University of Kent, Canterbury

Freie Universität Berlin / Free University of Berlin

School of Arts

Fachbereich Philosophie und Geisteswissenschaften / Department of Philosophy and Humanities,

Peter Szondi-Institut für Allgemeine und Vergleichende Literaturwissenschaft / Peter Szondi

Institute of Comparative Literature

Text and Event in Early Modern Europe (TEEME)

An Erasmus Mundus Joint Doctorate

Ph.D. Dissertation

THE FUNCTIONS OF TEXTS IN PRINTED IMAGES:

Text and Image in Reproductive Prints by Hieronymus Cock, Antonio Salamanca, and Antonio Lafreri

VOLUME 1: TEXT

Alexandra Kocsis

Supervisors:

Dr. Ben Thomas, Senior Lecturer in History of Art

(School of Arts, University of Kent)

Prof. Dr. Claudia Olk, Professor of English and Comparative Literature

(Peter-Szondi-Institute, Freie Universität Berlin)

2017

Abstract

This thesis provides a systematic analysis of textual frameworks in reproductive prints issued by three sixteenth-century publishers. The main purpose is to highlight the role of additional texts in the process of transmitting images by significant artists to a wide circle of audiences. The analysis of the relation between text and image in single sheet prints helps to reconsider the historical function of reproductive prints by introducing a point of view that is different from earlier scholarship. I argue that textual commentaries attached to printed images were intended to take part in the art theoretical discourse of their time. Inscriptions contextualised artistic achievements and helped to form the viewer's response to the image by commenting on the artistic significance of the picture or on the excellence of the artist. The analysis of additional texts reveals the artistic and historical consciousness inherent in the prints, especially in the case of the sheets published by Hieronymus Cock. Hence, my thesis demonstrates the special role of prints in the northern art theoretical context.

The present study also considers the role of prints beyond their artistic use. The "utilitarian" function of prints is explored through case studies. The connection between the culture of love and prints is examined in the chapter on Antonio Salamanca. Examples by Hieronymus Cock and Antonio Lafreri provide a comparative perspective on religious prints in the era of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation. Through the case studies, my thesis points out how the historical context influenced the selection of quotations or the commission of contemporary texts, and touches upon the importance of the collaboration between humanists (art theoreticians and poets) and the protagonists of the print world. The comparative European perspective highlights the specific and general characteristics of the inscribed texts in the prints from Antwerp and Rome. While previous scholarship emphasised the model role of the Roman publishers, this thesis nuances the picture with the hypothesis of mutual exchange between Lafreri and Cock, indicating the correlation among prints produced for the common European market.

Die Funktionen von Text in Druckgraphiken:

Text-Bild-Verhältnisse in der Reproduktionsgraphik von Hieronymus Cock, Antonio Salamanca und Antonio Lafreri

Die vorliegende Dissertation legt eine systematische Analyse von Text-Bild-Verhältnissen in den Reproduktionsgraphiken dreier Verleger des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts vor. Im Zentrum steht die Frage nach der Funktion zusätzlicher Inschriften, insbesondere im Hinblick auf die Rezeption der Bilder bedeutender Künstler durch einen großen Adressatenkreis. Die Detailanalyse von Text-Bild-Beziehungen in Einblattstichen ergänzen die bisherige Forschung zur historischen Funktion von Druckgraphiken. In meiner Arbeit vertrete ich die These, dass die zu den gedruckten Bildern hinzugefügten Textkommentare zum Kunstdiskurs des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts beitragen sollten. Sie kontextualisieren künstlerische Leistungen und leiteten die Betrachter in ihrer Auseinandersetzung mit den Graphiken an, indem sie auf den hohen künstlerischen Wert des jeweiligen Werkes bzw. Künstlers verweisen. Die Analyse dieser Texte stellt das künstlerische und das historische Bewusstsein heraus, das den Drucken zugrunde liegt, was insbesondere für die Arbeiten von Hieronymus Cock gilt. So zeigt meine Dissertation, dass die Reproduktionsgraphik eine wichtige Rolle im nordeuropäischen Kunstdiskurs spielte.

Die Arbeit fragt anhand von Fallstudien außerdem nach der Bedeutung der Druckgraphiken jenseits ihrer explizit künstlerischen bzw. kunsttheoretischen Funktion. Das Kapitel zu Antonio Salamanca untersucht die Verbindung einiger seiner mythologischen Stiche zur Kultur der höfischen Liebe. Hieronymus Cocks und Antonio Lafreris Blätter erlauben eine vergleichende Analyse religiöser Druckgraphiken in Italien bzw. den Niederlanden in der Zeit von Reformation und Gegenreformation. Über die Fallstudien kann nachgewiesen werden, wie sehr der historische Kontext die Auswahl der Zitate oder auch die Beauftragung zeitgenössischer Texte beeinflusst hat. Die Beispiele verweisen darüber hinaus auf die Bedeutung der Zusammenarbeit zwischen Humanisten (Kunsttheoretikern und Dichtern) sowie den Protagonisten in der Welt des Drucks. Die komparatistische europäische Perspektive beleuchtet schließlich sowohl Spezifika als auch allgemeine Tendenzen in Text-Bild-Verhältnissen in der Reproduktionsgraphik von Antwerpen und Rom. Während die Forschung bisher die Modellfunktion der römischen Verleger betont hat, zeichnet meine Dissertation mit ihrer Hypothese über den wechselseitigen Austausch zwischen Lafreri und Cock ein nuancierteres Bild, insofern als es die Beziehung zwischen Drucken betrachtet, die für einen gemeinsamen europäischen Markt produziert wurden.

(Translated by Aleksandra Ivanova, Freie Universität Berlin)

CONTENTS

Total word count of volume 1: 95706
Word count excluding footnotes and bibliography: 75800

Acknowledgements

INTRODUCTION
Reproductive prints

"You should examine, reflect upon, (and) fear this image of the dreadful court of justice exhibited through the skill, color, and hand of Bonarotus" - reads an excerpt from the Latin text inscribed in a print after Michelangelo's *Last Judgment* fresco (cat.117). This relatively small sheet published by Antonio Lafreri in Rome, probably in the 1570s, is an ideal example of a sixteenth-century reproductive print. It depicts an independent painted work that survives until today. The text added to the image mentions the creator of the image, thus the print meets even the modern requirements of reproduction.[1] The additional text also expands on the religious significance and meditative potentials of the depiction, and thus suggests that the sheet was not only meant as a collectible item for art lovers. The anonymous narrator of the eight-line Latin poem addresses the reader-viewer with an imperative, encouraging him or her to respond to the image in an emotionally and intellectually intense way.[2] On the one hand, the viewer is expected to admire the talent of the painter that is translated into the monochrome visual language of the print. At the same time, the inscription urges the spectator to experience the strong religious message of the image. The utilitarian and artistic purposes intertwine smoothly in this print; authorship and the talent of the artist are valued, and the function of the religious image is highlighted at the same time.

Lafreri's print showcases that communication with the audience was an important aspect of prints. It suggests that additional inscriptions in reproductive prints can show how the producers expected the audience to react to the images. Thus the analysis of these texts can reveal how the creators of the prints thought about the relation of the viewer and the image, what information they considered worth emphasising, and in what form and style they preferred to communicate ideas with the audience. This thesis looks at additional texts that were included in reproductive prints produced by three sixteenth-century publishers, and attempts to delineate the communicative strategies of these prints through

---

[1] David Landau and Peter Parshall emphasised that if one used the modern term "reproductive" one should keep its original meaning. According to this interpretation, reproductive prints should be faithful and complete copies of an independent work of art, intentionally made with the purpose of reproduction, and this intention should be expressed on the print. David Landau and Peter W. Parshall, *The Renaissance Print: 1470-1550* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), 162-168.
[2] I use the term "viewer-reader" when it is important to highlight the bimediality of the prints, that their whole meaning is only comprehensible through the combination of text and image. The order of the two words always follows the logic of the analysis: if the section is about the textual part of the print, the audience is identified as "reader-viewer" but if the examination concerns the visual part, then the spectator is called the "viewer-reader."

text and image. The analysis of the function of texts and their relation to the images can help us understand the development of the utilitarian and artistic functions of prints, how the two aspects worked together in the creation of meaning.

There are not many sixteenth-century prints that suggest such a clear position and consciousness about reproduction as Lafreri's print after Michelangelo's fresco. In most cases, the painted version of the invention is missing, either because it did not survive or it never existed. The basis of creating a print was always a drawing that was either prepared by the inventor or another draughtsman translating a painted version for the engraver. Since the term reproductive print was not used in this period, the rigid modern concept behind it is not fully adaptable. This thesis looks at the beginnings of reproductions, how the idea of transmitting a work of art in print appeared and developed in the prints themselves. On the other hand, indicating the inventor began to be a standard element of prints in the second half of the sixteenth century. This thesis attempts to show how the appearance of the designer's name became more and more standard in print production. The three publishers chosen for examination represent three stages in the process of acknowledging the inventor of the images.

The use of the word "reproductive" as a historical term has been refuted several times in the scholarship because of its anachronistic character and devaluing overtone. Firstly, the development of modern artistic reproduction was closely connected to the expansion of photography, thus to a mechanical way of copying.[3] This meant an accurate and faithful duplication of the depicted image, which cannot be applied to sixteenth-century prints as a standard. Secondly, "reproductive" implies a less creative work according to modern notions of art, which led to the depreciation of prints. The revision of the terminology became a topic in twentieth-century scholarship, and the idea emerged to compare prints depicting works of art to literary translation. The new term "translational print" *(stampa di traduzione, übersetzende Grafik)* shifted the emphasis from the issue of accuracy to the interpretative relationship between prints and their prototypes.[4] Early reproductions were defined as a dialogue between the printmaker and the original work.[5]

---

[3] Lisa Pon, *Raphael, Dürer, and Marcantonio Raimondi: Copying and the Italian Renaissance Print* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), 29-33.
[4] Evelina Borea, "Stampa figurative e pubblico dalle origini all'affermazione nel Cinquecento," in *Storia dell'Arte Italiana*, vol. 2, ed. Giovanni Previtali (Turin: G. Einaudi, 1979), 374-380. Norberto Gramaccini and Hans Jakob Meier, ed., *Die Kunst der Interpretation: italienische Reproduktionsgraphik 1485-1600* (Berlin: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 2009), 37-39.
[5] Norberto Gramaccini, "Die Aura der Reproduzierbarkeit: zum Aufkommen der Bronzestatuetten und des Kupferstichs im 15. Jahrhundert," in *Das Modell in der bildenden Kunst des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit*, ed. Heike Richter (Petersberg: Städelschen Museums-Verein, 2006), 62.

The creative approach of the engraver was emphasised, and sometimes even the function of the prints as reproductions was questioned.[6] However, in spite of this trend in the scholarship, the term remained in use to indicate the artistic significance and production circumstances of early modern prints.

The term "reproductive" is used in this thesis with a wide meaning, embracing all the prints that were produced on the basis of drawings, paintings, and sculptures, created by an artist different from the engraver.[7] Using an extended definition of the term means leaving it open to new interpretations. Trying to find a less anachronistic intepretation of the idea means keeping a powerful and widely used concept but at the same time adapting it to the historical situation of the early modern period. The term "reproductive" is still useful in defining one of the purposes of the prints, namely to transmit artistic achievements and visual inventions. During the analysis of the oeuvre of three sixteenth-century print publishers, a contemporaneous consciousness about reproduction will be analysed with the help of narrative inscriptions in the prints themselves. The examination will expand only on prints that include inscribed texts concerning the topic of the depiction. These texts help to redefine the historical function of the prints, their religious, poetic, meditative, or artistic purposes. By looking at the significance of reproductive prints from an artistic perspective, but at the same time looking for the devotional, intellectual, and poetic meaning of the sheets, this thesis is interested in how the different purposes of the prints intertwine closely.

Lafreri's print after Michelangelo's work demonstrates well the link between print culture and contemporaneous poetry. In this case, the name of the writer does not appear on the print, but this was also changing in the period. Just as the name of the designer became more and more important for single sheet publishers, the authors of the additional inscriptions also began to appear in a few examples. Beyond authorship, the number of poetic texts written to accompany the images also increased. The choice of including a brief religious poem instead of Biblical quotations or other authoritative texts balanced the relation of text and image in the prints. The use of contemporaneous poetry was an important stylistic decision. The analyses of specific examples in the thesis will show which sort of images were matched with poetic texts, how the styles of text and image

---

[6] Michael Bury, "On Some Engravings by Giorgio Ghisi Commonly Called 'Reproductive'," *Print Quarterly* 10 (1993): 19.

[7] In a similar way as the authors and curators of the exhibition *Paper Museums* used it. Rebecca Zorach and Elizabeth Rodini, "On Imitation and Invention: An Introduction to the Reproductive Print," in *Paper Museums: the Reproductive Print in Europe, 1500-1800*, ed. Rebecca Zorach and Elizabeth Rodini (Chicago, Ill.: David and Alfred Smart Museum of Art, 2005), 2.

were adapted to each other. The *Last Judgment* is an ideal example for how text and image were united in single sheet prints content-wise, stylistically, and visually.

Text and image

The use of both text and image to convey a message was not a new phenomenon in the second half of the sixteenth-century but this period was an important phase in the history of combining different media in one work. The appearance and spread of printing, the possibility of multiplying visual and textual messages in hundreds of identical copies played an important role in this history, changing the relation between viewers and works combining the two media, texts and images. This thesis looks at an episode of this story. Examining how artistic inventions were framed with texts gives a better understanding of how the producers intended printed images to be viewed. The analysis of early modern reproductive prints can provide further evidence that the formulation of the artistic canon did not only happen in theoretical or biographical writings. In my opinion, single sheet prints provided the viewer-reader with a visual version of a history of images and artistic inventions. As Elizabeth Eisenstein formulated in her groundbreaking book on the role of the printing press, "the new arts of printing and engraving, far from reducing the importance of images, increased opportunities for image makers and helped to launch art history down its present path."[8] This thesis attempts to reveal what role inscriptions in prints played in this process.

Words were incorporated in visual imagery at several points through the history of images, even before the Christian era. Multi-media genres combining text and image appeared in various forms from the Odyssey landscapes of Roman antiquity through late medieval *tituli*, inscriptions in paintings, inscriptions on frames of paintings to emblem books of the early modern period. The combination of text and image was not an unusual experience for the medieval and early modern spectators. Multi-media genres should not be surprising for the twenty-first century eye either since we are living in a world where "the visual and the verbal are evidently working together."[9] However, the disciplinary division of the academic world put more emphasis on the divide of word and image, than on their working together. The historical narrative of text and image as a complementary,

---

[8] Elizabeth L. Eisenstein, *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change* (Cambridge: University Press, 1979), 68.
[9] John A. Bateman, *Text and Image: a Critical Introduction to the Visual/Verbal Divide* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2014), 11.

integrative unity had to be rediscovered by interdisciplinary research.[10] The present thesis fits this trend of scholarship, and attempts to interpret the issue of reproductive prints from an interdisciplinary point of view by putting emphasis on the textual parts of the prints.

Few studies deal with the function of the incorporated or superimposed texts in medieval and early modern paintings. This area of text and image scholarship is especially interesting for the present research on sixteenth-century reproductive prints since these studies show what kind of text-image relations medieval and early modern audiences were familiar with, and what traditions reproductive prints could potentially follow. Mieczysław Wallis distinguished four major functions of inscriptions in medieval paintings: giving information about the depicted figures and scenes; providing statements about the depicted persons; invocations of the supposed viewers (e.g., prayers); and authorial statements (painters' signatures). He also noted that texts in medieval paintings were mostly quotations from authoritative corpuses, and added a fifth category for the sixteenth century, namely mottos in portraits.[11] In his book developed from a lecture series, John Sparrow wrote a chapter on texts in Renaissance and baroque works of art. Sparrow divided texts into two major categories similar to Wallis's classification. Inscriptions were described either as labels (such as names and familiar quotes serving the identification of figures and stories), or texts carrying a complex message (prayers, descriptions of the depicted figures). Sparrow also mentioned the case of "literary inscriptions," for example the use of Dante quotes in certain examples, and the emergence of inscriptions imitating the forms of ancient Roman lettering.[12]

The studies by Wallis and Sparrow are far from being comprehensive, however, their general conclusions shed light on the main traditions of inscriptions in paintings, their informative and communicative functions, and the limited textual sources they derived from. A more in-depth analysis by Dario Covi on inscriptions in fifteenth-century Florentine painting identified the same trend. Covi demonstrated that many inscriptions written in paintings were selected from among well known and often quoted Biblical and liturgical texts. These inscriptions were used since the medieval period in order to help the viewers identify the meaning of painted scenes and connect images with the proper

---

[10] On "word and image" research see Norbert H. Ott, "Texte und Bilder, Beziehungen zwischen den Medien Kunst und Literatur in Mittelalter und Früher Neuzeit," in *Die Verschriftlichung der Welt, Bild, Text und Zahl in der Kultur des Mittelalters und der Frühen Neuzeit*, ed. Horst Wenzel, Wilfried Seipel, and Gotthart Wunberg (Milan: Skira, 2000), 119-126.

[11] Mieczysław Wallis, "Inscriptions in Painting," *Semiotica* 9 (1973): 4-33.

[12] John Sparrow, *Visible Words, A Study of Inscriptions in and as Books and Works of Art* (Cambridge: University Press, 1969).

sections of religious ceremonies (a typical example is the incorporation of the hymn *Gloria in excelsis Deo* in Nativity scenes). On the other hand, Covi drew attention to developments after the first decades of the fifteenth century when secular and classical sources also appeared among inscribed texts. The change was reflected also in the new concern about matching the style and content of image and text in paintings of the late fifteenth century. Covi referred to this new approach towards text-image combination as "inscription consciousness."[13]

This new consciousness about selecting and presenting texts in images is connected to the increasing epigraphic interest and to the appearance of printing that made many literary sources more accessible. On the other hand, the emerging theoretical interest in the relation of text and image also gave a new impetus to multi-media creations in the sixteenth century. Humanist treatises on art rediscovered the opportunities in ideas like the comparison and competition of poetry and the visual arts.[14] Theoretical treatises on the function and working of text and image also appeared in the period, inspired by the example of multi-media genres like emblem books.[15]

Parallel to these developments in painting and in art theoretical writings, text and image also thrived in the medium of single sheet woodcuts and engravings. Religious prints mostly operated with texts like prayers, invocations, speeches of the depicted figures, or identifying labels. These prints served spiritual goals, and communication was a major issue for them: images spoke to their viewers, and the spectators answered with a prayer to the depicted divine person. Major new research has been done recently regarding fifteenth-century religious prints, with a focus on functions, the role of texts, and the ways of engaging the viewers of the sheets. The 2005 exhibition catalogue, *Origins of European Printmaking*, was an important step towards analysing functions of prints beyond their aesthetic aspects, summing up the new ways of thinking about the medium.[16] The catalogue entries also included transcriptions and translations of texts appearing in several prints thus putting emphasis on the role of inscriptions in the relation of prints and their audience. David Areford's 2010 book, *The Viewer and the Printed Image in Late Medieval*

---

[13] Dario A. Covi, *The Inscription in Fifteenth-Century Florentine Painting* (New York: Garland, 1986), 201.

[14] Rensselaer W. Lee, "Ut Pictura Poesis: The Humanistic Theory of Painting," *The Art Bulletin* 22 (1940): 196-269.

[15] Margriet Hoogvliet, "Mixing Text and Image: French and Italian Theories from the Late Middle Ages to the Early Sixteenth Century," in *Multi-media Compositions from the Middle Ages to the Early Modern Period*, ed. Margriet Hoogvliet (Leuven: Peeters, 2004), 76-103.

[16] See especially Peter Schmidt, "The Multiple Image: The Beginnings of Printmaking, between Old Theories and New Approaches," in *Origins of European Printmaking, Fifteenth-Century Woodcuts and their Public*, ed. Peter Parshall and Rainer Schoch (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), 37-56.

Europe, followed this direction of research. The focus was not primarily on text-image relations, but inscriptions gained an important role in the analysis of the interactive relationship between prints and their users, in the construction of meaning that involved the spectator. Areford also highlighted how anachronistic it is to apply the conclusions of Walter Benjamin's often-referenced essay, *The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction*, to late medieval and early modern printed objects. Areford emphasised that multiplication and availability of images did not destroy their aura but had the opposite result, enhanced their efficacy by engaging the spectator in a close and personal relationship with the depiction.[17]

Although art historians started to discover the importance of texts in early prints, the most recent comprehensive study of text-image construction in print was written by a literary scholar. Sabine Griese's massive research on fifteenth-century German woodcuts and engravings explored the context of the hybrid medium, the sources and parallel appearances of the same texts that appeared in prints, and their functions in relation to the reader-viewer. Griese emphasised that fifteenth-century prints were primarily applied art (*Gebrauchskunst*) that is their religious historical function was far more important than the aesthetic of their visual parts. She pointed out the role of prints as a medium of communication that enabled and enhanced meditative techniques, and served as a concentrated form of religious and cultural contexts.[18] Griese contrasted the engravings of Dürer that gave us the typical picture of early modern graphic arts (monochrome, without texts, and with aesthetic ambitions) with the hybrid religious woodcuts before Dürer that were not aimed at a highly educated, connoisseur audience.[19] This contrasting reflects very well the position of older scholarship that drew a distinction between artistic prints and "small devotional images."[20] However, it has been recently established that even Dürer was busy with writing poems (prayers and German doggerel verses) for broadsides besides publishing his images in collaboration with humanist poets.[21] The existence of Dürer's texts suggests that the separation of prints with aesthetic purpose from those with religious, meditative aims has to be reconsidered, especially regarding the sixteenth-century

[17] David S. Areford, *The Viewer and the Printed Image in Late Medieval Europe* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010), 16.
[18] Sabine Griese, *Text-Bilder und ihre Kontexte, Medialität und Materialität von Einblatt-Holz- und Metallschnitten des 15. Jahrhunderts* (Zürich, Chronos Verlag, 2011), 363.
[19] Griese, *Text-Bilder und ihre Kontexte*, 25.
[20] Schmidt, "The Multiple Image," 41.
[21] David Hotchkiss Price, *Albrecht Dürer's Renaissance, Humanism, Reformation, and the Art of Faith* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2003), 110.

engraved material. In her study of the changing functions of Netherlandish prints, Ilja M. Veldman already deemed it anachronistic to apply the division of "utilitarian and artistic prints" for the early period of Netherlandish printmaking, and this began to change only around 1600.[22]

Concerning sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century prints, a comprehensive analysis of text-image relations has not been written; only case studies are available on individual examples. Significant research was done on examples of collaboration between humanist writers, scholars, and Netherlandish artists.[23] Elizabeth McGrath and Peter van der Coelen emphasised the role of the Neo-Latin poets, and they regarded the creation of Latin inscriptions as a humanist task to achieve "a literary complement to the picture" instead of compiling merely descriptive verses. McGrath focused primarily on the early seventeenth century, whereas Van der Coelen was interested in the circumstances of production and in the collaborative process of printmaking in the late sixteenth century.[24] Frank Büttner attempted to see the function of texts in prints in the context of wider text-image developments. He suggested considering texts on prints as predecessors of modern titles, which first appeared on reproductive prints where thematic inscriptions were intended to contextualise images released from their original context.[25]

Defining the single sheet print, Peter Parshall also highlighted this feature of prints. Writing about fifteenth-century woodcuts, Parshall foregrounded that prints "disrupted the traditional relationship between artisan and client and promoted the autonomy of the image as an object of personal possession."[26] For sixteenth-century reproductive prints, this

---

[22] Ilja M Veldman, "From Indulgence to Collector's Item: Functions of Printmaking in the Netherlands," in Veldman, *Images for the Eye and the Soul, Function and Meaning in Netherlandish Prints* (Leiden: Primavera, 2006), 9.

[23] For example Ilja M. Veldman analysed the relationship between Heemskerck and the humanist Hadrianus Junius, "Maarten van Heemskerck and Hadrianus Junius: The Relationship between a Painter and a Humanist," *Simiolus* 7 (1974): 35-54, Konrad Renger analysed Latin inscriptions in prints after Brueghel, Konrad Renger, "Verhältnis von Text und Bild in der Graphik (Beobachtungen zu Mißverhältnissen)," in *Wort und Bild in der niederländischen Kunst und Literatur des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts*, ed. Herman Vekeman and Justus Müller Hofstede (Erfstadt: Lukassen, 1984), 151-161, or Anja Wolkenhauer examined the role of inscriptions in Goltzius's prints, Anja Wolkenhauer, "Genese und Funktion von Epigrammen in der Druckgraphik des 16. Jahrhunderts am Beispiel einiger Stiche von Hendrick Goltzius," in *Künstler und Literat: Schrift- und Buchkultur in der europäischen Renaissance*, ed. Bodo Guthmüller, Berndt Hamm and Andreas Tönnesmann (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2006), 336-339.

[24] Elizabeth McGrath, "Rubens's Susanna and the Elders and moralizing inscriptions on prints," in *Wort und Bild*, ed. Vekeman - Müller Hofstede, 73-90; Peter Van der Coelen, "Producing Texts for Prints: Artists, Poets and Publishers," in *The Authority of the Word: Reflecting on Image and Text in Northern Europe, 1400-1700*, ed. Celeste Brusati, Karl A.E. Enenkel and Walter Melion (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 83-85.

[25] Frank Büttner, "Bildbeschriftungen, Zur Angabe von Autor und Bildtitel in der frühen Druckgraphik," *Mitteilungen des Sonderforschungsbereichs* 573 (2007): 13-23.

[26] Peter Parshall, "Introduction: The Modern Historiography of Early Printmaking," in *The Woodcut in Fifteenth-Century Europe*, ed. Peter Parshall (Washington: National Gallery of Art, 2009), 9-15.

definition is even more relevant, since they were connected to independent works of art (paintings, sculptures, or drawings) that existed in this traditional relationship. Once the invention of an artist was printed in a single sheet, it had lost its original context. Even if the artist provided the engraver with a drawing intended for the aim of printing, still there had to be a translation process both visually and content-wise. The image was released from the space in which it was originally intended to work, and was seen by hundreds of anonymous viewers in print. A broader audience gained access to the image that may have been in private use before, only available for the chosen few or only on festive occasions. The print had to transmit a work from another context and market it in a different situation. Producing works of art for an open market and an international audience was not a new concept in the middle of the sixteenth century but reproductive prints were special exactly because of their intermediary situation.[27] While artists working for the open market usually standardised their products both in their form and in their subject in order to appeal to the anonymous audience, reproductive prints could achieve this standardisation by the means of additional tools. Inscriptions helped the engraver and the publisher to standardise the meaning and accommodate the image according to the taste, interest, and demand of the intended audience.

Their exceptional position and situation makes reproductive prints ideal for examining the functions of texts and for focusing on the problem of artistic versus utilitarian prints. Inscriptions in reproductive prints could refer to the original situation of the image, mention the inventor and other producers, but could also expand on the topic of the depiction, and could help the viewer to approach the depiction. By looking at the texts in reproductive prints, one can discover the possible intentions behind publishing certain images and topics, their artistic, cultural, or religious messages. I believe that the phenomenon of reproductive prints can be reconsidered based on the information transmitted through the inscriptions.

David Areford concluded his analysis of late medieval prints that there was "no clear delineation between a period of 'nonartistic' and 'artistic' prints," and one should not

---

[27] According to Berit Wagner, creating images for the open market, independent from the taste of patrons and donators, existed well before the widespread growth of the graphic arts. Berit Wagner, *Bilder ohne Auftraggeber: der deutsche Kunsthandel im 15. und frühen 16. Jahrhundert* (Petersberg: Imhof, 2014), esp. 50. See also Part II Mass Marketing in Lynn F. Jacobs, *Early Netherlandish Carved Altarpieces, 1380 - 1550: Medieval Tastes and Mass Marketing* (Cambridge: University Press, 1998), esp. 149-165. Lorne Campbell and Elizabeth Alice Honig also stressed that the commercialisation of artistic production was happening during the fifteenth century. Lorne Campbell, "The Art Market in the Southern Netherlands in the Fifteenth Century," *Burlington Magazine* 118 (1976): 188-198; Elizabeth Alice Honig, *Painting and the Market in Early Modern Antwerp* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 15.

ignore the cultic and devotional functions of prints with "the rise of print collecting and connoisseurship." He called on art historians to put more emphasis on the viewers of printed images, spectators who were not only engaged with the artistic narrative of prints but also with its content and ways of communication.[28] This thesis attempts to examine sixteenth-century reproductive prints from the point of view of communication: how text and image worked together in order to transmit information, and involve the reader-viewer into the world of the print.

The emergence of professional single sheet publishers:
Hieronymus Cock, Antonio Salamanca, Antonio Lafreri

The emergence of publishers boosted the professionalisation of the single sheet print business in the sixteenth-century, following the model of book publishing.[29] The publisher was the manager of the business who took the responsibility for the form and content of the product, signing the prints with his name, using the Latin word *excudere*, and the name of his city as the publisher's address. Professional publishers of the second half of the sixteenth century put their name consistently on their prints; the publisher's address appeared in the sheets even if neither the engraver, nor the designer was mentioned. The publisher's responsibility was on the one hand financial, since he bought the copper plates, commissioned the images, built a stock of prints, and sold them on the international market.[30] On the other hand, he also took social and political responsibility as the final editor of the sheets, and he was assumed to have had influence on choosing texts and matching them with the images.[31] This possible role in editing makes the oeuvre of a publisher interesting for the examination of textual frameworks. Moreover, a publisher's oeuvre is characterised by the diversity of the printed material, since he could acquire his stock from various sources, and could commission prints by different engravers and designers. The variety in style and content makes the work of a publisher ideal for studying questions like the relation of text and image, or the question of reproductive print.

Antonio Salamanca, Antonio Lafreri, and Hieronymus Cock stand out among the print producers with the amount of prints they published in the four decades between 1540

---

[28] Areford, *The Viewer and the Printed Image*, 270.
[29] Landau and Parshall, *The Renaissance Print*, 298-302.
[30] Antony Griffiths's definition. Antony Griffiths, *The Print Before Photography* (London: The British Museum Press, 2016), 18.
[31] Jan Van der Stock, *Printing Images in Antwerp: the Introduction of Printmaking in a City, Fifteenth Century to 1585* (Rotterdam: Sound & Vision Interactive, 1998), 144; Van der Coelen, "Producing texts for prints," 85.

16

and 1580. They were active at approximately the same time in two major European cities. Salamanca and Lafreri operated their businesses in Rome, while Cock worked in Antwerp. Although they built their print shops far from each other geographically, their works circulated internationally, and addressed at least partially the same audience. They were most probably aware of each other's publications, and also had important contacts in common, for example engravers, or influential patrons. Their works provide ideal material for a comparative study. The purpose of the comparison is to look at patterns, differences and similarities in the three publishers' use of inscriptions in reproductive prints.

In the last decades, the interest of print scholars turned towards single-sheet publishers. Historical overviews of early modern printmaking examined the role of publishers, and the workflow of single sheet publishing. Peter Parshall and David Landau dedicated sections to the beginnings of print publishing in Antwerp, and to print publishing in Italy (Rome and Venice) in a book that was still mostly focused on artists and printmakers.[32] Antony Griffith focused on the role of publishers beyond the sixteenth century, and Christopher Witcombe gave a structured, commented catalogue of the output of the significant Roman publishers in his survey of sixteenth-century Roman printmaking.[33] Exhibition catalogues and doctoral theses placed the publishers in historical context, and gave comprehensive lists of Cock's and Lafreri's stock.[34] The pioneering work by Timothy Allan Riggs (dissertation submitted in 1971) on Hieronymus Cock is still a pivotal study to consult, and two dissertations were written about Antonio Lafreri recently, by Birte Rubach and Alessia Alberti.[35] Besides the scholarship on the publishers, the volumes of the New Hollstein series on engravers who worked for them, or on prints after certain artists also served as starting points of this research. The volumes compiled by Manfred Sellink on Cornelis Cort and by Edward Wouk on Frans Floris were of special interest for the thesis.[36] All these publications help to put the three publishers in historical

[32] Landau and Parshall, *The Renaissance Print*, esp. 220-223, 298-309.

[33] Griffiths, *The Print Before Photography*, esp. 270-303; Christopher Witcombe, *Print Publishing in Sixteenth-Century Rome: Growth and Expansion, Rivalry and Murder* (London: Harvey Miller Publishers, 2008).

[34] The most important exhibition catalogues are Michael Bury, *The Print in Italy: 1550-1620* (London: The British Museum Press, 2001) and Joris Van Grieken, Ger Luijten, and Jan Van der Stock ed., *Hieronymus Cock: The Renaissance in Print* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013).

[35] The published versions of these dissertations: Timothy A. Riggs, *Hieronymus Cock: Printmaker and Publisher* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1977). Birte Rubach, *ANT. LAFRERI FORMIS ROMAE, Der Verleger Antonio Lafreri und seine Druckgraphikproduktion* (Berlin: Lukas Verlag, 2016); Alessia Alberti, "Contributi per Antoine Lafréry. Un editore francese a Roma tra Rinascimento e Controriforma," *Annali di critica d'arte* 7 (2011): 75-116.

[36] Manfred Sellink, *Cornelis Cort*, vols.1-3, The New Hollstein Dutch & Flemish Etchings, Engravings and Woodcuts, 1450 - 1700 (Rotterdam, Sound & Vision Publishers, 2000); Edward Wouk, *Frans Floris*, vols 1-

context, bringing together archival sources and the evidence found in the prints themselves, giving the essential information and chronology of their prints. These studies provided the basic knowledge indispensable to start my own research, especially the catalogues of Cock's and Lafreri's publications.

Publishers became important in art historical research but texts in prints were only studied in brief case studies of individual prints, or were mentioned in articles dealing with other issues. In my opinion, the focus on the textual frameworks of prints, especially in a European comparative context, sheds light on an important angle of print culture. The comparative perspective was already present in previous scholarship on Hieronymus Cock. In the local context, his business neither had any real rivals, nor antecedents comparable in the size and endeavours of the business. Around 1550, a few single sheet print publishers appeared parallel in Antwerp, but only Cock managed to establish a flourishing international business on a larger scale.[37] The *Aux Quatre Vents* is usually compared to contemporaneous print production in Rome, both because of its structure as a market-oriented publishing house, and because of the characteristics of the printed sheets.[38] In earlier scholarship, it was assumed that Cock himself visited Rome before he started his Antwerp business thus he was directly inspired by the Roman developments in single sheet print publishing.[39] In the lack of evidence, recent literature is more careful about this study trip to Rome, however, the influence of Roman prints is still regarded as an important aspect of Cock's production.[40] Antonio Salamanca and Antonio Lafreri, who were active approximately the same time as Cock, are often mentioned in connection with their northern colleague. Salamanca, a book publisher with Spanish origin, started to deal with single sheet prints in the 1530s, and the earliest known sheet published by the French Lafreri is from 1544. They were competitors, publishing copies of each other's plates, until they finally became partners in 1553.[41] After the sack of Rome in 1527, a great demand emerged for antiquarian prints; Salamanca and Lafreri both started the enterprise of engraving the Roman ruins, archaeological findings, and sculptures.

2, The New Hollstein Dutch & Flemish Etchings, Engravings and Woodcuts, 1450 - 1700 (Rotterdam, Sound & Vision Publishers, 2011). Edward Wouk's individual articles were also used in this thesis, see the references in the text.

[37] E.g., Hans Liefrinck and Gerard de Jode, see Riggs, *Hieronymus Cock*, 20-21.

[38] Ger Luijten, "Hieronymus Cock and the Italian Printmakers and Publishers of his Day," in *Hieronymus Cock*, ed. Van Grieken et al., 31.

[39] Riggs, *Hieronymus Cock*, 30-31.

[40] Jan Van der Stock, "Hieronymus Cock and Volcxken Diericx, Print Publishers in Antwerp," in *Hieronymus Cock*, ed. Van Grieken et al., 17; Luijten, "Hieronymus Cock," 31.

[41] Bury, *The Print in Italy*, 122.

The audience of Salamanca, Lafreri, and Cock must have been somewhat comparable, since their production was at least partly intended for an international audience. This fact would explain the use of Latin inscriptions in the majority of the prints. The merchants doing their business in Antwerp and the pilgrims of Rome constituted an important proportion of customers for Cock and Lafreri. In contrast, David Landau and Peter Parshall assumed that Salamanca aimed primarily at a smaller circle of connoisseurs, collectors, scholars, and artists who were looking for various images connected to antiquity (history, mythology, ornamental, and architectural figures).[42] This hypothesis seems to be proven by the fact that Salamanca published few prints with religious topics, while Lafreri focused on religious subject matter more and more after the Council of Trent took place in the 1560s.[43] The local context also played an important part in the production of all the three publishers, since it influenced the topics and content of the sheets, and resulted in the appearance of the vernacular languages in several prints. One of the questions of this study is how local developments and changes in taste, or historical events influenced the creation of prints, and the selection of texts for the prints.

The analysis of the material in the next chapter starts with Hieronymus Cock, although chronologically he opened his Antwerp business the latest from among the three publishers. Salamanca started his business significantly earlier, and Lafreri also began publishing single sheet prints a few years before Cock, however, he operated his business mostly parallel to the Antwerp publisher, and also outlived Cock by seven years. As it will be demonstrated, one can find a conscious justification and theoretical approach in Cock's oeuvre, both regarding the issue of reproductive prints and the use of narrative texts. This consciousness makes him an ideal first case to show the relevance of reproductive prints in the sixteenth century. The Roman material is analysed in contrast to Cock's publications in order to highlight the differences in their approach.

This thesis seeks to give a more nuanced picture of the practices of combining text and image. Through the close reading of texts, analysing their message, tone, voice, and visual form, this study will show different stages of the forming of reproductive prints, and attempts to show the various ways they could function in the hand of the viewer. Strategies of communication will be studied in selected examples to show the role of texts, and how they contributed to the understanding and interpretation of the printed images. Through the examination of the corpus of texts used by each publisher, the primary goal of the thesis is

---

[42] Landau and Parshall, *The Renaissance Print*, 303.
[43] Eckhard Leuschner, "Antonio Lafreri's Religious Prints," *Print Quarterly* 30 (2013): 87.

to reveal a conscious strategy behind applying certain kinds of texts. Looking for traditional and innovative uses of quotations and poetic texts composed for the prints, the analysis seeks to determine, interpret, and compare the choices of the publishers.

The thesis consists of three parts; the first two discuss the three publishers in separate chapters, according to the location of their business, Antwerp and Rome, and the third, leading to the conclusion, gives a comparative perspective. The first two parts present and examine the material through four case studies, with an overview of the use of inscriptions by each publisher in the introduction to the chapters. These prefaces to each chapter provide a brief comprehensive overview, while the case studies focus on significant examples from the works of the three publishers. The case studies represent topics connected to the characteristics of the three publishers. In Cock's case, the first issue is the question of conscious canon formation, the use of reproductive prints for marketing inventions and artists. The second case study provides an opportunity to reassess the function of religious prints in the period of the Reformation, and to deal with the controversial category of "devotional print" in the multiconfessional context. The chapter on Salamanca presents a case study from among mythological prints that formed the most significant group according to the depicted topic among the older Roman publisher's prints. The sheets connected to the subject of love demonstrate how contemporaneous love poetry was connected to print culture. In the case of Lafreri, the case study focuses on religious imagery in order to contrast these prints with the Antwerp material. This examination intends to reformulate the relation between the reproductive and devotional aspects of prints in the Roman context of the Counter-Reformation.

The third part is a visual analysis of the three publishers' works from the point of view of frames and framing. The first chapter in this section looks at a parallel example of text and image combination, inscribed picture frames around paintings. Inscribed wooden frames, a phenomenon characteristic mainly in the Netherlands, help to situate prints in the contemporaneous culture of mixing text and image. The painted parallels are interesting to compare to the prints both regarding the content of the inscriptions and the visual relation of text and image. The last two chapters examine this relation in the prints, how the two media is presented in the layout of the sheets, how text and image interact with each other and with the viewer, and whether their relations can be characterised as hierarchical or equal depending on their visual presentation. Communication is an important aspect in the analysis of the content of the texts, and the visual involvement of the viewer plays an

equally important role. The appearance of inscriptions, their position, framing, and relation to the image, strengthens the messages of text and image in print.

The analyses are intended to reveal how text and image worked together in one object to engage the viewer intellectually and emotionally, to urge the spectator to understand and interact with the depicted story, and appreciate the artistic merit of the inventor. The case studies aim at demonstrating that the artistic and utilitarian aspects of the prints did not stand in opposition to each other but served the same goal, to present the message to the audience in a complex and engaging way.

PART I: ANTWERP

Inscriptions in prints published by Hieronymus Cock

Around the middle of the sixteenth century, Antwerp counted as one of the most heavily populated European cities with its 100,000 inhabitants that included more than 1000 foreign merchants.[44] Hieronymus Cock established his publishing house named *Aux Quatre Vents* (At the Sign of the Four Winds) in the context of the second flourishing phase of the Antwerp art market. When Cock opened his business around 1548-1550, he chose not to buy a house in the *Lombardevest* that was the traditional district of printers. Most probably from 1549, the publishing house was operating in a building close to the "schilderspand," the centre for dealing with art on a daily basis, established in 1540 on the second floor of the New Burse.[45] In 1563, Cock and his wife bought a second house near another luxury market, the Tapestry Hall.[46] A sheet from the series *Scenographiae sive Perspectivae* (designed by Hans Vredeman de Vries in 1560) contains a street view of Antwerp with the depiction of the publishing house on the corner of Lange Nieuwstraat and Sint-Katelijnevest.[47] If this image reflects at least partially the real appearance of the house, then it had a shop on the ground floor open for visitors from the street. The proximity of the large-scale art market also had an effect on the business. Cock sold his products not only in his shop but most probably distributed them among other dealers as well.[48] Beyond the closed circle of local connoisseurs, he must have had a wider audience, even if this was not as wide as the audience of the mass-produced low-end panel paintings that were sold at the New Burse.

In this context, facing a large anonymous and heterogeneous clientele, inscriptions were an important means of communication in the single sheet prints. First, the publisher must have felt the need to provide the anonymous individual viewer-reader with interpretative clues to the image. Narrative inscriptions served as a guide through the depiction for the viewer, while at the same time influencing the viewer's perception of the

---

[44] Filip Vermeylen, *Painting for the Market: Commercialization of Art in Antwerp's Golden Age* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003), 37.

[45] Petra Maclot, "An imaginary visit to The Four Winds, the house and shop of Hieronymus Cock and Volcxken Diericx," *Simiolus* 39 (2017): 161.

[46] It is not clear where the *Aux Quatre Vents* was operating when it was set up around 1548-1550, and when it moved from near the New Burse to the new building near the Tapestry Hall. Jan Van der Stock assumes that the publishing house was possibly working in more than one buildings at the same time. Van der Stock, "Hieronymus Cock and Volcxken Diericx," 15.

[47] *Hieronymus Cock*, ed. Van Grieken et al., 76-77.

[48] A contract from 1582 (when Cock's widow, Volcxken Diericx, managed the business) suggests that the publishing house was in contact with the manager of the art market who acted as a dealer of Cock's prints. Van der Stock, *Printing Images in Antwerp*, 114. Cock also sold his prints with the help of Plantin's international contacts. Vermeylen, *Painting for the Market,* 92.

image by putting emphasis on certain aspects and ignoring others. On the other hand, inscriptions referring to the producers of the print, especially those crediting the inventor, created an important paratextual framework for art connoisseurs. Michael Bury pointed out that Hieronymus Cock's oeuvre is different from the work of other contemporaneous publishers and engravers as he consciously applied texts connected to the topic and inscriptions referring to the designer in the same prints.[49] The consistent use of both kinds of inscriptions makes Cock's oeuvre the ideal first example of this thesis. His prints provide many good examples to revisit the opposition of the reproductive and utilitarian aspects of prints, and to examine the interplay of the two functions.

Cock was a pioneer in consistently crediting the designer of the image. The expression mostly used in this context was that of the inventor, sometimes in abbreviated form (*inv*, *inve*) but most of the times using the whole word. The author of the image was almost always mentioned as the inventor regardless of the existence of a painted version of the same work. Even in the dedication attached to the print series of the *Labours of Hercules* after the paintings of Frans Floris, the latter is credited as the inventor in the sheets and not referred to as the painter (cat.8.b-k). There are only few exceptions where the word *pinxit* was used in connection to the designer. In the *Dialectica* sheet from the 1565 series of the *Liberal Arts* after Floris, a separate inscription was put on a tablet referring to Floris's paintings in Nicolaas Jonghelinck's villa (cat.11.b).[50] However, in other sheets of the same series, Floris is still credited as the inventor. A similar case is the *Meeting of Solomon and Sheba*, where Floris is mentioned as the painter (*sic pinxit*) in the narrative caption below the image, while he is also credited as the inventor in the brief inscription superimposed on the image (cat.2). These examples show that the producers of the prints did not think in rigid categories, and the most important criterion was to acknowledge the intellectual author of the image. A further enlightening example is the print after Rogier van der Weyden's altarpiece that included the inscription "the invention of Master Rogier," although visually it clearly referred to the painted panel as its starting point (cat.48.a). This suggests that Cock's circle did not consider the difference between prints based on paintings and prints based on preparatory drawings but it was the invention of the artist that they appreciated above all. The next chapter will show that the importance of prints was perceived in their mediating role between the painter and the wider audience.

---

[49] Bury, "On Some Engravings by Giorgio Ghisi," 17.
[50] *FRANC FLORVS / PINXIT IN SVBVR-/BANO NICOLAI / IONGELINC PROPE / VRBEM ANVERPIA[M]*

Cock's works provide good material to reassess the historical function of prints in creating a visual canon.

Beyond consistently acknowledging their names, the origin of the designers was also important for Cock, especially if they were Italian or famous artists of former times. In several prints, the native city of the artists was given as additional information next to their name, for example Andrea del Sarto's and Bronzino's Florentine origin was mentioned in some prints (*Holy Family*, *Zachariah and Gabriel*, *Nativity*, cat.45, 47.a, 59), Giulio Romano was referred to as "Julius Mantua" in two prints after his design (*Niobe*, *The Three Fates*, cat.3, 65), and Raphael's native city, Urbino, was added to his name in three prints (*School of Athens*, *Disputa*, *Sacrifice of Isaac*, cat.4, 5, 58). The same practice appeared in prints after famous northern masters, Lucas van Leyden and Rogier van der Weyden (the *Holy Family* was inscribed with *Lucas de Leyda Hollandus Inventor*, and the *Deposition* carries the inscription *M Rogerij Belgae inuentum*, cat.24, 48.a). This feature followed the tradition of painters' signatures, however, it also shows the publisher's interest in marketing images together with the context of their origin. It was not only the names of famous painters, but also their nationality that was expected to sell the prints.

The case of prints acknowledged as designs by Hieronymus Bosch reveals the importance of names, especially famous artist's names for Cock. Most of the prints published with references to Bosch were not based on his works but rather on drawings and prints by his followers.[51] Realising the market value of the master's images, some prints were simply imitating Bosch's style and motifs. As Larry Silver pointed out, marketability and popularity were key aspects when creating these prints.[52] They acted like reproductive prints and sometimes even looked like they were reproducing a concrete object (like the triptych of the *Last Judgment*, cat.30).

This brief introductory survey demonstrates Cock's consciousness about the inventors' names, his awareness of the popularity of certain images and their marketability. The first case study will expand on this aspect of Cock's oeuvre, looking at a few prints with inscriptions that tend to combine comments on the inventor's talent, the quality of the image, and the topic of the depiction. These examples help understand the historical function of the prints, and reveal the importance of narrative captions regarding

---

[51] For this topic see Marissa Bass and Elizabeth Wyckoff, "Sons of 's-Hertogenbosch: Hieronymus Bosch's Local Legacy in Print," *Art in Print* 5 (2015): 4-13, and Peter Fuhring ed., *Beyond Bosch: the afterlife of a Renaissance master in print* (St. Louis, Mo.: Saint Louis Art Museum, 2015).
[52] Larry Silver, "Second Bosch. Family Resemblance and the Marketing of Art," *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* 50 (1999): 31-50.

the reproductive aspect of prints. A further paratext, a dedicatory poem gives additional clues for how Cock and his circle saw the artistic role of the prints. These examples reflect one local artist's importance in experimenting with the textual apparatus of reproductive prints. The second part of the first case study looks into further prints after the Antwerp painter, Frans Floris, and examines how captions expanding on the topic of the printed images could support the painter's appreciation and fame. In the first case study, the central topic is the artistic aspect of the prints, and the analysis aims at revealing the specific meaning of reproductive prints in the Antwerp context. In contrast, the second case study focuses on the "utilitarian" aspect of religious prints. The question of communication, how and what the prints conveyed to the audience, is a central topic of both case studies.

The reconstructed stocklist of the *Aux Quatre Vents* publishing house consists of 1200 plates, and the inventory of Cock's widow, Volcxken Diericx's possessions even lists 1604 plates.[53] The case studies only look at a small portion of this material, with a focus on the prints published in Cock's lifetime, most of them published in the period before the iconoclasm of 1566. The close reading of certain selected examples contributes to a better understanding of textual frameworks.

CASE STUDY 1
Reproductive prints and the status of the painter-inventor

Cock's interest in publishing the inventor's name in printed images is clearly present in the prints. A series of artist portraits published after Cock's death reveals the historical nature of this consistent interest in artists' names. In 1572, Cock's widow, Volcxken Diericx, published the series of portraits of twenty-three painters from the Netherlands (including Cock himself). The project titled *Pictorum Aliquot Celebrium Germaniae Inferioris Effigies* was probably initiated by Cock and was planned already in the 1560s.[54] The humanist Dominicus Lampsonius (1532-1599) provided Latin verses to accompany the portraits, praising and briefly introducing the painters starting with the Van Eyck brothers and continuing to Pieter Brueghel, Frans Floris, and Lambert Lombard. Walter S. Melion emphasised the importance of the series in creating "the first northern

---

[53] Joris Van Grieken, "Establishing and Marketing the Publisher's List," in *Hieronymus Cock*, ed. Van Grieken et al., 22.
[54] *Hieronymus Cock*, ed. Van Grieken et al., 272.

canon" of artists, and thus its influence on later art theoretical and biographical writings (like Karel van Mander).[55]

This series shows many developments of the artistic world North of the Alps. Some of the innovations were specifically connected to print culture and Cock's work. First, it is important that one of the earliest attempts for establishing the artistic canon took the form of a portrait series. The prints followed the tradition of providing the audience with portraits of famous men (*uomini illustri*). Joris Van Grieken indicated that including painters in this visual tradition meant that artists achieved an eagerly awaited intellectual status for themselves.[56] Secondly, the series communicated the bimedial version of the canon using both text and image to create the historical sequence of Netherlandish artists. As Sarah Meiers put it, Cock "aspired to create and propagate a visual history of the arts in the Low Countries."[57] The portrait series may be understood as the northern contribution to the history of painting in text and image, a witty response to the long descriptions of artists' biographies in the Italian version of the story.[58]

It is no wonder that Cock chose to present the painters in this way since he was working with text-image creations throughout his career. The combination of text and image corresponded with the way he communicated ideas throughout his work as a publisher. Moreover, not only the form but also the content, the need to answer the Italian writings about art, existed in Cock's work already in the 1550s. I believe that the poems composed for reproductive prints anticipated the ambitious project of the portrait series. The first part of this chapter will show that some inscriptions in reproductive prints served the same purpose as the portrait series: they aimed to join the discourse on art and to market Netherlandish art both in image and text.

In the dedicatory poem to the portrait series, which served to commemorate the publisher, Lampsonius also mentioned the role of the prints published by Cock during his lifetime. In Lampsonius's poem, even Painting herself mourned the death of the Antwerp publisher. "Small wonder – she *(Pictura)* owed more to you than to anyone, since you shirked no expense and no labour, in order that plates struck from your designs would

---

[55] Walter S. Melion, *Shaping the Netherlandish Canon: Karel van Mander's Schilder-boeck* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), 143.

[56] *Hieronymus Cock*, ed. Van Grieken et al., 273.

[57] Sarah Meiers, "Portraits in Print: Hieronymus Cock, Dominicus Lampsonius, and 'Pictorum aliquot celebrium Germaniae inferioris effigies'," *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 69 (2006): 2.

[58] Meiers analysed in detail why the portrait series is not a direct follower of Vasari's biographies, what the major differences between the two versions of artists' histories are. However, she also pointed out that Vasari's biographies must have had influence in one of the most important commercial metropolises of the north. Meiers, "Portraits in Print," 14-15.

present the new breed of artists in the whole faraway world."[59] Strictly speaking, this sentence concerns the portrait series, however, it can also be understood as a general statement about Cock's work, and this way it reveals a contemporaneous idea about the function of reproductive prints as mediators of artistic achievements. Translating visual ideas on paper and making them public was a key aspect of the prints. It was the publisher's task to contextualise these inventions among all the other printed images, to give a standardised and consistent textual framework in order to position the publications in the world of printed images. Inscriptions in prints claimed legitimacy for reproductive prints and for northern artists at the same time. In this chapter, I will argue that additional inscriptions played a much more important role than has previously been acknowledged.

How can we trace the artistic and historical consciousness in the prints reproducing paintings, frescos, and drawings by Italian and Netherlandish masters? What ideas emerge in the additional inscriptions and how are they connected to theoretical concepts? The first case study looks for the answers to these questions through the analysis of selected prints and their inscriptions. The combination of text and image was an effective tool to stress certain features of the image and to channel the reception of the pictures reproduced according to the agenda of the producers (the publisher, the original artist, or the author of the text). In this case, I am looking for evidence in the inscriptions that may imply an elevated status of the painter by emphasising the erudition of the invention, the quality of the image, or the excellence of the execution. In the first subchapter, a few specific examples are analysed to show how inscriptions could reflect art theoretical discourses of the period and disseminate the fame of certain artists to a broader audience. In the second subchapter, I examine how reproductive prints could shape the public image of a painter, with a special focus on prints after the works of the Antwerp artist, Frans Floris, whose inventions seemingly achieved a special position and status among the prints published by Cock. I propose to interpret the inscriptions as marketing tools that were meant to communicate the painter's achievement just like the printed image - the former in poetic terms, the latter by visual means. The case studies on Cock's works attempt to introduce the publisher as the initiator of combining image and text. The examination aims at

---

[59] Translation is by Daniel Hadas that was realised in the frame of the project of the Courtauld Institute 'Picturing the Netherlandish Canon'. http://www.courtauld.org.uk/netherlandishcanon/lampsonius/image-tombstone/02.html (last accessed 08.07.2017).

revealing his effort in trying to make the prints more appealing, but also more legitimate for an erudite audience by using both visual and verbal rhetoric.[60]

Publishing and marketing the painter and his image:

the laudatory aspect of inscriptions

The *Raising of the Brazen Serpent* (cat.1) was the first sheet among the prints published by Hieronymus Cock in which the Neo-Latin inscription included the poet's name. The print was engraved in 1555 after a lost painting of the Antwerp artist, Frans Floris.[61] Acknowledging the writer of the caption was not yet the usual practice in the 1550s-1560s, thus one would suspect that the publisher had a special agenda with this print.[62] The inscription, framed in the upper right corner of the depiction, was written by the humanist Dominicus Lampsonius. This print is the first known evidence for his contribution to the printmaking business, and the verse is his earliest known poem that was composed to accompany a painting. It was also the first instance of the collaboration between him and Cock that proved to be a long lasting professional relationship.

Lampsonius lived in London between 1554 and 1558 as the secretary of Reginald Pole, thus it is questionable whether he has seen Floris's painting or created the poem on the basis of a drawing or even a written account.[63] The text itself is rather an explication of the Biblical story than a detailed description of a painting that would suggest the latter option. However, the poem also comments on the achievement of the painter and lauds the work's expressivity and educational effect, thus, the author at least pretended to have seen the painted original. The *Raising of the Brazen Serpent* may have been one of the first examples for the combination of a printed reproduction of an artwork and a poem that

---

[60] In a recent article, Walter S. Melion looked for theoretical content in some of Hieronymus Cock's prints that I will also analyse in the following chapter. Melion found that with the help of both text and image, these prints by Cock communicated allegorical thoughts about "pictorial invention and execution" (he called these prints "allegories of art"). While in his interpretation, these prints conveyed the artists' views on image-making, he did not put an emphasis on the role of the publisher in disseminating these ideas. Walter S. Melion, "*Apellea et ipse manu*: Hieronymus Cock and His Allegories of Art – *Apollo, Diana, and the Niobids*, *The Labors of Hercules*, *Hercules and the Pygmies*, and *The Raising of the Brazen Serpent*," in *Myth, Allegory, and Faith*, ed. Bernard Barryte (Stanford, Ca.: Iris & B. Gerald Cantor Center for Visual Arts, 2016), 181-201.

[61] *Hieronymus Cock*, ed. Van Grieken et al., 180.

[62] Although this practice was not unprecedented. In the same year, another painting by Floris, the *Sacrifice of Noah*, was reproduced by Balthasar Bos that included a letterpress inscription, a Neo-Latin poem composed and signed by Cornelis Grapheus, secretary of Antwerp. Grapheus's poem only commented on the topic and moral of the depiction, and does not praise the painter or his outstanding achievement. For the reproduction of the print see Wouk, *Frans Floris*, vol. 1, 34.

[63] For Lampsonius's biographical details see Jean Puraye, *Dominique Lampson humaniste 1532-99* (Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1950), 17.

praised the inventor and expanded on the topic of the depiction at the same time. Several sixteenth-century prints included texts explaining the depicted story or figures, and there are also some containing laudatory words but it is difficult to find a print with the combination of the two types of inscriptions. To some extent a print by Giorgio Ghisi after Michelangelo's *Last Judgment* is comparable where a praising caption was inserted in the composition ("Michelangelo Buonarotti, the picked flower of the Tuscans in the two most beautiful imitative arts of human life, painting and sculpture, which perished altogether with his age").[64] However, this celebration of Michelangelo is more like an adorned acknowledgement of the original artist, and his praise is not combined with a narrative text. By lauding the original artist in a poetic inscription, Lampsonius gave a new direction to the painter's representation in printed form. The humanist verse added a new interpretative layer to the image. On the one hand, the inscription provided an opportunity to control the message and moral of the image, and, on the other hand, it enhanced the role of the print as a marketing tool for the painter by the means of positive commentary.

Hieronymus Cock published two further prints in 1557 with similar inscriptions. Lampsonius's text was probably regarded as a model for these further poems that proves Cock's special purpose with the *Brazen Serpent*. The poem in the *Killing of Niobe's Children by Apollo and Diana* (cat.3) presents the painter of the original, Giulio Romano, as an unequalled artist in the Rome of his age. The inscription in the *Meeting of Sheba and Solomon* (cat.2) praises the expressive qualities of this other work by Frans Floris, the painter of the *Brazen Serpent*. These captions are not signed, and their authors are not identified. In the case of the *Meeting of Sheba and Solomon*, one might suspect a writer with similar educational background as Lampsonius, because of the complicated Neo-Latin formulation, while the verse in the Niobe sheet has a much simpler structure and word order. The publisher, Hieronymus Cock, may have determined the general character of these later verses, or the other verses were directly inspired by Lampsonius's text from the *Brazen Serpent* because the structure of the three epigrams is remarkably similar. Each starts with explaining the topic of the depiction and continues with a comment on the original work of art in the second part of the text. The texts proceed from the description of the subject towards the praise of the painter.

In each case, the paintings are described as outstanding in depicting the moral of the topic. The verses in the two prints after Floris suggest that there was a painting once by

---

[64] Suzanne Boorsch, *The Engravings of Giorgio Ghisi* (New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1985), 53.

Floris. In the *Meeting of Sheba and Solomon*, the text speaks clearly about an image that Floris painted. In the *Brazen Serpent*, Lampsonius implies that the model was a painting by referring to Apelles. Of course, the inscriptions do not provide sufficient evidence for the existence of the paintings, referring to the images as paintings might have also been a marketing strategy of Floris and Cock. However, from the point of view of the present analysis, the most important is what the producers wanted to communicate about the pictures. All the three verses were written with the idea of the originals in mind since they all ignore the fact that the viewer is looking at a monochrome reproductive print instead of the painting when reading the texts. The prints are regarded as being direct mediators of the qualities of the paintings and the styles of the artists, without any doubt about their truthfulness. This approach reflects how reproductive prints were understood in the 1550s. The prints completed with laudatory captions could serve as both visual and textual evidence of the painters' achievement. While the image provided the viewer with a truthful rendering of the original, the inscription was a tool of art criticism, a means of positive judgment, "humanist framework" of the image. These three sheets demonstrate how prints may have participated in the discussion about art by using both word and image to influence the reader-viewer's opinion about a certain piece.

The terminology used in the verses to characterise the painters and the paintings is relatively limited and concise but sufficient to elevate the works of art to the status of masterpieces in the eye of the beholder. For example, Lampsonius identified Floris's excellence in his "Apellean hand" (*Apellea manu*) in the poem in the *Brazen Serpent*, while Giulio Romano is described as the author of the divine work (*auctor operis divini*) depicting the punishment of Niobe. The use of these epithets suggests the awareness of the (mainly Italian) art theoretical discourse of the time, and it reveals the aim to position the prints within this context. For instance, the association of artistic achievement with divinity, thus the labelling of works of modern artists as divine was a typical feature of Giorgio Vasari's *Lives of the Most Excellent Painters* (first edition in 1550). By the 1550s, as Patricia Emison's analysis showed, the term "divine" has lost its connotations with "holy," and had more connection with exceptional fame.[65] In the first edition of Giulio Romano's biography, Vasari also used the attribute "divine" in connection with one of his

---

[65] For the analysis of the term, its history, and its relation to Michelangelo see Patricia A. Emison, *Creating the "Divine" Artist: from Dante to Michelangelo* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), esp. 174.

works, and wrote that his talent was already celebrated in his life.[66] This might have inspired the verse in the print, which was published seven years after Vasari's book. However, Vasari's statement was slightly altered in the caption, reformulated to sound "more classical". Giulio Romano was claimed to be unequalled in the Rome of his time (*sua Roma*). This could be understood as a reference to the city, the place of his activity as an artist, but also as a hint to antiquity, as an extension of its cultural legacy to the Renaissance. The "divine work" of Giulio is regarded as a direct continuation of antique artistic excellence. Even the topic, classical mythology, may have supported this interpretation. The *Killing of Niobe's Children by Apollo and Diana* was a divine work of art because its fame was expected to survive in the coming ages just as the reputation of the ancient artists outlived centuries.[67]

Lampsonius also determined antiquity as a referential point of art criticism when he praised the "Apellean hand" of Floris. To compare a modern painter to Apelles, one of the most famous antique artists, may have been a commonplace by the 1550s, several epitaph epigrams in the first edition of Vasari's work compared the deceased artists to Apelles.[68] The appreciation of the ancient artist was based on Pliny's writings, which were fundamental texts of humanist learning in the period. However, the phrase of the "Apellean hand," which may have been coined by Lampsonius, might imply more theoretical background than a simple comparison between the ancient and the modern painter.[69] The concept of the painter's hand being a symbol of his talent appeared in connection with Giotto and Michelangelo, the best modern artists, in Vasari's *Lives*. Paul Barolsky analysed how Vasari's description of Michelangelo working with his "divine hand" on the Sistine ceiling frescos was aimed at a comparison between the hand of the

---

[66] "Fece ancora a Iacopo Fuccheri tedesco, in Roma nella chiesa di Santa Maria d'Anima, una tavola alla cappella loro, ch'è molto lodata, (...) che certo è cosa divina." "Era questo ingegno tanto celebrato di nome e di grado, che la sua fama e dolcezza di natura fu cagione che..." Giorgio Vasari, *Le Vite de' più eccellenti pittori scultori e architettori*, vol. 5, ed. Rosanna Bettarini and Paola Barocchi (Florence: Sansoni, 1966-1987), 62, 64.

