for an Old Testament and mythological representation (figs. II.66-67).²⁴⁶ Both paintings in the foreground show the recovery of an antique statue of Jupiter, an event Van Heemskerck may have heard of during his time in Rome. The statue depicted has been recognised as the one which was present in the Villa Madama through a drawing in Van Heemskerck's sketchbook. It was found already in 1525 near the *Porta del Popolo* (fig. II.68).²⁴⁷ The number of designs for prints in which Van Heemskerck introduced the antique world is certainly too high to mention all of them. Some important examples with Biblical subjects are prints such as *Balaam and the angel* (fig. II.69, 1554), *The story of Ruth and Boaz* (fig. II.70, 1550) and the prints of the series *The disasters of the Jewish people* (1569), in which the story takes place in (ruinous) landscapes scattered with ancient buildings reminiscent of what he had observed in Rome.²⁴⁸

These paintings and prints show that Maarten van Heemskerck used his Roman *vedute* back home as a fund of motifs he could draw from to stimulate his 'inventions'. Although many 'classical' elements in his paintings and prints are clearly reminiscent of what can be found in his preserved

²⁴⁴ Paris, Musée du Louvre, Cabinet des Arts Graphiques, inv. RF 36729. Pen and brown ink, 203 x 267 mm, signed and dated: *Martyn Van Heemskerck/Inventor et Fecit, 1570*.

²⁴⁵ Baltimore, The Walters Art Gallery, inv. 656. Oil on canvas, 147,4 x 383,8 cm, signed and dated two times: *MHF[ecit] 1535; MARTIN VAN HEEMSKERCK 1536*. See Grosshans 1980, cat. 19; Amsterdam 1986, vol. 2, cat. 104, p. 223.

²⁴⁶ *Landscape with the Good Samaritan*, Haarlem, Frans Halsmuseum, inv. 156. Oil on panel, 71,5 x 97 cm, ca. 1550; *Landscape with a view of Rome*, current whereabouts unknown (formerly private collection O. Fischel, Vienna, 1914; private collection Rudolf Illner, Wien, 1919). Oil on panel, transferred to canvas, 125 x 190 cm, ca. 1550. See Grosshans 1980, cats. 58-59; on-line database RKD Images: <http://www.rkd.nl/rkd/b/vlhrv1b3imsgb555bpcwlgne/detail.aspx?parentprifef=>, last consulted August 2009. The inventory number of the first painting indicated on the on-line database of the *Frans Halsmuseum* (inv. os I-142) differs from the one given by Grosshans.

²⁴⁷ Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Kupferstichkabinett, inv. 79 D2 fol. 46r. See Grosshans 1980, cats. 56, 58, pp. 178-179.

²⁴⁸ Veldman 1993-1994, vol. 1, respectively nos. 77 (etched and engraved by Dirck Volkertsz. Coornhert), 91 (etched by Dirck Volkertsz. Coornhert), 237-258 (engraved by Philips Galle).

Roman drawings, hardly any of the motifs were directly copied from them.²⁴⁹ The faithful copy of the *Colosseum* in his only painted self-portrait therefore stands out.

As we have seen, Van Heemskerck represented the *Colosseum* in paintings and prints also in a more ruinous state than he had observed and drawn it during his stay in Rome. Furthermore, in different views made in Rome on the spot, he has omitted ‘modern’ architecture and concentrated on the antique (ruined) monuments. From this we can conclude that Van Heemskerck had a deep fascination for the ruined state.²⁵⁰ In fact, his drawings of the newly erected St. Peter’s basilica, which at the time of his Roman sojourn was reduced to a ‘*Neubauruine*’, are the only ones showing contemporary architecture. Apparently Van Heemskerck preferred to reinvent the original antique Roman monuments and buildings he had drawn in Rome in prints and paintings rather than to rely on the derived renaissance architecture he had seen in the city. A rare example of an architectural setting reminiscent of Roman renaissance architecture can be recognised in a print representing the *Adoration of the Magi* from the series *The disasters of the Jewish people*, engraved by Philips Galle in 1569 (fig. II.71). The Adoration takes place in fantastic architecture based on Bramante’s famous spiral staircase in the Belvedere Palace and is represented in a ruinous state.²⁵¹ The architecture cannot be linked to any of Van Heemskerck’s left drawings.

Next to the architectural motifs in Maarten van Heemskerck’s paintings and prints, also the landscape derives from what he had observed and drawn in Rome and its *campagna*. On some of the versos of the larger sheets preserved in the second *Berlin album* roughly sketched landscape impressions can be found (figs. II.72-75).²⁵² Van Heemskerck seems to have exercised in this way the depiction of the Roman countryside, the dreamed setting for his later works. Interestingly, two other drawings with antique sculpture and architecture which most probably originated in Rome on the back show imaginative landscapes scattered with (invented) ruins (figs. II.76r-v, 77r-v).²⁵³ These drawings also seem to prefigure Van Heemskerck’s intentions to disassociate

²⁴⁹ Veldman 2008, pp. 53-54.

²⁵⁰ See in this respect Thoenes 1986, p. 486: *Worum es ging, war letztlich das Motiv der Zerstörung – es sind eben ‘cose disfacte’, und genau dies war es, was die Nordländer frappte, und was sie ohne Zweifel auch suchten.*

²⁵¹ Grosshans 1980, p. 39; Thoenes 1986, p. 485.

²⁵² See for instance Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Kupferstichkabinett, inv. 79 D3, fol. 21v, 40v, 45v, 51v.

²⁵³ (1) *Study drawing with Roman sculpture*, (verso) *Fantastic mountainous landscape*, private collection. Pen and brown ink, 204 x 260 mm. For the rock mass in the landscape on the verso, Van Heemskerck seems to have been inspired by Jan van Scorel’s representation of the mountain cave of Sainte-Baume in his painting of Maria Magdalen now in the Rijksmuseum. See Amsterdam 1995, cat. 1, p. 25; on-line publication *Early Netherlandish paintings in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam. Volume I – Artists born before 1500*: <http://www.rijksmuseum.nl/collectie/zoeken/asset.jsp?id=SK-A-372&lang=nl>, last consulted August 2009;

(2) *Ruins of the Septizonium di Severo*, (verso) *Two sketches of landscapes with ruins*, Rome, Gabinetto dei Disegni e delle Stampe, inv. FN 491. Pen and brown ink, 293 x 170 mm, signed on the architrave with brush and brown ink in a later

himself from the literal citation of what he had drawn in the city. His painting then of a *Landscape with the abduction of Helena*,²⁵⁴ which originated when he was still in Rome, appears as the result of the digestion of his faithful sketches of antique remains and the Roman *campagna* through drawings in which he incorporated the material already in a fanciful way. It becomes apparent from these drawings how closely working 'uyt den gheest' was involved with the act of designing a landscape.

One particular motif Van Heemskerck had drawn in Rome, he reworked back home in a surprisingly original way. For the grave of his father Jacob Willemsz. van Veen (1456-1535) in the Heemskerck churchyard he designed a memorial shaped like an obelisk, which was erected in 1570 (fig. II.78).²⁵⁵ The funeral monument is the earliest of this type in the Netherlands and is certainly based on the obelisks he had seen and drawn in Rome. In several of his drawings from the *Berlin albums* obelisks are included. Yet, the design of the monument seems to derive from the invented obelisk represented in the background of Van Heemskerck's drawn design for the title print of the series *Inventiones Heemskerckianae ex utroque testamento*, engraved by Philips Galle in 1569 (fig. II.43-44).²⁵⁶

Certainly one drawing, however, seems to have served another purpose than the careful documentation of the antique remains for the painter's own use. It concerns the aforementioned large drawing of the *Forum Romanum* seen from the Capitol Hill, which is fully signed and dated 'martijn/hemskeric/1535' on the right sidewall of the basilica *SS. Sergio e Bacco* (fig. II.48r).²⁵⁷ Since Van Heemskerck apparently did not feel the need to affirm his authorship on his Roman drawings, the signature may suggest that the drawing was commissioned, intended as a gift or made in preparation for a print. The format of the drawing, the degree of finish and meticulousness, and the extremely balanced composition lend support to our hypothesis. Maybe our last assumption is less plausible, since Van Heemskerck in most cases signed preparatory drawings for prints in a different way, with the addition 'inventor' to his name.²⁵⁸ In contrast with his sketchbook drawing of the forum, in this view medieval buildings are carefully included.²⁵⁹ Another example which may be considered as being made for similar reasons is a large signed

hand (probably on a rubbed out autograph signature): *MARTIN_HEMSKERCK DEH* [= de Haarlem]. On one of both landscape sketches on the verso, Van Heemskerck seems to have integrated a rough version of the ruin of the *Septizonium di Severo* drawn on the reverse side. See 's-Hertogenbosch/Rome 1992-1993, cat. 1.

²⁵⁴ See note 245.

²⁵⁵ Veldman 1977b, § 8.

²⁵⁶ See note 207.

²⁵⁷ See note 216.

²⁵⁸ See Preibisz 1911, pp. 82-100.

²⁵⁹ See note 218.

drawing representing the *Ruins of the Septizonium di Severo* (fig. II.77r).²⁶⁰ As Ilja Veldman has supposed, the inscription on the architrave in another hand 'MARTIN.HEMSKERCK DEH' may have been written on a rubbed out autograph signature. No other drawings of this 'category' seem to have been preserved.

If Maarten van Heemskerck indeed kept at least the greater part of his Roman drawings with him in Rome and after his return to Haarlem, other artists among his acquaintances and pupils may have had the chance to study them. As we have mentioned in the first chapter, copying drawings was part of the learning process for apprentices in the workshop at the time.²⁶¹ Yet, it is not known how Van Heemskerck felt about other artists consulting his Roman drawings. In any case he must have attached great value to them. From a fragment of a contract made in Rome on 2 November 1538 between Michiel Gast and the northern painter Laurens van Rotterdam, Hessel Miedema has deduced that Gast was mainly concerned with the copying of Van Rotterdam's Roman drawings available in his workshop. Laurens van Rotterdam apparently placed his drawings without restraint at his disposal. This interpretation however again is based on Miedema's rather strict interpretation of the term 'Const' in sixteenth century writings.²⁶² Some decades later, Paul Bril at the death of his brother Matthijs (1550-1583) inherited his drawings, among which his Roman *vedute*, and made them available for the many Netherlandish artists who came round or worked for a longer time in his workshop in Rome.²⁶³ From these examples we may conclude that it was not unusual to provide other artists with one's Roman drawings for study purposes.

It can further be concluded from reminiscences of Van Heemskerck's Roman drawings in other artists' work that they indeed must have been available to them, or at least to a certain extent. One of his Roman *vedute* with mostly unidentified ruins on both sides even shows evidence of the practice of copying, most probably performed by another artist (figs. II.79r-v).²⁶⁴ Part of the ruins depicted on both sides of the drawing have been incised for the purpose of transferring the composition in another drawing or print. However no drawings nor prints with the same

²⁶⁰ See note 253, no. 2.

²⁶¹ See § 1.2.

²⁶² Miedema 1988, p. 74: *voort alles wat hy [Laurens van Rotterdam] van consten heeft, dat sal hy hem [Michiel Gast] laten conterfeyten*. Miedema's description of Michiel Gast as a pupil is not entirely correct. Most probably he already had a certain artistic experience when he was appointed in Laurens van Rotterdam's workshop. See in this respect our master thesis (Ghent University, 2007) '*Alla ricerca di Michiel Gast (ca. 1515 – na 1577) & het Vlaamse landschap in Rome*', pp. 16-17.

²⁶³ Wood Ruby 1999, p. 11. See also § II.4, II.5.

²⁶⁴ *Study sheet with Roman ruins on both sides*, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, Rijksprentenkabinet, inv. RP-T-2008-93. Pen and brown ink, outlines partially indented for transfer, 187 x 282 mm. See Amsterdam 1995, cat. 2; Schapelhauman & Scholten 2009, no. 1, pp. 89-90.

representations have come to light so far. A more general remark we must make here is that several drawings from other (anonymous) authors in the *Berlin albums* stylistically bear resemblance to Van Heemskerck's Roman drawings. This is also the reason that most of the drawings from both albums were formerly attributed to him. Furthermore, several drawings recently attributed to Michiel Gast and dated around 1538-1543 were made of the same monuments, and from very close viewpoints. This is the case with a drawing of the narthex of the *Pantheon* in the second *Berlin album* (fig. II.80, compare with Van Heemskerck's drawing fig. II.81), and his views on the *Forum Romanum* (fig. II.82, compare with Van Heemskerck's drawing fig. II.48r) and the entrance hall of the old St. Peter's basilica and the Vatican palace from the collection of the Duke of Devonshire in Chatsworth (fig. II.83, compare with Van Heemskerck's drawing fig. II.84).²⁶⁵ The first drawing, like the three other sketches of the same hand in the *Berlin albums*, measures ca. 130 x 200 mm. This format corresponds more or less to the preserved sketchbook drawings from Maarten van Heemskerck, which may indicate that they belonged to a similar little sketchbook.²⁶⁶

Several artists have been thought to have copied Maarten van Heemskerck's Roman drawings. As we have seen before, the greater part of the drawings in the second *Berlin album* (56 folios of 94) are now attributed to Herman Posthumus.²⁶⁷ Among the group of drawings which Hülsen and Egger had recognised as from the same hand as the then still anonymous author of the *Mantuaner Skizzenbuch*, they considered several drawings as copies after Maarten van Heemskerck. An extremely faithful copy was made after the earlier referred to signed and dated drawing of the *Forum Romanum* (fig. II.48r).²⁶⁸ Because the watermark of the copy must date from around 1576,²⁶⁹ we can conclude now that the drawing originated long after Herman Posthumus' stay in Rome, maybe even after Van Heemskerck's death.²⁷⁰ Two other drawings present in the

²⁶⁵ See for the drawings attributed to Michiel Gast respectively: Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Kupferstichkabinett, inv. 79 D3, fol. 2r. Pen and ink, 134 x 197 mm; Chatsworth, The Duke of Devonshire and the Chatsworth Settlement Trustees, inv. 839A. Pen and brown ink, 158 x 227 mm; Id., inv. 839B. Pen and brown ink, 158 x 227 mm. See for Maarten van Heemskerck's drawings respectively: Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Kupferstichkabinett, inv. 79 D3, fol. 39r; Id., inv. KdZ 6696. Pen and brown ink, washed with bistre, 216 x 555 mm, signed and dated: *Martijn hemskeric 1535*; Vienna, Graphische Sammlung Albertina, inv. 31681. Pen and brown ink, 275 x 620 mm.

²⁶⁶ See § 1.2., note 83.

²⁶⁷ See p. 38.

²⁶⁸ Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Kupferstichkabinett, inv 79 D3, fol. 79v-80r. Pen and brown ink, washed, 236 x 544 mm. See for Maarten van Heemskerck's drawing note 216.

²⁶⁹ Hülsen & Egger 1913-1916 (ed. 1975), vol. 1, p. VII (*Erster Band*).

²⁷⁰ Documentary evidence has shown that Herman Posthumus was probably in Rome between 1536 and 1538. After a stay in Landshut, he was documented again in the Netherlands (Amsterdam) in 1549, 1553 and 1566 (see Brussels/Rome 1995, p. 283). Furthermore, a panoramic view on Rome in the second *Berlin album* attributed to him is dated 1536 (Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Kupferstichkabinett, inv. 79 D3 fols. 91v-92r). Supposedly the date of the watermark was also a reason for which Herman Posthumus (already identified in 1989 by Nicole Dacos as the Anonymus A from the *Berlin albums*) was not referred to as the author of the drawing in the exhibition catalogue *Fiamminghi a Roma* (see Brussels/Rome 1995, cat. 116, p. 223). Dacos in her article did not mention the watermark and attributed the drawing to Posthumus. She also

second *Berlin album* were dated by Hülsen and Egger around the same time on stylistic grounds and described as copies after lost drawings by Van Heemskerck (figs. II.85-86).²⁷¹ A last drawing with the *Colosseum* and a view on the southern part of the Palatine on the verso (fig. II.108b) was considered too weak to be done by Van Heemskerck and was therefore also called a copy after a lost drawing.²⁷² No further evidence was found to prove these hypotheses.

Another artist of whom it was argued that he relied on Maarten van Heemskerck's Roman *vedute* for the design of prints with Roman ruins, is Hieronymus Cock.²⁷³ Several authors even have postulated that Cock copied Maarten van Heemskerck's drawings in prints.²⁷⁴ Besides, several drawings from the second *Berlin album* now attributed to Herman Posthumus have also been associated with Cock's etchings of Roman ruins. Because of the complexity of the borrowings from other masters in the series of prints with Roman ruins Hieronymus Cock issued in 1551 and 1561 and of the artistic importance of the series, we will devote the following case study to the artist.

A third case of borrowing from Maarten van Heemskerck's Roman drawings was found in several drawings from a unique sketchbook in the collection of the *Rijksprentenkabinet* in Amsterdam.²⁷⁵ The small oblong sketchbook measures 145 x 225 mm and consists of twelve folios with drawings on both sides. It was formerly attributed to Maarten de Vos (1532-1603) on the basis of an inscription on the title page which was added at a later stage, when the volume was rebound (fig. II.87).²⁷⁶ This attribution was first questioned by M.L.L. Netto-Bol on the occasion of her publication about the sketchbook in 1976. Since then, the author has remained

considered the original drawing as a copy after Van Heemskerck (see Dacos 1989, p. 66, note 14). The latter drawing however has been generally acknowledged as an autograph drawing by Van Heemskerck (see for instance Amsterdam 1986, cat. 101; Brussels/Rome 1995, cat. 116; The Hague 2006, cat. 21).

²⁷¹ Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Kupferstichkabinett, inv. 79 D3 fols. 52r, 53r. In the Sir John Soane's Museum in London a drawing is preserved with the same composition as fol. 52r (see Fairbairn 1998, vol. 1, cat. 316, as anonymous eighteenth century English (?) draughtsman, after Marten van Heemskerck). Both drawings are considered to be copies after a lost original by Van Heemskerck. See Hülsen & Egger 1913-1916 (ed. 1975), vol. 1, p. VII (*Erster Band*); Egger 1911-1931, vol. 1, pp. 26-27, fig. 30; Veldman 1987, p. 372.

²⁷² Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Kupferstichkabinett, inv. 79 D3 47r-v. See Hülsen & Egger 1913-1916 (ed. 1975), vol. 1, p. VII (*Erster Band*).

²⁷³ Hülsen and Egger were the first authors to point to the similarities between Van Heemskerck's drawings and Cock's series of prints with Roman ruins. See Hülsen & Egger 1913-1916 (ed. 1975); Riggs 1977; Veldman 1977a; Bakker 2007-2008.

²⁷⁴ Hülsen and Egger 1913-1916 (ed. 1975), vol. 1, p. 34 (*Zweiter Band*); Netto-Bol 1975, without pages, note 10; Netto-Bol 1976, pp. 8, notes 23, 46; Wood Ruby 1999, p. 9, note 73.

²⁷⁵ Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, Rijksprentenkabinet, inv. 1935, A 45.

²⁷⁶ The inscription on the title page is the following: *Vier en Twintigh Stuks/ Studien, na de Antieken. met de Pen./geteekent enz. In, en Buijten Roomen./door den grooten Meester M. De Vos. van/ Antwerpen.* At the moment the volume was rebound, blue interleaves were added between the folios. The study of the watermark in the interleaves has shown that they were used in the Netherlands in the seventeenth century. See Netto-Bol 1976, p. 7.

anonymous.²⁷⁷ The sketchbook drawings, dated around 1560 on stylistic grounds, show different kinds of Roman motifs among which antique sculpture, architecture and landscapes. They are all executed in pen and brown ink and sometimes washed in colour. At the time Netto-Bol studied them, an underdrawing in grey black chalk was still visible in most drawings.²⁷⁸ From the misinterpretations and errors in the rather weak drawings and the spread of motifs from single objects throughout the volume, the same author concluded that the sketchbook may be considered as a volume of copies and not as a travel sketchbook.²⁷⁹ Furthermore, two drawings representing the southern transept of the new St. Peter's basilica (fig. II.88) and the statuary group of Hercules and Antaneus (fig. II.90) seem to derive directly from drawings by Maarten van Heemskerck present in the *Berlin albums* (see respectively figs. II.89, 91).²⁸⁰ In addition to this, a lot of other drawings from the sketchbook represent the same motifs as in Van Heemskerck's drawings, sometimes drawn from a close angle.²⁸¹ Since Netto-Bol could not link the greater deal of the drawn objects with other sixteenth century drawings than Van Heemskerck's and concluded that the original drawings must have made in Rome in the 1530s, she assumed that the anonymous draughtsman copied lost drawings by Maarten van Heemskerck.²⁸²

We would like to add to this that the case of Maarten van Heemskerck's Roman drawings is an exception in the sense that a large amount of them is still preserved. In general, other contemporary artists have left far less drawn traces of their Roman sojourn. This partly takes the edge of the argument that the objects represented in the sketchbook are almost absent in contemporary drawings, the more so since it turns out that already around Van Heemskerck's stay in Rome it was common practice to represent the same locations and monuments. Therefore, it is not totally inconceivable that the anonymous draughtsman had based himself also on drawings from other artists. Most probably, the author of the sketchbook was a pupil who copied other artists' drawings by way of practice. His drawing technique can to a certain extent be compared to Van Heemskerck's Roman sketchbook drawings. However, it seems that the draughtsman was more out to practice a language of forms than adapting a certain style. The coloured washes used by the anonymous artist do appear in Van Heemskerck's architecture drawings preserved in the first *Berlin album* but became more prevalent in Netherlandish artists' Roman *vedute* only later in the century.²⁸³ Since we have assumed that Maarten van Heemskerck kept his Roman sketches with him his entire life, the drawings from the sketchbook likely

²⁷⁷ Netto-Bol 1976, pp. 9-10; Veldman 2008, p. 54.

