Aus dem Kunstantiquariat:
PRINTS AND BOOKS

C.G. BOERNER
in collaboration with
HARRIS SCHRANK FINE PRINTS
1. **Querfüllung auf hellem Grund – Horizontal Ornament** mid-1470s

engraving; 57 x 73 mm (2 ¼ x 2 ⅞ inches)

Bartsch 116; Lehrs and Hollstein 107

**PROVENANCE**
Jean Masson, Amiens and Paris (not stamped, cf. Lugt 1494a); his sale Gilhofer & Ranschburg, Lucerne (in collaboration with L. Godefroy and L. Huteau, Paris), November 16–17, 1926
Carl and Rose Hirschler, née Dreyfus, Haarlem (Lugt 633a), acquired from Gilhofer & Ranschburg in May 1928; thence by descent

**EXHIBITION**

**LITERATURE**

Lehrs lists six impressions and Hollstein no more than eight, to which this one has to be added. Richard Field’s *Census* for the American collections lists only one impression in the Cooper-Hewitt Museum in New York.

This is the smallest of Schongauer’s ornament prints. While the background remains white, the sophisticated shading makes the leaf appear to move back and forth within a shallow relief.

Schongauer’s ornament prints can be divided into *Blattornamente* (leaf ornaments that show a large single leaf against a plain background, Lehrs 111–114) and *Querfüllungen* (oblong panel ornaments, Lehrs 107–110). In the former, the artist’s monogram becomes a tendril-like extension of the depicted leaf while in the latter it is typically set within the composition itself. Our small print, however, represents the sole exception: the letters ms are set outside of the borderline that frames the ornamental panel. This has been noted by Tilman Falk in his entry on it in the Munich catalogue. Ulrike Heinrichs, however, has addressed the conceptual implications of this easily missed detail. By setting the artist’s monogram outside the frame, the interior of the
frame—the pictorial area circumscribed by it—becomes explicitly defined as an image within the plate. And since the tendril has no visible stem and is cut off by the borderline in the lower-left corner, the image oscillates, at once giving the impression of a pictorial whole and pretending to be a view limited by a window frame (Ulrike Heinrichs, *Martin Schongauer: Maler und Kupferstecher. Kunst und Wissenschaft unter dem Primat des Sehens*, Munich/Berlin 2007, p. 393). Like Schongauer’s highly innovative prints showing the Man of Sorrows, the Virgin, or one of the Foolish Virgins as half-length figures (Lehrs 34, 37, and 86), it therefore transcends the medieval tradition of depicting all forms as whole and complete.
Israehl van Meckenem
ca. 1440–45 – Bocholt – 1503

2. *Die heiligen Cosmas und Damian* – *Saints Cosmas and Damian, Patron Saints of Physicians* 1460s

engraving; 161 x 127 mm (6 ⅜ x 5 inches)

**WATERMARK**
Gothic letter p

Bartsch 180; Geisberg 272 first state (of two); Lehrs 312 first state (of two), Hollstein second state (of three)

**PROVENANCE**
sale, Gutekunst & Klipstein, December 2, 1949, lot 194, ill. plate 3
P. & D. Colnaghi & Co., London (no stock number, but with the Lehrs number in Harold Wright’s hand on the verso)

**LITERATURE**
N.G. Stogdon, *Catalogue 11: Early Northern Engravings*, Middle Chinnock (UK) 1998, no. 15

A very good impression with the borderline showing all round but somewhat unevenly trimmed beyond it.

A rather rare, early plate. Lehrs estimates a total of ten impressions, but does not, however, list more than four, of which three are of his first state. Richard Field’s *Census* for the American collections lists only one impression in Boston.

The foundations for Max Lehss’s seminal nine-volume compendium on early Northern engravings were established in a series of 42 articles he published in the *Repertorium für Kunswissenschaft* between 1888 and 1894. Each article presented an important public or private collection of fifteenth-century prints. Part 36 in 1893 was devoted to the then-still-intact group in Militsch in Silesia, the core of it put together by Joachim IV Count of Maltzan in the first half of the seventeenth century (cf. Lugt 3024a and C.G. Boerner’s *Neue Lagerliste 78* of 1983). It was in his description of the Maltzan impression of Van Meckenem’s print that Lehrs first identified it correctly as showing Saints Cosmas and Damian. Bartsch had described it, based on Heineken, as *Le Médecin et l’apothicaire* (vol. 6, p. 271) and had grouped it accordingly among the secular subjects. Lehrs characterizes it as an early work and suggests that it is based on a lost model by the Master E.S. Max Geisberg, the first to compile a comprehensive catalogue raisonné of Van Meckenem’s prints in 1905, concurred with the early dating but considered it one of the artist’s own inventions as part of a group named after his *Martyrdom of Saint Stephen* (Lehrs 383). In his later *Geschichte und kritischer Katalog* of 1934 Lehss accepted this.

Bartsch should not be blamed for his misidentification of the subject matter, however. The twin Saints Cosmas and Damian were, indeed, physicians in third-century Cilicia (part of today’s Turkey) and after their martyrdom under Diocletian they became the patron saints of doctors, surgeons, apothecaries, and barbers.
Albrecht Dürer  
1471 – Nuremberg – 1528

3. **Reiter und Landsknecht – Knight on Horseback and the Lansquenet** ca. 1496–97

woodcut; 385 x 283 mm (15 ⅛ x 11 ⅛ inches)

Bartsch 131; Meder 265 IIa (of IId); Schoch/Mende/Scherbaum 106

**WATERMARK**

imperial orb (Meder 53)

**PROVENANCE**

pencil annotation verso: “131 Rose in Berlin 1842”
private collection, Netherlands

**LITERATURE**

*Dürer in America: His Graphic Work*, exhibition catalogue, National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., 1971, no. 83

The first “edition” of this large woodcut was printed on paper with the imperial orb watermark described under no. 53 in Meder’s appendix. Dürer also used this stock of fine paper for the so-called “proof impressions” of the Apocalypse woodcuts and for those images from the *Large Passion* for which the blocks were already finished before his Italian journey of 1506.

For this print, however, Meder differentiates between two “states”: a first state before a gap in the outline of the rock in the lower-right corner which is, as he writes, “often filled-in with pen and ink.” The earliest impressions of his second state he describes as being “of equal quality.” Since the printing quality and the paper of both the “Meder I” and “Meder IIa” impressions are identical, one has to assume that the gap in the contour of the stone as well as the fine crack noticeable below the right back hoof of the horse developed early on in the printing of the block.

Our impression shows all the hallmarks of the earliest printing as described by Meder, with the outline of the rock retouched and the small crack ever so slightly noticeable. The sheet is in excellent, unpressed condition with the horizontal drying fold still noticeable; it is trimmed on the borderline with the latter trimmed off for ca. 38 mm at the lower left.

*“The motif of a galloping rider forms the basis of a number of Dürer’s early prints and drawings and finally emerges with unforgettable force in the great *Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse*. The *Knight and the Lansquenet* is not only one of the most important predecessors of this composition; it is also the first major woodcut in which Dürer gives the landscape as much prominence as the figures, and it thus directly anticipates the union of these two elements found in several of the most beautiful prints of the *Large Passion*. The convincing three-dimensionality and striking luminosity of the fruit tree on the left form a particularly impressive example of Dürer’s skill” (Jay A. Levenson in: cat. Washington, pp. 160f.). The manuscript inventory of the Nuremberg collector Paulus Behaim of 1618 calls the print “Rennender reüter”—a plainly descriptive title which,
as Rainer Schoch remarks, can equally be read as an expression of perplexity (in Schoch/Mende/Scherbaum, p. 49). To this day the true subject of this monumental woodcut has remained elusive—but unlike many of Dürer’s often-puzzling compositions this one has not prompted much research in recent years. What is clear at least is that the “Reiter” is not a “Ritter” since he does not wear armor. The rider is dressed in princely garb, though, and carries a Bidenhänder (a two-handed sword). The soldier on foot is a Landsknecht carrying his customary halberd. The subject matter is most likely not biblical but to be found among secular, allegorical themes. As so often, however, Dürer refuses to include details or symbols that would allow a precise identification and one is left with the observation that the two figures appear to be fleeing—from where or from what remains open.

Albrecht Dürer
1471 – Nuremberg – 1528

4.    Das Löwenwappen mit dem Hahn – Coat of Arms with a Lion and a Cock    ca. 1502–3

engraving, 185 x 118 mm (7 ¾ x 4 ¾ inches)

Bartsch 100; Meder 97 b (of g); Schoch/Mende/Scherbaum 35

WATERMARK
small jug (Meder 158)

PROVENANCE
P. & D. Colnaghi & Co., London (their stock no. in pencil on the verso C. 31530)
Daniela Laube Inc. Fine Art, New York, cat. 4, no. 5

LITERATURE
Dürer in America: His Graphic Work, exhibition catalogue, National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., 1971, no. 28

A fine and clear Meder b impression; trimmed just inside the platemark, leaving a small filet of paper round the borderline.

This wonderful heraldic image is stylistically closely related to the Coat of Arms with a Skull of 1503 but clearly predates it. “During this period Dürer was particularly fascinated with the problem of rendering textures with the burin, and in this print he seems purposely to have assembled objects with very diverse surface quality …, finding precise linear equivalents for the fluffy plumage of the cock, the highly polished jousting helmet, the shaggy mane of the lion, and the brittle ornamental foliage” (Jay A. Levenson in cat. Washington, pp.130f.). This is an imaginary coat of arms that does not relate to a noble family.

The helmet crowning the shield very closely resembles the one depicted from three different sides by Dürer in a watercolor of ca. 1500, now in the Louvre (Winkel 177). The model for this study sheet was probably a helmet that Dürer saw in the armory in Nuremberg.
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Albrecht Dürer
1471 – Nuremberg – 1528

5.  Kardinal Albrecht von Brandenburg (Der große Kardinal) – Cardinal Albrecht von Brandenburg in Profile (The Large Cardinal)  1523

ingraving; 175 x 129 mm (6 ⅞ x 5 ⅓ inches)

Bartsch 103; Meder 101 Ia (of f) of two states; Schoch/Mende/Scherbaum 97

PROVENANCE
Moriz von Kuffner, Vienna (not stamped; on the history of this collection see the preface in our catalogue Graphik der Dürerzeit, Düsseldorf/New York 2003, pp. 3–5);
thence by descent until 2002
C.G. Boerner, Düsseldorf/New York
private collection, Switzerland

LITERATURE
Dürer in America: His Graphic Work, exhibition catalogue, National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., 1971, no. 75

A fine impression, printing with tone; a horizontal printer’s crease below the center of the sheet; in very good condition with generous margins all round.

By the age of 23, Albrecht (1490–1545), the son of the Elector of Brandenburg, had already been made Bishop of Halberstadt and Archbishop of Magdeburg. The following year, in 1514, he became Archbishop of Mainz—contrary to cannon law and only after a very significant financial offering to encourage the granting of an exception that would allow him to hold all three offices simultaneously. To pay for this, he had to borrow money from the Fugger banking family in Augsburg. The sale of indulgences to repay this loan, which had been agreed with the Pope, led to the 95 theses against this practice published by Martin Luther in 1517, a broadside that ultimately set off the Reformation.

Dürer had made his first portrait print of the so-called “Small Cardinal” four years earlier in 1519, when they both attended the Reichstag in Augsburg. The drawing that formed the basis for the print is now in the Albertina (Winkler 568). The artist met Albrecht von Brandenburg again during the Reichstag in Nuremberg when the present portrait was created. This time, the subject is depicted in pure profile, based on a silverpoint drawing now in Paris (Winkler 896). The cardinal was in Nuremberg in the spring of 1522 and again between November and February of 1523. We know that Dürer delivered the plate together with an edition of five hundred impressions by the following summer from a letter he wrote to the cardinal on September 4, 1523. Since the latter had not acknowledged the receipt of the prints in a previous letter, Dürer was worried that the portrait had either been disliked or that his package had not arrived (for Dürer’s letter see Rupprich, vol. 1, p. 238). This correspondence provides us with rare documentary evidence to answer that popular (and for pre-nineteenth-century prints extremely difficult) question: “How many impressions did the artist pull?”
Hans Baldung Grien
ca. 1484/85 Schwäbisch Gmünd (?) – Strasbourg 1545

6. *Christus in Halbfigur mit sechs Engeln (Ecce Homo) – Christ as Man of Sorrows (Ecce Homo)* 1511

woodcut; 124 x 83 mm (4 ⅞ x 3 ¼ inches)

Bartsch 41; Hollstein 54; Mende 27

PROVENANCE
P. & D. Colnaghi & Co., London (their stock no. in pencil on the verso C. 27787)

LITERATURE

The catalogue for the Karlsruhe exhibition of 1959, still by far the best reference work for technical questions on the artist’s work, explicitly lists six impressions of this print as “u.a.” (among others), implying many more. The market during the past century suggests a somewhat different picture. C.G. Boerner never had the print during the post-war years, and before World War II we were only able to offer it once; in that case the impression came from the collection of Friedrich August II of Saxony (Lugt 971f.) and was described in our catalogue as being “von größter Seltenheit” (of greatest rarity; C.G. Boerner, Leipzig, November 10–12, 1926, lot 100 with full-page illustration on p. 11).

This is a good, clear impression with small margins all round but with a restoration in the lower-right corner (the lower part of the letter “B” is redrawn). It remains a virtually unobtainable print and, according to said Boerner catalogue, “eine der ergriffendsten Darstellungen Baldungs” (one of Baldung’s most moving images).

* Baudung repeatedly depicted the theme of the dead Christ, from an early drawing of ca. 1507 (in the Lehman collection at the Metropolitan Museum of Art) to his famous prints *Christ Carried to Heaven by Angels* (Bartsch 43) and *Man of Sorrows before a Column* (Bartsch 42), both of 1515–17. Our small print can be set chronologically between these works. As so often, Baldung takes a traditional iconography and idiosyncratically reinvents it.