[67] Walter S. Melion even goes so far that he interprets the phrase as a comparison of Giulio to the gods of the story. As Melion puts it "like Apollo and Diana, whose vengeance transformed Niobe into living stone (...), Giulio, in his drawing *all'antica*, brings ancient marbles to life." Melion, "*Apellea et ipse manu*," 184. In my opinion, the historical use of the word divine connected to artists suggests that the author of the poem did not necessarily imply this complicated meaning of the text.

[68] Ruth Wedgwood Kennedy, "Apelles redivivus," in *Essays in memory of Karl Lehmann*, ed. Lucy Freeman (New York: Institute of Fine Arts, 1964), 160.

[69] Lampsonius used the phrase later in the laudatory poem written to a series of prints after Floris's paintings, and also in another poem written on his own portrait by Antonis Mor ("*Morus Apellea pinxerat ora manu* / Mor painted it with his own Apellean hand"), see Puraye, *Dominique Lampson*, 100.

Creator and the inspired hand of the most excellent modern artist.[70] The cult of the artist's hand and the concept of the divine origin of his creativity helped to shift the artist's status from a simple craftsman to the intelligentsia. The "Apellean hand" may imply similar meaning since Apelles was celebrated as the prototype of the learned artist who had written treatises on the principles of art, and was practised in arithmetic, geometry, and rhetoric.[71]

Labelling the painter's hand as "Apellean" may have referred to his eloquence and his learnedness. As Annette de Vries pointed out, for Lampsonius and for theorists and artists following him, the notion of the skilled and experienced hand did not stand in opposition to the intellect.[72] The symbol of the talented hand incorporated wider epistemic, rhetorical, and literary traditions, which was essential for an artist to create monumental compositions of mythological or Biblical subjects. The painter's hand had to act as a mediator between the written corpora of knowledge and the viewer – this aspect is clearly emphasised in the printed inscriptions. The idea that paintings can mediate knowledge is supported by Lampsonius's comparison between the Holy Scripture and Floris's image in revealing religious sin since the verse describes the educational power of the image equal to verbal expression. Similarly, the image of the horrific punishment of Niobe and her children is interpreted by the anonymous author as moral warning for the reader-viewer not to commit the sin of arrogance. The third poem in the *Meeting of Sheba and Solomon* is slightly different. Here the anonymous commentator praises Floris for showing both protagonists so wise and knowledgeable that one cannot decide who is the more admirable. The emphasis is again on the content that was conveyed in the best way by Floris's painting. All the three poetic inscriptions exemplify that texts not only contribute to a

---

[70] Paul Barolsky, "The Artist's Hand," in *The Craft of Art: Originality and Industry in the Italian Renaissance and Baroque Workshop*, ed. Andrew Ladis and Carolyn H. Wood (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1995), 12-14.

[71] For Apelles and rhetorics see Emison, *Creating the "Divine" Artist*, 100. About Apelles's learnedness and treatises see Zirka Zaremba Filipczak, *Picturing Art in Antwerp: 1550-1700* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987), 26. A passage from a northern historical treatise (Vaernewyck's *Historiae van Belgis* from 1568) proves how widespread the idea about Apelles's learnedness was. "hy [Apelles] was de erste gheleert Schilder, ende seyde dattet onmoghelyck was Schilder te zyne sonder die Kennisse van Arithmetica ende Geometria te hebben..." Quoted after Matthias Winner, *Die Quellen der Pictura-Allegorien in gemalten Bildergalerien des 17. Jahrhunderts zu Antwerpen* (Doctoral thesis, Köln: Philosophische Fakultät der Universität zu Köln, 1957), 10.

[72] Annette de Vries, "Hondius meets Van Mander: The Cultural Appropriation of the First Netherlandish Book on the Visual Arts System of Knowledge in a Series of Artists' Portraits," in *The Artist as Reader: on Education and Non-Education of Early Modern Artists*, ed. Heiko Damm, Michael Thimann, and Claus Zittel (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 264. The new catalogue of the Ashmolean exhibition of Raphael's drawings suggested a similar interpretation of the Italian artist's drawings, using the phrase of „the eloquence of the artist's hand." Catherine Whistler, "Raphael's Hands," in *Raphael: The Drawings*, ed. Catherine Whistler and Ben Thomas (Oxford: Ashmolean Museum, 2017), 29-41.

better understanding of an image but they can also shape the viewer's judgment of an image, and can establish a distinguished status of the image and its creator.

Remarkably, the laudatory poems did not appear in those prints that were engraved after the most famous and established artists like Raphael or the Netherlandish Lambert Lombard, but in sheets after Frans Floris and Giulio Romano, pupils of those great masters. Did the idea of combining comments on the topic of the depiction with the praise of the painter emerge later than when the first monumental prints were published by Hieronymus Cock? Why did Frans Floris play such a distinguished role that the publisher commissioned praising inscriptions to two of his works in a row? The context in which the three analysed prints appeared in 1555 and 1557 reveals some details about this issue.

Netherlandish works were reproduced and published from the very beginning of Hieronymus Cock's career, parallel to celebrated Italian masterpieces. According to the list of Cock's publications reconstructed by Timothy Riggs, the number of prints published after works of Italian and Netherlandish artists was relatively balanced in the first five years of Cock's activity.[73] However, all the northern works selected for publication fell into the category of "Italianate" in style (i.e., they were the work of painters who have been to Italy before and had first-hand experience of ancient and modern Italian art).[74] Thus, the output of the *Aux Quatre Vents* publishing house seemed to be coherent stylistically. This direction was set out by one of the first prints published by Cock in 1550, the engraving after Raphael's *School of Athens* (cat.4). This print was programmatic not only in its style but in its monumental size, in the way of acknowledging all the contributors including the artist of the original work, and in the interpretative inscription put in a tablet in the lower left corner of the print. The three prints analysed above should be seen in this context, especially the *Raising of the Brazen Serpent* that is comparable to the *School of Athens* both in size and in the form of the inscription (a framed tablet).[75]

The *Brazen Serpent* was the last one of three monumental religious compositions dedicated by Cock to Antoine Perrenot de Granvelle, between 1551 and 1555. Granvelle was the Bishop of Arras, later also cardinal, the first minister of Charles V, collector of ancient and modern works of art, and possibly an early patron of Cock's publishing

---

[73] Riggs, *Hieronymus Cock*, 44-45.

[74] Godelieve Denhaene and Edward Wouk, "Hieronymus Cock and the Italianate Artists," in *Hieronymus Cock*, ed. Van Grieken et al., 149.

[75] In size, the print after Floris's painting even surpasses the one after Raphael. The *Brazen Serpent* is 1165 x 901 mm, while the *School of Athens* is 521 x 815 mm. *Hieronymus Cock*, ed. Van Grieken et al., 126, 180.

business.[76] The two earlier prints dedicated to him, the *Last Supper* after Lambert Lombard and the engraving after Raphael's other fresco from the Vatican, the *Disputa*, were published in 1551 and 1552 respectively (cat.5-6). All of them contain interpretative inscriptions but the poem in the *Brazen Serpent* is the only signed verse in this group. Lampsonius's text is also peculiar because of his comment on Floris's excellence. Raphael and Lombard did not need any more the praising comments since their reputation was well established, while the publisher may still have felt the need to legitimise the project of the monumental print after Floris's work. His fame still needed marketing in order to become equal to those well-known masters.

I propose that a difference can be traced in the "printed image" of Floris and other painters already in 1555. Floris, in collaboration with his publisher, manipulated the "public image" of his works more consciously than others, and wanted to disseminate his inventions and achievements in a more coherent way. Dominicus Lampsonius had a major role in this strategy, and the collaboration must have served his interest at the beginning of his career. To have his name associated with printed images and with the work of an excellent painter, who deserved to have such a high status patron as Granvelle, must have been an important point in Lampsonius's plans. Thus Floris and Lampsonius supported each other's endeavours for reputation and status. It may not be a coincidence that the earliest signed laudatory poem in a reproductive print was composed by Lampsonius who later wrote the first artist's biography of the North, who established connections to different Italian artists and theorists, and who had a constant interest in reproductive printmaking during his life and work. He built his reputation as an "art theorist", an ideal counterpart of Vasari, consciously as early as 1555 (when he was only twenty-three years old), when Floris was still working on his self-representation as an excellent artist.

Lampsonius must have had an agenda for propagating art in image and text already in the 1550s. He wrote several poems to the paintings by Anthonis Mor, a Greek verse was painted in Mor's 1558 self-portrait, and Latin verses were added on the picture frames of two portraits from 1559.[77] From his later works and letters one may assume that he envisioned a canon of Netherlandish works in printed form, complete with commentary in captions as a well conceptualised answer to Giorgio Vasari's ignorance of northern artistic

---

[76] About his relationship to Hieronymus Cock see Claudia Banz, *Höfisches Mäzenatentum in Brüssel: Kardinal Antoine Perrenot de Granvelle und die Erzherzöge Albrecht und Isabella* (Berlin: Mann, 2000), 63-64; Edward H. Wouk, "Antoine Perrenot de Granvelle, the Aux Quatre Vents press, and the Patronage of Prints in Early Modern Europe," *Simiolus* 38 (2015): 31-61.

[77] Joanna Woodall, *Anthonis Mor: Art and Authority* (Zwolle: Waanders, 2007), 10-17. We also know further Latin ekphrastic poems from Lampsonius's letters. Puraye, *Dominique Lampson*, 97-100.

achievements. Lampsonius later also felt the need to formulate his answer to Vasari in letters (1565, 1567) in which he provided information about northern artists and their masterpieces that Vasari incorporated in his 1568 edition of the *Vite*.[78] As early as 1555, the poem in the *Raising of the Brazen Serpent* clearly indicates Lampsonius's interest in the dissemination of artistic invention in reproductive prints, and gives the direction of his art theoretical approach where poetry did not serve as a competitor of painting but as a useful tool to market it. Hieronymus Cock played a significant role in realising these ideas, and may have also been the co-initiator of the discourse. He clearly had a business interest in connecting the media he was selling and the world of the possible audience, the learned connoisseurs.

The prominence of the *Brazen Serpent* already suggested that Frans Floris had a special place in Hieronymus Cock's publishing strategy. Almost a decade later, Lampsonius composed a poem on the importance of reproductive prints in connection with a series of prints after Floris's paintings. The dedicatory poem published along with the *Labours of Hercules* in 1563 is an essential source for how Cock and his circle were thinking about the role of reproductive printmaking (cat.8.a).[79] Lampsonius composed the dedication on behalf of Cock to Nicolaas Jonghelinck, the owner of Floris's paintings.[80] The way he wrote about the prints in comparison with the painted models reveals a lot about their status and function. Just like in the shorter texts in the prints, Floris was praised several times in the dedication, Lampsonius called his right hand divine (*divina Flori dextera*) and, again, Apellean (*Flori Apellea manu*).

Lampsonius applied a smart rhetoric in his poem. Seemingly, he depreciated the prints, and begged for Jonghelinck's pardon for the "secret project" of Cock, namely that he published the series without the owner knowing about it. He described the relation of the magnificent painted works and the prints after them similar to the relation of "the body to (its) thin shadow" (*quae non magis, quam corpori / exilis umbra, Flori operibus aureis / sunt digna comparier*). However, at the same time Lampsonius claimed that "those engraved in thin piece of metal with accurate diligence will bring pleasure mixed with

---

[78] For the letters see tr. Maria Teresa Sciolla, *Da van Eyck a Brueghel: scritti sulle arti di Domenico Lampsonio* (Torino: UTET, 2001), and for comments on them see Melion, *Shaping the Netherlandish Canon*, 146-152.

[79] The letterpress text of the dedication was attached to the first edition of the series. The only known copy is in Brussels, Royal Library (inv. s.1 11683-1). *Hieronymus Cock*, ed. Van Grieken et al., 166.

[80] The series was painted around 1555 for a chamber in Jonghelinck's suburban villa. Manfred Sellink, *Cornelis Cort, Accomplished Plate-Cutter from Hoorn in Holland* (Rotterdam: Museum Boymans-van Beuningen, 1994), 91.

benefits of all the most beautiful art to the connoisseurs." The text made it clear that the prints served as vehicles of Floris's masterpieces, and they helped to spread the painter's fame. They made Floris's achievement known even to "learned Italy" (*docta Italia*), and generated a competition that ended with the victory of Floris, and thus Netherlandish art.[81] Despite the acknowledgement of the far-reaching role of prints, Lampsonius still seems to have felt the need to use a defensive tone. He urged those who did not believe the primacy of Netherlandish art on the basis of the prints, to observe the originals in Jonghelinck's house. The praise of the Antwerp merchant as the "passionate lover of the arts and hater of sordid parsimony" strengthened Lampsonius's argument in favour of Cock. As the poet pointed out, Jonghelinck did not lose anything with the publication of the images but shared the delight of enjoying excellent art. He was celebrated on this occasion, Lampsonius compared him to Hercules who did not achieve his labours for his own good but benefitted the world with his heroic deeds. Jonghelinck did not contribute actively to the publication but if he pardoned Cock, and if he was happy with the result of this "theft" (*furtum sagacis Coqui*) through which the "hidden art" (*abditae artis*) of his house became available for many more art lovers, then he deserved to be compared to the great ancient hero.[82]

While Lampsonius seemingly diminished the standing of prints, he still recognised their importance in canon formation. Walter S. Melion has pointed out how Lampsonius conceptualised the "defense of northern prints" in his letters to Vasari, Titian, and Giulio Clovio (respectively in 1565, 1567, and 1570).[83] In my opinion, these ideas received more publicity with his dedication to the *Labours of Hercules* series already in 1563. The longer dedicatory poem was a fitting form to express more complex theoretical ideas than a shorter poem accompanying the image on the same sheet. Despite the visual separation, this composition is not less important in the marketing process, since it contains explicit arguments in favour of prints. Lampsonius's letters to Vasari in 1564 and 1565 prove that he followed the Italian developments of the writings about art and artists, and contacted one of the most important authors of the period. In the 1565 letter, Lampsonius proposed

---

[81] This argument can be referred to as paragone between Italian and Netherlandish art. See Caecilie Weissert, *Die kunstreichste Kunst der Künste: niederländische Malerei im 16. Jahrhundert* (München: Hirmer, 2011), 208.

[82] This comparison is especially interesting in the light of Weissert's interpretation of the Hercules series as the expression of civic political consciousness in Antwerp. Caecilie Weissert, "Zwischen Herrscher- und Bürgertugend: Der Herkuleszyklus von Frans Floris in der Villa des Nicolaes Jongelinck," in *Zwischen Lust und Frust, die Kunst in den Niederlanden und am Hof Philipps II. von Spanien*, ed. Caecilie Weissert, Sabine Poeschel, and Nils Büttner (Köln: Böhlau, 2013), 17-47.

[83] Melion, *Shaping the Netherlandish Canon*, 150.

to Vasari collaboration on a print series of Biblical images – the Italian artist would have provided the visual inventions, while Lampsonius would have completed them with Neo-Latin poems.[84] For the northern humanist, reproductive prints were the ideal way of communicating visual and textual compositions. This 1565 idea also suggests that Lampsonius's interest in art theoretical writings started already with the reproductive prints of the 1550s and early 1560s. The 1555-1557 prints with the laudatory inscriptions are also peculiar in the European context. As the chapter on Lafreri will show, inscriptions combining the praise of the artist with the description of the topic appeared a few years later in Rome.[85]

Text and image in prints after Frans Floris:

marketing the *pictor doctus*

In the previous subchapter, those prints were considered that included texts commenting on the inventor-painter's talent, the quality of the image, and expanding on the role of reproductive prints. These are important examples in showing the theoretical and historical interest of the producers, and especially Cock's intentions in publishing particular images and artists. However, these prints are only a small portion of Cock's publications, and most of the texts inscribed in prints do not comment on the artistic merit of the image but rather elaborate on the topic depicted. The following analysis focuses on how narrative inscriptions could also contribute to the fame of the inventor. How did text and image work together to transmit not only pictures by a certain artist but also market a complex image of his art?

As the above analysis showed, Frans Floris was a central figure in Cock's oeuvre. This chapter aims at supporting this idea by examining prints after his invention that include narrative texts, and looking at how these texts contributed to his recognition. In later sources, Floris was often referred to as a learned painter, a *pictor doctus*. The ideal of the learned painter was an early modern humanist concept, it is missing from ancient theoretical sources (whether it never existed in this form or the relevant sources were lost, is an open question). Fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Italian theoreticians like Ghiberti, Alberti, Dolce, Lomazzo, or Armenini built up the new model from two main sources: firstly they based the idea on the well-known, admired example of the *poeta doctus*, and

---

[84] Puraye, *Dominique Lampson*, 88.
[85] See the analysis of Beatrizet's and Scultori's prints after Giotto's and Michelangelo's works in the fourth case study of this thesis, in the chapter on Lafreri.

secondly they transferred Vitruvius's expectations of the educated architect to the painter and the sculptor of their age. The proper erudition for a painter meant above all a comprehensive knowledge of poetry and literature, since these disciplines provided the artist with a necessary basis for creating new inventions. However, as Rensselaer W. Lee and Jan Białostocki pointed out, the idea of the learned painter remained a theory with "partial basis in reality."[86] Painters may have had the chance to attend Latin school,[87] but they probably did not own an extensive library to consult with during their everyday work. Although the ideal may have never reached reality, but it was a well-fashioned and widespread idea that became more and more popular North of the Alps as well.

Karel van Mander described Frans Floris as a talented painter who had "a great insight and judgment on whatever topic (...) be it concerning spiritual things or relating to philosophy or poetic matters."[88] The painter-poet Lucas de Heere praised Floris, his master, as a painter who surpassed the ancient Apelles by his "divine science" applied in his paintings.[89] According to Jochen Becker, the word "science" here must refer to Floris's learnedness in poetry and philosophy, as later stated by Van Mander.[90] De Heere's poem was published in 1565, in the same year when the mural paintings on the facade of Floris's own house in Antwerp had been completed. There is a consensus in the scholarship about the interpretation of the whole decorative program as a statement on the status of the visual arts as liberal arts and as a reflection of the new ideal of the learned artist.[91] The façade decoration shows Floris's interest in managing and marketing his own fame, and the

---

[86] Lee, "Ut Pictura Poesis," 235. Białostocki, after examining evidence on the libraries of artists, claimed a clear gap between the ideal of the learned painter and everyday reality. Jan Białostocki, "Doctus artifex and the library of the artist in XVIth and XVIIth century," in *De arte et libris: Festschrift Erasmus, 1934 – 1984*, ed. Abraham Horodisch (Amsterdam: Erasmus Antiquariaat en Boekhandel, 1984), 11-22. More recently about the learnedness of artsist see Francis Ames-Lewis, *The Intellectual Life of the Early Renaissance Artist* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), esp. 22-26.

[87] Evonne Anita Levy, "Ideal and reality of the learned artist: the schooling of Italian and Netherlandish artists," in *Children of Mercury: the education of artists in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries* (Providence, RI: Department of Art, Brown University, 1984), 20-24.

[88] Karel van Mander, *The Lives of the Illustrious Netherlandish and German Painters: from the First Edition of the Schilder-boeck* (1603 - 1604), vol. 1, trans. Hessel Miedema (Doornspijk: Davaco, 1994), 217-218.

[89] "Naer dien ghi deur u Goddelicke scientie / Appelles name, zo hebt wtgevaegt en verdreuen." Lucas de Heere, *Den hof en boomgaerd der poësien*, ed. W. Waterschoot (Zwolle: Tjeenk, 1969), 39.

[90] Jochen Becker, "Zur niederländischen Kunstliteratur des 16. Jahrhunderts: Lucas de Heere," *Simiolus* 6 (1972-1973): 124.

[91] Carl Van de Velde, "The Painted Decoration of Floris's House," in *Netherlandish Mannerism*, ed. Görel Cavalli-Björkman (Stockholm: Nationalmuseum, 1985), 127-134; Zirka Zaremba Filipczak, *Picturing Art in Antwerp*, 35-39; Catherine King, "Artes Liberales and the Mural Decoration on the House of Frans Floris, Antwerp, c. 1565," *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 52 (1989): 239-256; Larry Silver, "Goltzius, Honor, and Gold," in *Habitus: Norm und Transgression in Text und Bild*, ed. Tobias Frese and Annette Hoffmann (Berlin: Akademia Verlag, 2011), 319; Edward H. Wouk, "Humanae Societati Necessaria: The Painted Façade of the House of Frans Floris," in *The notion of the painter-architect in Italy and the Southern Low Countries*, ed. Piet Lombaerde (Turnhout: Brepols, 2014), 89-125.

comments on his erudition prove that he achieved this goal. It has not been analysed in detail how this image of Floris was built up with the help of texts in prints. Edward Wouk pointed out Floris's conscious use of the printed medium, but he did not examine in detail the additional narrative texts in prints after Floris.[92] This chapter examines how texts worked together with the printed images in order to market the learnedness of the painter-inventor. The previous subchapter showed that the conscious use of texts was meant to influence the viewer's reception of images. The following analysis focuses on how the textual framework guides the reader-viewer through the experience of the print, and suggests an erudite reading of the image.

The series of the *Labours of Hercules* (cat.8) after Floris's paintings was already mentioned because of the statements on reproductive printmaking in the dedicatory poem written by Dominicus Lampsonius. The series is interesting also beyond the theoretical ideas formulated in the dedication. There are short texts engraved in two columns below each image, most probably composed by Lampsonius. These verses focus on the mythological content, they function like short summaries of the episodes depicted, and they list the deeds of Hercules in a straightforward manner. The captions identify the figures by giving the mythological names of the protagonists of each scene. The name of Hercules only appears in the first two sheets, then the third person singular endings of the verbs refer to him, thus emphasising the coherence of the series. The sheets are expected to be "read" in a sequence according to the numbers appearing on each of them.

The visual division of the texts into two columns reflects a dual structure of their contents and the dual structure of the images too. Almost all the sheets (except for two, *Hercules Slays the Nemean Lion* and *Hercules Defeats Antaeus*, cat.8.c,j.) contain scenes both in the fore- and background. This arrangement is obvious in the case of two sheets where two episodes of the labours are combined in one image. In his paintings for Jonghelinck, Floris depicted the twelve episodes in ten panels, probably because of the lack of space in the chamber they were meant to decorate.[93] The scene of Hercules feeding Diomedes to his own carnivorous mares and his striking down Cacus are depicted in one composition (cat.8.h), and Hercules's struggle with the Caledonian boar is combined with his slaying the three-headed Geryon in one sheet (cat.8.i). These compositions provided the inspirational source for the other six cases where one episode is split into two scenes.

---

[92] See Wouk, *Frans Floris*, vol. 1, XXXIII.
[93] *Hieronymus Cock*, ed. Van Grieken et al., 166.

The format of the images was changed to the horizontal or "landscape" format during the process of printmaking since Floris's paintings were vertical or "portrait" compositions.[94] The inscriptions follow the dual structuring of the scenes, describing the two parts of the compositions in two columns, often starting with the one in the background, perhaps to bring it to the viewer's attention. For instance, the caption in the first sheet depicting the combat between Hercules and the centaurs mentions first the abduction of Hippodamia which is depicted in the upper right part of the image, and speaks about the main scene of Hercules striking down the centaurs only afterwards (cat.8.b). In the sixth sheet, Deianeira appears in the background with her companions holding the first cornucopia, won for her from Achelous by Hercules, and she is mentioned in the second part of the inscription (cat.8.g). The structure of the texts directs the reader in the image. Lampsonius achieved a close connection of text and image by rhetorical means, addressing figures of the story (like Molorchus and Cerberus) and using demonstrative pronouns. The captions have a complementary character in relation to the images, they serve as aides-memoires for the readers, reminding them of the whole story, evoking figures that are not even depicted in the images. For example, the poet invokes Molorchus, Hercules's host in Nemea in the second print (cat.8.c), or speaks about the Hesperides crying about the apples stolen by Hercules in the fourth sheet (cat.8.e). By evoking intricate details of the mythological context, the verses could become the painter's support in the struggle for his intellectual status. Reproductive prints were the ideal medium to disseminate this idea to a broader audience. In this case, the praise of Floris was separated from the visual space of the images in the dedicatory poem but the short narrative captions could also contribute to his fame as a knowledgeable painter.

The series of Hercules's labours highlights an important point in the printmaking and publishing process. The paintings by Floris were based on a twelfth-century moralising tradition (the treatise *De imaginibus deorum* by Albricus Philosophus) that interpreted each scene as the virtuous hero defeating the evil.[95] A few years later when publishing the images in print, shorter, image-related texts were commissioned from a humanist collaborator who put the emphasis on the mythological details instead of the moral message.

---

[94] Wouk, *Frans Floris*, vol. 2, 14.
[95] As Sellink pointed out, the iconographical details and the order of the labours are the same in Floris's images and in Albricus's work. Sellink, *Cornelis Cort*, 91.

The *Hercules and the Pygmies* was published in the same year, 1563, engraved by Cornelis Cort presumably after a lost painting by Floris (cat.9). A similar dynamic occurs in this sheet as in the series of the labours: the image was based on a longer textual source, whereas a contemporaneous, image-related text was applied in the print. Floris followed a third-century description of an ancient painting of the same topic, Philostratus's ekphrasis from his *Imagines*.[96] Details of the depiction, like the king of the pygmies overseeing the fire attack against Hercules's head, or the figure of Somnus appearing beneath the sleeping Hercules, prove the close relation of the image to the ancient text. Floris's lost painting was a reconstruction of the artwork described by the third-century writer. Reconstructing paintings on the basis of ancient literary descriptions was not an unusual practice in the period.[97] The print after Floris's lost painting enhances the competition with the antique even in the layout of the sheet that could have reminded the viewers of the structure of ancient Roman epitaphs inasmuch as a mythological scene was placed above the Latin inscription. The Neo-Latin text, an epigram from Andrea Alciato's emblem book, also contributes to this emulative effort. The Roman type capitalised inscription framed by an illusionistic cartouche imitates carved stone inscriptions.

The spatial illusion of the frame and especially its perspective (one sees the upper ledge from above) enhances the two-dimensional "painted" character of the image. The carved inscription, seemingly, is intended to become part of the viewer's reality. Through its form, the framed inscription defines the depiction "as an image," while it would fade into the three-dimensional reality of a built environment (for example when pasted on the wall). The tension between depiction and reality, the two-dimensional space of the image and the illusion of three-dimensionality of the frame is even more emphasised with the head of the defeated Antaeus at the edge of the depiction. His hair falls down to the frame and casts a shadow on the inscription, connecting the two different realities. The extension of the image into the illusionistic reality of the frame points out the difference of the two

---

[96] Philostratus the Elder, Philostratus the Younger, Callistratus, *Philostratus the Elder, Imagines, Philostratus the Younger, Imagines. Callistratus, Descriptions,* tr. Arthur Fairbanks, Loeb Classical Library 256, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1931): 228-229.

[97] In general about this topic see Jodi Cranston, "Longing for the lost: ekphrasis, rivalry, and the figuration of notional artworks in Italian Renaissance painting," *Word & Image* 27 (2011): 212. The same episode was actually painted by Jan van Scorel before Floris, probably before 1554. His painting was also lost, just like Floris's panel, but Neo-Latin epigrams preserved its composition in descriptions. It is questionable whether Floris knew Scorel's image or the poems about it (Guépin insists on Floris emulating the older master, but Sellink doubts this connection). However, comparing the print after Floris and the Latin poetic descriptions after Scorel, one finds several differences both in the composition and in the motifs (like the figure of Sleep does not have a robe in Floris's image or the position of Hercules and Antaeus is slightly different here). J. P. Guépin, "Hercules belegerd door de Pygmeeën, schilderijen van Jan van Scorel en Frans Floris naar een Icon van Philostratus," *Oud Holland* 102 (1988): 155-167.

virtual spaces but at the same time creates a dialogue between them. This visual interaction highlights that the meaning is created during the parallel reading of text and image.

The depicted story unfolds in a circular way visually from left to right, then back to the middle, following the direction of reading at least partially. Through this compositional feature, the image follows the linear narrative of the story and thus suggests the viewer to "read" the image in a similar way as a text. If one starts deciphering the print, first glimpses at the body of Antaeus and his head casting shadow on the first line of the inscription which speaks about someone having a refreshing sleep (*DVM DORMIT, DVLCI RECREAT DVM CORPORA SOMNO*). At the first glance, Antaeus and Hercules look very similar, especially because of the pose of their right arms, their identities could easily be mistaken, both sleeping with open mouths. This confusion builds up tension in the viewer that can only be relieved by observing and deciphering both the visual and verbal messages accurately.

The antithetical presentation of Hercules and Antaeus as hero and antihero gives the viewer the first clue for identification. The state of the figures (living and dead) is clearly indicated by parallel motifs. Antaeus lies with his head downwards; his corpse leaves the illusionistic world of the picture, with his head falling down to the inscription he enters the space of the viewer, the world of mortals. A dead, broken trunk beneath him symbolises his defeat; a dry branch of its root is stretched along the body but disappears behind the frame, probably underground, this way implying Antaeus's belonging to the earth. In contrast, Hercules lies on his back with his head upwards in the right-hand part of the image, under the huge, living pine tree. One only gets an explanatory interpretation of the events when reaching the second "stanza" in the middle of the sheet. This part of the text is similar to a title, it points out the essence of the events depicted. Hercules is mentioned as Alceus's descendent, and the mistake of the pygmies, who thought to overcome the victorious hero while sleeping, is emphasised. Finally, the last section speaks about the event after Hercules was awakened; his awakening from sleep, a crucial moment of the story appears only in the inscription, and only the result of his anger is depicted in the middle of the background. Hercules leaves the scenery with his small enemies wrapped in the skin of the lion. This second depiction of the hero is relegated to the background. The caption serves to bring this motif to the viewer's attention. Alciato's epigram is based on the same source as Floris's image, the description by Philostratus.[98]

---

[98] John Manning, "Alciati and Philostratus's Icones," *Emblematica* 1 (1986): 207.

However, instead of simply repeating the story, the epigram offers an alternative interpretation. By choosing this epigram, the publisher could complete the image with the text instead of duplicating the visual information in verses.

The epigram focuses on the point of view of the pygmies, completing the moral of the image by emphasising one possible interpretation, namely that no one should presume too far beyond their own strength.[99] The message is not the same if one only reads the epigram or only looks at the image. Contrary to the inscription, Antaeus's figure has a central role in the depiction; his presence evokes the fight of the two heroes that happened just before the depicted events. In addition, Somnus, the god of dreams, plays an important role in Hercules's falling asleep, applying his branch, presumably full with the water of the Lethe (as described in *Aeneid* V.854-855), to Hercules's temple, thus making him vulnerable. Somnus may be regarded as a link between the events happening on the earth and the assembly of the gods among the clouds who act as distant spectators but may be partly responsible for the joke played with Hercules.[100] The message of the image is a warning to Hercules (and to all victorious men) not to rest even after his victory, because one never knows when another enemy will appear or when the gods will decide to turn one's fate upside down (hence the role of Somnus as the messenger of the gods). For even though Antaeus lies dead on the ground, the trunk beneath him has a new branch. The visual parallels, the similarity of Hercules and Antaeus, which causes confusion in the viewer at first, can be interpreted as an emphasis laid on the warning for Hercules that his fate can easily end catastrophically, like Antaeus's life did, if he is ignorant of the possible dangers of the enemy "growing" again.

By the means of parallel reading, one achieves a richer reception of the sheet, can choose among the possible interpretations, and get to know the moral of the story from the different point of views of the protagonists. Considering the reproductive character of the print, the combination of a reconstructed ancient image and a popular Neo-Latin text also offers a richer reading. Text and image show the painter's learnedness in poetry and his familiarity with the mythological context. Furthermore, Alciato's emblem book was

---

[99] The message is explicitly present in Alciato's book in the form of the motto which reads *IN EOS QVI SVPRA VIRES quicquam audent* (Against those who venture on what is beyond their powers).

[100] The figure of Somnus was closely connected to Mercury, both were regarded as the messengers of the gods in Neo-Latin poetry. Bettina Windau, *Somnus. Neutlateinische Dichtung an und über de Schlaf* (Trier: WVT Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, 1998), 51. Walter S. Melion proposed that the assembly of the gods was a reference to an episode of the Odyssey (8.256). Melion also suggested the whole print to be understood as an allegory of art, identifying Floris as the Hercules of art. In my opinion that is too speculative in this specific case, although the theoretical approach was not unusual in Cock's prints. Melion, "*Apellea et ipse manu*," 191-192.

succesful, and the audience may have recognised his text, thus the fame of Alciato also contributed to the fame of Floris.

Completing and complicating the meaning of the image was a key function of captions. The choice of the text could easily shift the emphasis, and highlight some aspects of the depiction in order to guide the viewer's attention to a certain detail. The print after Floris's *Adam and Eve Lamenting Abel* (cat.10) included a similar contemporaneous Neo-Latin text as the *Hercules and the Pygmies*. The text directed the viewer's attention to the motif of the lion and the lamb, depicted in the right side of the sheet. This motif helped the viewer connect the Old Testament episode of Abel's murder with Christ's death. By emphasising this part of the composition, the caption did not only complete the image with an important symbolic layer of meaning but also pointed out Floris's interest in the emulation of antique art. Concerning the *Hercules and the Pygmies*, it has been often pointed out that Floris used ancient sarcophagi as a compositional model, and also as inspiration in creating certain figures.[101] The motif of the lion killing the lamb in the *Adam and Eve Lamenting Abel* was also inspired by ancient sculpture. Many Roman sarcophagi show the motif of the fierce lion grabbing a deer and sinking its teeth into the prey's neck or head (see for example the pieces showcased in the Vatican Museums). The lion symbolising death received a new meaning in Floris's image where the deer is exchanged for the lamb, the symbol of Christ. Beyond the Christianised meaning, Floris clearly meant the motif as a reference to ancient sculpture since even its position on the edge of the composition imitates the placement of the lion and deer on the corners of sarcophagi. By highlighting this motif, the Neo-Latin caption emphasised Floris's visual knowledge of ancient art.

In the dedication to the *Labours of Hercules*, Lampsonius urged Jonghelinck to allow the reproduction of another series, the *Seven Liberal Arts*, painted by Floris around 1555 probably for the library of Jonghelinck's villa. The series was published by Cock in 1565 with a shorter dedication to the wealthy merchant which was incorporated in the first sheet (cat.11.a). Presumably, the explanatory captions in these prints were also composed by Lampsonius.[102] Another series of the personification of the liberal arts (completed with Industry, Apollo, and Minerva) had already been published by Cock after Floris's

---

[101] For example, Edward Wouk pointed out the use of the *Laocoon*, and the connection between the sleeping Hercules and Endymion in a sarcophagus of the Villa Doria Pamphili. Edward Wouk, "Con la perfettione et le bellezze che si vede nelle figure…: Cornelis Cort and the Transformation of Engraving in Europe, c. 1565," in *Myth, Allegory, and Faith*, ed. Bernard Barryte, 236. I have also found a source of the figure of Somnus in another Endymion Sarcophagus in the Roman National Museum, Baths of Diocletian.
[102] *Hieronymus Cock*, ed. Van Grieken et al., 186.

inventions in 1551 (cat.12). Those early prints however differed significantly from the depiction of the personifications in 1565 that showed the conscious strategy of Floris and Cock to market the prints as the result of an erudite collaboration.

Floris is mentioned as the inventor in each sheet of the 1565 series, while he is not even mentioned in the 1551 series. The setting in which the personifications are presented is also remarkably different. The earlier series depicted single figures in landscapes, surrounded by the attributes, symbols, and instruments of the arts, while the personifications introduced themselves in first person singular form in the short captions (the only exception is *Rhetorica*). In the 1565 images, the female figures were placed in vivid multi-figure scenes practising and teaching their art, and the captions by Lampsonius summarised the essence of their knowledge.[103] The text in the first sheet (*Grammatica*, cat.11.a) is of particular interest: Lampsonius paraphrased Horace here, a line from the second epistle (II.126). Lampsonius transferred a sentence on the role of poetry (replaced *poeta* with *grammatica*), and used the formulation by the antique author to express the educational importance of the first liberal art.[104] The text affirms what one could decipher from the image, at the same time it achieves a further dimension with the reference to Horace. The caption shows Floris's familiarity with ancient poetry, something that was expected of a learned artist. The short comparison of the two series of the liberal arts shows the development in the "marketing strategies" of the prints after Floris. The difference between the two series fourteen years apart reflects the changing expectations towards the collaboration of texts and images that was prepared by the prints with the laudatory inscriptions.

The series of the *Pastoral Goddesses* from 1564 (cat.13) provides the most plausible example to illustrate Floris's goal of showing his poetic knowledge. The short captions in the eight sheets are quotations from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, *Fasti*, and Virgil's *Georgics*. What is exceptional about them is the explicit reference to the antique authors whose names appear in each sheet. As it will be analysed in the next chapter on religious prints, referring to the fitting Biblical passages was a usual practice in Cock's prints. On the contrary, names of antique authors rarely appeared in sixteenth-century sheets. As Edward Wouk pointed out, the quotations served "to demonstrate a perceived affinity

---

[103] Sellink refers to the compositions as innovative everyday settings. Sellink, *Cornelis Cort,* 133.
[104] *GRAMMATICA OS TENERVM PVERI, BALBVM QVE FIGVRAT, / SCIENTIARVM CETERARVM IANITRIX*

between Floris's art and his poetic sources."[105] The indication of the ancient poets could serve as guidance for the audience to the mythological context but it may have been intended as a sign of the painter's erudition as well. The selected quotes are very different from each other in voice and tone. One of the texts makes the image speak in first person voice (Flora, cat.13.a), others simply describe some features of the figures to help the reader-viewer identify them (Pomona, Daphne, cat.13.d,h), some of the texts address the viewers, urging them to venerate the depicted goddesses (Napaea, Ceres, cat.13.f,c), and some even address the nymphs on behalf of the viewer (Pales, Naias, cat.13.b,g). The different quotes did not only serve the purpose of identification since the short inscriptions of the names of the goddesses superimposed on the images could fulfil this function. The lines from Ovid's and Virgil's works established a relation between the reader-viewer and the image, provided further information on the depicted figures, and emphasised Floris's poetic knowledge at the same time.

The informative aspect of the captions was important in sheets depicting mythological figures and stories. Carl van de Velde identified the sources of two further mythological prints.[106] The text included in the *Apollo and the Muses* from 1565 (cat.14) is a shortened paraphrase of Giraldi's corresponding section on the muses in his *Historia Deis Gentium* (published in Basel, 1548), while the Latin poem in the *Diana and Actaeon* (cat.15) derives from Johannes Posthius's version of the *Metamorphoses* (1563). In these cases, the contemporaneous texts were "reused" to match with the images without acknowledging the sources. It must have been the content that mattered during the selection of these texts, not their authoritative role. However, this does not necessarily mean that these Neo-Latin compositions could not strengthen the fame of the inventor. Beyond providing information on the mythological background, they enrich the image by poetical and rhetorical means through the parallel reading of text and image, just as in the case of the *Hercules and the Pygmies*. The verse on Actaeon's metamorphosis was adapted from a publication where this summarising text was combined with an image, thus it fitted well in the print. The text describes and explains the image, but at the same time also interprets it in a poetic way. It completes the image with a moral interpretative layer that was not possible to express by visual means, and could only be achieved through the unity of poetry and painting.

---

[105] Wouk, *Frans Floris*, vol. 1, LIX.

[106] Carl Van de Velde, "Introduction," in *Classical Mythology in the Netherlands in the Age of Renaissance and Baroque*, ed. Carl Van de Velde (Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 9-15.

The prints published by Cock used several strategies to present the inventor as a knowledgeable, talented artist. In the most obvious cases, the texts combined the descriptions of the topic with laudatory comments. Moreover, the acknowledgment of the poetic author, the emphasis on some aspects of the image, and even the addition of symbolic or moral meaning had the potential to influence the viewer-reader's impression of the work and its creator. Additional texts in mythological or Biblical prints after Floris's designs could influence the public image of the painter among the connoisseurs who purchased Cock's publications in order to enjoy the delight of masterful art. The question emerges if this was a special approach that only occurred in prints after Floris. Was the Antwerp painter the only artist who realised the potential of prints in communicating certain features of his art? The comparison between prints after Floris and Lombard aims at answering this question by looking at the difference between the marketing of the two painters' images.

Floris and Lombard in print:
different marketing strategies of master and pupil

Dominicus Lampsonius had an important role in creating the special position of Floris among the reproduced artists in Cock's publications. He supported the publisher and the painter with several poetic compositions that prepared his later theoretical works. Although the print production in the 1550s and early 1560s featured Floris as the ideal painter, in 1565, Lampsonius devoted the first northern artist biography not to Floris but to the Liège painter, Lambert Lombard. In the biography, Lombard embodied the ideal of the modern northern artist, a *pictor doctus* and *homo eruditus*, the best painter who provided theory and intellectual engagement for painting, elevated the status of the artist, influenced all his contemporaries. Floris seems to have lost his appeal to Lampsonius, who presented him as a negative figure in the *Effigies* in 1572.[107] Floris is described here as someone who places quantity over quality and who did not use his talent in the right way, while Lampsonius did not even try to characterise Lombard in a few lines but directed the reader-viewer to his biography that he considered a proper description of Lombard's

---

[107] "If, Floris you had acquired for yourself as much skill as you had natural ability as a painter (since you preferred to paint many things than to paint a lot, and neither the just delay of the file nor hard work pleased you) – I would cry out 'yield painters from all lands, whom either our grandfathers or our fathers produced.'" Translation is by Daniel Hadas in http://www.courtauld.org.uk/netherlandishcanon/image-tombstone/25.html (last accessed 08.07.2017).

achievements and merit.[108] Floris's personal and professional decline may have influenced the judgement about him in the decades close to his death.[109] That Lombard and Lampsonius belonged to the same intellectual circles of Liège, while Cock and Floris lived and worked in Antwerp, could also have an influence on their relationship.

On the one hand, the biography of 1565 signals a turning point in the collaboration between Lampsonius, Cock, and Floris. On the other hand, the publication of this longer theoretical writing in Latin was a culmination of ideas that must have determined the work of Lampsonius and his collaborators too. Having a closer look at Lombard's biography would help specify those ideas that were already present in the reproductive prints of the 1550s and early 1560s: the ideal of the learned painter, his relation to poetic knowledge and texts in works of art.

Throughout the biography of Lombard, Lampsonius presented the work of the artist as an intellectual pursuit instead of weary manual labour.[110] Two passages may illustrate how Lombard used his theoretical and literary knowledge in practice. The first episode appears at the beginning of the book where Lampsonius mentions the visit of Michael Zagrius, the secretary of Middleburg, in Lombard's studio. Zagrius, the great admirer of the art of painting, encourages Lombard to read Pliny and become aware of the erudition of ancient art *(priscorum artificium doctrinam).*[111] While looking around, Zagrius observes an image of Dido with an inscription, and he points out a grammatical error in the (possibly Latin) text which one may assume was written by Lombard himself.[112] The story reflects the need of literary and poetic knowledge and the ambition of the painter to express his learnedness in the framework of his image through an

---

[108] "It does not please [me], Lombard, to write here in a few verses an epigraph which would be suitable to your merits. Those pages contain it which (if our works deserve to be read) the Lampsonian pen wrote about you." Translation is by Daniel Hadas in http://www.courtauld.org.uk/netherlandishcanon/image-tombstone/21.html (last accessed 08.07.2017).

[109] On Floris's shock and breakdown after the inconoclasm in 1566 see Edward H. Wouk, "Frans Floris's Allegory of the Trinity (1562) and the Limits of Tolerance," *Art History* 38 (2015): 62. Van Mander also mentions Floris's problems with alcohol. Mander, *The lives of the illustrious Netherlandish and German painters*, 218.

[110] The idea of the *pictor doctus* by Vitruvius and, following him, by Alberti is based on the concept of the learned architect who is primarily directing the work of others and is not connected to any forms of manual labour. See Emma Barker, Nick Webb, and Kim Woods, "Historical introduction: the idea of the artist," in *The Changing Status of the Artist*, ed. Emma Barker, Nick Webb, and Kim Woods (New Heaven: Yale University Press, 1999), 18.

[111] Domenicus Lampsonius, *Lamberti Lombardi apud Eburones pictoris celeberrimi vita* (Bruges: Hubert Goltzius, 1565), 6. [French translation: Jean Hubaux and Jean Puraye, "Dominique Lampson. Lamberti Lombardi apud Eburones pictoris celeberrimi vita. Traduction et notes," *Revue Belge d'Archéologie et d'Histoire de l'art* 18 (1949): 63.]

[112] *...in inscriptione as Didus Reginae Carthaginis effigiem apposita Lombardo...* It is hard to tell whether Lampsonius is speaking here about a painting or a drawing as the image or portrait of Dido. Lampsonius, *Lamberti Lombardi*, 6.

inscription. In reproductive prints, one could read the caption as the indicator of the inventor's learnedness along the same logic. The figure of Zagrius also draws attention to the role of humanists who provided assistance for artists when it came to the topic of texts, language, and poetry. Lampsonius himself fulfilled such a role in Cock's print production.

In a later passage, Lampsonius described Lombard as a collector of antique coins, who read and interpreted the inscriptions and the images (*symbola*) on them – a typical humanist activity in the period.[113] The description firstly shows how he used his knowledge to reveal the meaning of these depictions. Secondly, it may also suggest a source of Lombard's erudition. The inscriptions and iconography of the coins did not only enrich his numismatic scholarship but could help him collecting ancient motifs and formulating new inscriptions to his own works. These episodes show how the ideal sixteenth-century Netherlandish painter could have been connected to literary texts during his work and social life. Even if this description by Lampsonius is an idealised picture of the learned painter, it reflects the expectations towards the visual artist to read, interpret, and use literary sources. In the conclusion of the biography, Lampsonius advised the young ambitious artists to follow the example of Lombard, the only way of excellence, and unite scholarly learning with the study of art (*praeceptis litterarum studia cum his artibus coniunxerint*), as the greatest painters (Pamphilus, Alberti, and Dürer) did in the past.[114]

Lampsonius's work on Lombard established the ideal of the learned northern artist-humanist (painter, architect, poet, philosopher, and scholar in one person) who preferred inventing motifs and drawing to the realising of ideas.[115] Lombard was described as a scholarly painter who, after examining and imitating antique masterpieces, extracted the essential rules of art to create the "grammar of painting" (*picturae grammatica*).[116] Jochen Becker examined how Lampsonius based his art theoretical ideas and the description of Lombard's working methods on the principles and system of ancient rhetoric.[117] As he pointed out, the reference to artistic experience and knowledge as *grammatica* and the invention of the scientific system of artistic rules served Lampsonius's goal to elevate the

---

[113] *...quorum numismatum inscriptiones tanta facilitate legebat, et symbola tam scite interpretabatur...* Lampsonius, *Lamberti Lombardi*, 30. [Hubaux-Puraye, "Dominique Lampson," 74]

[114] Lampsonius, *Lamberti Lombardi*, 37. [Hubaux-Puraye, "Dominique Lampson," 77]

[115] *...prae his tamen omnibus illa mihipotissimum satisfecit, quod eum animadverti monochromatis & deliniatione magis semper delectatum fuisse, quam coloribus postea addendis, inductione animi praestantissimorum quorumcunque artificum communi, qui fere inventionis ac lineamentorum excellentiam, atque reprehensam undequaque bonitatem studiosus, quam colorum lenocinia, persequuntur.* Lampsonius, *Lamberti Lombardi*, 33. [Hubaux-Puraye, "Dominique Lampson," 75]

[116] Lampsonius, *Lamberti Lombardi*, 14. [Hubaux-Puraye, "Dominique Lampson," 67]

[117] Becker, "Zur niederländischen Kunstliteratur," 48-49.

art of painting to the status of the liberal arts. The idea of separating the intellectual and manual part of the painter's work and emphasising invention over execution was a crucial argument for the liberal artist status of the painter. This distinction of the different phases of artistic creation was also present in Floris's representation, for example in his signature in some of his paintings and in his workshop practices.[118] Edward Wouk assumed that Floris's studio was organised after Raphael's example, separating the intellectual task of invention, the noble and pleasurable work of the master, from the execution of a piece on canvas, the duty of the apprentices and assistants.[119] From this point of view, prints were especially useful means of self-representation. As shown in the introduction, prints introduced the designer as the inventor, the intellectual creator of the image, while the actual work, the engraving of the composition was done by a different hand, by the printmaker, whose name sometimes did not even appear on the printed image.

Prints were ideal means to advertise oneself as a learned humanist, engaged with poetry, history, and philosophy, less interested in the manual aspect of artistic creation. According to Lampsonius, Lombard realised the potential of prints in disseminating his inventions, and, following the example of Mantegna, Dürer, and Raphael, he established a school in his house for his students copying his drawings on copper plates.[120] Timothy Riggs pointed out that, although Lampsonius's statement might be an exaggeration, Lombard indeed fostered his works to be engraved, and many of them were published by Hieronymus Cock.[121] However, it was Frans Floris who really explored the opportunity and used the advantages of prints in his self-representation and much more prints survived after his works than after his master's invention. Floris was mentioned by Lampsonius in Lombard's biography as one of the best students who would merit a separate biography.[122]

Hieronymus Cock published far more prints after Floris's works than after Lombard's (at least one can assume on the basis of the surviving sheets). Most of the prints after Lombard can be dated in the 1550s, and the first monumental print, the already mentioned *Last Supper*, was produced in 1551. Prints after Floris's images were published

---

[118] Filipczak indicated the importance of the signature FF. IN. ET FE. 1556 in Floris's St. Luke. Filipczak, *Picturing Art in Antwerp*, 31. Tobias Burg lists four more examples with similar signatures (FF. IV. ET F. 1550 in the *Banquet of the Gods* in KMSKA, Antwerp; FF. IN. ET. F. 1554 in the *Fall of the Rebel Angels* in KMSKA, Antwerp; FF. ENTVERPIEN. INVE. FAC. 1565 in the *Last Judgement* in KHM, Vienna; FF / ET / IN in the *Susanna and the elders* in the Uffizi, Florence), and assumes that Floris (among other painters) was inflenced by the practice of signatures in prints. Tobias Burg, *Die Signatur. Formen und Funktionen vom Mittelalter bis zum 17. Jahrhundert* (Berlin: Lit Verlag Dr. W Hopf, 2007), 424.
[119] Wouk, "Humanae Societati Necessaria," 107.
[120] Lampsonius, *Lamberti Lombardi*, 34. [Hubaux-Puraye, "Dominique Lampson," 76]
[121] Riggs, *Hieronymus Cock*, 19.
[122] Lampsonius, *Lamberti Lombardi*, 31. [Hubaux-Puraye, "Dominique Lampson," 75]

mostly after 1555, well into the 1560s. The difference between Lombard's and Floris's representation in prints is not only quantitative. The texts added to the images of the two painters show further differences, and suggest the lack of strategy in Lombard's case. The inscriptions in the prints after Floris derive from various sources, while the texts added to Lombard's images are generally shorter. In many religious prints after Lombard, the additional texts are exact quotations of Biblical texts (e.g., *Crucifixion* from 1557, *Crucifixion* from 1563, *Conversion of St Paul*, *Christ with Martha and Mary Magdalene* from 1556, *The Miraculous Draught of Fishes* from 1556). Among the prints after Floris, there is a smaller amount of prints with Biblical quotations (e.g., *Massacre of the Innocents*, *St Jerome* ca. 1560, and the *Judgment of Solomon* from 1556), and the Biblical stories are usually summarised in concise inscriptions (e.g., *King Josiah Renews the Covenant in the Temple*, *Solomon Anointed King*, or both prints depicting *Loth and his Daughters*). Late antique poems on Biblical topics were selected for one sheet after Floris and Lombard respectively (*Solomon Directing the Building of the Temple* after Floris and *Christ Carrying the Cross* after Bosch after Lombard).[123] Furthermore, a considerable number of Biblical images after Floris were completed with presumably original Neo-Latin texts (*Adam and Eve Lamenting Abel* from 1564, *Resurrection* from 1557, *Sacrifice of Isaac* from 1560, *Susanna and the Elders* from 1556), and in two cases the authors also comment on the painter's excellence (*Brazen Serpent*, *Sheba and Solomon*). Among the prints after Lombard, the *Last Supper* (1551) and its pendant, *Christ Washing the Feet of His Apostles* (1557), are combined with shorter Neo-Latin poems. These captions put an emphasis on the content of the depictions, and did not make any comment on the artist's skills. Interestingly, several prints after Lombard contained exact Biblical quotations, while prints after Floris were more often completed with original texts and paraphrases rather than quotations. This may reflect the publisher's careful management of texts. The examination of mythological and allegorical prints will help to see a clearer picture of the phenomenon.

Two "archeological prints" were published after Lombard in the early 1550s.[124] The print of a Roman sacrificial procession includes a moralising caption, which describes and interprets the image but at the same time judges the act depicted (cat.16). The text ends with a fitting quotation from the *Aeneid* (VIII.106), a fragment from the description of the Arcadian king and his entourage making offerings to the gods in front of their city.

---

[123] For the analysis of the role of late antique texts see the next case study, especially pages 62-65.
[124] Term by Godelieve Denhaene, see *Hieronymus Cock*, ed. Van Grieken et al., 113.

The *Sacrifice to Priapus* (cat.17) contains an epigram from the collection of ancient poetry called *Priapeia* (printed several times from the fifteenth century onward in Italy).[125] These prints could be comparable to those after Floris analysed in the previous subchapter. However, these prints could hardly contribute to the fame of Lombard since his name is either relatively hidden (the short indication "L.Lom" appears in the Roman procession) or is not even mentioned (only the publisher is credited in the Priapus sheet). In the print of the *Sacrifice to Priapus*, Lombard's name was omitted even though it had a prominent position in the drawing that the print was based on.[126] It must have been a conscious choice of the producers of the prints to leave out the name of the inventor in this case. With these sheets, the publisher's intention was to enrich his repertoire of antique prints with figurative sheets depicting religious customs of the ancient world. The topic of the depiction played a more important part than the reproductive aspect. The only case in which the erudition of Lombard could be demonstrated with the help of prints is the series of the *Four Seasons* (cat.18). In these four sheets, his role as the inventor is properly credited. The short captions under the images of the personifications are the four lines of a poem by Vomanius, from the textual tradition of the so-called *Carmina XII sapientum* (it is part of a cycle of tetrastichs on the four seasons).[127]

Mythological and allegorical prints after Floris were completed with a diverse range of texts. Firstly, two series (*Labours of Hercules*, *Seven Liberal Arts*) were completed with Neo-Latin compositions, verses by Lampsonius. Sixteenth-century texts were also used extensively to match the images. The allegory of different musical instruments (titled by Riggs as *Musical Party*, cat.19) was completed with an apt passage from Erasmus's *Parabolae Sive Similia* (Basel, 1545) that compared the different effects of different kinds of music to the phenomenon of magnetism (from the section containing paraphrases of various works by Aristotle, Pliny, and Theophrastus). Passages from Juan Luis Vives's treatise, *De anima et vita*, were added to the sheets depicting the five senses (cat.20).[128] Three mythological sheets with a paraphrase or quotation from Alciato, Giraldi, and Posthius were already mentioned. Ancient sources also served as accompanying texts of the images. The scene depicting Scaevola placing his hand on a

---

[125] *Hieronymus Cock*, ed. Van Grieken et al., 114.

[126] For the drawing see *Hieronymus Cock*, ed. Van Grieken et al., 114.

[127] A corpus of inscriptions from late classical antiquity, organised in twelve cycles of twelve poems (each cycle with a different topic). Anne Friedrich, *Das Symposium der XII sapientes, Kommentar und Verfasserfrage* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2001), 54.

[128] Carl Nordenfalk, "The Five Senses in Flemish Art before 1600," in *Netherlandish Mannerism*, ed. Görel Cavalli-Björkman (Stockholm: Nationalmuseum, 1985), 138-139.

burning altar is completed with a short line from Livius's *Ab Urbe Condita* (cat.21), and quotations from Ovid and Virgil were added to the images of *Pastoral goddesses* (cat.13). For the series of the moral *Virtues* (cat.22), Neo-Latin verses were probably commissioned, the one-line texts are presumably based on textbook sources of Latin verse. A few instances of paraphrases are recognisable, for example the line in *Perseverantia* starts with a quotation from Ovid's *Elegy XI*, while the text in *Concordia* is a paraphrase of the Roman poet, Calpurnius Siculus's second eclogue. As a comparison, one could refer to the series of the cardinal virtues Cock published after Lombard's inventions in 1557 (cat.23). In this case, the female personifications were put in niches, imitating sculpted figures, and only their names were added to the sheets as a kind of label.

A great variety of texts served the marketing of Floris's images, made them more relevant and desirable for the audience, while the prints by Lombard usually got simpler captions. Names of the authors, classical or contemporaneous, appeared in prints after Floris's design. In contrast, none of the additional texts in prints after Lombard commented on the talent of the painter or the quality of his invention. Hieronymus Cock realised the ideas of Lampsonius's biography of the ideal northern artist already in the decade before the publication of the book in the prints after Floris. The collaboration between publisher, humanist, and possibly also the painter himself resulted in a conscious use of the printed medium for disseminating not only inventions by Floris but also a coherent image of his artistry. Before the genre of the artistic biography appeared in the Netherlands, inscriptions in prints fulfilled a similar role as ekphrastic writings and prose commentaries on art. Reproductive prints did not only disseminate artistic inventions but many of them provided the viewers with images matched with commentaries on art and the ideal artist. The case of Floris and Lombard suggests the publisher's active role and conscious strategy behind the choices of texts. With the help of Lampsonius, Cock even managed to include a description on the function of reproductive prints in a dedication, and thus set the place of his prints in the international discourse on art.

In general, reproductive prints by Cock were meant to disseminate images of art historical importance and to circulate selected visual inventions. The intellectual work of the inventor-painter was the most important element of the print, the inventor was celebrated for the visual idea that found its way into the print. The merit of the visual invention was communicated with the help of texts printed next to the images. From the point of view of communication in the captions, the production process of the printed image was not important. The work of the engraver had to be a transparent layer of the

print, it had to convey the visual message by translating the invention truthfully into the monochrome medium of the print. Whether the print was made on the basis of a drawing provided by the painter, or originated in a copy of a painted picture, it could propagate the learnedness of the inventor in the same way through the collaboration of printed text and image.

So far, the narrative captions were scrutinised in order to understand how the additional texts could propagate the knowledge of the inventor by emphasising certain motifs or a certain interpretation of the depicted story. The following case study will look at the other side of the coin: how the narrative texts communicated the topic of the image to the audience. What style, tone, and voice were used in these texts, how did they relate to the reader-viewer? The case study of the laudatory inscriptions and the captions in prints after Floris showed that an important function of the texts was to mediate between the image and its viewer, to frame the image with certain ideas. This creates an especially interesting situation concerning religious prints in the era of the Reformation. The next chapter will focus on how the textual framework could influence the meaning of religious prints in order to adapt the images to the changing expectations of a transitory period, and how they were meant to create a balance between the religious and artistic message of the print.

CASE STUDY 2

Religious prints and the influence of the Reformation

Religious imagery is the largest group by subject among the prints published by Hieronymus Cock. As the largest group in the publisher's oeuvre, it is necessarily diverse, containing many narrative images, mainly stories from the Old and New Testament, but some traditionally iconic images as well, like the picture of the Holy Family. The religious prints published by Cock are different from fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century prints that contained prayers for indulgences, invocations, or texts used in Catholic liturgy.[129] Whereas more and more studies deal with the religious function and importance of early prints, there are still many questions to be explored about the changing features of sixteenth-century religious prints. Cock's publications are ideal to analyse how communication with the audience changed, since these prints were published in a time when change, conflicts, and the appearance of different ideas were everyday experiences in religious life. On the other hand, as discussed in the first chapter, Cock was conscious about the reproductive dimension of the prints, providing a wide European audience with masterpieces of religious art in prints. This aspect, the artistic and aesthetic value of the images also influenced how their religious message was formulated in the additional narrative inscriptions, what quotations were selected, and how texts were adapted to the context of the print (literary style, tone, and voice of contemporaneous texts).

The characteristics of Cock's religious prints were discussed briefly in previous scholarship. Timothy Riggs indicated that the Antwerp publisher was not interested in marketing "cheap devotional icons" but focused on the parables, episodes of Christ's life, and Old Testament stories with a moral message for a wealthy, educated audience.[130] In contrast, Joris Van Grieken lately pointed out that Cock's stocklist was most probably more complex, containing less expensive prints with traditionally devotional imagery as well. According to the inventory of Cock's widow's belongings, the publishing house had several small plates ("plaetken") with the depiction of popular saints (like St Gregory, St Barbara, St Anne, St Francis, or St Catherine), passion series, the images of "Our Lady in

---

[129] See examples of fifteenth-century German prints including prayers and indulgences in *Origins of European Printmaking,* ed. Parshall and Schoch, esp. 73, 98, 157, 240, 248-250. Fifteenth-century Italian examples can be found in Mark J. Zucker, "Early Italian Engravings for Religious Orders," *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 56 (1993): 366-384. For sixteenth-century prints after a painting by Raphael see Elisabeth Schröter, "Raffaels Madonna di Foligno. Ein Pestbild?" *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 50 (1987): esp. 51-55.

[130] Riggs, *Hieronymus Cock*, 206-207.

the Sun," and the seven sorrows of the Virgin.[131] The sheets printed from these plates were neither identified nor included in the reconstructed stocklist of Cock because the publisher's name and address was probably missing from them. Van Grieken assumed that these plates may have been acquired by Cock and not engraved especially for the publishing house. The intention behind leaving out the publisher's name and address may have been to separate these sheets from the carefully selected "higher-end" engravings created exclusively for the publishing house.[132]

The inventory list proves the versatility of the *Aux Quatre Vents* but also the conscious strategy of the publisher to realise and address different demands of a large, heterogeneous audience. On the one hand, this meant differences in quality. Reproductive prints after designs by renowned artists, with witty Latin inscriptions were aimed at an educated audience, in contrast with the anonymous smaller prints. On the other hand, the publisher had to take into account the changing religious situation in Antwerp, as well as in Europe, and what it meant regarding religious imagery. Although the Habsburg authorities suppressed reformist thought, and banned and burned the works of Luther, his publications were still circulating and had a significant influence on the highly urbanised Netherlandish society from 1519 onwards. As Jonathan Israel pointed out, the high level of literacy and the impact of Erasmus's works in the Latin schools provided the basis for reformist movements. However, Protestantism remained decentralised and many different varieties of doctrines evolved because of the official repression of any criticism.[133] In this atmosphere, a great part of the educated elite chose to remain outwardly Catholic but to reject and to criticise the old Church inwardly. Many lay- and clergymen (office-holders, merchants, and academics) became involved with the spiritualist movements based on humanist criticism and Biblical piety.[134] Guido Marnef described a "varied middle group" between orthodox Catholics and Protestants in Antwerp. This extensive group included people who remained faithful to the pre-Tridentine Church and also involved many who criticised the late medieval practices of piety but did not openly leave the old Church.[135] A considerable proportion of the educated audience interested in Cock's prints must have

---

[131] Van Grieken, "Establishing and Marketing the Publisher's List," 23. For the inventory see Erik Duverger, *Antwerpse kunstinventarissen uit de zeventiede eeuw*, vol. 1 (Brussels: Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letterem en Schone Kunsten van Belgie, 1984), 17-37. One can find popular devotional prints among the entries on pages 36-37.
[132] Van Grieken, "Establishing and Marketing the Publisher's List," 23.
[133] Jonathan Israel, *The Dutch Republic* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 79-85.
[134] Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 94-97.
[135] Guido Marnef, *Antwerp in the Age of Reformation* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1996), 56.

belonged to this diverse group. How did the engravers and the publisher react to this situation? Do the prints show any signs that their producers realised the complex religious conditions in the city, and did they attempt to adopt, or maybe take advantage of this situation?