²⁷⁸ Netto-Bol 1976, p. 7.

²⁷⁹ Id., p. 8.

²⁸⁰ Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Kupferstichkabinett, inv. 79 D3, fol. 54r; 79 D2 fol. 59r. See Netto-Bol 1976, p. 7.

²⁸¹ Id., pp. 7-61.

²⁸² Id., pp. 9-10.

²⁸³ See for the use of coloured washes in northern Roman *vedute* Meijer 1999, p. 8.

originated in his workshop. The draughtsman may have encountered drawings of other artists in the same environment.²⁸⁴ Another remark we can make is that the apprentice apparently thought that it was useful to preserve his copied drawings in a durable and easily consultable small bound sketchbook. We may conclude from this that he made the drawings maybe not only as an exercise to train the hand but probably with a clear purpose in mind.

As we have mentioned, Netto-Bol dated the sketchbook drawings around 1560 on stylistic grounds. This date is based on her comparison of two folios from the sketchbook with two landscapes from the circle of Jan van Scorel.²⁸⁵ Since the group of drawings attributed to Van Scorel and his followers has not been studied thoroughly and to date raises questions, her argumentation seems to lack a solid basis.²⁸⁶ We can now only assume that the sketchbook drawings originated after Van Heemskerck's return to the Netherlands ca. 1536-1537.

At the end of our analysis of Maarten van Heemskerck's Roman drawings and the ways in which he reworked them, we can make some conclusions which can clarify our view on the origin and artistic use of the drawings as a reference for later northern artists.

In the first place, several characteristics of later northern artists' drawings made 'from nature' in Rome seem to originate from Maarten van Heemskerck's Roman sketches.²⁸⁷ As Van Mander reported, the artist during his stay in the city spent a lot of time in the open air to copy things from the wealth of antique remains. Beside his drawings of fragmentary antique sculpture and architecture, also city views and pure landscape sketches are preserved. In fact, Van Heemskerck was the first northern artist who represented the Roman ruins in their urban context, and of which we can ascertain that he left the walled town to draw his panoramic views on the city and the Roman *campagna*.²⁸⁸ His drawings of the antique *Tempio della Sibilla* and the waterfalls at Tivoli (fig. II.72) preserved in the *Berlin albums* for instance bear testimony to this.²⁸⁹ Northern artists of later generations would also leave the densely populated city centre to go drawing in the Roman *campagna*. Around the turn of the century, northern artists such as Gerard I ter Borch (1582/83- 1662) and Willem II van Nieulandt (1584-1635) apparently became interested in the

²⁸⁴ See also § II.4.

²⁸⁵ Netto-Bol 1976, p. 10, note 45, with reference to Boon 1955.

²⁸⁶ See § II.2., notes 149-150.

²⁸⁷ See in this respect also Prof. Dr. Em. Meijer's general remarks about northern artists' Roman drawings in the second half of the sixteenth century (Meijer 1999, p. 8, with reference to Brussels/Roma 1995).

²⁸⁸ See in this respect also our paper 'Vedute and landscape drawings from Dutch and Flemish artists in Rome and *campagna* (ca. 1500-1650). Study about the places Dutch and Flemish artists have visited and drawn in and around Rome during their stay in the Eternal City' (Utrecht University, 2008).

²⁸⁹ Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Kupferstichkabinett, inv. 79 D3 fol. 21r-v.

more trivial aspects of the ‘modern’ city (figs. II.92-93).²⁹⁰ An early example of this tendency can be found in Pieter Bruegel the Elder’s (ca. 1525-1569) *View on the Ripa Grande* (fig. II.94, ca. 1552-1554).²⁹¹ In the second half of the century, *vedute* of certain areas and locations in the city became more numerous, and other Netherlandish artists would represent the same monuments from the same viewpoints.²⁹² This is a practice we already encounter in Van Heemskerck’s circle. Moreover, Van Heemskerck himself must have been in contact with other artists’ Roman drawings, from which he adopted a sensitivity for the representation of certain places. When it concerns Van Heemskerck’s drawing technique, the use of pen and ink in combination with coloured washes was also applied in later northern artists’ Roman drawings. His Roman nature drawings show his interest in the meticulous, quasi archaeological documentation of motifs and forms, but also a preference for rendering the slanted landscape of the Roman *‘disabitata’*. We have further mentioned the spontaneous character of the drawings, which contrast evidently with the only preserved Roman drawings of an earlier northern artist who had visited the city, Jan Gossaert.

A second conclusion can be drawn from Van Heemskerck’s storing and making use of his Roman sketches. As we have remarked earlier, it is quite unusual that so many of his drawings done ‘from nature’ are still preserved. Working drawings at least from the sixteenth century did not come down to us in large numbers.²⁹³ Since the selection process which took place over the past centuries is something we can only rarely gain some understanding of, this cannot be explained easily. However, as we have noted in the first chapter, there are indications that as early as the sixteenth century, beside autonomous drawings, rough sketches and study drawings were already appreciated by early collectors.²⁹⁴

When it concerns the scarcely preserved Roman drawings ‘from nature’ of other contemporary and later northern artists, an explanation has been found in Van Mander’s writings.²⁹⁵ In fact, in the first chapter of *Den Grondt* Van Mander reminded artists not to return ‘empty-handed’

²⁹⁰ Gerard I ter Borch, *View of Via Panisperna looking towards Sta Maria Maggiore in Rome*, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, Rijksprentenkabinet, inv. RP-T-1886-A-870. Pen and brown ink, 247 x 197 mm, signed and dated: *G.T.Borch.F.in Roma Anno 1609* (Kettering 1988, vol. 1, cat. GSr 11; Amsterdam 2001, p. 51, fig. B); Willem II van Nieulandt, *View on the Quirinal in Rome*, Brunswick, Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum, inv. Z 1272. Pen and brown ink, washed in brown, grey and blue, 274 x 434 mm, inscribed and dated: *palatso de.../ monte cavael.../In Roma al.../ 17 oktober 16...* (Amsterdam 2001, p. 39, fig. C).

²⁹¹ Chatsworth, The Duke of Devonshire and the Chatsworth Settlement Trustees, inv. 841. Pen and two different brown inks, 208 x 283 mm. See Brussels/Rome 1995, cat. 39. See in this respect also our paper ‘*Vedute* and landscape drawings from Dutch and Flemish artists in Rome and *campagna* (ca. 1500-1650). Study about the places Dutch and Flemish artists have visited and drawn in and around Rome during their stay in the Eternal City’ (Utrecht University, 2008).

²⁹² See also § II.5.

²⁹³ See for instance Robinson & Wolff 1986-1987, p. 25.

²⁹⁴ See § I.2., p. 19, note 97.

²⁹⁵ Veldman 2008, p. 54, note 18.

(*'ledich'*) from Rome.²⁹⁶ Rather than bringing their Roman drawings with them upon their return home, he herewith urged artists to bring 'in the bosom' (*'in den boesem'*) or to cherish the memory of all things they had seen.²⁹⁷ The artistic practice of copying 'from nature' as a sort of mental nourishment is closely connected with Van Mander's explicit suggestion for prospective as well as experienced artists to practice drawing '*naer het leven'* to be able to 'invent' lifelike images '*uyt den gheest'*. Two fragments about drawing practices in Rome and Italy respectively from the lives of Bartholomeus Spranger (1546-1611) and Hendrick Goltzius (1558-1617) in the *Schilder-boeck* have been associated with Van Mander's view. In his biography of Spranger Van Mander wrote that the artist did not draw much in Rome and had left the city without taking any works of art with him.²⁹⁸ About Goltzius' stay in Rome Van Mander reported that 'he dedicated himself, as ordinary students do, steadily and diligently to drawing after the best and most important antiques'.²⁹⁹ Yet, Goltzius probably only brought detailed drawings with him from Italy merely with the intention to publish them as prints. Miedema argued therefore that 'where it was solely for his own study, he was satisfied with looking'.³⁰⁰

It would be too easy however to assume on the basis of these lines from Van Mander's *Schilder-boeck* that northern artists who visited Rome in the second half of the century did not find it appropriate to carry home drawings 'from nature'. Besides, the same fragments could be interpreted in another way. Since Van Mander mentions that Spranger 'surprisingly' did not draw much in Rome, and Goltzius like young artists did draw 'the important antiques', it may also be understood that drawing the antique remains was still practiced at the time Bartholomeus Spranger en Hendrik Goltzius stayed in the Eternal City. Furthermore, the fact that there are no more extant Roman *vedute* of some northern artists who travelled southwards in the sixteenth century, does not necessarily mean that they did not make them and may have relied on their drawings 'from nature' for the design of other, still preserved works.

²⁹⁶ Van Mander 1604, fol. 7v: *Te lesten siet toe, niet te keeren ledich/Van t'gheen daer ghy om uyt gaet t'uwer baten,/Brenge van Roome mede teyckenen zedich,/En t'wel schilderen van de stad Venedich (...).*

²⁹⁷ Van Mander 1604 (ed. Miedema 1973), vol. 2, pp. 413-414; Van Mander 1604 (ed. Miedema 1994-1999), vol. 5, p. 98; Miedema 1989, p. 274.

²⁹⁸ Van Mander 1604, fol. 271r 39-45: *Noyt en weet ick, dat hy sich selven t'hooft gebroken heeft met yet nae het fraey dinghen (dat te Room overvloedich is, soo Antijcken, als Schilderijen, oft anders) veel te teyckenen. Ick meen hy noyt blat papier te dier oorsaeck en heeft vuyl ghemaect, een dinghen seer te verwonderen: soo dat hy vertreckende van Room nae Oostenrijck, gantsch geen Const in packen te voeren en hadde, met veel meerder ghemack draghende alles vast in zijnen boesem.* See for the interpretation of the fragment also DaCosta Kaufmann 1997.

²⁹⁹ Van Mander 1604, fol. 283r 29-31: *(...) begaf hem als eenighe slechte leer-jonghers, stadigh en vlijtigh te conterfeyten de beste en besonderste Antijcken.*

³⁰⁰ Van Mander 1604 (ed. Miedema 1994-1999), vol. 5, pp. 99, 190-191. Miedema gave the example of Goltzius accompanying the pope's galleys to watch the naked slaves rowing. See also Miedema 1969.

No Roman *vedute* for instance are known to have remained from Hendrick van Cleve (ca. 1524-1589), and the only testimony of Pieter Bruegel the Elder's drawing activities in the city concerns the earlier mentioned *veduta* of the *Ripa Grande* (fig. II.94).³⁰¹ They were among the first northern landscape artists who visited Rome after Maarten van Heemskerck. There are however good reasons to assume that they based themselves on now lost Roman views made 'from nature' in their work. According to Van Mander Van Cleve 'travelled to Italy and other countries where he made and portrayed many things and views from life which he then later used in his works'. Although Van Mander added to this that he did not see all the places he drew with his own eyes,³⁰² and probably most of his drawn and painted panoramic views on Rome dating from the 1580s indeed originated through other intermediaries, it has been argued that his design for the *Panorama of Rome* published by Hendrik Hondius around 1600 was based on Roman views and detailed drawings of buildings and monuments 'from nature' (fig. II.95a-c).³⁰³ Pieter Bruegel on the other hand has been believed to have mainly travelled southwards 'to experience the scenery'. A still preserved group of drawings with Alpine and Italian countryside views bear witness to his topographical interest. Upon his return home, these nature impressions inspired him for the design of landscape paintings and prints.³⁰⁴ In and around Rome, Bruegel must have made other drawings 'from nature' than the one preserved. This has been argued on the basis of reminiscences of the vaulting of the *Colosseum* in two paintings of the Tower of Babel (figs. II.96-97)³⁰⁵ and the topographical ground of his representation of the fall of the Aniene river at Tivoli in the print *Prospectus Tyburtinus* (fig. II.98, ca. 1555).³⁰⁶

The examples of the way of using Roman *vedute* made 'from life' in the work of Hendrick van Cleve and Pieter Bruegel demonstrate that they relied for the greater part on their own 'invention' in the way Van Mander would urge artists to do some decades later. From our case study about Jan van Scorel we have concluded that the artist in the architectural backgrounds of his paintings reminiscent of his travels most probably combined different elements he had seen and drawn 'from life'. As we have shown, Maarten van Heemskerck held much less to his Roman drawings when he evoked classical Antiquity in paintings and prints. The monuments and ruins depicted in general bear only vague similarity to what he had observed and drawn in Rome. Therefore, Van Heemskerck may be regarded as the first northern artist who assimilated the heritage of the antique world in such a highly fanciful way.

³⁰¹ See note 291.

³⁰² See § I.2., note 56.

³⁰³ See Orenstein 1990.

³⁰⁴ Washington/New York 1986-1987, cat. 24, pp. 91-92. See § I.1., note 22.

³⁰⁵ Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, inv. GG_1026. Oil on panel, 114 x 155 cm, signed and dated: *BRVEGEL. FE.*

M.CCCCC.LXIII; Rotterdam, Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, inv. 2443. Oil on panel, 59,9 x 74,6 cm, ca. 1563.

³⁰⁶ Washington/New York 1986-1987, cat. 26, p. 96.

Maarten van Heemskerck's most outstanding painting in this respect, the *Landscape with the abduction of Helena* (fig. II.65, 1535-1536), has been frequently compared to his contemporary Herman Posthumus' *Landscape with antique ruins* (fig. II.99, 1536)³⁰⁷ This work, as Van Heemskerck's painting, most probably originated on commission by an Italian patron. In Posthumus' painting however, more ruins are represented that correspond to sculpture and architecture which are known through contemporary drawings by Amico Aspertini (1474/75-1552), Maarten van Heemskerck and Francisco de Hollanda (1517/18-1584) to be present in Rome by 1636. Almost none of the Berlin drawings attributed to Posthumus could be associated with the painted motifs.³⁰⁸ Conversely, the significance of the paintings is the same. Both painters regret the decay of the antique world and, like Van Scorel, present the ruin as a reminder of transience. The inscription in Posthumus' painting from Ovid's *Metamorphoses* serves as a motto: 'Ravenous time and envious age, you destroy everything'.³⁰⁹

³⁰⁷ Vaduz, Sammlung des Regierenden Fürsten von Liechtenstein. Oil on canvas, 96 x 141,5 cm, signed and dated: *Hermañus Posthumus pingebat* 1536. See for instance Bruyn 1988; Brussels/Rome 1995, cat. 156.

³⁰⁸ Olitsky Rubinstein 1985. See for possible relations with drawings attributed to Posthumus in the *Berlin albums* cats. 41, 51 and 54.

³⁰⁹ Id., p. 425 (*Tempus edax rerum tuque invidiosa vetutas omnia destruitis*); Bruyn 1988, pp. 96-97.

II.4. Hieronymus Cock

Within the scope of our research, Hieronymus Cock's (Antwerp 1518 - Antwerp 1570) publication of three series of prints with antique ruins and views on Rome between 1551 and 1562 cannot be neglected. Undoubtedly, the concept of the first series was a *novum* at the time, since it was the first series of large qualitative prints representing authentic Roman ruins in a landscape setting.³¹⁰ Because of the use northern artists have made of the series for the integration of antique ruins in their work, the series deserves particular attention.

Hieronymus Cock published a first series of twenty-five prints with the title *Praecipua Aliquot Romanae Antiquitatis Ruinarum Monumenta vivis prospectibus ad veri imitationem designata* (...) in Antwerp in May 1551. Ten years later a second series of twelve plates came out, without title. The plates had approximately the same size of the etchings of 1551. Because of the dimensions of the prints and the absence of a title page, the series has been considered an extension of the first set. In 1562 the last series of twenty-one prints entitled *Operum antiquorum hinc inde per deversas Europae regiones* (...) was issued.³¹¹

For some of the prints of the first two series, preparatory drawings have been preserved. Three drawings in the collection of the *National Gallery of Scotland* are considered immediate preparatory studies for the etchings by Cock in the first series (figs. II.100, 102, 104, see for the prints respectively figs. II.101, 103, 105). Two of them on the reverse have been indented for the purpose of transfer on to the copper plate.³¹² A fourth drawing preserved in the *Fitzwilliam Museum* in Cambridge also seems to have been made in preparation for a print. The back, as one of the drawings in Edinburgh, was blackened for transfer (fig. II.106).³¹³ No print with the same composition however has been discovered so far. Because its dimensions differ from the other drawings, it was most probably not made in preparation for the same series. It has been generally

³¹⁰ Riggs 1977, pp. 167-168.

³¹¹ Id., pp. 256-266, cats. II.A.1-25; pp. 296-299, cats. II.C.98-109; pp. 299-303, cats. II.C.110-130. Bouwewijn Bakker recently translated the texts on the title prints as follows: 'Some important monumental ruins from Roman antiquity, skilfully depicted by Hieronymus Cock in views true to life, for the purpose of imitating reality' (first series); 'This new little book contains the remains and ruins of ancient Roman works of art scattered here and there over different regions of Europe to which all ages must look up in admiration, depicted as faithfully to life as splendidly. Printed by Hieronymus Cock, painter, in Antwerp... 1562' (third series). See Bakker 2007-2008, Appendix.

³¹² *Roman ruins, flooded*, Edinburgh, National Gallery of Scotland, inv. D 1033. Pen and black ink, 220 x 317 mm (see for the print Riggs 1977, cat. II.A.24); *Ruins of the Colosseum: a vaulted passage*, id., inv. D 1034. Pen and black ink, 214 x 290 mm, signed and dated: *.H.COCK.F 1550* (see for the print Riggs 1977, cat. II.A.9); *Ruins of the Colosseum*, id., inv. D 1035. Pen and black ink, 217 x 325 mm, dated: *1550* (see for the print Riggs 1977, cat. II.A.3). See Riggs 1977, cat. I.A.D2-D4, pp. 237-238. The first two drawings were traced over with a stylus on the reverse, the first mentioned drawing was also blackened on the back. See Andrews 1985, vol. 1, p. 19, no. D 1033.

³¹³ *Roman ruins*, Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, inv. PD.242.1963. Pen and brown ink, 235 x 523 mm, signed and dated: *HIERONI.COCK.F.1550*. See Brussels/Rome 1995, cat. 61, p. 148.

accepted that these four drawings were made by Hieronymus Cock himself.³¹⁴ A last drawing was catalogued by Timothy Riggs as ‘perhaps made by Cock’ and considers a preparatory stage for a print from the second ruin-series executed by Jan and Lucas van Duetecum (fig. II.107).³¹⁵

Although the possibility that Cock made the drawings ‘from life’ in Rome has been considered, they originated most probably in Antwerp in 1550 on the basis of preliminary sketches he or other northern artists had made in Rome.³¹⁶ Different elements at least point in this direction. In the first place, the date ‘1550’, which occurs as an autographic annotation on three of the four drawings, could suggest that the drawings were made in Rome in this year. In 1550, however, Cock’s publishing activities in Antwerp must have prevented him from travelling.³¹⁷ A second argument may be found in the stylistic and compositional qualities of the drawings, which do not argue for the direct observation ‘from life’. The use of parallel and cross hatchings for instance seem to indicate the function of the drawing, and staffage may have been introduced deliberately. Besides, one of the prints in the first series shows the effaced date ‘154[6?]’, which Timothy Riggs has interpreted as the year the original drawing was made. The drawing according to him may have turned directly into print, without intermediate stage. The date may further suggest that also other original sketches were made around the same time in Rome and that Cock decided later to mention the year in which the preparatory drawings and etchings were made on the plates.³¹⁸

Riggs has further interpreted the effaced date on the print as an indication for Cock’s possible stay in Rome. His sojourn in the city is not documented, but it is most plausible that he went there between 1546, the year of his reception in the Antwerp guild of St. Luke and 1548, the date of publication of his first known series of prints. In any case, Cock’s drawings and prints of Roman ruins have been considered as the main argument for an Italian journey.³¹⁹ There is however a possibility that the preliminary drawings for the series were made by other artists. As is known, Cock worked frequently from other artists’ drawings without mentioning their names on the prints (cf *infra*).³²⁰ Moreover, different elements in Cock’s prints of the first and also second series of Roman ruins indicate that he relied on other draughtsmen’s sketches.