Cynthia Robison describes the woodcut aptly as “essentially a conflation of two types of devotional images, that of the *Ecce Homo* and of the so-called *Angel’s Pietà*. From the former Baldung took the figure of Christ crowned with thorns with his arms bound before him; from the latter he took the notion of angels supporting … the body of Christ in a cloud-bordered or heavenly environment. In combining these types Baldung also departed from the two traditions. Whereas devotional images of the *Ecce Homo*, for example, invariably represent Christ alive and observing the viewer, Baldung shows us a helpless Christ, represented as if dead.” She further observes
that Christ’s stigmata are not visible here. We cannot know for sure, therefore, whether or not the Crucifixion has already taken place. “As a result, we are presented with an image that seemingly presupposes Christ’s death, but that also evokes the course of the Passion and of Christ’s suffering prior to the Crucifixion. In this context the inscription Ecce Homo is no longer limited to its historically determined reference to the display of Christ to the crowd outside of Pilate’s house, but assumes the character of an imperative exhorting the viewer to respond to the totality of Christ’s sacrifice” (cat. Washington/New Haven, pp. 152f).

While thoroughly “Baldung-esque” from the formulation of the theme to the style of the drawing to the work of the Formschneider, it has been noted that the print bears a very close relationship to Dürer’s powerful black-chalk drawing depicting the head of Christ with the crown of thorns now in the British Museum (Winkler 272). The latter is dated 1503, the very year in which Baldung entered the older master’s workshop in Nuremberg. In its extreme expressionism the drawing is somewhat of an aberration in Dürer’s oeuvre—he did not pursue this exaggerated form of emotional expression in his prints. But it is characteristic for Baldung who not only took this mode further but was also fearless in translating it into the more public medium of the print.
7. **Der heilige Christophorus – Saint Christopher** ca. 1518–20

woodcut; 120 x 94 mm (4 ¾ x 3 ¾ inches)

Bartsch 6; Dodgson, vol. 2, p. 259, no. 9; Hollstein 9; Winzinger 269

**LITERATURE**

cat. New Haven/St. Louis/Philadelphia, no. 87 (there dated ca. 1520–30)

Like all of Wolf Huber’s prints, of great rarity. Hollstein lists impressions in Basel, Berlin, Dresden, London (2), Munich, New York, Paris (2), and Vienna. C.G. Boerner was only able to offer it once after World War II, in *Neue Lagerliste 20* in 1957, where it is described as no. 112 with the remark that this rare print was not even to be found in the collections of Paul Davidsohn (Lugt 654) and Adalbert von Lanna (Lugt 2773), both strong in early German material; neither was it part of the extraordinary woodcut collection of Josef Wünsch (who owned no less than eight of Huber’s 13 woodcuts, four of them in duplicate!) sold at C.G. Boerner in Leipzig in May 1927. A very good and sharp impression with the full borderline showing all round; the top-right corner restored.

* 

Little is known about Huber’s origins and his early career. In the papers documenting the commission of 1515 for the Saint Anne altarpiece in the parish church in Feldkirch in the Austrian region of Vorarlberg he is named as “Wolfgang Huber von Veldkürch, jetz wohnhaft zue Passaw” (Wolfgang Huber from Feldkirch, now living in Passau). From this year until the end of his life Wolf was employed as court painter to Duke Ernst of Bavaria, the bishop-administrator of Passau, and later to his successor, Count Niklas II von Salm.

Huber was a highly accomplished draftsman and it is possible that his prolificacy in producing fluently drawn landscapes meant that he felt no need to experiment with translating them into etchings as Altdorfer did. He only made 13 single-sheet woodcuts, all showing small-scale figures in abundant landscapes or within elaborate architectural structures. All of them are of great rarity. The extremely fine and dense network of lines must have created an enormous challenge for the *Formschneider* and undoubtedly limited the number of impressions that could be pulled from the blocks.

This landscape with Saint Christopher is a perfect example of the idiosyncrasy inherent in Huber’s concept of landscape. The composition appears to be driven by a *horror vacui*; even the sky is filled with clouds and rays of light emanating from the moon. The draperies of both the saint and the Christ Child are shown wildly swirling while neither the trees nor the surface of the water give any hint of a gust of wind. In one respect, however, this element is highly characteristic of the art of the Danube School; the movement and agitation is not caused by natural phenomena but should be read as a visualization of the inner turmoil of the depicted figures—in this case, the giant strong man who, carrying the small child, suddenly realizes that he is supporting the weight of the world on his shoulders.
The multitalented Augustin Hirschvogel was the son of Veit Hirschvogel the Elder (1461–1525), Nuremberg’s most important and influential stained-glass painter at the time. The onset of the Reformation reduced the demand for stained glass in church buildings. When his older brother, Veit the Younger, took over the father’s workshop, the market for Kabinetscheiben (small stained-glass panels) was most likely not large enough to support both brothers, forcing the younger Augustin to look for new sources of income. Around 1536–37 Augustin Hirschvogel left Nuremberg. Working in different towns he now practiced mathematics and made a name for himself as a cartographer. He came to the attention of the imperial court in Vienna and made maps of Austria and Carinthia for Emperor Ferdinand I. He ultimately settled in Vienna in 1544. This also brought him in contact with the artists of the Danube School, most notably Albrecht Altdorfer (ca. 1480–1538) and Wolf Huber (ca. 1485–1553). Both played an important role in establishing landscape as an independent subject in drawing, watercolor, and painting. Altdorfer’s etchings represent his seminal contribution to this emancipation of landscape. The new technique was ideally suited to the translation of his drawings into the medium of print for an expanding group of collectors.

During the last decade of his life—about three decades after Altdorfer’s pioneering efforts—Hirschvogel created the 35 landscape etchings for which he is best remembered today. Colles Baxter rightly suggests that “the fact that Hirschvogel was both an etcher of landscape and mapmaker may not be entirely fortuitous. In both activities man seeks to know the land and fix his knowledge or perceptions in visual images” (cat. New Haven/St. Louis/Philadelphia, p. 88). All but five of the landscapes are dated between 1543 and 1549. Unlike the early etchings by Dürer and the Hopfers in Augsburg, which were made using iron plates, Hirschvogel was among the first printmakers to regularly etch on copper. Despite his career as a cartographer, however, most of his landscapes—apart from his view of Passau of 1546 (Bartsch 72) and two multi-plate panoramic views of Vienna of 1547 (Bartsch 80 and 81)—were invented, borrowing motifs from the first generation of landscapists. Hirschvogel repeatedly drew on elements from the work of such predecessors as Altdorfer, Huber, and even Dürer.

None of this, however, should diminish Hirschvogel’s own creative achievement as evidenced in the two beautifully and delicately drawn scenes offered here. And while not as (virtually) unobtainable as the landscape etchings of Altdorfer, “Hirschvogel’s prints are absolutely rare, and since the war extremely scarce on the market” (Stogdon, s.p., in the section on the artist in his catalogue of German Landscapes; Stogdon has also provided a census of surviving impressions that is referenced in the individual entries below. For a concise and fairly recent biographical note on the artist see also the entry by Jane S. Peters in Kristin L. Spangenberg (ed.), Six Centuries of Master Prints: Treasures from the Herbert Greer French Collection, exhibition catalogue, Cincinnati Art Museum, 1993, pp. 100–102, no. 63).
8.  *Landschaft mit einer Felsenburg in der Mitte – Landscape with a Castle on a High Bluff at Center, a Tree in the Foreground to the Left*  1546

etching; 62 x 148 mm (2 7/16 x 5 13/16 inches)

Bartsch and Schwarz 52; Hollstein 26

**LITERATURE**

N.G. Stogdon, *Catalogue 9: German Landscapes of the 16th Century*, Middle Chinnock (UK) 1993, no. 14 (his census calculates ca. 18 impressions)

A fine and strong, partially even somewhat over-inked impression; trimmed on or just within the platemark but showing small margins beyond the borderline; in excellent condition.
9. **Die Burg im See – The Castle on an Island in a Lake** 1546

etching; 78 x 153 mm (3 ¾ x 6 ¾ inches)

Bartsch and Schwarz 55; Hollstein 29

**PROVENANCE**

Gutekunst & Klipstein, Berne, April 20, 1956, lot 77, described as: *charmantes Blatt, in einem sehr schönen, tadellos erhaltenen Exemplar mit schmalem Rändchen. Eine der seltensten Landschaftsradierungen Hirschvogels und in den letzten Jahren im Handel kaum vorgekommen.*

**LITERATURE**

N.G. Stogdon, *Catalogue 9: German Landscapes of the 16th Century*, Middle Chinnock (UK) 1993, no. 16 (his census calculates 8–10 impressions)

A superb impression, clearly showing the contrast between the darker repousoir elements in the foreground, the delicately drawn castle at the center, and the fine outlines of the landscape in the distance. Trimmed on or just within the platemark but showing a small margin beyond the borderline; in very good condition with only the palest of stains at the upper right.

Next to Hirschvogel’s *View of Passau* (Bartsch 72) from the same year, the architecture of the large fortified Wasserschloss here is probably the most realistic in Hirschvogel’s landscape etchings. It looks like an actual structure, unlike the more generic fortifications that usually occupy the artist’s vistas.
Lucas van Leyden
ca. 1494 (or earlier) – Leiden – 1533

10. **The Dance of Saint Mary Magdalene, or The Wordly Life of Mary Magdalene** 1519

engraving; 290 x 397 mm (11 ⅜ x 15 ⅝ inches)

Bartsch and Hollstein 122, *New Hollstein* Ia (of III);

**WATERMARK**
Gothic p (*New Hollstein* 6c–d)

**PROVENANCE**
Julian Marshall, London (not stamped; cf. Lugt 1494);
his sale, Sotheby’s, Wilkinson & Hodge, London, June 30, 1864, lot 1046, bought by Holloway for Morrison (this print mentioned in Lugt)
Alfred Morrison, London (Lugt 151)
Richard Zinser, Forest Hills, NY (not in Lugt)
private collection

**LITERATURE**

Jan Piet Filedt Kok, who compiled the volume on Lucas van Leyden in the *New Hollstein* series, lists only 16 of what he describes as “good impressions” of his state Ia in public collections, to which a second impression at the Metropolitan Museum in New York and ours can be added.

A fine impression; trimmed within the platemark but retaining a small margin beyond the borderline; some minimal retouching along the hardly noticeable vertical fold at the center; otherwise in remarkably good condition for a print of this date and size.

The panoramic scene tells the story of Mary Magdalene in three episodes. The way in which the artist groups these episodes within the composition is highly unusual. In the foreground prominence is given to the subject of the dancing Mary Magdalene, a scene that references her worldly
life before her conversion. She is dressed in contemporary costume and surrounded by couples all looking as if they just “stepped out of Lucas’ milieu” (cat. Washington/Boston, p. 192). The scene has virtually no precedent in the visual arts. Another equally unusual scene, also belonging to the Magdalene’s courtly life, shows her as a huntress on horseback. It occupies a wide strip of the middle ground, stretching across nearly the whole width of the composition. The artist introduces the ultimate twist by setting the standard iconography of sainthood, showing the Magdalene lifted to heaven by four angels, at the far back of the scene. The composition is far too unusual to be seen as a devotional image depicting a Christian saint. It was clearly intended for the print connoisseur who had to discover the tiny figure of the saint above the far horizon in order to identify the iconography of the scene as a whole.

The print represents, in many respects, the culmination of Lucas van Leyden’s art as a printmaker. Michael Matile calls it the sum of Lucas’s art of visual narrative (“die Summe seiner visuellen Erzählkunst”; cat. Zurich, p. 85). He further suggests that the artist might have realized this himself since he never engraved another plate of this size. Ellen Jacobowitz and Stephanie Stepanek are intrigued that “in view of its complex landscape setting and wealth of narrative detail, a remarkable feature of this print is its clarity and orderliness. As a well-orchestrated composition on an impressively ambitious scale, this engraving stands as a tour de force both in the artist’s own career and in the history of printmaking” (cat. Washington/Boston, p. 192).
Lucas van Leyden  
c. 1494 (or earlier) – Leiden – 1533

11. **Ornament with the Head of a Soldier** 1527

ingraving; 118 x 77 mm (4 ⅝ x 3 ⅛ inches)

Bartsch and Hollstein 160, *New Hollstein* a (of b)

**PROVENANCE**
Princes of Waldburg-Wolffegg, Wolffegg (Lugt 2542);
private collection, Germany

**LITERATURE**

After completing his engraving titled *The Poet Vergil Suspended in a Basket* (Bartsch 136) in 1525, Lucas van Leyden stopped making prints. When he resumed printmaking two years later he focused predominantly on small-size works like this one. Of the five prints by him dated 1527, three are ornamental designs. *Two Boys with a Helmet and a Standard* (Bartsch 165) is related to ours. Both prints show magnificently decorated helmets. Here the—most likely fictional—portrait of the soldier is set into a *tondo* surrounded by acanthus scrolls and tendrils. The print is no longer visually linked to the late-Gothic tradition like much of Lucas’s earlier work. He thus skillfully displays his “modern,” Renaissance credentials and, with the profile medallion, even alludes to the classical Roman tradition of the portrait *tondo*. 
Heinrich Aldegrever
1502 Paderborn (?) – Soest 1555 or 1561

12. **Ornament mit einer Fledermaus – Ornamental Design with Bat** 1550

engraving; 68 x 50 mm (2 11/16 x 2 inches)

Bartsch, Hollstein, and *New Hollstein* 282

PROVENANCE
private collection, Germany

Aldegrever is famous for his ornamental designs. They were intended to provide a source of ideas for different craftsmen to decorate their products in metal, wood, ceramics, or gypsum. However, these highly wrought compositions, often far too complex to be simply translated into a decorative object, functioned equally as independent art works, much sought after by collectors.