The reproductive aspect of the prints complicates the picture since many prints depicting religious topics reproduced images of a different context, for example they were created by Italian artists. The producers of prints used additional inscriptions to adjust the images to the new context, shifting the emphasis, or sometimes completely changing the message of images by the means of words. This chapter focuses on this function of the additional captions, and how their characteristics reveal the diverse features of religious prints. The goal of the analysis is to show that the group of religious prints published by Cock was not at all homogeneous but reflected the diversity of the period, ranging from simple and "traditional" devotional prints to more sophisticated, multi-figure images matched with complex poetic texts. The use of certain texts reveals new characteristics of religious prints and new ways through which the prints communicated with their potential viewers.

Speaking images, Biblical quotations, and late antique poetry

The "small devotional prints" published by Cock were not identified but there are some prints in his high-end stock that can be labelled as "traditional." It is worth starting the analysis with these examples to highlight the contrast with the more innovative prints. At the same time, even those prints regarded as traditional in their subjects or in the characteristics of the texts were adapted to the taste of the period. Texts in many prints followed well-established traditions of combining text and image, and Biblical quotes or paraphrases were often matched with the printed images. Biblical quotations appear in many prints published by Cock, even in prints with a clear reproductive character. For example, the *Holy Family* after Lucas van Leyden was inscribed with a quote from Matthew (1:22-23), referring to the birth of Christ as fulfilling the prophecy of Isaiah (cat.24). The inscription expanding on Leyden's role (*Lucas de Leijda Hollandus Inuentor*) was put right next to the explanatory, well-known Biblical place. As already mentioned in the previous chapter, prints after the invention of Lombard or Floris were also often matched with authoritative quotations.

As inscriptions mentioning the inventing artist became an almost standard element in Cock's works, references to the Bible passages corresponding to the depicted figures or

scene also appeared in many prints with religious topics. Even if the caption of the image was not a quote but a paraphrase of the Biblical text, it was a growing practice to give the reference to the relevant passage of the Bible (e.g., *St Paul Baptising in Ephesos* after Heemskerck, cat.25, or the many series after Heemskerck's design such as *David and Saul*, *Tamar and Amnon*, *The Story of Tobias*).[136] These short references helped the reader-viewer to find the whole story if they were not satisfied with the short descriptive paraphrases that fitted below the images.

Biblical quotes served as tools of identifying the topic of multi-figure scenes in many prints. In these instances, their simple and descriptive character helped the reader-viewer to recognise the story and the protagonists. The reference to the related book of the Bible was useful in finding the detailed textual source of lesser-known Old Testament narratives, for example in some prints after Floris's design like the *King Josiah Renews the Covenant in the Temple*, or *Solomon Anointed King*, or in the many Old Testament series engraved after the drawings of Maarten van Heemskerck (e.g., *The Story of Gideon*).[137]

Cock published only one image of the *Madonna and Child* (cat.26), Cornelis Cort engraved the sheet probably after the design of Giulio Clovio, although the inventor's name did not appear in the print.[138] The text added to this image is a quote from Luke 1:46-49 that was used in Catholic liturgy (often referred to as the *Magnificat* hymn). In the text, Mary speaks in first person voice, praising God for choosing her for great things, also pointing out that all the future generations will call her blessed for this. Her humility is expressed both in the text by referring to God's role, and calling herself the servant of the Lord, and in the image by her half-closed eyes fixed on the ground. On the one hand, this print follows the tradition of earlier religious woodcuts and engravings by including a liturgical text, depicting the holy persons in a close-up setting, and making one of the depicted figures speak through the inscribed text. On the other hand, neither Mary nor Christ seeks connection with the viewer through eye contact, and the text is not an intercessory prayer or similar text urging a dialogue between the reader-viewer and the depicted divine persons. The print follows a certain tradition but adapts it to the second half of the sixteenth century at the same time.

The function of inscriptions as direct speeches of the depicted figures has a long tradition in art, and fifteenth-century religious woodcuts applied this tool of

---

[136] For the series after Heemskerck see Riggs, *Hieronymus Cock*, 344.
[137] Riggs, *Hieronymus Cock*, 332, 333, 343.
[138] Milan Pelc, *Prints after Giulio Clovio* (Zagreb: Prints and Drawings Department of the Croatian Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1998), 66.

communication especially often.[139] Prints by Cock followed this tradition, while adapting it to the sixteenth-century context. Some mythological prints were already mentioned in the previous chapter where figures communicated information about themselves to the audience in direct speeches (see for example the early series of the *Liberal Arts* after Floris, or one sheet from the *Pastoral Goddesses*, cat.12, 13.a). In Cock's prints, most of the direct speeches were not put on scrolls or in speech bubbles next to the mouth of the figures as in medieval examples (the only exception is the *Parable of the Wise and Foolish Virgins* after Brueghel, where an angel announces the arrival of the bridegroom with Matthew 25:6 inscribed on a scroll, cat.28). In most prints, the speeches are put below the image, separated visually from the depiction by a thin margin line. For example, in the print depicting *Christ with Martha and Mary Magdalene* after Lambert Lombard's design, Christ is talking to Martha with the words from Luke 10:41 (cat.27). The text completes the image of the gesturing and conversing figures, and at the same time helps the viewer to identify the scene by naming of the female protagonists of the story, Martha and Mary.

The text could also be framed and placed on an illusionistic tablet below the image, as in the *Parable of the Wise and Foolish Virgins* after Brueghel (cat.28), where the dialogue of the virgins was inscribed on *all'antica* tablets below the image. In this case, the division of the text into two parts on two tablets followed the visual divide of the image that separated the sections of the wise and the foolish virgins. The lower part of the image translated the Biblical story into the sixteenth-century by showing the wise virgins working in the house on the left, while the foolish ones dance outside on the right in contemporaneous garments and amongst everyday objects. In the upper, heavenly sphere, Christ receives the wise virgins, while the foolish only find a closed door. The sides are clearly divided between the wise and foolish virgins, yet oddly enough, the text written on the tablets below the image do not correspond. The request of the foolish virgins to the wise appears in the section depicting the wise virgins, and the answer of the wise virgins is to be read below the dancing foolish virgins. The speeches of the characters are not next to those who utter them. The story is still understandable this way but the mixing up of the sides reveals that the print was probably only completed with the inscriptions in a later phase of production, and was not planned well before (which is also supported by the strange position of the last word *EXTINGVNTVR* on the left side).

---

[139] For further episodes of this tradition see for example Roger Tarr, "*Visibile parlare*: The spoken word in fourteenth-century central Italian painting," *Word & Image* 13 (1997): 223-244.

Two *Last Judgment* prints after Brueghel and Bosch follow this practice of the depicted figures communicating through Biblical quotes. In the *Last Judgment* after Brueghel, Christ invites the blessed and righteous to heaven, and sentences the damned to the everlasting fire with the words from Matthew 25:34 and 41, both in Latin and in Flemish (cat.29). The words of Christ are directed to the depicted souls, however, they could be also interpreted by the reader-viewers as a warning for themselves. In the *Last Judgment* after Bosch, texts from the Old Testament (Wisdom 3:1 and 10) are used to describe the side of the blessed and the side of the damned (the arrangement was an important aspect here, see cat.30). In the middle panel, angels fight with demons as described in Revelation 12:7, the archangels protect some of the souls and direct them to a path in the background, supposedly leading to paradise. Psalm 24:7 is written below the image: "Lift up your heads, you gates; be lifted up, you ancient doors, that the King of glory may come in." Although Christ does not appear in this part of the image, the text announces his presence and refers to the salvation he brings to humankind. The same Psalm excerpt was put in a print after Brueghel that depicts Christ's descent into limbo (cat.31). In that print, Christ himself appears to save people from the mouth of hell, very similar scenery to the central panel of the printed Bosch-triptych. The identity of the narrator is ambiguous in both cases – it is not clear whether Christ demands the gates (of hell) to open up.

In other examples, the direct speeches of the depicted figures are embedded in a longer text, and the Biblical quotations were selected in a way that included both descriptive parts and the dialogues of the protagonists. The *Last Supper* after Frans Floris includes the dialogue between Christ and John over the dinner table, a text that was combined from the different gospels (cat.32). The transitory texts between the different speakers' parts remain in the quotation, probably because the speeches were not put next to the figures, and it was easier to give the dialogue a proper form this way. Similarly, in the *Conversion of St Paul* after Lombard, *dixit* ("he said") was inserted many times in the dialogue between Christ and Saul (cat.33). It was also possible to include descriptive sentences in between the direct speeches of the protagonist, like in the print depicting *The Miraculous Draught of Fishes* after Lombard's design (inscribed with John 21:7-8, 12, cat.34). In the *Judgment of Solomon* after Floris, the abridged version of the Biblical story was written below the image (with a reference to the relevant book of the Bible, cat.35). Solomon's judgment was spoken by the king himself in direct speech, a fitting match for the image showing him gesturing while announcing the decision.

The examples of the speaking images mentioned above follow a late medieval tradition but at the same time these engravings differ from fifteenth-century woodcuts. The speaking figures in the prints published by Cock do not speak to the viewer-reader, but they converse amongst themselves. The direct speeches from the Bible make the scenes more vivid, helping the viewer to identify the story, without directly addressing the viewer. This was not only true for Old Testament narrative scenes but also for the only Madonna image of Cock. Even in rare instances when the selected Biblical texts address the reader-viewer, they give a general moral message rather than establishing an intense communicative situation (like in the *St Jerome* print after Floris with Ecclesiastes 7:40, cat.36, or in the *Resurrection* after Coxcie's design with John 11:25[140]). In general, the Biblical quotations helped in creating the world of the depicted scenes, making them more vivid and dramatic through the words of the protagonists, and references to the relevant scriptural sections made it easier for the spectator to evoke the stories. The simple and well-known Latin also served this goal.

Even when using the Biblical quotes, some editing was involved in the process of matching image and text, especially if the purpose was to make the figures speak through the chosen passages. Other criteria could also play a role in the selection of certain texts. In the case of reproductive prints, the style of the image could influence the choice of the inscription. In a few prints, late antique poetic texts were chosen instead of Biblical quotes. These texts had a very different character from the scriptural excerpts, they laid more emphasis on the interpretation than on simple description or explanation, and their poetic, literary style matched with the stylistic aspirations of the image.

The print of the *Carrying of the Cross* from ca. 1560 is an ideal example for the use of a late antique text in order to create a stylistically consistent reproductive print (cat.37). The print published a drawing by Lambert Lombard that he probably made of a lost painting by Hieronymus Bosch.[141] The complexity of authorship is revealed in the print that refers to Bosch as the inventor of the design but also mentions Lombard who "restored" (*restituit*) the image. Thus the print served Cock's interest of delineating an artistic canon with focus on the great Netherlandish names, and also fitted Lombard's mission of the revival of antiquity and the local art of the past. Edward Wouk placed the

---

[140] Sellink, *Cornelis Cort*, vol. 1, 75.

[141] For Lombard's drawing see *Hieronymus Cock*, ed. Van Grieken et al., 274. Edward Wouk supposed that the drawing was based on a lost painting by Bosch but he also mentioned that earlier scholarship assumed that Lombard did not only use one single source but comprised the drawing of several works by Bosch. Edward H. Wouk, "Reclaiming the antiquities of Gaul: Lambert Lombard and the history of Northern art," *Simiolus* 36 (2012): 52.

drawing and the print in the context of Lombard's archaeological interest, and pointed out that Lombard did not only copy Bosch but made the figures fit his own *all'antica* visual vocabulary.[142] Marissa Bass also compared the composition and the flat character of the figures in a horizontal line to the features of ancient Roman relief sculpture.[143] The late antique poetic paraphrase of the Biblical events matched this image stylistically. The inscription is taken from the relevant section of Sedulius's epic poem, the *Carmen Paschale* (book five, lines 164-169).[144]

Sedulius was a poet and priest in fifth-century Rome who reformulated the narratives of the gospels in classical style (evoking and imitating classical poets like Virgil or Ovid). The *Carmen Paschale* was popular and often quoted in the medieval period, some parts were even adapted to the Roman liturgy and it continued to be highly popular in the sixteenth century. With over thirty editions between 1501 and 1588, and widely used as school text, the *Carmen Paschale* had remarkable authoritative power, even if not the same as Biblical texts.[145] The passage chosen for the print was able to complete the image in a sophisticated way, and to give an *all'antica* flavour with its Virgilian style of Latin. The text completed the image with colours, commenting that the colour of Christ's robe resembled blood, reflecting his suffering ("he was dressed in a cheap robe with reddish purple thread, so that his entire appearance would be an image of his bloody death").[146] The text helped the viewer to imagine the colourful version of the image that also supported the idea of reproduction. Moreover, Sedulius's text provided a stylistic parallel to Lombard's reconstruction of the image by Bosch. The late antique poet used his source, the narrative of the Bible, in the same way as Lombard used the work of Bosch, transforming it in *all'antica* style, aiming at imitating and even emulating classical forms but preserving the original message and appealing to the authority of the source. Text and image translated the message according to specific stylistic expectations. Their transformative efforts created a perfect stylistic unity in the print.

It has not been noted in previous scholarship that another late antique text played an even more important role in Cock's prints. Verses from Prudentius's fourth-century

---

[142] Wouk, "Reclaiming the antiquities of Gaul," 52.
[143] Marissa Bass, "Christ carrying the cross," in *Beyond Bosch, the afterlife of a Renaissance master in print*, ed. Peter Fuhring (St. Louis, Mo.: Saint Louis Art Museum, 2015), 123.
[144] Apart from the first two lines which were probably added.
[145] P. W. A. Th. Van der Laan, "Imitation créative dans le *Carmen Paschale* de Sédulius," in *Early Christian poetry: a collection of essays*, ed. J. den Boeft and A. Hilhorst (Leiden: Brill, 1993), 135-137; Carl P. E. Springer, *The Gospel as Epic in Late Antiquity, the Paschale Carmen of Sedulius* (Leiden: Brill, 1988), 1, 136.
[146] Translation from Sellink, *Cornelis Cort,* 65.

titulus cycle were inscribed in six prints engraved after Italian and Netherlandish inventions. The *Dittochaeum* or *Tituli historiarum* is the shortest work by Prudentius, composed of 49 tetrastichs elucidating the main episodes of the Old and the New Testament. The verses transform the content of the Bible in the classical pagan genre of the epigram, supposedly to make the moral message stylistically more attractive for the educated late antique audience.[147] The *tituli* were texts intended to accompany images, although it is debated whether Prudentius's verses were composed as fictive *tituli* that is only a literary genre, abbreviated Biblical paraphrases without any practical purpose, or as an explanatory text for a concrete image cycle (e.g., frescos).[148] Their image-related character was revealed by the use of demonstrative pronouns and the present tense. In the prints published by Cock, the verses could effectively function according to their original purpose for the first time in a long period. As is the case with Sedulius's *Carmen Paschale*, the *Dittochaeum* was also referenced, copied, and printed several times thus the text had an authoritative character (in the case of Prudentius, the author's fame also carried a certain aura of authority). However, Prudentius's verses had never been used as inscriptions in images before, so their use as captions in Cock's publications is an important innovative moment in the history of their reception.

The six prints with the verses from the *Dittochaeum* support the idea that Cock played a major role in the selection of texts for prints (cat.38-43). The publisher is the only common figure in the production of the six prints. They were engraved by different printmakers (Philips Galle, Pieter van der Heyden, and not firmly identified engravers) after the designs of different Italian (Andrea del Sarto, Bronzino, Raphael) and Netherlandish (Heemskerck, Floris) artists. Cock probably had access to a volume of Prudentius's works that contained the *Dittochaeum*, and the image-related late antique texts were at hand when looking for a stylistically fitting inscription. Cock might have intended to revive the ancient literary genre in the printed context as well.[149]

---

[147] Christian Kaesser, "Text, text, and image in Prudentius's Tituli Historiarum," in *Text und Bild: Tagungsbeiträge*, ed. Victoria Zimmer-Panagl (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaft, 2010), 164-165. See also Arwed Arnulf, *Versus ad Picturas. Studien zur Titulusdichtung als Quellengattung der Kunstgeschichte von der Antike bis zum Hochmittelalter* (Munich: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 1997), 67, and Renate Pillinger, *Die Tituli Historiarum oder das sogenannte Dittochaeon des Prudentius* (Vienna: Verlag der Österrischen Akademie der Wissenschaft, 1980).

[148] Recently Arwed Arnulf has accepted the latter interpretation, even if the cycle of the images is no longer surely identifiable; Christian Kaesser regarded the work as an attractive epigrammatic adaptation of the biblical content. Arnulf, *Versus ad Picturas*, 102; Kaesser, "Text, text, and image," 164-165.

[149] I mentioned my hypothesis about Cock's conscious revival of the *tituli* tradition in Alexandra Kocsis, "Recontextualizing Raphael: The Function(s) of Inscriptions in Sixteenth-Century Reproductive Prints," *Annual of Medieval Studies at CEU* 21 (2015): 92-93.

From among the six prints, four carry the name of the inventor (Heemskerck, Floris, Sarto, and Bronzino), one is attributed to Raphael based on the letter "R" inscribed in the image (reproducing one of the Vatican tapestries), and one only contains the name of Cock and the monogram of the engraver Pieter van der Heyden. All the six images follow the *all'antica* style visually. The texts by Prudentius work like the excerpt by Sedulius, they complete the images with an additional layer of meaning, often additional information as well. For example, in the *Adoration of the Magi* (fig.38), the verse puts emphasis on Mary's emotion (that she was amazed by the gifts and her son), and this is how the doctrinal part of the inscription is introduced (that Christ is God, man, and supreme king at the same time). The text in the *Building of Solomon's Temple* (cat.40) after Floris's design emphasises the parallel between Solomon's temple and Christ building a "temple" in the hearts of the faithful, thus strengthening the typological meaning of the image. The *Capturing of St John the Baptist* (cat.41) engraved by van der Heyden is the strangest among the six prints from the point of view of selecting Prudentius's verse. The poem expands on Salome's role in St John's fate, and tells the events that happened before and after the depicted scene. Recounting the story of Salome probably served to identify the story depicted (although the Baptist is clearly identifiable through his robe and cross). In this case, the inscription does not even relate to the depiction but contextualises the image in the narrative story.

In the two remaining prints after Sarto's and Bronzino's frescos, there are major changes implemented in the printed versions of the images. Interestingly, the visual alterations fit the texts by Prudentius. The print of the *Crossing of the Red Sea* (cat.42.a) was engraved after Bronzino's fresco in the Palazzo Vecchio (cat.42.b). The painted image consists of three episodes (the preparation for the flight from Egypt, the crossing of the Red Sea, and Moses appointing Joshua) and incorporates crypto-portraits of the Medici entourage. The composition was understood as a political allegory of Cosimo's victory at Montemurlo and his founding of the new Medici dynasty in Florence in the context of the decoration of the whole chapel.[150] In contrast, the verse from the *Dittochaeum* that was inscribed in the printed version summarised only the episode of the crossing, which provided its reader-viewer with a reduced interpretation of the image. One could decipher the different scenes in the fore- and background but the emphasis was on the part of the story that is highlighted by the explanatory text. On the other hand, Bronzino's image was

---

[150] Janet Cox-Rearick, *Bronzino's Chapel of Eleonora in the Palazzo Vecchio* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 306-314.

modified in the print, it included the Israelites crossing the parted sea that was not part of Bronzino's fresco. In the print, the image of the crossing and the parting of the sea could be seen next to the drowning of Pharaoh's army.[151] The contrast of the parted and closed sea was emphasised in the caption, and with the modification it was also visualised in the printed image. The fact that the changes made in Bronzino's image fit the text by Prudentius suggests that the authority of the text was realised and prioritised by the producers of the printed image.

In the print after a fresco from Andrea del Sarto's grisaille cycle in the cortile of the Chiostro dello Scalzo, the image underwent even more modification, with its main focus being shifted (cat.43).[152] Prudentius's epigram identifies the printed image as the baptism of Christ while Sarto's original image depicted the baptism of the multitude. The latter topic must have been regarded unusual on its own as a printed image while it had an important role in the cycle that depicted the main events of St John's life.[153] Sarto's main characters, St John and the kneeling young man, remained the same in the print but the tetragrammaton symbolising God the Father appeared among the clouds in the background and was connected to the main figures with the beam of divine light and the dove of the Holy Spirit. The inscription referred to these additional motifs, thus highlighting their significance (the opening of the heaven with the dove is a reference to Luke 3:21-22). The anonymous young man from Sarto's fresco is thus transformed into Christ. The scene with the numerous half-naked surrounding figures, with the help of Prudentius's text (which begins with mentioning the baptism of the people) seems to unite the two episodes in one image. The change implemented in Sarto's image matched the additional text just like in the case of Bronzino. Prudentius's text was not only applied for its style but must have been regarded an authoritative version of the scriptural narratives.

These examples reveal the mutual interaction between text and image in print that sometimes required editing or the change of the image in order to balance the visual and the textual parts of the prints. The publisher must have had a role in balancing between the

---

[151] Sarah Van Ooteghem also pointed out the difference between the print and the fresco, and supposed that the engraver worked from Bronzino's separate preparatory drawings instead of the painted version. *Hieronymus Cock*, ed. Van Grieken et al., 138.

[152] Hieronymus Cock reproduced four images from the extensive decoration programme which depicted the main events from the life of St. John the Baptist. *Zachariah and the Angel* (1551); *The Baptism of Christ* (1553); *The Arrest of St. John the Baptist*; *Salome with the head of St. John the Baptist*. One of them, *The Arrest of St. John*, did not even contain a reference to Sarto, thus cannot be regarded as reproductive. Riggs, *Hieronymus Cock*, 173 (footnote 16). The difference in the format, size, and layout of the four sheets clearly indicate that Cock did not intend them as a coherent series.

[153] On the cycle and the order of the specific images see John Shearman, *Andrea del Sarto*, vol. 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965), 52-74.

two media and in creating the integrative unity. The examples reflect his willingness to subordinate Italian images to northern textual purposes. The most famous example for changing the meaning of the image by the means of an additional inscription was Cock's print after Raphael's fresco, the *School of Athens* (cat.4). The last part of this chapter will discuss the special position of this early monumental print (published in 1550) among religious prints by Cock, how and why Raphael's image was adapted to the northern context.

This subchapter gave an overview of how authoritative texts were applied to prints published by Cock. The extensive use of Biblical texts is connected on the one hand to the characteristics of these religious images as multi-figure narratives. It is interesting that the prints followed the tradition of speaking images but at the same time the dialogues remained limited among the depicted figures. On the other hand, the emphasis on Biblical quotes was also in connection with the increased interest and turning towards the Bible because of the Reformation. At the same time, more elegant and classical texts also began to play an important part in completing narrative religious images of the 1550s. The stylistic criterion is a further sign of the conscious use of texts in reproductive prints. Matching the style of the inscriptions with the style of the image was a similar practice to using captions to propagate the learnedness of the inventor.

Contemporaneous texts for didactic and moralising images

The inscriptions from late antique poetic sources provide a good transition to those prints that contain texts most probably written for the combination of text and image in print. These contemporaneous texts tend to give an interpretation that bring the images closer to their spectators, even address them in order to maximise their affect on the reader-viewers. These prints represent a second strand of how the function and communicative strategies of religious prints were construed in the second half of the sixteenth century.

Three prints give the thread of the analysis that were issued in the first five years of the publishing house, and were all dedicated to the influential politician and clergyman, Antoine Perrenot de Granvelle. They are monumental in size; two of them were printed from two copper plates. The *Last Supper* after Lambert Lombard's lost painting (cat.6), the *Heavenly Hosts Praise the Trinity* (cat.5) after Raphael's *Disputa*, and the already analysed *Raising of the Brazen Serpent* after Frans Floris's lost painting (cat.1) are good examples to show how the function of printed images was envisioned on the Catholic side.

Edward Wouk supposed that the role of Granvelle's patronage played an important role in the success of Cock's business, both financially and ideologically.[154] Granvelle was a famous collector of antique and modern art and played an important role as the protector of the Catholic faith. He participated in the Council of Trent on behalf of Charles V in 1545, and later in the early 1560s, as first counsellor of Margaret of Parma, he played an important part in reorganising the ecclesiastic hierarchy in the Netherlands.[155]

Granvelle was the ideal beholder of Cock's prints; coming from a humanist background, he must have appreciated the reproductive aspect, and he had an interest in the religious message at the same time. As mentioned in the first case study, the prints after Lombard, Raphael, and Floris were significant projects for the young publishing house, reproducing important paintings by modern artists in *all'antica* style. On the other hand, the images were completed with Neo-Latin captions that set out the ideal function of religious imagery, namely the didactic aspect of the depictions. Interestingly, each text focused on the viewer's approach or reaction to the image, thus they demonstrated how the didactic function of the prints worked.

In 1551, Giorgio Ghisi engraved a print after Lombard's Liège fresco of the Last Supper (cat.6). The inscription added to Lombard's image directed the attention to the story of Judas instead of expanding on the Eucharist that was traditionally the principal message of the scene.[156] The text focused on the moral of the episode, showing the viewer an example to follow. The inscription described Christ's actions in short sentences, and presented the scene as an illustration of the virtue of clemency: "An example of very admirable clemency. He knows the betrayer is present. He announces that he will be betrayed. He does not betray the betrayer. Matthew XXVI."[157] The use of the word *exemplum* is an interesting detail of the inscription. On the one hand, it refers to Christ's exemplary role in practising the virtue of clemency. However, *exemplum* can also mean the image itself since the picture gives a visualisation of this virtue. It depicts the turmoil

---

[154] Wouk, "Antoine Perrenot de Granvelle," 32. For further scholarship on Granvelle's patronage see Banz, *Höfisches Mäzenatentum in Brüssel*, esp. 63-64.

[155] Maurice Van Durme, "Les Granvelle au service des Habsbourg," in *Les Granvelle et les Anciens Pays-Bas*, ed. Krista de Jonge and Gustaaf Janssens (Leuven: University Press, 2000), 28.

[156] Suzanne Boorsch indicated that Giorgio Ghisi, the engraver of Lombard's *Last Supper*, implemented a change in the gesture of Christ's right hand between the first and second state of the print. The modification happened in order to emphasise the Eucharistic aspect of the image. Boorsch, *The Engravings of Giorgio Ghisi*, 66. Edward Wouk also assumed that this happened in line with the doctrine of transubstantiation declared in the same year at the Council of Trent. Wouk, "Antoine Perrenot de Granvelle," 52.

[157] *PER ADMIRANDAE MANSVETVDINIS EXEMPLV[M]. / NOVIT PRAESENTEM PRODITOREM, SE PRODITV[M] / IRI INDICAT. PRODITOREM NON PRODIT. MAT. XXVI.* Translation from Boorsch, *The Engravings of Giorgio Ghisi*, 64.

of the disciples, guessing the meaning of Christ's words, trying to find out who would be the betrayer among them, as described in Matthew 26:20-22. The image provides the viewer with a direct visual experience, while the text concludes a possible moral of the scene.

Another image from the same fresco cycle was published by Cock in 1557. The *Christ Washing the Feet of the Apostles* (cat.7) follows Ghisi's print of the *Last Supper* in style, and the additional inscription is also comparable in the two prints.[158] The Latin lines in the *Christ Washing the Feet of the Apostles* describe the scene in a sentence, and then the anonymous narrator cries out: "O, (such) an example of extraordinary humility!"[159] The same word, *exemplum* is used in this print as in the *Last Supper*, and similarly, it has double meaning and function. On the one hand, it labels Christ's gesture as the virtue of humility. On the other hand, it refers to the didactic function of the image showing an example of the virtue of humility to its viewers. The inscription served to help the viewer identify the moral lesson of the print. Both prints after Lombard's lost paintings present the images as ideal examples of virtues, using well-known images of Christ's life. This approach towards images is not unique to the two prints after Lombard, as the concept of understanding the image as an example appears in other prints as well. For example, the caption in the print depicting Susanna and the elders (engraved by Pieter van der Heyden after Floris's design, cat.44) presents the protagonist as "the example of extraordinary chastity." The exemplary role of Susanna as the personification of a chaste life is expressed in a similar way as in the prints after Lombard. A short sentence, just like a title, emphasises this interpretation, and then a brief description reveals the moral of the story (how Susanna resisted the elders, and by denying desire, she would find God). In all the three prints, the inscriptions provide a moral interpretation of a well-known Biblical episode, thus the prints translated the monumental images for the use of everyday life.[160]

The second monumental religious print dedicated to Granvelle also includes the idea of visual example. Giorgio Ghisi's print reproduces Raphael's fresco, the *Dispute on the Holy Sacrament* (cat.5). The image derives from the Stanza della Segnatura in the Vatican, displaying the Trinity encircled by angels, Mary, St John the Baptist, personages from the Old and New Testaments, saints, and significant figures of ecclesiastical history.

---

[158] Boorsch, *The Engravings of Giorgio Ghisi*, 66.
[159] *O SINGVLARIS HVMILITATIS EXEMPLVM.*
[160] Interestingly, in some mythological prints published by Salamanca, similar situation occurred: the mythological stories and figures were translated and adopted to the everyday exeperience of sixteenth-century viewers by the means of Petrarchan love poetry. See the third case study, the chapter on Salamanca.

In the middle of the picture, four putti are holding up the four books of the gospels, and the Eucharistic wafer is placed on the altar surrounded by the figures engaged in dialogue.[161] Ghisi's print presented the audience with Raphael's famous image, *all'antica* style, and at the same time with a traditional Catholic representation (especially with the Risen Christ surrounded by the intervening figures of Mary and St John the Baptist).[162] The additional Latin caption, inscribed on a parapet in the lower right corner of the composition, referred to the depiction as the adoration of the Trinity, thus simplifying the meaning of Raphael's image, and shifting the emphasis of the interpretation. This inscription starts with the description of the image ("Here the Heavenly Hosts praise the majesty of the triune and the one God. They admire and religiously adore the princes of the sacred Church"). Then instead of giving a statement of interpretation like in the previously examined prints, the narrator turns to the viewer, and poses the question "who would not be inflamed to piety" roused by that example.[163] The anonymous author of the text chose a literary device that is interesting in this context. The rhetorical question serves to engage the spectators, and prompts them to follow the example set before their eyes in the image. The way in which this question is posed implies that there is no one who would not be affected by the pious example of the depicted figures. Using a question instead of a statement was a stylistic choice. It implied the expectation that this provocative question would move the reader-viewers, and enhance the effect of the image. Thus the monumental image of Raphael was translated to the personal experience of the viewer.

The inscriptions referring to the images as mediators of exemplary acts imply an appraisal of the depictions' expressive qualities, which effectively capture the viewer's attention. This is an idea that was explicitly present in the third monumental print dedicated to Granvelle, the *Raising of the Brazen Serpent* that was already analysed in the first case study from the point of view of its reproductive aspect (cat.1). While the previous chapter focused on the role of the print in advertising the painter's talent, Lampsonius's text is also interesting from the perspective of its religious content, elucidating the topic of the depiction. In the first part of this long Neo-Latin poem, the viewer is informed about the events which preceded the scenes depicted: that God sent poisonous serpents to punish the wandering Israelites because of their ill-natured

---

[161] On the facets of the meaning of Raphael's image see recently Paul Taylor, "Julius II and the Stanza della Segnatura," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 72 (2009): esp. 121-122.
[162] Edward Wouk even assumed that the print was intended to spread ideas on the doctrine of transubstantiation. Wouk, "Antoine Perrenot de Granvelle," 51.
[163] *QVIS VEL ISTOR / EXEMPLO PROVOCATVS AD / PIETATE[M] NON INFLAMETVR.* Translation from Boorsch, *The Engravings of Giorgio Ghisi*, 68.

complaints and disobedience (namely that they criticised Moses and doubted God's plan, as described in Numbers 21:4-5). In the second part, the narrator turns to the "impious people," and warns them that wickedness and sins cannot remain hidden.[164] The addressee of the vocative form of "impious people" is ambiguous. Lampsonius could have turned to the depicted figures, the Israelites, but might have addressed the potentially sinful viewers of the image with the same words. The last four lines could have been read as a general warning to any sinful people in the past, present, and future, for God can see even hidden crimes. The beholder could even have a look at how these sins are punished by looking at the heroic, suffering nudes in the foreground. This vivid depiction of physical misery gives a cautionary example to the viewers.

Besides warning the beholder of the consequences of secret crimes, Lampsonius also made an important point about the status of Floris's image. According to the poem, the painter exhibits the sins of the Israelites and the following divine punishment to the audience just as effectively as "the sacred writings of your Moses." Comparing the effect of Floris's painting and the Holy Scripture, Lampsonius made an argument for the religious use of images.[165] When he described the educational power of the image equal, or at least similar, to verbal expression, he emphasised the ability of images to illustrate religious content, to serve as examples, and to help viewers visualise and thus understand certain events and arguments. The prints analysed earlier, the images of Lombard and Raphael, strove for the same effect by referring to the images as examples, as the visualisation of exemplary action. Lampsonius made a further step with the comparison of Floris's image and the Biblical text; he introduced the concept of *ut pictura poesis*, and reinterpreted it for the religious context.

The prints dedicated to Granvelle show important ideas about Catholic printed images. The texts placed emphasis on the expressive qualities of the pictures serving didactic purposes. This was not a new concept regarding the function of images, but the way this view was expressed in the captions was specific to the medium, for example the combination of descriptive sentences with communicative situations, like addressing the

---

[164] The last four lines of the inscription reads *Tu tamen, impia gens, seclis ne forte futuris / Ignotum scelus hoc posse latere putes, / Non modo sacra tui Mosis te scripta, sed olim / Prodet Apellea Florus et ipse manu.* // "Nevertheless you, impious people, should not think by any chance that this sin can hide unknown in coming ages, (since) not only the sacred writings of your Moses, but also Floris himself by his Appellean hand will reveal it."

[165] As Walter S. Melion pointed out, the story of the Brazen Serpent already implies "the defense of sacred image-making" according to the exegetical tradition of the *Glossa ordinaria* that drew parallel between the Brazen Serpent sent for healing and Christ the Saviour. Melion, "*Apellea et ipse manu*," 196-200.

viewer-reader. On the other hand, the communication with the viewer is rather sophisticated and cautious compared to earlier religious prints, or even contemporaneous religious prints from Rome (e.g., see the examples published by Lafreri in the fourth case study). The narrators did not use the imperative mood, and did not address the viewers unambiguously. The reproductive aspect of the prints must have had a role in these characteristics of the inscriptions, especially in the case of the already famous painters, like Lombard and Raphael. The use of a rhetorical question, or the idea of *ut pictura poesis* matched the famous *all'antica* images in style. At the same time, the prints managed to argue for the use of images by the means of additional texts.

Further examples support the idea that the characteristics of the texts were adapted to the images. A print after the painting of the *Holy Family* by Andrea del Sarto (now in the Metropolitan Museum) included a Neo-Latin inscription similar in structure to the caption of the *Adoration of the Trinity*. In this print, the text starts with describing the scene as the veneration of Jesus by the young St John the Baptist (cat.45). After the identification of the topic, the narrator poses a rhetorical question, similar to the caption of the print after Raphael's fresco. The question *Quid mirum?* ("Why is this surprising?") is followed by an immediate answer, reminding the reader-viewer about the first encounter of the two children in their mothers' womb.[166] The rhetorical question in between the two descriptive sentences gives rhythm to the text, functioning as a caesura in the middle of the line.[167] This brief question functions as an expressive device, similar to the Christ Child's gaze in the middle of the composition. Both serve to catch the spectator's attention and to engage the reader. The *Holy Family* with close-ups of the divine figures was a traditional devotional subject. However, the text set on the surface of an antique-like, illusionistic tablet, explored the same rhetorical means as the monumental print after Raphael, explaining the topic in elegant terms. The inventor's name appeared in a prominent place, on the stone plinth at the feet of Christ. Sarto's authorship was clearly important in this print since his name and city was spelled out in a relatively long inscription (*Andreae*

---

[166] *IOANNES INFANTEM INFANS VENERATVR IESVM. QVID MIRVM? IN MATRIS LATITANS QVEM NOVERAT ALVO*. // The child Johannes venerates the new-born Jesus. What is surprising (about this)? They had (already) recognised (each other) hidden in the womb of their mothers.

[167] The brief question was used in a similar way as a caesura (designating a new line) in classical poetry, for example in Ovid's *Ars amatoria* (3:110). Interestingly, the same phrase was used by Lampsonius in the dedicatory poem written to the *Effigies*, the portrait series of Netherlandish painters (referred to in the introduction to the first case study). This might be more than a coincidence, and it may suggest that Lampsonius wrote also the brief poem for the print after Sarto's Madonna.

Sartij Florentin inuent). The poetic inscription was formulated to fit this context, both visually with the Roman capitals and stylistically with the well-structured Latin line.

One more example fits this group of prints analysed so far, since it is comparable to the monumental prints dedicated to Granvelle both in size and style. The *Resurrection* after Frans Floris's design was published in 1557, engraved by the Van Doetecum brothers (cat.46).[168] The Neo-Latin poem below the image was probably composed for the print.[169] The text in the *Resurrection* has a primarily descriptive character, expanding on Christ's triumph over death. In the middle of the composition, the second stanza introduces a different voice. Here the narrator addresses Christ with a vocative form, and then immediately returns to the descriptive voice in the next part of the text. The use of the vocative case establishes a more direct relation between the reader-viewer and the divine protagonist since the spectators could identify themselves with the narrator's voice addressing the risen Christ. At the same time, the author consciously avoids changing to a voice similar to a prayer, the first and last stanzas achieving a generally descriptive, distanced, and rather neutral tone for the poem. Although the second stanza would enhance the communication between the image and the viewer, the rest of the text rather establishes a poetic direction, formulating the essence of the teaching about the resurrection of Christ. The text uses extreme contrasts, like death and resurrection, destruction and triumph, punishment and new justice, tomb and the stars, to express the meaning of the image by poetic means. The same opposites are present in the print visually, between the radiant image of Christ and the darkness of the tomb, between the unconscious, sleeping figures of the soldiers and the levitating figure of Christ. The six-line verse amplifies the effect of the contrasts, and gives them theological meaning.

In conclusion, the prints analysed here represent a new type of Catholic religious print that used communication in a moderate way, and put emphasis on the moral message. The printed images were regarded as important mediators of the message, just as instructive as the text of the Bible. Lampsonius's verse in the *Brazen Serpent* proves the belief in the didactic power of images. At the same time, inscriptions provided additional information about the depicted topics but also translated the depicted scenes for the early modern viewer. Although some texts addressed the beholder, they still maintained a

---

[168] *Hieronymus Cock*, ed. Van Grieken et al., 156.
[169] "Once destroyed death, and had accomplished grace, life, health to return from wretchedness, the resurrected conqueror celebrates a triumph. You pay off the punishment to death, oh Christ, but (as) resurrecting conqueror you give life and new justice to the world. Who bore bitter death, hanging from the cross, resurrects from the tomb alive and aims at the stars."

certain distance, and paid attention not to slide into the voice of prayer or invocation. This was true for both the narrative stories with many figures and the iconic images with a few monumental characters (like the Holy Family, or the resurrected Christ).

Appealing to a multiconfessional audience

Ilja M. Veldman characterised the changes in religious art before the iconoclasm of 1566 as "a new attitude to religion" influenced by Erasmian Christian humanism.[170] This change was not a spectacular one but involved slight modifications in the emphasis and also the ambiguous interpretation of images. It did not mean significant changes in iconography, and the same images could have been used in both Catholic and reformed practice.[171] As Maryan W. Ainsworth pointed out, new additional motifs and indefiniteness reflected the changing attitude towards religious images.[172] Additional texts in reproductive prints can tell more about the approach towards images in the period, since they served to highlight some aspects of the meaning of visual representations. In this section, texts and images in selected reproductive prints will be analysed to show features that can be linked to the influence of the Reformation. These features can be small details of interpretation, and in most of the cases they are far from being unambiguous. The prints intended as representatives of the Catholic side do not make a homogeneous group, and they also show a changing character compared to religious prints of the previous period. The examples showing the potential influence of the Reformation are also diverse. Cock never published anything overtly Reformist, however, the inscriptions inserted into his prints reveal the changing religious culture and the presence of reformed ideas.

The first example is from 1554, a print after an Italian work of art engraved by Giorgio Ghisi that was a programmatic early publication by Cock just as the print after Raphael's *Disputa*.[173] The *Nativity* after Agnolo Bronzino's oil panel depicts the Holy Family, angels, and shepherds adoring the newborn Christ Child. The painting was commissioned around 1540 by a Florentine nobleman, Filippo di Averardo Salviati, most

---

[170] Ilja M. Veldman, "Protestantism and the Arts," in *Seeing beyond the Word: Visual Arts and the Calvinist Tradition*, ed. Paul Corby Finney (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1999), 398-399.
[171] Ilja M. Veldman, "Convictions and polemics: protestant imagery in the sixteenth century," in Ilja M. Veldman, *Images for the Eye and the Soul* (Leiden: Primavera, 2006), 92.
[172] Maryan W. Ainsworth, "Religious Painting from 1500 to 1550: Continuity and Innovation on the Eve of the Iconoclasm," in *From Van Eyck to Bruegel: Early Netherlandish Painting in the Metropolitan Museum of Art*, ed. Keith Christiansen and Maryan W. Ainsworth (New York: Abrams, 1998), 325.
[173] It was the fourth print Ghisi engraved for Cock. Boorsch, *The Engravings of Giorgio Ghisi*, 71.

probably as a house altar for the chapel of his villa (cat.47.b).[174] The print follows the painting accurately in the main features of the composition, although Ghisi implemented a few changes in the printed copy (cat.47.a). For example, Mary and Jesus received haloes, the dark brick wall behind the figures was made slightly higher, a significantly different landscape with a city appeared in the distant background, and the upper part was completed with clouds and two additional putti holding inscriptions. Some of the changes can be explained by the limitations of the print medium which compelled the artist to apply more contrast (as in the case of the wall) and unrealistic motifs (as in the case of the divine light of the star) to render the colours of the original into monochrome.

The introduction of the inscriptions cannot be explained with the different characters of the two media. It was a conscious choice of the producers to include texts to guide the potential new owners of the image. On the other hand, the difference between the colourful painting and the monochrome print could have an influence on the character of the additional texts. In the painting, the figure of the Christ Child is visually emphasised by the colour of the cloth he is lying on, and the light coming from his body, similar to the light of the star in the blue sky. The use of light and colour to guide the viewer's gaze was not transferable to the print, so the figure of Mary in the middle of the composition received more visual emphasis in the print. In line with this visual difference, the inscriptions shifted the emphasis from Christ to the visually central figure of Mary. The captions in the wreaths list the main events of Christ's life from Mary's point of view. The first inscription puts the birth of Jesus into historical context by referring to Christ's genealogy through Mary as the daughter of Heli or Joachim, and also by mentioning the year of his birth, 3960 after the creation of the world. While the first caption celebrates Mary as the Virgin giving birth to the long awaited Messiah, the second one refers to her as the witness of Christ's deeds and suffering. The textual framework extends the meaning of the image; the viewer is guided to the broader perspective of the history of redemption. The subject of the Nativity gives the occasion for the viewer-reader to meditate about the life of the Saviour. In a concise record, the reader is guided through the life of Christ,

---

[174] Alessandro Cecchi assumes that it may have been commissioned on the occasion of Filippo marrying his cousin, Maria Gualterotti, in 1538, and kept close to the nuptial chamber as a house altar. Alessandro Cecchi, "Il Bronzino, Die Anbetung der Hirten (cat. nr. 21)," in *Von Raffael bis Tiepolo: italienische Kunst aus der Sammlung des Fürstenhauses Esterházy*, ed. István Barkóczi (München: Klinkhardt & Biermann, 1999), 154.

recounting "him doing great things, enduring painful things, dying, rising from the grave, returning to his father."[175]

The inscriptions might have been consciously formulated in a summarising way to appeal to a confessionally diverse audience. Mary is not represented here as a mediatrix, the figure of intercession between the faithful and God, which was the traditional aspect of her late medieval cult.[176] In the print, she is primarily celebrated as the mother of Christ who assisted at the most important events of her son's life and thus deserved to join him in heaven. The text invites the audience to meditate on Mary's role in the history of redemption.[177] Apart from the general characteristic of the inscription, one particular detail supports the idea that the print may have been intended for a multiconfessional audience. Luther calculated exactly 3960 years from the creation of the world to the coming of Christ. His work on Biblical chronology titled *Supputatio Annorum Mundi* was first published in Latin in 1541 (Wittenberg), just a decade before the print. Although Luther's system was similar to the popular medieval scheme which placed the birth of Christ around the year 4000 from creation, the forty years difference played an important role in connecting the timeline of the Bible to Luther's theology and to his own position in time, writing in 1540.[178] Placing the Nativity in this historical context was most probably intentional in the print.

According to written sources, Ghisi's print made Bronzino's painting famous in Europe, its role in the dissemination of Bronzino's image is significant.[179] Since it provided the easiest way to consult the privately owned picture, it was often copied in Italy as well. Copies of Ghisi's print not only prove the importance of its reproductive aspect but they also highlight the ambiguous character of the inscriptions. The texts in the

---

[175] Translation from Boorsch, *The Engravings of Giorgio Ghisi*, 71.

[176] Bridget Heal, *The Cult of the Virgin Mary in Early Modern Germany: Protestant and Catholic Piety, 1500-1648* (Cambridge: University Press, 2007), 25.

[177] Mary's primary role was redefined by the Reformers as the model of faith. Jaroslav Pelikan, *Mary Through the Centuries* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), 159-160.

[178] The calculation was influenced by the Talmud and connected to the Prophecy of Seventy Weeks by Daniel. Luther calculated 40 AD as 4000 AM when the Apostolic Council of Jerusalem took place according (Acts of the Apostle 15) which announced the end of the Law of Moses, thus the beginning of the new era of Christianity. Luther also consciously positioned himself writing the work in 1540 in 5500 anno mundi, thus five hundred years before the end of the world. James Barr, "Luther and Biblical Chronolgy," in *Bible and Interpretation*, vol. 1, ed. John Barton (Oxford: University Press, 2013), 424-425.

[179] Giorgio Vasari wrote about the image in the *Life of Bronzino*: "of such beauty that it has no equal, as everyone knows, that work being now in engraving." Vasari, *Le Vite,* vol. 7, 596. Raffaello Borghini also mentioned it in the *Il riposo*: "Antonio Salviati has a painting by Bronzino of The Nativity of Christ in little figures, which is considered a very rare thing, as it truly is, and it can be seen in a print, and copied in many places, which Salviati has courteously allowed." Raffaello Borghini, *Il riposo* (Florence: Giorgio Marescotti, 1548), 535. Translations quoted from Boorsch, *The Engravings of Giorgio Ghisi*, 73-74.

wreaths were only readable from a closer point of view, so that from a distance, only the traditional image of the Nativity was visible. The inscriptions could only be deciphered through close observation. On the other hand, the message of the text was formulated to address a general, potentially multiconfessional audience and the small detail with Luther's dating was only recogniseable to those familiar with Biblical chronology, or interested in Luther's writings. This could be why it could happen that Antonio Lafreri published a copy of Ghisi's print without changing the texts. However, two more copies show that later Italian copyists took the trouble to select different texts befitting their ideas about the function of religious prints.

In 1565, when copying Ghisi's print, Giovanni Battista Cavalieri placed Biblical quotations, the prophecies of Isaiah (7:14, 9:6) in the wreaths (cat.47.c).[180] These texts were closely associated with the Nativity, and used as Christmas tropes in the Roman Catholic liturgy.[181] Additionally, a further liturgical text celebrating the mystery of the incarnation was applied to the lower margin of the print. The antiphon *O admirabile commercium* was traditionally sung in the office of 1st January (the octave day of the Nativity).[182] Cavalieri preserved the first half of Cock's text as the last line in the lower margin, but completed it with another chronology.[183] The year 751 *ab urbe condita* was given as the date of Christ's birth in addition to the year from the creation of the world. Thus a more conservative and local dating was provided besides the "Lutheran" one.[184] Cavalieri changed the texts of historical perspective for the authoritative quotations which must have been well-known from liturgy and shifted the focus back to the topic of the incarnation instead of the Marian point of view. An anonymous copy of Ghisi's print also suggests that liturgical texts must have been regarded more appropriate for a Nativity scene in the Italian context in general. The sheet (Szépművészeti Múzeum, Budapest, inv. nr. 45721, cat.47.d) contains the hymn from the Mass ordinary (*GLORIA IN EXCELSIS*

---

[180] *ESAIAS CAP VII / Ecce virgo concipiet / et pariet filium et vo/cabitur nomen eius Emanuel // Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Emanuel. ESAIAS CAP IX / Parvulus natus est / nobis et filius datus est / nobis et factus est principa/tus super humerum eius / et vocabitur Deus / Fortis //* For to us a child is born, to us a son is given, and the government will be on his shoulders. And he will be called Mighty.

[181] James W. McKinnon, *The Advent Project: The Later Seventh-Century Creation of the Roman Mass Proper*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), 184.

[182] Martin Herz, *Sacrum commercium: eine begriffsgeschichtliche Studie zur Theologie der römischen Liturgiesprache* (München: Zink, 1958), 24.

[183] *Maria omnium foeminarum felicissima post tot secula expectatum salvatorem IESVM parit Anno a mundi origine MMDCCCCLX et Ab Vrbe condita DCCLI*

[184] Early Christian authors usually dated of the birth of Christ around 751-754 AUC. Jack Finegan, *Handbook of Biblical Chronology: Principles of Time Reckoning in the Ancient World and Problems of Chronology in the Bible* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 1998), 291.

DEO ET IN TERRA PAX), held by the putto in the middle, which was regularly included in Nativity (or Adoration) scenes in Renaissance paintings.[185] Compared to this, Ghisi's *Nativity* published by Cock represents a completely different interpretative strand.

Ghisi's print after Bronzino shows how an Italian work of art was adapted for a new, multiconfessional context through inscriptions. The close reading of the print shows the influence of the Antwerp context, through a shifting emphasis and a small, seemingly insignificant detail in the additional text. The next example was published by Cock a decade later, in 1565. Its topic is similar to Bronzino's *Nativity*, depicting an important moment of Christ's life, with an established visual tradition. However, its reproductive aspect was especially important since it presented the audience with a "local" masterpiece. The *Descent from the Cross* was an already famous and admired painting when Cock published its printed version (cat.48). Rogier van der Weyden's painting was installed in the Leuven chapel of the Archers' Guild more than a hundred and thirty years earlier (around 1435). By the time of the publication of the print, the original had already been acquired by Philip II and transported to Madrid, leaving behind several copies in the Netherlands.[186] Cock's print was an important milestone in the history of copying Weyden's image since this is the earliest source which mentions the painter as the creator of the original composition.[187] The image must have been well known in Antwerp where a special version of its copy became popular in the first decades of the sixteenth century. In these Antwerp copies, the original T-shape was changed to a rectangular form and a detailed landscape appeared in the background.[188] The print by Cock follows this trend based on the local taste and tradition. Although it is not possible to trace the image which served as its prototype, its figures resemble the original more than any other surviving copies from Antwerp.[189]

---

[185] For example Pietro Perugino's image in the Yale University Art Gallery (1496), Giovanni Antonio Bevilacqua's (1500-1510) and Girolamo da Santa Croce's images in the Dresden Gemäldegalerie, or Domenico Ghirlandaio's painting in the Ospedale degli Innocenti, Florence (1585-1588).

[186] Amy Powell, *Depositions: Scenes from the Late Medieval Church and the Modern Museum* (New York: Zone Books, 2006), 550.

[187] Powell, *Depositions,* 550-555.

[188] The earliest known version of such copies from 1518 is by the workshop of Joos van Cleve (Philadelphia Museum of Art). Later versions appeared in the auction catalogues of the Christie's (Amsterdam 9 May 2011) and the Sotheby's (London, 7 December 2006). Hélène Mund, "Original, Copy, and Influence, a Complex Issue," in *Rogier van der Weyden: 1400 - 1464, Master of Passions*, ed. Lorne Campbell and Jan Van der Stock (Zwolle: Waanders, 2009), 198.

[189] Joris Van Grieken assumes that a lost altarpiece by Quentin Metsys, painted for the chapel of the Joiner's Guild in the Church of Our Lady around 1507-1508, was the model of Cock's print. Joris Van Grieken, "*Rogerij Belgae Inventum*," in *Rogier van der Weyden in Context*, ed. Lorne Campbell and Jan Van der Stock (Leuven: Peeters, 2012), 356.

It is interesting to examine what happened to Weyden's image in the print, and what role the additional inscription played in its transformation on paper. The major visual changes in Cock's print diminish the exact aspects for which Weyden's original image was celebrated. The painter's talent for portraying extreme emotions was already emphasised in the fifteenth-century.[190] Modern scholarship considered the naturalistic depiction of tears and sorrow significant in the emotional effect of the image.[191] Although the poses of the figures and their facial gestures remained the same, tears are entirely missing from the printed image. This may be the result of the copyist's limited access to the model, namely that tears were not as significant for a distant spectator as they are in the detailed photos of the painting today. However, the lack of tears is especially stunning in the case of a small scale object which was intended for private use and for intimate observation. Furthermore, the side wound of Christ, which was an important motif of late medieval piety and the centre of the original composition, is hardly visible in the printed image. Since the monochrome print was not able to depict colours, the dramatic effect of Christ's blood and Mary's pale face is also missing from the sheet.

Compared to the timeless "irrational space" of the painted shrine in Weyden's image, the print clearly locates the episode in the passion narrative.[192] The landscape with the panoramic view of Jerusalem in the background completed the scene with a historical setting. The enlarged cross refers to the Crucifixion, while the mouth of a cave behind Magdalene is a hint to the Entombment. The inscription on the lower margin strengthens this feature by emphasising the significance and meaning of Christ's sacrifice. The quotation from Peter's first epistle determines the viewer's position in the history of salvation. Through Christ's sacrifice, the faithful have the chance to leave all their sins behind and live a righteous life.[193] It is not Christ's suffering which is emphasised here but the moral responsibility of the viewer to accept his sacrifice and to live ethically to deserve salvation. The emphasis was no longer on empathy and compassion achieved through the image of extreme suffering but on the moral interpretation of the Passion.

---

[190] Jan Van der Stock, "Canon in context," in Cambell and Van der Stock ed., *Rogier van der Weyden in Context*, 12.

[191] Ervin Panofsky, *Die Altniederländische Malerei*, vol 1 (Cologne: DuMont, 2001) 254.

[192] Stephan Kemperdick, "Von der Vorlage zum Kunstwerk: Rogier van der Weydens *Große Kreuzabnahme,*" in *Original – Kopie – Zitat: Kunstwerke des Mittelalters und der Frühen Neuzeit*, ed. Wolfgang Augustyn and Ulrich Söding (Passau: Klinger, 2010), 209.

[193] *PECCATA NOSTRA IPSE PERTVLI[T] QVO PECCATIS MORT[V]I IVSTITIAE VIVEREMVS* // "He himself bore our sins so that we might die to sins and live for righteousness" (based on 1 Peter 2:24).

It may not be a coincidence that those parts of the Biblical text that mention Christ's body on the cross and his wounds that heal the faithful were not included in the print.[194] The spectator is invited to think about the depiction not by the means of drama, or by the signs of bodily suffering but according to the moral interpretation of the sacrifice.[195] The text plays an important role in emphasising this message even against the visual narrative. According to the consensus in modern scholarship, the main message of Weyden's image is expressed through the figure of the Virgin Mary who imitates Christ's position in her fainting. Mary shares the suffering of his son; her compassion inspires the viewer to the imitation of Christ.[196] The Virgin becomes a co-Redeemer that is also visually expressed with a fine motif in the painting; Mary Magdalene's belt is inscribed with the names of Jesus and Mary, thus connecting the two figures through words as well.[197] This inscription is missing from the print, which is otherwise relatively faithful in reproducing the details of the painted figures. Mary's role is not emphasised in the print by any means, but overshadowed by the inscription on the lower margin referring only to Christ.

The print translated the late medieval devotional image, which was intended to rouse pious feelings in the viewers by applying dramatic emotions and appealing to timeless compassion, into an early modern image of the passion of Christ with an emphasis on the redemptive aspect of his suffering. Joris Van Grieken characterised the print as "appealing for conservative taste" and intended for the traditional domestic market.[198] In my opinion, however, the sheet published by Cock reflects the changing religious climate, the decline of the forms of late medieval piety, and a morally and ethically oriented religious practice.

---

[194] The text from Peter's epistle reads as follows: *qui peccata nostra ipse pertulit in corpore suo super lignum ut peccatis mortui iustitiae viveremus cuius livore sanati estis* // He himself bore our sins in his body on the tree, so that we might die to sins and live for righteousness; by his wounds you have been healed.

[195] Bridget Heal pointed out lately that Passion piety was also present in Lutheran circles. In the Lutheran meditation on the Crucifixion the focus was shifted from the compassion with Christ's suffering to the experience of the viewer's own sins and to taking the responsibility for Christ's misery, who died on the cross for the sins of mankind. See Bridget Heal, "The Catholic Eye and the Protestant Ear," in *The Myth of the Reformation*, ed. Peter Opitz (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), 333-334.

[196] Otto von Simson, "Compassio and Co-redemptio in Roger van der Weyden's *Descent from the Cross*," *The Art Bulletin* 35 (1953): 9-16; Amy Powell, *Depositions*, 146. Martin Büchsel even adds that Mary's face with her eyes only half closed refers to her vision of Christ's resurrection. Martin Büchsel, "Das Schächer-Fragment des Meisters von Flémalle, Reue und Erkenntnis, ein Beispiel emotionaler Selbstkontrolle," in *Habitus*, ed. Tobias Frese and Annette Hoffmann (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2011): 96.

[197] Lorne Campbell, "The new pictorial language of Rogier van der Weyden," in Campbell and Van der Stock ed., *Rogier van der Weyden: 1400 - 1464*, 37, 43.

[198] Van Grieken, "*Rogerij Belgae Inventum*," 356.

The prints after Bronzino's and Weyden's images provided good case studies to look at differences between the Italian and Netherlandish tastes for religious prints, and even highlighted the changing approach towards religious images within the Netherlands. The close reading of these two prints helped position Cock's religious prints in historical and geographical perspectives. These prints were also the showcase for a special strategy; while they did not include overtly Reformist messages, small details, and the shift of emphasis revealed their flexible nature. The next print provides a more evident example of this adaptability, and it also highlights where the limits of this flexibility lay.

Cock published the *Christ on the Cross Between the Two Thieves* between 1554 and 1559 after Maarten van Heemskerck's design (cat.49.a).[199] The central image of the Crucifixion was completed with French letterpress texts printed on separate sheets but imitating the frame design of Heemskerck's image. The sheets with letterpress text were attached to the central image like wings of a triptych.[200] In this form, the three-part print imitates a winged altarpiece. Every panel is framed, and the central image has even a predella which is inscribed with Latin text. A painted original is not known by Heemskerck, although the form of the print gives the illusion of imitating a concrete object.

The Latin text on the predella addresses the reader-viewer, and incites him or her to believe in God and to meditate on Christ's sacrifice in order to attain salvation.[201] Such a direct call upon the viewer is unusual among the inscriptions in Cock's prints; this voice must be in connection with the form of the image as an imitation of a house altar. The typographic texts on the wings are quotations from the book of Isaiah, the gospel of John, and from the Pauline letters (to the Ephesians, Philippians, Romans, and Corinthians). Based on comparison with different early modern French translations of the Bible, I could

---

[199] Heemskerck's drawing which served as its direct model is dated 1554. There is no surviving painted model, the *Crucifixion* by Heemskerck from 1543 (Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Ghent) is similar to the print both in motifs, and in the form of the panel, however, the poses of the figures, and the composition are not identical with those in the printed image. The drawing is in the Teylers Museum, Haarlem. Ilja M. Veldman, *Maarten van Heemskerck*, vol. 1, The New Hollstein Dutch & Flemish Etchings, Engravings and Woodcuts, 1450 - 1700 (Roosendaal: van Poll, 1994), nr. 383.

[200] The texts were published in 1559 according to the privilege inscription. Nadine M. Orenstein assumes that it was either Sander Jansens or Christopher Plantin who printed the letterpress texts for Cock. He collaborated with both publishers on other projects in the period. Nadine M. Orenstein, "Images to Print: Pieter Bruegel's Engagement with Printmaking," in *Pieter Bruegel the Elder, Drawings and Prints*, ed. Nadine M. Orenstein (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2001), 50.

[201] *CREDE DEVM TIBI FACTVM HOMINEM TIBI ACERBAQVE PASSVM, VITAQVE SIT FIDEI CONSONA, SALVVS ERIS* // Believe in God who created Man for you and for you he endured misfortunes so that life will be in accordance with faith and you will be saved.

identify the source of the texts as the Leuven Catholic Bible that was published in 1550.[202] In summary, the print shows the image of Calvary surrounded by vernacular quotations from the official French translation of the Bible in the form of a house altar. At first glance, the print seems to fit in the conventional category of the private devotional image. However, the presence of the vernacular, the selection of the extracts, and the layout of the work are highly unusual, and suggest that Reformist thinking shaped this particular publication.

The quotations from the French Bible serve to substitute the visual representations on the wings attached to the central image. If one searches for parallels of longer texts appearing in the context of an altarpiece (which is the form clearly imitated by the print), the first association is to Dutch text paintings from after 1566 which similarly contained carefully selected and compiled excerpts from the Bible.[203] The idea to couple an image with Biblical quotations, and thus to authorise the picture with the word of Scripture, may reflect the Lutheran attitude towards images, the visualisation of faith.[204] However, the structure of the print, a central image surrounded by texts on the wings, is not unknown in late medieval devotional art. Similar triptychs can be found in Bruges and Tournai museums, with the Virgin and Child in the central panel, and prayers painted with golden letters on the black background of the wings.[205] The work attributed to Gossen van der Weyden (late fifteenth century, Museum of Fine Arts, Tournai, cat.49.b) includes intercessory prayers (*Salve Regina Misericordiae* and *Ave Maria gratia plena*), while the triptych by Ambrosius Benson (1533, Groeningemuseum, Bruges, cat.49.c) contains Marian antiphons (*Ave Regina coelorum*, *O Maria flos virginum*, *Mediatrix nostra*).[206] Not only images of the Virgin and Child contained such texts: different prayers (*Regina coeli*, invocations to the Godfather, to the Virgin, and to Christ) were inscribed in golden letters

---

[202] I have compared in details the extracts from Isaiah 43 with the translation of Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples and the 1550 Leuven edition. *La Saincte Bible: en françoys, translatée selon la pure et entière traduction de Sainct Hierome* (Antwerp: Martin Lempereur, 1530); *La Saincte Bible nouvellement translatée de latin en françois* (Leuven: Bartholomy de Grave, Anthoine Marie Bergagne, and Jehan de Uvaen, 1550).