³¹⁴ Riggs 1977, cats. I.A.D1-D4, pp. 236-238; cats. II.A.1-25, pp. 256-266.

³¹⁵ *Roman ruins on the south side of the Palatine*, Leiden, Rijksuniversiteit, Prentenkabinet, inv. AW 1185. Pen and brown ink, 220 x 320 mm. Id., cat. I.A.Q1, p. 239.

³¹⁶ Id., cats. I.A.D1-D4, pp. 236-238; cats. II.A.1-25, pp. 256-266.

³¹⁷ Id., pp. 30-31, 46-48.

³¹⁸ Id., p. 246.

³¹⁹ Id., pp. 30, 264.

³²⁰ See for instance Id., pp. 255, 263-264.

Hülsen and Egger have been the first authors to establish that several of the prints in the first series bear strong resemblances to drawings attributed to Maarten van Heemskerck and the anonymous artist A, now identified as Herman Posthumus, present in the two *Berlin albums*.³²¹ No less than eight prints can be associated with drawings from the albums and with Van Heemskerck's drawing from the *Forum Romanum* preserved separately in Berlin (figs. II.105, 109, 110, 112, 113, 115, 117, 118 see for the corresponding drawings respectively figs. II.108a-b, 56, 111a-b, 108a, 114, 116, 48r, 54/119/120/121).³²² Although the views in the prints come very close to the drawings and are represented from vantage points that in some cases coincide almost with the ones the original draughtsmen must have adopted, the designs for the prints apparently were not based directly on the drawings. A plausible explanation is that Cock for the preparatory drawings relied on sketches 'from nature' which he or other artists had made from a slightly different angle. As we have seen before, Van Heemskerck already adopted in his Roman drawings viewpoints which were used before by other artists, and several drawings by contemporary artists in the Berlin albums show the same views from similar angles. One of Cock's own preserved drawings which was made in preparation for a print of the *Colosseum* in the first series (figs. II.104-105), was based almost certainly on very similar drawings attributed to Herman Posthumus in the second *Berlin album* (figs. II.108a-b). This observation confirms that Cock based his preparatory drawings for the prints on other artist's Roman sketches. It is not inconceivable that Cock inspired (part of) his print series on drawings selected from portfolios kept in Van Heemskerck's workshop, where he may have preserved his own Roman drawings together with those from other artists. An argument for this hypothesis can be found in the *Berlin albums* itself, which very well could be a compilation of Van Heemskerck's portfolio drawings.

Also in the second series of prints with Roman ruins, comparisons with drawings from the *Berlin albums* can be made. A first print bears considerable similarity to a drawing from Maarten van Heemskerck in the second *Berlin album* (fig. II.122, compare with drawing fig. II.123). Because the drawing has other dimensions than the print, it seems likely that the print was based on another, preparatory drawing analogous to the only one preserved for the series, which was

³²¹ Hülsen & Egger 1913-1916 (ed. 1975). See also Riggs 1977, cats. II.A.1-25, pp. 256-299. Veldman 1977a, pp. 110-111.

³²² Hollstein, vol. 4, no. 23 - compare with Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Kupferstichkabinett, inv. 79 D3, fols. 47r, 94v (both attributed to Posthumus); no. 26 - compare with id. inv. 79 D2, fol. 70r (Van Heemskerck); no. 34 - compare with id., inv. 79 D3 fol. 85r, 87v (both attributed to Posthumus); no. 38 - compare with id., inv. 79 D3 47r (attributed to Posthumus); no. 40 - compare with id., inv. 79 D3 fol. 84v (attributed to Posthumus); no. 41 - compare with id., inv. 79 D2 fol. 58r (Van Heemskerck); no. 42 - compare with id., inv. KdZ 6696 (Van Heemskerck); no. 43 - compare with id., inv. 79 D3 fols. 37r, 50r (both Van Heemskerck), 82v, 84r (both attributed to Posthumus).

tentatively attributed to Hieronymus Cock (fig. II.107).³²³ Other drawings from Van Heemskerck and attributed to Michiel Gast can be linked to a print of the St. Peter's basilica under construction (figs. II.124-125, compare with print fig. II.126).³²⁴ Hülsen and Egger furthermore have expressed the belief that the print with a view on a sculpture garden was inspired by a lost drawing by Maarten van Heemskerck (fig. II.127).³²⁵

Before we will discuss the possible reasons for which Cock published several sets of antique ruins and Roman views, we would like to deal shortly with the artistic specificity of the series.³²⁶ What strikes the most in all the three series is the 'picturesque' character of the prints. This way of representing antique ruins differs from Van Heemskerck's more archaeological approach. Besides, Cock apparently gave preference to the representation of more anonymous ruins and omitted more well-known Roman architecture. In the first series he also made combinations of monuments which in reality were situated at a certain distance from each other³²⁷ and combined different viewpoints in one single print.³²⁸ The prints in the two first series are completed with inscriptions with an identification of the locations represented, in the third set only two prints are inscribed. It has been noticed that several ruins were wrongly identified and that other inscriptions were not entirely correct. This is another indication that Cock must have sought at least part of his sources for the prints with other artists. Timothy Riggs has expressed the belief that the fanciful landscape elements were added by Cock himself, with the intention 'to change them from simple documentary views to finished pictorial compositions'.³²⁹ Although Riggs considered the landscape as a pure 'invented' addition, Prof. Dr. Bert Meijer has demonstrated that for instance the landscape view on the left side of a print with the ruins of the Palatine from the first series is not entirely fanciful (fig. II.110).³³⁰ In each of the series, which in general are predominated by prints of Roman ruins, Cock also inserted a 'modern' view, such as a *veduta* on the Tiber island with the *Ponte dei Quattro Capi* (fig. II.128) or on the medieval buildings of the

³²³ Nalis 1998, vol. 2, no. 204 – compare with Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Kupferstichkabinett, inv. 79 D3, fol. 55r (Van Heemskerck). See also Hülsen & Egger 1913-1916 (ed. 1975), vol. 1, p. 34 (*Zweiter Band*); Riggs 1977, p. 296, no. 98, p. 299. See note 215.

³²⁴ Nalis 1998, vol. 2, no. 215 – compare with Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Kupferstichkabinett, inv. 79 D2, fol. 13r (Van Heemskerck); fol. 15r (attributed to Michiel Gast). This resemblance went unnoticed.

³²⁵ Nalis 1998, vol. 2, no. 208. See Hülsen & Egger 1913-1916 (ed. 1975), vol. 2, p. 67.

³²⁶ See also Riggs 1977, pp. 167-168.

³²⁷ The Septizonium in a view on the Palatine (Hollstein, vol. 4, no. 34) is represented too close to the other ruins. The same monument is juxtaposed erroneously to the *Colosseum* in another print (Hollstein, vol. 4, no. 38). See respectively figs. II.110, 112.

³²⁸ Hollstein, vol. 4, no. 42. Compare the print in fig. II.118 to the drawings figs. II.54 (Maarten van Heemskerck), 55 (Master of the Escorialensis Codex), 119 (Maarten van Heemskerck), 120 and 121 (both attributed to Herman Posthumus).

³²⁹ Riggs 1977, pp. 33, 264.

³³⁰ Brussels/Rome 1995, cat. 62.

Capitol (fig. II.129).³³¹ The third series, as the text of the title print indicates, includes beside Roman ruins and views depictions of ‘ruins of ancient Roman works of art scattered here and there over different regions of Europe’.³³² Since it has not been possible to establish the source for the design of the prints, nor to identify all the locations depicted, no conclusions could be drawn from this specification.³³³

Both the title texts of the first and third series of Roman ruins mention that the views are ‘true to life’.³³⁴ From the total of thirteen title pages of Cock’s print series which have survived, the frontispieces of the two *Small Landscape* series with views near Antwerp (1559, 1561) similarly mention that the prints were made ‘from life’ (*‘ad vivum’* and *‘al te samen gheconterfeyt naer dleven’*).³³⁵ This stating was certainly not a novelty at the time.³³⁶ As we have seen in our case study about Jan Gossaert’s Roman drawings, in the contemporary inscription on his drawing of the *Colosseum* reference was made to its truthful aspect (*‘Mabusen eghenen/handt Contrafetet in Roma/Colosens’*).³³⁷ The explicit mentioning both in the case of Cock’s prints and the drawing of Jan Gossaert seems to suggest the importance a certain target audience must have attached to it.

As we have noted before, the prints with Roman ruins does certainly not provide us with a true picture, but rather create a lifelike impression. Just as with the drawings for the series of the *Small Landscapes*, the sketches Cock relied on for the design of the series with antique ruins and Roman views were most probably done ‘from life’ and initially not intended as designs for prints. None of the prints of both sets mention the name of the original draughtsman. Several artists have been proposed as designer of the *Small Landscapes*, but none of the identifications were fully convincing.³³⁸ A possible explanation may be that the designs for both the *Small Landscapes* series as well as the ruin series were based on drawings by different artists, probably without famous names. In connection with the addition *‘ad vivum’* to the title of the *Small Landscape* series, Peter Parshall has further remarked that Cock by omitting the authorship on the prints would also emphasise that their design was not invented but was done directly *‘naer het leven’*.³³⁹ The same theory can equally be applied to the series with antique ruins and Roman views.

³³¹ See respectively Hollstein, vol. 4, no. 46 (first series); Nalis 1998, vol. 2, no. 254 (third series).

³³² See note 311.

³³³ Riggs 1977, pp. 299-303, cats. II.C.110-130; Nalis 1998, vol. 2, nos. 234-254.

³³⁴ See note 311.

³³⁵ See for an English translation of the texts Bakker 2007-2008, Appendix. Boudewijn Bakker in this article examines the text of thirteen extant title prints of Hieronymus Cock’s series in order to gain an insight in the publisher’s ‘target group’ and thus also in the possible functions of the various series.

³³⁶ See § I.2.

³³⁷ See § II.1, p. 23.

³³⁸ Hautekeete 2000, p. 51, note 46.

³³⁹ Gibson 2000, p. 11, with reference to Parshall 1993, pp. 570-572.

Parshall furthermore considered the omitting of the authorship of the *Small landscapes* as 'symptomatic of a temporary, though important change in the priorities of the northern printmaking and image-collecting'. With reference to the print series, he postulated that the 'identity of the primary witness' became less important than the 'self-sufficiency of that which is witnessed'.³⁴⁰ Within the scope of our research, it is an interesting question whether this general conclusion could also be applied to the artistic production of sixteenth century Netherlandish artists' Roman drawings. From our exposition so far however, it may be clear that the interpretation of the function of the drawings is a rather complex matter. It is certainly not easy to answer for instance to what extent the absence of a signature on the greater part of the extant drawings relates to the aspirations of possible customers. Further comparative research within the field of sixteenth century draughtsmanship is therefore certainly required. On the other hand, autographic specifications of the location depicted possibly accompanied with a date can be encountered frequently in northern artists' Roman drawings dating from the second half of the century. These could be also interpreted as identifications of 'primary witness'.

Early examples of signed Roman drawings are known from Jan I Brueghel.³⁴¹ Other signed *vedute* from the first decades of the seventeenth century can be found in the oeuvre of Gerard I ter Borch (1582/83-1662)³⁴² and Bartholomeus Breenbergh (1598/1600-1657).³⁴³ Large groups of drawings by Breenbergh have been preserved together until long after his death.³⁴⁴ This could possibly mean that his drawings were already much sought after during his life, which could also explain why he provided them with a signature. The popularity of Breenbergh's drawings some decades after his death is confirmed by an inscription by the painter Philips Koninck (1619-1688)

³⁴⁰ For a clear understanding of the matter, we prefer to repeat the interesting point Parshall made literally: 'The very fact that the authorship of the *Small Landscapes* has been lost to us is symptomatic of a temporary, though important change in the priorities of northern printmaking and image-collecting. To be sure we would not claim that the draughtsman of the *Small Landscapes* was being actively suppressed by the publisher in order to promote some notion of unmediated objectivity. However, at the very least we can say with respect to the *Small Landscapes* – where authorship and specific location are notably left undisclosed, and the original drawings sharply modified under the publisher's scrutiny – that the identity of the primary witness is no longer as important as the self-sufficiency of that which is witnessed. The anonymous author has temporarily returned to the pictorial arts in northern Europe, but now largely confined to the 'observed' as opposed to the purportedly 'invented' image. Elsewhere in painters' and sculptors' workshops, and in the ateliers of silversmiths and clockmakers, Renaissance artists and artisans were signing their products more often, not less often. Moreover, this decline in the advertisement of authorship went hand in hand with the cultivation of a lively interest in describing the world of appearances in northern European art.' See Parshall 1993, p. 572.

³⁴¹ Bedoni 1983, § II.1.

³⁴² The topographical notes on several drawings from Ter Borch's Roman sketchbook are considered to be written on the spot. Apparently, he added other inscriptions with his name, date and more general indication of place (such as '*in Roma*' or '*buijten Roma*') after returning home. Ter Borch's Roman *vedute* were probably intended as souvenir ('*aide-memoire*') of his stay in Rome and as working material for his pupils. See Kettering 1988, vol. 1, p. 6, cats. GSr.

³⁴³ Roethlisberger 1969, p. 7.

³⁴⁴ Amsterdam 2001, p. 72.

on a drawing now in the collection of the Fondation Custodia in Paris: *'Dit is van Bredenberg d'alderbeste tekening/ die hem dear niet vooren koopt die maeckt verkeerde rekening/p.k.'*³⁴⁵

The autographic mentioning 'from life' seems to have appeared around the same time in northern draughtsmen's Roman sketches.³⁴⁶ An early example is a loose sheet of Ter Borch, which in addition to his name, a date and general indication of place, bears the autograph inscription '*naet leven*' (fig. II.130, 1610).³⁴⁷ Alison Mc Neil Kettering interpreted the annotation as a possible sign of the expectations of the recipient. She expressed the belief that the drawing was not executed for the painter's own use, but was rather intended to sell or to give away.³⁴⁸ Around the same time, in the first decade of the seventeenth century, the phrase '*naer het leven*' appeared in other drawn genres. In a number of Roelant Savery's (1576-1639) so-called '*naer het leven*' drawings of peasants, beggars and the like made during his travels in and around Prague, the words '*naer het leven*' are often inscribed on the bottom or corner of the sheet. Using the term in this way, it seems to acquire the function of a signature. It remains unclear however to whom this explicit mentioning was directed. Other notations on the same drawings concerning the colours of what is represented seem to have been meant for the painter himself.³⁴⁹ Several motifs from the drawings have been recognised in paintings and finished drawings.³⁵⁰

To help provide an answer now to the question for whom Cock's prints of antique ruins and Roman views were intended, an indication may be found in the title text of the first set. Boudewijn Bakker has recently brought to the attention that the phrase '*ad veri imitationem*' (for the purpose of imitating reality) explicitly aimed at the use other artists could make of the prints. More specifically, he has concluded that the prints were intended for artists who had not been in Italy and thus could not rely on their own observations of Roman antiquities.³⁵¹

³⁴⁵ *Ruins of the Villa of Maecenas at Tivoli*, Paris, Institut Néerlandais, Fondation Custodia (Coll. F. Lugt), inv. 3032. Pen and pencil and black ink over black chalk, 352 x 505 mm, signed and dated: *BB fecit / Ao: 1627* (Amsterdam 2001, p. 71). See also Brussels/Rotterdam/Paris/Bern 1968-1969, vol. 1, cat. 26, p. 28.

³⁴⁶ On one of the few preserved drawings Matthijs Brill has made during his stay in Rome in the late 1570s and early 1580s, his brother Paul noted that it was done 'from life' (*'nae het leeven*). This and other of Matthijs Brill's extant Roman drawings give a rather elaborated impression. They are worked out in detail and give proof of well-considered compositional choices. On the basis of Paul Brill's annotation, it has been assumed that the drawings were prepared in the open air, and finished in the atelier. See Brussels/Rome 1995, cat. 22, p. 91.

³⁴⁷ *Ruins of the Frontispizio di Nerone on the Quirinal*, Rotterdam, Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, inv. H 24. Pen and brush in brown, brush in grey, 158 x 125 mm, signed and dated: *G.T.Borch. Fecit naet leven in Roemen. Anno 1610*. See Kettering 1988, vol. 1, p. 6; vol. 2, Appendix 1, no. 7.

³⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

³⁴⁹ To our knowledge, the colour indications on a group of sixteenth century Roman *vedute* tentatively attributed to Pieter Vlerick (1539-1581) are exceptional within the sixteenth century production of Roman views 'from life'. The drawings may have been intended as autonomous documentation. See Meijer 1999, p. 12.

³⁵⁰ Swan 1995, pp. 356-357, with reference to Spicer-Durham 1979, vol. 1, § 4.

³⁵¹ Bakker 2007-2008, pp. 61-62. From his study of the title texts of the remaining title prints from Hieronymus Cock's series of prints Bakker concluded that in the case of the series with architectural and ornamental designs after Hans

This should mean that the prints would have been used like other northern artists have based themselves on their own drawings of antique architecture. Among the scarce earlier northern artists of whom Roman drawings have been preserved which can be linked to other artistic creations belong Jan Gossaert and Maarten van Heemskerck. As we have seen in the case study about Jan Gossaert, he was probably inspired by the extant sketch of the *Colosseum* for the design of fantastic architecture in other drawings.³⁵² Other lost Roman drawings may have served the same purpose. Maarten van Heemskerck on the other hand seems to have used his Roman sketches mainly as a source of inspiration for the depiction of newly invented ruins and buildings in several paintings and prints. The function of the Roman drawings of these artists seems rather inconsistent to the way in which the series is recommended by Cock and how the ruins are represented in the prints. Cock's reference to the 'purpose of imitating reality' in the title text of the print series seems to point to the direct copying of the ruins in drawings or other artistic media. By representing genuine Roman ruins in a 'picturesque' landscape setting, Cock added an 'invented' aspect to the prints which seems to suggest at the same time how other artists could integrate antique ruins in their work.

With reference to the *Small Landscape* views and the prints of Roman ruins, Riggs has further remarked that 'they commemorate the observation rather than the invention of architecture'.³⁵³ An important question which arises from this assumption is for which purpose artists actually made use of the series, at least if they did. When artists were indeed satisfied with the mere borrowing of motifs from the series, the importance which already at the time of Cock must have been attached to the artistic concept of 'invention' becomes problematic.³⁵⁴

When it concerns the two *Small Landscape* series, there are no direct uses known in surviving drawings or paintings. They are therefore considered as early precursors of the autonomous landscape genre which created a furore in the northern Netherlands at the beginning of the seventeenth century. Boudewijn Bakker has recently tried to refute this argument by suggesting

Vredeman de Vries, Cornelis Floris and Jacob Floris and an anonymous artist the public addressed (painters, other practitioners of the visual arts and non professional art lovers) becomes rather clear, while the titles of the landscape series (among which the two *Small landscape* series, two series of Roman ruins (1551 and 1562) and a series of village scenes and mountain landscapes designed by Matthijs Cock) give far less information about their target group. The titles of *Small Landscapes* series and of those with Roman ruins make no mention at all of possible purchasers. Only the series done after Matthijs Cock is praised 'for the general use of painters'.

³⁵² See § II.1., p. 25.

³⁵³ Riggs 1977, p. 185.

³⁵⁴ See in this respect also Parshall's remark on the *Small Landscapes* series. Parshall 1993, note 42: 'A half-century after Cock's publication Carel van Mander firmly discriminated against the adequacy of mere observation, a view that certainly had long precedent in artistic practice. No doubt the status of the *Small Landscapes* in this debate is complex and problematic'.

that the *Small Landscape* series, as the prints of Roman ruins, as it was announced in the title print of one of the last series (*ad veri imitationem*), ‘were intended as repertoires of separate motifs from which the artist inventor could choose when constructing a more ambitious composition’.³⁵⁵ He also referred to a drawing from the *Errera sketchbook* (fig. II.131), which was compiled by one or more anonymous artists around 1530-1540 and consists of drawings of different subjects originating most probably for the greater part in the studio.³⁵⁶ The sketchbook-sheet represents a farmhouse in a rural setting and already according to Gibson was made for the purpose of providing a ‘repertoire of landscape motifs’.³⁵⁷ Different elements of the drawing reappear in paintings from the workshop of Herri met de Bles (ca. 1510-1533/66). Furthermore, two paintings originating from the same workshop are known in which the same composition is adopted. One of the paintings is preserved in Brussels (fig. II.132), the other was formerly in Berlin.³⁵⁸ There is however no evidence to conclude that the *Small Landscape* prints were used in the same way. Another argument to conclude that the series was deliberately intended for artists, Bakker has found in the later editions of the series issued respectively by Philips Galle (1601) and Claes Janz Visscher (1612), who recommended the series ‘for the benefit of painters’.³⁵⁹

We will now take a closer look at the way the prints with Roman ruins have been used by artists. Our overview will be confined to some examples of borrowings from Cock’s series which are known in the literature on individual artists.