This design, centered on a bat, is among the works by Aldegrever that reveal the influence of Italian art. Numerous motifs are crammed together on this tiny sheet: masks and trophies of war, but also a grasshopper, a snail, a dragonfly, and a butterfly. They are all represented as proportionately far larger than the bat and together accentuate the fantastic, even surreal aspect of the composition. The menagerie is completed by a mouse and a lizard in the lower corners, while serpents crawl out from the heads of the herms. Most of these creatures are nocturnal, and, indeed, a lighted lamp is suspended above the bat—indicating that is a nighttime scene.

The design was so much admired in its day that it was even copied in a Venetian woodcut in 1567 (Karl Bernd Heppe (ed.), *Heinrich Aldegrever, die Kleinmeister und das Kunsthandwerk der Renaissance*, exhibition catalogue, Evangelische Stadtkirche Unna, 1986, p. 241, ill. 428). Ultimately, this small print confirms Hans Wolfgang Singer’s observation that “these masterpieces of ornamental design form the most lasting basis for Aldegrever’s fame” (Hans Wolfgang Singer, *Die Kleinmeister*, Bielefeld/Leipzig 1908, p. 70).
**Federico Barocci**
ca. 1535 – Urbino – 1612

13. **L’Annunciazione – The Annunciation** ca. 1584–87

etching, engraving, and drypoint; 435 x 313 mm (17 ⅛ x 12 ⅜ inches)

Bartsch, vol. 17, p. 2, no. 1; Pillsbury/Richards 75

**WATERMARK**
fleur-de-lis in small circle

**PROVENANCE**
P. & D. Colnaghi & Co., London
Eliot Hodgkin (1905–1987)
private collection, United Kingdom

**EXHIBITED**

A very good impression, before all the later reworking; the small area in the trees visible through the window in the far background has been retouched in pen and ink by a later hand—erroneously, since it remains blank even in the earliest impressions. The sheet is otherwise in very good condition and has been trimmed to the borderline of the composition.

The *Annunciation* is arguably Barocci’s most important print. It reproduces the altarpiece commissioned by Francesco Maria II della Rovere for the ducal chapel in the basilica in Loreto in 1582 (replaced by a copy in mosaic in the eighteenth century, the painting is now in the Vatican). An engraved copy by Philippe Thomassin of 1588 provides a *terminus ante quem* for the dating of the Barocci print that was, in all likelihood, executed after the completion of the painting in 1584.

“The print demonstrates Barocci’s full mastery of the printed line. While the treatment of reflected light on the angel’s back recalls reproductive engraving in its use of line pattern with slightly curved hatchings … the etched hatchings elsewhere create a subtle pattern that becomes a shimmer of movement within the shaded areas. Barocci depicted the soft texture of the Virgin’s cloak by using a mixture of etched and engraved parallel lines mingled with clustered dots; the crisp sheen of the angel’s taffeta-like robe is described by patches of etched or engraved parallels, varied in weight each from the other, and bounded by white highlights” (Louise S. Richards in: Pillsbury/Richards, p. 105).

The plate for the print survives. It was recorded among the artist’s possessions in his studio when he died and entered the collection of the Calcografia Nazionale in Rome as early as 1709. It was reprinted well into the twentieth century, making the print as such very common. However, good and strictly contemporary impressions like ours (it shows the same type of watermark as the one in the Art Institute of Chicago, justly believed to be the finest in the United States), are rare and difficult to find.
Hendrick Goltzius
1558 Mühlbracht – Haarlem 1617

14. Pietà 1596

enraving; 186 x 129 mm (7 ⅜ x 5 ⅛ inches)

Bartsch 41; Hirschmann 50 (second (final) state); Strauss 331 (second (final) state)

watermark
crowned shield with fleur-de-lis with pendant letters WR (?) (for different variations of this watermark cf. the chapter “Shield with Strasbourg Lily,” in: The New Hollstein: The Muller Dynasty, part 2, pp. 311–317)

provenance
Eduard von Asten, Eupen (annotated in pencil on the verso with the date 1949; not in Lugt)

literature

A very good impression in excellent condition; with small margins all round.

The Pietà represents a high point in Goltzius’s response to the work of Albrecht Dürer, making it therefore also one of the chief works of the “Dürer Renaissanc.” Goltzius chose as models engravings by Dürer from around 1520, all of them showing the Virgin with the infant Christ against a scenic background. There is a striking similarity between Goltzius’s print and elements of Dürer’s Virgin with the Swaddled Child of 1520 (Bartsch 38), most notably the composition, posture, and drapery of the two figures as well as the shape of their halos and the way the sky is filled with the rays emanating from them. Even Goltzius’s placement of his monogram on a stone tablet relates to that of Dürer’s in his print of the Virgin and Child.

However, none of those stylistically and compositionally comparable works by Dürer show the body of the adult Christ. And although this is predominantly a northern tradition, Dürer himself never actually made a true Vesperbild (as the Pietà is often called in Germany). Goltzius’s most obvious and prominent reference here is Michelangelo’s marble Pietà in St. Peter’s in Rome of 1497–1500. “Goltzius undoubtedly saw the famous statue and may well have drawn it.” Five years after his trip to Italy he might have also used one of the reproductive engravings of this famous sculpture (Huigen Leeflang in cat. Amsterdam/New York/Toledo, pp. 226f.).
Johannes Sadeler the Elder  
1550 Brussels – Venice ca. 1600

15. **Bacchus Sitting on a Barrel Flanked by Amor and the Allegory of Music**  
   (after Joos van Winghe)  

   ca. 1588–95

   engraving; 440 x 295 mm (17 5/16 x 11 5/18 inches)

   Hollstein 477

   **Watermark**

   two bands of letters

   A splendid impression; with generous margins all round.

   The allegorical association of music (the female figure at left), wine (Bacchus), and love (the winged Amor at right) in Joos van Winghe’s (1544–1603) composition is thematically related to the more famous subject that brings together Venus, Ceres, and Bacchus: *Sine Cerere et Baccho friget Venus*. Both groupings are allegories of good living. Accordingly, the Latin text on Sadeler’s print can be freely translated as “Music, Bacchus, Love / caresses, excites, fulfills / with her voice, with drink, with fiery passion / the ears, the heart, the veins” (translation by Wouter Kloek, cat. no. 230: “Joachim Wtewael, Banquet of the Gods,” in: *Dawn of the Golden Age: Northern Netherlandish Art 1580–1620*, exhibition catalogue, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam 1993–94, pp. 558f.)

   Johann Sadeler left the family workshop in Antwerp in 1580, first to go to Cologne and then, in 1586, to Frankfurt. It was here that he would have met Joos van Winghe. Born in Brussels, Van Winghe had studied in Rome and Paris; he had returned for a period to work in Brussels but left for Frankfurt in 1585 where he became a citizen in 1588. Sadeler and Van Winghe therefore coincided for two years in Frankfurt. In 1587 the Bavarian Duke Wilhelm V had invited Johannes Sadeler to Munich where he employed him as court engraver from 1588 with an annual salary of two hundred guilders. Sadeler signs this print as “Bavarie Duc: chalcograph”; we can therefore assume that it was published during his Munich sojourn which lasted until 1595. Most likely prompted by the disastrous financial situation of the ducal court in Munich, Sadeler took official leave at that point and moved on to Verona, Venice, and Rome. He died in Venice, probably in August of 1600.

   The print is dedicated to Karl, Markgraf von Burgau (1560–1618), the son of Archduke Ferdinand of Austria and Philippine Welser.
Jan Harmensz. Muller
1571 – Amsterdam – 1628

16.  **Apotheosis of the Arts, or The Artists Escape from the Barbarians to Mount Olympus**
1597 (after Bartholomäus Spranger)

 engraving from two plates; overall 685 x 502 mm (27 x 19 13/16 inches)

Bartsch 76; Hollstein 72; New Hollstein 76 third (final) state

watermark (on both sheets)
running bear without cartouche (New Hollstein: The Muller Dynasty, part 2, p. 270; used ca. 1598–1608 acc. to Lindt)

Very good, homogenous impressions from the two plates on paper with identical watermarks.

Very rare. According to the New Hollstein, the first state is known only in a unique impression in Frankfurt and there are two impressions each in Amsterdam and London of the second state; even the final state is listed there in merely eight impressions.

The three arts, Architecture, Painting, and Sculpture, are seen ascending toward Zeus, shown surrounded by his fellow gods on Mount Olympus. They are carried by trumpet-blowing Fame and supported by the western wind Zephyr who blows blossoms from below. A dark cloud shields them from the arrows of the Turks that can be seen in the lower-right corner. The former flourishing of the arts in the service of the emperor, the pope, and other rulers is depicted in the lower-left corner. In the background to the left, however, one notices the destruction that, according to the Latin verses accompanying the image, was caused by the “barbarians.” The print was created at a moment when the Turkish threat was particularly severe. The year before, the Ottoman forces had won the most important battle for this period of the conflict at Mezö-Keresztes. It is reasonable to assume that the ongoing warfare must have had a huge financial impact on the court of Rudolph II in Prague where Spranger had been working since 1581 and that he might have contemplated a return to his hometown of Antwerp. This print is, accordingly, dedicated to the consuls and senators of his native city.

Next to Goltzius, Jan Muller is the most important printmaker of Dutch Mannerism. He was the son of the Amsterdam printmaker and publisher Harmen Jansz. Muller (1540–1617) and worked for Goltzius until 1589. From 1590 he published his prints with his father. During the next 15 years he created many plates after Cornelis Cornelisz. van Haarlem (1562–1638) and ultimately became the foremost interpreter of the designs of the Prague court artist Bartholomäus Spranger (1546–1611).
Christoffel Jegher
1596 – Antwerp – 1652/53

17.  *The Temptation of Christ by the Devil* (after Peter Paul Rubens)  ca. 1630

woodcut; 328 x 433 mm (12 ⅞ x 17 ⅛ inches)

Le Blanc 6 first state (of two); Hollstein 6 second state (of three)

In fine, untreated condition and therefore nicely showing the *retroussage* from the block on the verso of the sheet.

The woodcut shows one of the 39 ceiling paintings in the Jesuit Church in Antwerp. They were commissioned in 1620 and the contract explicitly required Rubens to provide oil sketches in his own hand (while the final paintings might be executed by his assistants). The paintings were completely destroyed by fire in 1718. The compositions served as models for three prints from Rubens's workshop, including his own etching of *St. Catherine, Jegher's Coronation of the Virgin;* and the present woodcut. The oil sketch showing the scene of Christ's temptation, formerly in the collection of Count Seilern, is now at the Courtauld Gallery in London. It is most likely that Rubens gave Jegher this (or a similar) oil sketch as model since it is much closer to the woodcut than the engravings that record the completed paintings.

As was generally the case with the woodcuts, Rubens was closely, even overwhelmingly involved in their creation. As Peter Parshall has observed: “If there was a psychotherapist in Antwerp who specialized in blockcutting anxiety, then Jegher must have been his best patient” (exhibition review “Rubens and the Woodcut,” in: *Print Quarterly*, vol. 22, 2005, pp. 466–472, here p. 471). Corrections in oil and ink on an impression of the *Temptation of Christ* in the Bibliothèque nationale in Paris prove his point. Rubens clearly saw the woodcuts as works of art in their own right rather than as mere reproductions. “The paintings were to be seen from a distance, and the simpler the image, the bolder the impact on the viewer. For the woodcut, however, Rubens could elaborate all the passages he had to simplify. The rocks and gnarled trees behind Christ are enlarged in proportion and drawn with rich profusion of detail” (Mary L. Myers, “Rubens and the Woodcuts of Christoffel Jegher,” in: *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin*, summer 1966, pp. 7–23, here p. 21).
18. Male Nude, Seated and Standing – “Het Rolwagentje” (The Walking Frame) ca. 1646

etching; 195 x 129 mm (7 11/16 x 5 7/16 inches)

Bartsch 194, White/Boon first state (of three); Hind 222; New Hollstein 233 first state (of eight)

PROVENANCE
David Geddes, Edinburgh (according to a pencil inscription by Colnaghi's on the verso, with the date 1804)
Reverend Hilgrove Cox, Watlington, Oxfordshire (Lugt 1298c); his sale, Sotheby's, London, March 8, 1922
P & D. Colnaghi & Co., London (their stock nos. in pencil on verso C 8921 and 23610)
Carl and Rose Hirschler, née Dreyfus, Haarlem (Lugt 633a); thence by descent

LITERATURE
Erik Hinterding, Ger Luijten, and Martin Royalton-Kisch (eds.), Rembrandt the Printmaker, exhibition catalogue, Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam/British Museum, London, 2000–01, no. 51

A very good impression, printing with subtle tone, of the first and only state printed during Rembrandt's lifetime; thread margins all round.

The print is from a group of three, all showing the same male model and dating from ca. 1646. The other two show the man alone (Seated Male Nude, Bartsch 193; and Seated Male Nude, One Leg Extended, Bartsch 196), while our print shows him twice. The other crucial difference is that this print includes a genre scene in the background of a woman with a small child using a frame construction intended to help it learn to walk. Erik Hinterding explained that this is not merely an incidental inclusion—a sort of snapshot from the artist’s studio that happens to show the child with its nanny in the background. “In the seventeenth century, teaching a child to walk in a baby walker was a common metaphor for ‘learning’ or ‘practising’ in general. Its illustration behind two studies from life must undoubtedly be read as an exhortation to young artists—they can only master their art by constant practice” (in cat. Amsterdam/London, p. 213).