[203] About this genre see Mia M. Mochizuki, *The Netherlandish Image after Iconoclasm, 1566-1572* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008).

[204] Joseph Leo Koerner, *The Reformation of the Image* (London: Reaktion Books, 2004), esp. 42-46.

[205] There is another small triptych with a central Virgin and Child panel (32.3 x 21.4 cm, ca. 1485) by a follower of Hugo van der Goes and wings with painted prayers from the Hours of the Virgin (*Ave Sanctissima*) in the National Gallery London. Although in this case the framed wings and the central panel did not belong together originally (most probably a nineteenth-century art dealer is responsible for the present installation of the work) but they are approximately from the same period, and the installation of both objects respectively must have been similar to the present one. Susan Frances Jones, *Van Eyck to Gossaert: towards a Northern Renaissance* (London: National Gallery, 2011), 84.

[206] Hélène Verougstraete, *Frames and Supports in 15th- and 16th-century Southern Netherlandish Painting* (Brussels: Royal Institute for Cultural Heritage, 2015), 674, 446.

on the reverse of the wings of a Passion triptych by Adriaen Ysenbrant's workshop (ca. 1520, cat.49.d).[207] Two copies after Rogier van der Weyden's half-length *Deposition* are also installed in triptych form. The wings of an anonymous version include a supplicatory prayer.[208] The other copy by the Antwerp workshop of Quentin Matsys (Museo Lazaro-Galdiano, Madrid) is also flanked by two inscribed wings with passages from the Seven Prayers of St Gregory which was often part of Book of Hours in the period.[209] The verses in the Madrid and London triptychs were also prayers for indulgence. According to the tradition, one could get thousands of years of indulgence, i.e., less suffering in purgatory, by reciting the texts in front of an appropriate picture, thus the compilation of image and text was practical for the viewers.[210]

Given the similarity of the works by different masters and from different locations, one would assume that this type of small devotional images was widespread around the end of the fifteenth century.[211] Furthermore, two anonymous narrative images with Biblical quotations on the wings are closer in time to the print published after Heemskerck's invention (the *Adoration of the Magi* triptych from 1545, St John's Hospital, Bruges and the *Crucifixion* triptych from 1554, Our Lady of the Pottery Museum, Bruges, cat.49.e-f).[212] The structure is the same as in the Marian triptychs but these later works represent a similar trend as the print after Heemskerck. The earlier devotional triptychs included prayers to indicate the expected attitude of the viewer towards the image, to incite the audience to pray to the Virgin with the help of the image. The two triptychs from the middle of the sixteenth century contain the narrative context of the depicted scene and excerpts which were symbolically connected to Christ. These texts clearly have a different relation to the images and to the viewer than the invocations next to the image of the Virgin or the suffering Christ. The texts on the later triptychs provide an interpretation of the depictions instead of inciting the viewer for prayer. Similarly, the texts next to Heemskerck's image return to the text of the Bible, and help the reader-

---

[207] Denise Fallon, "Une intervention d'Adriaen Ysenbrant ou de son atelier dans un triptyque maniériste de 1520, conservé á Bruges," *Bulletin de l'Institute Royal du Patrimoine Artistique* 19 (1982-1983): 133-144.

[208] Sixten Ringbom, *Icon to Narrative: the Rise of the Dramatic Close-up in Fifteenth-Century Devotional Painting* (Åbo: Åbo Akad., 1965), 125 (fig. 77).

[209] Craig Harbison, "Visions and Meditations in Early Flemish Painting," *Simiolus* 15 (1985): 103-104.

[210] Ringbom called this type of devotional pictures "images of indulgence." Sixten Ringbom, "Maria in Sole and the Virgin of the Rosary," Journal *of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 25 (1962): 326-330, and Ringbom, *Icon to Narrative*, 125.

[211] Lynn F. Jacobs called it a „relatively common practice," listing less examples from the fifteenth century. Lynn F. Jacobs, *Opening Doors: the Early Netherlandish Triptych Reinterpreted.* (University Park, Pa.: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2012), 17.

[212] Verougstraete, *Frames and Supports*, 392, 486.

viewer interpret the image, and comprehend the significance of the depicted scene in connection to his or her own salvation.

It is interesting to examine the rhetorical structure of the selected texts attached to the printed image after Heemskerck's design. When starting to decipher the print, the viewers supposedly proceeded from the middle where they began with the two lines of Latin text on the predella, and then continued reading the left wing. The Latin text summarises the essential meaning of the Crucifixion in a sentence, and invites the audience to interpret the central image. The French Biblical quotations continue to explain the connection of Christ's sacrifice, salvation, and faith. The row of excerpts begins with the lines from Isaiah (43:3, 10-11, 25) as if God was speaking to the reader-viewer. "I am the Lord your God, the Holy One of Israel, your Savior. Before me no god was formed, nor will there be one after me. I, even I, am the Lord, and apart from me there is no savior. I, even I, am he who blots out your transgressions, for my own sake, and remembers your sins no more." The first person singular voice adds a dramatic tone to the opening while emphasising that only God can repeal sin and give grace. Then a shift takes place with the first two quotations from John (11:25, 14:6). The voice of the texts is still first person singular, but here Christ starts to speak to the reader-viewer. His role as intercessor to God ("No one comes to the Father except through me") is emphasised. The third extract from John, passage 1:29 ("Look, the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world") serves as a transition from the first person to the third person in the rest of the explanatory quotations, which mention God and Christ. It is the voice of Christ speaking once more in the last quotation from John (3:16, "For God so loved the world that he gave his one and only Son, that whoever believes in him shall not perish but have eternal life"), but he is talking about himself in the third person (it is the famous passage where Jesus explains salvation to Nicodemus in Jerusalem). This text has a concluding role: it connects the different ideas of the previous quotations that only spoke about the role of God and Christ in salvation separately.

Still on the left wing, the quote from the epistle to the Ephesians opens the row of texts in which St Paul interprets faith, salvation, and Christ's sacrifice on the cross. This is the much-disputed quote that contains the idea of justification by grace and was interpreted by Protestants as supporting the doctrine of justification by faith alone ("For it is by grace you have been saved, through faith, and this not from yourselves, it is the gift of God, not by works" Ephesians 2:8-10). It is anticipated by the previous texts, and also introduces the next part of the selection where this idea will be in focus. The last line on the left wing

("he humbled himself and became obedient to death, even death on a cross," Philippians 2:8) leads the viewer-reader back to the middle, to the image of the crucified Christ.[213] It is also connected to the concluding excerpt on the right wing, forming a circle of meaning; Christ accepted death humbly but he conquered it at the same time, as Paul in 1 Corinthians 15:54 pointed out, "death has been swallowed up in victory."[214] By conquering death and sin, God gives salvation to the faithful through Christ. The same interpretation of the Crucifixion is emphasised in the print after Weyden's altar by the Latin inscription: Christ bore all the sins of the world on the cross so that the faithful will be saved by his sacrifice.

The selection of the texts from various Pauline letters besides Heemskerck's image can be read as alluding to the Protestant doctrine of justification by faith.[215] The idea is emphasised through Ephesians 2:8 ("For it is by grace you have been saved, through faith, and this not from yourselves, it is the gift of God, not by works"), Romans 5:1 ("we have been justified through faith"), and Romans 5:8 ("Christ died for us. Since we have now been justified by his blood"), and it is also reflected in the central Latin text. However, does this mean that the print was intended for a Protestant audience? After all, no interpretation is attached to the Biblical quotations; it is only the selection that implies that this is possible. The texts are in the vernacular but they derive from the official Catholic French translation of the Bible. There was a need for vernacular Bible reading in Catholic circles as well and it was tolerated by theologians and the State in the 1540s. The official translations and the ban on any Reformist commentary in vernacular editions served to control this need, since the prohibition of translation was no longer an option following the

---

[213] It is interesting that this very excerpt was chosen to refer to the image of the crucified Christ, emphasising the humiliating aspect of the Crucifixion as the worst execution mode of the Romans applied to those with the biggest crime and/or lowest social status. Heemskerck's image also contains a hint for the early modern spectator to understand the stigmatising role of crucifixion in the first century: around Christ, there are bodies hanged and broken at the wheel in the background. According to Mitchell B. Merback, these modes of execution were comparable to that of the practice of the crucifixion by the Romans, and served to help the late medieval/early modern viewers to understand the humiliating aspect of the crucifixion in the time of Christ. Mitchell B. Merback, *The Thief, the Cross, and the Wheel: Pain and the Spectacle of Punishment in Medieval and Renaissance Europe* (London: Reaktion Books, 1999), esp. 199-215.

[214] Interestingly, this particular passage from the first epistle to the Cortinthians was also used in Cranach's different altarpieces like those in Gotha (1505), Prague and the *Schneeberg Altarpiece* (1539) in connection with the image of the triumphant and risen Christ. See Bonnie J. Noble, "A work in which the angels are wont to rejoice: Lucas Cranach's *Schneeberg Altarpiece*," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 34 (2003): 1026.

[215] Freya Strecker has already analysed the print in this way, with an emphasis on the figure of the Roman officer who recognised Christ as the son of God. See Freya Strecker, *Augsburger Altäre zwischen Reformation (1537) und 1635: Bildkritik, Repräsentation und Konfessionalisierung* (Münster: Lit, 1998), 121-122.

Protestant emphasis on the Bible.[216] Hieronymus Cock did not risk anything when putting this print on the market since it did not contain overtly Reformist thoughts. Moreover, as one can read in the privilege inscription inserted after the quotations on the right wing, the print was approved by the censor ("Imprimé a Anvers avec Grace & Privilege, & appropation du Commissaire de la Ma. Royale L. Metsuis").

The interplay of text and image could be understood in different ways. Although the text helped the reader-viewer to contextualise the depiction, it still needed interpretation. The biblical quotations left the ultimate interpretation to the viewer and that was a smart strategy in the complex religious situation of the Netherlands in the 1550s. The form of the late medieval devotional image was used to emphasise the role of faith. However, the change was not abrupt, the small painted altars also showed changes by the sixteenth century, leaving behind intercessory prayers and rather building on texts from the Bible. In this context, the rhetorical structure of the selected quotes around Heemskerck's Crucifixion can reveal more about the changing approach towards religious images. While the left wing includes texts in which God and Christ address the reader-viewer, none of the texts incorporated in the print provide an answer from the beholder's perspective. The quotes do not set up a situation of discussion between Christ and the viewer (which will be showcased by several examples in Lafreri's oeuvre, see the fourth case study of the thesis). Instead, in the quotes from the Pauline letters, the narrator Paul often speaks in a general first person plural voice, thus including the viewer in his speech. The texts from the letters are interpretative commentaries on the image; they elucidate faith, salvation, and Christ's sacrifice. The selected texts are intended on the whole to teach the spectator – the quotes are used as didactic devices, and from this aspect, the print after Heemskerck is similar to the prints intended for Catholic circles. In summary, the Crucifixion print does not take a clear stand, but most probably tried to appeal to a universal Christian audience.

The print after Heemskerck's image also plays a central role among the other prints thematising the Passion of Christ and his Resurrection published by Cock. From among Cock's four single sheet prints depicting the Crucifixion, three contain inscriptions which also appeared on the print after Heemskerck. There is a print engraved by Pieter van der Heyden after Lambert Lombard's design that contains the Latin line (*CREDE DEVM...*) that was inscribed in the predella of Heemskerck's image (cat.50).[217] Another Crucifixion

---

[216] Wim François, "Vernacular Bible reading and censorship in early sixteenth century," in *Lay Bibles in Europe 1450-1800*, ed. Mathijs Lamberigts and August den Hollander (Leuven: University Press, 2006), 92.
[217] Riggs, *Hieronymus Cock*, 351.

after Lombard's design (from 1563) features John 1:29 and 3:16 (cat.51). The same combination of quotes appears in a print depicting Christ carrying the cross after Michiel Coxcie's design (cat.52). Romans 8:32 was included in an anonymous Crucifixion and in the depiction of the Lamentation of Christ from ca. 1550 (engraved by Pieter van der Heyden, cat.53).[218] These prints were published in the same decade as the one with Heemskerck's image, both before and after its assumed time of publication. They reveal that the selection of texts on the *Crucifixion* after Heemskerck was a collection of quotations often used by the publisher, indicating a conscious strategy of matching image and text aimed at a specific meaning. Although the message only displays its full complexity in the print after Heemskerck, it was present in other prints connected to the same subject. The inscriptions allowed the readers to meditate on the moral message, reminding them of the meaning of the picture, of ideas such as God's love for mankind in sacrificing his Son, and the attainment of salvation by faith. The connection between the print after Heemskerck and the other prints of the Passion demonstrates that the publisher was working with the same texts in prints depicting the same topic. On the other hand, the use of the same texts, and texts with a similar meaning reveals the message of the prints. The use of Biblical quotes central to the theological discussion in the period, both in Reform-minded and Catholic circles, highlights Cock's astute sense of business.

Paul's writings were especially popular, and they even matched more traditional messages. Another Crucifixion after Lombard's design (cat.54) included excerpts from the Epistle to the Galatians (6:14) and Isaiah (53:5). Here the narrator (Paul) talks about the greatness of Christ's sacrifice, and the role of mankind in his suffering. The combination of Old and New Testament excerpts gives a similar moralising message as formulated in the images of the Passion so far. The viewer is urged to realise his or her own sinfulness, and its part in Christ's sacrifice in order to praise the Lord properly. The quote from Paul's epistle with its first person voice gives the beholder the chance to identify with the message.

In my opinion, one has to consider one of Cock's most famous prints, Giorgio Ghisi's engraving after Raphael's *School of Athens* (cat.4), in the light of the above analysis. It has been noted several times that Hieronymus Cock applied inscriptions to change the subject of some images he published, the most famous case is the print after

---

[218] For the anonymous Crucifixion see Riggs, *Hieronymus Cock*, 374. (nr. 250)

Raphael's Vatican fresco.[219] In the print published in 1550, Raphael's *School of Athens* with the figures of Plato and Aristotle in the middle of the composition was transformed into a scene from the Acts of the Apostles. The new interpretation of the image was communicated with the help of a Latin text placed in the lower left corner of the depiction. The identification of the image with the episode of St Paul preaching in Athens was probably based on the main figure's resemblance to St Paul's iconography. With his long beard, receding hairline, and a book in the hand Plato looked like Paul's traditional image. However, does the visual resemblance sufficiently explain the reinterpretation? One could argue that Cock deliberately "Christianised" the topic of the depiction, hoping for a wider market for the print, or to avoid the charge of publishing improper pagan images.[220] The antiquarian interest might have needed some legitimisation in sixteenth-century Antwerp. Placing Raphael's image in the framework of the Biblical story must have served similar ends as the moralising captions added to several prints depicting ancient Roman scenes. Prominent examples are the *Frieze with Roman Sacrificial Procession* after Lambert Lombard's design (cat.16), Galle's print after Luca Penni's *Fighting Gladiators* (cat.55), or Ghisi's print of Bertani's *Judgment of Paris* (cat.56). The two former prints contain inscriptions that speak negatively about the ancient rituals depicted. "This is how the ancients, people ignorant of what was right, once placated the will of the gods..." reads the moralising comment under the image of the Roman sacrifice. The tone of the caption under the image of the gladiators is similar: "In ancient times, men knew nothing about brotherly love or true religion, and for the funerals of famous men they held gladiatorial contests of the utmost cruelty."[221] In Ghisi's print, the Latin inscription below the image comments on the vanity and shamelessness of Venus, and also criticises Paris and his judgment by calling him "uncultivated" (*STOLIDI IVDICIVM PARIDIS*).[222]

Ilja M. Veldman drew attention to Jozef IJsewijn's hypothesis that sixteenth-century Latin literature in the Netherlands was essentially moralistic and religious in character. According to Veldman, this attitude was also present in the visual arts especially through additional inscriptions and captions, even in prints depicting scenes or topics from

---

[219] Riggs, *Hieronymus Cock*, 160; Michael Bury, "On Some Engravings by Giorgio Ghisi," 17.

[220] Jeremy Wood argued similarly, although he thought that it was Ghisi who was responsible for the change of the topic, adjusting the print to the Netherlandish context. Jeremy Wood, "Cannibalized Prints and Early Art History: Vasari, Bellori and Fréart de Chambray on Raphael," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 51 (1988): 213.

[221] Translations from Sellink, *Cornelis Cort*, 122 and *Hieronymus Cock,* ed. Van Grieken et al., 142.

[222] Boorsch, *The Engravings of Giorgio Ghisi*, 79.

antiquity.[223] However, these prints of antique themes differ from the example of the *School of Athens* insofar as their topics may be regarded as opposed to the principle teachings of Christian faith, and had to be explained with moralising arguments. The *School of Athens* as an allegorical image of ancient philosophers must have been seen as a different category. On the other hand, it has been noted several times that there was general confusion about the subject of Raphael's fresco, and even Vasari commented on its topic erroneously as a syncretistic depiction of philosophers and evangelists.[224]

All these aspects could contribute to the decision of transforming Raphael's image of the ancient philosophers into the picture of Paul's preaching. However, one more factor must have been important for the publisher, namely Paul's importance in the period of the Reformation, especially in Antwerp where the writings of Luther were influential. Paul was a central figure of the period, his writings and the episodes of his life in the Acts of the Apostles were interpreted by humanists and theologians with different spiritual and intellectual backgrounds.[225] The apostle was also the ideal prototype of humanists: he travelled around the Roman Empire, spoke three languages, and was a good rhetorician. The example of the triptych after Heemskerck's Crucifixion also shows the significance of the writings of St Paul, even in the interpretation of images of the Passion of Christ (as noted, Romans 8:32 was inscribed in two more images of the Passion). Cock may have played on the visual resemblance of Plato and Paul but his intention was to publish a print that focused on the idealised and celebrated apostle. The educated viewers of the image, if they sympathised with Reformist ideas, could identify themselves with the Athenian philosophers who were taught by Paul, "the apostle of the new faith."[226] At the same time, this "Christianised" version of Raphael's image presented a well-known scene of Catholic iconography. Ghisi's print after Raphael was an earlier but similar case to Heemskerck's *Crucifixion*, using the popularity of Paul to appeal to a potentially multiconfessional audience. The print was programmatic as an early publication of Cock from this point of view as well, not only from stylistic and visual perspectives. Through paraphrasing the

---

[223] See Ilja M. Veldman, "Elements of Continuity: A Finger Raised in Warning," *Simiolus* 20 (1990-1991): 127.

[224] On the reception of the fresco see Konrad Oberhuber, *Polarität und Synthese in Raffaels Schule von Athen* (Stuttgart: Urachhaus, 1983), 54, Wood, "Cannibalized Prints and Early Art History," 216, and Sharon Gregory, *Vasari and the Renaissance Print* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012), 147.

[225] On Paul's importance see *A Companion to Paul in the Reformation*, ed. R. Ward Holder (Leiden: Brill, 2009), esp. the introduction by the editor, 1-14.

[226] Ramakers suggested such a parallel between the followers of Protestantism and heathens converted by Paul concerning rhetorician apostle plays. Bart Ramakers, "The work of a painter: Willem van Haecht's apostle plays, 1563-1565," in *Understanding Art in Antwerp*, ed. Bart Ramakers (Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 245.

Biblical passage, Raphael's image was adapted to the everyday context of the audience, experiencing Paul's importance in the religious and intellectual life of the period of the Reformation.

It may have been no coincidence that this first print by Ghisi for Cock was not dedicated to Antoine Perrenot de Granvelle, although the image would have fitted the influential patron's taste and collecting strategy. If Cock's intention with this reproductive print was similar to the examples analysed above, then one could assume he changed the topic of Raphael's image consciously in order to address a wider audience. The 1601 inventory of the plates in the publishing house lists this work as "Schole van Raphael." This may indicate that the topic of the fresco was known already at that time.[227] Since Cock chose a central narrative of the period, the print may have attracted not only those who were interested in Raphael's famous composition and *all'antica* style but it could appeal to a wider audience with its subject. The translation of the topic was contributing to the success of the reproductive print; the inscriptions may tell us that Cock already had an excellent business sense at the beginning of his career as print publisher. On the other hand, the monumental image of Raphael reinterpreted as the image of the popular apostle of the period indicated Cock's goals as a publisher. It was important for him to issue famous inventions of contemporaneous artists, to address current topics of the period, and to reach audiences beyond confessional limitations with universal religious images.

A great part of the prints analysed here popularised and dramatised Biblical stories and scenes, following the tradition of the speaking image, with an emphasis on the moral meaning translating the images for the everyday world of a sixteenth-century viewer. Images of the Crucifixion were matched with carefully selected Biblical quotes emphasising the moral message, thus offering a neutral Christian image for a wide audience. Some images were inscribed with elegant late antique poems, while others were completed with contemporaneous texts. In these prints, it was an important point to adjust the way the message was communicated to the style of the image. Artistic value and religious meaning were combined, Neo-Latin poetry was a perfect companion to the printed images of Floris, Raphael, Lombard, or Sarto.

The examples explored in this chapter reveal the diversity of religious prints in the second half of the sixteenth century, both regarding their visual and textual parts. This variety indicates that it is not possible to put these prints under the umbrella term of

---

[227] Duverger, *Antwerpse kunstinventarissen*, 27.

"devotional print." The prints examined above could appeal to viewers with different religious positions. They could be seen as reproductions of famous art works, some of them were conventional religious images following patterns of late medieval piety, while in many other prints, the reader-viewer could witness a constant experimenting in order to create a new type of Catholic printed image. In the monumental print after Floris, Lampsonius formulated the essential role of religious images as teaching the reader-viewer. According to him, didactic images had a similar legitimacy to the Biblical text. At the same time, some other prints could also be appropriate for those seeking reforms in religious life because of the shift in emphasis and the character of the inscriptions.

The differences between the groups of prints show that Cock intended them for a diverse audience, and that the customers could chose whatever was the most fitting for them. As the prints were intended for an open market, diversity was a business strategy for the publisher. On the other hand, standardisation was a useful tool in the hand of the publisher. He could use the same text for several prints with similar topics (e.g., using a verse by Prudentius for two different *Adoration of the Magi* sheets, cat.38-39), he determined the choices of texts, and influenced the message of groups of prints (for example in the Passion images). The analysis of the religious prints supports the hypothesis delineated in the first chapter that Cock was consciously operating with different kinds of texts in the prints. Based on the two case sudies, one could even speculate about which volumes Cock may have used. For instance, he must have had access to a volume of Prudentius's works including the *Dittochaeum* (that was usually published together with the late antique authors' works, for example in the 1501 edition by Aldus Manutius). Mythological verses printed in three prints by Cock were published in the same volume during the sixteenth century. The late antique poem by Vomanius in the *Four Seasons* series after Lombard (cat.18), the poem in the Priapeia sheet (cat.17), and the line in a *Bacchanalia* scene (cat.57) were published in the same Aldine edition titled *Diversorum veterum poetarum in Priapum lusus* in 1534.[228] The development of book publishing must have had a significant influence on the single sheet publishing business as well. Hieronymus Cock used a great variety of texts that were well known and published several times in the period, from classical poetry and prose to contemporaneous authors (like Vives, Alciato, or Erasmus).

---

[228] This was a volume containing poetry former attributed to Virgil but their authorship was revised in the early sixteenth century, thus Aldus published them separately from his great Virgil-volume (1517), under a different title. See Friedrich, *Das Symposium der XII sapientes*, 27.

In conclusion, the strategic choice of texts served two main purposes, business and the dissemination of artistic fame and inventions. On the one hand, the captions in Cock's prints revealed art historical consciousness, the intentional use of paratext to create an art historical canon in image and text. On the other hand, the additional texts were deliberately selected to serve religious, moralistic, and didactic needs, building on traditions while simultaneously considering the changing religious situation. The case studies delineate a picture of a publisher who was responsive to the developments of his time, following the prevailing ideas. The awareness of art theoretical and religious discourses of the period was reflected in the choices of texts for his prints.

PART II: ROME

Single sheet print publishing in Rome

In contrast to Cock's special position in the urban context of Antwerp, Salamanca and Lafreri operated their businesses in the district called Parione that was the centre of Roman printmaking for several decades by the middle of the sixteenth century.[229] Salamanca led a large shop as a bookseller (*libraro*) in the Campo dei Fiori where he employed eight assistants. Lafreri's shop was operated on the other side of the same district in the Via del Parione. After they merged the two publishing houses in partnership, they both kept their shops, however, Salamanca's production of single sheet prints dropped significantly.[230] At the same time, Lafreri's business became more and more successful. In the 1550s, his shop became a popular meeting point for humanist scholars and print collectors interested in ancient Rome.

The population of Parione consisted mainly of rich and educated people. According to a census of the 1530s, several well-established Roman families and five cardinals had their main residence in the district, among them were the Sassi and the Galli, known for their significant collections of ancient sculptures in their gardens.[231] The area quickly became a cosmopolitan centre of bankers, goldsmiths, merchants of precious devotional objects, printmakers, and book publishers. The Roman print businesses also relied on the remarkable number of pilgrims and other visitors of the city who searched for antiquities and the outstanding works of modern artists. The main streets of the district (Via del Pellegrino, Via Papalis) were principal thoroughfares for pilgrims and visitors to the papal court who wanted to pass the Ponte S. Angelo, the most important bridge over the Tiber to the Vatican. In the second half of the sixteenth century, approximately thirty thousand pilgrims were recorded each year, and over five hundred thousand in Jubilee years (e.g., 1575).[232] A large and diverse clientele developed from the wealthy inhabitants and the international visitors of the city, and guaranteed the success of the Roman publishing houses in the second half of the sixteenth century. This diverse audience, made of international and local customers at the same time, was comparable to Cock's clientele in Antwerp. The merchants in the northern metropolis and the pilgrims of the Eternal City similarly guaranteed the mobility of prints.

---

[229] For the early modern history of the district and its connection with the printers and publishers see Witcombe, *Print Publishing in Sixteenth-Century Rome*, 61-68.
[230] Landau and Parshall, *The Renaissance Print*, 302.
[231] Witcombe, *Print Publishing in Sixteenth-Century Rome*, 62.
[232] Bury, *The Print in Italy*, 121-122.

Although the audience of single sheet prints was similarly diverse in Rome and Antwerp, there was an important difference between the production of the Roman and the Antwerp publishers. Hieronymus Cock published mostly prints which he commissioned from engravers, while Salamanca and Lafreri often acquired older plates, had them inscribed with their own addresses, and republished them. According to the calculations of Landau and Parshall, from the 190 prints that bear Salamanca's name (*excudit*), fewer than thirty pieces were commissioned by the publisher himself. He acquired a large number of printing plates (93 pieces) from the heirs of Il Baviera who organised the publication of prints after Raphael's designs in the first decades of the sixteenth century. Salamanca bought copper plates initiated by engravers such as the Master of the Die and Enea Vico, and he also published copies after older prints by Raimondi.[233] Christopher Witcombe pointed out that these practices were new in the Roman single sheet print business.[234] This difference in production is crucial in comparing the prints by the three publishers. In the case of Antwerp, one could formulate a hypothesis about Cock being responsible for the final editing of the sheets, namely that he commissioned images and texts, and had control over how they were combined. When Salamanca and Lafreri reissued a print, they usually did not change its visual appearance or content, only added their names on the margins. These prints reflected the practices and tastes of an earlier period. However, the fact that some prints were reissued several times proves their popularity that could eventually last for decades or even centuries in some cases. One has to investigate the specific print in its different states in order to identify the phase of the production when the inscriptions were added to the images.

Many reissued prints will be analysed in the chapter about Salamanca's publications. I decided to include these prints in the analysis because they help see the Spanish publisher's work as a transition between periods. These acquired and reprinted sheets connect Salamanca to the works of print producers operating in the decades before he started his single sheet publishing business. The republished prints show the persistent interest in certain topics and styles, and the comparison with prints first published by Salamanca reveal differences and continuities in the use of texts between the first and second half of the sixteenth century. Therefore, the case studies of prints published in Rome provide a broader perspective on the key issues of the thesis such as the relation of text and image or the question of the reproductive aspect of prints. While some of Lafreri's

---

[233] Landau and Parshall, *The Renaissance Print*, 303.
[234] Witcombe, *Print Publishing in Sixteenth-Century Rome*, 71.

prints were issued in the 1570s, a few sheets reprinted by Salamanca originate from the 1520s-1530s. The longer time span gives an insight into the changes in the use of texts in reproductive prints, and also provides a broader ground for the comparison of print publishing in Antwerp and Rome.

Inscriptions in prints published by Antonio Salamanca

From Antwerp in 1550-1566, this chapter jumps one decade back in time to Rome in the 1540s. In a comparative perspective, the case study of Salamanca presents the approach to texts in prints and the issue of reproduction before the period of Hieronymus Cock. The prints by Salamanca display an early phase of development regarding texts in prints from many points of view, for example the consistent use of inscriptions about authorship. Nevertheless, Antonio Salamanca's single sheet publishing business was a new phenomenon on the Roman print market in the first half of the sixteenth century. His activity marked the beginning of an era when publishers became more and more ambitious with print projects, they owned a large stock of plates, and supplied a growing international market with precious paper objects. Christopher Witcombe regarded Il Baviera, Raphael's publisher, to be the first commercial publisher; however, Il Baviera did not sign his prints.[235] Salamanca was consistent about designating his ownership of the plates. The appearance and spread of inscriptions, both acknowledging the author and the topic of the image, happened in this context. With the growing number of narrative captions and inscriptions about the producers of the print, Salamanca's prints followed and enhanced a tendency set out by the print production of the first decades of the sixteenth century. This brief introduction aims to describe the overall characteristics of the inscriptions in the prints published by Salamanca, and to recognise the features of the beginnings of inscribing prints on a larger scale. Beyond the general analysis, the focus is laid on a smaller group of mythological prints, which, in my opinion, reflect an important facet of the taste for inscriptions in single sheet prints.

In 1538, Salamanca published a sheet depicting Raphael's *Transfiguration*, the earliest dated single sheet print of the publishing house (cat.67). This print is usually regarded as the first "conscious" reproduction of an independent work of art.[236] The Latin inscription below the printed image specifies the location and the author of the painting, thus reveals the intention of the producers to provide the audience with printed version

---

[235] Witcombe, *Print Publishing in Sixteenth-Century Rome*, 11.
[236] Landau and Parshall, *The Renaissance Print*, 166.

of Raphael's painting. The *Transfiguration* is not the only example for such an inscription among the prints published by Salamanca; the legend on the *Visitation* after Andrea del Sarto's fresco similarly indicates the location of the painted original in a Florentine church (cat.68). However, Salamanca was not always consistent in indicating the name of the inventor, and also most of the prints he published were made after drawn models rather than paintings. While the name of the publisher is a constant feature on the sheets, the inventor is only acknowledged a few times. For example, the most famous artists are usually credited as inventors. In the prints after Michelangelo, there is usually a short reference to the artist (the only exception is the *Head of a Damned Soul*), and Raphael's authorship is also indicated in some prints after his design. Yet the inventor is not mentioned at all in most of the prints.

The relation of narrative inscriptions and legends about authorship seems also arbitrary. A number of prints from Salamanca's stock carry inscriptions concerning the topic of the depiction but most of these sheets do not mention the inventor of the image. For example, the majority of mythological sheets that include additional explanatory verses do not mention the inventor of the image (e.g., *Death of Meleager*, *Killing of Niobe's Children*, *Chariot of Diana*, cat.69-71). Michael Bury already established that "subject prints" with explanatory inscriptions and prints reproducing famous visual models seem to be separated in Salamanca's stock.[237] Inscriptions concerning authorship and inscriptions about the topic of the image rarely appear in the same print. Exceptions include the copy of the *Judgment of Paris* after Raphael (cat.72), the *Visitation* after Andrea del Sarto (published both under Salamanca's and Lafreri's name, probably at the same time, cat.68), the *Tityus* after Michelangelo's drawing (cat.73), the *Suicide of Lucretia* after Parmigianino (cat. 75), and the *Combat of Reason and Lust* after Baccio Bandinelli's design (cat.86). The inscription on the *Visitation* briefly mentions the topic of the depiction, and the rest of the text expands on Sarto's role as the painter of the original, praising him as *celeberrimus aetatis suae pictor*. However, this sheet after Sarto's image is a late print that was produced during the time of rivalry between Salamanca and Lafreri, and the inscription probably shows the influence of the younger publisher. Both the *Judgment of Paris* and the *Tityus* contain only a short sentence concerning the topic of the image. These title-like inscriptions were typical in the prints published by Salamanca.

---

[237] Bury, "On Some Engravings by Giorgio Ghisi," 17.

Below the image of Lucretia committing suicide, one can read her last speech in first person voice, addressing the issue of her innocence in a four-line Italian verse.

The *Combat of Reason and Lust* is the only print among the listed examples that contains a longer and more complex Latin poem (cat.86). The print was based on a lost drawing by Baccio Bandinelli, whose role as the inventor is emphasised on the sheet by the central position of the inscription *BACCIVS BRANDIN INVEN*. Since indicating authorship was not a consistent feature of Salamanca's practice, the question arises how Bandinelli was involved in the project, and if there was a possibility of collaboration similar to the relationship between Cock and Floris. In general, Bandinelli had an interest in publishing his drawings in prints, and prints brought him fame all over Europe according to Vasari.[238] Bandinelli followed Raphael in his interest in printmaking and in the workflow of providing engravers with drawings to be engraved. He must have shared the theoretical ideas concerning the primary importance of *disegno*, and drawings being able to display artistic knowledge in the most effective way.[239] In general, Bandinelli's figures in the prints after his inventions show a certain statuesque character, but the printed compositions are not directly connected to his actual sculptural works. Just like in the case of Raphael, prints were important for Bandinelli to disseminate his inventions and his *disegno*.

Bandinelli usually initiated collaborations with printmakers, and controlled the working process to some extent. Two of the printmakers he worked with, Marcantonio Raimondi and Marco Dente, also engraved Raphael's works. During important projects like the *Massacre of the Innocents* or the *Martyrdom of St Lawrence*, Bandinelli provided the engravers with drawings that he specifically designed for the purpose of creating a print. A surviving document proves that he initiated the creation of the *Combat of Reason and Lust* as well, however, the history of this print is more complicated, and Bandinelli's personal role is not so clear in the end. He made an initial agreement with Niccolò della Casa about engraving his invention *unum disegnum Duelli Amoris* in 1544.[240] However,

---

[238] Vasari made this comment concerning the *Massacre of the Innocents* engraved by Marco Dente. Vasari, *Le Vite*, vol. 5, 245.

[239] Leonard Barkan, *Unearthing the Past: Archaeology and Aesthetics in the Making of Renaissance Culture* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999), 320-321; Ben Thomas, "The Academy of Baccio Bandinelli," *Print Quarterly* 22 (2005): 3. On the parallel between Raphael and Bandinelli see Kathleen Weil-Garris, "Bandinelli and Michelangelo: A Problem of Artistic Identity," in *Art the Ape of Nature, Studies in Honor of H. W. Janson*, ed. Moshe Barasch and Lucy Freeman Sandler (New York: Harry N. Abrams Publishers, 1981), 233-235.

[240] The document is transcribed in Louis A. Waldman, *Baccio Bandinelli and Art at the Medici Court: A Corpus of Early Modern Sources* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 2004), 283.

there is no evidence that della Casa was working on this project, and finally the sheet was engraved by Nicolas Beatrizet and published by Antonio Salamanca in 1545.[241]

In case of the *Combat of Reason and Lust*, Bandinelli probably did not oversee the production process. His name appears in the old form in the print (*BACCIVS BRANDIN INVEN*).[242] Beatrizet most likely took this form from an earlier print, for instance, from Raimondi's *Martyrdom of St Lawrence* or Veneziano's *Academy*. Although Salamanca published a few prints that can be connected to Bandinelli, none of these indicate that he had any relationship with the Florentine sculptor. Salamanca acquired the plate and published the third state of Veneziano's *Academy* with his own name added. He published the *Birth of the Virgin Mary* after Bandinelli's study for his Loreto relief in 1540 without mentioning the sculptor's name (cat.77).[243] In 1548, Salamanca also published a reversed copy of an unfinished portrait print of Bandinelli in his studio, without specifying who is depicted in the image (cat.78). The portrait was based on a print (probably left unfinished) by the same Niccolò della Casa who was originally commissioned by Bandinelli to engrave the *Combat of Reason and Lust*.[244] Erna Fiorentini assumed that the portrait print was published by Salamanca without the knowledge of Bandinelli, and was not meant as the sculptor's image but as a collector's portrait in general, reflecting the interest and self-image of Salamanca's ideal clients.[245] These examples indicate that Salamanca did not work together with Bandinelli, but obtained images connected to him from various sources, and used them in different ways. The monumental sheet of the *Combat of Reason*

---

[241] Patricia Emison assumed that Bandinelli met the engraver Beatrizet when he was working on a project for the Medici popes in Rome, however, no evidence proves this hypothesis. Patricia Emison, *The Art of Teaching: Sixteenth-Century Allegorical Prints and Drawings* (New Haven: Yale University Art Gallery, 1986), 17.

[242] In order to become a Knight of St. James (which he was made by Charles V in October 1529) Baccio Brandini began to use the name of the Sienese noble family (Bandinelli) instead of his original name. Rona Goffen, *Renaissance Rivals: Michelangelo, Leonardo, Raphael, Titian* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), 191.

[243] The print was based on a preparatory drawing by Bandinelli now in the Uffizi, see Madeline Cirillo Archer, *The Illustrated Bartsch*, *Commentary,* vol. 28 (New York: Abaris Books, 1995), 11. There is a second version of this print, engraved and published by Beatrizet with Bandinelli's name in the form he insisted on (*Bacius Florentinus inventor*). Silvia Bianchi saw Salamanca's sheet as the reversed copy of Beatrizet's earlier print while lately Michela Zurla articulated the opposite view. According to Zurla, Beatrizet copied Salamanca's 1540 print, and added Bandinelli's authorship. This might have happened when Beatrizet was working on the *Combat of Reason and Lust* in 1545. However, it is remarkable that if Beatrizet collaborated with Bandinelli on the occasion of the *Birth of the Virgin*, why he used the old form of the sculptor's name on the allegorical print engraved for Salamanca in 1545. Silvia Bianchi, "Catalogo dell'opera incisa di Nicola Beatrizet," *Grafica d'arte* 54 (2003): 5; Michela Zurla, "84. Nicolas Beatrizet da Baccio Bandinelli, Nascita della Vergine," in *Baccio Bandinelli: Scultore e maestro (1493-1560)*, ed. Detlef Heikamp and Beatrice Paolozzi Strozzi (Florence: Giunti, 2014), 542.

[244] Erna Fiorentini and Raphael Rosenberg, "Baccio Bandinelli's Self-Portrait," *Print Quarterly* 19 (2002): 35.

[245] Erna Fiorentini, *Ikonographie eines Wandels: Form und Intention von Selbstbildnis und Porträt des Bildhauers im Italien des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Munich: Tenea Verlag für Medien, 1999), 55.

and Lust may have included the inventor's name simply because by the middle of the 1540s it meant an additional market value.

The above mentioned details about Salamanca's publications of Bandinelli's images also suggest that the sculptor was not involved in the creation of the *Combat of Reason and Lust*. His drawing was interpreted and explained by the Latin poem, added to the print later during the production process. The visual relation of text and image is also telling. The design and framing of the Latin text looks accidental, the four stanzas are put in four adjacent, simple tablets. The last tablet does not even have a closing line in the lower right corner of the composition but the left hand and right foot of the sitting figure enclose the right ledge of the text (cat.86.b). Therefore, it is likely that spacing was not particularly planned, the last but one line only fitted in the composition with the two last words (*astra nubibus*) put above each other. It seems as if the careful finishing of the legend was not a priority for the producers but it was added at last to make the print more appealing to a certain audience. The scarce evidence seems to confirm the hypothesis that it may have been the publisher who was responsible for the addition of the Latin verse, or at least it was added in a later phase of the production.

The *Combat of Reason and Lust* is comparable in size and in ambitions to Bandinelli's previous print projects. An important difference compared to other monumental prints after Bandinelli's invention is the additional Latin poem expanding on the topic of the depiction. This feature is usually explained by the fact that the print was released by Salamanca, a professional publisher. In modern art historical scholarship, Salamanca's name has been connected to the idea that the professionalisation of printmaking business triggered the use of explanatory inscriptions.[246] The *Combat of Reason and Lust* with the eight-line Latin verse is interesting to compare to the prints after Michelangelo's drawings. Salamanca published two prints after Michelangelo's famous presentation drawings, the *Tityus* and the *Dream* (cat.73-74). No elaborate inscriptions were included in these prints, although the topics depicted are quite sophisticated. Only one of them included a narrative, explanatory framework: the *Tityus* bears a title-like brief Latin sentence below the image. The lack of explanatory verses is also remarkable in the case of mythological and allegorical prints after Michelangelo's drawings by the other

---

[246] Landau and Parshall, *The Renaissance Print*, 288; Gramaccini and Meier ed., *Die Kunst der Interpretation,* 181.

significant Roman publisher, Antonio Lafreri.[247] One would expect that the prints after the learned painter who was also famous for writing poetry would include witty poems.[248] However, this was not the case with most of the sixteenth-century prints after Michelangelo's images. Michelangelo himself avoided using texts in his painterly works. The ancestors of Christ in the Sistine Chapel frescos are the only examples from his oeuvre where he applied inscriptions next to the images. Leonard Barkan analysed in details how Michelangelo used words and images next to each other in his notes and drafts, and how he used authoritative texts by Dante and Petrarch, moreover, prayers in order to express his thoughts.[249] However, in his finished works Michelangelo categorically separated the fields of words and images from each other, and the presentation drawings are not exceptions to this. Maybe the authority of Michelangelo's drawings prevented the engravers and the publishers from adding explanatory verses to the images. On the other hand, Antonio Lafreri published a few prints with religious subjects after Michelangelo's inventions that included explanatory or poetic texts (these prints will be analysed in the fourth case study of this thesis). Thus the allegorical and mythological prints may have been consciously designed without any explanatory inscriptions in order to leave the task of deciphering the message to the viewers. Unlike the prints after Michelangelo's drawings, the *Combat of Reason and Lust* after Bandinelli signals a new approach towards images in print that involved explanatory inscriptions.

Since there are not many prints in Salamanca's stock that combine the acknowledgment of the inventor and narrative inscriptions, to find out more about the characteristics of the narrative inscriptions one has to look beyond the prints with inscriptions about the inventors. The inscribed texts in many prints are descriptive (e.g., *Abigail and David*, the *Cupid and Psyche* series, cat.79-80) or title-like (e.g., *Diana in her Chariot*, *God Creating the Animals*, the *Meeting of Scipio and Hannibal*, the *Birth of the Virgin Mary*, *Cain killing Abel*, cat.71, 77, 81-83). The texts are usually closely related to the images. For example, the first short sentence on the sheet of the *Death of Meleager* determines the topic and also contains an adverb of place referring to the image ("One weeps here for the fate of Meleager," cat.69). Similarly, the first line of the poem below the image of *Mars and Venus* by Enea Vico introduces the topic with the same adverb

---

[247] On prints after Michelangelo's presentation drawings see Michael Bury, "Michelangelo's *Dream* and Prints," in *Michelangelo's Dream*, ed. Stephanie Buck (London: Holberton, 2010), 66-73.

[248] Leonard Barkan asserted that "Michelangelo came to be understood in his lifetime as a literary man," based on his substantial poetic works. Leonard Barkan, *Michelangelo, a Life on Paper* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2011), 4.

[249] Barkan, *Michelangelo, a Life on Paper*, 69.

(cat.76). The text in the print after Sarto's *Visitation* also starts with *quam vides, hanc* ("what you see here," cat.68). The *Killing of Niobe's Children* includes a more complex, moralising narrative text (cat.70). The story of Niobe and her children is depicted aligned with the classical sources of the myth (e.g., Ovid) as an exemplum of haughtiness. The anonymous narrator of the poem warns the reader-viewers not to commit the same sin, and beware of the punishment. The same formulation (*discite*, i.e., "you should all learn") is used to draw the attention of the audience to Niobe's fault that is applied in the text written on the *Combat of Reason and Lust* to draw the moral conclusion of the allegorical battle.

A distinct feature of the prints published by Salamanca is that almost all the inscriptions were probably composed with the images in mind, with the purpose to be included in the prints. Quotations were very rarely used, one of the rare examples is Caraglio's print after Rosso's *Rape of the Sabines* with the brief quotation from Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* (cat.84). Another important exception is the refreshed plate of the *Quos Ego* engraved by Marcantonio Raimondi after Raphael's design (cat.85). This print presents the first book of the *Aeneid* in ten scenes, completed with a late antique pentastich taken from the *Argumenta XII Librorum Aeneidos*.[250] The Latin legend here gives a summary of the scenes in five lines. It fits the print well because of its summarising character, and helps the reader-viewer follow and understand the chain of events illustrated, however, it does not give any interpretation of the depicted episodes. The *Quos Ego* is a typical example for Salamanca acquiring an older plate from the circle of Raphael and publishing it again without any change. This situation makes it challanging to draw any conclusions regarding Salamanca's strategy of inscribing prints. Some prints may reveal more information about what was popular and on demand for a longer time span. Thus the focus of the examination is not only Salamanca but rather the continuity of lettering he represented in the transitory decades of the 1540s-1560s.

This brief overview of the narrative inscriptions showed the exceptional character of the *Combat of Reason and Lust* (cat.86). This print after Bandinelli's design deserves more attention as one of the first prints that contains both the name of the inventor and an ambitious, interpretative, narrative text. Therefore, the *Combat of Reason and Lust* is in

---

[250] Part of the so-called *Carmina XII sapientum*, a corpus of inscriptions from Late Classical antiquity, organized in twelve cycles of twelve poems (each cycle with a different topic). See Friedrich, *Das Symposium der XII sapientes,* 59. The text was also published in the Aldine edition of Virgil's works. In the online catalogue of the The Hunterian Museum and Art Gallery (University of Glasgow), the hypothesis is formulated that the Aldine edition from 1505 served as the source of the text for Raimondi (or Raphael). http://www.huntsearch.gla.ac.uk/cgibin/foxweb/huntsearch/DetailedResults_printable.fwx?collection=art&searchTerm=3679 (last accessed on 04.08.2016)

the focus of my analysis in this chapter. This introduction delineated the reproductive aspect of Salamanca's prints, or rather the lack of the conscious and consistent address of this aspect of the prints in the additional inscriptions. The brief examination of the narrative inscriptions in general revealed that these texts mostly provide descriptions and further information on the depicted topic. The *Combat of Reason and Lust* after Bandinelli's design is interesting exactly because the additional Latin text below the image provides the opportunity to look for further meanings beyond the first level of understanding of the depicted scene. This chapter focuses on prints depicting mythological and allegorical figures, and aims at discerning their "utilitarian" aspect, the possible "practical" function of text and image.

CASE STUDY 3
Mythological-allegorical prints and the culture of love

Six prints on the nature of carnal love

Apart from having both narrative inscriptions and the acknowledgement of the inventor, the *Combat of Reason and Lust* is interesting also because of its topic. It is a moralising, allegorical depiction of the perturbations of the soul: the battle of reason and desire. This print is related to a group of other prints in Salamanca's stock which all depict the passions of the human soul, love and lovesickness (cat.86-91). Like the *Combat of Reason and Lust,* all these prints show mythological scenes with classical deities or figures in *all'antica* costumes and settings, but at the same time they include explanatory verses interpreting the seemingly mythological figures as visual embodiments of the forces and notions of the soul.

Six thematically connected prints are the focus of detailed examination in this chapter. I selected these prints from Salamanca's stock because they provide the opportunity to identify the relation between prints and contemporaneous philosophical and literary discourses; thus their function could be connected to a well-defined cultural context. For example, the mythological-allegorical character of the images and the use of certain humanist textual sources in the inscriptions relate them to mythological paintings of the early sixteenth century. I will demonstrate that some of the prints show thematic resemblances to the studiolo images of Isabella d'Este and that the purpose of the prints was also similar to those of the precious paintings. These selected prints were intended to visualise the forces of the human soul, emotions connected to love and lovesickness, but in

a cheaper medium and on a smaller scale. However, they were probably used in a somewhat similar way, only in a less ambitious and less luxurious private study room environment than the studiolo paintings.

Nicolas Beatrizet's *Combat of Reason and Lust* was published by Salamanca in 1545, the latest among the prints that I analyse here. It is the only sheet among them in which the inventor is acknowledged. There is not much information available on the other five prints, they have only rarely been analysed in detail in previous scholarship, and the narrative inscriptions were often ignored. Because of the lack of detailed inscriptions about authorship and the lack of any surviving preparatory drawings, it is not even certain who invented the design of the images. One of the later and bigger compositions is attributed to Bandinelli, while the earlier prints are usually referred to as images after Raphael's design.[251]

The *Sailing Amor* was engraved by Agostino Veneziano, his monogram was written on Venus's shell (cat.89). Two prints are usually attributed to the Master of the Die, however, in my opinion, one of them relates visually to the print by Veneziano. The profile of Venus in the *Allegory of the Two Lovers* (cat.88) is closer to Veneziano's Venus in the *Sailing Amor* than to Venus in the print depicting Jupiter, Apollo, Venus, and Amor by the Master of the Die (cat.87). Furthermore, the way of depicting clouds with a definite outline and just a few further hatchings is also similar to the *Sailing Amor* and the *Allegory of the Two Lovers*, but different from the *Jupiter, Apollo, Venus, and Amor* (here clouds appear without an outline and with a lot more hatchings and cross-hatchings). The setting and framing of the textual parts are also similar to the *Sailing Amor* and to the *Allegory of the Two Lovers*. The plates bearing the two Italian stanzas do not match the images in width, and their shorter ledges do not match the outlines of the images. This way the dark background gains more space and gives more depth to the depiction, strengthening the illusion of the sculpted plates. On the contrary, the plate bearing the Italian inscription in the *Jupiter, Apollo, Venus, and Amor* is more linear, and does not convey a sculptural effect. Thus the *Allegory of the Two Lovers* was more probably engraved by Veneziano, while the *Jupiter, Apollo, Venus, and Amor* can still be attributed to the Master of the Die because of its connection to another print that displays his signature, the *Sleeping Amor* (Bartsch XV.201.25).

---

[251] Bartsch mentioned Raphael in connection with these prints. Adam Bartsch, *Le Peintre-graveur*, vol. 14 (Vienna: J. V. Degen, 1813), 189; Bartsch, *Le Peintre-graveur*, vol. 15, 200-202. This attribution is usually adopted in museum catalogues, and it is also repeated in Corinna Höper, *Raffael und die Folgen: das Kunstwerk in Zeitaltern seiner graphischen Reproduzierbarkeit* (Ostfildern: Hatje Cantz, 2001), 190.

Concerning the two larger prints, the *Allegory of the Passions* was inscribed with the monogram O.O.V., while the *Allegory on the Cruelty of Love* did not include any inscriptions concerning authorship, except for Salamanca's name (cat.90-91).[252] Bartsch attributed the design of the *Allegory on the Cruelty of Love* to Bandinelli.[253] Based on a comparison to the figures in Bandinelli's *Massacre of the Innocents*, Patricia Emison also regarded the connection between the print and Bandinelli possible.[254] In contrast, Madeline Cirillo Archer rejected Bandinelli's role in the invention on the basis of quality reasons ("unarticulated musculature"), thus the question of the inventor remained unresolved.[255] In my opinion, the anonymous print is strongly oriented towards Michelangelo's works. The naked young man leaning forward and the standing boy with his raised right arm behind him could be connected to the Sistine *ignudi* of Michelangelo, and even the figure of Cupid seen from behind resembles the reading boy who appears behind the Delphic sibyl on the Sistine Ceiling (cat.90.b). The group of putti boiling an unconscious child in a cauldron may remind us to Michelangelo's drawing (or the print by Beatrizet based on the drawing), the *Bacchanal of Children* (cat.90.c).[256]

All these resemblances make it more plausible that the anonymous designer took motifs and ideas from several different sources and combined them in a new composition. According to Vasari's narrative, Michelangelo was Bandinelli's biggest rival.[257] Bandinelli did sketches after works of Michelangelo (like the *Cascina* cartoon or the Sistine Ceiling) but he usually translated the sources according to his own artistic vocabulary and taste, and aimed at emulation rather than copying.[258] Thus one may find it difficult to maintain the attribution to Bandinelli especially because of the "patchwork" character of the image. However, the anonymous print resembles also to the *Combat of Reason and Lust* in some aspects: the format, the multi-figure *all'antica* composition, and the big cloud of smoke in the background (which was also referred to as the fate of mortals if Venus wins the battle in the text on Beatrizet's print) is similar in the two sheets. The use of antique sculptural

---

[252] The scholarship mentioning the *Allegory of the Passions* usually transcribes the monogram as O.O.V.I.VEN. In my opinion, I.VEN is rather the abbreviated form of *invenit* or *inventor*.

[253] Bartsch, *Le Peintre-graveur*, vol. 15, 55.

[254] Emison, *The Art of Teaching*, 42.

[255] Archer, *The Illustrated Bartsch, Commentary*, vol. 28, 52.

[256] Arthur Ewart Popham and Joannes Wilde, *The Italian Drawings of the XV and XVI Centuries in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen at Windsor Castle* (London: Phaidon, 1949), 254-255.

[257] The paragone between Michelangelo and Bandinelli was the main motif in Vasari's biography of the latter sculptor. See also Goffen, *Renaissance Rivals*, esp. 341-350. Hana Gründler and Alessandro Nova, "Concorrenza e invenzione: la biografia vasariana di Baccio Bandinelli," in *Baccio Bandinelli*, ed. Heikamp and Paolozzi Strozzi, 60-67.

[258] Barkan, *Unearthing the Past*, 315.

models, like the Belvedere torso in case of the young man leaning towards the central female figure, is a common feature of the two prints too. The character of the image may be similar to the *Combat of Reason and Lust*, however, the reason for this similarity was not the person of the designer but the similar topic, and probably the similar date of production. The print by the Monogrammist O.O.V is also comparable to these prints in being oriented towards antique sculpture and Michelangelesque forms. Alessia Alberti pointed out the similarity between the central figure of the anonymous print and Michelangelo's male nude in the *Dream*, but one can also cite the Belvedere torso and the *Laocoon* as visual inspirations for the suffering figure.[259]

Except for the print by the Monogrammist O.O.V, which is dated on the sheet to 1542, the dates of creation of the rest are also unsure. The most certain information concerning these sheets is the fact that Antonio Salamanca published them sometime between 1540 and 1560 in Rome. About the three prints by Veneziano and the Master of the Die one can assume with a certain confidence that they were engraved earlier in the century, maybe in the 1520s-1530s. Salamanca most probably bought the already used copper plates at the beginning of the 1540s, added his own name and published new impressions from them. In the case of the other two, it is not so clear whether they were also older plates reused or whether they were produced in cooperation with the publisher. Although some earlier states of these prints without the name of Salamanca are preserved, their style and the date 1542 on the *Allegory of the Passions* seem to indicate a later date of creation, and thus it may be possible that the Roman publisher commissioned them.[260] While the earlier three sheets by Veneziano and the Master of the Die are similar even in their format and size (they all measure around 190 x 220 mm), the latter two prints are more than double the size of the small ones, thus they are comparable in scale to Beatrizet's print after Bandinelli, the *Combat of Reason and Lust*.

The above introduced six prints are similar to each other in showing the negative effects and consequences of love, and the passions of the soul. As Malcolm Bull asserted, it was one of the biggest challenges of Renaissance artists to give new meanings to mythological stories and to accommodate the mythological figures to the tastes and views of the audiences in early modern society.[261] In mythological prints, adding narrative

---

[259] For Alessia Alberti's comparison with Michelangelo's drawing and the print see *D'après Michelangelo*, ed. Alessia Alberti, Alessandro Rovetta and Claudio Salsi (Venice: Marsilio, 2015), 201.

[260] There is such an impression of the *Allegory of the Passions* in the Museum of Fine Arts Budapest (inv. nr. 7332), and one of the *Allegory of the Cruelty of Love* in the Albertina, Vienna (TIB 2801.062 S1).

[261] Malcolm Bull, *The Mirror of the Gods* (London: Allen Lane, 2005), 7.

inscriptions was one way to make the prints attractive, and to make the customers identify themselves with the depicted subjects (especially if the inscriptions were in the vernacular). The inscriptions played an important role in the reinterpretation of classical sources (for example adding a moral reading), and in the transformation of classical figures in order to express contemporaneous ideas. This is the main difference between the prints that are to be analysed in the following and other mythological prints from among Salamanca's publications.[262] For example, the series depicting and relating the story of Cupid and Psyche does not attempt to reinterpret the mythological tale but simply recounts Apuleius in the vernacular inscriptions below the images (cat.80). The *Quos Ego*, which contains late antique quotations, is usually regarded as an attempt to reconstruct the famous Virgilian scenes in image and text rather than as a new interpretation of the classical source (cat.85).[263] These prints also tell famous love stories but they do not attempt to adapt their narratives to the early modern context which all the prints to be analysed in the following subchapters aspire to do. Intertextuality played an important role in those analysed prints that include Italian inscriptions. Since all of them are thematically connected to contemporaneous popular ideas about Cupid, and about the experience of love, Petrarchan poetry is not by chance a prominent source used by the anonymous authors of the verses. It is interesting how the poetic texts written on prints were influenced by popular humanist culture. The *Combat of Reason and Lust* played a similar role in adapting and popularising humanist (popular Neoplatonic) ideas.

Due to Salamanca's diverse strategies in acquiring copper plates and commissioning prints, these sheets come from different sources and from different decades of the sixteenth century. The sheet after Bandinelli's design stands out from this group of prints for various reasons. The monumental size, the quality of the design, the Latin verse, and the indication of the inventor all show the higher ambitions of the producers. However, this chapter intends to demonstrate that Beatrizet's print based on Bandinelli's invention clearly belongs to a certain tradition of mythological-allegorical prints, even if it attempts to emulate the previous examples. The sheet after Bandinelli is situated in the context of the other prints on love published by Salamanca in order to emphasise the

---

[262] David Landau and Peter Parshall pointed out that the biggest thematic group in Salamanca's stock is the category of mythological prints; more than half of the prints published by him are images of ancient history and mythology. Landau and Parshall, *The Renaissance Print*, 303.

[263] Lawrence Nees, "Le *Quos Ego* de Marc-Antoine Raimondi: L'adaptation d'une source antique par Raphael," *Nouvelles de l'estampe* 40-41 (1978): 21. Recently Christian Kleinbub interpreted the sheet as Raphael's statement regarding the *paragone* debate. Christian K. Kleinbub, "Raphael's Quos Ego: forgotten document of the Renaissance paragone," *Word & Image* 28 (2012): 287-301.

similarities between them, and to show how they reflect a demand from the audience for mythological prints to be reinterpreted according to sixteenth-century ideas on desire, carnal love, the nature of Cupid, and lovesickness.

Classical deities and the forces of the soul

In the *Combat of Reason and Lust*, the Latin poem works in a close relationship with the image (cat.86.a). The eight lines describe and explain the topic. The first stanza identifies the two antagonists standing in the middle of the composition with bows in their hands as *Ratio* and *Cupido*, and the hovering female allegorical figure between them as generous Mind (*generosa Mens*). The second and third stanzas describe the action taking place in the image, how *Mens* takes the side of *Ratio*. The verse also explains two scenarios about what one can expect in case one of the two opponent parties wins the battle. The last stanza establishes contact with the reader-viewers, and offers a moral conclusion: "You should all learn, oh mortals, that the stars stand as high above the clouds as sacred reason stands above idle desires." The text emphasises the allegorical meaning of the image over the mythological content that is evident from the fact that only Venus is mentioned from among the assembled classical deities. The figures of the gods (Diana, Mercury, Hercules, Jove, Saturn, and a river god appear behind Apollo, while Venus and Vulcan act on Cupid's side) are easily recognisable from their attributes. The caption introduces a second layer of interpretation beyond what one can see in the image. Nevertheless, it is interesting that the few written sources concerning the print rather identify the topic on the basis of the mythological components, thus they focus on the visual part of the print. The contract between Bandinelli and Niccolò della Casa mentions the drawing of the war of Love (*Amor*), while Vasari writes about the print depicting the fight between Cupid and Apollo in the presence of all the gods.[264]

In modern scholarship, Erwin Panofsky interpreted the sheet in terms of Neoplatonic philosophy. According to Panofsky, the two groups of the gods around Cupid and Apollo, and the figure of *Mens* in between them illustrate the tripartite, hierarchical structure of the Lower Soul, Reason, and the Mind from Marsilio Ficino's writings.[265] *Mens* has the key role in Panofsky's understanding of the print.[266] Floating above and observing the fight between earthly desire and reason, *Mens* offers help to Apollo-Reason

---

[264] For the text of the contract see Waldman, *Baccio Bandinelli*, 283. Vasari wrote about "…la zuffa di Cupido e d'Apollo, presenti tutti gli dèi..." Vasari, *Le Vite*, vol. 5, 18.
[265] Erwin Panofsky, *Studies in Iconology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1939), 136-137.
[266] Panofsky, *Studies in Iconology,* 150, 137.

by illuminating his side with divine light, ("throws light on the honourable deeds" as the Latin inscription says) and by covering the impious side of Cupid and Venus with clouds generated by a horn-like device. Panofsky was apparently irritated both by the image that shows the continuous, open battle between inferior desire and reason (he calls it a "bitter and undecided struggle"), and by the Latin verses which "bewilder rather than enlighten" the reader-viewers according to him.[267] He insisted that only the reading of Ficino's works could help the viewers to decipher the meaning of the print. In a later interpretation by Patricia Emison, this close relation between Bandinelli's invention and Ficino's writings is questioned, however, she also considered the print as an important means of disseminating Neoplatonic thoughts to a wider audience.[268] The Neoplatonist theory of love and the soul certainly plays an important role in Bandinelli's invention, although the print is a simplified expression of Ficino's system. In my opinion, the *Combat of Reason and Lust* was most probably understandable on its own, especially because the print can be contextualised in the wider perception of mythological inventions.

The allegorical interpretation of classical deities had a long tradition before the sixteenth century, and gained momentum with Renaissance philosophical thinking.[269] Bandinelli's composition depicting the two opposite sides in the moment of the battle has been compared to psychomachy scenes, and to moralising interpretations of the famous battle of the gods in the twentieth book of the Iliad.[270] However, in my opinion, the print was not intended to illustrate any well-known episodes of ancient mythology. Rather, Bandinelli used the figures of deities and *all'antica* visual vocabulary to express contemporary philosophical and moralising ideas in a way that was both desirable and understandable for the audience.