A well-known example is the Italian artist Paolo Veronese’s (1528-1588) adopting of several motifs from Hieronymus Cock’s first series of Roman ruins in his decorative landscape frescoes dating from the early 1560s in the *Villa Maser* in the *Veneto*.³⁶⁰ The ruins Veronese introduced in the frescoes differ only in detail from the ones in Cock’s prints. Four frescoes have been related to prints by Cock (figs. II.133, 134, 135, 137 compare respectively to the prints figs. II.128/101, 110, 136, 138).³⁶¹ For the majority of the other frescoes, Veronese relied on prints with fantastic ruins and antique buildings published by Battista Pittoni in 1561. This Veronese etcher in the

³⁵⁵ Bakker 2007-2008, pp. 62-63.

³⁵⁶ Brussels, Koninklijke Musea voor Schone Kunsten van België, Tekeningen kabinet, inv. 4630. Ca. 135 x 210 mm, ca. 1530-1540. See Brussels 2000, cat. 36, pp. 104-105; see also § 1.2.

³⁵⁷ Bakker 2007-2008, p. 62, note 36, with reference to Gibson 2000, p. 13.

³⁵⁸ *The farm*, Brussels, Koninklijke Musea voor Schone Kunsten van België, inv. 4704. Oil on panel, 20,5 x 27,5 cm. The other painting formerly belonged to the collection of R. von Kaufmann and later became part of the collection Kappel in Berlin. The latter painting was dated 16.19.April. On the basis of this date, it has been assumed that the composition records an actual farm (Gibson 2000, p. 13). Stefaan Hautekeete has expressed the belief that both the drawing and the painting preserved in Brussels probably were based on the same lost prototype, which must have been a *in situ* representation of a farm in the neighbourhood of Antwerp (Brussels 2000, cat. 36, pp. 104-105).

³⁵⁹ Bakker 2007-2008, pp. 62-63.

³⁶⁰ Turner 1966, p. 205 ff, see especially pp. 208-209; Oberhuber 1968.

³⁶¹ Oberhuber 1968, pp. 212-214.

same year issued a series with reversed copies of Cock's antique ruins and Roman views (cf *infra*).³⁶²

One of the earliest northern painters who must have based himself on the same series is Lambert van Noort (ca. 1520-1570/71). In his painting *David and Abigail* (fig. II.139, 1557) several antique ruins on the second plan clearly derive from Cock's prints (figs. II.112, 140, 141).³⁶³ Besides, Van Noort included other architectural motifs, among which a fantastic building which also appears in several paintings by Jan van Scorel.³⁶⁴ It has been assumed that Van Noort was active in the last painter's workshop before he settled in Antwerp in the guild-year 1549-1550. Another source for his 'invention' may have been the right part of the print *Balaam and the angel* from Maarten van Heemskerck, which was published by Hieronymus Cock in 1554 (fig. II.69).³⁶⁵ In a study drawing preserved in Oxford, Van Noort included other antique ruins which also appear in Cock's series of 1551 (fig. II.142, compare with the prints in figs. II.110, 113).³⁶⁶ Furthermore, for the architecture in the background of two paintings of the *Adoration of the Shepherds* (figs. II.143, 144, respectively 1555 and 1568) Van Noort may have relied on contemporary drawn or printed representations of the St. Peter's basilica under construction.³⁶⁷ Other architectural 'inventions' in different artistic media (drawings, prints and stained glass) give proof of his knowledge of Sebastiano Serlio's (1475-1554) treatise on architecture, which was translated in Dutch by Pieter Coecke van Aelst from 1539 on.³⁶⁸ Lambert van Noort's travel to Italy is not documented but may have taken place between March 1558 and the end of the following year.³⁶⁹ From the examples given it becomes clear that Van Noort relied on Cock's prints already before he may have seen the ruins with his own eyes. Furthermore, it is certainly remarkable that Van Noort may have based himself on Van Heemskerck's print in his painting *David and Abigail*. This print

³⁶² Turner 1966, p. 209 ff, Oberhuber 1968, p. 214 ff.

³⁶³ Basel, Öffentliche Kunstsammlung, Amerbach Kabinett, inv. 462. Oil on canvas, 104 x 202 cm, signed and dated: L. VA.N./1557.3. See Van Ruyven-Zeman 1995, pp. 17, 84, cat. S.1; Brussels/Rome 1995, cat. 146.

³⁶⁴ The fantastic building at the right of the *Septizonium* can be seen in connection with similar buildings in Van Scorel's Obervellach triptych and the paintings *St. James healing a Paralytic* (fig. II.26) and *Landscape with Bathsheba* (fig. II.27). See also Van Ruyven-Zeman 1995, p. 90; see § II.2., p. 32.

³⁶⁵ Van Ruyven-Zeman 1995, p. 84, note 47; see § II.3., p. 45.

³⁶⁶ *Study drawing with Roman ruins and nine figures, among which couples*, Oxford, Ashmolean Museum, inv. 56c. Pen and brown ink, washed in grey and red-brown over black chalk, 222 x 187 mm. See Van Ruyven-Zeman 1995, pp. 50, 84, cat. T.33.

³⁶⁷ Antwerp, Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, inv. 448. Oil on panel, 228 x 227 cm, signed: *Lambertus a Noort. Inuen: pingebat* and dated: *Ao. 1555*; Brussels, Koninklijke Musea voor Schone Kunsten van België, inv. 332. Oil on panel, 147 x 200 cm, signed and dated: *L. VA.N. INVEN: PINGEBAT. AN. 1568*. See Van Ruyven-Zeman 1995, pp. 17, 83-84, note 45, cats. S.2 and S.3. The architecture in the paintings bears resemblance for instance to several elements of the interior of the new St. Peter's basilica as represented in a drawing preserved in the second *Berlin album* (fig. II.85, see § II.3., note 271) and a drawing attributed to Maarten van Heemskerck in Stockholm (fig. 145, see § II.3., note 215).

³⁶⁸ Van Ruyven-Zeman 1995, pp. 80-84.

³⁶⁹ Brussels/Rome 1995, cat. 146, pp. 268-269; Van Ruyven-Zeman 1995, p. 14.

was certainly not intended as a topographically correct representation, as Cock's print series were. No Roman drawings attributable to the artist have come to light so far.

Another case of borrowing from Cock's first ruins series has been suggested with reference to the ruins in the background of one of Lucas de Heere's (1534-1584) few preserved works: the painting *The sleeping Arts in times of war* (fig. II.146).³⁷⁰ The possibility exists that part of the ruins represented derive from Cock's print with the ruins of the Palatine in a landscape (fig. II.110). There is no evidence to assume that De Heere travelled southwards, but according to Van Mander he was interested in the art of the antiques.³⁷¹ Van Mander also reported that De Heere drew the landscape around Namen and Dinant 'from life'.³⁷²

We will now turn to the parallels between Cock's series of antique ruins and Roman views and the work of Matthijs Bril (1550-1583) and the Bril's circle of northern artists in Rome. Matthijs, the eldest of the two Bril brothers, first travelled to Italy. He must have arrived in Rome around 1574-75 but was only mentioned first in the city in 1581. Shortly afterwards, Matthijs was joined by his brother Paul. The Brils were the first Netherlandish landscape artists who managed to run their own workshop in the city.³⁷³ At Matthijs' death, Paul must have kept his drawings from nature of Roman ruins in his studio.³⁷⁴ Several Netherlandish artists later copied these drawings.

We have already earlier drawn attention to the fact that sixteenth century northern artists in their Roman *vedute* seem to have depicted the same ruins and monuments time and again, sometimes from very similar vantage points.³⁷⁵ Wood Ruby has recently stated that 'little outright copying of ruin drawings seem to have been done until the end of the century, when Jan I Brueghel and others began copying Matthijs Bril's series (...)'. She argued that the northern artists returned to the same places after having seen depictions of their predecessors rather than just copied them and continued to do so also in the last decades of the century, when they also worked after Matthijs Bril's drawings.³⁷⁶ In our case study about the Roman drawings of Maarten van Heemskerck, we have referred to similar sketches from other artists. None of these could be reduced to a mere copy. Further comparative research is certainly needed to see to what extent

³⁷⁰ Turin, Galleria Sabauda, inv. 320. Oil on canvas, 184 x 232 mm. See Brussels/Rome 1995, cat. 119.

³⁷¹ Id., cat. 119, pp. 226, 229.

³⁷² See § I.2., p. 11, note 41.

³⁷³ Wood Ruby 1999, p. 11; Hendriks 2003, pp. 17-29.

³⁷⁴ This has been deduced from an inscription by Paul Bril on the verso of one of Matthijs' drawings preserved in the Louvre: *The arch of Septimus Severus*, Paris, Musée du Louvre, Cabinet des Arts Graphiques, inv. 20.955. Pen and brown ink, 207 x 275 mm, inscribed at the back: *dit is een van de besste desenne die lck van matijs mijn broeder nae het leeven hebbe*. See Brussels/Rome 1995, cat. 22; see also note 346.

³⁷⁵ See in this respect also Wood Ruby 1999, p. 9.

³⁷⁶ Id., pp. 9, 28-29, § 5.

Ruby's statement is valuable also as it concerns drawings of northern artists who stayed in Rome after Van Heemskerck and before Matthijs Bril's topographical sketches became available in his brother's studio. Generally speaking, less attention was paid to the Roman drawings from this period. In addition to this, also the influence of Cock's series of prints with Roman ruins in this period needs further investigation.

In any case, it becomes clear also from several of Matthijs Bril's extant Roman drawings that he visited and drew the same locations as earlier northern artists.³⁷⁷ He may have seen Roman sketches of his fellow countrymen before he set off for this journey southwards. Besides, he must have had knowledge of Cock's first series of prints with Roman ruins. His view on the Forum of Nerva was made from a very close viewpoint to the print of the same place in Cock's series, but as Van Heemskerck did before him, he omitted the medieval *Torre dei Conti* (fig. II.147, compare with Van Heemskerck's drawing fig. II.54 and Cock's print fig. II.118).³⁷⁸ As Maarten van Heemskerck, he depicted also the *Trofeo di Mario*, a monument which does not occur in Cock's prints and of which we have not found other earlier representations (fig. II.148, see for Van Heemskerck's drawing fig. II.149).³⁷⁹ Two of Matthijs Bril's preserved drawings can be associated with his Roman fresco works. His drawings of the *Torre delle Milizie* and the *Ponte Sant' Angelo and Castel Sant' Angelo* however were certainly not directly copied in the related frescoes (figs. II.150, 152, see for the frescoes respectively figs. II.151, 153).³⁸⁰ This, together with the high degree of finish of the drawings caused Louisa Wood Ruby to interpret Matthijs Bril's Roman drawings as autonomous works. She proposed to consider them as 'reference tools'

³⁷⁷ See in this respect our paper 'Vedute and landscape drawings from Dutch and Flemish artists in Rome and *campagna* (ca. 1500-1650). Study about the places Dutch and Flemish artists have visited and drawn in and around Rome during their stay in the Eternal City' (Utrecht University, 2008). Matthijs Bril's few extant Roman drawings are preserved in the *Louvre* and in the *Fondation Custodia* in Paris. In the most recent publication on Matthijs Bril's drawings, Lisa Wood Ruby added to this group a drawing from a private Dutch collection. See Brussels/Rome 1995, cat. 22, note 1; Wood Ruby 2003, p. 73.

³⁷⁸ Paris, Musée du Louvre, Cabinet des Arts Graphiques, inv. 20.958. Pen and brown ink, 220 x 422 mm. See Brussels/Rome 1995, cat. 25, p. 95; see for Maarten van Heemskerck's drawing § II.3., p. 41.

³⁷⁹ Paris, Musée du Louvre, Cabinet des Arts Graphiques, inv. 20.980. Pen and brown ink, 190 x 271 mm; Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Kupferstichkabinett, inv. 79 D3 fol. 49r.

³⁸⁰ Paris, Musée du Louvre, Cabinet des Arts Graphiques, inv. 20.959. Pen and brown ink, 220 x 422 mm; Id., inv. 873. Pen and brown ink, 220 x 422 mm. Both drawings give proof of extremely balanced compositions. In the drawing of the *Ponte Sant' Angelo and Castel Sant' Angelo*, the bridge is represented with four arches, while it in reality has only three. Besides, in the fresco, the cupola of the St. Peter's basilica is higher. The composition of the latest drawing has been adopted by several later artists, among which Jan I Brueghel. Brueghel's drawing preserved in Darmstadt however is considered to have been originated independently of Matthijs Bril's drawing (see § II.5., pp. 76-77, note 420). The corresponding frescoes are respectively on the second floor of the south wall of the first room of the *Torre dei Venti* (The Room with Topographical Views, early 1580's) and in the Loggia of Gregroy XIII on the third floor of the Vatican (late 1570's). See Brussels/Rome 1995, cats. 23-24, pp. 92-94; Wood Ruby 2003, pp. 73-74.

which served the painter during the execution of the commissioned frescoes. As finished works, they could either have functioned as models for prints or paintings, or as collector's items.³⁸¹

Unlike his brother Matthijs, Paul Bril had probably less interest in drawing in the open air. Few preserved drawings are believed to have been made 'from nature', among which two sketches of antique ruins, a *Sketch of Tivoli and temple of the Sybil* and a *Landscape with round temple* (figs. II.154-155).³⁸² The first drawing functioned as a model for two other drawings with the temple situated in a fantastic mountainous landscape, a sheet which served as an 'intermediary stage' and a finished drawing (figs. II.156-157). The finished version, signed with Paul Bril's name and with a pair of spectacles was traced for transfer and engraved by Raphael I Saedeler (fig. II. 158). Together, these drawings give us a unique insight in Paul Bril's working methods.³⁸³ Bril also integrated round temples inspired by the Temple of the Sybil in small landscape paintings on copper.³⁸⁴ Real topographical views are rare in Paul Bril's painted oeuvre. In 1601, he was commissioned by the Roman aristocrat Asdrubale Mattei to paint the family country estates outside Rome. Four of the paintings intended as '*sopraporte*' have been preserved, among which a *veduta* of *Castel Belmonte* (fig. II.159).³⁸⁵ The only other known topographical painting concerns a *View of Bracciano*, probably another 'overdoor' made in the early 1620s for Don Paolo Giordano II, Prince Orisini and duke of Bracciano from 1615 (fig. II.160).³⁸⁶ These paintings at least suggest that Bril made other drawings 'from nature' which have not survived. Furthermore, his paintings which include Roman ruins may suggest that he, like his brother, worked from drawings made on the site.³⁸⁷ It would certainly surprise if Paul Bril, who lived in Rome till his death in 1626, had worked from other sources than his own, or possibly his brother's drawings 'from nature'.

³⁸¹ Wood Ruby 2003, pp. 73-74, 83-84. Willem II van Nieulandt (ca. 1584 – 1635) has later issued several loose prints and series with ruins and Roman views among which several prints go back to Matthijs Bril's Roman drawings. The prints concerned do not mention Bril's name. See Hollstein, vol. 14, nos. 6-9, 17. See also Brussels/Rome 1995, p. 265, note 1; Amsterdam 2001, p. 42, note 25.

³⁸² Paris, Musée du Louvre, Cabinet des Arts Graphiques, inv. 19.816. Pen and brown ink over black chalk, graphite with brown and blue wash, 279 x 250 mm; Id., inv. 19.782. Pen and brown ink over black chalk, with grey wash, 183 x 267 mm. See Wood Ruby 1999, § 3, see especially p. 29, cats. 47, 91.

³⁸³ *Temple of the Sybil at Tivoli*, Paris, Musée du Louvre, Cabinet des Arts Graphiques, inv. 19.774. Pen and brown ink over black chalk, grey wash, 198 x 275 mm; *Temple of the Sybil at Tivoli*, id., inv. 19.773. Pen and brown ink and brown and grey wash, 203 x 270 mm, inscribed: *Pauolo/Brilo*. See Wood Ruby 1999, pp. 29-30, cats. 48-49. See for the print Hollstein, vol. 21, no. 219.

³⁸⁴ Brussels/Rome 1995, cats. 28, 30, p. 99, note 1.

³⁸⁵ Rome, Galleria Nazionale d'Arte Antica, Palazzo Barberini, inv. 1983. Oil on canvas, 155 x 220 cm. See Brussels/Rome 1995, cat. 31, pp. 100-101.

³⁸⁶ Private collection, oil on canvas, 75,5 x 163,6 cm. See London 2002, cat. 2.

³⁸⁷ See for instance Paul Bril's paintings with ruins of the *Forum Romanum* in Dresden and Brunswick, which include antique ruins and Roman monuments combined in an untruthful way. See respectively 's-Hertogenbosch 2001, cat. 36; Cologne/Zürich/Vienna 1996-1997, cat. 5.

In an article published in 1980 about the *Rijksmuseum* painting *Roman ruins with the meeting of Rebecca and Eliezer* however, Bernard Aikema has demonstrated that the antique ruins depicted (among which the Temple of Saturn, the Temple of Vespasianus, the Temple of Minerva of the Forum of Nerva, and the ruins of the Palatine) derive from different prints of Cock's first ruin-series (fig. II.161, see for the related prints figs. 110, 117, 138).³⁸⁸ This painting bears the signature *P.Bril*, an inscription which was assumed authentic. Meanwhile, the painting has been attributed to Willem II van Nieulandt (1584-1635) and dated around 1600-1620.³⁸⁹ Van Nieulandt stayed in Rome for approximately one year in 1602-1603. During his short sojourn in the city, the painter copied Matthijs Bril's drawings preserved in Paul's atelier and likely drew extensively the antique ruins in the open air.³⁹⁰ After his return home, Van Nieulandt continued to work in the style of Paul Bril in paintings and prints, which is also the reason why his paintings have been frequently attributed to Bril. The Roman ruins he had admired and drawn in Rome remained Van Nieulandt's most important source of inspiration. Because his painted oeuvre as well as his drawings and prints have barely been studied, it still remains difficult to sort out the origin of his motifs. Yet it is certain that the complexity of his borrowing of motifs of different artists concerns the main challenge for the further examination of his work. Several of the Roman monuments he used in his paintings and prints in any case go back to the drawings of Matthijs Bril. For the design of his painted *vedute*, he seems to have also relied on various print series. Didier Bodart has suggested that he may have used prints published by Giovanni Maggi and Claude Duchet, and from the *Speculum Romanae Magnificentiae* published by Nicolaus van Aelst.³⁹¹ Apparently, Van Nieulandt preferred to always make new combinations of various antique monuments. Maybe his own Roman drawings were not sufficient enough to satisfy his search for new motifs, which caused him to rely of prints by other artists. Hieronymus Cock's print series of Roman ruins is a source that Bodart has not connected with the work of Willem II van Nieulandt. Aikema however has demonstrated convincingly that several monuments in the *Rijksmuseum* painting derive from Cock's first set of prints with Roman ruins. Therefore, we may conclude that the series still was valuable to a painter who in the early seventeenth century wanted to include Roman monuments in his landscape paintings.

³⁸⁸ Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. SK-A-63. Oil on copper, 41,5 x 57 mm. See Aikema 1980.

³⁸⁹ See for this new attribution and dating the on-line catalogue of the *Rijksmuseum*:

<http://www.rijksmuseum.nl/collectie/zoeken/asset.jsp?id=SK-A-63&lang=en>, last consulted August 2009. As Aikema has remarked, the Temple of Minerva in the print series is represented in reverse. Van Nieulandt certainly knew the monument from his stay in Rome and depicted the monument correctly by reversing the print. See Aikema 1980 p. 12.

³⁹⁰ Wood Ruby has proposed to attribute a group of ruin drawings copied after Mathijs Bril and another group of topographical drawings dated 1602 or 1603 in a similar hand to Willem II van Nieulandt. See Wood Ruby 1999, pp. 46-47.

³⁹¹ Salerno 1991, with reference to Bodart 1970, vol. 1, pp. 251-270.