The Amsterdam/London exhibition of 2000–01 that brought together most of Rembrandt's drawings relating directly to his prints showed no less than three drawings by three of his pupils that must have been made during the same sessions with this model (see ibid., pp. 215 and 217, figs. a, c, and d). Rembrandt, for his part, “almost certainly drew directly on to the copper plate” noticeable in a variety of corrections—to the right forearm of the seated figure, for example. The etching further reveals such imperfections as white patches where the lines were not bitten. These areas were “corrected” in later states but Hinterding's watermark research has demonstrated that effectively every state after the first state cannot originate with Rembrandt since the papers in all later states date from the late seventeenth and even the eighteenth century (ibid., pp. 213 and 217 as well as The New Hollstein, co-authored by him).
etching, drypoint, and sulphur tinting; 84 x 162 mm (3 ¾ x 6 ⅜ inches)

Bartsch 227, White/Boon second (final) state; Hind 243; New Hollstein 249 second (final) state

watermark
countermark lb (belonging to foolscap with five-pointed collar; cf. Hinterding, vol. 2, pp. 82f.; vol. 3 p. 136 ill.)

PROVENANCE
Carl Schlösser, Elberfeld (Lugt 636);
his sale, F.A.C. Prestel, Frankfurt/Main, June 7ff., 1880, lot 573, described as: “Étude parfaitement belle, les barbes d’un velouté et d’une vigueur magnifique, la planche sale; avec petites marges et avec les coins du papier en haut. 196 Marks to a “Lind”
C.G. Boerner, Leipzig
Carl and Rose Hirschler, née Dreyfus, Haarlem (Lugt 633a), acquired in March 1928; thence by descent

LITERATURE
Cynthia P. Schneider, Rembrandt’s Landscapes: Drawings and Prints, exhibition catalogue, National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., 1990, no. 21

In its size and proportion, and in the format with the arched top, this haunting little landscape seems as though it should be a pendant to the Landscape with a Square Tower dated 1650 (Bartsch 218). Yet Cynthia Schneider, in her investigations on Rembrandt as a landscape artist, separates them into two different categories. This is because the prominent square tower in the latter is an invention of the artist and should therefore be grouped among what she calls “imaginary landscapes” while the unusual looking obelisk in our sheet has been recognized since Lugt as the banpaal (border marker) that stood on the road to Haarlem. The composition as a whole, however, “is a free invention … Rembrandt has depicted a typical langhuis stolp, with its adjacent haystack, next to the obelisk, so that the three forms blend into one unit. … In merging the farmhouse and banpaal Rembrandt revealed his characteristic fascination with juxtaposing mundane and exotic motifs in landscape” (Schneider, pp. 114f.).

The changes between the two states that are known for this print seem minimal at first: most noticeable are the added diagonal shading lines to the roofs of the buildings in the distance at right and the vertical shading to the base of the obelisk. (A pentimento to the tip of the obelisk is already visible in the first state, with its apex just below the edge of the plate; however, no impression has survived in which the monument has not already been expanded beyond the frame of the composition.) In addition, Rembrandt reduced the richness of the drypoint accents. It is important to realize that this is not the effect of wear (and hence less desirable) but that the artist made a conscious choice to do so. He must have realized that the dark drypoint patches under-
mined the balance of the composition as a whole. The strongest support for the fact that we are not arguing here in favor of the second state merely because it is what we can offer is to be found in the sky of our print; it shows that Rembrandt added sulphur tinting that is hardly present in the first state. Instead of simply reworking the shadows with a drypoint needle (which would have been the simpler option), the artist wiped sulphur paste directly onto the plate to create a tonal effect not unlike that of wash in a drawing. As a result, the different parts of this small but complex landscape view are now far more successfully integrated: “The combined effect of the supplemental linear shading, sulphur tinting, faint scratches, and reduced burr transforms the deep shadows and sharp contrasts of the first state into a more balanced and unified composition in the second” (ibid., p. 116).
Rembrandt Harmensz. van Rijn
1606 Leiden – Amsterdam 1669

20.  **The Triumph of Mordecai**  ca. 1641

etching and drypoint; 175 x 213 mm (6 ¾ by 8 ½ inches)

Bartsch 40, White/Boon only state; Hind 172; New Hollstein 185 third state (of four)

**WATERMARK**
countermark letter r

A fine impression, with substantial burr in the drypoint work, particularly toward the left as is usual in early impressions, but also strongly printed at right so as to allow balance; with generous margins all round.

Hinterding and Rutgers, the authors of *The New Hollstein* on Rembrandt, discovered three impressions pulled before small details on the plate had been finished; they describe them as a unique first state and as a second state that is known in two impressions. Their fourth state is a very late, eighteenth-century reworking of the original plate.

*The Triumph of Mordecai* shows a scene from the Old Testament *Book of Esther* in which the two main protagonists of a very complex story—Mordecai shown royally clothed and mounted on a horse, and Haman, his enemy, forced to act as his herald, standing in the foreground—are as yet unaware of their imminent fates. For King Ahasuerus has been informed by Esther, his Jewish consort, of the dastardly plot hatched by Haman, his favorite: since Mordecai, Esther’s stepfather, has refused to pay homage to him, Haman intends to massacre all the Jews in the empire and to hang Mordecai from a gallows that he has already had erected. In the meantime, the king has discovered that Mordecai has foiled an attempt on his life and thus honors him with this procession. Mordecai is not yet aware of the reason for his royal treatment and Haman does not realize that he is the one who will, in fact, be hanged on the gallows.

In his etching Rembrandt referred to two other depictions of this scene: Lucas van Leyden’s engraving of 1515 (Bartsch 32), an almost frieze-like composition populated by a large crowd paying homage to Mordecai, and a painting of 1621 by Rembrandt’s teacher Pieter Lastman, in which the scene is given more emotional and perspectival depth. If Rembrandt incorporated elements of both of these works into his version, in execution it represents a bravura display of a range of printmaking techniques that is entirely characteristic.
21. **Christ Preaching ("La Petite Tombe")** ca. 1657

etching, engraving, and drypoint on tissue-thin chine; 156 x 207 mm (6 ⅛ x 8 ⅛ inches)

Bartsch 67, White/Boon only state; Hind 256; New Hollstein 298 first state (of two)

**LITERATURE**


A fine impression in excellent condition; trimmed on or just outside the platemark all round.

In this print Rembrandt revisits the theme of his magnum opus, the so-called *Hundred Guilder Print* of ca. 1648 (Bartsch 74). This smaller, condensed version is one of the artist’s most balanced compositions. It has a classical serenity that has led scholars to point to the influence of Raphael’s Vatican fresco of *Parnassus*. Martin Royalton-Kisch notes that in 1652 Rembrandt sketched a version of Raphael’s work, well-known at the time through reproductive prints, in the *album amicorum* of his friend Jan Six. After establishing the overall scheme with a straightforward combination of horizontal and vertical elements, the artist enriched the details and atmospheric effects by going over the etched plate with a drypoint needle, thereby creating a lively “dialogue between clean etched lines and velvety drypoint lines fringed with rich burr” (Clifford Ackley in cat. Boston/Chicago, p. 208).

The *Petite Tombe* has traditionally been dated to ca. 1652. Based on his watermark research Erik Hinterding now proposes an execution date of ca. 1657 (cf. *The New Hollstein: Rembrandt. Text*, vol. 2, p. 270). Its somewhat confusing title was introduced by Gersaint in 1751 and later misunderstood as making reference to the “little tomb” on which Christ supposedly stands. In fact, this title refers back to Clement de Jonghe’s inventory where it is listed as “La Tombisch plaatjen” (La Tombe’s little plate), a reference to Nicholas La Tombe who might have commissioned the work. Members of the La Tombe family are noted in documents relating to Rembrandt dating to between 1650 and 1658 (cf. Martin Royalton-Kisch in cat. Amsterdam/London, pp. 280f., no. 68 and Clifford Ackley in cat. Boston, p. 208, note 6).

*A note on the paper:*

Rembrandt was keenly interested in the effects created by printing on different surfaces. In addition to European paper and vellum he also experimented with so-called “oriental papers.” The earliest known reference to exotic, non-European papers dates from a letter by the English traveler Edward Brown (1644–1708) of September 5, 1668, in which he described some prints by Rembrandt “upon Indian paper.” However, this is only a vague term referring generally to papers “from the Indies” or “imported from the Dutch East India Company.” *Gampi*, a highly prized Japanese paper that is fairly thick and has a delicate sheen and ivory color, is one of the papers Rembrandt used that has a most clearly established origin. The often tissue-thin grayish-white Chinese paper (traditionally referred to in the literature by its French name *chine*)
used in this impression of the print does not have the luster of the Japanese gampi paper but it was nevertheless prized for its softness and delicacy. It takes the ink clearly and precisely, printing the lines sharply and with good relief. Its softness also meant that it caused less wear to the delicate burr. This must undoubtedly be one reason that the artist often used it for his later prints, the Petite Tombé among them. In their most successful impressions these prints depended on the accents created by the extensive use of the drypoint needle. For the Petite Tombé Rembrandt appears to have employed various different surfaces: The New Hollstein lists 15 impressions on Japan, two on chine, and even one on vellum. (A good overview of the subject of oriental papers can be found in: Jacobus van Breda, “Rembrandt Etchings on Oriental Papers: Papers in the Collection of the National Gallery of Victoria,” in: Art Bulletin of Victoria, vol. 38, 1997, pp. 25–38.)
Rembrandt Harmensz. van Rijn
1606 Leiden – Amsterdam 1669

22.  **Christ at Emmaus: the larger plate**  1654

etching and drypoint; 213 x 161 mm (8 ¾ x 6 ¾ inches)

Bartsch 87, White/Boon second state (of three); Hind 282; New Hollstein 283 second state (of five)

**PROVENANCE**
August Artaria, Vienna (Lugt 33);
his sale, Artaria & Co., Vienna, May 6–13, 1896, lot 534, described as: _superbe épreuve avec beaucoup de barbes. Rare._

Julius Rosenberg, Copenhagen (Lugt 1519 and 1520);
his sale, C.G. Boerner, Leipzig, May 1–2, 1901, lot 178, described as: _prachtvoller Abdruck des zweiten Zustandes, mit starkem Grat ... Aus Sammlung Artaria._

Dr. Julius Elischer von Thurzómbánya, Budapest (Lugt 824)
P. & D. Colnaghi & Co., London (their stock no. in pencil on the verso C. 12793)
Percival Duxbury (1872–1945), Bredbury, Cheshire (acquired from the above in 1936)

Lilian Honor Lewis (by descent; d. 2013)

In this “larger plate” Rembrandt revisits a subject he first etched in 1634. The lively scene in the earlier print (Bartsch 88) looks like a vignette from everyday life while 20 years later the image is imbued with a monumental solemnity. Artists traditionally depict this scene showing Christ at the moment when he is breaking the bread. Rembrandt chooses the next instant, when the true identity of the traveler is revealed to the two disciples who had encountered him on their way to Emmaus (Luke 24:13–31). The translucency of the lightly etched composition fits the spiritual content at the core of the biblical story, emphasizing the ethereal figure of Christ shortly before he “vanished out of their sight.”

**Christ at Emmaus** belongs to a group of four vertical plates depicting scenes from the Life of Christ that are often understood as parts of a projected Passion series; the other three are _The Presentation in the Temple: in the Dark Manner_ (Bartsch 50); _The Descent from the Cross by Torchlight_ (Bartsch 83); and _The Entombment_ (Bartsch 86). _Christ at Emmaus_ and _The Descent from the Cross_ are the only ones dated in the plate, both 1654. The solemn _Presentation_ and the somber _Descent from the Cross_ are both densely wrought dark compositions; the _Entombment_ makes the transition between light and dark from the first to the second state whereas the present plate remains “lightly etched,” with only minimal, albeit effective, drypoint work added in the second state (New Hollstein’s states three through five no longer originate with Rembrandt). It is worth speculating that a fifth plate, _Christ Appearing to the Apostles_ (Bartsch 89), this one a horizontal composition but with precisely the same measurements, dated 1656, and also known only as a “lightly etched” print, might also have been part of such a late Passion cycle.

In the purely etched first state, the head and halo of Christ appear as if they have not actually
been finished—even if the survival of at least 25 impressions, according to New Hollstein, proves
that Rembrandt did pull a small edition. In this, the second state, he added a lot of work, all of
it in drypoint. There are more rays in the halo, and, most importantly, the face of Christ has now
been completed. However, the burr on the drypoint strokes wore away quickly. The patches of
burr showing in our impression along the slanted lines of the curtain and on the hat of the man
on the right most effectively indicate that this is a very early pull—representing the artist’s full
realization of this mature composition.

Rembrandt Harmensz. van Rijn
1606 Leiden – Amsterdam 1669

23. Jan Lutma, Goldsmith 1656
etching and drypoint on thin chine; 196 x 150 mm (7 1/6 × 5 7/8 inches)

Bartsch 276, White/Boon first state (of three); Hind 290; New Hollstein 293 first state (of five)

PROVENANCE
John Malcolm, Poltalloch, Argyleshire, Scotland; and London (cf. Lugt 1489)
British Museum, London, acquired from the above in 1895 (cf. for the museum’s stamps designated
to the Malcolm collection Lugt 1780–81; all the above according to the annotated Colnaghi label on the old backing of the frame)
P. & D. Colnaghi & Co., London (their stock no. in pencil on the verso C.21644)
Percival Duxbury (1872–1945), Bredbury, Cheshire (acquired from the above in 1936)
Lilian Honor Lewis (by descent; d. 2013)

A fine impression on very delicate and surprisingly well-preserved tissue-thin chine that beauti-
fully emphasizes the rich tonal effects created by a dense web of very fine etched lines to which
the artist added extensive burr in drypoint.