In the 1450s in his Latin comic work titled *Momus*, the god of mockery and criticism, Leon Battista Alberti wrote the following introduction to explain to his readers why he made the ancient gods the protagonists of his poetic invention:

> I noticed that ancient writers used to philosophise this way: by the names of the gods they wished their readers to understand those mental qualities which compel us towards one or another course of action [...] For this purpose they used Pluto, Venus, Mars, and blind Cupid and on the other side Pallas, Jove, Hercules, and gods like that [...] The former group represents the attractions and defects of desires and pleasures, arousal and frenzy while the latter represents the strength of

---

[267] Panofsky, *Studies in Iconology,* 153, 150.
[268] Emison, *The Art of Teaching*, 18.
[269] As emphasised in Jean Seznec, *The Survival of the Pagan Gods: The Mythological Tradition and its Place in Renaissance Humanism and Art* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1961), esp. 97-103.
[270] Seznec, *The Survival of the Pagan Gods*, 110-112.

mind and power of deliberation by which our rational souls are steeped in virtue or checked by reason [...] There is usually a relentless and arduous conflict between these qualities in the souls of men...[271]

The print published approximately hundred years later for an antiquarian audience did not need to justify the use of mythological figures anymore, since one of the goals may have been to provide the viewers with an image based on the study of antiquities.[272] However, Alberti's description of the opposite groups of gods and their interpretation as the perturbations of the human soul is particularly similar to what one can see and read in the print after Bandinelli's invention. The deities described by Alberti and drawn by Bandinelli are not exactly the same (Pluto, Mars, and Pallas are not depicted in the print, and Cupid is not blind), but the grouping of the gods is based on similar principles, and even the vocabulary used in Alberti's description meets the message of the print.[273] The goal of the print was to show the constant struggle of the forces of the soul, completed by a commentary on the hierarchy of those forces. Alberti writes about the "relentless conflict" of these powers, which is also the main topic of the print that depicts a frozen moment of the undecided, never-ending battle. The Latin text below the image delineates both alternatives, explaining the result of Apollo's triumph, and warning about the consequences of Venus's victory. Both for Alberti and for the producers of the print, the figures of the gods and their interaction served to illustrate and to make visible certain abstract ideas.

Joseph J. Campbell used the term "visualising device" in connection to mythological images from the first decades of the sixteenth century that were installed in Isabella d'Este's Mantuan studiolo.[274] The panel paintings by Mantegna, Perugino, Lorenzo Costa, and Correggio thematised the passions and perturbations of the soul caused by carnal love, lovesickness, and various further aspects of love. In Campbell's interpretation, these images were used during the "secular meditations" of their beholders, aiming at one's maintenance of mental health, and their handling was also intertwined with humanist ideals about contemplation.[275] The print after Bandinelli's invention is the

---

[271] Later in the text Alberti mentions Homer, Pindar, and Sophocles as his models. Leon Battista Alberti, *Momus*, tr. Sarah Knight (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003), 7.
[272] The figure of Vulcan is a reference to the pose of the main figure of the *Laocoon* group (Fiorentini, "Zweidimensionale Vorbilder," 273); Bandinelli may have used also the Belvedere torso and the Belvedere Apollo as models for the male foreground figure and the figure of Apollo with the bow.
[273] Alberti contrasts *cupiditas*, *voluptas*, and *furor* against *mens*, *virtus*, and *ratio*. For the Latin text see Alberti, *Momus*, 6.
[274] Stephen J. Campbell, *The Cabinet of Eros: Renaissance Mythological Painting and the Studiolo of Isabella d'Este* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), 21.
[275] Campbell, *The Cabinet of Eros*, 20.

successor of these images, implemented in a different, cheaper medium for a wider audience. Nevertheless, it was also intended for private use in one's library or maybe in a (less ambitious) studiolo. Even the topic of the *Combat of Reason and Lust* is similar to Perugino's *Battle of Chastity and Lasciviousness* or to Mantegna's *Pallas and the Vices*.[276]

The similarity of the paintings from around 1500 and the print after Bandinelli's design from 1545 may need some explanation because of the time gap. One possibility is to suppose a similar culture of viewing mythological images in the context of the poetic discourse on love, its psychology and theory. This is especially evident in the prints that combine text and image in the same work of art, this way providing the viewers clues for understanding. However, the *Combat of Reason and Lust* can also be seen in light of earlier prints that use the same visualising techniques but combine the images of mythological figures with vernacular texts, thus give a hint about the poetic tradition they belong to. These earlier prints filled the chronological gap between the studiolo paintings and the print after Bandinelli, and they most probably ensured the dissemination of an elite cultural trend in a wider circle of audience.

Two prints by the Master of the Die from the first decades of the sixteenth century depict gods and goddesses with their symbolic animals in triumphal chariots. The sheet depicting Jupiter, Apollo, Venus, and Cupid is especially close to the topic of Bandinelli's invention and also to Alberti's description of the opposing forces of the soul as combatant gods (cat.87). On the left, Jupiter appears in the clouds, ready to strike with his thunderbolt, while Apollo is riding a chariot with four horses. On the right, Venus is sitting in her cart driven by various beasts (an eagle, a peacock, Cerberus, and a sea horse), and a swan and Cupid appear behind her. Venus and Cupid seem to lose the combat in this print: Sun-Apollo takes more space in the composition, as if he wanted to expel Venus and her entourage from the image. Cupid is already escaping in the background, and the beasts of Venus's chariot spring back from Apollo's huge horses. The Italian verse below the image has an ambiguous relation to the depiction. First, it identifies the figures and describes the family relations between them. Given the ambiguous visual attributes, confirming the identity of the depicted figures seems necessary. Jove and Apollo are easily recognisable, and the radiance around the latter figure refers to his aspect as the sun. However, the beasts connected to Venus in the image are evidently not her symbolic animals: Cerberus is usually associated with the underworld, the seahorse belongs to Neptune, the eagle to Jove,

---

[276] Seznec already pointed out this connection, although he emphasised the didactic purpose and the link to the medieval tradition. Seznec, *The Survival of the Pagan Gods*, 109.

and the peacock to Juno. As mentioned by Bartsch, these animals refer to the main divinities, and therefore, the subjugated status of the beasts may be understood as the work of the infinite power of the goddess of love.[277]

In contrast to the apparently hostile atmosphere in the image, the text explains how the harmonious interaction of Sun-Apollo and Venus keeps the universe in motion and in bloom. These dynamics of warmth and love as positive forces of the visible world (since "they perform wonders" according to the verse) can hardly be understood as a battle between the deities but rather as an allegorical interpretation of the gods as natural forces. The conflict only appears in the last two lines of the text. After the descriptive part, the narrator shifts to the first person voice, lamenting about the opposite directions represented by the depicted gods. The narrator aims to serve both deities, and he cannot decide about which direction to take in life, and feels he is left with no choice. Thus the reader-viewer is made feel that the battle of the gods does not happen in the outside world but in the soul of the narrator.

It has not been noted so far that the continuous struggle of the different forces of the human soul is expressed with the help of a quotation from Petrarch's sonnet nr. 132 ("Ch'io medesmo non so quel ch'io mi voglio").[278] The anonymous author of the poem in the print could have borrowed this line in order to refer to the content of the whole sonnet. This particular poem by Petrarch is about the bittersweet suffering and the double nature of love which confuses the senses and the intellect. While the print after Bandinelli visualised the struggle of desire and reason in the human soul with a quite straightforward moral conclusion, the print by the Master of the Die shows the struggle between Apollo and Venus, reason and love, in more ambiguous terms. In the latter print, love does not exclusively mean the inferior desires, but it is the power which moves the world around.[279] The narrator of the verse, acting like the lover in Petrarch's sonnets, is perplexed between the two divinities, left without any concluding moral advice ("and I serve both of them and receive nothing because I myself do not know what I wish for myself"). The battle of Apollo and Venus, reason and desire, seems to be undecided in this print just as in the

---

[277] Bartsch, *Le Peintre-graveur*, vol. 15, 200. There is a third print by the Master of the Die titled the *Power of Love* (Bartsch XV.201.25), which was not published by Salamanca, but which is exactly about the infinite power of Cupid over all the other deities.

[278] Francesco Petrarca, *Rerum vulgarium fragmenta*, ed. Giuseppe Savoca (Florence: Leo S. Olschki Editore, 2008), 227.

[279] On the power of love as the creator, and the force which sets the universe in motion and maintains it see the third speech in Marsilio Ficino, *Commentary on Plato's Symposium*, tr. Sears Reynolds Jayne (Columbia: University of Missouri, 1944), 148-153.

Combat of Reason and Lust. However, while the Latin text in the print after Bandinelli's design mediates an authoritative moral message, the narrator of the Italian poem applies rather a hesitant and highly personal tone. The narrator of the Latin poem stands in between the depicted figures and the viewer-reader, addressing *Mens* with admiration, and turning to the viewer (and all mortals) with the intention to teach a moral lesson based on the image. In contrast, the narrator of the other verse in the *Jupiter, Apollo, Venus, and Cupid* shares his concerns with the reader in the first person voice, and acts as one of the viewers of the image. This narrator does not aim at drawing a moral conclusion from a superior position but sheds light on his own anxiety.

A similarly helpless narrator appears in the *Allegory of the Two Lovers* (cat.88). Here the image shows Juno and Venus in their chariots drawn respectively by doves and peacocks, with Cupid flying between the goddesses. The power relations are more balanced here, the battle seems to be shifting to the foreground where a peacock attacks two pigeons. Bartsch interpreted this image as the allegory of marriage and love, based on Juno's primary role as the wife of Jupiter, and on Venus's notorious reputation as a seductress.[280] However, the poem framed on the lower margin gives a more subtle interpretation. In this case, the narrator is talking about the rivalry between two lovers, and the very similar feelings that these suitors generate in his or her soul. Bartsch assumed that the masculine pronouns the narrator uses to address these two lovers were meant as references to the two allegorical figures of love and marriage (being two masculine nouns in Italian, "matrimonio" and "amore"). However, the text talks about the physical characteristics such as the beautiful eyes and sweet faces of the rival lovers, and delineates a lively picture of the two seducers. The passionate tone makes it difficult to read the text as an allegorical speech. The narrator might represent a female voice hesitating between two men, and two different life choices. In this case, the figures of the goddesses would represent the two ways in front of her, two role models with whom she should identify with. It is a peculiar possibility that the print addresses a female audience. Malcolm Bull pointed out that there was presumably a link between the sphere of women and the spread of mythological imagery which happened first on objects like wedding chests, birth trays, and trinket boxes.[281] The print presenting a presumably female voice and the image of goddesses fits in this hypothesis very well. Indeed, women from the elite of early modern society could partake in literary discourses to some extent and could even publish their

---

[280] Bartsch, *Le Peintre-graveur*, vol. 15, 202.
[281] Bull, *The Mirror of the Gods*, 39.

works, yet it is difficult to demonstrate the existence of female audience in the case of single sheet prints.[282]

The allusion to Petrarchan poetry plays a role in this print as well. In the last line, the narrator asks for Cupid's help in this difficult situation with a question borrowed from Petrarch's sonnet nr. 268 ("What should I do, what do you advise me, Amor?").[283] The quoted line is at the very beginning of the poem in which Petrarch is lamenting on the death of Laura. In this case, the anonymous author of the text of the print probably did not want to refer to the whole Petrarchan sonnet, but appropriated the first line because it fitted the perplexity of the situation. The desperate petition to Cupid also enhances the personal tone of the poem.

The above analysed two prints share the feature of the confused narrator who expresses his or her anxiety and despair with a concluding line borrowed from the sonnets of Petrarch. The first person voice is an important characteristic of the texts, it may have made the prints emotionally more accessible for the reader-viewers, enabled them the meditation on their own self, and encouraged them to analyse their own psychic condition in allegorical and poetic terms. Campbell pointed out the role of the Petrarchan lyrical tradition in the emergence of Italian mythological painting.[284] The analysed prints provide further insights into the modes how Petrarchan texts and ideas were used to psychologise mythological images. The Petrarchan tradition may have been used in a mechanic way to express melancholic anxiety, but also in order to show the author's familiarity with the fashionable and famous poetic works. Neither print depicts strictly Petrarchan themes but they mediate a controversial and ambiguous picture on love, and lay particular emphasis on the perturbations of the human soul, anxiety and perplexity when facing one's own emotions. These prints show some similarities with the *Combat of Reason and Lust*, for example they similarly visualise the opposing forces of the soul as conflicting classical deities, but at the same time they do not offer a categorical moral conclusion. This difference might be the result of chronological distance. The print after Bandinelli's design

---

[282] On women taking part in elite literary life in sixteenth-century Italy see Diana Robin, *Publishing Women, Salons, the Presses, and the Counter-Reformation in Sixteenth-Century Italy* (London: The University of Chicago Press, 2007). For an attempt to find the female audience of sixteenth-century prints see Sara F. Matthews Grieco, "Persuasive Pictures: Didactic Prints and the Construction of the Social Identity of Women in Sixteenth-Century Italy," in *Women in Italian Renaissance Culture and Society*, ed. Letizia Panizza (Oxford: Legenda, 2000), 258-314.

[283] Petrarca, *Rerum vulgarium fragmenta*, 422-431.

[284] Stephen J. Campbell, "Eros in the Flesh: Petrarchan Desire, the Embodies Eros, and Male Beauty in Italian Art, 1500-1540," *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 35 (2005): esp. 632.

probably builds on the previous prints to some extent, but gives a less ambiguous image in the hand of the 1540s audience.

Suffering lovers and the dark practices of Cupid

In the period from the end of the fifteenth until the first half of the sixteenth century there was a growing theoretical interest in the issue of love and lovesickness. Renaissance love theory got a new impetus with the publication of Ficino's commentary on Plato's *Symposium* (titled *De Amore*, published in 1484) that gave rise to the literary genre of the *trattato d'amore* (Leone Ebreo, Mario Equicola, Baldassare Castiglione, or Pietro Bembo could be mentioned as the most famous authors of this new genre). These treatises, usually written in dialogue form and in the vernacular, treated love "as an intellectual, nonsexual, or even anti-sexual phenomenon," based on the Neoplatonic philosophical discourse.[285] It was Pietro Bembo who connected this theoretical framework to the poetry of Petrarch, and thus highly influenced the courtly approach towards love; through his work, earthly or profane love, and the perturbations of the soul were regarded as channels to reach divine love.[286] In Bembo's dialogue titled *Gli Asolani* (1505), the figure of Perottino formulated the concept of earthly love as bitter suffering, playing with the similarity of the two words *amore* and *amaro*.[287] He also compared love to fire, and the suffering lover to the heroes tormented by the Furies, such as Orestes or Ajax.[288] Figures in Castiglione's *Book of the Courtier* also mention and expand on the lovers' sufferings. In the first book, Ottaviano Fregoso condemns the continuous lamentation of male lovers. Pietro Bembo himself appears in the fourth book of Castiglione's work, and asserts that

---

[285] John Charles Nelson, *Renaissance Theory of Love* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1958), 70. See also Nesca A. Robb, *Neoplatonism of the Italian Renaissance* (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd: 1935), 212. See a list of authors and titles belonging to the genre in Wouter J. Hanegraaff, "Under the Mantle of Love: the Mystical Eroticisms of Marsilio Ficino and Giordano Bruno," in *Hidden Intercourse: Eros and Sexuality in the History of Western Esotericism*, ed. Wouter J. Hanegraaff and Jeffrey J. Kripal (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 175.

[286] Donald Allen Beecher, "Quattrocento Views on the Eroticization of the Imagination," in *Eros and Anteros: the Medical Traditions of Love in the Renaissance*, ed. Donald Allen Beecher and Massimo Ciavolella (Ottawa: Dovehouse Edition, 1992), 57; Stefano Jossa, "Bembo and Italian Petrarchism," in *The Cambridge Companion to Petrarch*, ed. Albert Russell Ascoli and Unn Falkeid (Cambridge: University Press, 2015), 193.

[287] "...così amare sanza amaritudine non si può, né altro è amaritudine che amore." Pietro Bembo, *Gli Asolani*, ed. Giorgio Dilemmi (Florence: Presso l'Accademia della Crusca, 1991), 19.

[288] "...che noi Amore chiamiamo, gli scrittori alcuna volta chiamano fuoco, perciò che, sì come il fuoco e suoi alimenti consuma, così noi consuma et distrugge Amore; alcuna volta furore, volendo rassimigliare l'amante a quegli che sono dalle Furie sollecitati, sì come d'Oreste et d'Aiace et d'alcun' altri si scrive." Bembo, *Gli Asolani*, 23.

lovesickness is even part of spiritual love that does not seek earthly pleasures. Bembo explains that the soul can also suffer from the absence of the beloved beauty.[289]

Parallel to these theoretical discussions and formulations in printed books, Petrarchism became a fashionable "social game" among the courtiers; composing poems and experiencing lovesickness were essential parts of this trend.[290] The present analysis of the prints aims at broadening our knowledge about this flourishing interest from a different angle. While the previously examined sheets focused more on the moralising aspect, the contrast of reason and carnal love, and expressed this idea in an elegant, facile manner, the prints to be analysed in this subchapter show a more dramatic image of love, and concentrate on the lover's suffering and the dark side of Cupid. Both approaches were part of contemporaneous courtly culture.

Agostino Veneziano's engraving, *The Sailing Amor*, is probably closer in time to the previously analysed two prints but it provides a perfect link to the later sheets from the 1540s, depicting suffering lovers (cat.89). The design is usually attributed to Raphael, just like in the case of the two previously analysed prints. The image depicts a suffering male figure leaning to a tree trunk on the seashore where Venus is riding on a scallop shell and Cupid is sailing in a small boat fabricated from his own weaponry and clothes. Three more putti are flying above them in the clouds. The figures derive from different sources, and are combined together to give a visualisation of a medically oriented idea of the melancholic disease of love.[291]

The motif of the sailing Cupid can be found in antique mosaics (for example in the Santa Constanza in Rome) but this classical image received a completely new interpretation in this print due to the vernacular text added below the image.[292] In Veneziano's print, Cupid used all his tools to build the little bark with which, according to

---

[289] "ma piú tosto spaventato dai continui lamenti d'alcuni inamorati, i quali pallidi, mesti e taciturni, par che sempre abbiano la propria scontentezza dipinta negli occhi; e se parlano, accompagnando ogni parola con certi sospiri triplicati, di null'altra cosa ragionano che di lacrime, di tormenti, di disperazioni e desidèri di morte..." Baldassare Castiglione, *Il libro del Cortegiano*, ed. Giulio Preti (Turin: Einaudi, 1965), 22. For the relevant part of Bembo's speech see book 4, chapter LXVI, Castiglione, *Il libro del Cortegiano*, 380-382.

[290] Jossa, "Bembo and Italian Petrarchism," 195.

[291] All the figures can be connected to Raphael's circles. The birth of Venus in the sea was depicted in Cardinal Bibbiena's Stuffetta (there is also a printed version of the composition, Bartsch XIV.243.323), while the sailing Amor was previously published in an oval format print by Marco Dente (Bartsch XIV.179.219) which was also published by Salamanca with his name in addition (Ashmolean Museum, Oxford).

[292] For the antique mosaic prototypes see Charles Dempsey, *Inventing the Renaissance Putto* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001), 28. The motif of the sailing Cupid was also published by Salamanca in a separate print with a different motto (*Sic fuga violenta monet*) which was engraved by Marco Dente. The motif of the sailing Cupid is thus clearly conneted to the circle of artists around Raphael. Bartsch XIV.179.219, Ashmolean Museum, WA1863.1710.

the poem, he is travelling in the narrator's humours or body liquids ("this is how Amor, without Tiphys and Jason, became the master in the open sea of my humour"). If one looks at the details of the image, there is a stream running to the sea from behind the male figure which may be interpreted as his body fluids becoming visible, his inner world being projected to the landscape of the print. Cupid conquering one's body fluids, especially one's blood, and thus causing melancholy, was a commonplace in the medical discourse from the medieval period onwards (also addressed by Ficino in his *De Amore* as the problem of earthly love).[293] The male figure is clearly tormented in the image. The text is not a lament in this case but a relatively objective description, and Cupid's mastery in building a boat is more emphasised than the suffering of the narrator. Extending the nautical theme, the poem evokes some classical mythological figures from the story of the Argonauts, and emphasises Cupid's skilfulness. One cannot find a concluding Petrarchan line here, only some vocabulary reminds the reader of the vernacular lyrical tradition.[294] The first person voice makes the text similar to those in the previous prints, although this print by Veneziano is more descriptive and does not put an emphasis on the emotional state of the narrator. The focus is on the witty invention of Cupid building a boat out of his weaponry but the first person voice still allows the viewer-reader to identify himself with the speaking character who is depicted in affliction.

The motifs of suffering and the condemnation of Cupid as a cunning and cruel force lead us to two further prints published by Salamanca probably later than the sheets printed from the refreshed plates by Veneziano and the Master of the Die. The *Allegory of Love* and the *Allegory of the Passions* both depict the sufferings of male lovers in an *all'antica* setting but gods or mythological figures do not take part in these allegorical images, except for Cupid. These two prints demonstrate how the antique visual repertoire could be used to express early modern content without directly involving any mythological stories.

In the *Allegory of Love*, text and image are both essential to the understanding of all the nuances of the meaning, just like in the case of the *Combat of Reason and Lust*. The elements of the picture may remind the viewer of mythological stories but the image is not

---

[293] Dempsey, *Inventing the Renaissance Putto*, 63. See Ficino's interpretation of vulgar love as madness caused by black bile or burned blood, Ficino, *Commentary on Plato's Symposium*, 222, 226, 230. See also Beecher, "Quattrocento Views on the Eroticization of the Imagination," 53-55.
[294] The phrase "il periglioso varco" or the perilous gate of death is used by Petrarch in sonnet nr. 91, Petrarca, *Rerum vulgarium fragmenta*, 159.

a direct illustration of any antique texts.[295] In the middle of the composition, Cupid is playing dice with a woman in an *all'antica* architectural setting (cat.90.a). There are human body parts on the table, hands, eyes, a face, and hearts next to the dice. A naked child is sitting behind the table, and a wounded male body appears next to him; heads of little putti with arrows peek from inside the wound. With his left hand Cupid is feeding dogs with a human heart; the animals are standing in his triumphal cart, a chariot of fire with four horses.[296] Around the two main characters, there are several figures following their game or discussing, two groups of three men and two couples with children are arranged on the two sides of the group in the middle. In the foreground, five putti torment a child who is lying unconscious in a cauldron put on the fire. Smoke coming from Cupid's chariot fills the background; a horse and another chariot with four horses and a male figure appear in the sky.

Below the image, in an illusionary box-like space, three cartouches carry eight-line stanzas. This Italian text is the first person narrator's lament on the cruelty of Cupid. In the first stanza, he is describing the physical symptoms of love. The description is a typical example of the "affetti contrari," a poetic use of contradiction and oxymorons, often applied by Petrarch in his sonnets, for example in sonnet nr. 134.[297] The text itself is not a direct imitation of any poems by Petrarch but it is to be found almost word by word, only in a different order of the lines, in a later work, the *Eroici furori* by Giordano Bruno, published in 1585. Bruno's work "combines philosophy with poetry" as it includes sonnets and commentary to them in a dialogue form.[298] Bruno consciously applied the typical formal features and ideas of Petrarchist lyrics, and he also followed the Neoplatonist tradition of love treatises in condemning sensual pleasure and elevating true love to the

---

[295] Art historians tried to trace the mythological background story, identifying the figure of the mother sometimes with Venus, other times with Fortuna or Medea. The latter heroine apparently came into picture because she was a sorceress, and the dice game could be connected to her figure. According to antique textual tradition Cupid was playing the dice with Ganymedes before he was asked to make Medea fall in love with Jason so the Argonauts could succeed in their journey for the Golden Fleece. Bartsch, *Le Peintre-graveur*, vol. 15, 55. Stefania Massari interpreted all the figures as gods (in spite of the fact that there are no attributes in the image and no mentions of Jove or Apollo in the text), and the central female figure as Fortuna. In her explanation, the print was based on Ficino's writings, and depicted the allegory of creation with Fortuna and Amor ruling the world in the middle of the composition. Remarkably, Massari did not expand on the connections between the exact details of Ficino's works and the image, and also ignores the Italian text written on the print itself. Stefania Massari, *Tra mito e allegoria: immagini a stampa nel '500 e '600* (Rome: Sistemi Informativi, 1989), 270-272.
[296] The chariot is depicted according to Petrarch's description in the *Triumph of Love* (book 1, line 23): "sovr' un carro di foco un garzon crudo." Francesco Petrarca, *Trionfi, Rime estravaganti, Codice degli Abbozzi*, ed. Vinicio Pacca and Laura Paolino (Milan: Arnoldo Mondadori, 1996), 56.
[297] Petrarca, *Rerum vulgarium fragmenta*, 229.
[298] Nelson, *Renaissance Theory of Love*, 163.

realm of the divine.[299] Apart from the excerpt, there is no connection between Bruno's work and the print, neither the figures depicted in the image, nor a similar story appears in the *Eroici furori*. It is an interesting question whether Bruno used the verse in the print or whether the two texts had a common root in sixteenth-century poetry. In any case, the engraving proves the link between print culture and the world of love treatises, the common interest in the forms of lovesickness. Bruno may have owned a copy of the print and was inspired by the poetic work of the anonymous writer.

After the Petrarchist description of the lover's physical and emotional state, the narrator of the print introduces the "story" of the image. As he relates, the described horrors do not stop people from falling in love, as happened with the narrator's own mother. She had lost her mind in passion, and lost her child when playing dice with Cupid. This way the last lines of the first stanza identify the female protagonist of the image as the mother of the narrator. The second stanza specifies the situation further, the narrator describes himself as a child sitting on the table where the game takes place, and thus we can identify him with the infant figure pointing towards himself in the middle of the image. In the third stanza, the description of the game continues by enlisting Cupid's trophies taken from tormented lovers. At the end, the reader-viewer has an image of the cruel infant god who "is living on robbery and stealing cries."

The vernacular verse itself gives a clue about the nature of the print: the narrator mentions two antique authors, Catullus and Virgil. They are not cited as models for text and image but as authorities who did not write about such a topic, story, or scene. It is worth looking briefly at what these references might have meant for the author of the Italian verse, besides name-dropping. Catullus was a "model for personal poetry" in the Renaissance, his works were seen as obscene but sentimental and elegant at the same time, he was an authority on passions.[300] Virgil wrote the famous quote *amor vincit omnia* (*Eclogues* 10.69), he was an authority on love and mythological matters. Referring to these writers could show, on the one hand, the narrator's erudition in Latin. On the other hand, these references situated the vernacular poem in the context of classical literary tradition, and showed the context that the anonymous author was aware of. Moreover, it may also be an explanation for why art historians could not find the antique mythological tradition

---

[299] On Bruno and Petrarch see Florian Mehltretter, "Giordano Bruno und der Petrarkismus: Bemerkungen zum ersten Teil der *Eroici furori*," *Romanistisches Jahrbuch* 54 (2003): 146-179. On Bruno and Ficino see Hanegraaff, "Under the Mantle of Love," 175-207.

[300] Julia Haig Gasser, *Catullus and his Renaissance Readers* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1993), 193-194.

behind the story. As the narrator points out, such a horrific story did not exist in classical sources but it was a typical narrative of the early modern age.

An episode from the second book of the *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili* seems to be the closest to the meaning and "story" of the print. This vernacular work illustrated with woodcuts tells the romance of Poliphilo and the nymph Polia, and is usually regarded by present day scholars as a compendium of humanist learning (a compilation of historical, literary, and mythological knowledge) based partly on antique sources and partly on early modern invention.[301] In the second book, the female protagonist, Polia, recounts her dream in which Cupid made two women, who refused to accept his power, to draw his chariot, and then killed them, sliced their bodies into pieces, and fed a dragon, a lion and a wolf with their remains. Witnessing this cruel episode makes Polia accept Poliphilo's love that she rejected before.[302] The extent of cruelty that characterises Cupid here is similar to that of the print, although the narrative line of the two "stories" is quite the opposite. In Polia's dream the women were punished for rejecting love, while the body parts with which Cupid is playing dice in the print were taken as love tokens.[303] Seemingly, Cupid was especially cruel to both those who accepted and those who rejected his power.

The unknown tormented lovers of the print were probably punished because of worldly emotions and sensual pleasures. The goal of this motif was to show the power of Cupid, and the horrors caused by love. Patricia Emison saw this cynical, profane approach as a counter reaction to the mystical Petrarchist ideas on love.[304] This interpretation would give a new understanding to the Petrarchist first stanza. The sufferings of the dismembered lovers in general, and the pain of the narrator as an individual case, show only the horrors, the dark side of love; lovesickness is clearly understood here as a negative phenomenon which is better to avoid. The Petrarchan "affetti contrari" are applied here to horrify the readers; the agonising state of the hopeless lover is not presented as an ideal example to follow. The horrors depicted in text and image connote better with the title *Allegory of the Cruelty of Cupid*. The terrifying effect of image and text may have mediated moralising pretext, similarly to the *Combat of Reason and Lust*. It is easy to see the story of the mother who lost her child through gambling with dice in a moralising context: blaming the

---

[301] See for example Rosemary Trippe, "The Hypnerotomachia Poliphili, Image, Text, and Vernacular Poetics," *Renaissance Quarterly* 55 (2002): 1223.

[302] Francesco Colonna, *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili, The Strife of Love in a Dream*, tr. Joscelyn Godwin (London: Thames & Hudson, 2005), 400-408.

[303] The story of dismembering as a revenge is based on an episode from Boccaccio's *Decameron*. Andrea Bayer ed., *Art and Love in Renaissance Italy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 143.

[304] Emison, *The Art of Teaching*, 42.

mother for the misery of the offspring could remind the early modern viewer of Eve and the original sin. According to the anonymous print, the vicious circle of love starts with the mother and continues with the son who inherited the tendency for suffering. The image also expresses this idea by showing the different ages of man in the figures of different male characters, from a newborn child to a bearded adult man. The universal power of Cupid, which determines one's fate from the moment of birth, is demonstrated with these figures.

Similarly to the horrors described and depicted in the *Allegory of the Cruelty of Cupid*, the anonymous print of the *Allegory of the Passions* shows the terrifying effects of love (cat.91.a). In the image, the viewer encounters a male nude in a detailed landscape who is tormented by a snake and a lion, while another figure is running away from him in panic. Cupid is preparing his arrow in the background. A sonnet of fourteen lines is written on an illusionistic piece of paper, a cartellino composed within the image. The narrator of the poem laments on all his miseries caused by love; and the savage beasts symbolise the torments of wild desires to which he fell prey.

The impression of this print preserved in the Rijksmuseum comes from a sixteenth-century collector's album that was recently reconstructed. The context in which the print was placed may provide some evidence about its reception, at least in the eye of a northern collector who had his album compiled most probably in Venice.[305] The *Allegory of the Passions* was included among mythological images, directly before the images of Hercules's works showing heroic fights.[306] It is intriguing why this print was placed next to the popular heroic images in spite of the fact that the text clearly stated the topic of the depiction. This arrangement may imply that the owner thought of the allegorical print as a parallel figure to Hercules. The tormented lover was either seen as a parody of the heroic struggles or the beasts of sensual desires might have been regarded as similar to the monsters that Hercules had to defeat. Furthermore, the main figure of the print is a reference to one of the most famous ancient sculptures known in the Renaissance, the marble *Laocoon*. This visual connection with an ancient story might have given the idea for the compiler of the album to place the allegorical print on lovesickness next to the classical stories.

---

[305] Joyce Zelen, "The Venetian Print Album of Johann Georg I Zobel von Giebelstadt," *The Rijksmuseum Bulletin* 63 (2015): 2-51.
[306] Zelen, "The Venetian Print Album," 34.

The visual allusion to the *Laocoon* is parallel to the intertextual references of the sonnet. If anyone had doubts that the inventor of the image relied on the ancient pictorial source, the anonymous poet of the Italian verse makes the reference clear by stating in the very first line that the depiction is not the horrific example of the *Laocoon*. One encounters the same strategy here as in the previously examined print. As the narrator of the *Allegory of the Cruelty of Cupid* referred to Catullus and Virgil as counterpoints of the depiction, similarly, the author of the verse in the *Allegory of the Passions* also draws attention to a pictorial tradition that is completely reinterpreted in the sheet. The comment on the *Laocoon* indicates the pictorial model, thus gives a good reason for the collectors of antiquities to buy the sheet, but at the same time notes that it is not the story of the Trojan priest which is meant here.[307] Furthermore, the first stanza is basically a list of what the image is not about. The second line is an allusion to Petrarch's *Triumph of Love* (book 1, lines 89-90) where famous figures are listed that Cupid conquered, for example, Caesar.[308] The fourth line probably alludes to Petrarch himself as the Tuscan who was tormented by cruel Love. The anonymous narrator of the poem states clearly that the print does not depict these famous stories. The second stanza then explains that the image symbolises the narrator's own suffering. As he relates, he was seduced and fell prey to an asp, and now he has to subject himself to all the fierce desires and passions of the seductress. Sensuality is symbolised by the wild beasts in the image.

In the third stanza, the typical symptoms of Petrarchan love are expressed: the lover's melancholy is described as caused by the absence of the beloved, and this lack appears as the generating impulse of desire ("my light is robbed of his precious treasure which turns and flees, (and) this is the way that she draws my heart more than any other"). The second parts of all the three lines allude to sonnets from Petrarch's *Canzoniere* (nr. 179, 6, 310)[309]. The last stanza turns back to the image, explaining once again how the protagonist is condemned by Cupid to bear the torments of the beasts of desire. He is in absolute despair "dying alive," and his image serves as an example of Love's cruelty, just like in the story of the previous print.

The *Allegory of the Passions* is not a unique example for using the visual model of the *Laocoon* to express the horrors of sensual love. The ancient sculpture could be used as a model for the tormented lover because by the time it was a widely known topos of pathos

---

[307] The northern collector, Johann Georg I Zobel, also visited Rome, thus he could most probably have looked at the *Laocoon* in person. Zelen, "The Venetian Print Album," 14.
[308] Petrarca, *Trionfi*, 74.
[309] Petrarca, *Rerum vulgarium fragmenta*, 9, 286, 488.

and physical suffering, and was used by other artists in a similar sense.[310] The closest example to the print in iconography is a painted panel, the *Allegory of Passions* by Correggio, created around 1528 for the studiolo of Isabella d'Este (cat.91.b).[311] The screaming faces of the central printed and painted figures are especially similar, and the motif of the tormenting snakes is also common in the two works (although in Correggio's painting the female figures of the Furies are tormenting the satyr-Laocoon with small snakes, while a huge asp is attacking the protagonist in the print). According to Campbell's interpretation, Correggio's picture depicts the mental pain of someone who falls prey to his own emotions and psychic perturbations, with a slightly parodical character added by the figure of the satyr-Laocoon.[312] The print mediates a surprisingly similar content, with the difference that this interpretation is not hypothetical anymore because of the clear explanation of the sonnet. The intertextual references also give the poetic source of inspiration, namely Petrarch. However, the interpretation of the Petrarchist tradition seems to be more ambiguous in the print than in Correggio's painting. The print seems to be much more direct, completed with the voice of the suffering narrator; the first person voice makes the torments of love more individual, less abstract, and makes it possible for the viewer-reader to easily identify themselves with the pain felt by the agonising figure. The contrast between the first stanza and the rest of the sonnet strengthens the impression that the print tells a very personal and very general account at the same time. The horrors of love could happen to any viewers. The first stanza lists famous examples of lovesickness, stating that the image is not depicting these legendary miseries but the pain of the author, the poetic self. Through image and text, the print personalises the torments of lovesickness.

It is not clear whether this personalised image of the tormented lover is a satirical or a serious presentation of the Petrarchist model of mental suffering. Or, as a third option, should one take it as a terrifying moral example against the emotional and sensual excesses of the soul, just like in the previously analysed prints? A brief comparison with another image, which similarly connects the issue of love, the *Laocoon* as the visual model of suffering, and Petrarchist motifs, may help to position the print of the *Allegory of the Passions*. Another print engraved in the 1520s by Gian Giacomo Caraglio after a drawing

---

[310] Leopold D. Ettlinger, "*Exemplum Doloris*. Reflections of the *Laocoon* group," in *De Artibus Opuscula XL. Essays in honour of Erwin Panofsky*, ed. Millard Meiss (New York: New York University Press, 1961), 121-126.
[311] For the details on the dating see Campbell, *The Cabinet of Eros*, 222. I borrowed the title given to Correggio's painting by Campbell for the print because of their similarity in form and content.
[312] Campbell, *The Cabinet of Eros*, 233-234.

of Rosso Fiorentino gives another example for the parodical use of the *Laocoon*, combined with the textual tradition of Petrarch (Bartsch XV.92.58). The print seems to belong to the same trend that the three earlier prints represented. Caraglio's print after Rosso depicts a wildly screaming, naked figure riding a dragon in a dark forest. In his dynamic position he is an imitation of the *Laocoon*, however, his desiccated, castrated body is in great contrast with the muscular hero. Rosso's *Fury* or *Livor* is holding a skull, tormented by a snake, and has a singing swan as his companion. The second state of the print contains a sixteen-line vernacular poem below the image that describes the horrors of the image in first person voice from the point of view of the wild figure.[313] Some of the vocabulary is borrowed from Petrarch's *Canzoniere*, however, not whole lines as in the prints published by Salamanca. Campbell interpreted Caraglio's sheet as "representing erotic madness or obsession," reintepreting the Petrarchan tradition in a "nightmarish exaggeration."[314] Eike D. Schmidt saw the print as the reflection of the art theoretical concepts of inspiration, and also emphasised the satirical use of *Laocoon* as the topos of physical and psychic pain in order to show a negative image of erotic ecstasy.[315] This tendency, to convert the expression of extreme suffering into the image of immoderate sexuality, culminated in Aretino's comparison of the participants of an orgy to the constellation of the *Laocoon* group (in his *Ragionamento della Nanna e della Antonia*, 1534).[316]

In contrast to these extreme parodies and complex interpretations, the print published by Salamanca is much simpler in the sense that the protagonist is a positive figure. He is attacked by the beasts of desire and Cupid, thus engaged in a heroic struggle with these forces. Neither in Correggio's painting nor in the print after Rosso's drawing are the main figures entirely positive but they rather belong to the world of the beasts. In the print published by Salamanca, the man attacked by the savages is portrayed as a victim in both image and text, which may be a hint to the moral meaning of the sheet. The hypothesis about the moral interpretation is supported by the escaping figure in the background that is looking outside the image, towards the viewer. He may suggest that the audience needs to beware of Cupid and the excesses of the soul. Struggling with the beasts

---

[313] For the English translation see Eugene A. Carroll, *Rosso Fiorentino: drawings, prints, and decorative arts* (Washington: National Gallery of Art, 1987), 72.
[314] Stephen J. Campbell, "*Fare una Cosa Morta Parer Viva*: Michelangelo, Rosso, and the (Un)divinity of Art," *The Art Bulletin* 84 (2002): 600.
[315] Eike D. Schmidt, "*Furor* und *Imitatio*: Visuelle Topoi in den Laokoon-Parodien Rosso Fiorentinos und Tizians," in *Visuelle Topoi: Erfindung und tradiertes Wissen in den Künsten der italienischen Renaissance*, ed. Ulrich Pfisterer and Max Seidel (Munich: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 2003), 351-370.
[316] Schmidt, "*Furor* und *Imitatio*," 368.

of desire is a similarly heroic battle as the works of Hercules – as a northern owner of the print, Johann Georg Zobel expressed by arranging these topics next to each other. Just as the story of a similarly individual victim and the horrors in the *Allegory of the Cruelty of Cupid*, the *Allegory of the Passions* warns the reader-viewer of the consequences of gambling with Cupid and playing with emotions.

In conclusion, the last two analysed prints interpreted the Petrarchist tradition in a different way than the earlier prints engraved by the Master of the Die and Agostino Veneziano. In the earlier examples the motif of suffering and disharmony appeared but did not dominate the message of the sheets. In contrast, the *Allegory of the Cruelty of Cupid* and the *Allegory of the Passions* provided the viewer with a horrific and frightening image of love. However, the use of the Petrarchist tradition did not turn into parody, rather it included a moral warning, just like the *Combat of Reason and Lust*. It is true in general for the analysed six prints that the earlier images are not so complicated and refined, the voice of the texts in these sheets is less dramatic. The later prints show more complicated imagery based on sophisticated invention, and they included a subtle play of intertextual and visual references, thus building a learned context around the images.

All the analysed prints present a special iconography of love, based on modern ideas and ancient forms, expressing philosophical ideas and emotional content with the help of mythological figures. When Salamanca put all the prints on the market, prints showing different stages of love theories of the sixteenth century appeared next to each other, and became available at the same time. The analogies with the Mantuan studiolo paintings reveal that there was a widespread need for images of love and lovesickness during the century, and the ideas that first appeared in precious panel paintings became popular in the medium of print. The combination of text and image, the mutual explanation of visual and literary parts was necessary in this setting where a wider anonymous audience was expected to handle the sheets. In Latin or in the vernacular, in first person voice or in a more philosophical tone, all the six prints present struggling forces of the human soul under mythological masks.

The reproductive aspect was not as important in Salamanca's stock in general: those prints inscribed with narrative texts rarely acknowledged the inventor of the design. From this point of view, the *Combat of Reason and Lust* signals the beginning of a new era when the authors of the image (and sometimes even the text) step into the foreground. The prints by Cock and Lafreri represent this next stage of development with their more consistent use of texts on authorship. The six prints on love showed Salamanca's position

125

in the transitory period. There is a stunning difference between the mythological prints published by Cock after Floris and the mythological-allegorical prints by Salamanca analysed in this chapter. The *Combat of Reason and Lust* prefigured the direction that Cock represented a decade later, however, it is still closely connected to the poetic prints on love produced a decade earlier in the circle of Raphael.

The prints with the vernacular texts analysed in depth in this chapter offer an example for the "utilitarian" aspect being dominant. The prints embedded in the contemporaneous poetic discourse on love provided their reader-viewers with philosophical, moralistic, and poetic help to self-reflection. On the other hand, they also provided their users with vital ideas about the courtly culture of love (hence the Petrarchist tendency of the verses). The personal voice of the Italian poems offered the viewers the possibility of identifying themselves with the allegorical meaning. To match an image with a text in first person voice was a traditional mode of communication in prints, and it was used extensively especially in religious prints. In the chapter on Cock's publications, there were several examples for both religious and mythological-allegorical prints that followed the tradition of the "speaking image." However, in the Antwerp examples, mostly a depicted figure, the protagonist of the image started speaking to the viewer-reader. In the prints on love by Salamanca, the first person narrators of the poems have an outside point of view, they describe and interpret the images, even though the print might visualise their inner self or emotions in a symbolic way. In the *Allegory on the Cruelty of Cupid*, the narrator, even though he appears in the image as a child, sets himself outside the image since he describes the events depicted with the use of the past tense. Similarly in the *Allegory of the Passions*, the narrator speaks about the image as the symbolic image of his suffering and emotions, but he does not address the viewer from within the image, he does not speak as the figure depicted. Through this intermediate position, the poems represent a self-reflective attitude towards one's inner world, feelings, emotions, hesitations, and suffering. The poems urge the reader-viewer to practice a similar self-reflection with the help of the symbolic repertoire of text and image. From this perspective, the Latin poem of the *Combat of Reason and Lust* represents a different stage of thinking. There is no need for identification in this case, the narrator stands in a distance from the image and from the emotional upheaval of the soul, and gives advice to the reader-viewer from an authoritative moral perspective.

The analysed examples show that there was a great demand for certain topics. The popularity of the prints is clear from the presumably high number of impressions. The

plate of the *Combat of Reason and Lust* was printed until worn out, then refreshed and used again by Salamanca.[317] The other plates were already used when bought by the publisher. This indicates that hundreds, or even more than one thousand impressions were printed from the plates.[318] These prints were not only precious for collectors with antiquarian interest but must have been popular among those who were aware of the discourses on love and lovesickness, for example among those following the obsession of the courtly society with Petrarch. The group of prints depicting issues of love also proves the place of prints in daily life, and suggests that these publications were looked at and meditated on by their owners. The texts included in the prints were used as aids to guide self-analysis, directing the reader-viewer's thoughts towards a moral resolution of the troubles of the heart.

---

[317] One can find evidence for this in the two impressions in Berlin (inv. nr. 997-21 and 996-21), one of them with a correction in the publisher's signature, evidently printed from a refreshed plate. Further evidence for its popularity is that Adriaen de Vries, a sculptor from the next generation, used the print as inspirational source when creating a sculpture of Mercury. Erna Fiorentini, "Zweidimensionale Vorbilder. Überlegungen zu Baccio Bandinellis *Kampf der Götter*, dem Augsburger *Merkur* und Adriaen de Vries's Florentiner Inspirationsquellen," *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 63 (2000): 269-277.

[318] Based on written sources, Bury estimated around 1000 impressions from a plate, even more if retouched. Bury, *The Print in Italy*, 47. Griffiths calculated 2000-4000 impressions of "finely engraved plates" depending on retouch. Griffiths, *The Print Before Photography*, 50.

Inscriptions in prints published by Antonio Lafreri

The first prints by Antonio Lafreri were published in 1544, a few years after Salamanca started to publish single sheet prints. Lafreri became an important rival of the Spanish publisher until they united their forces in partnership in 1553. Lafreri was the first single sheet print publisher who advertised and marketed his products in a printed stocklist.[319] The list of his prints was compiled around the middle of the 1570s, and tells a lot about Lafreri's strategy and approach towards authorship and reproductive prints, especially in the later period of his production. The listed works are arranged according to subject into five large groups (geography, Roman antiquities, historical-mythological stories, religious images, and miscellanies, mostly portraits). As Birte Rubach pointed out, approximately 25 percent from the more than five hundred entries provide the interested customer with names of the producers. In the sections of mythological and religious imagery, these names refer exclusively to the designers. For example Michelangelo is mentioned in 28 cases, while Raphael's name appears in 25 entries, but artists like Giulio Romano or Federico Zuccaro are also introduced in the list.[320]

Lafreri seems to have been more interested in acknowledging the inventors than Salamanca, and this must have been an important aspect for his clientele, too. The stocklist reflected the information that the prints themselves provided through inscriptions. Moreover, Lafreri published four frontispieces in order to help his customers systematise the purchased prints.[321] Two of the four were intended for religious prints, one for images of the Old and New Testament, the other for the images of Christ, God the Father, the Virgin, and other saints. Both religious frontispieces emphasise the reproductive aspect of the prints in the title, thus reflecting the importance of this feature for publisher and audience. The inscription on the earlier frontispiece presents the images *a diversis sculptoribus et pictoribus* (by different sculptors and painters), while the title in the later, more elaborate title page speaks about *imagines olim nobilicivm opificivm avt caelo avt penicillo* (images of respected works either carved or by the painter's brush).[322]

---

[319] Bury, *The Print in Italy*, 121-123. Book publishers already had the practice to publish stocklists of their production. Birte Rubach, *ANT. LAFRERI FORMIS ROMAE*, 77; Alberti, "Contributi per Antoine Lafréry," 77-78.
[320] Rubach, *ANT. LAFRERI FORMIS ROMAE*, 81-82. For the transcribed stocklist see Franz Ehrle, *Roma Prima di Sisti V: La Pianta di Roma Du Pérac-Lafréry del 1577* (Rome: Danesi, 1908), 56-59, and Rubach, *ANT. LAFRERI FORMIS ROMAE*, 425-437.
[321] For the frontispieces see Rubach, *ANT. LAFRERI FORMIS ROMAE*, 82-85.
[322] Rubach, ANT. LAFRERI FORMIS ROMAE, 394.

Lafreri apparently made an effort to refer to the designers of the images, especially if they were famous artists whose name could sell the prints. However, he and the engravers working for him were not entirely consistent about this feature. There is also a considerable amount of prints published by Lafreri, some of them reproducing Raphael's or Michelangelo's well-known designs, that do not mention the inventor. Giorgio Ghisi's print after Raphael's painting, the so-called *Madonna di Loreto*, is an example for lacking the name of the inventor entirely (cat.92). Michael Bury interpreted the print as a typical example for using a famous image to create "an effective devotional print" that is the opposite of conscious reproductions.[323] However, the print after Raphael's painting is different from the more traditional prints that included liturgical texts or prayers for indulgence, like the very similar image of the Holy Family framed and completed with a prayer for the octave of the Nativity, engraved by Sebastiano di Re (cat.93). A similar example is Beatrizet's print after the Madonna of Loreto with excerpts from a Marian antiphon, or another print by Beatrizet of Salviati's Madonna in the San Lorenzo in Damaso that referred to the indulgence connected to the shrine (cat.94-95). Compared to these examples, Ghisi's copy of Raphael's image, with the Neo-Latin poem based on antique poetry, seems to represent a different aspect of printed religious imagery.

On the one hand, this chapter aims at resolving the polarity of "reproductive" and "devotional" prints. The goal of the analysis is to point out how the two functions intertwine and could even enhance each other, as seen for example in the case of Cock's *Brazen Serpent* where Frans Floris's talent was praised for giving the audience an effective religious image similar to the Bible in its didactic power (cat.1). On the other hand, it would be too simplistic to see all sixteenth-century engravings with religious content as the same kind of object: the "devotional print." As pointed out by Peter Schmidt, this unified concept of the "devotional image" was already too simplistic to apply to fifteenth-century printed images.[324] This is even more the case in sixteenth-century engravings that aspired to meet artistic expectations in a changing religious context. Once more, the case study of Cock's religious prints provided an example for the diversity of religious images in print. The religious prints published by Lafreri in Rome originated in a different context than Cock's publications, and the analysis will show the major difference of the two publishers' works in the communication between the image and the viewer-reader through the captions. However, despite the different religious context and the geographical

---

[323] Bury, *The Print in Italy*, 10.
[324] Schmidt, "The Multiple Image," 41.

distance, there were also similar features of sixteenth-century religious prints north and south of the Alps.

I believe that the analysis of captions helps to reveal and interpret the nuances of prints with religious imagery. In this chapter, I would like to address how a growing demand for religious imagery was intertwined with questions of authorship and style, and how these expectations influenced in the prints. In the case of Lafreri, religious prints are much more significant in number than in his colleague, Salamanca's stock, and they provide a good opportunity to analyse the question of authorship and the role of the artistic inventor. In Lafreri's oeuvre, the prints with religious topics more often include longer narrative captions than allegorical or mythological sheets, and references to the inventors of the design also appear in many more cases in the religious prints. Moreover, many mythological prints with longer inscriptions were not engraved for Lafreri, but they were either copies of earlier prints, or older copper plates acquired by the publisher.[325] The issue of copying, refreshing, and reissuing the prints was addressed in the chapter on Salamanca's mythological prints. There will also be some examples in the religious material by Lafreri, however, most of Lafreri's copies of earlier prints were completed with additional captions so they provide a different interpretation of the prints.

In the case of Lafreri, the frontispieces for collectors already showed a certain consciousness about his stock that was not the case with Salamanca. The more consistent crediting of the inventor is also a significant difference between the two Roman publishers. This chapter aims at analysing whether Lafreri, in contrast to Salamanca, had a consistent strategy of selecting texts for single sheet prints. Religious prints provide an ideal material for the comparison with Cock whose religious sheets were studied in the second case study of this thesis. Beyond looking for similar features in Cock's and Lafreri's religious material, the central question is whether Lafreri had a similarly significant role in the lettering of the prints as Cock had in Antwerp.

---

[325] For example, Lafreri acquired older plates by the Master of the Die, or in 1565 he took possession of four plates (*Venus and the Rose*, *Allegory of Hunting*, *Last Supper*, *Apollo and the Muses*) that were engraved by Gaspare Osello and originally published by the Venetian Niccolo Nelli in 1563, but these plates were already copies of prints from the 1550s, originally engraved by Giorgio Ghisi (after designs of different artists). Christophe Witcombe, *Copyright in the Renaissance: Prints and the Privilegio in Sixteenth-Century Venice and Rome* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 127.

CASE STUDY 4

Religious prints and authorship in Counter-Reformation Rome

Prints with religious topics made up the largest group according to subject in Lafreri's production, two fifths of the stocklist according to Bury.[326] The shift towards this topic is significant compared to Salamanca's production. This change is usually explained as resulting from the impact of the Counter-Reformation.[327] However, the characteristics of Lafreri's image-text creations were not looked at in detail, and the different groups and patterns in the material were not explained in previous scholarship. Prints of the Roman antiquities, the other large group in Lafreri's production, were studied more in greater detail. However, the links between the lettering in the two groups, and the similarities in the inscriptions, has not yet been scrutinised.

The present analysis aims at revealing the different aspects of the production of religious prints, and the various motivations behind the combination of text and image. This first subchapter focuses on prints that include inscriptions combining the interpretation of the depicted topic with comments on the designers. They provide a comparative perspective to the first case study, the analysis of similar prints with texts praising the inventors in Cock's stock. In the following subchapters, prints are sorted according to the inventors of the designs. Prints after Raphael and Michelangelo are examined separately from the prints after the younger generation of painters who lived and worked in Rome around the same time of Lafreri's business. The goal of the separation of prints after famous masters and younger painters is to detect the differences from the reproductive point of view between the representations of these painters in the prints. On the other hand, this case study explores whether the captions were unified and standardised regardless of the inventors, and whether older images were contextualised according to the taste of a different religious culture by the means of additional texts. The overall objective is to find out the function of texts composed for the images of religious works of art.

In 1559 and 1562, Antonio Lafreri published two prints reproducing works by Michelangelo and Giotto with captions mentioning the topic and the inventor of the design at the same time (cat.96-97). Both prints were engraved by Nicolas Beatrizet who was most probably responsible for the inscriptions as well. These texts could be considered as extended signatures and minute descriptions of all the details of the images. Especially the

---

[326] Bury, *The Print in Italy*, 127.
[327] Landau and Parshall, *The Renaissance Print*, 304.

earlier one after Giotto's *Navicella* focuses on the circumstances of production. Beatrizet gave all the details, starting with the exact location and subject, which is followed by the technique of the original work, the name and native city of the artist, and finally the date of creation. The mosaic is praised as a work executed in a very fine manner in every detail. The second part of the caption expands on the role of the engraver, emphasising his task in the creation of a similarly fine copy. The inscription in the later print after Michelangelo's *Last Judgment* fresco similarly draws the viewer's attention to the great achievement of the engraver. In this text, Michelangelo's skill and genius (*ars et ingenium*) is praised for having depicted the day of the Last Judgment admirably. Beatrizet played with these laudatory words in order to highlight his own achievement by contrasting his talent with the great master's, saying that he depicted the image "with effort and intelligence," and "in the most elegant way." Both inscriptions could also be understood as dedications in which the engraver addressed the anonymous audience of the prints, drawing attention to the artistic merit of both the original artists and himself. Beatrizet carefully commented on the status of the prints, assuring the viewer that the printed image is not an inferior form of art.

These inscriptions are concise, focusing on the factual details; they give the viewers the most important information about the images (designer, subject, technique and location of the original, engraver). It is probably not a coincidence that this kind of inscription was to be found in prints reproducing the most famous works of Giotto and Michelangelo. One can observe in these captions the antiquarian interest in the accurate details of the image, similar to the prints of Roman antiquities. Beatrizet was indeed involved in reproducing antique ruins and sculptural fragments, for example his prints of the sarcophagus depicting the *Battle of the Amazons* (1559) or the relief of the *Triumph of Marcus Aurelius* (1560) were published by Lafreri.[328] These prints and many more similar sheets gave the antiquarian collectors the most important information about the depicted pieces in the same way. The similarity of the inscriptions in prints by Beatrizet reflects his role in inscribing the sheets. The voice of the texts, the signature-like character, already gave a hint about his involvement in creating the inscriptions. The style of the lettering is identical in the prints reproducing modern and antique works. The similar character of the inscriptions may indicate that the works of Giotto and Michelangelo were also regarded as spectacles of the city, similar in their artistic merit to the remains of antiquity. A further example, that was not published by Lafreri but engraved by Beatrizet, is the print after

---

[328] On Beatrizet reproducing ancient sculptural works see Michael Bury, "Beatrizet and the 'Reproduction' of Antique Relief Sculpture," *Print Quarterly* 13 (1996): 111-126.

Michelangelo's sculpture, the *Risen Christ*. The sheet includes the same type of inscription indicating the technique, material, subject, designer, and location of the original. The print was occasionally inserted in the *Speculum* collections of printed antiquities. Michelangelo's sculpture clearly succeeded in being included among the ancient works of art.[329]

The concise inscriptions typical for Beatrizet's prints had an impact on other sheets by Lafreri that were engraved by different printmakers. A few years later Lafreri published a print after a famous painting by Raphael, which included a shorter but similar caption. The concise inscription in the *Transfiguration* describes the subject, determines the location of the painting, and identifies the artist in one sentence (cat.98). This print was probably also intended as an image of the spectacular Roman painting, and was sought after by collectors focusing on the famous works of the city. The inscription in the 1561 print after Andrea del Sarto's *Visitation*, which was published both by Lafreri and Salamanca, also follows the practice seen in Beatrizet's prints (cat.99). First, the subject of the image is indicated. Then the viewer is told that the Florentine Andreas, the most famous painter of his age, created the original in a Florentine church. Interestingly, the compiler of the text made a mistake concerning the location of the fresco since the image reproduces Sarto's fresco from the Chiostro dello Scalzo, and not from the Santissima Annunziata church. The Florentine work was presented in a similar fashion to the famous Roman examples, however, the lack of local knowledge is apparent in this case.

The inscriptions analysed so far do not expand on the subjects of the depictions: it is just one element among the information communicated about the images. Among Lafreri's publications, there are also sheets that include texts combining the information on the original work and the religious function of the image. The very first print by Lafreri with this kind of inscription was published in 1566. The text in Adamo Scultori's engraving after Michelangelo's *Pietà* is also interesting from an art theoretical point of view (cat.100). Namely, the caption refers to some ideas about the ideal of a perfect sculpture. At first glance, the text seems to be similar to those by Beatrizet; it starts with the name of the designer and the location of the original work. However, the second part is a comment on the expressive qualities of Michelangelo's sculpture. According to the text, the statue makes the viewer feel the pain of the suffering mother, and makes the audience see the miserable figures as real bodies rather than sculpted marble. This sentence implies

---

[329] Bernadine Barnes, *Michelangelo in Print: Reproductions as Response in the Sixteenth Century* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010), 158.

two major ideas. First, the religious use and significance of the sculpture and the print are emphasised by the reference to the viewer's compassion. On the other hand, the same sentence could have been read and interpreted as a praise of Michelangelo's ability in tricking the perception of the viewer by creating a sculpture that seems to be alive. The concept of the living sculpture was already present in Classical epigrams of the Greek Anthology as a sophisticated strategy to praise sculptors in ekphrastic poetry. Dante applied the same topos in a passage of his *Purgatory* (10.20-45), when describing a marble relief of the Annunciation. Sources indicate that the idea had a long tradition in general. However, Rebekah Smick showed that the topos was also closely connected to Michelangelo's *Pietà* in art theoretical writings from the middle of the sixteenth century. This tradition of interpreting the marble as living started with Benedetto Varchi's lecture of 1547 (published in 1550), and continued in various poetic and prose descriptions and appraisals of Michelangelo's sculpture.[330] Compared to these commentaries, the text in Scultori's print is innovative in combining the topos of the living marble with the compassion of the viewer. The landscape in the background helps to complete the illusion: by showing the future tomb of Christ, the print places the sculpture in the religious narrative. Michelangelo's statue was often put in imaginary landscapes in earlier prints, however, Scultori's sheet firstly connected the figures and the image of the open tomb.[331] The inscription speaks about the image of the statue as if the viewer is standing in front of the original; the print is regarded as a mediator of the original work, not only from a stylistic point of view but also with respect to its effect on the viewer.

A similar approach to the printed image can be observed in one of the most innovative and complex but least studied prints by Lafreri. The copy of Martino Rota's sheet after Michelangelo's Sistine fresco of the Last Judgment was already mentioned in the introduction since it is an ideal example for the reproductive and utilitarian aspects being combined together in unity (cat.117).[332] The anonymous print was published

---

[330] John Shearman, *Only connect... Art and the Spectator in the Italian Renaissance* (Princeton: University Press, 1992), 114; Rebekah Smick, "Evoking Michelangelo's Vatican *Pietà*: Transformations in the Topos of Living Stone," in *The Eye of the Poet: Studies in Reciprocity of the Visual and Literary Arts from the Renaissance to the Present,* ed. Amy Golahny (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1996), 23-52; Idem, "Vivid Thinking: Word and Image in Descriptive Techniques of the Renaissance," in *Antiquity and its Interpreters*, ed. Alina Payne, Ann Kuttner, and Rebekah Smick (Cambridge: University Press, 2000), 159-173.
[331] For the previous prints see Barnes, *Michelangelo in Print*, 150-151.
[332] For the place of Rota's print in the sequence of printed images after the Last Judgment see Barnes, *Michelangelo in Print*, 109.

sometime after 1569, among the late publications of Lafreri.[333] The sheet includes a poetic inscription below the image, the first example by Lafreri that a longer poem combined the explanation of the subject with comments on the designer of the original work. The poem urges the reader-viewers to meditate on the dreadful subject and to appreciate Michelangelo's work. The text even refers to the colour of the original image, which is peculiar since the viewer is looking at the printed monochrome version of the fresco. This reference to the original is similar to the *pinxit* inscriptions in many prints that allude to the designer. By referring to the colour, the text indicates that the print was regarded as a mediator that enabled the viewers to imagine the painted original.

Through formulating the essence of the image, its artistic and religious message in verse, the anonymous *Last Judgment* comes close to the art theoretical framework built around some prints in Antwerp. Northern prints may have had an influence on Lafreri when he decided to include a poem with artistic references next to a famous image. As shown in the first case study, Hieronymus Cock in Antwerp operated with similar inscriptions already in the 1550s, the most famous among them is Dominicus Lampsonius's poem on the reproduction of Frans Floris's *Brazen Serpent* (cat.1). Lafreri must have been aware of the print produced by his northern rival, and this might have influenced the creation of the new printed version of Michelangelo's well-known image.

Longer comments on the reproductive aspect of the prints are rare in Lafreri's stock. Moreover, these comments are more likely the evidence of the status of the images as highlights of the city, comparable to antiquities, than comments on the artist's talent and the qualities of his work. Inscriptions concerning the religious topic and meaning of the pictures are more common. The focus of the next subchapters is on the religious message of the prints, exploring how this content is transmitted to the audience with the help of texts. By looking at how the reproductive and devotional aspects of the prints intertwine, this chapter intends to show whether Lafreri's religious images were innovative in their text-image combinations, and how they fitted the rest of the publisher's stock without famous artistic backgrounds. The Counter-Reformation clearly played an important role in forming the message of texts and images, however, it was not the only force shaping the prints. Lafreri built his stock of prints consciously and that fact implied the purposeful and calculated combination of images and texts.

---

[333] Alessia Alberti calls the engraver Monogrammist CBS because of the letters found in the lower right corner of the image. Alessia Alberti, *L'indice di Antonio Lafrery: origini e ricostruzione di un repertorio di immagini a stampa nell'eta' della controriforma* (PhD thesis, Universita Cattolica del Sacro Cuore Milano, 2009), 343.

Prints after Raphael's design:
communication with the audience

In the material after Raphael's design one can find examples for very different kind of inscriptions, both concerning the subject and Raphael's authorship. As already mentioned, Cort's engraving of the *Transfiguration* (cat.98) presented the painting as an attraction of a Roman church, while in the print of the *Madonna di Loreto*, that was based on a similarly well-known if not even more famous painting, Raphael was not even mentioned (cat.92).[334] There are several examples that include a short reference to Raphael in various forms but only a few include longer captions concerning the subject. There are many prints after Raphael without narrative inscriptions (e.g., copies of the *Massacre of the Innocents*), and even if there are captions in prints, they are usually brief, title-like sentences (e.g., *Coronation of the Virgin* and *Ascension of the Virgin* by the Master of the Die).[335] This section focuses on the most significant prints with longer narrative captions. The main questions are how these prints fitted Lafreri's stock, whether they were connected to other prints through visual or textual motifs, and how similar they were to other religious prints that were not designed by famous painters of the era. The most important issue of Italian religious printmaking, how the inscriptions were used to establish the connection between the viewer and the printed image, plays a central role in the chapter.