From the use Paolo Veronese, but also Lambert van Noort and probably Lucas de Heere made from the first series of Cock's prints with Roman ruins, we may deduce that it was not their primary interest to represent topographically correct antique ruins. As Veronese also relied on Pittoni's series with fantastic ruins in his landscape frescoes in the *Villa Masser*, it seems that he rather searched for a picturesque effect. Lambert van Noort in his painting *David and Abigail* introduced Roman ruins and buildings from various sources, among which a fanciful architecture derived from Van Scorel. This does not alter the fact that both artists depicted the antique ruins deriving from Cock's series in a more or less truthful way or have 'imitated reality'. If Lucas de Heere at last based himself on Cock's print with the ruins of the Palatine in his painting *The sleeping Arts in times of war*, he certainly did this without the intention to represent these particular antique remains. Besides, Matthijs Bril's drawings demonstrate how the artist had adopted Cock's prints with Roman ruins in his visual memory.

The painted oeuvre of Willem II van Nieulandt on the other hand, includes mainly real Roman ruins and monuments, which he copied probably partly from his own drawings but also derived from other artists' topographical prints and drawings. In his paintings dating from the first two decades of the seventeenth century, the aspect of invention is limited to the combining of actual Roman monuments in a landscape setting, which in some respect is also what Cock did in his ruin prints, whereas in the work of earlier artists such as Maarten van Heemskerck and Herman Posthumus, newly invented and extensively altered Roman ruins and buildings appeared.

It remains unanswered how long and to what extent northern artists relied on Cock's print series for the introduction of Roman ruin-motifs in their work.³⁹² Further research is therefore certainly required. As we have seen, it is certainly not true that only artists who did not have the chance to travel to Rome made use of the prints. In addition to this, we can remark that no traces have been found of artistic reuse of the prints from the series Cock issued in the early 1560s. The last set of prints, in contrast to the two first series, represents mostly unidentified ruins.

From our examples of how artists made use of Hieronymus Cock's series of ruins, it cannot be deduced what the particular intentions of Cock as a publisher were. It becomes clear that artists must have made up a significant part of an audience which to date we do not know exactly whom it existed of.³⁹³ Yet, at the same time, we may assume that his series of Roman ruins have appealed a broad, learned, and not only northern public.³⁹⁴ As we have seen before, depictions of

³⁹² Aikema 1980, p. 15.

³⁹³ Riggs 1977, § 5.

³⁹⁴ Id., pp. 206-207.

ruinous landscapes already since Van Scorel must have been appreciated for their evocation of decay and transience. The influence of the first series is further proved by copies issued by Du Cerceau and Pittoni in the 1550s and early 1560s.³⁹⁵

³⁹⁵ Riggs 1977, p. 265.

II.5. Tobias Verhaecht

We have already pointed out in our case study about Hieronymus Cock that comparatively more Roman drawings made ‘from nature’ dating from the second half of the sixteenth century have in general received less attention in the art historical literature. An overall view on the Roman drawn production of northern artists from this period is still lacking. Further investigation on the subject however necessarily lies beyond the purposes of the present study. We have preferred therefore to single out one interesting case.

In this last case study we will focus on the Roman drawings of Tobias Verhaecht (Antwerp 1561-Antwerp 1630).³⁹⁶ Verhaecht descended of an Antwerp family of artists and received his first artistic instruction most probably from his father Cornelis van Haecht.³⁹⁷ Van Mander very shortly mentioned Verhaecht as ‘a good, subtle landscape painter’.³⁹⁸ There is no documentary evidence for a stay in Italy, but later authors have written about the painter’s artistic activities in Rome and Florence. Giulio Mancini recorded that a certain ‘Tobia’ stayed several years in Rome where he carried out private and public commissions. To this Mancini added that he surpassed with his landscapes other artists like Herri met de Bles, Domenico Campagnola and Matthijs Brill.³⁹⁹ According to Cornelis De Bie Verhaecht had been to Italy, where he worked at the court of the Grand Duke of Tuscany in Florence and made landscape frescoes in Rome.⁴⁰⁰ None of the painter’s Italian painted work has been recovered yet. It is generally assumed that Verhaecht’s stay in Italy took place in the 1580s. In any case he must have returned back to his native Antwerp by 1590, the year he was inscribed as the son of a master (*meesterssoon*) in the guild of St. Luke.⁴⁰¹ In the 1590s Verhaecht was the court painter of Archduke Ernest of Austria. Around the same time, the Emperor Rudolf II of Prague in a letter to Archiduke Albrecht expressed his interest in the painter’s work.⁴⁰² Between 1591 and 1612 Verhaecht had several apprentices.⁴⁰³

³⁹⁶ Ursula Härting recently has corrected the year of Tobias Verhaecht’s death. See Härting 1993, p. 93.

³⁹⁷ Van Roey 1968; Van den Branden 1883, p. 383 ff.

³⁹⁸ Van Mander 1604, fol. 294r 46-47 - 295v 1: *Daer is ooc t’Antwerpen Tobias Verhaeght, die een aerdigh goet Landschap-maker is.*

³⁹⁹ Mancini 1617-1621 (ed. Marucchi 1956-1957), vol. 1, p. 259; vol. 2, pp. 163-164: *Molti anni sono fu in Roma Tobia ***, nato in ***, qual nei paesaggi dette gran satisfatione, lasciando quelle cose cosi trite e stentate che per avanti in simil sorte di pitture solevan fare I fiammenghi. Che, se ben il Civetta per avanti, il Campagniola, Matteino et altri havevan operato bene, nondimeno non con questa prestezza et resolutione come fece Tobia. Del qual si vedono alchune cose private et, delle publiche, in S. Spirito, nella schala che del claustro si ascende in chiesa.*

⁴⁰⁰ De Bie 1662, p. 48: *Men siet hoe wonderlijk hy binnen ’t stadt Florencen/Verbreydt heeft sijne Const to aenlock vande Menschen/Alwaer hij in het Hof des Hertoghs heeft verkeert/Die hem met groote jonst heeft om zijn Const vereert,/Daer hy met cloeck verstant PICTVRAS diepste gronden/In ’t Italiaens gheberght heeft door ’t Pinceel ghevonden (...) De Edel Stadt van Room die can dat oock bewijsen/En thoonen dat hy was in fijne Const te prijsen/Die daer in Fresco is met wonderheydt te sien/Hoe fraey hy is gheweest in Landschap en Ruien (...).*

⁴⁰¹ Rombouts & Van Lerijs 1864-1876, vol. 1, p. 359.

⁴⁰² Härting 1993, p. 94.

⁴⁰³ Rombouts & Van Lerijs 1864-1876, vol. 1, pp. 366, 368, 379, 381, 383, 384, 389, 410, 414, 422, 432, 445, 487.

Drawings attributed to Verhaecht's pupil Pieter van den Hoeck⁴⁰⁴ bear stylistic resemblance to his master's drawings.⁴⁰⁵ Verhaecht is also traditionally called the first teacher of Peter Paul Rubens (1577-1640).

Tobias Verhaecht is mainly known for his 'archaic' panoramic mountainous landscapes in the tradition of Pieter Bruegel the Elder. His landscape paintings recall to mind in particular the *Large landscapes*, a set of twelve prints which Hieronymus Cock published around 1550-1560 after Bruegel's designs inspired by the alpine landscape. Verhaecht frequently introduced biblical or historical scenes in his paintings. This figural staffage was sometimes added by colleagues such as Sebastiaen Vrancx, Jan I Brueghel and Frans Francken II. His paintings in the world landscape tradition are composed of certain decorative formulas which he reused time and again.⁴⁰⁶ Besides, it has been remarked that Verhaecht in several of his paintings seems to have introduced topographical details.⁴⁰⁷ In *A hunting adventure of Maximilian I*, signed with a monogram and dated 1615, the landscape is inspired by the Inn valley in Austria, where the emperor on Easter Monday 1590 got lost while he was hunting on the *Martinswand* (fig. II.162).⁴⁰⁸ The figures in the painting were added by Sebastiaen Vrancx. Another example is the painting *Alpine landscape with a castle*, in which the castle bears reminiscence of *Schloss Ortenstein* in the Swiss canton Graubünden (fig. II.164).⁴⁰⁹

There is also a large group of panoramic landscape drawings preserved which do not relate to Verhaecht's known paintings. Some of the drawings are monogrammed and dated within the two first decades of the seventeenth century and therefore belong to the mature work of the artist.⁴¹⁰ His few preserved topographical drawings, among which a *Panoramic view on the castle of Pierre-Ernest de Mansfeld* and a *View on Ponte Sant' Angelo and Castel Sant' Angelo* because of their rarity

⁴⁰⁴ Pieter van den Hoeck was inscribed in the Antwerp guild in 1603. In 1626 Peeter Cornelisz. van Hoeck of Antwerp, pupil of Tobias Verhaecht, entered the guild in Brussels. See Rombouts & Van Lierus 1864-1876, vol. 1, p. 422.

⁴⁰⁵ Stechow 1975; Spicer 1988.

⁴⁰⁶ Gibson 1989, p. 82.

⁴⁰⁷ Devisscher 1996; Vlieghe 1998a, p. 183. Remarkable in this respect is also Cornelis De Bie's praise for Verhaecht as a landscape painter who worked 'from life': *Waarom dat sijnen Naem door Const sal eeuwich dueren:/Omdat sijn vry Pinceel naer 't leven heeft ghewerckt/Die al de wetenschap van d'Eel Pictur versterckt*. See De Bie 1662, p. 48.

⁴⁰⁸ Brussels, Koninklijke Musea voor Schone Kunsten van België, inv. 2794. Oil on panel, 75,5 x 140,5 cm, signed (monogram) and dated *TVH 1615*. See Brussels 2004, without pages.

⁴⁰⁹ Basel, Kunstmuseum Basel, inv. G 1971.6. Oil on panel, 35,5 x 47,5 cm. See Boerlin 1973.

⁴¹⁰ *Mountain landscape*, Sotheby's, Amsterdam, 15 November 1995, lot. 2. Pen and brown ink, washed, 209 x 267 mm, signed (monogram) and dated: *TVH 1605*; *Mountain landscape with travellers*, New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, Rogers fund, inv. 58.72. Pen and brown ink, brown and blue wash, black chalk, 251 x 348 mm, signed (monogram) and dated: *TVH 1616*; *Mountain landscape with Tobias and the angel*, Leningrad, Hermitage, inv. 15090. Pen and brown ink, brown and dark blue wash, 179 x 271 mm, signed (monogram) and dated: *TVH 1517* (Brussels/Rotterdam/Paris 1972-1973, cat. 107); *Mountain landscape with travellers*, Hamburg, Kunsthalle, inv. 22636. Pen and bistre, blue wash, 188 x 296 mm, signed (monogram) and dated: *TVH 1620*.

have been considered quite recently as probably made after drawings or prints by other artists (figs. II.165-166).⁴¹¹

Nonetheless, already in the late 1930s, A.H. Scott-Elliott demonstrated the connection of a drawing with a view of the Inn valley attributed to Verhaecht and the already mentioned painting *A hunting adventure of Maximilian I* (fig. II.163).⁴¹² The landscape setting of the painting corresponds largely to the drawing, which shows the *Martinswand* seen from nearer. Several topographic details in the drawing reoccur in the painting. It seems most likely that the drawing was made, or based on drawings executed on the spot. Verhaecht may have passed the valley of the Inn on his way to or back from Italy.

Furthermore, the *Rijksmuseum* preserves a drawing of the colonnade over the *Clivius Scauri*, a street parallel to the SS. Giovanni e Paolo in Rome, which already in 1972 was tentatively attributed to Tobias Verhaecht (fig. II.168).⁴¹³ The drawing formerly went under the name of Paul Bril, but could be attributed convincingly to Verhaecht on the basis of his distinctive nervous drawing style. Because the sketch was made on a sheet produced in Italy, it has been assumed that the drawing originated in the same country.

It has been further demonstrated by Lisa Wood Ruby that a great amount of unsigned studies 'from life' known as done by Paul Bril in reality can be attributed to other northern artists who visited the Bril workshop in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century.⁴¹⁴ In any case, it would almost be inconceivable that Verhaecht did not come in contact with Paul Bril during his stay in Rome in the 1680s. Moreover, two other drawings with Roman views seem to furnish proof of his presence in the Bril workshop. A first drawing is the earlier referred to *View on Ponte Sant' Angelo and Castel Sant' Angelo*,⁴¹⁵ a second drawing shows the *Forum Romanum* and is kept in a private collection in Argentina (figs. II.166, 171).⁴¹⁶ Both *vedute* show almost the same

⁴¹¹ Luxembourg 2007, vol. 2, cat. 86, p. 494. See for the drawings respectively: Luxembourg, Musée National d'Histoire et d'Art, inv. 1984-194. Pen and brown ink, washed and heightened with water colour, 289 x 412 mm (Luxembourg 2007, vol. 2, cat. 86); Saint Petersburg, The State Hermitage Museum, inv. 7464. Pen and pencil in brown and dark blue, 259 x 407 mm (Brussels/Rotterdam/Paris 1972-1973, cat. 106).

⁴¹² *A view of the Inn valley with the Martinswand*, pen, pencil and wash, 205 x 412 mm. See Boerlin 1973, p. 269, note 5, with reference to Scott-Elliott 1939-1940 (both authors erroneously refer to the painting with inv. 201, which is in fact an old catalogue number). The drawing Scott-Elliott examined in his article is referred to as in the collection of 'A.P. Oppé, Esq. C.B.'. It is not known where the drawing is preserved now.

⁴¹³ Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, Rijksprentenkabinet, inv. RP-T-1897 A 3373. Pen and pencil in brown ink over traces of black chalk or graphite, 222 x 171 mm, inscribed on the verso: *bril 2[?]-8*. See London/Paris/Bern/Brussels 1972, cat. 12, p. 16; Schapelhouman 1987, cat. 86; Brussels/Rome 1995, cat. 224.

⁴¹⁴ Wood Ruby 1999, p. 29.

⁴¹⁵ See note 411.

⁴¹⁶ *View on the forum, with monks and pilgrims in the foreground*, Sotheby's, Amsterdam, 8 November 2000, lot. 36. Pen and brown ink, over traces of black chalk, numbered in brown ink: 9, 170x 220 mm, now in a private collection, Argentina.

compositions of monuments as in two extant drawings of Matthijs Bril (see respectively figs. II.152, 173).⁴¹⁷ Because his sketches were made from a different angle, we may assume that Verhaecht saw Matthijs Bril's drawings in his brother Paul's studio and was inspired to draw the same locations on the site.

In the last decades, other drawings of (identified and unidentified) Roman ruins which could be ascribed to Tobias Verhaecht on stylistic grounds appeared on the art market (figs. II.174-179).⁴¹⁸ Several of these drawings have been annotated 'P.BRIL' in the same hand and were therefore formerly attributed to Paul Bril. Furthermore, they have approximately the same dimensions of the previously mentioned Roman views in Amsterdam and Argentina. To this series can be added two larger sheets with drawings of the same ruins seen through an arch, of which one is preserved in Oxford (figs. II.180-181).⁴¹⁹

Several sheets of this group of drawings with Roman views can be compared to drawings of other northern artists who were in Rome around the same time as Tobias Verhaecht and among which several copied drawings of Matthijs Bril. We have already mentioned that Matthijs Bril's drawing of *Castel Sant' Angelo* and the *Forum Romanum* must have been available in the workshop of Paul Bril. Tobias Verhaecht is not the only artist who made drawings of the same locations. Jan I Brueghel's (1568-1625) drawing of the *Ponte Sant' Angelo and Castel Sant' Angelo* in Darmstadt is made from a different angle and shows the *castello* behind an overgrown Tiber-bank

See the on-line database RKD Images: [http://www.rkd.nl/rkddb/\(v\)hrv1b3imsgb555bpcwlgne\)/detail.aspx?parentprifref=](http://www.rkd.nl/rkddb/(v)hrv1b3imsgb555bpcwlgne)/detail.aspx?parentprifref=), last consulted August 2009.

⁴¹⁷ See for Matthijs Bril's drawing of the *Ponte Sant' Angelo and Castel Sant' Angelo* note 380. His drawing of the *Forum Romanum* is preserved in Paris: Paris, Musée du Louvre, Cabinet des Arts Graphiques, inv. 20.954. Pen and brown ink, 184 x 275 mm. See also Wood Ruby 1999, pp. 43-44.

⁴¹⁸ (1) *Classical ruins with two figures*, Christie's, New York, 22 January 2003, lot 89. Pen and brown ink, brown wash over black chalk, 171 x 222 mm, inscribed: P.BRIL (recto), *bril* ..2 (verso); (2) *The ruins of a Roman substructure*, Christie's, Amsterdam, 24 November 1992, H. Van Leeuwen sale, lot 209. Black lead, pen and brown ink, brown wash, 217 x 172 mm, inscribed: P.BRIL (recto), *bril* 28. (verso); (3) *The interior of the Colosseum*, Christie's, Amsterdam, 30 November 1987, lot 22. Pen and brown ink over black chalk, light brown wash, 221 x 173 mm, inscribed: P.BRIL (now in Ottawa, National Gallery of Canada, see Ottawa/Cambridge/Fredericton 2003-2005, cat. 23); (4) *A landscape with ruins*, Sotheby's, London, 16 November 1972, lot 12. Pen and ink, brown wash over black chalk, 217 x 172 mm, inscribed: P.BRIL (Art Gallery Jean Willems, Brussels, 1984. cat. 5, as Tobias Verhaecht, *The ruins of the Palatine*); (5) *Classical ruins with two figures*, Christie's, Paris, 21 March 2002, lot. 101. Pen and brown ink, brown wash over black chalk, 161 x 220 mm; (6) *A view of Rome with the Torre delle Milizie and Trajan's Column beyond*, Christie's, Amsterdam, 25 November 1991, lot 11. Pen and brown ink, washed, 173 x 226 mm, numbered: 6[?] (Art Gallery Jean Willems, Brussels, 1992, cat. 1). Lisa Wood Ruby identified the series on the basis of the drawing in Amsterdam (see note 413) and the drawings mentioned here as nos. 1-3. We could add the drawings with nos. 4-6.

⁴¹⁹ *A rugged landscape, seen through an arch*, Amsterdam, Sotheby's, 15 November 1995, lot. 177. Pen and brown ink, washed, 330 x 260 mm; *Ruins of ancient buildings at Rome, seen through an archway in the foreground*, Oxford, The Ashmolean Museum, inv. WA1941.137. Pen and bistre over chalk, 412 x 272 mm. The drawing in Oxford is still attributed to Paul Bril. For the information on the last drawing, I owe debt to Ms Angelamaria Aceto, Print Room assistant at the Department of Western art of the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford (cf e-mail correspondence, 16 July 2009).

(fig. II.167).⁴²⁰ The St. Peter's basilica is represented with its dome completed. The construction of the cupola was finished in 1593, one year before Brueghel made his sketch. There are also several drawings preserved with the same view on the *Forum Romanum*. A *veduta* of Hendrik de Clerck (ca. 1570-1630) - a northern artist who was documented in Rome in 1587 - shows the same monuments from a different viewpoint (fig. II.172).⁴²¹ De Clerck's drawing on the other hand bears considerable similarity to Verhaecht's view on the forum. The possibility exists that they returned to the site and drew the monuments side by side. Since Tobias Verhaecht apparently was in the habit of making drawings 'from nature', it seems in any case difficult to explain that they may have copied the same prototype.⁴²² The medieval *Clivus Scauri* was also depicted by Jan I Brueghel and Willem II van Niculandt (1584-1635) (see respectively figs. II.169-170).⁴²³ At last, the larger drawings with ruins seen through an arch attributable to Tobias Verhaecht show the same site as in two drawings by Jan I Brueghel (figs. II.182-183).⁴²⁴ The location has been recognised in Brueghel's drawing preserved in Rotterdam as the *Terme di Caracalla*.⁴²⁵ Verhaecht however always chose different vantage points. This excludes the possibility that the artists copied the same prototypes. Although several of Verhaecht's drawings show ruins which cannot be identified,⁴²⁶ we may assume that they were, like his other drawings with Roman views, drawn 'from life' or based on drawings of existing places.

From this it becomes clear that the group of drawings with the same dimensions may originate from a sketchbook or a loose series on the same paper Tobias Verhaecht used in Rome to draw in the open air, possibly in the company of other northern artists. His larger drawings of antique

⁴²⁰ Darmstadt, Hessisches Landesmuseum, inv. AE 397. Pen and brush in brown and blue, 179 x 269 mm, inscribed: *Roma 13 November 1594*. See Winner 1985, p. 89; Märker & Bergsträsser 1998, cat. 66.

⁴²¹ Wolfegg, Fürstlich zu Waldburg-Wolfegg'sches Kupferstichkabinett. Pen and brown ink, brown wash, 275 x 430 mm, signed (monogram): *HDC*. See Schapelhouman 1987, cat. 5, p. 12; Brussels/Rome 1995, cat. 55, p. 139.