While rare and sought after by connoisseurs, the first state is not, strictly speaking, a “working
proof.” Too many impressions survive (New Hollstein lists ca. 40 impressions, including three, this
one not included, on Chinese paper). The plate is a technical tour de force, combining delicate
etching and bold accents in drypoint. Rembrandt then used it—probably without permission
from the sitter, who commissioned the print—to experiment with effects on different printing
surfaces. In addition to European papers (with different watermarks) and chine, he also used
Japanese gampi paper as well as cartridge paper. It is only from this plate that several weak and
gray impressions survive (often bearing the marks of the most esteemed collectors), also known as
“silverprints” or “Makulatur impressions,” made by printing the plate without re-inking. Further-
more, there are no less than four counterproofs known.

Rembrandt made substantial changes to the plate between the first and the second state. Most
importantly, he added a window in the wall behind the sitter and added shadows to the wall. Yet
he also “refreshed” the plate in many places where the drypoint burr had started to wear. The artist’s
signature and date were added only now at the upper center, as was an engraved inscription at lower right (probably not by Rembrandt but by a professional calligraphic engraver): *Joannes Lutma Aurifex Natus Groningae* (Johannes Lutma, goldsmith, born in Groningen).

Jan Lutma (ca. 1584–1669) came from Emden in East Friesland (not Groningen as stated in the inscription in the second state) and had worked in Paris before settling in Amsterdam in 1621. As a goldsmith, he was celebrated for his mastery in chasing. A silver drinking bowl with Lutma’s mark, not dissimilar to the one visible on the table at right, survives in the Rijksmuseum. The print has always been coveted as one of Rembrandt’s most penetrating psychological portraits. His genius in capturing the sitter’s personality becomes even more apparent if one compares it to the print of Jan Lutma made by his son, Jan Lutma the Younger, the same year (see the next entry in this catalogue).

**Jan Lutma the Younger**  
1624 – Amsterdam – 1689

**24. ** *Johannes Lutma Aurifex*  
1656

etching with *opus mallei* (punchwork); 245 x 206 mm (9 ½ x 8 ⅛ inches)

Bartsch 1797, vol. 2, p. 133, no. 75; Rovinski, vol. 2, no. 435; Hollstein 5 only state

**LITERATURE**


A very good impression; trimmed on or just within the platemark but retaining a paper margin beyond the borderline.

We know that in old age Lutma “began to experience problems with his eyes. Yet in 1656 he declared that he had been cured of his blindness” (Ger Luijten in cat. Amsterdam/London, p. 332). This is, incidentally, the same year not only of Rembrandt’s celebrated portrait print of Lutma but also of this etching by the goldsmith’s son. The expression of the sitter in Rembrandt’s print can be described as somewhat absent; indeed, his eyes are half-closed. The heavy eyelids are even more pronounced here, and the younger Lutma further added a pair of spectacles that the goldsmith holds in his right hand. There must clearly be a link between the prints and Lutma’s recovery. Perhaps he commissioned them to use as elaborate and extravagant calling cards to announce that he was, at the age of 72, still (or again) working in the craft that had brought him fame and even public commissions.
In 1662 the painter Charles Le Brun (1619–1690) became director of the Manufacture des Gobelins (the royal manufactory of tapestries). His first design project was a series of tapestries depicting the cycles of the four elements and the four seasons. After its completion, probably in 1667, the miniaturist Jacques Bailly (1629 or 1634–1679), in collaboration with the calligrapher Nicolas Jarry (born between 1605 and 1620–died between 1666 and 1674) presented Louis XIV with a manuscript depicting the devises, the emblematic allegories positioned at the center of the elaborate borders surrounding each of the tapestries. Bailly’s miniatures are the immediate source for the present set of etchings, and it was Bailly who commissioned the prints from Sébastien Leclerc. The set was first published in 1668 and printed by Claude Blageart. André Félibien had already published an unillustrated explanation of the devises in 1665, before the tapestries were finished (a second edition appeared in 1667). The edition of 1668 seems to be exceedingly rare. There is one in the Bibliothèque nationale in Paris (call no. Ad 107) and one in the Getty Research Institute in Los Angeles (call no. 1391–388), both printing Félibien’s explanations in prose above and verse by Charles Perrault below each device. The Getty’s copy further includes Leclerc’s eight double-page engravings of the full tapestries that were only published in 1670, probably making it a compilation of the 1670 edition and Blageart’s first edition of 1668.
This is a superb and fresh set with no accompanying letterpress texts. It was printed only for the Cabinet du Roy, with two devices printed on each wide-margined sheet of heavy laid paper. Comparison with the copies of the 1668 edition with text shows that the present impressions of the individual plates are far superior to those in Blageart’s edition. Maxime Préaud knew only of the two other copies of the Cabinet du Roy edition in the Bibliothèque nationale (call nos. Aa 9 and Ed 59). The quality of the impressions there as well as in our set makes it very likely that their printing even predates Blageart’s edition of 1668.
Robert Nanteuil
1623 Reims – Paris 1678

26. **Portrait of Cardinal Richelieu** (after Philippe de Champaigne) 1657

engraving; 345 x 268 mm (13 ⅜ x 10 ⅝ inches)

Robert-Dumesnil 218; Petitjean/Wickert 200 third state (of four)

This is a somewhat unusual print in Nanteuil’s oeuvre, made 15 years after Richelieu’s death. Armand Jean du Plessis, Cardinal-Duke of Richelieu and of Fronsac (1585–1642), was, arguably, the most powerful man in France during the first half of the seventeenth century. He became secretary of state in 1616 and in 1624 was appointed chief minister to King Louis XIII, a position he held until his death in 1642; at that point he was succeeded by Cardinal Mazarin, whose career he had fostered. By restraining the power of the nobility, Richelieu was instrumental in transforming France into a centralized state and effectively laid the groundwork for the absolutist reign of Louis XIV.

Nanteuil was a master of the most subtle variations, especially in the way he framed his portraits. If one were to line up a whole group of them next to each other it would become apparent that what appears to be a simple oval profile is, in effect, part of a delicate interplay between the portrait itself, its background, the coat of arms below, and the differently designed bases that support the oval frames. This portrait, however, is one of the few where the “window” is shaped not as an oval but as a rectangle. There is no decorative profile of any kind either; instead two long laurel branches, intertwined below, surround the cardinal’s portrait—similar to the oak-leaf branches that surround an equally rectangular portrait of Richelieu’s successor, the Cardinal Mazarin, engraved by Nanteuil the same year (Petitjean/Wickert 158).

While Mazarin’s portrait is taken *ad vivum*, our print is based on Philippe de Champaigne’s (1602–1674) famous portrait of Richelieu, several variants of which exist, most of them dating from the 1630s. After moving to Paris in 1647, Nanteuil worked closely with Champaigne, who at that time was the leading portrait painter in France and, as Thomas Head Thomas points out, the artist “who had most influence upon him.” Champaigne’s “precise style of drawing was sympathetic to Nanteuil’s own instinct,—and it was exceptionally adapted to line-engraving” (Thomas Head Thomas, *French Portrait Engraving of the XVIIth and XVIIIth Centuries*, London 1910, p. 54).
Robert Nanteuil
1623 Reims – Paris 1678

27.  Portrait of Jean Chapelain 1655

engraving; 267 x 189 mm (10 ½ x 7 7/16 inches)

Robert-Dumesnil 60; Petitjean/Wickert 43 first state (of four)

Very fine impression; with thread margins all round.

The portrait was engraved as an illustration for Jean Chapelain’s epic poem about Jeanne d’Arc, La Pucelle ou la France délivrée, first published by Augustin Courbé in Paris in 1656.

An eminent homme de lettres, Chapelain (1595–1674) was among the founding members of the Académie française when it was established in 1635. He had published only very little when La Pucelle came out, a poem on which he had worked for 20 years. The work proved so popular that six editions were printed within 18 months. Unfortunately, however, it was soon after made the subject of one of the biting satires of Nicolas Boileau-Despréaux, effectively bringing Chapelain’s poetic reputation to an end. Respect for the literary critic nonetheless survived: “Chapelain s’était cru un poète, alors qu’il n’était qu’un bon critique littéraire” (Petitjean/Wickert, p. 161).
Charles Perrault
1628 – Paris – 1703

28.  *Les Hommes illustres qui ont paru en France pendant ce siècle: Avec leurs portraits au naturel*

2 vols. bound in one; Paris: Antoine Dezallier 1696–1700

first edition, first issue with the biographies and portraits of Antoine Arnauld (vol. 2, pp. 15–16) and Blaise Pascal (vol. 2, pp. 65–66) that were suppressed by the censors in the second issue and replaced with those of Louis Thomassin and Charles du Fresne du Cange; this copy has all four portraits with their accompanying texts (pp. 15f. and 65f. in vol. 2 are hence counted twice)

engraved allegorical title-page in vol. 1, the vignettes and tailpieces engraved by Sébastien Leclerc (1637–1714) and the woodcut headpieces by Pierre Le Sueur (1669–1750); overall the book contains 102 engraved plates by Claude Duflos (1665–1727), Gérard Edelinck (1640–1707), Jacques Lubin (ca. 1659–after 1703), Robert Nanteuil (1623–1678), Pieter Louis van Schuppen (1627–1702), and Louis Simonneau (1654–1727); five plates are unsigned

sheets 424 x 275 mm (16 ¾ x 11 inches)

fine nineteenth-century green-leather binding by René Victor Chambolle (1834–1898) and Hippolyte Duru (d. 1884) with their stamp “Chambolle-Duru” inside front cover

PROVENANCE
Jacques Vieillard, Bordeaux (his book label inside front cover);
his sale, André Desvouges with experts Francisque Lefrançois and Marcel Mounastre-Picamilh, Hôtel Drouot, Paris, March 12–15, 1929, lot 271
Raphaël Esmérian, New York (his book label inside front cover but not in his sales with experts Georges Blaizot and Claude Guérin, Palais Galliera, Paris, 1972–74; however, a file card for this book is in the Esmérian papers kept at the Grolier Club in New York)

Charles Perrault is today best known for establishing the *Contes de Fées* (Fairy Tales) in French literature. The two main collections, *Contes en vers* and *Histoires ou contes du temps passé, avec des moralités*, were published in 1695 and 1697 respectively. Perrault came from a wealthy Parisian family, studied law, and made a career under Louis XIV and his powerful finance minister, Jean Baptiste Colbert. He used his influence to have his brother chosen over Gian Lorenzo Bernini as the architect for a new east wing of the Louvre, built between 1667 and 1670.

In 1668, Perrault wrote *La Peinture* to honor the king’s first painter, Charles Le Brun. His treatise *Critique de l’Opéra* of 1674 instigated the literary debate known today as the “Querelle des Anciens et des Modernes” (Quarrel of the Ancients and the Moderns). Perrault was the leading supporter of the “Moderns,” claiming superiority for the science but also for the literature and art of his time over that of antiquity. This position represented an open attack on the French Academy and the Academy of Painting. For the latter, ancient art was the standard against which all contemporary work must be judged. Perrault summarized his position in a series of dialogues that
LES HOMMES ILLUSTRES
QUI ONT PARU EN FRANCE
pendant ce Siecle :

Avec leurs Portraits au naturel.

Par M. Perrault, de l'Academie Francoise.

A PARIS.
Chez ANTOINE DEZALLIER, rue Saint Jacques, à la
Constance d'or.

M DC. XCVI

AVEC PRIVILEGE DU Roi.
each compare “old” and “new.” Ultimately, they made up the four volumes of the Parallèles des anciens et des modernes en ce qui regarde les arts et les sciences published between 1688 and 1698. However, the positions taken by the different parties were often somewhat confusing. “Perrault, who was a skillful controversialist, pointed to Lebrun and Racine, the two stoutest supporters of the ancients, as the examples of contemporary artists who had excelled these very ancients. In the same way he maintained that Louis XIV was himself a proof that kings were as great in the seventeenth century as they had been in antiquity” (Anthony Blunt, Art and Architecture in France 1500–1700, 4th ed., Harmondsworth 1980, p. 360).

Perrault’s Les Hommes illustres qui ont paru en France pendant ce siècle has to be seen within the context of this ongoing debate and his effort to elevate the culture of his time over all that came before; accordingly he states in his preface “comme le siècle où nous vivons … a vu toutes les Sciences & tous les arts s’élever en quelque sorte à leur dernière perfection.” Yet Blunt’s remarks serve as a warning that the illustrious contemporaries who should be included in any such list are not always obvious. While it is not surprising, therefore, that the selection provoked controversy it is probably fair to say that any selection would have created the same result. The two volumes, here, as often, bound into one, assemble the engraved portraits together with two-page long descriptions, printed in letterpress, of the lives and merits of eminent Frenchmen who lived under the reigns of Louis XIII and Louis XIV. At least two in the second volume of 1700, Antoine Arnauld and Blaise Pascal, roused the censors and were consecutively suppressed and then replaced by those of Louis Thomassin and Charles du Fresne du Cange in a second printing.

Arnauld was the most influential representative of Jansenism in the second half of the seventeenth century. This theological movement within the Catholic Church emphasized human depravity and the necessity of divine grace and was opposed to many elements of the Catholic hierarchy, most notably the Jesuit order. The mathematician and Christian philosopher Pascal was also a follower; once the Jesuit controversy had forced Arnauld into hiding he took up his cause by writing a series of polemic letters. They were collected and published anonymously under the title Provinciales in 1657 in Cologne. The suppression of both portraits is evidence that the impact of these Jansenist debates lingered as late as 1700.