When Lafreri published copies of two early prints by the Raphael workshop, both images were completed with four lines of Latin verse on the lower margins (cat.101-102). The *Christ Falling on the Way to Calvary* was originally engraved by Agostino Veneziano in 1517 after the monumental painting of the *Spasimo*.[336] The first version of the *Descent from the Cross* was engraved by Marcantonio Raimondi, presumably after drawn inventions of Raphael.[337] Neither print include texts in their original versions. The Neo-Latin poems were added when anonymous engravers copied the images for Lafreri. The size and layout of the prints is very similar, the address of Lafreri (*Romae Ant. Lafrerij*)

---

[334] The *Madonna di Loreto* was the most copied work by Raphael; more than sixty painted versions were created after the original before the eighteenth century and there are also early printed replicas. Boorsch, *The Engravings of Giorgio Ghisi*, 173; Jürg Meyer zur Capellen, *Raphael: A Critical Catalogue of His Paintings*, vol. 2, *The Roman Religious Paintings, ca. 1508-1520* (Landshut: Arcos, 2005), 92.

[335] Bartsch XIV.23.20.A, XIV.24.20.B, XV.188.7, and 189.9.

[336] It has been suggested that Veneziano did not have time to create the print between the finishing of the panel and its transport to Sicily, so he did not copy the finished painting but drawings and possibly the modello. Landau and Parshall, *The Renaissance Print*, 121.

[337] Innis H. Shoemaker, *The Engravings of Marcantonio Raimondi* (Lawrence, KA: Spencer Museum of Art, 1981), 160.

and the reference to Raphael (*Raphael urb in*) look the same, and are put on the plate in the same place.[338] The form of the Latin letters is also very close to each other in the two prints; the only difference is in the use of punctuation (which is much more extensive on the *Calvary*). This may indicate that the same printmaker engraved the two prints at the same time, or if one was created later, then it was intended as a pair to the other. Both poems end with the same word (*onus*), and they sound as question and answer that belong together. The two images are not directly consecutive scenes of Christ's Passion, so it seems that Raphael's authorship connects them. The texts were composed and added consciously, so when a customer bought the prints for Raphael's famous images, they got a thematically united pair of sheets at the same time. These paper objects do not only celebrate artistic achievement but they offer the opportunity for a religious meditative exercise.

On the *Calvary* print, a first person narrator laments about the weight of the cross by comparing Christ's suffering with a personal concern about bearing burdens (cat.101). The text exemplifies the reaction of an ideal viewer to the image of Christ carrying his cross: it focuses on the feeling of compassion for Christ's pains while the narrator is also meditating about their own burdens. Thus the inscription fits the intentional meaning of the original panel that was made for the high altar of Sta. Maria dello Spasimo church in Palermo. In line with the dedication of the church, the main topic of the painting was the *compassio Mariae*.[339] Visually, this remained the leitmotif in the print as well, with the slight modification of involving the viewer into the compassion through the inscribed poem. On the other hand, with the help of the caption, the focus is shifted from the swoon of Mary to another figure in the depiction that provides the viewer with an even more fitting model of compassion, Simon of Cyrene. In the picture, he jumps to the falling Christ and grabs the cross to help him, while looking angrily at the soldiers. Simon is a figure with which the viewers can identify themselves: he takes the heavy burden from Christ with confidence. He seems to be the opposite of the poetic narrator who is lamenting about the weight of the cross, and has bad consciousness about abandoning his own duty.

The contrast of the ideal Simon and the hesitant, self-doubting narrator was not a new way to interpret a scene like Raphael's. In 1534, the priest Cola Giacomo D'Alibrando published his poem of seventy-six stanzas that describes the production

---

[338] This was not the usual practice, the place of the address varied a lot in the prints.

[339] Meyer zur Capellen, *Raphael*, vol. 2, 150.

process, installation, design, and reception of Polidoro da Caravaggio's Sicilian altarpiece, the *Way to Calvary*. In the thirty-ninth stanza of his ekphrasis, when Alibrando described Simon taking the cross from the falling Christ, he interrupted the narration. He cried out, addressing and blaming himself, that he was only lamenting about the pain but did not help the Saviour. He urged himself to follow Simon's example. In this ecstatic moment, Alibrando wrote that he saw Christ himself instead of the painting, felt his pain, and wanted to act instead of the laments.[340] Seeing the figure of Simon meant an emotional peak in the description of the painting, where the narrator felt the need to reflect and respond to the painting, confusing the depiction with reality. Similarly, the narrator imagined himself as part of the image in the print after Raphael's design, when he cried out "Why, oh Christ, does your burden seem so heavy now?" This sentence implies that he follows the good example set by Simon and finally takes the (imaginary and allegorical) burden from Christ. The inscription also features a highly emotional moment, urging the audience to respond to the image in a similar way.

The inscription on the *Descent from the Cross* uses a comparable strategy of involving the viewer in the (pictorial) narrative (cat.102). After explaining Christ's sacrifice and his death on the cross, the narrator turns to the witnesses of the Crucifixion ("Oh pious crowd, receive the lifeless Lord"). By observing the print, the viewer could also become one of the witnesses receiving Christ in a symbolic way. In this print, the duty is not so harsh and heavy anymore, since the viewer does not have to take the cross but the body of Christ, the "sweet burden." The sacrifice of the Crucifixion (which is not depicted in the two prints after Raphael but was available among Lafreri's prints in many forms) transformed the burden of pain into salvation. The dialogue of the two poems is also interesting from the point of view of poetic voice. In the *Calvary*, the first person narrator is talking to Christ. The viewers could easily embrace this text and identify themselves with the voice. In the *Descent from the Cross*, a much more neutral, third person voice draws the conclusion and addresses the viewer, answering all the doubts raised in the previous print.

The analysed inscriptions served the purpose of communicating with the viewer. The small, black-and-white images on paper were necessarily not as spectacular as monumental paintings or sculptures. Texts added to the printed images help intensify the

---

[340] Cola Giacomo D'Alibrando, *Il spasmo di Maria Vergine: Ottave per un dipinto di Polidoro da Caravaggio a Messina*, ed. Barbara Agosti, Giancarlo Alfano, and Ippolita di Majo (Naples: Paparo, 1999), 18-19.

viewer's (emotional) response to the depiction. The role of the first person narrator in the Neo-Latin poems is similar to the role of the suffering narrators in the Petrarchist vernacular poems in the prints by Salamanca, analysed in the third case study. The first person voice could build an intimate relation between the printed image and its viewer-reader that could be useful in religious contemplation as well as in meditation on the self. It is also an effective tool to draw the viewer into the composition.

Involving the viewer-reader could also happen with the help of seemingly descriptive texts. Two further prints after Raphael's design provide good examples for different practices. Giorgio Ghisi's print that reproduces Raphael's *Madonna di Loreto* or *Madonna of the Veil* was already mentioned in the introduction (cat.92). The painting was displayed on feast days in the Roman church Santa Maria del Popolo, not far from Antonio Lafreri's shop.[341] The relatively small size of the printed sheet may indicate that the intended audience was, at least partly, the crowd of pilgrims who visited Rome in the jubilee year of 1575.[342] The *Ascension of Christ*, engraved by Andrea Marelli, put the figures of Raphael's lost drawing for the Scuola Nuova cartoon in new context by adding a spectacular landscape background (cat.103).[343] Raphael's name does not appear in either sheet, although the models of these prints were well-known. Were these prints only meant for religious purposes? How do the texts introduce the content of the sheets?

For the first instance, the verses on Ghisi's *Madonna of the Veil* and Marelli's *Ascension of Christ* seem to simply describe the scenes depicted with an emphasis on the emotions of the figures. In the case of the Madonna, the verse about the smiles of mother and son complements the delicate play of the hands, gazes, and draperies in the image, leading the eye of the viewer through the composition. Similarly, the poem describing the Ascension follows the dynamics of the image, first commenting on the figure of Christ ("The vanquisher of the all vanquishing death rises up to heaven"), then leading the viewer to contemplate the figures of the eleven apostles who follow the ascension with their eyes and thoughts. The last line formulates the wish of the apostles to follow Christ in his ascension to heaven, a desire that the viewer can share with the depicted figures. Similarly, the last line on the sheet of the Madonna, the mother's gaze at her son is parallel to the spectator's meditation on the image. Like in the previously examined Passion sheets, we

---

[341] Boorsch, *The Engravings of Giorgio Ghisi*, 172.

[342] Bury, *The Print in Italy*, 120-121.

[343] The print most probably copied the figures from an earlier engraving by Nicolas Beatrizet, from 1541, that was also published by Lafreri in the second state. Beatrizet's print mentioned Raphael's authorship (RA. VR. INVENT.). Rubach, *ANT. LAFRERI FORMIS ROMAE*, 186.

find parallels in these two texts as well, although in this case it is not probable that they belonged together as a pair. The "eyes" of the depicted figures gain an important role in the second part of both inscriptions: the Virgin fixes her eyes on her son, and the apostles follow the ascending Christ with their eyes. The texts direct the attention of the viewer-reader towards the "gazes" in the image, this way providing the viewer with models of meditation.

Besides offering an opportunity for the audience to emotionally identify with the figures depicted, the verses also add a sophisticated, intellectual dimension to the images. The prints are more than simple devotional imagery, although they served this purpose as well, in a refined way. Both poems allude to the works of Virgil; the motif of the smiling boy and his parents is a topic in the fourth eclogue, while the first words *It coelo* on the *Ascension* were taken from the eleventh book of the Aeneid.[344] Just as Raphael was not credited in these sheets, the anonymous authors of the texts did not refer to Virgil's name or works either. However, the formal features of the prints, both pictorial and literary, must have been recognisable for an educated audience who could read the sophistications of Neo-Latin poems and Raphael's style. The visual language of Raphael and the texts inspired by Virgilian style represented a similar artistic register, and they were combined to meet the expectations of the audience concerning decorum. This feature is apparent in the prints after Raphael's design. Nevertheless, stylistic unity was a general principle when combining texts and images in single sheets, especially when the texts were composed for the prints. The style of the images usually determined the character of the texts, parallel artistic goals in text and image created a unity in the sheets. From this point of view, the prints after Raphael are comparable to Cock's religious prints with late antique texts. Especially similar is the case of the *Carrying of the Cross* where Bosch's image was made *all'antica* by Lambert Lombard and was combined with an excerpt from Sedulius's epic poem of Virgilian style to emphasise the stylistic choice (cat.37). The similar artistic unity in the prints after Raphael suggests that the sheets were not only practical tools in religious contemplation but they had aesthetic value for the connoisseurs as well.

Evoking emotions in the viewer was a strategy applied in several prints published by Lafreri. The inscription in a print attributed after the design of Francesco Salviati is

---

[344] *Incipe, parve puer, risu cognoscere matrem / matri longa decem tulerunt fastidia menses / incipe, parve puer qui non risere parenti...* Virgil, *Eclogue*s, IV.60-63; *...it caelo clamorque uirum clangorque tubarum...* Virgil, *Aeneid,* XI.192.

interestingly close to Ghisi's Raphael-Madonna.[345] The print after Salviati depicts Adam and Eve with their newborn child in the wilderness (cat.104). The six-line verse on the lower margin starts with a very similar description of the sweet play of smiles and kisses between mother and son as in Ghisi's print. Then the description in the *Adam and Eve* print turns into an explanation of how the baby, although born from sinful flesh, brings happiness not only for his parents, but also for the whole world. The print was identified with the first birth ("il primo nato") in Lafreri's stocklist, which would indicate that we see the newborn Cain in Eve's arms.[346] Nevertheless, the caption encourages both the parents depicted and probably also the audience to be merry (*este hylares*) because the child brings long-lasting joy and makes them stronger. A motif in the background, two branches intertwining each other in the shape of a cross, implies that the image could also be understood as a typological reference to another birth. Eve could be interpreted as the antitype of Mary, especially because of her pose holding the child. Although they are not exactly the same size, the *Adam and Eve* after Salviati and the *Madonna of the Veil* after Raphael (cat.92) are linked. The pose of the children and especially the similarities of the Neo-Latin verses indicate that they implied the possibility to be paired by the purchaser. The publication of the frontispieces also suggests that Lafreri counted on the collector's desire to mix, match, and organise prints.[347] Furthermore, the similarity of the texts indicates that Lafreri was also conscious about the combination of texts and images, and at least partially intended to have a coherent stock of prints. The connection provided the clients with an opportunity and not with a compulsory order. The *Adam and Eve* print was also linked to another print presumably after Salviati's design, the *Adam and Eve Lamenting Abel* (catalogued in the stocklist as the first death, "il primo morto," cat.105).[348] Emotions play an important role in this print as well, the sadness and lament of the parents is emphasised both visually and in the Latin text. The wretchedness of Cain's sin is also highlighted, making clear that the adult life of Cain did not meet the joyful expectations expressed at his birth.

It is hard to find further examples for such close connection between the prints, but the sheets after Raphael's design fitted well a larger group of religious prints published by Lafreri. The communication between the depiction and the viewer is an important purpose of captions in general, and arousing emotions is a usual strategy to achieve this purpose.

---

[345] Preparatory drawing in Museum of Arizona, Tucson. Rubach, *ANT. LAFRERI FORMIS ROMAE*, 138.
[346] Rubach, *ANT. LAFRERI FORMIS ROMAE*, 432.
[347] Bury, *The Print in Italy*, 49-50.
[348] Rubach, *ANT. LAFRERI FORMIS ROMAE*, 138.

For example, the Latin lines in Cherubino Alberti's small sheet depicting Christ carrying the cross with the Virgin in the background addresses all the mothers in the name of the suffering Christ (cat.106). Referring to the compassion, the figure of Christ advises the onlookers not to weep for him but for themselves. Similarly, the verse in a small *Ecce Homo* sheet explains how the suffering of Christ means the suffering of all the faithful, again addressing all the viewers in the vocative (cat.107). These are typical examples of small devotional sheets with didactic inscriptions that make the depicted figures speak to the viewer. We find a similarly didactic tone in the caption of the *Crucifixion* by Tobias Cicchino (cat.108). However, this text is comparable to the verses in the *Madonna* and *Ascension* prints after Raphael. The anonymous poet of Cicchino's print started the four-line Neo-Latin poem with borrowing from a classical text.[349] This must have been a conscious choice to set up the literary style of the piece, just as the authors used quotes from Virgil in the texts matched with the images after Raphael.

Raphael's images fitted this context of small and traditional religious prints published by Lafreri. The publisher certainly meant them as possible elements in an album of religious images collected under his frontispieces. Although he did not publish perfectly matching images but we can still find traces of planning in his attempt to create small groups of certain prints. Several examples demonstrated how Lafreri succeeded in creating thematic or meditative connections between the prints based on the design of the same artist, in this case Raphael. In Lafreri's stock, subject matter and artistic authorship completed each other to satisfy the collectors' needs. Prints chosen on the basis of authorship offered the opportunity of meditative use as well. Moreover, these prints also provided the audience with examples of Neo-Latin poetry based on classical sources and style. While one could acquire prints with fashionable Petrarchist love poetry from Salamanca, Lafreri offered elegant Neo-Latin religious poetry matched to the images of Raphael. The literary merit must have been just as important in marketing the prints, as the artistic fame of Raphael.

Prints after Michelangelo: the Jesuit connection

In the introduction of this case study, some prints after Michelangelo's works were already mentioned and analysed. Scultori's sheet after the *Pietà* or the anonymous Sistine

---

[349] *Summa Deum pietas* is from Statius's *Consolatio ad Claudium Etruscum*, part of his *Silvae*. Statius, *Silvae*, ed. and tr. D. R. Shackleton Bailey, Loeb Classical Library 206 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2015), 182.

Last Judgment were among the first prints by Lafreri that included inscriptions combining comments on artistic merit and religious content. In contrast with Cock's practice who used laudatory captions to propagate less famous artists' works, in Rome, these inscriptions first appeared in prints after Michelangelo. This subchapter is intended to solve the questions how Michelangelo's fame influenced the message of the prints, and whether the religious sheets after his designs were different from what we could observe in the case of Raphael.

Before returning to the *Last Judgment* sheet to examine its religious message and significance in details, inscriptions in prints after Michelangelo's designs will be explored in general. It was pointed out in the chapter on Salamanca that the prints after Michelangelo's design were usually not completed with narrative inscriptions. This observation also applies to the prints published by Lafreri. While Michelangelo's authorship is usually acknowledged in the sheets, captions about the depicted subjects are rare. As already analysed in the introduction, the works of the Florentine artist were usually regarded as attractions of Rome, and the prints after them had a similar status as prints after antiquities, especially in the case of the Sistine frescos. Giulio Bonasone's print after the *Judith and Holofernes* scene from the Sistine ceiling is an exception with the six-line Italian poem inserted into the image (cat.109). However, this text, that was supposed to be written by the engraver himself, is a simple account of the Biblical story, rather explaining than interpreting the depiction.[350] Among the prints after the presentation drawings, the *Tityus* and the *Ganymede* include Latin captions but they are concise and descriptive titles (cat.110-111). All the three prints are examples for the kind of lettering that transmitted information about the stories in a concise way, and aimed at helping the viewers in the identification rather than in the interpretation.

Another presentation drawing, this time with a religious topic for Vittoria Colonna provides a more interesting example. In this case, the drawing itself included an inscription, a quote from Dante's *Paradise* (29.91), which all the prints reproducing this drawn version of the Pietà took over. Beatrizet's print, published by Lafreri in 1547, was no exception from this, although the French engraver put the figures in an entirely new context, in a decorative architectural background (cat.112). The line by Dante was added by Michelangelo who had the habit to quote Petrarch and Dante (sometimes by heart) in

---

[350] Barnes assumed that Bonasone wrote the text. Barnes, *Michelangelo in Print*, 32.

his notes and drawings.[351] The prints reflect this practice and also the predilection for the vernacular classics in general. This is also one of the rare examples when there is evidence that the designer matched the text with the image.

The above-mentioned examples all acknowledge Michelangelo as the inventor of the compositions but there are also religious prints after his design that do not credit his role. A *Crucifixion* sheet seems to represent a typical example of a devotional print. Lafreri published the copy of a print by Philippe Soye without the credit given to Michelangelo, although in the model sheet his role was properly acknowledged (cat.113).[352] The print includes the same Biblical quotation (1 Peter 2:24) that was inscribed on Rogier van der Weyden's image of the *Deposition* in the print published by Cock (cat.48.a). In Lafreri's case, the whole line was used to express the central message of the salvation, including the reference to the healing power of Christ's wounds. This difference in the selection and editing of the Biblical excerpt provides further evidence in support of the hypothesis formulated in the chapter on Cock's prints. The religious context had an influence on the combination of text and image in prints. The more traditional interpretation of Christ's Passion with an emphasis on his physical suffering and his wounds fitted the context of Counter-Reformation Rome. The emphasis on this aspect of the print might explain the lack of reference to Michelangelo's authorship in the first state.

There are two other examples among the prints after Michelangelo's drawings where the distinction of reproductive versus devotional prints seems to work. The difference between the two versions of the *Madonna of Silence* by the French printmaker, Philippe de Soye, provides the first case. The 1566 sheet followed Michelangelo's drawing more closely and referred to him as the inventor, while Biblical quotes and a sentence-like concise caption about the subject was added to the design (cat.114).[353] The other, smaller variant of the same subject from 1565 transformed the poses of the figures, however, the composition remained similar to Michelangelo's (cat.115). Nevertheless, the Florentine artist was not credited in this version, and the caption about the subject took up the entire lower margin together with Lafreri's address. The explanation of the discrepancy might be that this version was not regarded anymore as Michelangelo's design because of the changes. Even more intriguing is the second case, the versions of *Jesus and the Samaritan*

---

[351] Barkan, *Michelangelo, a Life on Paper*, 69.
[352] Rubach, *ANT. LAFRERI FORMIS ROMAE*, 178.
[353] Soye probably copied another print and not directly the drawing. Rubach, *ANT. LAFRERI FORMIS ROMAE*, 198. For the discussion of the printed versions of Michelangelo's design see Barnes, *Michelangelo in Print*, 82-85.

Woman at the Well (cat.116.a-b). Lafreri published Beatrizet's print of this subject with the reference to Michelangelo, and a copy of it without Michelangelo's name but with the relevant Biblical quote (John 4:13-14) instead. The text first identifies the scene, and then provides the viewer with Jesus's words to the Samaritan woman, thus makes the depicted figure speak in a very similar manner as Biblical quotes made figures speak in Cock's religious prints. Seemingly, Lafreri offered his audience the choice between the "speaking" religious image and Michelangelo's invention, in other words between devotional and reproductive prints. Although the image remained almost the same in the two versions of the print, the different texts indeed shifted the emphasis of meaning. A possible explanation is that the copy of Bearizet's print was a response to the increasing demand for the image. However, by the time the copy was completed, the expectations towards prints with religious topics might have transformed.

Certainly, the preferences about the appearance of the prints must have changed during the long timespan of Lafreri's business. Michelangelo's images were especially on demand, and prints were copied and published in several versions. The print after the Sistine *Last Judgment* fresco shows this change in the expectations perfectly (cat.117). The sheet was mentioned already in the first subchapter concerning its reproductive aspect. Here the focus is on its religious message, how it fitted or differed from the other examples mentioned above. When choosing this particular *Last Judgment* print from Lafreri's stock, the viewer received a complex product that satisfied the need for a sophisticated religious message and artistic reproduction at the same time. The caption describes the image as a mirror (*speculum*) of the fate of humankind, life and death on the day of divine judgment. The didactic role of the scene is emphasised in the first stanza with the subjunctive form *discat* ("he shall learn") that appears two times. In the second stanza, the narrator of the poem urges the reader-viewer "to examine, reflect upon, and fear" the depiction that the skilled hand of Michelangelo created. These two lines encourage the viewers to respond and react to the image, and praise Michelangelo's ability in creating an expressive picture at the same time. His skill, colour, and hand created an image that generates even the feeling of fear in the spectator. Pietro Aretino, one of the first commentators of Michelangelo's work, emphasised the horror that the image caused in the viewer. He pointed out that the picture made the spectator tremble as if he was experiencing the Last Judgment in reality. Since Aretino's letter was published several times, his thoughts on the fresco must have been popular and influential still in the 1560s-1570s, providing the

interpretative framework even for Lafreri's print.[354] The inscribed text below the printed image ends with a philosophical question about how one will experience that dreadful time if one does not fail at the judgment. The text suggests that the print enables the viewer to imagine both Michelangelo's admirable image, and also to meditate on the Day of Judgment.

While the inscription makes it clear that this print was regarded as both a truthful reproduction of the fresco and an expressive religious image, the setting of the picture also supports both functions of the print. The depiction of the architectural context reminds the viewer of the original place of the image as a wall painting, and the portrait of Michelangelo further emphasises his authorship. On the other hand, the rich decorative frame around the image and the poetic commentary associates the print with devotional sheets that were pasted on the wall. This kind of ornamental frame is highly unusual among Lafreri's publications, except for two anonymous prints depicting the bust images of Christ and Mary (cat.118.a-b). The frames in the three prints are surprisingly similar in their motifs and layout: black floral forms and white, intertwining ribbons encircle the images and the tablets bearing the captions. The three prints are also similar in their size, the *Last Judgment* is only a little smaller than the other two (same height but less wide). Both the figure of Christ and the Virgin look downwards (although the direction of the gaze is more downwards in Mary's image), and turn either towards each other if one perceives them as a pair of images, or towards a third picture in the middle. The very similar frames suggest a close connection among the three nearly same size prints: Lafreri's clients could have assembled them as a triptych.

This connection to the images of Christ as *Salvator mundi* and the most beautiful Virgin definitely places Michelangelo's image among other devotional prints, just like the prints after Raphael were connected to other sheets through the narrative inscriptions. The bust portraits of the holy figures with radiant haloes look like printed icons, and even the filigree-like, ornamental frame accentuates this impression. The texts inscribed under the images set up a traditional prayer-like situation between the reader-viewer and the depicted figure. The two lines underneath the picture of the Virgin praise her as unique among women being daughter, bride, and mother of God at the same time. The inscription under Christ's image starts with praise parallel to the Virgin's, addressing Christ as ruler of the

---

[354] Bernadine Barnes, *Michelangelo's Last Judgment: the Renaissance Response* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 75-78. For the Italian text of Aretino's letter see Pietro Aretino, *Lettere, il primo e il secondo libro*, ed. Francesco Flora (Milan, 1960), 236-239.

world, saviour, and creator. The second line evokes emotions in the viewer, and creates the prayer-like relation of the viewer and the depicted figure.[355] However, the texts in these prints are not quotes from well-known Biblical or liturgical sources that the viewer could evoke when seeing the lines. They might have been written for the prints just like all the other Neo-Latin poems analysed from Lafreri's stock so far. The images of Christ and the Virgin seem to be "modernised" versions of traditional devotional prints that were intended for an educated Catholic audience of the Counter-Reformation, just like the print after Michelangelo's *Last Judgment*.

Interestingly, the reception history of the "most beautiful Virgin" print gives a hint about this supposed audience and about the use of these images in the religious context of the last decades of the sixteenth-century. It has not been noted yet that the image of the Virgin was copied in a woodcut and inserted among the illustrations of the first Jesuit treatise on the Virgin (cat.118.c). Petrus Canisius's *De Maria Virgine incomparabili et Dei genitrice sacrosancta libri quinque* was first published in Ingolstadt in 1577, probably just a few years after Lafreri's print. The woodcut copy of the Virgin is put between the first and second book, and was preceded by Philippus Menzelius's ekphrastic poem. Canisius did not only use the image of the Virgin but incorporated also the verse from Lafreri's print. The text was interpreted as the titulus of this specific icon of Mary, "daughter, bride, and mother of God".[356] Walter S. Melion examined the place and significance of the image of the Virgin in the treatise, and put it in the context of Canisius's defence of the use of religious images and visual devotion. As he explained, the image of Mary served as a starting-point for the viewer's own contemplation and also provided an ideal model of prayer, visually and spiritually.[357]

Canisius's treatise is a prefect example for the use of images during meditation, and he is an ardent defender of religious images in general.[358] Apparently, prints played an important part in his meditation and in the practices he described in the treatise. In this case, the copy and reuse of Lafreri's print cannot be simply explained with the question of

---

[355] *Laetifica uultu pectora nostra tuo* ("Let our hearts rejoice in your face!") which might be read as a reference to 2 Corinthians 4:6 as well.

[356] In the preceding poem Menzelius alludes to this part of the text as well. Petrus Canisius, *De Maria Virgine incomparabili et Dei genitrice sacrosancta libri quinque* (Ingolstadt: David Sartorius, 1577), 99.

[357] As Melion put it, the copy of Lafreri's print served as "the contemplative image of the Virgin's self-image." Walter S. Melion, "*Quae lecta Canisius offert et spectata Diu*: the Pictorial Images in Petrus Canisius's De Maria Virgine of 1577/1583," in *Early Modern Eyes*, ed. Walter S. Melion and Lee Palmer Wandel (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 259.

[358] Naturally, he also emphasises the viewers' awareness of the status of images as representations. Melion, "*Quae lecta Canisius offert et spectata Diu*," 263.

medium, namely that it was easier to provide the woodcutter with a printed model for the illustration. This particular image of the Virgin is described and explained in verse and prose in the first and second book of the treatise. The Jesuit Canisius and his readers can be seen as an ideal example of Lafreri's clients, the "user" of his elegant text-image creations. The image of the Virgin was not the only print by Lafreri that Canisius used in his Marian treatise. He also inserted the woodcut copy of the image of the *Virgin Immaculate with her Symbols*, a print by Cornelis Cort, published in 1567 by Lafreri (cat.119.a). The woodcutter gave a reversed and simplified copy of Cort's print, in this case omitting the original inscription on the lower margin. The image was used two times, as illustration between chapter twelve and thirteen in the third book and between chapter seven and eight in the fifth book of the treatise (cat.119.b).[359] Cort's image depicts an increasingly popular iconography of Mary, the *Tota pulchra* type that combines the Woman Clothed in the Sun from the Book of Revelation and the Old Testament symbols of the Virgin's immaculacy.[360] It is not surprising that Canisius used this image twice in the treatise that was intended to defend the Catholic cult of Mary and the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. The symbols of Mary were also summarised in the Loretan Litany that was printed in Germany in the 1550s most probably at the initiation of Canisius. He visited the Marian pilgrimage site in Loreto several times.[361]

Unsurprisingly, the third print by Lafreri that Canisius used for his treatise depicted the Madonna of Loreto (engraved by Nicolas Beatrizet, published in two versions, cat.94 and 120.a). In this case, the creator of the woodcut followed the engraving freely, keeping the pose of the Virgin and her setting in a decorative niche but adding ornamental details and minor changes to the image (like the motifs on Mary's robe, the crown of the Christ Child, his sitting pose instead of standing, and the decor of the niche). However, the type of the Madonna image is clearly the same in the three prints. Canisius added the paraphrase of Isaiah 7:14 (changing the Vulgate future tense to *perfectum*) on the arch above the Madonna and a further verse about Mary's role in salvation. This woodcut appears at the very beginning of the treatise, after the dedication to the Bavarian duke, Albert V. Canisius probably placed the image of the Madonna of Loreto consciously at the beginning of the work, and thus he revealed the importance of the pilgrimage site concerning the renewed cult of Mary and for the entire treatise.

---

[359] Canisius, *De Maria Virgine*, 291, 589.
[360] About the iconography see Reinhold Baumstark, ed., *Rom in Bayern: Kunst und Spiritualität der ersten Jesuiten* (Munich: Hirmer, 1997), 479.
[361] Heal, *The Cult of the Virgin Mary*, 150.

Loreto also leads to the issue of how Canisius acquired the prints that were published in Rome by Lafreri. In 1568, the Jesuit priest travelled to Rome from Dillingen through Loreto, together with the Augsburg bishop and cardinal, Otto Truchsess von Waldburg. Canisius returned to Augsburg in 1569, while the cardinal remained in Rome until his death in 1573.[362] Canisius could have easily bought the prints in Rome personally, but the cardinal might have connected Lafreri and the Jesuit priest. The Roman publisher dedicated several prints to Waldburg from 1563 onwards, for example the second version of Beatrizet's print of the Madonna of Loreto.[363] Waldburg had a significant personal collection, and acted as an art dealer for Albert V, so it is possible that he was also interested in prints and collecting paper objects.[364] It might not be a coincidence that the Madonna of Loreto dedicated to Waldburg inspired the first full-page woodcut in Canisius's treatise. The connection reveals their common devotion to the Marian cult site; however, it also gives a hint about how Canisius had become aware of Lafreri's publications.

Canisius might have known the *Last Judgment* print as well that also bears a caption indicating its potential use in meditative practice. The link between a Jesuit treatise and Lafreri's prints makes palpable the connection between printmaking and Counter-Reformation religious culture. Seemingly, artistic merit and sublime style was not seen in contradiction with devotional purposes in this medium. The prints after Michelangelo are good examples of the intersection of artistic and religious culture. His images were esteemed not only because of their style but also because of their expressive features that could transmit religious message effectively.

Affective art and Neo-Latin poetry:
prints after the new generation of painters

Besides prints after the famous artists of the first half of the sixteenth century, Lafreri published many works of painters who lived and worked mostly in Rome, around the same time as he was operating his business. This subchapter focuses on those prints after Federico Zuccari, Girolamo Muziano, Marco Pino, and Giulio Clovio that contain narrative captions. The names of these painters were also included in Lafreri's stocklist

---

[362] Peter Rummel, "Der Heilige und der Kirchenfürst," *Jahrbuch des Historischen Vereins Dillingen* 102 (2001): 175.

[363] For the list of the prints with dedication to Waldburg see Alberti, "Contributi per Antoine Lafréry," 112-114.

[364] Noes M. Overbeeke, "Cardinal Otto Truchsess von Waldburg and his Role as Art Dealer for Albrecht V of Bavaria (1568-73)," *Journal of the History of Collections* 6 (1994): 173-179.

(although not as often as Michelangelo or Raphael), and the prints displayed their authorship most of the time prominently.[365] From among the nine prints analysed here after Zuccari's design, only two did not credit him as inventor of the image, while Muziano's name appears on all the examined sheets after his works.

This generation of painters recognised the importance of emotions in communicating with the viewers – an important feature that already appeared in the previously analysed prints. When the prints after their design include verses, these often emphasise and enhance the spiritual involvement of the viewers in the depicted scenes, or give the audience thoughts and ideas to meditate on. For example, the print after Marco Pino's painting, the *Adoration of the Shepherds*, includes a short poem that addresses the spectator several times in four lines (cat.121). The verse starts with the standard exclamation, calling for the viewer's attention with the Latin exclamation *en* ("behold," or "see"), then continuing with an imperative in the second stanza (*disce* "you shall learn"), and ending with three vocatives in the last line ("Oh ashes, oh disgusting dust, oh man"). The poem emphasises the contrast of Jesus being the Son of God, the heavenly king, and the impoverished circumstances of his birth. The anonymous narrator warns the viewer not to look for imperial luxury (*Disce domos Tyrias nec quaerere uestes* - the adjective "Tyrian" alludes to purple, the colour of royal grandeur). The spectator should meditate on the vanity of worldly riches, since death, the fate of mankind will turn all the possessions into dust and ashes (hence the narrator addresses mankind as ashes and dust at the very end of the poem). The text ensures the communication of important ideas, and sets the tone of highly emotional response to the event depicted. In this case, the text enhances a meaning that was already expressed by visual means in the picture. In the foreground, the shepherds appear at the bottom of the stairs leading to the Christ Child. As if the viewer was looking through a window, these figures emerge from behind the frame of the image. Their position, closest to the viewer, suggests that they have a similar place, and their gestures might be seen as models for the spectator, urging for emotional involvement in the scene.

To understand the innovative character of this print, one only has to recall the *Nativity* published by Cock after Bronzino's painting (cat.47.a). Pino's and Bronzino's compositions are similar in the position of the Virgin and the Christ Child in the middle of the image. The two figures of Mary are especially close to each other, both kneeling, covered by rich draperies, looking down to the Holy Child, their hands in a prayer position

---

[365] Rubach, *ANT. LAFRERI FORMIS ROMAE*, 82.

with only the fingertips touching each other. The landscape with mountains and a city in the background, the angels arranged in a circle in the sky, and the stone steps leading to the protagonist are all identical motifs in the two pictures. The close visual connection even suggests that Pino was inspired by Bronzino's image, most probably a printed version of it when creating his own image of the *Adoration of the Shepherds*. The most important difference between the images is the appearance of the gesturing mediator figures in the foreground of Pino's composition. The inscriptions in the two prints published by Cock and Lafreri enhance this difference. As pointed out in the second case study, the texts in Cock's print emphasise the historical aspect of the image, while the caption in Lafreri's publication aims at the involvement of the reader-viewer in the scene.

Gauvin Alexander Bailey emphasised "the importance of affective art" in painting around 1600, especially in connection with Jesuit commissions.[366] In the case of Federico Zuccari or Girolamo Muziano, the Jesuit connection is not only speculative. These painters played an important role in the Society's artistic enterprises in the Eternal City. They developed their visual language and selected their subjects in line with the spiritual milieu of the period, and this is reflected in the prints published after their designs. For example, the predilection for Marian topics and for the depictions of the saints appears among the publications of Lafreri as well. On the other hand, texts and images intended for intense contemplative work served to encourage the participation of the viewer, and captions often aimed at enhancing the emotional effect of prints.

Federico Zuccari was in charge for the first fresco decoration of a Roman Jesuit church, the SS. Annunziata in the Collegio Romano.[367] His tribune vault fresco, the *Annunciation with Prophets*, was lost during later building projects, and the image only survived in a monumental print published by Lafreri in 1571 (cat.122). The existence of a drawing suggests that Zuccari was involved in the production of the print, and adjusted his composition to the medium of engraving.[368] However, the inscription on the lower margin emphasises the role of the print as reproduction of the fresco, and it is further highlighted by the depiction of the spandrels that suggests the original context of the image, the architectural setting. In this case, the inscriptions in the image (on the plates held by the prophets, below the spandrel figures, and on the pieces of paper in the lower corners) were

---

[366] Gauvin Alexander Bailey, *Between Renaissance and Baroque: Jesuit Art in Rome, 1565-1610* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003), 261.

[367] It was probably finished by 1567 when the church was first in use. Bailey, *Between Renaissance and Baroque*, 115.

[368] Drawing in the Louvre. Bury, *The Print in Italy*, 73 and 115. Rubach, *ANT. LAFRERI FORMIS ROMAE*, 148.

most probably also part of the painted image, since they are important elements of the composition and bearers of meaning. Moreover, all the texts are quotations from the Bible, which is self-explanatory in the ecclesiastical context, but rare in Lafreri's prints. Moses starts the row of the prophets, staring at the spectator on the left. He holds the only quote addressing the reader-viewer, thus prompting meditation on the subject.[369] The other texts (the prophecies, the symbolic names of Mary, and the Genesis quotes) provide the viewer with different stages and facets of meaning to be deciphered. Walter S. Melion analysed in detail how the different sections of text and image lead the viewer to the mystery of the incarnation.[370]

The inclusion of the viewer happens in this print rather visually through Moses, and Adam and Eve in the spandrels (the latter figures being the closest to the viewer, and recalling the original sin of humankind). Cort's print after Zuccari's fresco represents a different trend from the print after Marco Pino's painting. The *Annunciation* print builds less on emotional involvement, but rather puts emphasis on the meditation of exegetical tradition. This tendency was also connected to Jesuit ideas, and an element of Zuccari's fresco even found its way into Canisius's treatise. The symbols of Mary that appear in the background of the *Annunciation*, are similar to the depiction of the same symbols in Cort's earlier print, the *Virgin Immaculate with her Symbols* (cat.119.a), which was later copied in a woodcut version in Canisius's Marian treatise. By 1567, when Lafreri published the *Virgin Immaculate*, Zuccari's fresco in the SS. Annunziata was also completed. Cort might have used the symbols of the fresco already in 1567, or maybe Zuccari was involved in the creation of the earlier print as well, although he is not credited in the sheet. Both prints, the *Virgin Immaculate* and the *Annunciation with Prophets* was intended for meticulous interpretation and meditation on the subject, the Immaculate Conception and the mystery of incarnation. This kind of contemplation was encouraged in Canisius's treatise, and the topic was also a central concept of his writings.

The *Virgin Immaculate* by Cort was an important publication among Lafreri's prints, and it has a further connection with prints after Zuccari's design. It was one of the first prints published by Lafreri with a contemporaneous author's name after the Neo-Latin verse. The Portuguese Achilles Statius composed the poem to the *Virgin Immaculata* and

---

[369] "The Lord your God will raise up for you a prophet like me from among you, from your brethren." Deuteronomy 18:15.
[370] Walter S. Melion, Celeste Brusati, and Karl A. E. Enenkel, "Introduction: Scriptural Authority in Word and Image," in *The Authority of the Word: Reflecting on Image and Text in Northern Europe, 1400-1700*, ed. Walter S. Melion, Celeste Brusati, and Karl A. E. Enenkel (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 6-22.

also to two further sheets after Federico Zuccari's design that were engraved by Cort in 1567 and 1568. The *Presentation of Christ in the Temple* and *Moses and Aaron before the Pharaoh* were both first issued by Antonio D. Salamanca (cat.123.a, 124.a). These sheets were published by Lafreri only in copies which tells a lot about the character of the collaboration between Cornelis Cort and the Roman publisher (cat.123.b, 124.b). Lafreri issued a number of prints engraved by Cort since his arrival in Rome in 1566 (especially prints after the designs by painters working in Rome at the same time, like Zuccari or Giulio Clovio). However, Cort was not exclusively working for Lafreri, but sold his engraved works for other publishers as well.[371] This may suggest that Cort was the initiator of the collaboration with Roman painters, and consequently had a close creative relationship with them. Cort's collaboration with Titian in Venice and Lampsonius's recommendation letter of 1570 to Giulio Clovio also supports this idea of close relationship between Roman painters and the Netherlandish printmaker.[372] The publisher Lafreri did not oversee and organise Cort's Roman projects closely, in contrast to what one could assume in the case of Hieronymus Cock. In some cases, Lafreri had to settle for copies, and he did not have a say in the combination of text and image either. The copies of the *Presentation of Christ in the Temple* and *Moses and Aaron before the Pharaoh* are good examples for this. These copies did not mention the author of the poetic texts anymore. In the case of the story of Moses and Aaron, Lafreri's name was put instead of Achilles Statius. In the *Presentation of Christ in the Temple*, the reference to Federico Zuccari occupied the space where Statius's name was written before. This suggests that Lafreri was not particularly interested in acknowledging the author of the captions in these cases when acquiring the copies. The reference to the painter Zuccari and Lafreri's own address were more important for the publisher.

Since the appearance of a humanist author's name in the prints was a major innovation, it is an important question who was involved in this, and what the relation the contributors was. This issue also reveals a lot about Lafreri's business strategies, and the customs of production. Lafreri published a book of famous antique portraits in 1569 that was compiled by Achilles Statius.[373] This book proves that they must have had some kind of personal connection that could have started with the single sheet religious prints a few years earlier. Statius settled in Rome around the beginning of the 1560s, so his

---

[371] Rubach, *ANT. LAFRERI FORMIS ROMAE*, 63.
[372] Bury, *The Print in Italy*, 142.
[373] *Inlustrium viror ut ut exstant in Urbe vultus* (Rome: Lafreri, 1569). Rubach, *ANT. LAFRERI FORMIS ROMAE*, 122-123, 380.

acquaintance with Lafreri could not start much earlier.[374] They both had contacts with the Roman antiquarian milieu (for example with the scholar Jean Matal), which could have been the starting-point for their collaboration.[375] The engraver Cornelis Cort was a further link between Lafreri and Statius, and he may have been the initiator of the practice of putting Statius's name in the prints as well. As already mentioned, Statius's name was omitted in the prints that were published in copies by Lafreri, so Cort seems to have had more interest in putting Statius's name on the prints. Cort's experiences of the Antwerp single-sheet publishing world where he worked with Hieronymus Cock and the humanist Dominicus Lampsonius, may have determined his preferences. In Antwerp, the humanist providing poetic compositions for single sheet prints already played a significant role, and his work was acknowledged. Cornelis Cort may have transmitted the idea from Antwerp that the author of the caption should be credited in prints just like the inventor of the image. However, the adoption of this practice did not mean the adoption of the close collaboration that worked in Antwerp. While the prints published by Hieronymus Cock with Lampsonius's name fitted a well-constructed strategy of canon formation and transmitted the theory about the function of prints, Statius's role remained "only" the literary commentator of the depicted subjects.

The poems by Achilles Statius expand on the topic of the depictions in a way that takes into consideration what is depicted in the images and how the topic is treated visually. The present tense suggests that the verses were meant as descriptions of the images. The second halves of the poems usually provide interpretation, or further thoughts about the depicted subjects. In the print depicting *Moses and Aaron before the Pharaoh*, the two last lines refer to the consequences of the Pharaoh's denial (cat.124). The speech of Simeon in the *Presentation* print is a free paraphrase of his *Nunc dimittis* song from Luke 2:29-32, while the last line anticipates the death of Christ (cat.123). The text in the *Immaculata* sheet summarises the meaning of the symbolic image, and emphasises that the Virgin is more admirable, and that the Bible honours her more than mankind could apprehend (cat.119.a). This is the only text from the three that addresses the depicted figure, and this way strengthens the communication between the image and the viewer. The voice of the texts is adapted to the type of the depictions; the narrative images

---

[374] On biographical data regarding Statius see Alejandra Guzman Almagro, "A Portuguese Contribution to Sixteenth-Century Roman Antiquarianism," in *Portuguese Humanism and the Republic of Letters*, ed. Maria Berbara and Karl A. E. Enenkel (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 356.

[375] See Almagro, "A Portuguese Contribution," 356 for Statius's Roman contacts, and Rubach, *ANT. LAFRERI FORMIS ROMAE*, 38-41 for the analysis of the collaboration between Lafreri and Jean Matal.

received descriptive captions, while the Madonna picture was completed with a text addressing the depicted figure. Unlike Lampsonius in the north, Statius was interested in the narrative and the religious content of the pictures, and not in the artistic aspect of the prints. During his Roman activity, Statius was engaged in writing sacred poetry in classical meters, for example he worked on his own paraphrases of the Psalms. His poetic works remained in manuscript, they were never published in book form.[376] Prints may have meant for Statius an alternative platform for promulgating his poetry, a platform for literary expression.

Prints after Zuccari provide a good opportunity to compare texts of different character. Although Statius's poems seem to be simple and descriptive at the first instance, he deployed diverse techniques and topoi in his texts, like the tradition of the speaking figure, or the narrator's address of the depicted person. This way, the verses correspond to traditional expectations towards inscriptions in religious images, but at the same time the style and voice of the texts are more sophisticated. Two prints depicting the Coronation of the Virgin after Zuccari's design may shed more light on this difference. They are similar in size, and they were published around the same time. The *Coronation by Angels* was engraved by Cort in 1574 (probably after a drawing by Zuccari), and the *Coronation by Christ* is probably the copy of a 1576 print after Zuccari's altarpiece in the San Lorenzo in Damaso (cat.125-126). The latter print did not include a reference to Zuccari, maybe because his image was extensively modified (a landscape with a city was depicted instead of the martyrdom of St Lawrence, and kneeling figures of saints in the lower part of the image). This image also had a drawn frame (a possible sign that it was intended to be pasted on the wall), and the text in a decorative plate is similar to prayers or prayer-like texts in devotional prints. The first two lines describe the scene, while the second stanza urges the reader-viewer to lead a pious life (be humble and chaste), and to pray to the Virgin to reach salvation. In contrast, the text in the *Coronation by Angels* addresses the viewers indirectly, not in the imperative ("The pious shall offer their pious heart"). What is usually addressed as the difference between devotional and reproductive prints, is mainly a difference in the intended audiences. The *Coronation by Christ* was probably aimed at a more general audience (maybe the pilgrims of Rome), while the *Coronation by Angels* must have been appreciated for artistic and literary values as well.

---

[376] Almagro, "A Portuguese Contribution," 357; Virginia Brown ed., *Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum: Medieval and Renaissance Translations and Commentaries*, vol. 7 (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of Amsterdam Press, 1992), 265.

Prints with descriptive, explanatory texts were common in the material after Federico Zuccari's design. The two allegorical sheets, also engraved by Cort in 1566 and 1572, *Justice Rewarding the Worthy* and the *Calumny of Apelles* are good examples for simple lettering (cat.127-128). However, a short and seemingly straightforward text can also add a further layer of interpretation to the images. The *Presentation of Mary in the Temple* after Zuccari's elder brother, Taddeo, was completed with a short text that highlighted the symbolic meaning of the image (cat.129). By leading the attention of the reader-viewer to the parallel between the temple and Mary's virgin womb as the shrine of God, the text goes beyond the description of the image, and helps the spectator search for a meditative subject, and look beyond the literal interpretation of the scene.

The last print to be analysed after Zuccari leads back to the role of the publisher. The *Ascension of Christ* (cat.130) by an anonymous engraver contains the same text that was combined with Raphael's image of the Ascension in another print (cat.103). Since neither of the sheets is dated, it cannot be determined which was published first. The images are iconographically identical, but differ in composition, Zuccari did not copy Raphael's image. However, the typography and the layout of the inscriptions in the two prints are close to each other. The only connection between the two images is Lafreri who must have organised the combination of text and images in this case. As analysed in the subchapter on Raphael, the text was a perfect choice for an *all'antica* image. It is classicising in style, and connects the viewer with the image for a meditative goal. Using the same text in two different prints was a strategy also applied by Hieronymus Cock. In general, this approach shows the organisational role of the professional publishers.

The prints after Zuccari's designs shed light on the role of Cornelis Cort concerning the combination of texts and images. Prints published by Lafreri after the works of Girolamo Muziano give further insight on the issue of texts and engravers, and how the character of inscriptions could depend on the person of the printmaker. Nicolas Beatrizet engraved two prints after Muziano that include similar inscriptions, the *Raising of the Daughter of Jairus* and the *St Elisabeth of Hungary* (cat.131-132). Both prints depict compositions that were executed in painted versions as well. The *Resurrection of the Daughter of Jairus* was commissioned from Muziano by the cardinal Giovanni Ricci da Montepulciano for Philip II; the painting arrived in Spain in 1562.[377] Bury pointed out that there are considerable differences between Beatrizet's print and the painted panel, for

---

[377] Patrizia Tosini, *Girolamo Muziano 1532-1592: dalla maniera alla natura* (Rome: Ugo Bozzi, 2008), 346.

example, there is a figure appearing in the doorway in the painting that is missing from the print. Bury suggested that Muziano provided Beatrizet with a separate drawing for the engraving.[378] The *St Elisabeth* print reproduces a lost fresco painted by Muziano for the Duomo of Foligno ca. 1559.[379] Beatrizet's prints reflect well the characteristics of the painter's style: tall, solemn figures appear against simple architectural background, their powerful gestures emphasise (but not overemphasise) the emotionality of the scenes.[380] Interestingly, the texts matched to the images in Beatrizet's prints did not underline these qualities, but rather provided general comments on the topics.

As discussed earlier, the captions in Beatrizet's prints seem to follow a certain style both regarding the typography and the voice of the texts. Both prints after Muziano contain texts with the same typography (Roman capitals, only the contours engraved) as the print after Giotto's *Navicella*, or the sheets after Michelangelo's *Risen Christ* and *Last Judgment* (cat.96-97). The texts in the two prints after Muziano are also similar to these examples as they were all written in prose and not in the verse that was usual in prints published by Lafreri. The position of the inscriptions is also peculiar since they are superimposed on the images and were not arranged in stanzas below the image. In the case of the *Raising of the Daughter of Jairus*, the three lines are put in the foreground, on the floor, while in the *St Elisabeth* sheet, the longer inscription is written on the architectural background. In the print depicting the story of Jairus and his daughter, the text is a brief, one-sentence description of the scene, completed with a reference to the Biblical section. The longer inscription about St Elisabeth expands on her humility, her virtuous lifestyle and support of the poor and miserable instead of living in royal luxury.

In contrast, Lafreri published two sheets depicting the stigmatisation of St Francis after Muziano's design that were engraved by Cornelis Cort. These prints show that Beatrizet was an exception with his distinctive and consistent style of inscriptions. The prints by Cort reveal a more varied picture with very different inscriptions even in prints after the same inventor. One of the *St Francis* prints from 1567 includes only a brief, title-like inscription, visually similar to the inscriptions in Beatrizet's prints: Roman capital letters are superimposed on the image (cat.133). The second print from 1568 displays a completely different text in the usual layout and typography of Lafreri's prints, inscribed with cursive letters below the image, separated from it by a thin line (cat.134). The text in

---

[378] Bury, *The Print in Italy*, 98.
[379] Tosini, *Girolamo Muziano*, 463.
[380] Bailey called this list of characteristics the "Muziano canon." Bailey, *Between Renaissance and Baroque*, 28.

this latter print starts with a question; the poetic narrator addresses the depicted saint, and enquires about his spiritual experience. The second part of the poem is rather explanatory, talking about the stigmatisation as a new mystical experience, not only spiritual but also physical. The voice of the text (the vocative and the use of the second person pronoun) creates a communicative situation that the reader-viewer is invited to join. It gives meaning to the scene, but also opens it up for the spectator to connect to the depiction and the ideas represented here. This text is very different from the descriptive inscriptions in Beatrizet's prints, it matched the emotional style and fulfilled the expectations towards religious images of the 1560s.

From the time of his arrival in Rome, Cornelis Cort started to work with Giulio Clovio, the painter and miniaturist, who also resided in the city from the beginning of the 1560s until his death.[381] Two prints after Clovio's design, the *Adoration of the Magi* and the *Lamentation*, were published already in 1566, Cort's first year in Rome. Of the two, the small print of the *Adoration of the Magi* includes four lines of Neo-Latin verse (cat.135). The first half of the text describes the event depicted, the Magi bringing gifts to the Christ Child, while the second half draws a parallel between the Magi and the three Marys coming to the grave of Christ with incense. Clovio is not mentioned as inventor in this sheet, but a name appears in between the narrative caption and Lafreri's address, presumably the name of the author of the poem (*Pet. Stephanij*).[382] If the inscription really refers to the poet, then this sheet was the earliest published by Lafreri with the name of an author, a year before the prints with Statius's texts. The *Adoration of the Magi* was also engraved by Cort, which supports the hypothesis that he was an initiator of acknowledging the humanist authors in the prints.

The poem in the *Adoration of the Magi* is an elegant Neo-Latin text that reminds the spectator of the connection of Christ's birth and death; it is straightforward and descriptive, and neutral in voice. Compared to the *Adoration of the Shepherds* that was also engraved by Cort but designed by Marco del Pino (cat.121), the 1566 *Adoration of the Magi* looks like a routine solution of both the visual and the poetic exercise: both the pictorial and the literary composition appears to be classical. Two prints that were engraved by Cort after drawings by Clovio in 1568 reveal how diverse the additional texts could be even among the prints after the same artist. The *Lamentation of Christ* is a

---

[381] Bury, *The Print in Italy*, 111.
[382] It is not easy to identify the author under the name Petrus Stephanus. Alessia Alberti supposed that the poem was written by a Neapolitan humanist and historian, Pietro Di Stefano. However, she did not give any arguments that would support the hypothesis. Alberti, "Contributi per Antoine Lafréry," 109.

similarly classical composition inspired by Michelangelo's works (cat.136).[383] However, the prose caption below the image aims to intensify the compassion of the viewer by highlighting and condemning mankind's indifference at the Passion of Christ. Similarly, the effect of the *Crucifixion* from 1568 is enhanced by the caption below the image (cat.137). In this case, the figure of the crucified Christ addresses the reader-viewer, urging him (*homuncio*, "the little man") to follow the divine path, carry the cross for him, and live the life of Christ. He also rebukes the viewer why he is hesitating to carry the cross. The moral of this text is the same as in the *Christ Falling on the Way to Calvary* after Raphael (cat.101). However, the narrator has changed: while in the print after Raphael, it is the anonymous spectator speaking, in the print after Clovio, Christ talks to the viewer in a highly emotional tone (confronting him with questions and using the imperative). As Simon was a figure in the Raphael print with whom the viewers could identify, there is a similar figure in the print after Clovio as well. Longinus, the Roman centurion with the lance, stands behind John and looks up towards Christ; he is not as positive a figure as Simon, but the legend of his conversion may give a further layer of meaning to the words of Christ. The captions in both the *Lamentation* and the *Crucifixion* after Clovio build on the emotional involvement of the viewers, but at the same time, the prints acknowledge Clovio's role as the inventor of the designs (*Don Iulio Clouio de Crouuatia inuentor*). These prints are further examples that the reproductive and the devotional aspects did not exclude each other.

Just as in the case of Zuccari, Cort did not only work for Lafreri when creating the prints after Clovio. Some sheets were issued by other Roman publishers, and Lafreri could only acquire copies of them. The *Conversion of St Paul* is a late example of the collaboration of Cort and Clovio (cat.138). The print was first published by Lorenzo Vaccari in 1576, and probably very soon copied by Aliprando Caprioli for Lafreri, since he published it before his 1577 death.[384] The copy includes the same inscriptions as Cort's sheet: the credit to Clovio as inventor and four stanzas of Neo-Latin poem. While the picture depicts one moment in monumental details (God's appearance for Saul), the text puts the depicted scene in historical and spiritual context. The emphasis is on the contrast between Saul and Paul, the furious wolf, persecutor of Christians, and the great teacher and apostle, "the chosen instrument of the Lord." However, the text does not only describe

---

[383] Elena Calvillo, "Authoritative Copies and Divine Originals: Lucretian Metaphor, Painting on Stone, and the Problem of Originality in Michelangelo's Rome," *Renaissance Quarterly* 66 (2013): 453-508.
[384] Bury, *The Print in Italy*, 111.

the changes that happened in Saul-Paul as consequences of his vision, but it creates an interactive atmosphere. In the second stanza, the narrator addresses Christ and highlights Saul's sins committed against Christ's followers. In the last stanza, the narrator turns to the viewers, confronting them with the image and its morals. The spectator is encouraged to meditate on the visionary experience of Saul, and how his conversion to Paul was at the same time uplifting, stunning, and benumbing. The narrator repeatedly urges (*contemplaris, mediteris*) the reader-viewer to reflect upon the conversion narrative. This exhortation is similar to what one could read in the print after Michelangelo's *Last Judgment* that compelled the viewers to "examine, reflect upon, and fear" the depicted scene. These inscriptions suggest that the meditative function was an important aspect of the prints. The producers of the sheets made an effort to emphasise the potential use of prints as starting points of religious contemplation.

The last print to be analysed after Giulio Clovio's design unites many characteristics of the previously analysed prints. This is why it was left for last, although chronologically it was published years before Cort's engravings, in 1563. The *Crucifixion* was engraved by Domenico Zenoi, and dedicated to the same Otto Truchsess von Waldburg who was the patron of Petrus Canisius, and to whom Lafreri devoted other sheets of his stock (cat.139). The dedication also suggests that this print was among the "showcase" religious prints intended for the ideal viewers whom cardinal Waldburg, Canisius, and his readers represented. The long Latin text below the image played an important role in creating a religious print fitting the expectations of these clergymen.

Zenoi's print has a complex connection with other sheets, and it does not include a reference to Clovio.[385] The image was later copied by Jacob Bos, and published also by Lafreri, without the dedication, and with a shorter version of the text on the margin (cat.140). Interestingly, there are two further prints in Lafreri's stock, two prints of the Crucifixion engraved by Jacob Bos, that have the same relation to each other as Zenoi's and Bos's prints after Clovio. The 1564 print by Bos includes the longer version of the text and the dedicatory inscription, just as Zenoi's print does (cat.141). The 1566 copy of the image contains the shorter version of the Latin text, just as we find in Bos's copy after Clovio's design (cat.142). The main difference between the two images of the Crucifixion designed by Clovio and the anonymous artist is the presence of Veronica in the foreground (in Clovio's composition).

---

[385] Milan Pelc identified it as a design after Clovio. Pelc, *Prints after Giulio Clovio*, 114-115.

The longer and shorter poems are typical examples for inscriptions enhancing the communication between image and spectator. In the longer version, the first half of the poem is the narrator's speech addressed to the suffering Christ on the cross (cat.139, 141). The narrator asks why Christ undeservedly endured the pain and he also laments about his own sinfulness, thus gives the opportunity for the viewers to identify themselves with the emotional monologue. The shorter version, that is only identical with the longer text in the first two lines, tells the same moral (cat.140, 142).[386] Here the narrator condemns his own sins for being responsible for the crucifixion of the Lord. The second half of the longer text is the answer of the Crucified (*CHRISTI crucifixi, responsio*) where he relates that love made him take pain and the cross, and that the lamenting narrator or viewer should recompense him with love in return. The voice is changing in the second and third stanza, the Lord is speaking in first person at the beginning, then a third person description is inserted before his second speech ("only Love could triumph over me..."). The prints with the narrator's lament and the answer of the Crucified effectively unite the tradition of the speaking figure with the poetic invocation of the depicted person, thus it could be a perfect tool for meditation. In the case of Clovio's composition, the literary part of the print worked together with the visual as well. Just like in Pino's *Adoration of the Magi* (cat.121), there are figures in the foreground of the image, Veronica and two Roman soldiers, who partly disappear behind the "frame" of the picture. They communicate with the viewer as well. Veronica displays her veil towards the spectator, while the soldiers' gestures help turn the spectator's attention towards the focus of the image, the crucified Christ. The communication with the viewer was an important tool in Clovio's artistic repertory.

The prints with the longer version of the text include the title and the author of the text: *DIVI C. Cypriani ad Christum crucifixum Carmen*. The reference to the authorship of Saint Cyprian also appears in one of the prints with the shorter captions in an abbreviated form: *Haec Cypri*. Acknowledging the authorship of the church father seems to be the first step towards crediting the literary contributors, as it happened later with Achilles Statius. However, the origin of the "Cyprian" poem is rather ambiguous. The poem is not included in the modern critical edition of Cyprian's works, and it is also missing from the most important sixteenth-century publications, for example from the various volumes edited by

---

[386] The six lines of the shorter caption come from the same poem, they were combined from the first two and last two lines, and from the two lines after the section that was used in the longer caption.

Erasmus, or Paolo Manuzio's 1563 Roman publication.[387] This indicates that Cyprian's authorship of this particular text was not widely accepted in the early modern period either. There is one sixteenth-century Venetian edition of Cyprian's works that included the poem at the very end of the book.[388] The title of this book announced proudly that two poems were added to the works of Cyprian that were not published anywhere before this edition *(nec usquam antea impressa)*. The mention of the title makes it clear that one of the additional works was the poem on the Crucifixion that was later used in the prints published by Lafreri.

The second half of the longer poem in the 1563 print after Clovio (cat.139), which has the subtitle *Responsio Crucifixi* in the Venetian Cyprian edition and in the prints as well, is surely not by Saint Cyprian. It was composed by a fifteenth-century Milanese poet, Maffeo Veggio, and it was first published in 1521.[389] Josquin de Prez wrote music to the elegiac distich, and his motet of *Huc me sydereo* became well known; it was performed, copied in manuscripts, and printed in several editions around Europe.[390] It is surprising that Lafreri took over the attribution from the Venetian Cyprian edition in spite of the fame of Josquin de Prez's composition. The text was probably chosen because of its expressive but at the same time elegant, humanist approach towards the subject, but also because of its communicative character. The name of the church father gave authority to the text, just as the name of Michelangelo or Raphael performed a similar role in the reproductive prints.

Late antique authors were popular in the printmaking business, probably because these texts were similar in style to the early modern humanist verses on religious subjects. Wolfgang Fuhrmann referred to this as the "elegant approach" that was intended for an educated audience. The late antique practice was imitated already in the fifteenth century,

---

[387] For the modern critical edition see *Sancti Cypriani episcopi Opera* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1972-1999). The Erasmian edition was first published in 1520: *Opera Diui Caecilii Cypriani Episcopi Carthaginensis, ab innumeris mendis repurgata* (Basel: Froben, 1520). For the later Roman publication see *Thascius Caecilius Cyprianus, Opera, ad veritatem vetustissimorum exemplarium summa fide emendata, addito etiam quinto epistolarum libro, antea nunquam edito* (Roma: Paolo Manuzio, 1563).

[388] *D. Caecilii Cypriani episcopi Carthaginensis et martyris, Opera, Quibus nuper adiecimus eiusdem carmina quaedam de cruce Redemptoris atque ad crucifixum elegantissima, nec usquam antea impressa* (Venice: ad signum Spei, 1547), 815-816.

[389] Edward E. Lowinsky, "Josquin des Prez and Ascanio Sforza," in *Il Duomo di Milano, Congresso Internazionale*, ed. Maria Luisa Gatti Perer, vol 2 (Milan: La Rete, 1969), 18.