⁴²² A series of Hendrik de Clerck's Roman drawings is preserved in Wolfegg (see note 421). At least one of his ruin drawings bears considerable stylistic similarity to Verhaecht's Roman sketches (see Laureyssens 1997, p. 162, fig. 1). To draw conclusions from this, De Clerck's drawings at Wolfegg need further investigation.

⁴²³ Wood Ruby 1999, p. 43, note 324. See for the drawings respectively: Paris, Institut Néerlandais, Fondation Custodia (Coll. F. Lugt), inv. 7879. Pen and bistre, 262 x 204 mm, signed and dated: *Gio Breughel fecit Roma 15[...] Novembris: 1594/Therma(e) Diocletianes*; Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, inv. PD.200-1963. Pen and brown ink, 276 x 205 mm, inscribed: *In Roma 1602*. See Van Gelder 1967, p. 39, note 5; London/Paris/Bern/Brussels 1972, cat. 12.

⁴²⁴ Wood Ruby 1999, p. 43, note 325. See for Verhaecht's drawings of the site 419. Rotterdam, Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, inv. N.4. Inscribed: *Roma 159[5?]*; Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, inv. PD.195-1963. Pen and brown ink, brown and blue grey wash, 129 x 192 mm. Wood Ruby has not identified the ruins depicted.

⁴²⁵ According to Stefania Bedoni Brueghel's drawing in Rotterdam represents ruins from the *Terme di Caracalla* (Bedoni 1983, p. 36). Brueghel may have been inspired by his drawings of the site for the ruins he depicted in the painting *Landscape with a hermit reading and ruins* now in Milan (Brussels/Rome 1995, cat. 44a, p. 121). The drawing preserved in the Fitzwilliam Museum on the on-line collection database is entitled as 'Ruins in Rome':

http://www.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/opac/search/cataloguedetail.html?&preref=4384&_function_=xslt&_limit_=10, last consulted August 2009.

⁴²⁶ See note 418.

ruins may have belonged to another series of Roman views 'from life'.⁴²⁷ Verhaecht's Roman views are all well balanced compositions in which he sometimes included the same two characteristic figures.

The reasons for which northern artists from the 'Bril circle' in the last decades of the sixteenth century cumulatively drew the same Roman locations is a question which cannot be addressed here. To what extent the practice of copying Matthijs Bril's drawings can be regarded as part of the artistic training of the northern artists who came to Rome is another topic that requires further investigation.⁴²⁸ It seems clear however that several northern artists took a pleasure in copying Matthijs Bril's Roman sketches and returning to the same sites he had drawn. As regards Tobias Verhaecht's Roman drawings there are some possibilities for the way he made use of them.

We have mentioned earlier that it has been suggested that Tobias Verhaecht included topographical details in his paintings. In his paintings in Basel and Brussels he seems to have indeed relied on his own drawn observations of the landscape scene on his way to or back from Italy. The Brussels' painting furthermore has been associated with a topographical drawing of the Inn valley. Architectural details in two other paintings seem to have been based on what the artist may have seen and drawn in Italy. The ruins represented in *A mountainous landscape with figures* and in his *Fall of Icarus* preserved in Frankfurt am Main bear reminiscence respectively of the Temple of *Minerva Medica* in Rome and the Temple of the Sybil in Tivoli (see respectively figs. II.184-185).⁴²⁹ Topographical drawings from Verhaecht of these monuments have not been preserved, but it is not impossible that he drew the antique ruins 'from life'. Depictions of the same ancient temples from other northern artists of the 'Bril circle' have also been preserved. A drawing of the Temple of *Minerva Medica* from Hendrick de Clerck for instance is preserved in Wolfegg,⁴³⁰ and the monument is included in the print series with Roman ruins of Willem II van Nieulandt.⁴³¹ The Temple of the Sybil was drawn by Paul Bril and Jan I Brueghel, amongst others.⁴³² A ruined

⁴²⁷ Lisa Wood Ruby concluded from the group of drawings mentioned in note 418 as nos. 1-3 and the drawing in Amsterdam (note 413) that Verhaecht must have had a sketchbook for ruin drawings. See Wood Ruby 1999, p. 43.

⁴²⁸ On the basis of the group of Roman drawings Lisa Wood Ruby attributed to Jan I Brueghel, she has assumed that his draughtsmanship noticeably had improved through the copying of Matthijs Bril's drawings. *Id.*, p. 44.

⁴²⁹ *A mountainous landscape with elegant figures riding along a hillside path beside the ruins of a temple overlooking an extensive valley*, Philips, London, 7 December 1993. Oil on canvas, 101 x 155 cm; *The fall of Icarus*, Frankfurt am Main, Städelsches Kunstinstitut, inv. 1689. Oil on copper, diameter 25,7 cm.

⁴³⁰ Wolfegg, Fürstlich zu Waldburg-Wolfegg'sches Kupferstichkabinett. Pen and brown ink, brown wash, 276 x 430 mm, signed (monogram): *HDC*. See Laureyssens 1997, p. 163, fig. 2.

⁴³¹ Hollstein, vol. 14, no. 29.

⁴³² See for Paul Bril's drawing of the Temple of the Sybil § II.4., note 382, fig. 154. Jan I Brueghel's drawing of the ruined temple is preserved in Paris: Paris, Institut Néerlandais, Fondation Custodia (Coll. F. Lugt), inv. 6599. Pen and bistre, 219 x 183 mm, inscribed: *Templum de Sibilla Tiburtina 6 iuli 1593* (London/Paris/Bern/Brussels 1972, cat. 11).

temple reminiscent of the Temple of the Sibyl further is part of the fantastic landscape setting of a drawing from Verhaecht in Weimar (fig. II.186).⁴³³

Beside the drawing preserved in Weimar, several other fantastic landscape drawings attributed to Tobias Verhaecht are known which include ruins and southern views (figs. II.187-191).⁴³⁴ None of his extant Roman sketches can be associated with the drawings, but it seems clear that Verhaecht was inspired by what he had observed during his stay in Rome and Italy. One of the *capricci* from the collection of the *Rijksmuseum*, as the topographical drawing of the *Clivius Scauri*, was made on Italian paper, which may indicate that the drawing was made in Italy.⁴³⁵ Marijn Schapelhouman has considered the drawing in Amsterdam and another one preserved in Düsseldorf on stylistic grounds as early works of Verhaecht, which were probably made before his drawings dated in the first and second decennia of the seventeenth century.⁴³⁶ The *Panoramic view on the castle of Pierre-Ernest de Mansfeld* recently attributed to Verhaecht must date also from this early period (fig. II.165). Mousset could demonstrate that the castle is represented truthfully, but also shows some inaccuracies. The view most probably was made as a preparatory drawing for a print in the fifth volume of the *Civitates Orbis Terrarum* (1572-1617), a collection of townscape engravings published by Georg Braun and Franz Hogenberg.⁴³⁷ The volume was published in 1598, which serves as a *terminus ante quem* for the dating of the drawing.⁴³⁸ Three other fantastic landscape drawings with city views inspired by what Verhaecht may have seen and registered in Rome stylistically fit more with his late drawings.⁴³⁹

Verhaecht's *capricci* as well as his fantastic landscape drawings dating from the first two decades of the seventeenth century seem to have no connection with his known paintings or printed

⁴³³ *Mountainous landscape with ruin and figures in a boat*, Weimar, Goethe Nationalmuseum, inv. 863. Pen and ink over black chalk, 372 x 276 mm.

⁴³⁴ (1) *Landscape with antique ruins*, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, Rijksprentenkabinet, inv. RP-T-1898 A 3526. Pen and dark brown ink, pencil and light brown ink, 187 x 268 mm (Schapelhouman 1987, cat. 87; Brussels/Rome 1995, cat. 225). A drawing with the same composition in Vienna (Graphische Sammlung Albertina, inv. 13392) is considered as an autograph repetition; (2) *River landscape with antique ruins and travellers on a bridge*, Düsseldorf, Staatliche Kunstakademie, inv. FP 4812. Pen and brown ink over traces of black chalk, 220 x 341 mm (Brussels/Rome 1995, cat. 226); (3) *Town on a bay, galleys putting to sea on the right*, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, Rijksprentenkabinet, inv. RP-T-1946 26. Pen and dark brown ink over graphite or black chalk, 198 x 268 mm (Schapelhouman 1987, cat. 88); (4) *Fantastic river landscape with a castle in the middle distance and mountains in the background*, Sotheby's, Amsterdam, 17 November 1993, lot 45. Pen and brown ink, washed, 166 x 234 mm; (5) *Mountainous landscape with a town near a river*, Christie's, Amsterdam, 16 November 2005, lot. 225. Pen and brown ink, brown and blue wash over black chalk, 201 x 259 mm.

⁴³⁵ See note 434, no. 1. See Schapelhouman 1987, cat. 87; Brussels/Rome 1995, cat. 225.

⁴³⁶ See note 434, nos. 1-2. See Schapelhouman 1987, cats. 225-226.

⁴³⁷ See also § 1.2.

⁴³⁸ See Luxembourg 2007, vol. 2, cat. 87.

⁴³⁹ See note 434, nos. 3-5. With reference to drawing no. 3 see Schapelhouman 1987, cat. 88.

work.⁴⁴⁰ As Schapelhouman has suggested, these drawings may well have been intended for sale.⁴⁴¹ Besides, it is certainly remarkable that his drawings with antique ruins may have served him both to draw autonomous *capricci* of southern cityscapes and to integrate recognisable topographical details in his landscape paintings. If we may attach credit to Cornelis De Bie's biography of the artist, Verhaecht would have also represented ruins in his Roman landscape frescoes.⁴⁴² Since there must have been a public for depictions of antique ruins, we also cannot exclude that his Roman drawings came in the possession of interested buyers.⁴⁴³

To conclude we would like to point to some other drawings which are composed of Italian topographical details and fanciful elements in the oeuvre of a contemporary northern artist, Lodewijk Toeput (ca. 1550-1603/05). Toeput presumably came to Italy in the 1570s. After a stay in Venice, he settled in Treviso. Toeput's journey in Rome is not documented, but it has been assumed that he stayed in the city on the basis of topographical drawings ascribed to him and a print of the *Via Salaria* with the monogram 'L.P.', amongst other things.⁴⁴⁴ Throughout his entire artistic career Toeput drew different types of city views.⁴⁴⁵

With regard to Verhaecht's *capricci*, it is an interesting fact that Toeput added the annotation 'Rome' accompanied by a date on two cityscapes with fanciful details now in Rotterdam and Bergamo (see respectively figs. II.192-193).⁴⁴⁶ The inscriptions seem to suggest that the drawings were made on the spot. Yet, the compositions are built up rather schematically and no actual Roman buildings can be recognised. It seems more probable therefore that the inscription was added to come up to the expectations of a certain client or group of customers. Besides, it is remarkable that the schematic combination of (ruined) buildings and a river with a bridge corresponds with the *capricci* attributed to Tobias Verhaecht.

⁴⁴⁰ Only a few prints have been connected to the work of Tobias Verhaecht (see Van den Branden 1883, p. 384). Egbert van Panderen (ca. 1580-1637) probably in the early sixteenth century engraved four prints entitled *The four parts of the day* after designs by Verhaecht. One of the prints shows a street with in the background a view on Rome (fig. II.194). Several actual monuments are recognisable, but the view in its entirety is probably fanciful. A drawing which may have served as a preparatory design appeared on the art market in 1990 (fig. II.195): Philips, London, 12 December 1990, lot. 86, as attributed to Lodewijk Toeput. Pen and brown ink, washed over black chalk, outlines indented for transfer, 166 x 211 mm. See for the related print Hollstein, vol. 15, nos. 50-53; Bodart 1970, vol. 1, p. 239.

⁴⁴¹ Brussels/Rome 1995, cat. 226, p. 386.

⁴⁴² See note 400.

⁴⁴³ See also § II.4.

⁴⁴⁴ Brussels/Rome 1995, p. 377.

⁴⁴⁵ See in this respect Gerszi 1992; Gerszi 1999.

⁴⁴⁶ *View of a City*, Rotterdam, Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, inv. N.42. Pen and brown ink, blue wash, 191 x 230 mm, inscribed: *9 setebre/1601[7?]*; *Landscape with loving couple*, Bergamo, Accademia Carrara, inv. 320. Pen and various colours, washed, 203 x 260 mm, inscribed: *14 7bre 1601[4?]*. See Morselli 1988, p. 85; Gerszi 1992, p. 374. For the information on the drawing preserved in Rotterdam, I owe debt to Dr. Albert Elen, Senior Curator of Prints and Drawings of the Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen in Rotterdam (cf e-mail correspondence, 10 June 2009).

The depiction of ruined monuments in a fantastic mountainous landscape was certainly not new at the time. In our case studies about Jan van Scorel we have mentioned a group of fantastic landscape drawings with ruins from the ‘Van Scorel circle’ of which the attribution remains unclear.⁴⁴⁷ Furthermore, we have referred to two sheets with antique Roman sculpture and architecture attributed to Maarten van Heemskerck which on the back have drawings of imaginative landscapes scattered with (invented) ruins.⁴⁴⁸ With these sketchy landscape impressions, Van Heemskerck seems to have exercised to reinvent the Roman landscape. The results of it can be admired in his landscape paintings and prints inspired by the antique world. Tobias Verhaecht’s and Lodewijk Toeput’s drawings likely show that at the end of the century this type of drawings was appreciated by an interested public.

⁴⁴⁷ See § II.2., p. 30, notes 149-150.

⁴⁴⁸ See § II.3., pp. 46-47, note 253, figs. II.76r-v, 77r-v.

CONCLUSION

Having come to the end of our survey on the practice of drawing *vedute* ‘from nature’ in Rome by sixteenth century Netherlandish artists, we may conclude that the Roman drawings of the artists we have discussed in several case studies were used in different ways within the artistic process. Moreover, the practice of drawing in the open air in Rome has considerably affected the conception of sixteenth century northern art.

From our case study about the Roman drawings of Jan Gossaert it became clear that Gossaert for the design of his mythological paintings probably in the first place relied on other sources than his own drawings made in Rome. It is most likely that he as a painter employed at the humanistic court of Philip of Burgundy was acquainted with Vitruvius’ *De Architectura* and antique literary sources like Plinius’ *Historia Naturalis*, and based himself on these writings to create paintings with the intention to emulate antique art.

In Jan van Scorel’s quite dissimilar painted work we rather found a sensibility for the southern landscape, which may have been inspired by now lost drawn views made ‘from nature’ on his travels through the Holy Land and the Italian peninsula. Van Scorel probably also used his own drawings of real (Italian) buildings for the depiction of architectural elements in his paintings. Furthermore, Jan van Scorel seems to have been the first northern artist who introduced actual Roman *vedute* in his paintings. Remarkably, the Roman ruins depicted were chosen deliberately as symbolical references to the represented scenes. The vanitas symbol consisting of an obelisk, remaining columns of an antique temple and a pyramid all reminiscent of actual Roman examples further became a ‘workshop pattern’ in Van Scorel’s studio.

Maarten van Heemskerck’s paintings bear witness of the same affinity to the Italian landscape as his former master Jan van Scorel. The artist’s drawings made ‘from life’ in Rome and its *campagna* must have formed the immediate cause of the creation of landscape prints and paintings scattered with invented ruins and buildings or even introducing cityscapes reminiscent of Rome. As it appears from Van Heemskerck’s rough sketches of fantastic mountainous landscapes with ruins on the back of two Roman drawings made ‘from life’, the urge to ‘invent’ or to work ‘*uyt den gheest*’ could no longer be stemmed.

Although Hieronymus Cock relied on his own and/or other northern draughtsmen’s *vedute* made ‘from nature’ for the design of his print series with antique ruins and Roman views, the series provide us with a lifelike impression rather than that they are ‘true to life’. Several northern artists

who made use of the first series of prints with Roman ruins Cock had issued copied fragments of the prints in paintings. Besides, one of Matthijs Bril's influential Roman *vedute* bears testimony of the painter's adaptation of Cock's prints in his visual memory.

Like many other northern artists who stayed in Rome in the last decades of the sixteenth century and who came in contact with the drawings of Matthijs Bril, Tobias Verhaecht probably drew extensively 'from nature'. Verhaecht adopted topographical elements in his fantastic mountainous landscape paintings some of which are reminiscent of Roman ruins. On the other hand, several preserved *capricci*, possibly intended for sale, seem to have been based on real Roman or Italian views.

We have drawn the attention to the fact that it remains important to test Karel van Mander's art theory against the sixteenth century artistic practice. In the present study in particular we have tried to gain a better insight in the relationship between working '*naer het leven*' and '*uyt den gheest*' from the perspective of the use of Roman *vedute* made 'from life' within the creative process. On the basis of our findings in the different case studies, we may conclude that the use of Roman drawings made 'from life' is connected with the type of artistic work it was aimed at or which was appreciated by a possible customer or patron. In some cases, the artistic relevance of the concept of 'invention' needs to be refined.

As we have mentioned, Jan Gossaert presumably based himself on antique (literary) sources rather than his Roman drawings for the architectural setting of his mythological paintings commissioned by Philip of Burgundy. The contribution of his own 'invention' therefore also may be put in perspective.

Jan van Scorel according to Van Mander used (*'te pas ghebracht*) his drawing of Jerusalem in the middle panel of the *Lockhorst triptych* which represents Christ's entrance in the city. In other paintings he introduced Roman *vedute* and several architectural backgrounds in his painted work show buildings clearly reminiscent of what the artist had admired abroad.

It may be clear that Maarten van Heemskerck did not fail to use his 'invention' as much as he could, but his fanciful city views undoubtedly were inspired directly by what he had seen and drawn in the Eternal City. His Roman drawings likely served him his entire life as a cherished source of inspiration. The great importance Van Heemskerck personally must have attached to the practice of drawing the '*aerdicheden der Antijcken*' 'from life' appears from his painted self-portrait preserved in Cambridge, in which he included a second self-portrait in the form of a

draughtsman depicting the Colosseum 'from nature'. Besides, the rare large signed and dated Roman *veduta* of the *Forum Romanum seen from the Capitol Hill* (1535) which was probably made on commission or intended as a gift, may indicate that the Roman view 'from life' as an autonomous drawing was already sought after at this early date.

Hieronymus Cock's series of prints with antique ruins and Roman views were recommended as views 'true to life'. However, as we have seen, the aspect of 'invention' certainly played a part in the design of the series. Rather than relying on their own '*gheest*', several northern artists copied fragments of Cock's first series prints with Roman ruins for the architectural setting in their paintings.

Tobias Verhaecht as well introduced Roman ruins in fantastic landscape paintings, but he based himself most probably on his own drawings made 'from nature' in the Eternal City. Verhaecht's *capricci* also must have been derived from sketches made in the open air. Furthermore, we may not exclude that his Roman *vedute* too were in demand by interested buyers.