It is not without irony then—and possibly representing a sly move by Perrault the “controversialist”—that one of the two “substitutes,” Louis Thomassin, had been attacked by the Jansenists when teaching at the Sorbonne. He retreated from public life soon after to write, among other things, a comprehensive history of canon law. The other, Charles du Fresne, was a highly distinguished philologist and an important early historian of the Middle Ages and editor of the writings of Byzantine historians—in this respect a safe choice for inclusion.

The bulk of the portraits in volume one were engraved by Gérard Edelinck (33), whom our trusted Thomas Head Thomas calls “the greatest of the followers of Nanteuil, and the foremost engraver in France in the last part of the XVIIth century” (Thomas Head Thomas, French Portrait Engraving of the XVIth and XVIIth Centuries, London 1910, p. 67). Thomas even suggests that “his technical accomplishments … are more varied than Nanteuil’s” but has to concede that “his lines are never as direct, as expressive;—he uses more lines with less result” (ibid., p. 69).

The majority of the plates in the second volume were engraved by Jacques Lubin (31). Lubin was a pupil of Edelinck but it must be admitted that his portraits do not quite hold up to his teacher’s standards.
Where Edelinck leaves off the art of the Drevets begins.
(Thomas, p. 73)

The French portrait changed conceptually toward the end of the reign of the Sun King. It appears as if its purpose, the depiction of the likeness, character, and personality of the sitter had been gradually superseded by an increased attention to accessories. Whereas the portrait was raised to new heights by such artists as La Tour and Perroneau, it was the elaborate portraits d'apparat (typically showing a person surrounded by the material trappings of his or her daily life) that were most often reproduced in the prints of the period. The painter Hyacinthe Rigaud (1659–1743) had the most powerful influence upon portrait engraving of this kind. Indeed, all three large portraits offered here by Pierre Drevet père et fils as well as by their relative, Claude Drevet, are modeled on paintings by Rigaud.

Pierre Drevet
1663 Loire-sur-Rhône – Paris 1738

29.  Portrait of (Charles) Louis Hector Duc de Villars (after Hyacinthe Rigaud) 1714

engraving (and etching); 530 x 365 mm (20 7/8 x 14 3/8 inches)

Leblanc 115 third (final) state
Firmin-Didot 1875/77, 485
Firmin-Didot 1876, III (Portraits), 123
Inventaire du fonds français, III (Portraits), 119

WATERMARK
countermark B ♥ M

PROVENANCE
Falkeisen und Huber, Basel (Lugt 1008)

Fine impression with thread margins all round.

Pierre Drevet was born in the Loire and trained briefly in Lyon before arriving in Paris where he entered the atelier of Gérard Audran (1640–1703) who also became his first publisher. By 1692 the artist had begun to publish his plates himself. In 1696 or 1697 Drevet was appointed Graveur du roi, made Agrée to the Academy in 1703, received there in 1707, and, together with his son Pierre Imbert, given logement in the Louvre in 1726. While the Drevets became the dominating influence on French portrait engraving during the first decades of the eighteenth century, Pierre’s teacher was not a portrait engraver but a specialist in figure subjects. Thomas Head Thomas, (still) the best authority on the subject, sees this as the main reason for what he calls the “variety and elasticity” of Drevet’s technique. He then “worked back, later on, to a technique as neat and as carefully planned as Nanteuil’s. But … he arrived at it only by making a new beginning” (Thomas Head Thomas, French Portrait Engraving of the XVIIth and XVIIIth Centuries, London 1910, p. 86). Audran’s technique was based on etching and therefore quite fluid and free. Drevet
never used etching to the same extent but, unlike Nanteuil, for example, he did use it “to put in more quickly and easily what he considered less important parts of the plate; perhaps also for the preliminary outlines on the copper which served as guides to the engraver when working with the burin” (ibid., p. 88). Thomas describes the technique in the Duc de Villars as “more developed; the lines are more surely and neatly cut, arranged more effectively and with more foresight” (ibid., p. 89). The entry in Thieme/Becker also mentions it as being among the Hauptsstücke of the artist.

Pierre DREVET
1663 Loire-sur-Rhône – Paris 1738

Pierre Imbert DREVET
1697 – Paris – 1739

30. Portrait of René François de Beauveau du Rivau (after Hyacinthe Rigaud) 1727

engraving 487 x 357 mm (19 ⅞ x 14 ⅞ inches)

Firmin-Didot 1875/77, 403 only state
Firmin-Didot 1876, III (Portraits), 17 only state
Inventaire du fonds français, III (Portraits), 14 only state

WATERMARK
Name of Jesus in circle and countermark letters TD (similar to Heawood 2980; countermark similar to Heawood 2989)

A fine impression; trimmed just inside the platemark on three sides and with thread margin below.

Pierre Drevet’s son, Pierre Imbert, trained in his father’s workshop where he was soon allowed to collaborate on his father’s plates. Since both father and son would often sign plates Pierre Drevet or P. Drevet it is anything but straightforward to follow the father’s stylistic development, or, in some cases, to decide which of the two Pierres executed a specific plate. According to Thomas Head Thomas, “The evidence on this point is sometimes a tradition, sometimes a written record, sometimes the affirmation of cataloguers, sometimes hardly more than guesswork.” In his catalogue of Les Graveurs du portrait en France, Ambroise Firmin-Didot suggests “that the son worked on at least nine plates that were published under the father’s name,” the Portrait of Beauveau du Rivau being one of them, although Thomas remarks that “it is practically sure that this list of nine does not include all of the plates upon which he worked for his father, as he began working in his father’s atelier as a small boy.” He even suggests that when Pierre Imbert joined the workshop “immediately a higher standard of technical skill appears in the plates signed by his father” and that “most of the plates upon which the father and son worked together are superior to those upon which the father worked alone. In short Pierre Imbert Drevet was a decidedly more skillful engraver than his father, and was largely responsible for the rather sudden improvement that appears in his father’s work about 1715. No plate engraved by the father alone equals the Beauveau, upon which the son surely worked, and probably did most of the work” (all quotes from Thomas Head Thomas, French Portrait Engraving of the XVIIth and XVIIIth Centuries, London 1910, pp. 90f.).
Given the difficulties in establishing the different artist’s hands, Thomas introduces the term “Drevet technique” and it is in this context, in which he seems less concerned with distinguishing between father and son, that he addresses a long passage to the Portrait of Beauveau: “On comparing it with the rather loose and coarse manner of his earlier plates, it is evident that Drevet has worked back to the more skillful and precise burin work of Edelinck and Nanteuil. A loose technique had served Audran well enough in rendering the huge and rather loosely drawn canvases of Le Brun. But Rigaud’s drawing was far from loose; as he grew older it became more and more precise; the elaborate detail in his canvases became more and more highly finished, and more and more essential to the design. Rigaud’s great edifices of satin and ermine, his tumbling masses of drapery and richly embroidered brocades, the rich carving of chairs and tables and gilded thrones, the glitter of polished armour, and the shadowed columns rising out of his grey backgrounds,—all the elaborate accessories of his portraits, in short, were a bewildering problem for the engraver. The innumerable contrasts of light and shade and colour values, the tremendous compilation of detail,—the great variety of textures, the sheen of satin, the softness of fur, the rich and minute patterns of lacework,—and finally, the great size of the plate, demanded a more varied technique,—one that was capable of the most minute precision, and also more free and elastic than that of Edelinck: in one place more delicate, and in another still bolder. Perhaps the best description that can be made of the technique of the Beauveau (for instance) is to say that it has succeeded in all this. In the earlier and looser plates Drevet kept the breadth of the whole design, but sacrificed a good deal of the detail. In the Beauveau nothing of the original save the colour is lost” (ibid., 92f).

Claude Drevet
1697 Loire-sur-Rhône – Paris 1781

31. **Portrait of Charles-Gaspard-Guillaume de Vintimille** (after Hyacinthe Rigaud)
1736

engraving; 510 x 379 mm (20 ⅛ x 14 ⅛ inches)

Firmin-Didot 1875/77, 517 second (final) state
Firmin-Didot 1876, III (Portraits) 14, second (final) state
Inventaire du fonds français 9 second (final) state

WATERMARK
Name of Jesus in decorated border (similar to Heawood 2984) and countermark two bands of letters

A fine impression, trimmed just inside the platemark all round.

Claude Drevet was trained by his uncle, Pierre Drevet, and then joined his workshop; the logement in the Louvre was assigned to Claude on the death of his uncle and cousin in 1739. In spite of his long life, Claude made no more than 15 plates, only nine of which are portraits. “For the last thirty years of his life he seems to have given up on engraving, probably to carry on his printselling business.” Five of the nine portraits are large plates after Rigaud, the Vintimille being one of them. “In these he follows the final technique of his uncle and cousin quite without change, and with almost equal technical skill” (all quoted from Thomas Head Thomas, *French Portrait Engraving of the XVIIth and XVIIIth Centuries*, London 1910, p. 97). The entry in Thieme/Becker mentions this portrait as one of Claude Drevet’s chefs d’oeuvre (with the year 1731, the date of Rigaud’s painting).
Charles Gaspard Guillaume de Vintimille was the archbishop of Paris and Duc de Saint-Cloud. He is depicted here in clerical dress with the insignia of the Order of the Saint-Ésprit and seated in a study with his library visible in the background.
Anne-Claude-Philippe de Tubières, Comte de Caylus  
1692 – Paris – 1765

32. Études prises dans le bas peuple, ou les Cris de Paris – Studies Made Among the Common Folk (after Edmé Bouchardon) 1737–46

the complete set of five suites of etchings with engraving, of 12 plates each

The plates are numbered 1 through 12 at upper right in the first four suites; each plate also shows the name of the artist, the initials of the engraver, and the address of the publisher Joullain, all engraved. The final suite has no plate numbers, the artist’s name and the engraver’s initials are in scratched letters, and only the publisher’s address is engraved. (In the second suite the plate numbers have also been added in mss. at lower left; in the remaining suites each plate bears only the suite numbers 3 through 5 in mss. in the same place.)

sheets 313 x 230 mm (12 ¾ x 9 inches)

Inventaire du fonds français (Caylus) 59–63; (Fessard) 7

nineteenth-century red-morocco binding by Hardy-Mennil with their stamp inside front cover; in marbled slipcase with labels

PROVENANCE
Charles-François Capé (1806–1867), Paris (a pencil inscription on back endpaper Exemplaire de Cousin et Capé. Bien complet as well as a pencil inscription on first front flyleaf noting that the volume was part of sa bibliothèque particulière); his sale, Librairie Tross, Paris, November 5–7, 1868

Charles Cousin (1822–1894), Paris (his large book label inside front cover, his small monogram ticket on front end-paper; see also the inscription cited above under Capé); his sale, experts Maurice Delestre and M.A. Durel, Hôtel Drouot, Paris, April 7–11, 1891, lot 163, described as: Collection complète, rarissime, du plus vif intérêt. Épreuves superbes.

Hans Fürstenberg (also: Jean Furstenberg; 1890–1982), Beaumesnil (his book label on front end-paper; cf. Lugt 3615); in 1974 Fürstenberg’s complete collection of French eighteenth-century books was acquired by Otto Schäfer (1912–2000), Schweinfurt; his sale, Sotheby’s, London, December 7–8, 1995, lot 75 private collection

LITERATURE
Werner R. Deusch et al., Das Buch als Kunstwerk. Französische illustrierte Bücher des 18. Jahrhunderts aus der Bibliothek Hans Fürstenberg, exhibition catalogue, Schloss Ludwigsburg, Stuttgart 1965, no. 21


The title-pages of the first four suites show two publisher’s addresses, that of François Joullain (A Paris Chés Joullain Quay de la Megisserie à la Ville de Rome) and of Fessard (suite 1–3: Se Vendent à Paris, chez Fessard, rue St Denis au Grand St Louis chez un Mirotier près le Sepulchre, with a different street address in suite 4: chez Fessard Cloître St Germain de l’Auxerrois en entrant par la rue de l’Arbre see la premiere Maison neuve). The final suite was published by Joullain alone and its title-page therefore shows only his address. The publication dates for the first four suites were 1737 (suites 1 and 2); 1738 (suite 3); and 1742 (suite 4). Etienne Fessard’s father was the publisher and print dealer Jean-Baptiste Fessard. Yet he resided in rue des Fers in the parish of Saint Eustache “à la Couronne”; the “Fessard” mentioned on the first four title-pages must therefore have been Etienne himself, selling out of the shop of a mirror maker (mirotier). Jean-Baptiste père died in 1739, his widow the following year. This must have had consequences for the son and he did not continue the family business. It might also be the reason why the final suite of 1746 was published solely by François Joullain (1697–1778).

It is not clear that any proper “edition” of the first four sets with only Fessard’s address was ever published. So far we know of only one incomplete set of 36 plates in the British Museum, acquired in 1938 (inv. no. 1938,0502.22.1). Whereas 36 plates are the equivalent of three sets with 12 plates each, the compilation of this set is not the same. While the numbered plates are of necessity in the same place within the suites (i.e. a plate numbered “3” is the third plate within a suite), they are grouped into different suites compared to the sets published by Joullain (ours as well as a second one in the British Museum, inv. no. 1857,0613.733). The fact that individual plates could be assigned to different suites would ultimately also explain why, in the last three suites of our copy, the suite numbers are added in mss. on each plate at lower left. It was clearly meant to create a certain more-or-less consistent order for the binder.

The British Museum’s Joullain set acquired in 1857 was bound together with Bouchardon’s drawings for the prints, which are in reverse. (Another volume of drawings in the Bibliothèque nationale [inv. no. Oa. 132 a rés., in 4-to] catalogued in the IFF as “les dessins originaux,” are most likely counterproofs.)

The Cris de Paris in the form offered here is effectively the only complete edition of the series comprising all five suites. A fine copy with a distinguished provenance; the impressions of the last suite are especially fine.