[390] Jaap van Benthem, "Josquins Motette *Huc me sydereo*, oder Konstruktivismus als Ausdruck humanistisch geprägter Andacht?" in *Die Motette: Beiträge zu ihrer Gattunsgeschichte*, ed. Herbert Schneider (Mainz: Schott, 1992), 149.

and continued in the sixteenth as well.[391] Hieronymus Cock also used poems by other late antique authors, like Prudentius and Sedulius on religious prints. Lafreri's print with the Pseudo-Cyprian poem followed this tradition, and also added an important new feature by acknowledging the literary author, in this case religious authority as well.

Referencing the designers of the images and the authors of the texts became more and more important for Lafreri, as the stocklist and the frontispieces showed. However, inscriptions about the artists, the inventors, were still not as consistent in his production as was in the case of Hieronymus Cock's publications. In Lafreri's stock, it could happen that even Michelangelo's or Raphael's name was missing from the sheets, and the reference to the literary author was also not essential and primary for the publisher. However, the lack of acknowledgment of authorship (either visual or literary) did not necessarily mean that the sheets were "only" meant for devotional purposes. Moreover, the ambitious artistic prints were not to be interpreted exclusively as reproductions, but their religious meaning and function also played a significant role. The analysis of the inscriptions in prints after Raphael and Michelangelo revealed that these sheets were connected to other religious prints in Lafreri's stock on the basis of their content. Apparently, Lafreri was more conscious about the connectedness of religious prints, than he was about art theory. The material based on reproductive sheets shows that texts and images were consciously combined together to create effective prints that could serve the purpose of meditation. The link with the Jesuits, Canisius's treatise and the connection between the order and contemporaneous Roman painters, revealed an important aspect about the intended audiences. On the other hand, the deliberate stylistic choices, both regarding the textual and the visual parts of the prints, exhibit another facet of the clientele's needs. Religious function and decorum were equally important criteria when creating the prints.

The inscriptions in Lafreri's prints were mostly compositions contemporaneous with the images, and some of them must have been written with the intention to be included in the prints, but the authors are rarely identifiable. The appearance of the authors' name in some prints from the 1560s was an important new feature. The influence of northern prints published by Hieronymus Cock must have played a role in this change. The monumental Antwerp print of the *Raising of the Brazen Serpent* from 1555, published with Lampsonius's poem and his name underneath was an outstanding example for this practice (cat.1). In the 1560s, the acknowledgment of the writers became more widespread

---

[391] Wolfgang Fuhrmann, "The Simplicity of Sublimity in Josquin's Psalm-Motets," in *Josquin and the Sublime*, ed. Alberti Clement and Eric Jas (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011), 61.

in northern prints, the collaboration of Maarten Heemskerck, Philips Galle, and the humanist Hadrianus Junius is a clear example of this.[392]

While the appearance of the literary authors in the inscriptions on prints could be seen as an innovative step, communication with the viewer-reader builds on a longer tradition in the printed medium. The conversation between poetic narrators, the depicted figures, and the viewers appears in prints after the famous painters of the century, and in sheets after contemporaneous artists as well. Texts added to the images are often exploited as tools of direct communication, and are used to enhance the viewer's visual experience, to arouse emotions, and to provoke ideas on the depicted topic. Applying captions as means of connection between the depiction and the viewer was already a common strategy in the first religious woodcuts of the fifteenth century. However, this kind of communication usually happened with the help of prayers and invocations in the early woodcuts. In the religious prints published by Lafreri, liturgical texts and prayers are to be found in limited number. Instead, Neo-Latin poetry takes on the task of connecting viewers and images, since the texts usually had to fit the style of the visual parts of the engravings.

Apart from the fifteenth-century religious woodcut culture, there was the general tendency in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century visual arts for involving the viewer into the reality of the image. John Shearman defined the concepts of the "more engaged spectator" and the "transitive work of art" of the period. The transitive mode required the spectators to complete the images by their own presence, to participate in the reality of pictures. Shearman wrote about how the "conversational mode of the transitive work of art" was fully realised in the early modern period by bringing together long-standing practices such as the speaking devotional images, the Roman tradition of the speaking statues, and the topoi of Greek ekphrastic poetry.[393] Prints after the designs of renowned artists are even better examples for both aiming at the viewer's emotional and art theoretical experiences. By the combination of text and image, prints could communicate ideas on art and content, on artistic fame and religious function at the same time, in the same sheet. In the prints, visual and textual apparatus worked together to engage the audience, and in many cases, it was the inscription that initiated the communication with the reader-viewer.

In this chapter on Lafreri's publications, the role of poetry was highlighted in transmitting the religious message in the most effective, emotionally engaging way that

---

[392] Ilja M. Veldman, "Maarten van Heemskerck and Hadrianus Junius," 35-54.
[393] Shearman, *Only connect*, 58.

was the new trend of the second half of the sixteenth century. Captions held the liminal status in between image and spectator by communicating the message, translating the visual into verbal communication. Texts could add a completely new interpretative layer to the images and they could enhance the participatory strategies of the prints. By the means of the inscribed texts, the reader-viewers could be invited to take part in the depicted scene thus completing and enhancing the illusionistic effect of images. The last chapter will address the visual part of this strategy, how images were designed to be engaging, to create continuity with the spectator's world, and how the caption's liminal status was expressed visually.

PART III: FRAMES. COMPARATIVE VISUAL ANALYSIS

Framing the image with text

During the thematic and stylistic examination of the texts, the prints published by the Antwerp and two Roman publishers were considered separately. Before bringing together the results in the conclusion, this chapter offers a comparative visual analysis of the prints. The examination focuses on the visual relation between text and image, as well as on the connection between the elements of the printed sheet and the viewer. In general, texts are usually classified as separated, superimposed, or incorporated in images.[394] These categories are also essential in determining the position of the different elements of the print in relation to the viewer-reader, and in creating the overall illusion of the object. Through their form and position, texts can be integrated into the three-dimensional world of the depiction or they can stress the conflict between the two-dimensional surface of the paper and the illusionistic space of the depiction. In this chapter, the position and visual relations of texts and images will be examined through the motif of the frame and the concept of framing.

Frames as illusionistic decorative structures or fine margins are just as important parts of prints as the inscriptions. Frames create the hierarchical or equal status of text and image by setting or blurring visual limits, and by positioning text and image in spatial relation to each other. Frames create the overall layout of the sheets, and they contribute to creating or defying the illusionistic unity of the print. On the other hand, framing was an essential concept in the thematic analysis of the texts. As the previous chapters showed, texts added to the images functioned as interpretative frameworks in prints; they acted as mediator in between the viewer and the image, as literary interpreter of the visual. This final chapter examines this mediator role from the visual aspect.

In a printed paper object including both image and text, frames could have different functions and positions. The image could be framed in an illusionistic way, imitating more precious objects, for example paintings. On the other hand, a simple margin could also act as a framing device, separating the virtual space of the image from the surroundings (the remaining blank space of the sheet, the space of the environment, or even the space of the printed text). The inscribed texts could also be framed either in an illusionistic way or by margins, connected or separated from the margins or frame of the image. Frames highlight the character of the visual relation between image and text, and they indicate the

---

[394] Omar Calabrese and Betty Gigante, "La signature du peintre," *La part de l'oeil* 5 (1989): 28-31.

integrated, separated, or superimposed position of texts. Their structuring power contributes to the layout of the prints, the visual presentation of the message.

Frames play a significant role in forming the viewer's impression about the paper object, the reception of image and text. As Meyer Schapiro defined, the frame is "a finding and focusing device placed between the observer and the image."[395] Frames and borders in prints are instrumental in the relation of the print and the viewer-reader. The image can enter the space of the viewer with the help of illusionistic devices. Frames contribute to the illusion of the viewer's involvement by emphasising or defying the continuity between the fictive space of the image and the real space of the spectator. Texts in prints mostly exist on the threshold between the image and the viewer-reader, their direction of reading is arranged according to the point of view of the audience that is not necessarily the case in other inscribed objects, for example when inscriptions appear in paintings. Through their position and direction, captions in prints invite the reader-viewer, they create an entrance to the image, both to its visual world and its meaning.

The involvement of the viewer in the depicted scene or story was an important issue in the previous chapters; it was a key strategy of the prints' communication with the audience, especially in Rome. This comparative analysis looks at how this idea was visually realised in the prints. In general, this chapter aims at showing how the visual presentation of text and image is in line with the content of the prints, how the layout and the relation of the elements of the prints visually help to create the message. The analysis also aims at setting up a typology of frames, and at comparing the most important and popular forms. The comparative perspective on patterns and tendencies of framing sheds light on the possible exchanges and mutual influences among the three publishers.

Sixteenth-century viewers must have been used to contemplating images surrounded by commentaries on the margins, and even on the frames. As highlighted in the introduction, bimediality, the combination of text and image, was a popular feature of art works in the late medieval and early modern period in various genres of the visual arts. In the context of the visual analysis of frames in prints, one particular moment in the development of fifteenth- and sixteenth-century panel painting has to be mentioned. Inscribed frames represent a less-known tradition of late medieval and early modern painting that stretched from Jan van Eyck to the same sixteenth-century painters who were represented in prints, like Heemskerck or Floris.

---

[395] Meyer Schapiro, "On Some Problems in the Semiotics of Visual Art: Field and Vehicle in Image-Signs," *Simiolus* 6 (1972-1973): 11.

Wooden frames of painted panels were often embellished with texts in the fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Netherlands. Inscriptions represent a traditional feature of northern original frames according to handbooks of the topic.[396] The practice was most probably also present in Italy, although there are fewer surviving examples. When paintings were completed with an inscribed frame, the relation between the inscribed text and the painted image was similar to the relation of texts and images in prints. The wooden frames isolated the images from the environment but at the same time connected the viewer with the picture through the inscriptions. The texts gained a similarly liminal status when inscribed on wooden frames as in the margins of prints. Inscriptions on painted frames were written and carefully selected in order to establish the relation between the spectator and the depiction, and they provided the viewer with textual aid to intensify one's experience of deciphering the image. By the means of texts, the world of the viewer and the world of the depiction joined together.

Jan van Eyck's oeuvre usually serves as the principal example when describing the feature of inscribed wooden frames. Hans Belting and Dagmar Eichberger claimed the frame inscriptions being a consistent feature of the Eyckian oeuvre.[397] Van Eyck often signed his paintings on the frame, thus attaching his name, the date of completion, and sometimes also his motto to the images (for example the *Portrait of a Man with Red Turban*, the portraits of *Margaret van Eyck*, and *Jan de Leeuw*, or the *Virgin at the Fountain*).[398] The essential information about the pieces is often told by the depicted figures themselves, and they sometimes address the viewer on the frames of the pictures (e.g., portrait of *Jan de Leeuw*, plate 1).[399]

Besides the speaking portraits, several works by van Eyck include inscriptions running around the images that concern the topic or the depicted figures. This was probably a new phenomenon in painting.[400] As pointed out in the scholarship, most of the

---

[396] See for example the entry "Frame," in *The Grove Encyclopedia of Medieval Art and Architecture*, vol. 2, ed. Colum Hourihane (Oxford: University Press, 2012), 562, and Nicholas Penny, *Frames* (London: National Gallery Publications, 1997), 16.

[397] Hans Belting and Dagmar Eichberger, *Jan van Eyck als Erzähler: frühe Tafelbilder im Umkreis des New Yorker Doppeltafel* (Worms: Werner, 1983), 103.

[398] Verougstraete, *Frames and Supports*, 101.

[399] For the significance of the "me fecit" signatures and Van Eyck's motto see Horst Bredekamp, *Der Bildakt, Neufassung* (Berlin: Verlag Klaus Wagenbach, 2015), 86-90, and Karin Gludovatz, "Der Name am Rahmen, der Maler im Bild. Künstlerselbstverständnis und Produktionskommentar in den Signaturen Jan van Eycks," *Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte* 54 (2005): esp. 126-133.

[400] Maurits Smeyers referred to tombstones and miniatures as comparative material for lettering on the frames. Maurits Smeyers, "Jan van Eyck, archeologist? Reflections on Eyckian epigraphy," in *Archeological and historical aspects of West European Societies: Album Amicorum André Van Doorselaer*, ed. Marc Lodewijckx (Leuven: University Press, 1996), 404.

texts written on the frames of van Eyck's works are Biblical quotes closely connected to the depicted religious message, and also used in liturgical practice.[401] The excerpts evoke the relevant parts of church ritual, and at the same time help the viewer to meditate on the depiction. Enhancing the communication between image and beholder, between the depicted divine persons and the faithful spectator is a further goal of the texts. For example, on the lost frame of the *Berlin Madonna* (plate 2.B), the second person voice of the prayer prompts the viewer to address the Virgin. The inscription provides the spectator with the first praising words, and establishes the contact between the person depicted and the onlooker.[402] The frame of the central panel of the *Dresden Triptych* (plate 2.A) develops this feature further. First, the inscribed text praises the Virgin in third person voice (Wisdom 7:29, 26), then the excerpt from Ecclesiasticus (24:23-24) changes to first person.[403] The viewer could identify with the first half, and feel urged to continue the incantation of the text. In the second part, the Virgin seems to answer to the prayer. The image initiates communication between the viewer and the depicted figure with the help of texts, in a very similar way as for example the *Crucifixion* after Clovio published by Lafreri does with the help of the Pseudo-Cyprian text (cat.139).

The *Madrid Annunciation* (plate 2.C) is an example for material imitation and inscribed commentary working together to create an illusion. Here the inscriptions (Gabriel's salutation and Mary's answer from Luke 1:28 and 1:38) are not placed on the real wooden frame but on the second, illusionistic frame that imitates stone, just as the figures themselves. The duplicated frame serves to obscure the border between the painted surface and reality, and between sculpture and painting. When reading the words of the depicted figures, the viewer could see their materiality and object character through the painter's masterful imitation of marble.[404] Thus the speaking images of Gabriel and Mary

---

[401] Carol J. Purtle revealed that Jan van Eyck often worked with texts connected to the liturgy in general, and more specifically to local liturgical use. Carol J. Purtle, *The Marian Paintings of Jan van Eyck* (Princeton: University Press, 1982), 170.

[402] Inscription on the lower ledge: *FLOS FLORIOLORVM APPELLARIS* (you are called the flower of all the little flowers). Furthermore, the text of a hymn was originally running around the upper part of the image, and finished with the word *ETCET*, presumably the faithful viewer is expected to continue the text. *MATER HEC EST FILIA / PATER HIC EST NATVS / QVIS AVDIVIT TALIA / DEVS HOMO NATVS ETCET*. Purtle, *The Marian Paintings*, 149.

[403] *HEC EST SPECIOSIOR SOLE ET SVPER OMNEM DISPOSTITIONEM STELLARVM LVCI COMPARATA INVENITVR PRIOR. CANDOR EST ENIM LVCIS AETERNAE ET SPECVLVM SINE MACVLA DEI MAIESTATIS EST. // EGO QVASI VITIS FRVCTIVICAVI SVAVITATEM ODORIS ET FLORES MEI FRVCTIS HONORIS ET HONESTATIS. EGO MATER PVLCHARAE DILECTIONIS ET TIMORIS ET MAGNITVDINES ET SANCTAE SPEI.*

[404] Jeffrey F. Hamburger, "Seeing and Believing. The Suspicion of Sight and the Authentication of Vision in Late Medieval Art and Devotion," in *Imagination und Wirklichkeit. Zum Verhältnis von mentalen und realen*

came into life by the means of the words but they were seen as lifeless stone sculptures at the same time. The lettering of the frame represents a threshold between the image and the viewer; it connects them, serves as a framework both for the image and for the viewer's approach to the image. However, at the same time the inscriptions on the frame draw attention to the object character of the image, they emphasise its borders and limitations. The lines written in the composition support the illusion of the speaking image, while the frame inscriptions at least partially negate the illusion. Therefore, the practice of inscribing frames was an important invention in van Eyck's painting which reflected the "keen awareness of and sophisticated response to the religious and intellectual status of pictures."[405]

Jeffrey Hamburger emphasised that van Eyck's frames were tools for the artist to include the relation of the beholder and the image among the themes of his paintings.[406] The goal of the inscribed frames was to enhance the communication between the object, its representation, and the beholder. Moreover, the frames played an essential role in establishing a link between the viewer's world and the painted space visually. The followers of van Eyck's style recognised this as an inherent aspect of his works, and imitated the practice in order to create a close connection of image and beholder. For example, Petrus Christus followed van Eyck in signing the frames, and he also imitated the practice of inscribing devotional aids in archaic Romanesque lettering on the frame.[407]

While the lettering of Eyckian frames was examined in details in the scholarship, the sixteenth century is not a well-researched period from this point of view. Although there are some examples in the Netherlands, the research is far from systematic when it comes to inscribed sixteenth-century frames.[408] Jan Gossart is the only well-known painter from the beginning of the sixteenth century whose witty use of frames has been explored. Gossart used both illusionistic and real frames in combination with lettering. He followed van Eyck's practice of imitating materials other than wood (brass or golden relief lettering)

Bildern inder Kunst der frühen Neuzeit, ed. Klaus Krüger and Alessandro Nova (Mainz: Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 2000), 52-53.

[405] Bret Rothstein, "Vision and Devotion in Jan van Eyck's Virgin and Child with Canon Joris van der Paele," *Word & Image* 15 (1999): 271.

[406] Hamburger, "Seeing and Believing," 55.

[407] On the inscriptions of Petrus Christus's works see Maryan Wynn Ainsworth, *Petrus Christus: Renaissance Master of Bruges* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1994), 30.

[408] Significant anonymous examples are for instance several Madonna panels with prayer texts and the *Last Supper* altarpiece with a Biblical quote on its engaged frame. See *From Van Eyck to Bruegel*, ed. Ainsworth, 252 and 262. A more famous case is the *Last Judgment* by Jan Provoost in the Bruges city hall. Cornelis Knust, *Vorbild der Gerechtigkeit, Jan Provosts Gerichtsbild in Brügge* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007).

in the depiction of illusionistic frames. His practice of doubling the frame has its antecedent also in the work of van Eyck (e.g., the *Madrid Annunciation*, plate 2.C).

The frames around Gossart's paintings show diverse forms from simple black letters on the gilded background (e.g., *Venus and Cupid*, plate 3.D) to painted marble imitation (*Virgin and Child* in Cleveland, plate 3.A). The play with materials was not the only way to enhance the impression of unity between the space of the image and the space of the viewer. As Victor I. Stoichita pointed out, figures depicted before illusionistic frames (e.g., *Virgin and Child* in Berlin or in London, plate 3.B-C) seem to "emerge from the frame," thus step into the space of the viewer.[409] This is especially interesting in the Madonna images; the position of text and image is radically different here than in the earlier examples. In a few images by Gossart, it is the depicted figure that is closer to the spectator, the inscription is shifted in the background. The text cannot play anymore the role of the mediator between the painting and its viewer visually. The image "is coming into life" through the talent of the painter, and not through the painted words.[410] This might reveal a shift in the hierarchy of text and image in these specific paintings. The play with the different forms of real and illusionistic frames, and the incorporation of inscriptions into the painted composition drew attention to the illusion inherent in the paintings. While seemingly blurring the limit between the real world and the world of the image, these practices also revealed the status of the image as a piece of art.

The works by Gossart imply the changing relationship between inscribed texts and images, and point to those features that will be dominant on sixteenth-century frames, and in reproductive prints. Although some of the paintings include invocations to the depicted figures, Biblical quotes and descriptive texts also appear in these images. Moreover, the conscious play with the status of image and text reflects a theoretical approach towards pictures. Besides the Madonna images, there is a mythological work by Gossart that was also set in an inscribed wooden frame. The use of the detachable frame in the *Venus and Cupid* (plate 3.D) gives an important hint to the humanist involvement and erudite goals of combining text and image in a work of art. In the Latin verse on the outer frame, Venus addresses her son, Cupid, threatens him with punishment if he dares to apply his weapon against his mother.[411] However, her effort is seemingly useless: the images of her love

[409] Victor I. Stoichita, *The Self-Aware Image: an Insight into Early Modern Metapainting* (London: Harvey Miller Publishers, 2015), 95.
[410] Stoichita, *The Self-Aware Image*, 95.
[411] *NATE EFFRONS HOMINES SVPEROS QVE LACESSERE SVET[VS] NON MATRI PARCIS: PARCITO, NE PEREAS.* // Shameless son, you who are inclined to torment men and gods, you do not (even) spare your

affairs are depicted in roundels on the plinths of the columns that frame the struggling figures. The panel has been identified with an item in the inventory of Philip of Burgundy's Wijk castle as the *Venus and Cupid* which was kept under a curtain in Philip's study.[412] Stephanie Schrader pointed out the correspondence between the mythological image with double frame and a contemporary source on Philip's court. Gerardus Geldenhouwer described in Philip's biography that he employed "versifiers" to compile erudite texts for the decoration of images and buildings, thus pictures could be seen as both speaking and silent.[413] According to Schrader, the *Venus and Cupid* represents a fitting example: the image was speaking with the outer frame attached to it, and it was mute when separated from the commentary.

The example of the *Venus and Cupid* shows that composing poems to visual material was an important task of learned men (courtiers, humanists) already in the first half of the sixteenth century. This is an important point where the history of inscribed frames and prints connect to each other. In the second half of the sixteenth century, this connection becomes even more apparent with the appearance of Dominicus Lampsonius. He did not only compose poems to be included in prints but also wrote Neo-Latin poems to be inscribed on picture frames. Two portraits painted by Anthonis Mor bore his compositions. The portrait of the musician, Joannes Gallus, was completed with a quatrain signed by Lampsonius on the original frame (unfortunately lost in 1944), and Joanna Woodall assumed that Lampsonius wrote the couplet on the frame of the portrait of "Hugo" as well.[414] The main concept of the verses is the topos of speaking portraits that was already explored in the case of van Eyck.[415] The versatility of Lampsonius's work proves that there was a need to connect image and text, poetry and the visual arts, in various sixteenth-century genres.

Paintings by the same artists who created designs for prints bore inscriptions on the original frames as well. Not only portraits were made to speak through inscriptions but

---

(own) mother: cease, lest you be destroyed. Tr. from *Man, myth, and sensual pleasures: Jan Gossart's Renaissance*, ed. Maryan Wynn Ainsworth, Stijn Alsteens, and Nadine M. Orenstein (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2010), 229.

[412] Stephanie Schrader, "Gossart's Mythological Nudes and the Shaping of Philip of Burgundy's Erotic Identity," in *Man, myth, and sensual pleasures*, ed. Ainsworth et al., 62.

[413] Schrader, "Gossart's Mythological Nudes," 62-64. For Geldenhouwer's text see Sytske Weidema and Anna Koopstra, *Jan Gossart, the Documentary Evidence* (London: Harvey Miller, 2012), 47-48.

[414] The portrait of Gallus is in Kassel (Staatliche Museen). Becker, "Zur niederländischen Kunstliteratur," 52 and 61. "Hugo" is in private collection in London. Woodall, *Anthonis Mor*, 15.

[415] Becker refers to the *Anthologia graeca* as the possible inspirational source of Lampsonius. Becker, "Zur niederländischen Kunstliteratur," 51 and 61 (footnote 65). In general (and for further literature) on the tradition of images speaking in first person see Bredekamp, *Der Bildakt*, 65-98.

descriptive and moralising verses were also added to paintings. A family portrait painted by Frans Floris (plate 4.A) bears an inscription on its original frame that celebrates harmonious marriage and family life.[416] The *Lamentation* by Heemskerck (plate 4.B) is also framed by a short text in Latin. The lines running around the image describe how Christ's body was prepared and put in the new, pure tomb. The text does not direct the viewer's attention to the suffering of Christ but warns the faithful that a pure and scented soul is desirable for one's salvation. The unknown author of the verse drew parallels between the preparation of the dead body and the preparation of one's soul for the Last Judgment.[417]

This brief outline shows how the two traditions of inscribing prints and panel frames were closely connected in the Netherlands that is not only demonstrated in the similar practices but in the persons producing the design or the texts as well. Even less research has been done on inscribed picture frames in medieval and Renaissance Italy, although surviving examples indicate that the phenomenon was also present south of the Alps. Italian painters had signed altarpieces on the frame before Jan van Eyck, from the late thirteenth century onward.[418] Italian followers of Jan van Eyck also imitated the practice of using Biblical quotes on the frames. The most spectacular case is the Crucifixion canvas by Donato de' Bardi (plate 5.A) that has an original frame inscribed with a long prayer. The Genovese painter imitated the Romanising style of lettering used by van Eyck. The Latin inscription on the frame of de' Bardi's painting is a meditative prayer on the Crucifixion. It may be no coincidence that the prayer includes exactly that Biblical quote (Wisdom 7:26) which was inscribed on van Eyck's frames several times.[419] However, the use of words on wooden frames was not only a result of the imitation of van

---

[416] Van de Velde regards the frame original, see Carl van de Velde, *Frans Floris: Leven en Werken*, vol. 1 (Brussels: Paleis der Academien, 1975), 290. *VT NIL CONCORDI THALAMO FELICIVS OMNI IN VITA ESSE POTEST, ET SINE LITE TORO: / SIC MAGE IVCVNDVM NIHIL EST, QVAM CERNERE GNATOS CONCORDEIS NIVEO PECTORE PACE FRVI. 1561* // There cannot be anything happier in life than the wedlock which is harmonious from every aspects, and a marriage without quarrel: thus nothing is more delightful than seeing and being delighted in the children with pure hearts united in peace.

[417] *CORPVS PERVNCTVM AROMATE / PVRO SEPVLCRO CONDITVR / ODORA TANTVM PECTORA / MVNDA CHRISTVS DILIGIT* // The body, anointed with sweet spices, is put in the clean tomb. Christ only loves pure and sweet-smelling hearts.

[418] Gludovatz, "Der Name am Rahmen," 115.

[419] De' Bardi might have been inspired by Jan van Eyck's works available in Italy, like the lost Lomellini Triptych. *Jan van Eyck und seine Zeit, Flämische Meister und den Süden 1430-1530*, ed. Till-Holger Borchert and Andreas Beyer (Stuttgart: Belser, 2002), 99. Wisdom 7:29 and 26 was applied to van Eyck's several images, for example to the upper ledge of the frame of the *Madonna with Canon Joris van der Paele*, or to the upper frame of the central image of the Dresden Triptych. The same quote appears above Mary's head in the Deesis of the Ghent Altarpiece, and it is embroidered on Mary's robe in the Berlin Madonna. Purtle, *The Marian Paintings*, 37, 85, 149.

Eyck among the Italian artists. Inscriptions also appear on late fifteenth-century *all'antica* frames, for example around paintings by Ghirlandaio, Lippi, and Botticelli. The frames of these famous panels were inscribed with different kinds of texts: Biblical quotes make the figures of the Annunciation speak below Botticelli's image; Saint Bernhard addresses the reader-viewers below Lippi's work; and a title-like short sentence appears above Ghirlandaio's *Nativity* (plate 5.B-D).[420] These texts evoke the diverse traditions of matching texts with religious images, however, the visual playfulness that was an inherent feature in the Netherlandish examples of inscribed frames seems to be lacking on the frames south of the Alps.

I believe that this brief excursus on inscribed frames provides essential context to this chapter in particular, and also to the research presented in the thesis in general. The phenomenon of the inscribed frames proves that there was a need to connect image and text, poetry and the visual arts, in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century painting. Books and printed genres were not the only source of inspiration for the producers of the prints, and they must have looked at traditions in panel painting especially as they also worked with painters, and painted images when preparing reproductive prints. For strategies of communication and visual effect, the parallel tradition of inscribed frames must have provided examples to study and follow. On the other hand, it is interesting how the difference between inscriptions on frames north and south of the Alps also existed in the prints. The following comparative study aims at shedding light on this issue.

Printed frames of image and text

Among the publications of Salamanca, Lafreri, and Cock, there are only a few prints that present the images in illusionistic frames. When examining fifteenth-century Italian prints, Landau and Parshall pointed out that the appearance of frames around the images meant that they were used as cheap substitute for devotional paintings.[421] The prints with framed images by Cock and Lafreri suggest that this was still true in the sixteenth century. The most traditional religious prints published by Lafreri were completed with borders imitating wooden picture frames (for example the *Holy Family* by Sebastiano di Re, the *Coronation of the Virgin* after Zuccari or Beatrizet's print of the *Madonna of Loreto*, cat.93, 120.a, 126). Two prints published by Cock, the Boschian *Last*

---

[420] *SPIRITVS SANCTVS SVPERVENIET IN TE / ET VIRTVS ALTISSIMI OBVMBRABIT TIBI // ECCE ANCILLA DOMINI FIAT / MICHI SECVNDVM VERBVM TVVM*; *IN REBVS DVBIIS MARIAM COGITA MARIAM INVOCA*; *IPSVM QVEM GENVIT ADORAVIT MARIA.*

[421] Landau and Parshall, *The Renaissance Print*, 81.

Judgment and the *Crucifixion* after Heemskerck were similarly encased in trompe l'oeil frames imitating the form of painted triptychs of the period (cat.30, 49.a). In the case of the *Crucifixion*, the analysis of the texts written on the wings revealed that this print was only seemingly traditional; its producers used a traditional late medieval form of private devotion and reinterpreted it in the context of the Reformation. The use of framing in this print could have served the purpose of hiding its innovative character.

Frames were used as illusionistic tools not only to imitate panel paintings but also sculpted forms and filigree metalwork, like in Lafreri's print after Michelangelo's *Last Judgment* (cat.117). In the *Hunting* series after Stradanus's cartoons for tapestries, published by Cock in 1570, the images were surrounded by illusionistic depictions of reliefs and sculptures.[422] In the *Crucifixion with the Instruments of the Passion* after Lambert Lombard (cat.51), the motifs of the frame, the instruments of the Passion, also imitate three-dimensional forms. The inscriptions in this print are placed on tablets with grotesque frames imitating metal objects. The illusionistic frames included in these prints hint to their use as substitutes for more precious objects, and play on the illusionistic traditions of printmaking.

Previous scholarship did not pay attention to the modes of framing texts in prints, although this was a more widespread phenomenon than framing the images in sixteenth-century prints. Compared to the few example of framed images, there are many more prints by the three publishers in which the inscriptions, additional narrative texts are framed instead of the images. The prints depicting framed images provide the viewer with the illusion of an object in a closed imaginary reality. Only one of them, the Boschian *Last Judgment* triptych, includes narrative text outside the frame, in all the other examples the inscriptions are part of the illusionistic space of the image. In these cases, the texts look like commentaries, they appear in a visually subordinate position to the images. Conversely, when the texts are framed instead of the images, the relation between the two elements of the print changes into visually more equal status, or even to the advantage of the texts. Narrative inscriptions in decorative cartouches often imitate forms of relief sculpture and engraved stone surfaces. In prints depicting framed images, there is already a distinction made between the two-dimensional surface of the image and the illusionistic three-dimensional frame. When the inscriptions are separately framed, they enhance this difference between the elements of the prints. Framed captions introduce an illusionistic

---

[422] *Hieronymus Cock,* ed. Van Grieken et al., 190.

three-dimensional part that appears in between the image and viewer's space. Just as inscribed picture frames around painted panels, decoratively framed inscriptions in prints visually enhance the role of the texts as mediators of the message. The text appears as an element existing in between the space of the viewer-reader and the virtual space of the image.

Among the sheets issued by the three publishers, several prints by Salamanca and Cock include frames and decorative cartouches. Most of these frames show *all'antica* or grotesque visual vocabulary, and the ornamental forms of the frames are really diverse. Some of the printmakers aspired for the perfect illusion of three-dimensional forms, while in other prints the frames consist of simple and plain lines, stylised forms, and the illusion is built solely on the contrast of the dark background and the white plate. There are many examples of this kind of framing in the material published by Salamanca. The series depicting the story of Cupid and Psyche, the prints of *Abigail and David*, the *Killing of Niobe's Children*, or the *Allegory with Venus and Juno* include the Italian and Latin texts in plates ending in a concave indentation similar to a half-baluster (plate 6.A-D). The stanzas of the poems (two or four lines respectively) appear in separate plates next to each other so that the dark background becomes visible in between them, and the contrast gives the illusion of three-dimensionality. Prints like the *Combat of Reason and Lust* after Bandinelli, or *The Sailing Amor* engraved by Agostino Veneziano operated with simpler, concave semi-circular indentations at the ends of the shorter sides of the plates (plate 7.A-B). The concept of creating three-dimensionality with the contrast of dark background and white plate was also present in these prints.

Interestingly, the two antique-like forms were also used in prints from Antwerp from the 1550s onwards. The two-sheet print on the story of Balaam after Heemskerck's design, and *The Miraculous Draught of Fishes* after Lombard include frames with a half-baluster ending, very similar to Salamanca's publications (plate 6.E-F). Plates with concave semi-circular indentations at the ends were also bearing texts in prints published by Cock, like the bacchanalian scenes engraved by Cornelis Cort probably after Giulio Romano, Philips Galle's *Parable of the Wise and Foolish Virgins* after Pieter Bruegel the Elder, Coornhert's *Sheba before Salomon* after Floris, and the *Sacrifice of Isaac* after Raphael (plate 7.C-G).

The prints published with Salamanca's name in Rome are not easy to date precisely but they were most probably published earlier than the prints issued by Cock in Antwerp. It has long been established that Roman single sheet publications around the middle of the

sixteenth century influenced the beginnings of the Antwerp publishing business. First Timothy Riggs and lately Ger Luijten suggested that Cock's business was inspired by the example of Salamanca and Lafreri.[423] The formal similarities in the frames shed light on stylistic exchange. The printmakers working for Cock – Cornelis Cort, Dirk V. Coornhert, or Philips Galle – must have looked at Italian prints of the period as models to be followed when choosing the forms of layout and frames.

The forms of framing that appeared both among Salamanca's and Cock's publications most probably had a common starting point in single sheet prints from Raphael's circle. The "prototype" may have been Raimondi's *Quos Ego* (published first around 1510-1520, and reissued by Salamanca probably after 1540, cat.85). In the *Quos Ego*, both types of plates appeared bearing Roman type inscriptions. The print was intended to imitate sculpted and inscribed antique frames together with the small relief-like scenes. Slightly later, more printmakers connected to the circle of Raimondi started to use these forms, like the Master of the Die or Agostino Veneziano, whose prints were published again by Salamanca around the middle of the sixteenth century.

Given its Virgilian topic, the *Quos Ego* was intended to look like an ancient relief sculpture, and its layout was inspired by a special type of antique sculpted tablets, the so-called *tabula iliaca*.[424] However, the surviving examples of this ancient genre did not include frames of inscriptions, so Raphael and Raimondi had to find inspiration for the frames somewhere else. There are a few examples for similar inscribed tablets from antiquity. Ancient sarcophagi contain this version of the *tabula ansata* with two half balusters added to the shorter ends of a tablets (plate 8). The one in the British Museum (nr. 1896,0619.5) was found in Rome, brought to England from near the Torre Argentina, while another one, which was certainly known already in the Renaissance, is from Torcello cathedral.[425] On the other hand, the frame with the half-baluster indentation appears several times as frame of antique inscriptions in the first published epigraphic manual, Mazzocchi's sylloge (*Epigrammata antiquae urbis*, 1521).[426] Although there are many woodcut frames in this volume that were invented by early modern designers, the fact that there are some similar surviving Roman examples supports the antique origin of

---

[423] Riggs, *Hieronymus Cock*, 30, and Ger Luijten, "Hieronymus Cock and the Italian Printmakers," 30-35.
[424] Kleinbub, "Raphael's Quos Ego," 290.
[425] For the British Museum sarcophagus see Susan Walker, *Catalogue of Roman Sarcophagi in the British Museum* (London: The British Museum Press, 1990), 36. For the Torcello piece see the Census catalogue (ID 161337), http://census.bbaw.de (last visited 05.04.2017)
[426] On the woodcut frames in Mazzocchi's publication see Christopher S. Wood, "Notation of visual information in the earliest archeological scholarship," *Word & Image* 17 (2001): 111-113.

this form of framing. The *Quos Ego* transmitted antique visual vocabulary to many prints of the sixteenth century.

Interestingly, while Raimondi laid emphasis on the illusionistic three-dimensional depiction of the frames in the *Quos Ego*, the later prints by various printmakers published by Salamanca and Cock rather included stylised, simpler versions of the same forms. It seems that the printmakers counted on well-known conventions, namely that the viewers will understand the meaning of the simpler forms, and identify the purpose of imitating the forms of antiquity even in the simple, two-dimensional structures.

On the other hand, both Salamanca and Cock published many prints with inscribed plates that emphasised illusionistic three-dimensionality in more complex forms of frames. Salamanca issued prints by Enea Vico (*Lucretia*, *Venus and Mars*), and Beatrizet (*Cain and Abel*) with carefully formed, relief-like tablets, and two of the prints on carnal love included Italian texts written on decorative plates and displayed in a complex way (plate 9). In the *Allegory on the Cruelty of Love*, the three plates bearing the three stanzas of the poem look like thin metal sheets or paper rolls, decorated with complicated forms at the shorter ends. They are placed in a box-like space below the depiction, as if attached on the frames of this sculpted box. In the *Allegory of the Passions*, the Italian poem is written on a similar object that is ambiguously depicted from the material point of view. The folds on its lower ledge suggest that it is a sheet of paper, a decorative *cartellino*, however, the left shorter ledge and a split in the lower right corner makes it look like a sculpted, harder surface. Its status in the image is similarly ambiguous. For the first instance, it seems to be superimposed on the image, pasted on the surface of the depiction. However, the protagonist's right leg casts shadow on the upper right corner. In a witty way, the printmaker united two methods of displaying the text in order to play with the spectator's perception.

In Cock's publications, one can also find more complicated forms of framings. These frames are constructed to picture spatial illusion by the means of trapezoidal or semicircular indentations at the end of the tablets, or by the means of oblong or circular holes "cut" into the surface of the plates (examples on plate 10). Whereas most frames of texts were rather stylised, the engraver Cornelis Cort aimed at creating the illusion of real three-dimensional sculpted objects. In several prints, Cort emphasised three-dimensionality by distinguishing a dented field in the middle of the plate and an increased

surface of the actual frame (*Hercules Besieged by the Pygmies* after Frans Floris, *The Three Fates* after Giulio Romano, plate 10.E-F).[427]

The layout of the sheets is common in almost all the examples mentioned so far. The framed inscriptions appear on the lower margin, below the image, so the whole print, image and text, look like a relief sculpture put on an inscribed base or plinth. Many antique objects and fragments could provide inspiration for this arrangement of visual and textual parts, from tombstones to epitaphs and funerary altars with images of the gods. The layout of the prints served to enhance the illusion of three-dimensional, sculpted objects. It was not only the forms of the frames but also the overall illusion of the sheets that was intended to work as an *all'antica* object. Interestingly, the prints published by Salamanca played on the classical objects with their mythological and allegorical topics (only the prints depicting a scene from the story of David and Abigail, and Beatrizet's *Cain and Abel* show Biblical stories). This was not anymore the case in the Antwerp prints. Cock published many sheets with religious topics (e.g., the *Holy Family* after Andrea del Sarto, or scenes from Solomon's story after Floris's design) with texts in *all'antica* frames.

The layout and the separation of image and text by a decorative frame did not only serve illusionistic purposes. The framed inscriptions played an important role in displaying the images. By foregrounding the three-dimensionality of the tablets in contrast to the two-dimensionality of the picture, the framed inscriptions hinted to the status of the image as depiction. Hanne Kolind Poulsen analysed the theoretical significance of the framed inscriptions in relation to printed images in her study on Coornhert's allegorical, moralising prints after Heemskerck's design. According to Poulsen, highlighting the "object" status of images can be connected to Luther's ideas on the function of religious imagery.[428] This hypothesis could explain why there are many more framed inscriptions among Cock's publications than in the Roman material. As analysed in the second chapter on religious prints from Antwerp, reform-minded thinking on the function of images influenced some of the prints published by Cock. Beyond the influence of reform ideas, the status of images was a current theoretical concept in the period, and the play with frames added an interpretative layer to the prints that the humanist audience could enjoy as

---

[427] A third print by an anonymous printmaker after Andrea del Sarto's *Holy Family* in the Metropolitan Museum shows a similar concept of the tablet. One may suppose any connection with Cort, or maybe the use of a common model in the case of the tablet.

[428] Hanne Kolind Poulsen, "Faith and Visual Communication in the Netherlands of the Sixteenth Century," *SMK Art Journal*, ed. Peter Nørgaard Larsen (Copenhagen: National Gallery of Denmark, 2008): 90.

well. Prints with framed inscriptions brought into play theoretical ideas about the status of images and works of art.

The appearance of a special kind of framing supports the hypothesis that printmakers played with illusion, reality, and the status of the image consciously. Some texts were placed on plates and tablets that were superimposed on the images. By setting the framed inscriptions on the image instead of separating from it, the printmakers broke the illusion, and revealed that the images only imitated relief sculptures, or other three-dimensional objects. The two-dimensional character, and "object" status of the image became evidently visible with the superimposed tablets.

Texts on framed tablets superimposed on the image are most common among the publications of Cock from the three examined publishers (plate 11-13). The earliest superimposed tablet among Cock's publications appeared in the lower left corner of the print after Raphael's *School of Athens* that was reinterpreted as St Paul preaching in Athens with the help of the inscription. In this case, the status of the tablet is ambiguous. For the first instance, it fits perfectly in the architectural setting of the image, and it looks just as another stone parapet, like the one in the middle of the composition that is inscribed with Raphael's and Ghisi's name. However, if one pays more attention to the form and to the spatial relations of the tablet, it becomes clear that it is not connected to other elements of the composition, like the elder figure sitting behind it. Through the placement of the inscribed tablet, Ghisi highlighted the "object" status of Raphael's image, thus emphasised the function of the print as reproduction of a famous image. On the other hand, the tablet carries the paraphrase of the relevant part from the Acts of the Apostles. The inscription identifies St Paul as the protagonist, and its form influences the viewer's conception of the status of the image. As mentioned in the chapter on the religious prints published by Cock, the presence of reform ideas in Antwerp must have influenced the choice of the printmaker and the publisher to sell Raphael's famous image as a scene from the apostle's life rather than the assembly of ancient philosophers. The form and position of the narrative inscription provides further evidence for this hypothesis.

A year later, Ghisi engraved for Cock the *Last Supper* after Lambert Lombard (plate 12.D). This print displays the narrative inscription in *all'antica* frame but in a very different position from what was typical in other prints analysed so far. Ghisi depicted the scene as if happening on a stage by the means of inserting a dark stripe below the image. The dedicatory inscription, the reference to the inventor, Cock's name, and the privilege were written on this stripe, on a dented surface as being inscribed in stone. The framed

narrative inscription was put in the middle as if it was a separate tablet leant against the dark zone, the base of the stage, as if the tablet casted shadow on this base. The tablet became part of the illusion of the image but at the same time, it highlighted the illusionary status of the scene with its scale and form. With the inscribed tablet in the middle of the composition, the "object" status of the image, as imitation of a sculpted relief, became evident for the beholders.

Several other prints published by Cock in the 1550s and 1560s followed the example of Ghisi's print after Raphael's fresco by inserting a framed rectangular tablet in one corner of the image (e.g., *Esther before Ahasverus* after Lombard, *Killing of Niobe's Children* after Giulio Romano, *Allegory* after Floris, *Dialectica* after Floris, *Muses* after Floris, plate 11.B, D, 12.A-C). The monumental *Brazen Serpent* after Floris's design was a special case among these examples (plate 11.C). The engraver Pieter van der Heyden was probably inspired by Ghisi's solution of the framed tablet. However, Heyden pushed the meaning of the tablet further by shifting it from the corner of the image. The plate bearing Lampsonius's poem was connected to the margin of the image only with one of its four sides, thus its superimposed position became more evident than in Ghisi's print after Raphael. Timothy Riggs's irritation about the plate carrying Lampsonius's text highlights its particular position. Riggs blames Pieter van der Heyden's unskilfulness for the "unfortunate" placing of the tablet.[429] In my opinion, Heyden was proved skilful in destroying the illusion of the image. Lampsonius's poem resonated with the visual meaning of the tablet since it emphasised the didactic function of the ideal religious image that is achieved by the expressive qualities of the art work. Beyond serving a theoretical purpose, the tablet also highlighted the talent of the designer by denying the three-dimensionality of the image. The statuesque character of the figures could deceive the viewer in seeing real bodies but the superimposed tablet pointed out the flatness of the image, making the spectator realise the deception.

Superimposed tablets appeared in several prints published by Cock, but only one example is to be found among the prints published by Salamanca (the *Gladiators* engraved after Giulio Romano's design, Bartsch XV.29.2). Then there are two already mentioned prints that play with the status of the inscribed tablets. In the *Combat of Reason and Lust* and in the *Allegory of the Passions*, the plates begin as superimposed in the left lower part of the print but they are incorporated in the composition on the other end, and interact with

---

[429] Riggs, *Hieronymus Cock*, 97.

the figures depicted (plate 7.A, 9.D). In the print after Bandinelli's design, this was the result of the later addition of the plate and the inscription. In the case of the *Allegory of the Passions*, the engraver must have played consciously with the different layers of reality, and spatial relations of the composition, using visual virtuosity to catch the attention of the viewer, and to provoke thoughts about the status of the image. Cock also published a print in 1557, the *Calvary* after Lombard's design, which included an inscribed plate in an ambiguous position (plate 13.A). The tablet bearing Biblical quotes is superimposed on the image on the left side, while it transforms into a stone plate connecting to the rocky ground on the right side. Some plants even cover its right lower corner, and thus integrate the plate into the composition. The *Visitation* published both by Salamanca and Lafreri includes a similar tablet (plate 13.B). This *all'antica* plate is put in an ambiguous position: its upper ledge is parallel to the stairs that is the location of the meeting of Mary and Elisabeth, and it is not superimposed on any depicted object. On the right, the plate even casts shadow on the ground that suggests its place in the composition. However, the scale and form of the tablet suggest that it was not intended as part of the composition. It has a similar position in the image as the tablet in the *Crucifixion* after Lombard. The plates in these four prints function as if they were holding up and revealing illusion at the same time.

The analysis shows that printmakers working for Cock laid more emphasis on revealing the "object" status of the images. This might be the result of the illusionistic tradition in the Netherlands represented by van Eyck's frames, but the influence of the Reformation and the impact of the growing theoretical approach towards print publishing (that meant the conscious formation of an international artistic canon, praise of the designer-inventors) must have played a role, too. Prints with the superimposed tablets played consciously with the illusionistic traditions, and expected the beholders to decipher this additional interpretative layer. The *Brazen Serpent* shows what this meant in relation to religious images, and signals a new approach towards the function of religious imagery, as analysed in the chapter on religious prints published by Cock. The ultimate goal of the depiction was to teach the viewer, and even the superimposed tablet was a didactic device that could show the faithful the deceiving nature of images.

There are fewer prints including framed inscriptions than those showing a simpler, more general layout when the image is separated from the text only by a thin line, and no frames play a part in the composition. Many prints by Salamanca and Cock also show this format, and almost all the publications by Lafreri were issued in this form (the few framed images were analysed in the beginning of this chapter, and the only framed text appears in

the small *Ecce Homo* sheet, cat.107). Peter van der Coelen called this layout the "standard format," and connected its widespread appearance to the emergence of the publishing houses.[430] However, this was already the customary structure of many fifteenth-century religious woodcuts.[431] Therefore, this form represents the more traditional, less experimental trend, although the next chapter will show that playing with the viewer's perception was also possible in this layout. The simple structure also resembles other paper objects, like printed book layouts, and gave up providing the viewer with the illusion of antique objects.

There are two important conclusions to draw in this subchapter; both concern the influences between Roman and Antwerp print publishing. As shown in the section on *all'antica* frames of inscriptions, printmakers working in Antwerp must have looked at prints coming from Rome. The stylistic and formal connection between frames gives tangible evidence for the model role of the Roman publisher and his prints. In exchange, Cock's publishing house must have played an important role in spreading theoretical ideas about the status of images. The next subchapter will expand on this aspect of the Antwerp prints.

Crossing the frames: the viewer and the printed image

Meyer Schapiro defined any crossing of visual thresholds as an expressive device used in order to make the image more effective, dynamic, and moving. According to him, when elements of the image cross the frame of the depiction, the figure becomes more lively and energetic in the eye of the beholder. If the image is extended beyond its margins and frames, the spatial and illusionistic relations of image, frame, and the spectator undergo a change.[432] In general, the crossing part creates a bridge between the space of the depiction and the world of the viewer, and enhances the communication between the image and its spectator. This illusionistic device works exactly the opposite way to the superimposed, inscribed tablets. While the superimposed plate denies the illusionistic reality of the images, the crossing of the frame extends the illusion into the space of the spectator. This extension usually contributes to the meaning of the depiction, both regarding the specific content, and the general theoretical approach towards the status of the image.

---

[430] Van der Coelen, "Producing Texts for Prints," 75.
[431] For example see Griese, *Text-Bilder und ihre Kontexte*, 596, 609-623.
[432] Schapiro, "On Some Problems in the Semiotics of Visual Art," 11.

As Schapiro pointed out, the "violation of the frame" was already typical in medieval art, and the same idea lay behind the use of illusionistic, painted frames in Gossart's panels (as discussed above).[433] Figures stepping out of the image and crossing the margins appeared in prints from the first half of the sixteenth century as well. The play with the margin was usually applied as an illusionistic tool displaying and highlighting the inventive and artistic skills of designer and printmaker. For example, in Jacopo Caraglio's prints of the fighting Hercules after the design of Rosso Fiorentino, the feet and tails of the protagonist creatures often extend into the space of the cartouches below the images (plate 14). In another series made in collaboration of Rosso and Caraglio, the *Gods in Niches* (which was reissued by Salamanca as well), almost all the figures (or decorative details of their clothes, attributes) extend beyond the space of the niches. The play with frames propagated the talent of the artist, and made the figures seem even more sculpture-like, three-dimensional, and dynamic.[434]

The Hercules series was never completed with inscriptions, although the blank cartouches were ready for the texts. The series of the gods received Latin texts but they are short, and only served to identify the depicted figures. In the case of Caraglio's prints, the crossing of frames served to show artistic virtuosity. In the material by the three examined publishers, several examples demonstrate that showing skilfulness was still an important point for engravers of the second half of the sixteenth century. Cornelis Cort especially used this expressive device to show his talent of the burin (plate 15). In three prints depicting the allegorical figures of *Grammatica*, *Auditus*, and *Tactus* after Floris's design, objects (a book, a musical instrument), and one toe of the female figure (the sense of touching) cast shadow on the space below the image, and on the letters of the narrative inscriptions. Similarly, in Cort's print after Primaticcio showing the gods on Mount Olympus, the drapery and the spear crossing the margin of the circular image simply signaled artistic virtuosity, just as the whole composition was a display of extreme foreshortening. However, there are some other prints published by Cock, Lafreri, and Salamanca, in which the extension of the image on the frame or in the space of the inscription reveals other purposes beyond artistic virtuosity. The engravers and inventors often used the opportunity of the visual pun to introduce another layer of meaning, or to establish a connection between the two different realities of image and text.

---

[433] Schapiro, "On Some Problems in the Semiotics of Visual Art," 11.
[434] It is a tricky question who was responsible for these details. James Grantham Turner thinks it plausible that Caraglio changed Rosso's drawings in order to include such "visual tricks" in the prints. James Grantham Turner, "Caraglio's *Loves of the Gods*," *Print Quarterly* 24 (2007): 363.

Among Salamanca's publications, the *Death of Meleager* is the only print that has to be considered from this point of view (plate 16.A). Here, Meleager's dog steps out of the lower margin of the image, and the Italian narrative inscription surrounds its leg. This leg crossing the margin of the image can be interpreted as a gesture towards the viewer, an invitation for deeper involvement in the narrative of the depiction. The leg of the yowling dog interrupts the inscription after the word "piangesi" (one weeps or should weep), thus it functions as an exclamation mark, emphasising the meaning, and urging the viewer to feel empathy for the fate of the protagonist.

The position of the figure in relation to the text must not be a coincidence. When narrative inscriptions are involved in telling the story of a print, figures crossing the line between image and text play an important role in bringing together the messages of the two sections of the sheet. The weeping dog's leg was placed next to the word referring to the same meaning, exhorting the viewer's reaction to the story told in image and text. In the print of *Adam and Eve with the Baby Cain* published by Lafreri, Eve's foot is crossing the margin above the capital letter "E" in the third stanza of the Neo-Latin poem (plate 16.B). Thus, her second toe is pointing to the first letter of her name. The text does not specify the identity of the depicted figures, thus the pointing of Eve's toe plays an important role in helping the viewers recognise the Biblical first family. The position of the toe has an important labelling function. On the other hand, Eve's toe also guides the attention to the part of the text where the spectator is addressed. *Este hylares* ("Be joyful") can be interpreted as an exhortation to the depicted figures, the parents of the newborn child, but it is also a general encouragement of any beholder to cheer the arrival of a child. The relation of the pointing toe and the text is just as complex and symbolic as the cross-shape branches above Eve's head referring to the birth of Christ in a typological interpretation.

Toes crossing the margins appear in the prints published by Cock as well, with a similar function as in the two prints by Salamanca and Lafreri. In Cort's engraving after Floris's design for the series of the *Pastoral Goddesses*, Daphne's foot crosses the border between image and text just above the mention of her name in the Ovidian line (plate 16.D). The pointing big toe serves the same goal as Eve's toe in Lafreri's print, labelling and identifying the figure (although in this case her name was also written on the depiction). This is the eighth and last sheet of the series, and the only figure extending to the space of the text. Its concluding function in the series might explain why Daphne was chosen for the play with the margin. However, she is also different from the other nymphs

and goddesses of the series as she is depicted in the moment of her escape, and her metamorphosis into a laurel tree. Her toe crossing the border of the image shows her more dynamic in her tortured posture and movement. Moreover, her crossing of the margin might be read as a symbol for her transformation. Her toe stretches across the line between the illusionistic world of the image and the abstract space of the text, while her body changes from one form of living into another.

Eve's second toe plays an important part in a print published by Cock as well. In Cort's *Adam and Eve Lamenting Abel* after Floris's design, the lamenting mother's toe crosses the margin of the image above the word *FRATER*, pointing at the letter "T" (plate 16.C). In this case, Eve's toe emphasises the typological meaning of the scene as the "T" could be understood as a reference to another tragic event (and motherly suffering), Christ's death on the cross. This layer of interpretation is already expressed by comparing the murder of Abel by Cain to the lion killing a lamb, the symbol of Christ, in text and image (cat.10). The motifs come together visually, Eve's toe pointing at the T in the lower right corner, below the image of the lion mauling a lamb, thus introducing an emphasised typological reading of the sheet. The barren tree behind Eve could be read as a reference to Christ's cross, similarly to the branches forming a cross behind Eve in the print published by Lafreri (cat.104).

It would be interesting to know if there was any connection between the two prints with Eve's toe crossing the margins. The two prints from Rome and Antwerp are different from the rest of the examples: the pointing of the toe is planned to such an extent that they contribute with an additional symbolic meaning by highlighting individual letters in the inscription. This reflects a common complex thinking about the relation of text and image that takes into account even the smallest details, and considers the print as an intellectual puzzle for the beholder, similar to emblems. On the other hand, it is worth noting that the prints by Fagiuoli and Cort depict two scenes from the story of Adam and Eve. The Roman print had a counterpart, and they were probably sold by Lafreri as a pair.[435] The other print of the pair depicts the same scene as Cort's sheet after Floris's painting, the lament of Adam and Eve over the dead body of Abel (cat.105). There are even some formal similarities between the two prints (Eve's robust body and breasts, the style of her hair, the muscular, older figures of Adam, the sacrificial altars). It is not impossible that

---

[435] Hence the reference of Lafreri's stocklist to the prints as "il primo nato" and "il primo morto." Rubach, *ANT. LAFRERI FORMIS ROMAE*, 138.

Cort and Floris knew the two prints published by Lafreri, and that they influenced Cort's approach to the design, and to the setting of text and image in the print.

In the *Hercules and the Pygmies* print (cat.9), Cort again relied on the expressive tool of crossing the border between the space of the image and the space of the text. In this sheet, the visual illusion is more complex because the text, Alciato's Neo-Latin poem, was inscribed on a frame imitating sculpted stone. Some figures of the pygmies coming out of their underground dwellings are partially covered by the frame. The frame looks like a parapet that divides the world of the viewer from the world of the depicted scene, and the margins of the image act like a window through which the spectator is able to have a look at the story. In this setting, the dead Antaeus's hair falling down to the frame can only be interpreted as connecting the two different realities. The extension of the image into the illusionistic reality of the frame points out the difference of the two spaces but at the same time creates a dialogue between them. Antaeus's hair casts a shadow on the first line of the inscription that speaks about someone having a refreshing sleep (*dum dormit, dulci recreat dum corpora somno*). In this case, the figure is not connected to the text that he comes into contact with visually, since the part of the text that Antaeus's hair falls onto concerns the figure of Hercules. This could mislead the reader-viewers for the first instance, especially because the pose of the two unconscious and recumbent characters is comparable. Since both figures look as if sleeping for the first moment, one needs to observe text and image, and decipher the motifs of the whole image to understand the visual pun. One has to recall Hercules's attributes, recognise the flying figure of Somnus, the god of sleep, and read the second stanza of Alciato's poem to identify the story. Antaeus's position also helps the spectator to recognise the dead enemy in him. His head falling down to the inscription enters the space of the viewer, as if the image suggests that the dead corpse falls out of the mythological world, and joins the world of mortals in his death.

The *Hercules and the Pygmies* plays with blurring different realities. It includes the viewer's space into the depiction, and takes it into consideration when creating the meaning. In a later print engraved by Cort in Rome, and published by Lafreri, the beholder's world plays a role in a similarly symbolic way. In the *Annunciation with Prophets* after Zuccari's fresco, the layout imitates an architectural setting, with Adam and Eve in the spandrels (cat.122). These figures are depicted as closest to the beholder in the illusionistic space of the image, they extend beyond the margins of the composition, the three-dimensionality of their bodies is emphasised, and they lean forward towards the spectator (especially Eve). They share not only the space but also the fate of mankind with

the beholder, they belong to the same sinful world that is awaiting salvation. The semi-circular arch can also be seen as a window on the depicted scene.

The understanding of the frame or margin of the printed image as a window opening is especially relevant when the depicted space of the text looks like a parapet. In the *Hercules and the Pygmies*, figures are partly covered by the parapet, and they appear from below, and disappear behind the surface on which the text is placed. Religious prints depicting divine persons in close-up tend to show this layout. Typical examples are the images of the suffering Christ, copying painted compositions of the same topic (e.g., *Christ Carrying the Cross* engraved by Cort after Michiel Coxcie, published by Cock, Cherubino Alberti's *Christ Carrying the Cross*, and the anonymous *Ecce Homo* published by Lafreri, cat.52, 106, 107). Giorgio Ghisi applied the same composition in the *Mystic Marriage of St Catherine* after Correggio's design (cat.143). Narrative prints depicting many figures also show similar layout and composition. In Domenico Zenoi's print after Giulio Clovio's design, Veronica with her veil, and two Roman soldiers discussing the Crucifixion appear in the foreground, and their figures are cut in the knee by the borderline between the space of the image and the space of the narrative inscription (cat.139-140). Similarly, in Cort's print after Marco del Pino's painting, the adoring shepherds stand on the stairs leading to the Christ Child, and half of their bodies disappear behind the parapet carrying the Neo-Latin poem (cat.121). Their gazes and gestures guide the viewer's attention to the middle of the composition, and their position highlights this mediator role. The shepherds have the same position and setting in Pino's painting, but their intermediary role is more emphasised in the print by the addition of the text that addresses the viewers. The emotional gestures and the dynamic figures in the foreground could make an even greater impression on the viewer this way.

A soldier in another engraving by Cort played a similar role as the shepherds in the print after Pino or the soldiers in the *Crucifixion* after Clovio. In the *Moses and Aaron before the Pharaoh*, the margins of the image also act like a windowframe, and the soldier's figure in the lower right corner is cut by the knee (cat.124). However, his arm crosses the margin on the right side, thus he enters into the space of the viewer. Interestingly, here the concept of crossing the frame can be traced back to a drawing. The sheet in the British Museum is attributed to Taddeo Zuccari who took part in the

preparation of the painting project that was later executed by his brother, Federico.[436] Cort followed the preparatory drawing in the details when engraving the print, and translated the drawn arm of the soldier as if crossing the margin of the image. Thus the print is in contrast with the fresco where the painted surface is limited by the golden decorative frame, and the soldier's arm disappears behind it. This comparison between fresco, preparatory drawing, and print gives an idea about the differences of the media. Crossing the margin was a visual pun used more often in drawings and prints where the spectator could closely observe the smallest details of the image, and appreciate the playfulness of the composition.

Ghisi's print of the *Last Supper* after Lombard's design was already mentioned among the prints with inscribed plates superimposed on the images (plate 12.D-E). A pair image to this was published by Cock in 1557 that shows the same layout, the *all'antica* plate bearing the text put in the middle of the lower ledge of the composition of *Christ Washing the Feet of the Apostles*. In both prints, there is a dark stripe below the main scene that looks as if it was the edge of the stage where the story is happening. The Latin texts identifying the scenes as examples of virtues are put on these dark zones, thus enhancing the theatrical effect of the prints. In the 1557 print, there are two figures who look at the scene of Christ washing the feet of the apostles. These figures fit the group of the apostles in scale and in look, however, there are more than twelve male figures in the image altogether. The two half-figures stand "below the stage," apparently before the inscribed plate. They connect the space of the beholder with the scene; they act as spectators, commentators of the story. They could also be identified with the narrator of the Latin text who cries out in the last line, as if pointing to the scene happening before his eyes ("O, image of exemplary humility!"). They also provide the viewer with an exemplary reaction to the print. In this case, the image does not extend over its margins in a literal sense. However, with the placing of the two spectator figures before the superimposed tablet, the image is extended into the viewer's space in an illusionary way. The two male figures reinstate the illusion that was destroyed by the scale of the superimposed plate. The inclusion of the spectators in the image enhances the impression that one is looking at a scene performed on a stage, explained by an inscription placed on a massive plate. The engraver and the designer achieved to switch around the visual pun through the figures of spectators. The *Christ Washing the Feet of the Apostles* provided the

---

[436] *Taddeo and Federico Zuccaro, Artist-Brothers in Renaissance Rome*, ed. Julian Brooks and Peter M. Lukehart (Los Angeles: The J. Paul Getty Museum 2007), 63, fig. 17.

viewer with the ideal way of looking at religious imagery: getting involved in the scene but at the same time being reminded of the object status of the depiction by an inscribed text.

Using figures of the depiction to guide the viewer's gaze in the image, or to communicate with the spectators was not a new idea in the second half of the sixteenth century. In his work *On Painting*, Alberti already spoke about the role of these "commentator" figures in narrative images.[437] The structure of prints enabled the inventors and engravers to play with this concept. With the appearance of the separate space of the text, the commentator figures could be more dynamic by extending into the space of the inscriptions. The space of the text introduced another dimension of reality that connected the image with the space of the spectator. Crossing the boundary between image and text meant crossing the border between realities, leaving the world of the depiction (visionary space, mythological world, or the sphere of divine figures) and entering into the world of humankind. This crossing carried symbolic meaning, like the transformation of the depicted figure (e.g., Daphne), or the emphasis on death and sin (e.g., Antaeus, Adam and Eve). This phenomenon reflects a theoretical approach towards visual depiction, and towards the different media of text and image. The text was considered as part of the viewer's reality, while the image was regarded deceiving and illusionistic. The play with these different registers of meaning, and the staging of different realities served to get the beholder involved in the story of the depiction but also to make him or her conscious about the object status of images. The humanist audience must have appreciated this as an amusing game and a prompt to interpretation.