At the end of our investigation we must admit that we have by no means exhausted the study of the origin and function of sixteenth century northern Roman *vedute* made 'from nature'. In the present research we have broached a subject which deserves more attention and could be supplemented with other studies. In the first place, it is certainly required to gain a comprehensive view of the preserved sixteenth century Roman *vedute* to be able to draw more general conclusions. Besides, to explain the relevance of the concept of drawing 'from life' in the early Netherlandish artistic practice, further comparative research within the broad field of contemporary draughtsmanship is needed. As it concerns the further examination and retracing of Roman topographical motifs in sixteenth century imagery, it would be interesting to also take into consideration the work of artists who are assumed to have not been in Italy. We are convinced that the investigation of these broader issues would enrich our present view on sixteenth century northern drawing practices and the creative process in general.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abrahamse *et al.* 2008

J.E. Abrahamse *et al.* (eds.), *De verbeelde wereld. Liber amicorum Boudewijn Bakker*, Bussum 2008

Aikema 1980

B. Aikema, 'Romeinse ruïnes in een schilderij van Paul Bril', *Bulletin Rijksmuseum*, 28 (1980), 1, pp. 10-16

Alpers 1983

S. Alpers, *The Art of Describing. Dutch Art in the Seventeenth Century*, London 1983

Andrews 1985

K. Andrews, *Catalogue of Netherlandish drawings in the National Gallery of Scotland*, 2 vols., Edinburgh 1985

Bakker 2007-2008

B. Bakker, 'Pictores, adeste! Hieronymus Cock recommending his print series', *Simiolus*, 33 (2007-2008), 1-2, pp. 53-66

Bartelings *et al.* 2001

N. Bartelings, B. de Klerck, E.J. Sluijter (eds.), *Uit het Leidse Prentenkabinet: over tekeningen, prenten en foto's bij het afscheid van Anton Boschloo*, Leiden 2001

Bedoni 1983

S. Bedoni, *Jan Brueghel in Italia e il Collezionismo del Seicento*, Florence-Milan 1983

Bevers 1992-1993

H. Bevers, 'Antwerpener Zeichner 1550-1600', in: *Cologne/Antwerp/Vienna 1992-1993*, pp. 215-223

Bevers 1998

H. Bevers, 'The Antwerp sketchbook of the Bles workshop in the Berlin Kupferstichkabinett', in: *Muller et al.* 1998, pp. 39-50

De Bie 1662

C. De Bie, *Het gulden cabinet vande edele vry schilder-const (...)*, Antwerp 1662

Billen 1995

C. Billen, 'Vlaanderen. Geschiedenis en geografie van een land dat niet bestaat', in: *Brussels/Rome 1995*, pp. 48-52

Blankert 1978

A. Blankert, *Nederlandse 17de eeuwse italianiserende landschapsschilders*, Soest 1978

Bodart 1970

D. Bodart, *Les peintres des Pays-Bas méridionaux et de la principauté de Liège à Rome au XVIIème siècle*, 2 vols., Brussels 1970

Boerlin 1973

P.H. Boerlin, 'Bilder zwischen Imagination und Wirklichkeit: zu zwei Alpenlandschaften von Tobias Verhaecht', *Unsere Kunstdenkmäler*, 24 (1973) 4, pp. 267-274

Van den Boogert 1998

B. van den Boogert, 'Leren tekenen naar de natuur', in: *Amsterdam 1998*, pp. 19-25

Boon 1955

K.G. Boon, 'Tekeningen van en naar Scorel', *Oud Holland*, 70 (1955), 4, pp. 207-218

Boon 1978

K.G. Boon, *Netherlandish drawings of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries*, 2 vols., The Hague 1978

Boschloo *et al.* 1989

A.W.A. Boschloo *et al.*, *Academies of Art between Renaissance and Romanticism, Leids Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek*, 5-6 (1986-1987), The Hague 1989

Van den Branden 1883

F.J.P. Van den Branden, *Geschiedenis van de Antwerpsche schilderschool*, Antwerp 1883

Brenninkmeyer-de Rooij 1984

B. Brenninkmeyer-de Rooij, 'Theories of Art', in: *Haak 1984*, pp. 60-70

Brown 1986

C. Brown, 'Introduction', in: *London 1986*, pp. 11-44

Brown 2002

C. Brown, 'The birds of a feather', in: *London 2002*, pp. 34-41

Bruyn 1988

J. Bruyn, 'Old and new elements in 16th-century imagery', *Oud Holland*, 102 (1988), 2, pp. 90-113

- Buddensieg & Winner 1968
 T. Buddensieg & M. Winner (eds.), *Munuscula discipulorum: Kunsthistorische Studien Hans Kauffmann zum 70. Geburtstag, 1966*, Berlin 1968
- Buijsen 1993
 E. Buijsen, 'Tussen fantasie en werkelijkheid: 17^{de} eeuwse Hollandse landschapschilderkunst', in: Tokyo/Kasama Nichido/Kumamoto/Leiden 1992-1993, pp. 45-63
- Carpiceci 1987
 A.C. Carpiceci, 'La basilica Vaticana vista da Martin van Heemskerck', *Bolletino d'Arte*, 72 (1987), 44-45, pp. 67-128
- Cavalli-Björkman (ed.) 1985
 G. Cavalli-Björkman (ed.), *Netherlandish mannerism. Papers given at a symposium in Nationalmuseum Stockholm September 21-22, 1984*, Stockholm 1985
- Cavalli-Björkman (ed.) 1993
 G. Cavalli-Björkman (ed.), *Rembrandt and his pupils. Papers given at a symposium in Nationalmuseum Stockholm, 2-3 October 1992*, Stockholm 1993
- Chong 1987
 A. Chong, 'The drawings of Cornelis Poelenburgh', *Master drawings* 15 (1987), 1, pp. 2-62
- Dacos 1985
 N. Dacos, 'Hermannus Posthumus. Rome, Mantua, Lanshut', *The Burlington Magazine*, 127 (1985), 988, pp. 433-438
- Dacos 1989
 N. Dacos, 'L'Anonyme A de Berlin: Hermannus Posthumus', in: Harprath & Wrede 1989, pp. 61-80
- DaCosta Kaufmann 1997
 T. DaCosta Kaufmann, 'Reading Van Mander on the reception of Rome: a crux in the biography of Spranger in the *Schilder-boeck*', *Bolletino d'arte* (1997), 100, pp. 295-304
- Devisscher 1996
 H. Devisscher, 'Tobias Verhaecht', in: Turner 1996, vol. 32, pp. 250-251
- Dixon 1998
 L.S. Dixon (ed.), *In detail. New studies of Northern Renaissance art in honour of Walter S. Gibson*, Turnhout 1998
- Dobos 1999
 Z. Dobos (ed.), *Ex Fumo Lucem. Baroque Studies in Honour of Klára Garas Presented on Her Eightieth Birthday*, 2 vols., Budapest 1999
- Egger 1905-1906
 H. Egger, *Codex Escorialensis: ein Skizzenbuch aus der Werkstatt Domenico Ghirlandaios*, 2 vols., Vienna 1905-1906
- Egger 1911-1931
 H. Egger, *Römische Veduten. Handzeichnungen aus dem XV. bis XVIII. Jahrhundert zur Topographie der Stadt Rom*, 2 vols., Vienna 1911-1931
- Eiche et al. 1999
 S. Eiche, G. J. van der Sman, J. van Waadenoijen, *Fiamminghi a Roma 1508-1608: Proceedings of the Symposium held at Utrecht, Museum Catharijneconvent, 13.03.1995*, Florence 1999
- Fairbairn 1998
 L. Fairbairn, *Italian Renaissance Drawings from the collection of the Sir John Soane's Museum*, 2 vols., London 1998
- Faries 1975
 M. Faries, 'Underdrawings in the workshop production of Jan van Scorel – A study with infrared reflectography', *Scientific examination of early Netherlandish Painting. Applications in Art History, Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek*, 26 (1975), pp. 89-228
- Faries 1998
 M. Faries, 'Jan van Scorel's Jerusalem Landscapes', in: Dixon 1998, pp. 113-134
- Faries & Wolff 1996
 M. Faries & M. Wolff, 'Landscape in the Early Paintings of Jan van Scorel', *The Burlington Magazine*, 138 (1996), 1124, pp. 724-733
- Friedländer 1975
 M.J. Friedländer, *Early Netherlandish Painting. Jan van Scorel and Pieter Coeck van Aelst*, vol. 12, Leiden 1975

- Van Gelder 1942
J.G. Van Gelder, 'Jan Gossaert in Rome 1908-1909', *Oud Holland*, 59 (1942), pp. 1-11
- Van Gelder 1966-1967
J.G. Van Gelder, 'Jan van Scorel in Frankrijk en Vlaanderen', *Simiolus*, 1 (1966-1967), 1, pp. 5-36
- Van Gelder 1967
J.G. Van Gelder, 'Drawings by Jan van de Velde', *Master Drawings*, 5 (1967), 1, pp. 39-42
- Gerszi 1992
T. Gerszi, 'The draughtsmanship of Lodewijk Toeput', *Master Drawings*, 30 (1992), 4, pp. 367-388
- Gerszi 1999
T. Gerszi, 'Recent contributions to Lodewijk Toeput's Oeuvre of Drawings', in: Dobos 1999, pp. 89-96
- Gibson 1989
W.S. Gibson, *Mirror of the earth: the world landscape in sixteenth-century Flemish painting*, Princeton 1989
- Gibson 2000
W.S. Gibson, *Pleasant Places : The Rustic Landscape from Bruegel to Ruisdael*, Berkely etc. 2000
- Goeree 1668 (ed. Kwakkelstein 1998)
W. Goeree, *Willem Goeree: inleydinge tot de al-ghemeene teyken-konst: een kritische geannoteerde editie [Middelburg 1668]* (ed. M.W. Kwakkelstein), Leiden 1998
- Gombrich 1978
E.H. Gombrich, *Norm and form*, London 1978 (third edition)
- Gombrich 2002
E.H. Gombrich, *Art and Illusion. A study in the psychology of pictorial representation*, London 2002 (sixth edition)
- Grosshans 1980
R. Grosshans, *Maerten van Heemskerck. Die Gemälde*, Berlin 1980
- Haak 1984
B. Haak, *The Golden Age: Dutch painters of the seventeenth century*, London 1984
- Harprath & Wrede 1989
R. Harprath, H. Wrede (eds.), *Antikenzeichnung und Antikenstudium in Renaissance und Frühbarock. Akten des Internationalen Symposions, 8.-10. September 1986 in Coburg*, Mainz am Rhein 1989
- Härting 1993
U. Härting, 'Enige frühe Werke des Tobias Verhaecht (1561-1630)', in: Mai *et al.* 1993, pp. 93-103
- Haslinghuis & Janse 1997
E.J. Haslinghuis, H. Janse, *Bouwkundige termen. Verklarend woordenboek van de westerse architectuur- en bouwhistorie*, Leiden 1997
- Hautekeete 2000
S. Hautekeete, 'Van stad en Land: het beeld van Brabant in de vroege topografische tekenkunst', in: Brussels 2000, pp. 47-57
- Haverkamp-Begemann *et al.* 1999
E. Haverkamp-Begemann, M. Tavener Holmes, F. Koreny *et al.*, *The Robert Lehman Collection. Fifteenth- to Eighteenth-Century European Drawings. Central Europe, The Netherlands, France, England*, vol. 7, New York-Princeton 1999
- Held 1963
J.S. Held, 'The early appreciation of drawings', *Latin American Art and the Baroque Period in Europe. Studies in Western art: acts of the twentieth International congress of the history of art*, vol. 3, Princeton, New Jersey 1963
- Hendriks 2003
C. Hendriks, *Northern Landscapes on Roman walls: The frescoes of Matthijs and Paul Bril*, Florence 2003
- Herzog 1968a
S.J. Herzog, *Jan Gossaert, called Mabuse (ca. 1478-1532), a study of his chronology with a catalogue of his works* (diss. Bryn Mawr), s.l. 1968
- Herzog 1968b
S.J. Herzog, 'Tradition and Innovation in Gossart's Neptune and Amphitrite and Danae', *Bulletin Museum Boymans-van Beuningen*, 19 (1968), 1-3, pp. 25-41
- Hollstein
F.W.H. Hollstein's *Dutch & Flemish Etchings, Engravings and Woodcuts ca. 1450-1700*, 71 vols., Amsterdam etc., 1949-2009
- Hoogewerff 1929
G.J. Hoogewerff, 'Scorel-parallelten', *Oud Holland*, 46 (1929), pp. 197-214

- Van Hoogstraten 1678
 S. van Hoogstraten, *Inleyding tot de Hooge Schoole der Schilder-konst (...)*, Rotterdam 1678
- Horster 1984
 M. Horster, 'Der Minervatempel auf dem Forum Transitorium in Zeichnungen der Renaissance', *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz*, 28 (1984), 2, pp. 133-172
- Houbraken 1718-1721 (ed. Swillens & Vogelsang 1943-1953)
 A. Houbraken, *De groote schouburgh der Nederlantsche konstschilders en schilderessen* (eds. P.T.A. Swillens, W. Vogelsang), 3 vols., Maastricht 1943-1953
- Hülsen 1927
 C. Hülsen, 'Unbekannte Römische Zeichnungen von Marten van Heemskerck', *Mededelingen van het Nederlands Historisch Instituut te Rome*, 7 (1927), pp. 83-96
- Hülsen & Egger 1913-1916
 C. Hülsen, H. Egger, *Die römischen Skizzenbücher von Marten van Heemskerck im Königlichen Kupferstichkabinett zu Berlin*, 2 vols., Berlin 1913-1916
- Hülsen & Egger 1913-1916 (ed. 1975)
 C. Hülsen, H. Egger, *Die römischen Skizzenbücher von Marten van Heemskerck im Königlichen Kupferstichkabinett zu Berlin* [Berlin 1913-1916], Soest 1975
- Kettering 1988
 A.M. Kettering, *Drawings from the Ter Borch Studio Estate*, 2 vols., The Hague 1988
- Konst & Sellink 1995
 J. Konst, M. Sellink, *De Grote Schouwburg: Schildersbiografieën van Arnold Houbraken*, Amsterdam 1995
- Krautheimer 1949
 R. Krautheimer, 'Some drawings of Early Christian Basilicas in Rome: St. Peter's and S. Maria Maggiore', *The Art Bulletin*, 31 (1949), 3, pp. 211-215
- Laureyssens 1997
 W. Laureyssens, 'Dessins de Hendrick de Clerck à Rome et ses environs', *Bollettino d'arte (Fiamminghi a Roma 1508-1608, Atti del Convegno Internazionale, Bruxelles 24.02.1995-25.02.1995)*, 14 (1997), 100, pp. 161-170
- Legrand et al. 1994
 C. Legrand, J.-F. Méjanès, E. Starcky (ed.), *Le paysage en Europe du XVI au XVIIIe siècle: Actes du colloque organisé au Musée du Louvre par le Service Culturel du 25 au 27 janvier 1990*, Paris 1994
- Lugt 1968
 F. Lugt, *Inventaire général des dessins des Ecoles du Nord : Musée du Louvre, Cabinet des dessins, Maîtres des Anciens Pays-Bas nés avant 1550*, Paris 1968
- Mai et al. 1993
 E. Mai, K. Schütz, H. Vlieghe (eds.), *Die Malerei Antwerpens - Gattungen, Meister, Wirkungen : Studien zur flämischen Kunst des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts : Internationales Kolloquium Wien 1993*, Cologne 1994
- Mancini 1617-1621 (ed. Marucchi 1956-1957)
 G. Mancini, *Considerazioni sulla pittura* [Rome 1617-1621] (ed. A. Marucchi), 2 vols., Rome 1956-1957
- Van Mander 1604
 K. Van Mander, *Schilder-boeck*, Haarlem 1604
- Van Mander 1604 (ed. Miedema 1973)
 K. Van Mander, *Den grondt der edel vry schilder-const* [Haarlem 1604] (ed. H. Miedema), 2 vols., Utrecht 1973
- Van Mander 1604 (ed. Miedema 1994-1999)
 K. Van Mander, *Karel van Mander : The Lives of the Illustrious Netherlandish and German Painters, from the first edition of the Schilder-boeck (1603-1604)* [Haarlem 1604] (ed. H. Miedema), 6 vols., Doornspijk 1994-1999
- Märker & Bergsträsser 1998
 P. Märker & G. Bergsträsser, *Hundert Zeichnungen alter Meister aus dem Hessischen Landesmuseum Darmstadt*, Leipzig 1998
- Mason Rinaldi & Luciani 1988
 S. Mason Rinaldi & D. Luciani (eds.), *Toeput a Treviso: Ludovico Pozzoserrato, Lodewijk Toeput, pittore neerlandese nella civiltà veneta del tardo Cinquecento: atti del seminario, Treviso, 6-7 novembre 1987*, Asolo 1988
- Meder 1919 (ed. Ames 1978)
 J. Meder, *The mastery of Drawing* [Vienna 1919] (ed. Ames), 2 vols., New York 1978
- Meijer 1999
 B.W. Meijer, 'Introduction', in: Eiche et al. 1999, pp. 7-14.

- Meijer 2004
B.W. Meijer, 'Ritrarre la natura: dal Van Mander a Valerio Mariani', *Sztuka i kultura* (2004), 5, pp. 113-143
- Meijer 2006
B.W. Meijer, 'La perfetta imitazione de' veri paesi', in : Turin 2006, pp. 33-45 (English translation pp. 173-179)
- Mensger 2002
A. Mensger, *Jan Gossaert. Die niederländische Kunst zu Beginn der Neuzeit*, Berlin 2002
- Miedema 1969
H. Miedema, 'Het voorbeeldt niet te by te hebben. Over Hendrik Goltzius' tekeningen naar de antieken', in: *Miscellanea J.Q. van Regteren Altena*, Amsterdam 1969, pp. 74-78
- Miedema 1981
H. Miedema, *Kunst, kunstenaar en kunstwerk bij Karel van Mander: een analyse van zijn levensbeschrijvingen*, Alphen aan den Rijn 1981
- Miedema 1988
H. Miedema, 'Kunst, kunstenaar, kunstschilder. Een bijdrage tot de geschiedenis van de begrippen', *Oud Holland*, 102 (1988), 1, pp. 71-77
- Miedema 1989
H. Miedema, 'Over vakonderwijs aan kunstschilders in de Nederlanden tot de zeventiende eeuw', in: Boschloo *et al.* 1989, pp. 268-282
- Morselli 1988
R. Morselli, 'Toeput a Firenze e Roma', in: Mason Rinaldi & Luciani 1988, pp. 79-87
- Muller *et al.* 1998
N.E. Muller, B.J. Rosasco, J.H. Marrow (eds.), *Herri met de Bles: studies and explorations of the world landscape tradition*, Turnhout 1998
- Nalis 1998
H. Nalis, *The New Hollstein. Dutch and Flemish Etchings, Engravings and Woodcuts 1450-1700, The Van Doetecum Family*, 4 vols., Roosendaal 1993-1994
- Netto-Bol 1975
M.L.L. Netto-Bol, 'Einleitung', in: Hülsen & Egger 1913-1916 (ed. 1975), without pages
- Netto-Bol 1976
M.L.L. Netto-Bol, *The so-called Maarten de Vos Sketchbook of Drawings after the Antique*, The Hague 1976
- Nieuwenhuizen 2001
P. Nieuwenhuizen, 'Jan Gossaert, *Spinario en fragmenten van andere Romeinse beeldhouwwerken*, 1509', in: Bartelings *et al.* 2001, pp. 19-21
- Nuti 1994
L. Nuti, 'The perspective Plan in the Sixteenth Century: The Invention of a Representational Language', *The Art Bulletin* 76 (1994), 1, pp. 105-128
- Oberhuber 1968
K. Oberhuber, 'Hieronymus Cock, Battista Pittoni und Paolo Veronese in Villa Maser', in: Buddensieg & Winner 1968, pp. 207-224
- Oberhuber 1978
K. Oberhuber, *The illustrated Bartsch. The works of Marcantonio Raimondi and of his school*, vol. 26, New York 1978
- Olitsky Rubinstein 1985
R. Olitsky Rubinstein, 'Tempus edax rerum': A Newly Discovered Painting by Hermannus Posthumus, *The Burlington Magazine*, 127 (1985), 988, pp. 425-436
- Orenstein 1990
N. Orenstein, 'The Large Panorama of Rome by Hendrik Hondius I after Hendrick van Cleef III', *Bulletin Rijksmuseum*, 38 (1990), 1, pp. 25-36
- Parshall 1993
P. Parshall, 'Imago contrafacta: images and facts in the northern renaissance', *Art History*, 16 (1993), 4, pp. 554-579
- De Pauw-De Veen 1969
L. De Pauw-De Veen, *De begrippen 'schilder', 'schilderij' en 'schilderen' in de zeventiende eeuw*, Brussels 1969
- Plagemann 2002
V. Plagemann, 'Tod in Bologna. Hans Cranachs Reise 1537. Zur Frühgeschichte der Künstlerreisen nach Italien', *Niederdeutsche Beiträge zur Kunstgeschichte*, 41 (2002), pp. 27-155