* 

Edmé Bouchardon (1698–1762) composed the drawings for Les Cris de Paris in the 1730s. The 60 prints were etched by the Comte de Caylus who was a good friend and supporter of the artist. Caylus was an antiquarian, collector, writer on the arts, and, as evidenced here, also a very talented amateur graveur. Étienne Fessard (1714–1777), a pupil of the printmaker and publisher Edme Jeaurat, and one of the engravers to the king, finished the plates with the burin. Only the title-pages of the last three suites, however, explicitly state gravé à l’Eau forte par C. et retouché par Et. Fessard.
In addition to being a sculptor, Bouchardon was one of the most prolific French draftsmen of the eighteenth century. He won the Prix de Rome in 1722 and spent the following decade at the French Academy in that city. He was very successful and in much demand for portrait busts of French and British ex-patriots and grand tourists. Upon his return to Paris he continued his career as one of the leading sculptors of his day. Yet there might have been a brief period of transition and it was then that he began to put considerable energy into the drawing project for Les Cris de Paris. The choice of subject is somewhat surprising for an artist who had intensely studied the ancient (and modern) architecture and art of Rome. While clearly inspired by an existing tradition of prints of street-criers, Bouchardon's designs and Caylus's prints transcend the more usual comic and satirical conventions and instead show “down-to-earth, un-idealized embodiments of each profession. … The Études … have a poignancy owing to their very particularity. They evoke real individuals and real labour, stressing the exhaustion that comes from repetitive work rather than its picturesque appeal. … Bouchardon's series has elicited comparisons with Chardin's sympathetic domestic genre scenes, the earliest examples of which date to the mid-1730s” (Perrin Stein in: French Drawings from the British Museum: Clouet to Seurat, exhibition catalogue, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York/British Museum, London, 2005–06, p. 118).
William Hogarth  
1697 – London – 1764

33.  
**A Rake’s Progress**  1735

the complete set of eight

published by the artist, June 25, 1735

etching and engraving; plates averaging ca. 355 x 405 mm (ca. 14 x 16 inches)

Paulson 132 second state (of four), 133 fourth state (of five), 134 second state (of three [recte four]), 135 first state (of three), 136 first state (of three), 137 second state (of three), 138 third state (of four), and 139 second state (of three)

Hogarth was an extremely energetic promoter of his art, advertising in the papers but above all issuing subscriptions, in late 1733 in the present instance. This is a fine subscriber’s set on large sheets in excellent condition, with the states as found in all but a very few of the earliest copies of this first issue. (In theory, these very rare exceptions could include, at most, plates 1, 2, 3, and/or 7 in the preceding state which in each case consist merely of minor textual mistakes or variations which were then corrected, as here. In practice, a few sets are known with two, and more unusually still three, of these errors. Any still-earlier states are trial proofs.)

* 

The delayed publication was due partly to compositional difficulties in the paintings and prints, and the complexities involved in executing the set of engravings. More important was the anticipation of the passing by parliament of *An Act for the Encouragement of the Arts of Designing, Engraving, and Etching historical and other Prints, by vesting the Properties thereof in the Inventors and Engravers, during the Time therein mentioned*, known as “Hogarth’s Act” as he was its chief lobbyist. It went into effect on June 25, 1735; hence the appearance of that exact date on the plates. This Act gave protection for 14 years (hence the requirement for a date to be stated in a publication line) not to the printsellers, as had been the case with ‘privileges’ found on earlier publications, but to the artists and engravers, thus shielding them from the unauthorised piracy to which Hogarth, for instance, had been instantly subjected when he had issued *A Harlot’s Progress* in 1732. The Act also had the effect of raising standards, partly by putting a considerable dent in the business of mass-market publishers such as the Overton and Bowles dynasties, which thus had to widen their product base.

To Hogarth “Invention and Design,” subsumed into which was the imperative of commercial viability, was of paramount importance, and if he was an experienced practitioner, he recognised that certain limitations had been imposed on him by the narrowness of his training, and no doubt by his personality, and that his own skills in printmaking were not always suited to the subject matter (pressure of time must also have been an issue). *A Harlot’s Progress* had been executed with plainness and vigour, partly to accommodate a long run, but as the plates became more complex, other hands were often brought to bear; the whole conception of *Marriage-a-la-Mode*, for instance, called for the elegance and refinement associated at the time only with the
French school of engravers, so we find the series wholly executed by French residents of London in 1745 (Bernard Baron, Simon François Ravenet the Elder, and Gérard Jean Baptiste Scotin the Younger). In *A Rake's Progress*, according to Paulson, “although Hogarth makes no mention of the fact, he was assisted, at least with the second plate, by Louis Gérard Scotin,” who “must have made the first etching, since the plate is unreversed from the painting, and the engraving (or finishing) of the plate. His signature appears on the first engraved state; it disappears, however, from the published state after Hogarth re-engraved one of the faces. The other plates, reversed from the paintings, were probably etched by Hogarth and finished by Scotin, and then (characteristically) worked over by Hogarth. He apparently wanted to reduce the ‘French’ style of Scotin’s work” (Paulson, p. 89).

*A Rake’s Progress* is the most celebrated of the “Modern Moral Subjects” that Hogarth designed and published, beginning with *A Harlot’s Progress*, issued in 1732. There are single plates, such as *A Midnight Modern Conversation* of 1732–33; pairs, such as *Before* and *After* of 1736; series, such as *The Four Times of Day* of 1738; and series and “progresses” such as those of the *Harlot, Rake, and Marriage A-la-Mode* of 1745; as well as the dozen plates of *Industry and Idleness* of 1747.

* A brief synopsis of the plates, which does scant justice to their complex allusions, is given in the captions below each plate (everyone interested in more detail shall refer to Georg Christoph Lichtenbergs ausführliche Erklärungen der Hogarthischen Kupferstiche, published in five instalments by Lichtenberg’s close friend Johann Christian Dieterich in Göttingen 1794–99; these commentaries remain, to this day, unsurpassed in capturing the spirit of Hogarth’s works).
1. The first scene is set in a crumbling house which Tom Rakewell has inherited, with a lot of money and real and other property, from his miserly father. He has already begun to ape the habits of young aristocrats; he is being measured up for new clothes and is paying off the pregnant Sarah Young, his humble Oxford darling.

2. Tom has moved to a fashionable part of town and is importuned for custom by tradesmen, instructors (a prize-fighter, a fencing and a dancing master), and other professionals (a landscape gardener, for example). His sporting interests are noted; there is a huntsman and a jockey, and two pictures of fighting cocks hang on either side of Judgment of Paris, which alludes to his cultural pretensions, as well as to his preference for Venus over Minerva and Juno (Wisdom and Power).
3. Tom is going to the bad; he is at the Rose Tavern, Drury Lane, a House of Venus, drunk and disorderly, surrounded by whores, stealing and spitting gin.

4. Now Tom emerges from his sedan chair, near St James’s Palace, to be arrested for debt. The faithful Sarah, with her seamstress’s box (representing her honest labour), offers a bag of money towards his redemption.
5. Inside the dilapidated Marylebone Old Church, Tom is cynically marrying a rich, wall-eyed old woman, and eyeing the bridesmaid; in the background Sarah, with her child and mother, is trying to forbid the banns.

6. Tom, on his knees, wigless and at his wit's end, is in a gambling house in Covent Garden, where he has lost his old wife's money.
7. Tom is now in the Fleet, a debtors’ prison. A letter on the table rejects a play he has written; his wife harangues him and the gaoler asks for the expected garnish money. The ever-faithful Sarah has fainted.

8. Tom, out of his mind, is lying half-naked in the asylum for the indigent mad, the Bethlehem Hospital (Bedlam). The distressed Sarah attempts to calm him. A fashionably dressed woman averts her eyes, behind her fan, from the freak-show about her, particularly the naked man, crowned, who is urinating on his bed.
Isaac Beckett
1653 Kent – London 1688

34. **Self-Portrait by Sir Peter Lely** 1682–88

mezzotint; 339 x 250 mm (13 ⅜ x 9 ⅞ inches); tipped onto an old mount

Chaloner Smith 63 second state (of three), Russel third state (of four)

A fine and well-preserved impression of one of Beckett’s most famous mezzotints.

Beckett counts, together with Robert Williams (active 1680–1704), among the first Englishmen to extensively practice engraving in mezzotint. Earlier works had been executed by engravers of foreign birth. Another pioneer was John Smith (1652–1743), a pupil of Beckett, who, upon Beckett’s death in 1688, obtained possession of many of his plates. Among them was the plate of the present print; in our impression Smith’s name is given as publisher. It was first published by Alexander Browne (Chaloner Smith’s first state; there is also a proof impression, unfinished and before all letters in the British Museum, inv. no. 1874,0808.1261) and later included by John Boydell in his collection of *Heads of Illustrious and Celebrated Persons: Generally Connected with the History of Great Britain in the Reigns of James I. Charles I. Charles II. and James II.* (London 1811, opposite p. 57). Smith also inherited Beckett’s position as chief engraver to Godfrey Kneller. He engraved more than one hundred plates after Kneller’s portraits, work that also gave him access to prominent members of society.

Lely’s self-portrait (in the Uffizi in Florence) is the one most closely related to Beckett’s print.
Richard Earlom
1742 – London – 1822

35. Self-Portrait by Rembrandt 1767

mezzotint on laid paper; 505 x 355 mm (19 15/16 x 14 inches)

Charrington 49 second state (of three); Chaloner Smith 34 first state (of two)

PROVENANCE
Christopher Lennox-Boyd (his inventory number in pencil verso P. 8892)

A fine proof impression with scratched letters but already with the carefully executed coat of arms of the Duke of Montagu, the owner of Rembrandt’s painting, below the image in the center.

The published state of this print was included under no. 16 in volume 2 of John Boydell’s Sculp-tura Britannica. This was the title under which the first three volumes of Boydell’s A Collection of Prints Engraved after the Most Capital Paintings in England appeared between 1769 and 1773. Earlom’s print represents the earliest firm evidence of ownership for Rembrandt’s self-portrait of 1659. The inscription of the published state describes it as “in the Collection of his Grace the Duke of Montagu.” George Brudenell, 4th Earl of Cardigan, assumed the surname “Montagu” for himself and his children upon inheriting the estates of his father-in-law, the 2nd and (then) last Duke of Montagu, in 1749. In 1766 the old title was revived and George Brudenell became Duke of Montagu. He resided in what subsequently became known as Montagu House on Whitehall in London. The painting stayed in the family until it was sold by John Charles Montagu in 1928–29 through the agencies of Colnaghi in London and Knoedler in New York to Andrew Mellon who donated it to the National Gallery of Art in Washington, D.C. in 1937.

While some of the prints in the first two volumes had originally been published individually, the present mezzotint formed part of the portfolio, as can be seen in this proof impression which has the numbers for volume and plate already scratched into the lower-left corner.
36. **The Markets** (after Frans Snyders and Jan Boeckhorst)

*A Fruit Market* published March 25, 1775

etching and mezzotint on laid paper; 415 x 572 mm (16 ⅜ x 22 ½ inches)

Wessely 110 second (final) state; Rubinstein 12

*A Herb Market* published November 13, 1779

etching and mezzotint on laid paper; 413 x 574 mm (16 ¼ x 22 9/16 inches)

Wessely 111 second (final) state; Rubinstein 13

*A Fish Market* published June 1, 1782

etching and mezzotint on laid paper; 416 x 582 mm (16 ⅜ x 22 ¾ inches)

Wessely 112 second (final) state; Rubinstein 49

*A Game Market* published June 2, 1783

etching and mezzotint on laid paper; 415 x 578 mm (16 ⅜ x 22 ¾ inches)

Wessely 109 second (final) state; Rubinstein 50

The rare series in fine impressions, with small margins all round and in uniformly excellent condition.

The four *Markets* form part of *A Set of Prints Engraved after the Most Capital Paintings in the Collection of Her Imperial Majesty the Empress of Russia, Lately in the Possession of the Earl of Orford at Houghton Hall in Norfolk*, commonly known as *The Houghton Gallery*. This was one of the ambitious print publishing ventures undertaken by John Boydell (1720–1804) and ultimately consisted of 162 prints published in issues of ten at a time between 1774 and 1788. Unlike his even more expansive project, the 571 prints comprising *A Collection of Prints Engraved after the Most Capital Paintings in England*, published between 1769 and 1792 and mostly engraved—several by French engravers—in the Continental style of line engraving, nearly half of the plates for *The Houghton Gallery* were executed in mezzotint. As Gregory Rubinstein states in his study of Boydell’s project: “This medium, somewhat quicker and cheaper than line engraving, had for some reason never found as great favour with Continental collectors as it had in England (hence the sobriquet *manière anglaise*). Moreover, since mezzotint plates would have been incapable of supporting the large print runs necessary for wide foreign circulation, its extensive use in *The Houghton Gallery* shows that the publication was aimed at a rather narrower, more domestic audience” (Rubinstein, p. 4).
By the beginning of the 1770s, the precarious financial situation to which the estate of Houghton Hall had been reduced by George, 3rd Earl of Orford, became increasingly known to the public, as had the fate of the family’s famous collection of paintings, brought together by Sir Robert Walpole, later 1st Earl of Orford, between 1717 and 1745. It was his grandson, Horace Walpole, brought in to take control of the situation in 1773, who, much to his own regret, ultimately concluded that the only way to bring order to the estate’s finances was the sale of the collection. It was acquired by Catherine the Great, Empress of Russia, in 1779 and installed in the newly built Hermitage Palace in St. Petersburg. While the earliest publication date on the prints is 1774, it is fair to assume that “mounting uncertainty over the future of the Houghton collection was undoubtedly important in prompting Boydell to initiate the publication of *The Houghton Gallery engravings*” (ibid., 5). Whereas the *Fish Market* of 1782 still describes the original painting as being “in the Gallery at Houghton,” a note in the legend under the image of the latest of the four prints in this set, the Game Market of 1783, reads: “The Empress of Russia having purchased the Houghton Collection, the Proprietor had not time to make a Drawing from this Picture before their departure. The Duke of Newcastle having four Original Pictures by Snyders of the Markets, with very little variation, gave leave to make a Drawing from this Picture in order to make the set complete.”