This chapter showed that the use of frames reveals the conscious play with illusion and mediality in prints. The forms of frames and the phenomenon of crossing frames contributed to a better understanding of theoretical ideas behind printmaking and publishing, such as the status of the image, and its religious function. Frames also served to enhance the involvement of the viewer in the depiction, and thus gave further clues for their meditative function. These points are important since they all complete and strengthen the observations of the previous chapters. In the prints published by Cock, frames were often used in order to highlight the two-dimensionality of the images thus destroying the illusion created by artistic talent. Apparently, it was just as important for

---

[437] "I like there to be someone in the 'historia' who tells the spectators what is going on, and either beckons them with his hand to look, (…) or points to some danger or remarkable thing in the picture, or by his gestures invites you to laugh or weep with them." Leon Battista Alberti, *On Painting and On Sculpture*, ed. and tr. Cecil Grayson (London: Phaidon, 1972), 83.

Cock to neutralise the deceiving character of images as it was to emphasise the talent of the artist-inventors. Interestingly, texts inscribed in the prints provided opportunity for both purposes, they could praise the artist with words while destroy the betraying visual effect through their form and position. From this point of view, captions were used with more consciousness and consistency in Cock's prints than in the sheets published by Salamanca or Lafreri. While the involvement of the viewer in the scene was a more important aspect in the selection of texts in the Roman material, the form of the inscriptions was not exploited to such an extent as in the prints published by Cock. The play with frames and borders in the Antwerp prints has to be seen in parallel with the developments in painting, like the play with frames in van Eyck's and Gossart's works. This tradition might explain why the northern publisher and his collaborators were more conscious about framing image and text in their prints.

From the comparative point of view, observations made in this chapter delineate certain exchanges between the print world of Rome and Antwerp. First, certain forms of frames from the circle of Raphael reached Antwerp most probably through the mediation of Salamanca. The analysis of the different types of frames used in the prints published by Cock revealed some concrete moments of influence which can support the old hypothesis of Cock following the model of the Roman publishers. The borrowing and adaptation of specific forms and motifs shed light on the connection between prints around the middle of the sixteenth century, and provided some tangible evidence for the connection of the print businesses north and south of the Alps. The examination also highlighted the other side of the exchange. Later in the 1560s and 1570s, modes of framing in the northern prints might have been followed in the south, such as the superimposed tablet. The link between two prints of the story of Adam and Eve by Lafreri and Cock indicates that the two publishers followed each other's work closely, and borrowed from each other not only motifs but also ideas about connecting text and image in the prints.

CONCLUSION

Prints had an influential role in sixteenth-century visual culture with their widespread circulation and the hundreds of impressions that were produced from the individual plates. Many interested viewers gained knowledge of artistic inventions, outstanding oeuvres, and the innovations of style through reproductive prints. Even more important is that the audience had a close and potentially personal relationship with the paper objects purchased on the market or in the shop of the publisher. Therefore it is crucial to make sense of the textual frameworks through which these printed images were transmitted to the wider audience. The findings of my research contribute to a better understanding of the contexts in which printed images of leading sixteenth-century masters were viewed. The identification of the sources of inscribed texts and the analysis of their style and content contribute to a richer reading of the prints, considering both the artistic value and the possible practical functions of the sheets.

This thesis demonstrated how inscribed texts were intended to influence the viewer's perception of images. On the one hand, inscriptions placed the images in the art theoretical and historical context through highlighting the learnedness of the inventor, referencing antique artists as comparison, or evoking topoi of interpreting the visual arts. The consistent reference to the visual inventor and the acknowledgment of authorship, both visual and literary, were significant developments of the period that also helped the viewer-readers to contextualise printed images. The appearance of the literary author in the printed single sheets suggests that prints became an acknowledged platform for publishing poetic works or thoughts about art. On the other hand, the textual frameworks delineated the thematic messages of the images and revealed their potential everyday functions beyond their importance as collectibles. Inscribed commentaries help to comprehend the wider cultural context in which the prints functioned beyond their artistic value, from religious meditation through the courtly culture of love to moral contemplation.

The prints published by Hieronymus Cock presented a conscious and consistent acknowledgment of artistic achievements. The Antwerp publisher's systematic promotion of the arts and certain artists was clearly formulated in the inscriptions added to the printed images. He was the only publisher among the three analysed in this thesis who issued a text, a dedication to a mythological series after Frans Floris, that expanded on the role of reproductive prints as well (see cat.8.a). According to this groundbreaking paratext, prints were mediators of masterpieces, transmitters of artistic talent to a wide and far away

audience, like Italian humanists or artists. Cock and his circle realised the significance of the portable nature of prints parallel to Giorgio Vasari, who formulated similar thoughts on the benefit of printmaking in the 1568 edition of the *Vite*.[438] This loose definition of the reproductive aspect of the prints matches the modern sense of the term in its intermediary function. However, sixteenth-century theoreticians and publishers focused on the transmission of visual inventions, artistic ideas, and they did not put an emphasis on the existence of painted prototypes. This indifference was reflected in the wording of the inscriptions in Cock's prints.

Cock was not the first to realise the potential of prints in marketing painters and artistic ideas but he was the first to include a critical framework and theoretical comments in prints, such as texts praising the inventor's talent, commenting on the quality of the image or expanding on the position of the image in the history of art (e.g., by comparison with antique artists). These texts combined comments on the artistic aspect of the image with the discussion of the depicted subject, using the thematic message of the images to argue for the talent of the inventors (e.g., the print of the *Brazen Serpent* after Floris, cat.1). Similar inscriptions only appeared a few years later in Rome, in Antonio Lafreri's prints from the late 1550s onward. One of the most interesting findings of my research was that more art historical and theoretical awareness was evident in the Antwerp prints than in the Roman material. The prints published by Cock presented a parallel version of art history narrated in images and poetry, the northern response to the Italian corpus of art theoretical and biographical writings. This direction of Cock's oeuvre was the result of his collaboration with the humanist Dominicus Lampsonius who was an important initiator of art theoretical thinking and writing in the northern context. Lampsonius regarded prints as one of the ideal vehicles to communicate his thoughts on art and artists. In collaboration with Cock, Lampsonius must have experimented with the commentaries on the margins of printed images in order to compensate for the lack of writings on art and artists in the north.

Cock's prints that include texts concerning art historical and theoretical issues are not without precedent in the history of single sheet prints in the north. As early as 1522, a woodcut depicting an allegorical battle between naked men and peasants was published

---

[438] "E per ultimo, di tutto il giovamento che hanno gl'oltramontani avuto dal vedere, mediante le stampe, le maniere d'Italia, e gl'Italiani dall'aver veduto quelle degli stranieri et oltramontani, si deve avere, per la maggior parte, obligo a Marcantonio Bolognese." Vasari, *Le Vite,* vol.5, 25. On the topic of Vasari and printmaking see Barbara Stoltz, "Disegno versus Disegno stampato: Printmaking Theory in Vasari's Vite (1550-1568) in the Context of the Theory of disegno and the Libro de' Disegni," *Journal of Art Historiography* 7 (2012): 1-20.

with a long German poem in its second state. The text, beyond determining the topic of the depiction, expanded on the history of antique painting based on Pliny's writings, and also commented on the talent and character of the designer of the woodcut.[439] Although the satirical tone of the German verse is very different from the serious texts in Cock's prints published a few decades later, the idea is strikingly similar. It seems like a northern practice to communicate certain art theoretical ideas to the audience in the form of commentary next to a printed image. Such prior examples as the 1522 woodcut could have influenced Cock and his collaborators in choosing the medium of single sheet prints to communicate their theoretical ideas about prints and to celebrate artistic achievements in the paratext.

The stronger art historical and theoretical awareness could also be a result of Cock's conscious strategy of his single sheet business. The present analysis of his publications indicated that Cock was most probably responsible for matching image and text, and must have overseen or contributed to the selection of quotations. In contrast, Salamanca's or Lafreri's role is rather ambiguous. It was possible to highlight correlations among some of their prints through the analysis of the inscriptions (e.g., the six prints on love by Salamanca, or some religious prints after Raphael published by Lafreri). However, these correlations do not indicate a conscious planning of inscriptions to such an extent as in Cock's stock. In Lafreri's case, the prints even provided the opposite evidence, and revealed the probable role of printmakers in the lettering of prints. In my opinion, Nicolas Beatrizet was most probably responsible for the inscriptions, and Cornelis Cort might have influenced the layout and content of inscriptions in his prints produced in Italy.

Cock's prints were also innovative in including the name of a humanist writer in some printed sheets (Lampsonius's name appeared both below the poem on the *Brazen Serpent*, and on the dedication to the *Labours of Hercules* series, cat.1 and 8). This practice became widespread in northern prints by the end of the sixteenth century.[440] Although Cock and Lampsonius were not the only pioneers in acknowledging textual authorship, they had an important role in setting a precedent.[441] In the Roman material, the

---

[439] Second state with the verse in Karlsruhe, Staatliche Kunsthalle. Landau and Parshall, *The Renaissance Print*, 213-214.

[440] For instance, see the collaboration of different Latinists and Hendrick Goltzius's workshop. Jan Piet Filedt Kok, "Hendrick Goltzius. Engraver, Designer and Publisher 1582-1600," *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* 42-43 (1991-1992): esp. 160.

[441] In the 1560s, the collaboration of Maarten Heemskerck, Philips Galle, and the humanist Hadrianus Junius was also an important step towards establishing the standard of including the literary author's name in the prints. Veldman, "Maarten van Heemskerck and Hadrianus Junius," 35-54.

name of an author, the humanist Achilles Statius, only appeared in the 1560s in a few prints engraved by Cornelis Cort and published by Lafreri (cat.119.a, 123.a, 124.a). Cort moved from Antwerp to Italy and he might have had a role in transmitting the idea of crediting the humanist author in prints. His intermediary role between Antwerp and Rome points out the existence of mutual exchange between the two publishers and their prints. Cock's publications themselves must also have had an influence on printmaking and publishing in Europe but the direct connection through Cort's person makes the interrelation even more palpable. The hypothesis of mutual exchange between Cock and Lafreri is an important result of my research. The influence of the Roman publishers on Cock has been acknowledged several times in the scholarship and I have also found further evidence for this impact during the visual analysis of the prints. However, this thesis attempted to overcome the bias for the Italian side of the story, and emphasised the reciprocal impact in the relation of Cock and Lafreri. The inscribed texts in the prints clearly reflect the innovative character of Cock's business and its widespread European significance from the aspect of transmitting works of art and the fame of artists.

The connection of the Portuguese humanist, Achilles Statius, and Roman printmaking is a topic for further research. Whereas considerable scholarly work has been done on the collaboration of the humanist Lampsonius and Cock, and also the present examination of the texts inscribed in Cock's prints delineated the character of their cooperation, there is still a lot to be done on the connection of Roman humanists and single sheet printmaking. A possible direction of future research could focus on unpublished material in the Bibliotheca Vallicelliana: Statius's manuscripts of religious poetry. Thorough examination might reveal further poems used in prints that were not signed with Statius's name. My visit to the Biblioteca Vallicelliana proved that further palaeographic and provenance research is needed to find out more about the manuscripts connected to Statius. The future research about Statius's poetry and connections to the world of printmaking should also consider a more general examination of the relation of Neo-Latin religious poetry and Roman single sheet prints.

My research also revealed that contemporaneous poetry gained a more important role in Roman printmaking compared to the practice of the Antwerp publishing house. Most of the poems inscribed in the prints were closely connected to the images in the Roman prints so that one could assume they were written for the specific purpose of being included in the prints. While Neo-Latin poetry was an important tool for Cock in formulating art theoretical messages, the greater part of his publications included

quotations from a wide range of sources, from the Bible through antique and late antique literature (e.g., Priapeia, Sedulius, Prudentius) to various early modern works (e.g., Alciato, Vives, Giraldi). In contrast to Cock's prints, the use of contemporary poetry was dominant in the Roman material, although the verses remained almost always anonymous. My close analysis of Salamanca's prints revealed the role of Petrarchist poetry in interpreting mythological and allegorical images, thus involving the *all'antica* prints into the poetic discourse on love. In Lafreri's case, religious poetry played a significant part in the emotional engagement of the reader-viewers and in the connection between prints and Counter-Reformation religious culture. Whereas poetry was often used to channel commentaries on the artistic aspect of Cock's prints, the poetic texts in the prints of the two Roman publishers reflect the potential "utilitarian" functions of the prints.

This thesis showcased many prints that could provide the viewer-readers with the possibility of meditating on their own self from a moralistic or psychological point of view. This aspect was clearly enhanced by the inscriptions since they highlighted a certain interpretation of the printed images. The texts completed the images in order to communicate a specific meaning that might have been intrinsic to the depictions along with other possible interpretations. The inscriptions served to channel the perception of the image, and guided the reader-viewers to choose the specific meaning intended by the producers of the print. For example, Salamanca's love prints with Petrarchist texts appropriated mythological-allegorical figures and scenes to address one specific aspect of everyday sixteenth-century life, emotional suffering and the cruelty of love. The sheets gave the viewer-readers the chance to meditate on their similar experiences and feelings, and this was achieved solely through the inscriptions. The first person poetic voice of the inscribed texts reinterpreted the old topos of the "speaking image". In Salamanca's prints, it was not the depicted figure that started speaking but the first person narrator of the text addressed the depiction and thus reversed the traditional setup. The viewer-readers could identify themselves with the narrator and joined the conversation. By addressing and analysing the image at the same time, the viewer-reader could contemplate about his or her own emotional stand in relation to love.

Some of Lafreri's religious prints were animated in a similar way through the first person narrator of the inscriptions, for example in the print after Raphael's *Christ Carrying the Cross* or the *Crucifixion* after Clovio (cat.101 and 139). To provoke an even more intense emotional response and to enhance meditation on the depicted themes, the inscriptions in Lafreri's prints often addressed the reader-viewers directly. The character of

the additional texts in Lafreri's religious prints clearly reflects the context of the Counter-Reformation and its effect on the arts. As a result of the research for this thesis, it was even possible to establish a concrete connection with Counter-Reformation religious culture. The reception history of a pair of prints by Lafreri revealed that the Jesuit Petrus Canisius used and made copies of Lafreri's prints in his own publication, a treatise on the Virgin Mary. Canisius provided an opportunity to get closer to the ideal audience of Lafreri's religious prints, and verify the hypotheses that were formulated on the basis of the textual frameworks of the printed images, like the meditative function of the prints after Michelangelo's masterpieces. The case of Canisius points to another possible direction of future research since the close reading of Canisius's Marian treatise and search for any connections of his meditative practices and prints extended the scope of this thesis.

In contrast, the majority of religious prints published by Cock included authoritative texts (Biblical quotations, paraphrases, late antique poetic texts). This difference was also the result of the religious context: it was a "safe" choice to use Biblical texts in northern prints, they were highly popular in the period, and they also allowed the producers to offer prints for clients from different confessional backgrounds. Based on the evidence found in the additional inscriptions, this thesis introduced the hypothesis that some prints by Cock appealed to both reform-minded and Catholic viewer-readers. These prints achieved their universality through Biblical quotations that stood in the middle of disputes (e.g., the *Crucifixion* after Heemskerck, cat.49.a) and through the emphasis of the didactic function of images. Moreover, the visual analysis of the last chapter demonstrated that the producers of the Antwerp prints often used visual playfulness to draw their viewer's attention to the materiality of the prints. By destroying the illusion of imitating other objects, the prints emphasised the deceiving character of the images in line with reform-minded criticism towards images. Producing prints for the broadest possible audience was an essential part of Cock's business strategy.

This thesis looked at a very specific genre from an interdisciplinary point of view and analysed how texts were integrated in single sheet reproductive prints. The examination of the inscriptions produced a wider and, in my opinion, less anachronistic interpretation of the ambiguous term "reproductive". The purpose of this project was not to search for additional sources but to make sense of the sources that were described and catalogued for many decades but were not yet considered systematically and from the functional point of view. The principal goal was to transcribe, translate, interpret the texts in the prints, and to find correlations among them. The results produced new ideas for

what the future direction of archival research could be, for example looking for books that could have belonged to Cock or searching for further evidence for the collaboration of Italian poets, humanists, and printmakers. The analyses of prints by the three publishers revealed that the second half of the sixteenth century was a transitory period in the development of the combination of text and image, in their function and working. The understanding of prints as utilitarian, practical pieces and collectible art objects was present at the same time, in the same works. This thesis has showed that texts in prints should not be ignored, and should not be regarded as dull common places. Narrative and poetic texts in reproductive prints reflect a diverse and changing approach towards images, combining artistic and theoretical ideas with problems and topics of daily life and religious culture. When image and text are understood in relation to each other and in relation to the reader-viewer, the prints provide a wider perspective on sixteenth-century visual culture.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ainsworth, Maryan Wynn. *Petrus Christus: Renaissance Master of Bruges*. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1994.

_____. "Religious Painting from 1500 to 1550: Continuity and Innovation on the Eve of the Iconoclasm." In *From Van Eyck to Bruegel: Early Netherlandish Painting in the Metropolitan Museum of Art*. Ed. Keith Christiansen and Maryan W. Ainsworth, 319-327. New York: Abrams, 1998.

_____, Stijn Alsteens, and Nadine M. Orenstein ed. *Man, myth, and sensual pleasures: Jan Gossart's Renaissance*. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2010.

Alberti, Alessia. *L'indice di Antonio Lafrery: origini e ricostruzione di un repertorio di immagini a stampa nell'eta' della controriforma*. PhD thesis. Universita Cattolica del Sacro Cuore Milano, 2009.

_____. "Contributi per Antoine Lafréry. Un editore francese a Roma tra Rinascimento e Controriforma." *Annali di critica d'arte* 7 (2011): 75-116.

_____, Alessandro Rovetta and Claudio Salsi ed. *D'après Michelangelo*. Venice: Marsilio, 2015.

Alberti, Leon Battista. *On Painting and On Sculpture.* Ed. and translated by Cecil Grayson. London: Phaidon, 1972

_____. *Momus*. Translated by Sarah Knight. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003.

Almagro, Alejandra Guzman. "A Portuguese Contribution to Sixteenth-Century Roman Antiquarianism." In *Portuguese Humanism and the Republic of Letters*. Ed. Maria Berbara and Karl A. E. Enenkel, 353-373. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Ames-Lewis, Francis. *The Intellectual Life of the Early Renaissance Artist.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.

Archer, Madeline Cirillo. *The Illustrated Bartsch*, *Commentary.* Vol. 28. New York: Abaris Books, 1995.

Areford, David S. *The Viewer and the Printed Image in Late Medieval Europe*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2010.

Aretino, Pietro. *Lettere, il primo e il secondo libro*. Ed. Francesco Flora. Milan, 1960.

Arnulf, Arwed. *Versus ad Picturas. Studien zur Titulusdichtung als Quellengattung der Kunstgeschichte von der Antike bis zum Hochmittelalter*. Munich: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 1997.

Bailey, Gauvin Alexander. *Between Renaissance and Baroque: Jesuit Art in Rome, 1565-1610*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003.

Banz, Claudia. *Höfisches Mäzenatentum in Brüssel: Kardinal Antoine Perrenot de Granvelle und die Erzherzöge Albrecht und Isabella.* Berlin: Mann, 2000.

Barkan, Leonard. *Unearthing the Past: Archaeology and Aesthetics in the Making of Renaissance Culture.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999.

_____. *Michelangelo, a Life on Paper.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2011.

Barker, Emma, Nick Webb, and Kim Woods. "Historical introduction: the idea of the artist." In *The Changing Status of the Artist*. Ed. Emma Barker, Nick Webb, and Kim Woods, 7-26. New Heaven: Yale University Press, 1999.

Barnes, Bernadine. *Michelangelo's Last Judgment: the Renaissance Response*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.

_____. *Michelangelo in Print: Reproductions as Response in the Sixteenth Century*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2010.

Barolsky, Paul. "The Artist's Hand." In *The Craft of Art: Originality and Industry in the Italian Renaissance and Baroque Workshop*. Ed. Andrew Ladis and Carolyn H. Wood, 5-24. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1995.

Barr, James. "Luther and Biblical Chronolgy." In *Bible and Interpretation*. Vol. 1. Ed. John Barton, 423-439. Oxford: University Press, 2013.

Bartsch, Adam. *Le Peintre-graveur*. 15 vols. Vienna: J. V. Degen, 1803-1821.

Bass, Marissa and Elizabeth Wyckoff. "Sons of 's-Hertogenbosch: Hieronymus Bosch's Local Legacy in Print." *Art in Print* 5 (2015): 4-13.

Bateman, John A. *Text and Image: A Critical Introduction to the Visual/Verbal Divide*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2014.

Baumstark, Reinhold ed. *Rom in Bayern: Kunst und Spiritualität der ersten Jesuiten*. Munich: Hirmer, 1997.

Bayer, Andrea ed. *Art and Love in Renaissance Italy*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.

Becker, Jochen. "Zur niederländischen Kunstliteratur des 16. Jahrhunderts: Domenicus Lampsonius." *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* 24 (1973): 45-61.

_____. "Zur niederländischen Kunstliteratur des 16. Jahrhunderts: Lucas de Heere." *Simiolus* 6 (1972-1973): 113-127.

Beecher, Donald Allen. "Quattrocento Views on the Eroticization of the Imagination." In *Eros and Anteros: the Medical Traditions of Love in the Renaissance*. Ed. Donald Allen Beecher and Massimo Ciavolella, 49-66. Ottawa: Dovehouse Edition, 1992.

Belting, Hans and Dagmar Eichberger. *Jan van Eyck als Erzähler: frühe Tafelbilder im Umkreis des New Yorker Doppeltafel*. Worms: Werner, 1983.

Bembo, Pietro. *Gli Asolani*. Ed. Giorgio Dilemmi. Florence: Presso l'Accademia della Crusca, 1991.

Białostocki, Jan. "Doctus artifex and the library of the artist in XVIth and XVIIth century." In *De arte et libris: Festschrift Erasmus, 1934 – 1984*. Ed. Abraham Horodisch, 11-22. Amsterdam: Erasmus Antiquariaat en Boekhandel, 1984.

Bianchi, Silvia. "Catalogo dell'opera incisa di Nicola Beatrizet." *Grafica d'arte* 54 (2003): 3-12.

Boorsch, Suzanne. *The Engravings of Giorgio Ghisi*. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1985.

Borea, Evelina. "Stampa figurative e pubblico dalle origini all'affermazione nel Cinquecento." In *Storia dell'Arte Italiana*. Vol. 2. Ed. Giovanni Previtali, 374-380. Turin: G. Einaudi, 1979.

Borchert, Till-Holger and Andreas Beyer ed. *Jan van Eyck und seine Zeit, Flämische Meister und den Süden 1430-1530*. Stuttgart: Belser, 2002.

Bredekamp, Horst. *Der Bildakt, Neufassung*. Berlin: Verlag Klaus Wagenbach, 2015.

Brooks, Julian and Peter M. Lukehart ed. *Taddeo and Federico Zuccaro, Artist-Brothers in Renaissance Rome*. Los Angeles: The J. Paul Getty Museum 2007.

Brown, Virginia ed. *Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum: Medieval and Renaissance Translations and Commentaries*. Vol. 7. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of Amsterdam Press, 1992.

Bull, Malcolm. *The Mirror of the Gods*. London: Allen Lane, 2005.

Burg, Tobias. *Die Signatur. Formen und Funktionen vom Mittelalter bis zum 17. Jahrhundert*. Berlin: Lit Verlag Dr. W Hopf, 2007.

Bury, Michael. "On Some Engravings by Giorgio Ghisi Commonly Called 'Reproductive'." *Print Quarterly* 10 (1993): 4-19.

_____. "Beatrizet and the 'Reproduction' of Antique Relief Sculpture." *Print Quarterly* 13 (1996): 111-126.

_____. *The Print in Italy: 1550-1620*. London: The British Museum Press, 2001.

_____. "Michelangelo's *Dream* and Prints." In *Michelangelo's Dream*. Ed. Stephanie Buck, 66-73. London: Holberton, 2010.

Büchsel, Martin. "Das Schächer-Fragment des Meisters von Flémalle, Reue und Erkenntnis, ein Beispiel emotionaler Selbstkontrolle." In *Habitus*. Ed. Tobias Frese and Annette Hoffmann, 93-115. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2011.

Büttner, Frank. "Bildbeschriftungen, Zur Angabe von Autor und Bildtitel in der frühen Druckgraphik." *Mitteilungen des Sonderforschungsbereichs* 573 (2007): 13-23.

Calabrese, Omar and Betty Gigante. "La signature du peintre." *La part de l'oeil* 5 (1989): 26-43.

Calvillo, Elena. "Authoritative Copies and Divine Originals: Lucretian Metaphor, Painting on Stone, and the Problem of Originality in Michelangelo's Rome." *Renaissance Quarterly* 66 (2013): 453-508.

Campbell, Lorne. "The Art Market in the Southern Netherlands in the Fifteenth Century." *Burlington Magazine* 118 (1976): 188-198.

_____. "The new pictorial language of Rogier van der Weyden." In *Rogier van der Weyden: 1400 - 1464, Master of Passions*. Ed. Lorne Campbell and Jan Van der Stock, 32-61. Zwolle: Waanders, 2009.

Campbell, Stephen J. *The Cabinet of Eros: Renaissance Mythological Painting and the Studiolo of Isabella d'Este*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004.

_____. "Eros in the Flesh: Petrarchan Desire, the Embodies Eros, and Male Beauty in Italian Art, 1500-1540." *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 35 (2005): 629-662.

_____. "*Fare una Cosa Morta Parer Viva*: Michelangelo, Rosso, and the (Un)divinity of Art." *The Art Bulletin* 84 (2002): 596-620.

Canisius, Petrus. *De Maria Virgine incomparabili et Dei genitrice sacrosancta libri quinque*. Ingolstadt: David Sartorius, 1577.

Carroll, Eugene A. *Rosso Fiorentino: drawings, prints, and decorative arts*. Washington: National Gallery of Art, 1987.

Castiglione, Baldassare. *Il libro del Cortegiano*. Ed. Giulio Preti. Turin: Einaudi, 1965.

Cecchi, Alessandro. "Il Bronzino, Die Anbetung der Hirten (cat. nr. 21)." In *Von Raffael bis Tiepolo: italienische Kunst aus der Sammlung des Fürstenhauses Esterházy*. Ed. István Barkóczi, 154. München: Klinkhardt & Biermann, 1999.

Colonna, Francesco. *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili, The Strife of Love in a Dream*. Translated by Joscelyn Godwin. London: Thames & Hudson, 2005.

Cox-Rearick, Janet. *Bronzino's Chapel of Eleonora in the Palazzo Vecchio*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.

Covi, Dario A. *The Inscription in Fifteenth-Century Florentine Painting*. New York: Garland, 1986.

Cranston, Jodi. "Longing for the lost: ekphrasis, rivalry, and the figuration of notional artworks in Italian Renaissance painting." *Word & Image* 27 (2011): 212-219.

D'Alibrando, Cola Giacomo. *Il spasmo di Maria Vergine: Ottave per un dipinto di Polidoro da Caravaggio a Messina*. Ed. Barbara Agosti, Giancarlo Alfano, and Ippolita di Majo. Naples: Paparo, 1999.

D. Caecilii Cypriani episcopi Carthaginensis et martyris, Opera, Quibus nuper adiecimus eiusdem carmina quaedam de cruce Redemptoris atque ad crucifixum elegantissima, nec usquam antea impressa. Venice: Ad Signum Spei, 1547.

de Heere, Lucas. *Den hof en boomgaerd der poësien*. Ed. W. Waterschoot. Zwolle: Tjeenk, 1969.

Dempsey, Charles. *Inventing the Renaissance Putto*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001.

de Vries, Annette. "Hondius meets Van Mander: The Cultural Appropriation of the First Netherlandish Book on the Visual Arts System of Knowledge in a Series of Artists' Portraits." In *The Artist as Reader: on Education and Non-Education of Early Modern Artists*. Ed. Heiko Damm, Michael Thimann, and Claus Zittel, 259-304. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Duverger, Erik. *Antwerpse kunstinventarissen uit de zeventiede eeuw*. Vol. 1. Brussels: Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letterem en Schone Kunsten van Belgie, 1984.

Ehrle, Franz. *Roma Prima di Sisti V: La Pianta di Roma Du Pérac-Lafréry del 1577*. Rome: Danesi, 1908.

Eisenstein, Elizabeth L. *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change*. Cambridge: University Press, 1979.

Emison, Patricia A. *The Art of Teaching: Sixteenth-Century Allegorical Prints and Drawings*. New Haven: Yale University Art Gallery, 1986.

_____. *Creating the "Divine" Artist: from Dante to Michelangelo*. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Ettlinger, Leopold D. "*Exemplum Doloris*. Reflections of the *Laocoon* group." In *De Artibus Opuscula XL. Essays in honour of Erwin Panofsky*. Ed. Millard Meiss, 121-126. New York: New York University Press, 1961.

Fallon, Denise. "Une intervention d'Adriaen Ysenbrant ou de son atelier dans un triptyque maniériste de 1520, conservé á Bruges." *Bulletin de l'Institute Royal du Patrimoine Artistique* 19 (1982-1983): 133-144.

Ficino, Marsilio. *Commentary on Plato's Symposium*. Translated by Sears Reynolds Jayne. Columbia: University of Missouri, 1944.

Filipczak, Zirka Zaremba. *Picturing Art in Antwerp: 1550-1700*. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1987.

Finegan, Jack. *Handbook of Biblical Chronology: Principles of Time Reckoning in the Ancient World and Problems of Chronology in the Bible*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 1998.

Fiorentini, Erna and Raphael Rosenberg. "Baccio Bandinelli's Self-Portrait." *Print Quarterly* 19 (2002): 34-44.

Fiorentini, Erna. *Ikonographie eines Wandels: Form und Intention von Selbstbildnis und Porträt des Bildhauers im Italien des 16. Jahrhunderts*. Munich: Tenea Verlag für Medien, 1999.

_____. "Zweidimensionale Vorbilder. Überlegungen zu Baccio Bandinellis *Kampf der Götter*, dem Augsburger *Merkur* und Adriaen de Vries's Florentiner Inspirationsquellen." *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 63 (2000): 269-277.

François, Wim. "Vernacular Bible reading and censorship in early sixteenth century." In *Lay Bibles in Europe 1450-1800*. Ed. Mathijs Lamberigts and August den Hollander, 69-96. Leuven: University Press, 2006.

Friedrich, Anne. *Das Symposium der XII sapientes, Kommentar und Verfasserfrage*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2001.

Fuhring, Peter ed. *Beyond Bosch: the afterlife of a Renaissance master in print*. St Louis, Mo.: Saint Louis Art Museum, 2015.

Fuhrmann, Wolfgang. "The Simplicity of Sublimity in Josquin's Psalm-Motets." In *Josquin and the Sublime*. Ed. Alberti Clement and Eric Jas, 49-71. Turnhout: Brepols, 2011.

Gludovatz, Karin. "Der Name am Rahmen, der Maler im Bild. Künstlerselbstverständnis und Produktionskommentar in den Signaturen Jan van Eycks." *Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte* 54 (2005): 115-175.

Goffen, Rona. *Renaissance Rivals: Michelangelo, Leonardo, Raphael, Titian*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004.

Gramaccini, Norberto. "Die Aura der Reproduzierbarkeit: zum Aufkommen der Bronzestatuetten und des Kupferstichs im 15. Jahrhundert." In *Das Modell in der bildenden Kunst des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit*. Ed. Heike Richter, 57-64. Petersberg: Städelschen Museums-Verein, 2006.

Gramaccini, Norberto and Hans Jakob Meier, ed. *Die Kunst der Interpretation: italienische Reproduktionsgraphik 1485-1600*. Berlin: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 2009.

Gregory, Sharon. *Vasari and the Renaissance Print*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2012.

Griese, Sabine. *Text-Bilder und ihre Kontexte, Medialität und Materialität von Einblatt-Holz- und Metallschnitten des 15. Jahrhunderts*. Zürich, Chronos Verlag, 2011.

Griffiths, Antony. *The Print Before Photography*. London: The British Museum Press, 2016.

Gründler, Hana and Alessandro Nova. "Concorrenza e invenzione: la biografia vasariana di Baccio Bandinelli." In *Baccio Bandinelli: Scultore e maestro (1493-1560)*. Ed. Detlef Heikamp and Beatrice Paolozzi Strozzi, 60-67. Florence: Giunti, 2014.

Guépin, J. P. "Hercules belegerd door de Pygmeën, schilderijen van Jan van Scorel en Frans Floris naar een Icon van Philostratus." *Oud Holland* 102 (1988): 155-167.

Haig Gasser, Julia. *Catullus and his Renaissance Readers*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1993.

Hamburger, Jeffrey F. "Seeing and Believing. The Suspicion of Sight and the Authentication of Vision in Late Medieval Art and Devotion." In *Imagination und Wirklichkeit. Zum Verhältnis von mentalen und realen Bildern inder Kunst der frühen Neuzeit*. Ed. Klaus Krüger and Alessandro Nova, 47-69. Mainz: Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 2000.

Hanegraaff, Wouter J. "Under the Mantle of Love: the Mystical Eroticisms of Marsilio Ficino and Giordano Bruno." In *Hidden Intercourse: Eros and Sexuality in the History of Western Esotericism*. Ed. Wouter J. Hanegraaff and Jeffrey J. Kripal, 175-208. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Harbison, Craig. "Visions and Meditations in Early Flemish Painting." *Simiolus* 15 (1985): 103-104.

Heal, Bridget. *The Cult of the Virgin Mary in Early Modern Germany: Protestant and Catholic Piety, 1500-1648*. Cambridge: University Press, 2007.

_____. "The Catholic Eye and the Protestant Ear." In *The Myth of the Reformation*. Ed. Peter Opitz, 321-355. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013.

Herz, Martin. *Sacrum commercium: eine begriffsgeschichtliche Studie zur Theologie der römischen Liturgiesprache*. München: Zink, 1958.

Holder, R. Ward ed. *A Companion to Paul in the Reformation*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Honig, Elizabeth Alice. *Painting and the Market in Early Modern Antwerp*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.

Hoogvliet, Margriet. "Mixing Text and Image: French and Italian Theories from the Late Middle Ages to the Early Sixteenth Century." In *Multi-media Compositions from the Middle Ages to the Early Modern Period*. Ed. Margriet Hoogvliet, 76-103. Leuven: Peeters, 2004.

Hotchkiss Price, David. *Albrecht Dürer's Renaissance, Humanism, Reformation, and the Art of Faith*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2003.

Höper, Corinna. *Raffael und die Folgen: das Kunstwerk in Zeitaltern seiner graphischen Reproduzierbarkeit*. Ostfildern: Hatje Cantz, 2001.

Hubaux, Jean and Jean Puraye. "Dominique Lampson. Lamberti Lombardi apud Eburones pictoris celeberrimi vita. Traduction et notes." *Revue Belge d'Archéologie et d'Histoire de l'art* 18 (1949): 53-77.

Inlustrium viror ut ut exstant in Urbe vultus. Rome: Lafreri, 1569.

Israel, Jonathan. *The Dutch Republic*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Jacobs, Lynn F. *Early Netherlandish Carved Altarpieces, 1380 - 1550: Medieval Tastes and Mass Marketing*. Cambridge: University Press, 1998.

_____. *Opening Doors: the Early Netherlandish Triptych Reinterpreted*. University Park, Pa.: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2012.

Jones, Susan Frances. *Van Eyck to Gossaert: towards a Northern Renaissance.* London: National Gallery, 2011.

Jossa, Stefano. "Bembo and Italian Petrarchism." In *The Cambridge Companion to Petrarch*. Ed. Albert Russell Ascoli and Unn Falkeid, 191-200. Cambridge: University Press, 2015.

Kaesser, Christian. "Text, text, and image in Prudentius's Tituli Historiarum." In *Text und Bild: Tagungsbeiträge*. Ed. Victoria Zimmer-Panagl, 151-165. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaft, 2010.

Kemperdick, Stephan. "Von der Vorlage zum Kunstwerk: Rogier van der Weydens *Große Kreuzabnahme*." In *Original – Kopie – Zitat: Kunstwerke des Mittelalters und der Frühen Neuzeit*. Ed. Wolfgang Augustyn and Ulrich Söding, 207-230. Passau: Klinger, 2010.

King, Catherine. "Artes Liberales and the Mural Decoration on the House of Frans Floris, Antwerp, c. 156." *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 52 (1989): 239-256.

Kleinbub, Christian K. "Raphael's Quos Ego: forgotten document of the Renaissance paragone." *Word & Image* 28 (2012): 287-301.

Kloek, Thomas and Jan Piete Filedt Kok. *Kunst voor de beeldenstorm*. 's-Gravenhage: Staatsuitgeverij, 1986.

Knust, Cornelis. *Vorbild der Gerechtigkeit, Jan Provosts Gerichtsbild in Brügge.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007.

Kocsis, Alexandra. "Recontextualizing Raphael: The Function(s) of Inscriptions in Sixteenth-Century Reproductive Prints." *Annual of Medieval Studies at CEU* 21 (2015): 85-97.

Koerner, Joseph Leo. *The Reformation of the Image.* London: Reaktion Books, 2004.

Lampsonius, Domenicus. *Lamberti Lombardi apud Eburones pictoris celeberrimi vita.* Bruges: Hubert Goltzius, 1565.

Landau, David and Peter W. Parshall. *The Renaissance Print: 1470-1550.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994.

La Saincte Bible: en françoys, translatée selon la pure et entière traduction de Sainct Hierome. Antwerp: Martin Lempereur, 1530.

La Saincte Bible nouvellement translatée de latin en françois. Leuven: Bartholomy de Grave, Anthoine Marie Bergagne, and Jehan de Uvaen, 1550.

Lee, Rensselaer W. "Ut Pictura Poesis: The Humanistic Theory of Painting." *The Art Bulletin* 22 (1940): 196-269.

Leuschner, Eckhard. "Antonio Lafreri's Religious Prints." *Print Quarterly* 30 (2013): 87-89.

Levy, Evonne Anita. "Ideal and reality of the learned artist: the schooling of Italian and Netherlandish artists." In *Children of Mercury: the education of artists in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries*, 20-27. Providence, RI: Department of Art, Brown University, 1984.

Lowinsky, Edward E. "Josquin des Prez and Ascanio Sforza." In *Il Duomo di Milano, Congresso Internazionale*. Vol. 2. Ed. Maria Luisa Gatti Perer, 17-22. Milan: La Rete, 1969.

Luijten, Ger. "Hieronymus Cock and the Italian Printmakers and Publishers of his Day." In *Hieronymus Cock: The Renaissance in Print*. Ed. Joris Van Grieken, Ger Luijten, and Jan van der Stock, 30-35. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013.

Maclot, Petra. "An imaginary visit to The Four Winds, the house and shop of Hieronymus Cock and Volcxken Diericx." *Simiolus* 39 (2017): 161-182.

Manning, John. "Alciati and Philostratus's Icones." *Emblematica* 1 (1986): 207-210.

Marnef, Guido. *Antwerp in the Age of Reformation*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1996.

Massari, Stefania. *Tra mito e allegoria: immagini a stampa nel '500 e '600*. Rome: Sistemi Informativi, 1989.

Matthews Grieco, Sara F. "Persuasive Pictures: Didactic Prints and the Construction of the Social Identity of Women in Sixteenth-Century Italy." In *Women in Italian Renaissance Culture and Society*. Ed. Letizia Panizza, 258-314. Oxford: Legenda, 2000.

McGrath, Elizabeth. "Rubens's Susanna and the Elders and moralizing inscriptions on prints." In *Wort und Bild in der niederländischen Kunst und Literatur des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts*. Ed. Herman Vekeman and Justus Müller Hofstede, 73-90. Erfstadt: Lukassen, 1984.

McKinnon, James W. *The Advent Project: The Later Seventh-Century Creation of the Roman Mass Proper*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.

Mehltretter, Florian. "Giordano Bruno und der Petrarkismus: Bemerkungen zum ersten Teil der *Eroici furori*." *Romanistisches Jahrbuch* 54 (2003): 146-179.

Meiers, Sarah. "Portraits in Print: Hieronymus Cock, Dominicus Lampsonius, and 'Pictorum aliquot celebrium Germaniae inferioris effigies'." *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 69 (2006): 1-16.

Melion, Walter S. *Shaping the Netherlandish Canon: Karel van Mander's Schilder-boeck*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

_____. "*Quae lecta Canisius offert et spectata Diu*: the Pictorial Images in Petrus Canisius's De Maria Virgine of 1577/1583." In *Early Modern Eyes*. Ed. Walter S. Melion and Lee Palmer Wandel, 181-201. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

_____, Celeste Brusati, and Karl A. E. Enenkel. "Introduction: Scriptural Authority in Word and Image." In *The Authority of the Word: Reflecting on Image and Text in*

Northern Europe, 1400-1700. Ed. Walter S. Melion, Celeste Brusati, and Karl A. E. Enenkel, 6-22. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

_____. "*Apellea et ipse manu*: Hieronymus Cock and His Allegories of Art – *Apollo, Diana, and the Niobids*, *The Labors of Hercules*, *Hercules and the Pygmies*, and *The Raising of the Brazen Serpent*." In *Myth, Allegory, and Faith*, ed. Bernard Barryte, 181-201. Stanford, Ca.: Iris & B. Gerald Cantor Center for Visual Arts, 2016.

Merback, Mitchell B. *The Thief, the Cross, and the Wheel: Pain and the Spectacle of Punishment in Medieval and Renaissance Europe*. London: Reaktion Books, 1999.

Meyer zur Capellen, Jürg. *Raphael: A Critical Catalogue of His Paintings*. Vol. 2. Landshut: Arcos, 2005.

Mochizuki, Mia M. *The Netherlandish Image after Iconoclasm, 1566-1572*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008.

Mund, Hélène. "Original, Copy, and Influence, a Complex Issue." In *Rogier van der Weyden: 1400 - 1464, Master of Passions*. Ed. Lorne Campbell and Jan Van der Stock, 186-205. Zwolle: Waanders, 2009.

Nees, Lawrence. "Le *Quos Ego* de Marc-Antoine Raimondi: L'adaptation d'une source antique par Raphael." *Nouvelles de l'estampe* 40-41 (1978): 18-29.

Nelson, John Charles. *Renaissance Theory of Love*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1958.

Noble, Bonnie J. "A work in which the angels are wont to rejoice: Lucas Cranach's *Schneeberg Altarpiece*." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 34 (2003): 1011-1037.

Nordenfalk, Carl. "The Five Senses in Flemish Art before 1600." In *Netherlandish Mannerism*. Ed. Görel Cavalli-Björkman, 135-154. Stockholm: Nationalmuseum, 1985.

Oberhuber, Konrad. *Polarität und Synthese in Raffaels Schule von Athen*. Stuttgart: Urachhaus, 1983.

Opera Diui Caecilii Cypriani Episcopi Carthaginensis, ab innumeris mendis repurgata. Basel: Froben, 1520.

Orenstein, Nadine M. "Images to Print: Pieter Bruegel's Engagement with Printmaking." In *Pieter Bruegel the Elder, Drawings and Prints*. Ed. Nadine M. Orenstein, 41-56. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2001.

Ott, Norbert H. "Texte und Bilder, Beziehungen zwischen den Medien Kunst und Literatur in Mittelalter und Früher Neuzeit." In *Die Verschriftlichung der Welt, Bild, Text und Zahl in der Kultur des Mittelalters und der Frühen Neuzeit*. Ed. Horst Wenzel, Wilfried Seipel, and Gotthart Wunberg, 119-126. Milan: Skira, 2000.

Overbeeke, Noes M. "Cardinal Otto Truchsess von Waldburg and his Role as Art Dealer for Albrecht V of Bavaria (1568-73)." *Journal of the History of Collections* 6 (1994): 173-179.

Panofsky, Erwin. *Studies in Iconology*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1939.

_____. *Die Altniederländische Malerei*. Vol. 1. Cologne: DuMont, 2001.

Parshall, Peter and Rainer Schoch ed. *Origins of European Printmaking, Fifteenth-Century Woodcuts and their Public*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005.

Parshall, Peter. "Introduction: The Modern Historiography of Early Printmaking." In *The Woodcut in Fifteenth-Century Europe*. Ed. Peter Parshall, 9-15. Washington: National Gallery of Art, 2009.

Pelc, Milan. *Prints after Giulio Clovio*. Zagreb: Prints and Drawings Department of the Croatian Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1998.

Pelikan, Jaroslav. *Mary Through the Centuries*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996.

Penny, Nicholas. *Frames*. London: National Gallery Publications, 1997.

Petrarca, Francesco. *Rerum vulgarium fragmenta*. Ed. Giuseppe Savoca. Florence: Leo S. Olschki Editore, 2008.

_____. *Trionfi, Rime estravaganti, Codice degli Abbozzi*. Ed. Vinicio Pacca and Laura Paolino. Milan: Arnoldo Mondadori, 1996.

Philostratus the Elder, Philostratus the Younger, and Callistratus. *Philostratus the Elder, Imagines, Philostratus the Younger, Imagines. Callistratus, Descriptions*. Translated by

Arthur Fairbanks. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1931.

Pillinger, Renate. *Die Tituli Historiarum oder das sogenannte Dittochaeon des Prudentius*. Vienna: Verlag der Österrischen Akademie der Wissenschaft, 1980.

Pon, Lisa. *Raphael, Dürer, and Marcantonio Raimondi: Copying and the Italian Renaissance Print*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004.

Popham, Arthur Ewart and Joannes Wilde. *The Italian Drawings of the XV and XVI Centuries in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen at Windsor Castle*. London: Phaidon, 1949.

Powell, Amy. *Depositions: Scenes from the Late Medieval Church and the Modern Museum*. New York: Zone Books, 2006.

Poulsen, Hanne Kolind. "Faith and Visual Communication in the Netherlands of the Sixteenth Century." In *SMK Art Journal*. Ed. Peter Nørgaard Larsen, 84-101. Copenhagen: National Gallery of Denmark, 2008.

Puraye, Jean. *Dominique Lampson humaniste 1532-99*. Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1950.

Purtle, Carol J. *The Marian Paintings of Jan van Eyck*. Princeton: University Press, 1982.

Ramakers, Bart. "The work of a painter: Willem van Haecht's apostle plays, 1563-1565." In *Understanding Art in Antwerp*. Ed. Bart Ramakers, 229-254. Leuven: Peeters, 2011.

Renger, Konrad. "Verhältnis von Text und Bild in der Graphik (Beobachtungen zu Mißverhältnissen)." In *Wort und Bild in der niederländischen Kunst und Literatur des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts*. Ed. Herman Vekeman and Justus Müller Hofstede, 151-161. Erfstadt: Lukassen, 1984.

Riggs, Timothy A. *Hieronymus Cock: Printmaker and Publisher*. New York: Garland Publishing, 1977.

Ringbom, Sixten. "Maria in Sole and the Virgin of the Rosary." Journal *of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 25 (1962): 326-330.

_____. *Icon to Narrative: the Rise of the Dramatic Close-up in Fifteenth-Century Devotional Painting*. Åbo: Åbo Akad., 1965.

Robb, Nesca A. *Neoplatonism of the Italian Renaissance*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd: 1935.

Robin, Diana. *Publishing Women, Salons, the Presses, and the Counter-Reformation in Sixteenth-Century Italy*. London: The University of Chicago Press, 2007.

Rothstein, Bret. "Vision and Devotion in Jan van Eyck's Virgin and Child with Canon Joris van der Paele." *Word & Image* 15 (1999): 262-276.

Rubach, Birte. *ANT. LAFRERI FORMIS ROMAE, Der Verleger Antonio Lafreri und seine Druckgraphikproduktion*. Berlin: Lukas Verlag, 2016.

Rummel, Peter. "Der Heilige und der Kirchenfürst." *Jahrbuch des Historischen Vereins Dillingen* 102 (2001): 161-179.

Sancti Cypriani episcopi Opera. Turnhout: Brepols, 1972-1999.

Schapiro, Meyer. "On Some Problems in the Semiotics of Visual Art: Field and Vehicle in Image-Signs." *Simiolus* 6 (1972-1973): 9-19.

Schmidt, Eike D. "*Furor* und *Imitatio*: Visuelle Topoi in den Laokoon-Parodien Rosso Fiorentinos und Tizians." In *Visuelle Topoi: Erfindung und tradiertes Wissen in den Kiinsten der italienischen Renaissance*. Ed. Ulrich Pfisterer and Max Seidel, 351-370. Munich: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 2003.

Schmidt, Peter. "The Multiple Image: The Beginnings of Printmaking, between Old Theories and New Approaches." In *Origins of European Printmaking, Fifteenth-Century Woodcuts and their Public*. Ed. Peter Parshall and Rainer Schoch, 37-56. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005.

Schrader, Stephanie. "Gossart's Mythological Nudes and the Shaping of Philip of Burgundy's Erotic Identity." In *Man, myth, and sensual pleasures*. Ed. Maryan Wynn Ainsworth, Stijn Alsteens, and Nadine M. Orenstein, 57-67. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2010.

Schröter, Elisabeth. "Raffaels Madonna di Foligno. Ein Pestbild?" *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 50 (1987): 46-87.

Sciolla, Maria Teresa. *Da van Eyck a Brueghel: scritti sulle arti di Domenico Lampsonio*. Torino: UTET, 2001.

Sellink, Manfred. *Cornelis Cort, Accomplished Plate-Cutter from Hoorn in Holland*. Rotterdam: Museum Boymans-van Beuningen, 1994.

_____. *Cornelis Cort*. 3 vols. The New Hollstein Dutch & Flemish Etchings, Engravings and Woodcuts, 1450 – 1700. Rotterdam: Sound & Vision Publishers, 2000.

Seznec, Jean. *The Survival of the Pagan Gods: The Mythological Tradition and its Place in Renaissance Humanism and Art*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1961.

Shearman, John. *Andrea del Sarto*. Vol. 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965.

_____. *Only connect... Art and the Spectator in the Italian Renaissance*. Princeton: University Press, 1992.

Shoemaker, Innis H. *The Engravings of Marcantonio Raimondi*. Lawrence, KA: Spencer Museum of Art, 1981.

Silver, Larry. "Second Bosch. Family Resemblance and the Marketing of Art." *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* 50 (1999): 31-50.

_____. "Goltzius, Honor, and Gold." In *Habitus: Norm und Transgression in Text und Bild*. Ed. Tobias Frese and Annette Hoffmann, 315-330. Berlin: Akademia Verlag, 2011.

Smeyers, Maurits. "Jan van Eyck, archeologist? Reflections on Eyckian epigraphy." In *Archeological and historical aspects of West European Societies: Album Amicorum André Van Doorselaer*. Ed. Marc Lodewijckx, 403-414. Leuven: University Press, 1996.

Smick, Rebekah. "Evoking Michelangelo's Vatican *Pietà*: Transformations in the Topos of Living Stone." In *The Eye of the Poet: Studies in Reciprocity of the Visual and Literary Arts from the Renaissance to the Present*. Ed. Amy Golahny, 23-52. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1996.

_____. "Vivid Thinking: Word and Image in Descriptive Techniques of the Renaissance." In *Antiquity and its Interpreters*. Ed. Alina Payne, Ann Kuttner, and Rebekah Smick, 159-173. Cambridge: University Press, 2000.

Sparrow, John. *Visible Words, A Study of Inscriptions in and as Books and Works of Art*. Cambridge: University Press, 1969.

Springer, Carl P. E. *The Gospel as Epic in Late Antiquity, the Paschale Carmen of Sedulius*. Leiden: Brill, 1988.

Statius. *Silvae*. Translated by D. R. Shackleton Bailey. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2015.

Stoichita, Victor I. *The Self-Aware Image: an Insight into Early Modern Metapainting*. London: Harvey Miller Publishers, 2015.

Stoltz, Barbara. "Disegno versus Disegno stampato: Printmaking Theory in Vasari's Vite (1550-1568) in the Context of the Theory of disegno and the Libro de' Disegni." *Journal of Art Historiography* 7 (2012): 1-20.

Strecker, Freya. *Augsburger Altäre zwischen Reformation (1537) und 1635: Bildkritik, Repräsentation und Konfessionalisierung*. Münster: Lit, 1998.

Tarr, Roger. "*Visibile parlare*: The spoken word in fourteenth-century central Italian painting." *Word & Image* 13 (1997): 223-244.

Taylor, Paul. "Julius II and the Stanza della Segnatura." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 72 (2009): 103-141.

Thascius Caecilius Cyprianus, Opera, ad veritatem vetustissimorum exemplarium summa fide emendata, addito etiam quinto epistolarum libro, antea nunquam edito. Roma: Paolo Manuzio, 1563.

Thomas, Ben. "The Academy of Baccio Bandinelli." *Print Quarterly* 22 (2005): 3-14.

Tosini, Patrizia. *Girolamo Muziano 1532-1592: dalla maniera alla natura*. Rome: Ugo Bozzi, 2008.

Trippe, Rosemary. "The Hypnerotomachia Poliphili, Image, Text, and Vernacular Poetics." *Renaissance Quarterly* 55 (2002): 1222-1258.

Turner, James Grantham. "Caraglio's *Loves of the Gods*." *Print Quarterly* 24 (2007): 359-380.

Van Benthem, Jaap. "Josquins Motette *Huc me sydereo*, oder Konstruktivismus als Ausdruck humanistisch geprägter Andacht?" In *Die Motette: Beiträge zu ihrer Gattunsgeschichte*. Ed. Herbert Schneider, 135-164. Mainz: Schott, 1992.

Van der Coelen, Peter. "Producing Texts for Prints: Artists, Poets and Publishers." In *The Authority of the Word: Reflecting on Image and Text in Northern Europe, 1400-1700*. Ed. Celeste Brusati, Karl A.E. Enenkel and Walter Melion, 75-100. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Van der Laan, P. W. A. Th. "Imitation créative dans le *Carmen Paschale* de Sédulius." In *Early Christian poetry: a collection of essays*. Ed. J. den Boeft and A. Hilhorst, 135-166. Leiden: Brill, 1993.

Van der Stock, Jan. *Printing Images in Antwerp: the Introduction of Printmaking in a City, Fifteenth Century to 1585*. Rotterdam: Sound & Vision Interactive, 1998.

_____. "Hieronymus Cock and Volcxken Diericx, Print Publishers in Antwerp." In *Hieronymus Cock: The Renaissance in Print*. Ed. Joris Van Grieken, Ger Luijten, and Jan van der Stock, 14-19. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013.

Van de Velde, Carl. *Frans Floris: Leven en Werken*. Brussels: Paleis der Academien, 1975.

_____. "The Painted Decoration of Floris's House." In *Netherlandish Mannerism*. Ed. Görel Cavalli-Björkman, 127-134. Stockholm: Nationalmuseum, 1985.

_____. "Introduction." In *Classical Mythology in the Netherlands in the Age of Renaissance and Baroque*. Ed. Carl Van de Velde (Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 9-15.

_____. "Canon in context: Consumption of Early Netherlandish Images in the Fifteenth and first half of the Sixteenth Centuries." In *Rogier van der Weyden in Context*. Ed. Lorne Campbell and Jan Van der Stock, 3-22. Leuven: Peeters, 2012.

Van Durme, Maurice. "Les Granvelle au service des Habsbourg." In *Les Granvelle et les Anciens Pays-Bas*. Ed. Krista de Jonge and Gustaaf Janssens, 11-82. Leuven: University Press, 2000.

Van Grieken, Joris. "*Rogerij Belgae Inventum*." In *Rogier van der Weyden in Context*. Ed. Lorne Campbell and Jan Van der Stock, 353-364. Leuven: Peeters, 2012.

Van Grieken, Joris, Ger Luijten, and Jan van der Stock ed. *Hieronymus Cock: The Renaissance in Print*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013.

Van Grieken, Joris. "Establishing and Marketing the Publisher's List." In *Hieronymus Cock: The Renaissance in Print*. Ed. Joris Van Grieken, Ger Luijten, and Jan van der Stock, 22-29. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013.

Van Mander, Karel. *The Lives of the Illustrious Netherlandish and German Painters: from the First Edition of the Schilder-boeck* (1603 - 1604). Vol. 1. Translated by Hessel Miedema. Doornspijk: Davaco, 1994.

Vasari, Giorgio. *Le Vite de' più eccellenti pittori scultori e architettori*. Vols. 6. Ed. Rosanna Bettarini and Paola Barocchi. Florence: Sansoni, 1966-1987.

Veldman, Ilja M. "Maarten van Heemskerck and Hadrianus Junius: The Relationship between a Painter and a Humanist." *Simiolus* 7 (1974): 35-54.

_____. "Elements of Continuity: A Finger Raised in Warning." *Simiolus* 20 (1990-1991): 124-141.

_____. *Maarten van Heemskerck*. Vol. 1. The New Hollstein Dutch & Flemish Etchings, Engravings and Woodcuts, 1450 – 1700. Roosendaal: Van Poll, 1994.

_____. "Protestantism and the Arts: Sixteenth- and Sventeeth-Century Netherlands." In *Seeing beyond the Word: Visual Arts and the Calvinist Tradition*. Ed. Paul Corby Finney (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1999), 397-420.

_____. *Images for the Eye and the Soul, Function and Meaning in Netherlandish Prints*. Leiden: Primavera, 2006.

Vermeylen, Filip. *Painting for the Market: Commercialization of Art in Antwerp's Golden Age*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2003.

Verougstraete, Hélène. *Frames and Supports in 15th- and 16th-century Southern Netherlandish Painting*. Brussels: Royal Institute for Cultural Heritage, 2015.

von Simson, Otto. "Compassio and Co-redemptio in Roger van der Weyden's Descent from the Cross." *The Art Bulletin* 35 (1953): 9-16.

Wagner, Berit. *Bilder ohne Auftraggeber: der deutsche Kunsthandel im 15. und frühen 16. Jahrhundert*. Petersberg: Imhof, 2014.

Waldman, Louis A. *Baccio Bandinelli and Art at the Medici Court: A Corpus of Early Modern Sources.* Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 2004.

Walker, Susan. *Catalogue of Roman Sarcophagi in the British Museum*. London: The British Museum Press, 1990.

Wallis, Mieczysław. "Inscriptions in Painting." *Semiotica* 9 (1973): 4-33.

Wedgwood Kennedy, Ruth. "Apelles redivivus." In *Essays in memory of Karl Lehmann*. Ed. Lucy Freeman, 160-170. New York: Institute of Fine Arts, 1964.

Weidema, Sytske and Anna Koopstra. *Jan Gossart, the Documentary Evidence*. London: Harvey Miller, 2012.

Weil-Garris, Kathleen. "Bandinelli and Michelangelo: A Problem of Artistic Identity." In *Art the Ape of Nature, Studies in Honor of H. W. Janson*. Ed. Moshe Barasch and Lucy Freeman Sandler, 223-251. New York: Harry N. Abrams Publishers, 1981.

Weissert, Caecilie. *Die kunstreichste Kunst der Künste: niederländische Malerei im 16. Jahrhundert*. München: Hirmer, 2011.

_____. "Zwischen Herrscher- und Bürgertugend: Der Herkuleszyklus von Frans Floris in der Villa des Nicolaes Jongelinck." In *Zwischen Lust und Frust, die Kunst in den Niederlanden und am Hof Philipps II. von Spanien*. Ed. Caecilie Weissert, Sabine Poeschel, and Nils Büttner, 17-47. Köln: Böhlau, 2013.

Whistler, Catherine. "Raphael's Hands." In *Raphael: The Drawings*. Ed. Catherine Whistler and Ben Thomas, 29-41. Oxford: Ashmolean Museum, 2017.

Windau, Bettina. *Somnus. Neutlateinische Dichtung an und über de Schlaf*. Trier: WVT Wissentschaftlicher Verlag, 1998.

Winner, Matthias. *Die Quellen der Pictura-Allegorien in gemalten Bildergalerien des 17. Jahrhunderts zu Antwerpen*. Doctoral thesis. Köln: Philosophische Fakultät der Universität zu Köln, 1957.

Witcombe, Christopher. *Print Publishing in Sixteenth-Century Rome: Growth and Expansion, Rivalry and Murder*. London: Harvey Miller Publishers, 2008.

_____. *Copyright in the Renaissance: Prints and the Privilegio in Sixteenth-Century Venice and Rome*. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Wolkenhauer, Anja. "Genese und Funktion von Epigrammen in der Druckgraphik des 16. Jahrhunderts am Beispiel einiger Stiche von Hendrick Goltzius." In *Künstler und Literat: Schrift- und Buchkultur in der europäischen Renaissance*. Ed. Bodo Guthmüller, Berndt Hamm and Andreas Tönnesmann, 327-345. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2006.

Wood, Christopher S. "Notation of visual information in the earliest archeological scholarship." *Word & Image* 17 (2001): 94-118.

Wood, Jeremy. "Cannibalized Prints and Early Art History: Vasari, Bellori and Fréart de Chambray on Raphael." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 51 (1988): 210-220.

Woodall, Joanna. *Anthonis Mor: Art and Authority*. Zwolle: Waanders, 2007.

Wouk, Edward H. *Frans Floris*. 2 vols. The New Hollstein Dutch & Flemish Etchings, Engravings and Woodcuts, 1450 – 1700. Rotterdam, Sound & Vision Publishers, 2011.

_____. "Reclaiming the antiquities of Gaul: Lambert Lombard and the history of northern art." *Simiolus* 36 (2012): 35-65.

_____. "Humanae Societati Necessaria: The Painted Façade of the House of Frans Floris." In *The notion of the painter-architect in Italy and the Southern Low Countries*. Ed. Piet Lombaerde, 89-125. Turnhout: Brepols, 2014.

_____. "Antoine Perrenot de Granvelle, the Aux Quatre Vents press, and the Patronage of Prints in Early Modern Europe." *Simiolus* 38 (2015): 31-61.

_____. "Frans Floris's Allegory of the Trinity (1562) and the Limits of Tolerance." *Art History* 38 (2015): 39-67.

_____. "Con la perfettione et le bellezze che si vede nelle figure…: Cornelis Cort and the Transformation of Engraving in Europe, c. 1565." In *Myth, Allegory, and Faith*, ed. Bernard Barryte, 229-257. Stanford, Ca.: Iris & B. Gerald Cantor Center for Visual Arts, 2016.

Zelen, Joyce. "The Venetian Print Album of Johann Georg I Zobel von Giebelstadt." *The Rijksmuseum Bulletin* 63 (2015): 2-51.

Zorach, Rebecca and Elizabeth Rodini. "On Imitation and Invention: An Introduction to the Reproductive Print." In *Paper Museums: the Reproductive Print in Europe, 1500-1800*. Ed. Rebecca Zorach and Elizabeth Rodini, 1-30. Chicago, Ill: David and Alfred Smart Museum of Art, 2005.

Zucker, Mark J. "Early Italian Engravings for Religious Orders." *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 56 (1993): 366-384.

Zurla, Michela. "84. Nicolas Beatrizet da Baccio Bandinelli, Nascita della Vergine." In *Baccio Bandinelli: Scultore e maestro (1493-1560)*. Ed. Detlef Heikamp and Beatrice Paolozzi Strozzi, 542. Florence: Giunti, 2014.

I declare that I have referenced all resources and aids that were used and assure that the paper is authored independently on this basis.

Alexandra Kocsis

06.11.2017