- Plomp 2002
M.C. Plomp, *"Een voortreffelyke Liefhebberye": Het verzamelen van tekeningen door voornamen liefhebbers in de Republiek en later het Koninkrijk der Nederlanden, 1732-1833* (diss. Rijksuniversiteit Groningen), 2 vols., Groningen 2002
- Plomp 2003-2004
M.C. Plomp, 'The beauty or the different guises of nature. Studies of the Natural World and Landscapes', in: Amsterdam/New York/Toledo 2003-2004, pp. 169-201
- Popham 1932
A.E. Popham, *Catalogue of drawings by Dutch and Flemish artists preserved in the Department of Prints and Drawings of the British Museum*, vol. 5 (*Dutch and Flemish drawings of the XV and XVI centuries*), London 1932
- Pouncey & Gere 1962
P. Pouncey & J. Gere, *Raphael and his circle*, London 1962
- Preibisz 1911
L. Preibisz, *Martin van Heemskerck: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Romanismus in der Niederländischen Malerei des XVI. Jahrhunderts*, Leipzig 1911
- Van Regteren Altena 1964
I.Q. Van Regteren Altena, *Vereeuwigde stad: Rome door Nederlanders getekend, 1500-1900*, Amsterdam 1964
- Riggs 1977
T.A. Riggs, *Hieronymus Cock: printmaker and publisher*, New York 1977
- Robinson & Wolff 1986-1987
W.W. Robinson, M. Wolf, 'The functions of Drawings in the Netherlands in the Sixteenth Century', in: Washington/New York 1986-1987, pp. 25-40
- Roethlisberger 1969
M.G. Roethlisberger, *Bartholomeus Breenbergh: Handzeichnungen*, Berlin 1969
- Roethlisberger 1986
M.G. Roethlisberger, *Claude Lorrain: the Drawings*, 2 vols., New Haven 1968
- Van Roey 1968
J. van Roey, 'Het Antwerpse geslacht Van Haecht (Verhaecht). Tafereelmakers, schilders, kunsthandelaars', in: *Miscellanea Jozef Duverger: Bijdragen tot de kunstgeschiedenis der Nederlanden*, vol. 1, Ghent 1968, pp. 216-228
- Rombouts & Van Lerijs 1864-1876
De liggeren en andere historische archieven der Antwerpsche Sint Lucasgilde (...), 2 vols., Antwerp 1864-1876
- Rubinstein 2008-2009
G. Rubinstein, 'The Drawings of Jan Lievens', in: Washington/Milwaukee/Amsterdam 2008-2009, pp. 68-79
- Van Ruyven-Zeman 1995
Z. Van Ruyven-Zeman, 'Lambert van Noort. Inventor', *Verhandelingen van de Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België, Klasse der Schone Kunsten*, 57 (1995), 61
- Salerno 1991
L. Salerno, *I pittori di vedute in Italia (1580-1830)*, Rome 1991
- Von Sandrart 1675-1680
J. von Sandrart, *Teutsche Academie der Edlen Bau-, Bild- und Mahlerey-Künste*, 3 vols., Nürnberg 1675-1680
- Schapelhouman 1987
M. Schapelhouman, *Nederlandse tekeningen omstreeks 1600/Netherlandish drawings circa 1600, Catalogus van de Nederlandse Tekeningen in het Rijksprentenkabinet*, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, vol. 3, The Hague 1987
- Schapelhouman & Scholten 2009
M. Schapelhouman, F. Scholten, 'Eleven Drawings and a Statue. A Selection from the Van Regteren Altena Donation', *Bulletin Rijksmuseum* (2009), 1, pp. 88-110
- Schatborn 1991-1992
P. Schatborn, 'The importance of Drawing from Life – Some Preliminary Notes', in: Amsterdam/Vienna/New York/Cambridge 1991-1992, pp. 7-12
- Schatborn 1993
P. Schatborn, 'Rembrandt: from Life and from Memory', in: Cavalli-Björkman (ed.) 1993, pp. 156-172
- Schatborn 1994
P. Schatborn, 'La naissance du paysage naturaliste aux Pays-Bas et l'influence de la topographie aux environs de 1600', in: Legrand *et al.* 1994, pp. 47-65

- Schatborn 2001
 P. Schatborn, 'Nederlandse tekenaars in Italië', in : Amsterdam 2001, pp. 11-19
- Schreiber Jacoby 1996
 B. Schreiber Jacoby, 'Drawing', in : Turner 1996, vol. 9, pp. 212-233
- Scott-Elliott 1939-1940
 A.H. Scott-Elliott, 'Tobias Verhaecht (1561-1631) – A view of the Inn valley with the Martinswand – Collection A.P. Oppé, Esq., C.B. (...)', *Old Master Drawings*, 14 (1939-1940), 54-56, pp. 54-56
- Spicer 1988
 J.A. Spicer, 'Topographical Drawings of Central Europe by Artists from the Netherlands: The Case of Peeter Houck', *Master Drawings*, 26 (1988), 4, pp. 351-356
- Spicer-Durham 1979
 J.A. Spicer-Durham, 'The Drawings of Roelandt Savery' (diss. Yale University, New Haven), 2 vols., s.l. 1979
- Stechow 1975
 W. Stechow, 'Verhaecht and Houck, Teacher and Pupil', *Master Drawings*, 13 (1975), 2, pp. 145-147
- Steland 1989
 A.C. Steland, *Die Zeichnungen des Jan Asselijn*, Fridingen 1989
- Steland 2001-2002
 A.C. Steland, 'Studien zu Herman van Swanevelt – Zeichnungen zu Fresken und Gemälden', *Oud Holland* 115 (2001-2002), 1, pp. 19-60
- Steland-Stief 1971
 A.C. Steland, *Jan Asselijn – nach 1610 bis 1652*, Amsterdam 1971
- Sterk 1980
 J. Sterk, *Philips van Bourgondië (1465-1524), bisschop van Utrecht als protagonist van de renaissance: zijn leven en mecenaat*, Zutphen 1980
- Swan 1995
 C. Swan, 'Ad vivum, naer het leven, from the life: defining a mode of representation', *Word & Image*, 2 (1995), 4, pp. 353-372
- Van Thiel 1999
 P.J.J. van Thiel, *Cornelis Cornelisz van Haarlem (1562-1638) : A Monograph and Catalogue Raisonné*, Doornspijk 1999
- Thoenes 1986
 C. Thoenes, 'St. Peter als Ruine: Zu einigen Veduten Heemskercks', *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte*, 49 (1986), 4, pp. 481-501
- Troutman 1971
 P. Troutman, *Albrecht Dürer. Sketchbook of His Journey to the Netherlands 1520-21*, New York-Washington 1971
- Turner 1966
 A.R. Turner, *The vision of landscape in Renaissance Italy*, Princeton 1966
- Turner 1996
 J. Turner (ed.), *The dictionary of art*, 34 vols., New York 1996
- Veldman 1977a
 I.M. Veldman, [Review Hülsen & Egger 1913-1916] *Simiolus*, 9 (1977), 2, pp. 106-113
- Veldman 1977b
 I.M. Veldman, *Maarten van Heemskerck and Dutch Humanism in the Sixteenth Century*, Maarsse 1977
- Veldman 1987
 I.M. Veldman, 'Heemskercks Romeinse tekeningen en 'Anonymus B'', *Was getekend... tekenkunst door de eeuwen heen. Liber amicorum prof. dr. E.K.J. Reznicek, Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek*, 38 (1987), pp. 369-382
- Veldman 1993-1994
 I.M. Veldman, *The New Hollstein. Dutch and Flemish Etchings, Engravings and Woodcuts 1450-1700, Maarten van Heemskerck*, 2 vols., Roosendaal 1993-1994
- Veldman 2008
 I.M. Veldman, 'Landschap en de antieke kunst. Maarten van Heemskercks 'Berlijnse schetsboek'', in: Abrahamse et al. 2008, pp. 47-55
- Verberne 2001
 J. Verberne, 'De Bentveughels (1620/1621-1720) te Rome. Karakterisering van de groep en presentatie van een nieuw document', in: Amsterdam 2001, pp. 22-32

Vlieghe 1998a

H. Vlieghe, *Flemish art and architecture, 1585-1700*, New Haven etc. 1998

Vlieghe 1998b

H. Vlieghe, 'Flemish art, does it really exist?', *Simiolus*, 26 (1998), 3, pp. 187-200

Weber 1977

B. Weber, 'Die Figur des Zeichners in der Landschaft', *Zeitschrift für Schweizerische Archäologie und Kunstgeschichte*, 34 (1977), 1, pp. 44-82

Van de Wetering 1997

E. Van de Wetering, *Rembrandt: the painter at work*, Amsterdam 1997

Van de Wetering 1998

E. van de Wetering, 'Binnen of buiten? Episoden uit de geschiedenis van het buiten schilderen en tekenen', in: Amsterdam 1998, pp. 9-17

Wilton-Ely 1996

J. Wilton-Ely, 'Veduta', in: Turner 1996, vol. 32, pp. 110-114

Winner 1985

M. Winner, 'Vedute in Flemish landscape drawings of the 16th century', in: Cavalli-Björkman (ed.) 1985, pp. 85-96

Wolff-Metternich 1987

F. Wolff-Metternich, C. Thoenes (co-author), *Die frühen St.-Peter-Entwürfe, 1505-1514*, Tübingen 1987

Wood Ruby 1999

L. Wood Ruby, *Paul Bril: The Drawings*, Pictura Nova, 4, Turnhout 1999

Wood Ruby 2003

L. Wood Ruby, 'Before the Frescoes: the Drawings', in: Hendriks 2003, pp. 72-85

Zerner 1979

H. Zerner (ed.), *The illustrated Bartsch. Italian artists of the sixteenth century. School of Fontainebleau*, vol. 33, New York 1979

Exhibition catalogues

Antwerp 1999

Het licht van de Natuur. Het landschap in tekening en aquarel door Van Dyck en tijdgenoten (M. Royalton-Kisch), Antwerp (Rubenshuis) 1999

Amsterdam 1986

Kunst voor de Beeldenstorm, Noordnederlandse kunst 1525-1580 (eds. J.P. Filedt Kok et al.), 2 vols., Amsterdam (Rijksmuseum) 1986

Amsterdam 1993-1994

Dawn of the Golden Age: Northern Netherlandish art 1580-1620 (eds. G. Luijten, A. van Suchtelen, R.J. Baarsen et al.), Amsterdam (Rijksmuseum) 1993-1994

Amsterdam 1995

In de ban van Italië: tekeningen uit een Amsterdamse verzameling (I. Oud, M. Jonker, M. Schapelhouman), Amsterdam (Amsterdams Historische Museum) 1995

Amsterdam 1998

Buiten tekenen in Rembrandts tijd (B. van den Boogert, L.D. Couprie, L. van Oosterzee et al.), Amsterdam (Museum Het Rembrandthuis) 1998

Amsterdam 2001

Tekenen van warmte. 17^{de} eeuwse Nederlandse tekenaars in Italië (P. Schatborn, J. Verberne), Amsterdam (Rijksmuseum) 2001

Amsterdam/New York/Toledo 2003-2004

Hendrick Goltzius (1558-1617) : Drawings, prints and paintings (eds. H. Leeflang, G. Luijten), Amsterdam (Rijksmuseum), New York (The Metropolitan Museum of Art), Toledo (The Toledo Museum of Art) 2003-2004

Amsterdam/Vienna/New York/Cambridge 1991-1992

Seventeenth Century Dutch Drawings. A Selection from the Maida and George Abrams Collection (W.W. Robinson), Amsterdam (Rijksprentenkabinet, Rijksmuseum), Vienna (Graphische Sammlung Albertina), New York (Pierpont Morgan Library), Cambridge (The Fogg Art Museum) 1991-1992

Berlin 1967

Zeichner sehen die Antike: Europäische Handzeichnungen (M. Winner), 1450-1800, Berlin-Dahlem (Staatliche Museen der Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Kupferstichkabinett) 1967

Berlin 1975

Pieter Bruegel d. Ä. als Zeichner. Herkunft und Nachfolge (F.A. Anzelewsky et al.), Berlin (Staatliche Museen Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Kupferstichkabinett) 1975

Berlin 2007-2008

Disegno: Der Zeichner im Bild der Frühen Neuzeit (eds. H.-T. Schulze Altcapenberg, M. Thimann), Berlin (Staatliche Museen, Kupferstichkabinett) 2007-2008

Berlin/Amsterdam/London 1991-1992

Rembrandt: De meester & zijn werkplaats: Tekeningen & etsen (eds. H. Bevers, P. Schatborn, B. Welzel), Berlijn (Altes Museum), Amsterdam (Rijksmuseum), London (The National Gallery) 1991-1992

Brussels 2000

Met passer en penseel: Brussel en het oude hertogdom Brabant in beeld (eds. V. Van de Kerckhof, H. Bussers, V. Bücken), Brussels (Koninklijke Musea voor Schone Kunsten van België) 2000

Brussels 2004

Van (aanleg)tekening tot schildering. Sebastiaen Vrancx (Antwerpen 1573-1647) en zijn samenwerking met andere meesters (J. Vander Auwera, L. Bolle), Brussels (Koninklijke Musea voor Schone Kunsten van België) 2004

Brussels/Rotterdam/Paris/Bern 1968-1969

Landschapstekeningen van Hollandse meesters uit de XlIe eeuw uit de particuliere verzameling bewaard in het Institut Néerlandais te Parijs (C. van Hasselt), 2 vols., Brussels (Albert I-bibliotheek), Rotterdam (Museum Boymans-Van Beuningen), Parijs (Institut Néerlandais), Bern (Kunstmuseum) 1968-1969

Brussels/Rotterdam/Paris 1972-1973

Hollandse en Vlaamse tekeningen uit de zeventiende eeuw: verzameling van de Hermitage, Leningrad en het Museum Poesjkin, Moskou, Brussels (Koninklijke Bibliotheek Albert I), Rotterdam (Museum Boymans-Van Beuningen), Paris (Institut Néerlandais) 1972-1973

Brussels/Rome 1995

Fiamminghi a Roma. Kunstenaars uit de Nederlanden en het bisdom Luik te Rome tijdens de Renaissance (ed. H. Devisscher), Brussels (Paleis voor Schone Kunsten), Rome (Palazzo delle Esposizioni) 1995

Cologne/Antwerp/Vienna 1992-1993

Von Bruegel bis Rubens: Das goldene Jahrhundert der flämischen Malerei (eds. E. Mai, H. Vlieghe), Cologne (Wallraf-Richartz-Museum), Antwerp (Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten), Vienna (Kunsthistorisches Museum) 1992-1993

Cologne/Zürich/Vienna 1996-1997

Das Capriccio als Kunstprinzip: Zur Vorgeschichte der Moderne von Arcimboldo und Callot bis Tiepolo und Goya: Malerei, Zeichnung, Graphik (ed. E. Mai), Cologne (Wallraf-Richartz-Museum), Zürich (Kunsthaus), Vienna (Kunsthistorisches Museum im Palais Harrach) 1996-1997

Florence 1966

Artisti Olandesi e Fiamminghi in Italia. Disegni del Cinque e del Seicento della Collezione Frits Lugt (A. Blankert, C. Van Hasselt), Florence (Istituto Universitario Olandese di Storia dell' Arte) 1966

Florence 2008

Fiamminghi e Olandesi a Firenze: Disegni dalle collezioni degli Uffizi (eds. W.T. Kloek, B.W. Meijer), Florence (Gabinetto Disegni e Stampe degli Uffizi) 2008

The Hague 2006

Droom van Italië (H. van Os), The Hague (Koninklijk Kabinet van Schilderijen Mauritshuis) 2006

London 1986

Dutch landscape, the early years. Haarlem and Amsterdam 1590-1650 (C. Brown), London (The National Gallery) 1986

London 2002

Inspired by Italy. Dutch landscape painting 1600-1700 (L.B. Harwood), London (Dulwich Picture Gallery) 2002

London/Paris/Bern/Brussels 1972

Flemish drawings of the seventeenth century from the collection of Frits Lugt, Institut Néerlandais, Paris, London (Victoria and Albert Museum), Paris (Institut Néerlandais), Bern (Kunstmuseum), Brussels (Royal Library of Belgium) 1972

Luxembourg 2007

Un prince de la Renaissance, Pierre-Ernest de Mansfeld (1517-1604) (eds. J.L. Mousset, K. De Jonge), 2 vols., Luxembourg (Musée National d'Histoire et d'Art) 2007

Ottawa/Cambridge/Fredericton 2003-2005

Dessins flamands et hollandais du Musée des beaux-arts du Canada (ed. J.A. Spicer), Ottawa (Musée des Beaux-Arts du Canada), Cambridge (Arthur M. Sackler Museum, Harvard University Art Museums), Fredericton (Beaverbrook Art Gallery), 2003-2005

Providence 1978

The Origins of the Italian Veduta. An Exhibition by the Departments of Art, Brown University (E. Berns, D.E. Bonner, H.A. Dayag et al.), Providence (Bell Gallery) 1978

Rome 1971

Vedute Romane. Disegni dal XVI al XVIII secolo (M. Chiarini), Rome (Gabinetto Nazionale delle Stampe) 1971

Rome 2000-2001

Roma Veduta: disegni e stampe panoramiche della città dal XV al XIX secolo (cat. M.Gori Sassoli), Rome (Palazzo Poli) 2000-2001

Rotterdam/Bruges 1965

Jan Gossaert genaamd Mabuse (H. Pauwels, H.R. Hoetink, S. Herzog), Rotterdam (Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen), Bruges (Groeningemuseum) 1965

's-Hertogenbosch 1993

Roma Veduta: Rome gezien door Nederlandse meesters uit de 16de en 17de eeuw. Tekeningen en aquarellen uit de collectie van de Farnesina te Rome (N. Köhler, J.C.N. Bruintjes), 's-Hertogenbosch (Noordbrabants Museum) 1993

's-Hertogenbosch/Rome 1992-1993

Da Van Heemskerck a Van Wittel: Disegni fiamminghi e olandesi del XVI-XVII secolo dalle collezioni del Gabinetto dei Disegni e delle Stampe (J.C.N. Bruintjes, N. Köhler), 's-Hertogenbosch (Noordbrabants Museum), Rome (Istituto Nazionale per la Grafica, Gabinetto dei Disegni e delle Stampe) 1992-1993

's-Hertogenbosch 2001

Panorama op de wereld: Het landschap van Bosch tot Rubens (ed. P. Huys Janssen), 's-Hertogenbosch (Noordbrabants Museum) 2001

Tokyo/Kasama Nichido/Kumamoto/Leiden 1992-1993

Tussen fantasie en werkelijkheid. 17de eeuwse Hollandse landschapschilderkunst (ed. E. Buijsen), Tokyo (Tokyo Station Gallery), Kasama Nichido (Kasama Nichido Museum of Art), Kumamoto (Kumamoto Prefectural Museum of Art), Leiden (Stedelijk Museum De Lakenhal) 1992-1993

Turin 2006

Paesaggio e veduta da Poussin a Canaletto: Dipinti da Palazzo Barberini (R. Dubbini, A. Lo Bianco, A. Negro et al.), Turin (Pinacoteca Giovanni e Marella Agnelli) 2006

Utrecht 1955

Jan van Scorel (A.C. Esmeijer, S.H. Levie), Utrecht (Centraal Museum) 1955

Utrecht 1965

Nederlandse 17^e eeuwse Italianiserende landschapschilders (M.E. Houtzager, H.J. de Smedt, A. Blankert), Utrecht (Centraal Museum) 1965

Utrecht/Douai 1977

Jan van Scorel in Utrecht: altaarstukken en schilderijen omstreeks 1540, documenten, technisch onderzoek, Utrecht (Centraal Museum), Douai (Musée de la Chartreuse) 1977

Utrecht 2009

Exhibition guide: Scorels Roem. Hoe een Utrechtse schilder de Renaissance naar het Noorden bracht (L.M. Helmus), Utrecht (Centraal Museum) 2009

Vatican City 1988

Views of Rome from the Thomas Ashby collection in the Vatican Library: catalogue of a travelling exhibition in the U.S.A. (ed. R. Keaveney), London 1988

Vienna 1964-1965

Claude Lorrain und die Meister der römischen Landschaft im XVII. Jahrhundert, Vienna (Graphische Sammlung Albertina) 1964-1965

Vienna 2007-2008

Traum vom Süden: Die Niederländer malen Italien (ed. R. Trnek), Vienna (Gemäldegalerie der Akademie der bildenden Künste), Ostfildern 2007

Washington/New York 1986-1987

The Age of Bruegel: Netherlandish drawings in the Sixteenth century (J.O. Hand, J.R. Judson, W.W. Robinson, M. Wolf), Washington (National Gallery of Art), New York (Pierpont Morgan Library) 1986-1987

Washington/Milwaukee/Amsterdam 2008-2009

Jan Lievens. A Dutch Master Rediscovered (A.K. Wheelock Jr.), Washington (National Gallery of Art), Milwaukee (Milwaukee Art Museum), Amsterdam (Rembrandthuis) 2008-2009

Woerden 2007

Het zuiden tegemoet: de landschappen van Herman van Swanevelt (1603-1655) (A. Blankert *et al.*, ed. F. de Graaf), Woerden (Stadsmuseum) Harderwijk 2007

Internet sources

E-publication *Early Netherlandish paintings in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam. Volume I – Artists born before 1500*:

<http://www.rijksmuseum.nl/collectie/zoeken/asset.jsp?id=SK-A-670&lang=nl>

E-prepublication of the forthcoming *Catalogue of Paintings 1450-1600*, Centraal Museum, Utrecht:

http://www.centraalmuseum.nl/ContentFiles/21_Scorel_Lokhorst.pdf

http://www.centraalmuseum.nl/ContentFiles/24_Scorel_bewening.pdf

On-line collection database British Museum, London:

http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/search_the_collection_database.aspx

On-line collection database Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge:

<http://www.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/opac/search/search.html>

On-line image archive of the Noord-Hollands archief:

<http://www.beeldbank.noord-hollandsarchief.nl/>

On-line database RKD Images:

[http://www.rkd.nl/rkddb/\(vlhrv1b3imsgb555bpcwlgne\)/search.aspx](http://www.rkd.nl/rkddb/(vlhrv1b3imsgb555bpcwlgne)/search.aspx)

On-line Latin dictionary:

<http://clt.brepolis.net.proxy.library.uu.nl/dld/Default.aspx>