As a printmaker, Richard Earlom is distinguished by the way in which he developed the technique of mezzotint to take utmost advantage of the rich tonal effects it can provide. Especially noteworthy in this respect is his sparing use of the underlying etching. Instead of employing mezzotint in a general way merely to reinforce shadings created by etched marks, Earlom exploits mezzotint’s “greatest strength, its potential for infinite variations of continuous tone … the mezzotint ground is far more intricately worked, producing a livelier, more textured surface” compared to that in the work of other mezzotint artists of the period (ibid., p. 12). One detail that illustrates Earlom’s sophistication as a printmaker are the feathers of the dead swan that form the centerpiece of *A Game Market*: one can make out neither etched lines nor etched dots; the surface texture is convincingly rendered solely by the most subtle burnishing of the mezzotint ground.

The artists who executed the intermediate drawings for the first three prints were Joseph Farington (for the *Fruit Market* and the *Herb Market*) and George Farington (for the *Fish Market*). There is no draftsman mentioned on the fourth plate.
François-Louis-Thomas Francia
1772 – Calais – 1839


43 soft-ground etchings, some printed on blue paper, some handcolored, and many heightened with white (partially oxidized); trimmed to the edges and mounted on plain sheets of paper with pen-line borders, as issued; the prints vary in size; sheet size of the mounting papers 380 x 260 mm (15 x 10 ¾ inches)

Francia went early in his career to London where he studied watercolor under the guidance of Thomas Girtin. He had much success with his landscapes, often richly painted shore scenes in the style of Turner. Around 1799 he became a member of Girtin's Sketching Society and when the Society of Painters in Watercolour was founded in 1811 he was appointed its permanent secretary. Francia made his debut in the exhibitions at the Royal Academy in 1795 and he continued to submit works regularly until 1817 when he returned to his hometown of Calais; there, Richard Parkes Bonington briefly became his student.

In 1810 Francia published this little-known drawing book. The most comprehensive example seems to be the one in the British Museum (case book 165.b.15) which contains a title page, also executed in soft-ground etching but with engraved letters given for the title as quoted above. None of the prints are numbered and it is not clear how many the set originally contained. The book in the British Museum incorporates, in addition to the title-page (missing here), 58 prints. There is another large set in the Fogg Museum of Art at Harvard with 41 plates including the title-page (inv. no. M15645.1–41) and 16 single plates, many of which are duplicates, but sometimes printing as variants on differently colored paper (inv. nos. R15331–15347).

What we can offer here is a large but not complete set of 43 prints.

*The majority of the prints are neither signed nor dated and very often the original painter or draftsman is not identified either. The earliest date found here is 1802 and it is very likely that Francia started work on these print as early as that. He was very close to Thomas Girtin who, at the time of his premature death at the age of 27 in 1802, was working on a series of soft-ground and aquatint views of Paris that must clearly have been an inspiration for Francia (we would like to thank Patrick Noon for pointing out this important connection).

The prints are intriguing and convincing experiments in reproductive printmaking, reflecting the artist's efforts to replicate the appearance of chalk drawings through an intaglio process. Marjorie Cohn describes how “Francia drew some through laid paper so that the soft-ground picks up the screen pattern in dramatic fashion—a unique competence until the invention of transfer lithography” (“A History of Intaglio Printmaking” [review of Ad Stijnman, *Engraving and Etching*,...
As a result, the laid paper’s structure derived from the mold, and even watermarks appear as if they have been rubbed through while they are actually printed from the matrix on unusually thin and smooth wove paper. As a final touch, Francia applied watercolor and very often white heightening—and it may be that one of the reasons for the rarity of his prints, let alone of complete sets, is due to their resulting appeal to collectors, who wished to frame the individual sheets as if they were drawings or watercolors.
Christian Wilhelm Ernst Dietrich called Dietricy
1712 Weimar – Dresden 1774

38. Der Sibyllen-Tempel zu Tivoli – The Temple of Sibyl at Tivoli 1745

etching on laid paper, 207 x 147 mm (8 ⅛ x 5 ⅝ inches)

Linck 157 first state (of four), described as: sehr selten

With small margins all around the plate.

Dietricy was one of the most eclectic artists of his time and deserves to be championed among such contemporary “appropriation” artists as Sherrie Levine, Richard Prince, and Jeff Koons—if only they had heard of him…. He was able to draw or paint in almost any style on request and was, at least in his day, widely admired for this skill. For his “own” style he preferred the manner of the Dutch artists of the seventeenth century, especially the so-called “Italianates” who lived in Italy.

The young artist first studied with his father, the Weimar court painter Johann Georg Dietrich, and then with Alexander Thiele in Dresden. In 1730, at the age of 18, Thiele introduced him to Elector August II of Saxony (known as August the Strong) who employed him the following year as court painter. This appointment launched Dietricy’s career in Saxony. He was appointed director of the Dresden Gallery in 1748 and later became professor for landscape painting at the Dresden Academy. In 1743 he went for one year to Italy where he stayed in Venice and Rome.

During this sojourn he visited Tivoli. Our etching depicts the Roman monopteros on the rock above the waterfalls of River Aniene—a vista appreciated by artists and grand tourists from all over Europe. (At the time it was thought to have been dedicated to the Sibilla Tiburtina. Archaeologists only established later that it was, in fact, a temple of Vesta.) The elegant structure became the model for the numerous round temples found in landscape gardens around the world.

This rare early state of the print, with its delicately etched lighter areas standing in perfect balance to the more dense passages of shadow, brilliantly displays Dietricy’s technique. As the entry in the Allgemeines Künstler Lexikon states: “Seine Druckgraphik besticht durch technische Virtuosität und weist das gesamte Spektrum seiner malerischen Möglichkeiten auf” (his prints captivate through their technical virtuosity and show the whole spectrum of his painterly abilities).
Vues de la Sicile – Views of Sicily (after Jakob Philipp Hackert) 1782

12 etchings on laid paper; each ca. 153/160 x 205/209 mm (ca. 6 x 8 inches), sheets: 250 x 338 mm (ca. 9 x 13 inches)

Nagler, p. 488; Nicolas 44 (for the set) and sub-numbers 1–12

**Watermarks**
crowned coat of arms with bear (used in Berne or Bergzabern, cf. Piccard, vol. 15.2, nos. 1242 and 1246)
crowned coat of arms with fleur-de-lis
letters hblum

**Literature**

The complete set in the first edition with Hackert’s Roman address at the Piazza di Spagna.

A fine, homogeneous set with wide margins.

The 12 etchings are based on drawings that Hackert made during his first trip to Sicily in 1777. In those days it was quite an adventure to travel across the island, one hardly known to foreigners. To improve this situation, Richard Payne Knight, the grandson of a wealthy ironmaster and a member of the Society of Dilettanti, one of whose claims to fame is his somewhat scandalous first book, *An Account of the Remains of the Worship of Priapus* (1786), planned the publication of an illustrated description of Sicily, employing Hackert to draw noteworthy sites on their trip there together. Charles Gore, a grand tourist and artist dilettante from Lincolnshire, joined them on the Sicilian tour and kept a diary. (Gore later lived in Weimar; he died the same year as Hackert and Goethe published his biography as an appendix to that of the German painter.) However, for unknown reasons the planned book was never realized.

Back in Rome Hackert therefore decided to commission prints on his own account after his drawings. Rather than turning to any of the resident printmakers, however, he chose his former pupil Balthasar Anton Dunker in Berne. This choice might have reflected Hackert’s desire to have the etchings made strictly according to his requirements and to avoid any interpretative intervention by a graphic artist. In any case, he was pleased with Dunker’s work.
VUES DE LA SICILE
PEINTES PAR LA PH. HAGEBERT
GRAVÉES PAR R. D'URBINO

Dédicacé à Son Altesse Royale la Madamé Marie Thérèse
Infante des
Dona Nicola

Le Crater de l'Etna
Avec les ruines de la tour de Philosophie.
Wilhelm Friedrich Gmelin
1760 Badenweiler – Rome 1820

40. **Five Views from Rome, Tivoli, Albano Laziale, and its Surroundings** 1809–11

engravings on wove paper

**PROVENANCE**
three of the sheets have blind stamps with letters and numbers: “FC,” “RI,” “PA 1,” and “PA 3”
(none of them recorded by Lugt)

The full sheets with deckled edges; minor foxing.

Gmelin was born in Badenweiler in southwest Germany. In nearby Basel he was trained as an engraver in the studio of Christian van Mechel (1737–1817). He went to Italy in 1786 and soon settled in Rome. Gmelin became successful and in 1809 decided to publish his engravings himself, without the agency of a dealer. The prints offered here count among the first of his self-published works.

Views of Tivoli and its surroundings were sought-after souvenirs for visiting tourists. Gmelin’s views are topographically accurate and based on his studies *en plein air*. In two hand-drawn maps he made of the Tivoli and Albano regions (both are today in the Staatliche Kunsthalle Karlsruhe) he even marked the positions from which he had taken the views for his prints, thereby effectively presenting the evidence for their accuracy. Since he was a trained and highly skilled engraver, Gmelin’s prints differ technically from those of most of the other artists, mainly painters, working in Rome and using etching as their preferred medium.

The engravings were sold separately and were designed to stand on their own as individual images. In 1816, however, Gmelin decided to assemble 12 of them as a suite. There is a certain coherence between them; they all (with one exception) depict sites in the environs of Rome, are similar in size and layout, and are each accompanied by an explanatory text below the image. The portfolio was titled *Dissertazioni di Tivoli e di Albano in dodici tavole*. Each print was now numbered to indicate a correct order. The inclusion of the view of the Cimitero acattolico (non-Catholic cemetery) is the detail that proves that the format of the suite must have been an afterthought for the artist. The cimiterio is neither in Tivoli nor Albano but instead at the foot of the Cestius Pyramid along the Aurelian Wall in Rome.
Veduta di Ponte Lupo – View of Tivoli with the Temples and the Waterfalls 1809
267 x 334 mm (10 ½ x 13 ¾ inches) – Borchardt 147 (with the number I)

Veduta dei Condotti dell’Acqua Marzia – View of the Ruins of Two Aqueducts near Tivoli 1809
269 x 337 mm (10 ¾ x 13 ¼ inches) – Borchardt 152 (with the number VI)
Veduta di Monte Cavo – View from an Ancient Grave Fault over Lake Albano to Mount Cavo 1811
270 x 342 mm (10 ⅝ x 13 ⅛ inches) – Borchardt 155 (with the number IX)

Veduta del Monumento sepolcrale a Palazzuola – View of an Ancient Tomb at Palazzuola 1811
293 x 359 mm (11 ¾ x 14 ⅜ inches) – Borchardt 157 (with the number XI)
Veduta del luogo sepolcrale per gli Acattolici, presso la Piramide di Gajo Cestio in Roma – View of the Non-Catholic Cemetery in Rome  1810

292 x 356 mm (11 ½ x 14 inches) – Borchardt 158 (with the number XII)
Wilhelm Friedrich Gmelin
1760 Badenweiler – Rome 1820

41.  *Acis and Galatea* (after Claude Lorrain) 1813

etching and engraving on wove paper; 493 x 604 mm (19 7/16 x 23 ¾ inches)

Borchardt 124

After the Revolution in France, the French army invaded Italy and occupied Rome. Pius VI was taken prisoner and brought to Valence in France, where he died 1799. The Roman Republic was proclaimed in February 1798. As a result of the war only a few tourists came to Italy and many of the artists, having lost most of their clients, also left Rome. Gmelin went back to Germany where he stayed until 1801, only returning to Rome once the situation there became more settled. During this German period Gmelin stayed mainly in Dresden and occupied himself by making detailed drawings of many of the paintings in the Gemäldegalerie, which he then used as the basis for engraved reproductions.

Among the most famous of these is the print he made after the painting of *Acis and Galatea* by Claude Lorrain, painted in 1657 and in the Dresden Gallery since 1736 (Marcel Roethlisberger, *Claude Lorrain. The Paintings: Critical Catalogue*, 2 vols., New Haven 1961, LV 141). The plate was not finished and published until 1813. The subject of Claude's composition is taken from Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (xiii, 750–768). The river spirit Acis fell in love with the nymph Galatea but their love was destroyed by the jealous Polyphemus who killed Acis with a huge rock. Here, as in other prints after Claude, Gmelin used his full sophisticated repertoire as a printmaker to translate Claude's shimmery light into an intaglio image. The results were widely admired. When Goethe received Gmelin's engraving after another Claude, the so-called *Templum Veneris* (ibid., LV 178 with different title), he noted in his diary on March 29, 1806: “Sehr schöner Claude von Gmelin.”
Johann Christian Reinhart
1761 Hof – Rome 1847

42. Der Sturm, eine heroische, Schillern dedizirte Landschaft – The Storm, a Heroic Landscape, Dedicated to Schiller 1800

etching on wove paper; 407 x 510 mm (16 x 20 ¾ inches)

Andresen 96 second (final) state, Feuchtmayr third (final) state

LITERATURE
cat. London 1994, no. 95

Reinhart’s successful revival of the heroic landscape in painting is among his most important achievements. Paintings in this genre, like those of Nicolas Poussin and Gaspard Dughet, both active in seventeenth-century Rome, traditionally show rough landscapes inhabited chiefly by robust figures draped in antique dress. Reinhart chose to translate such images into a contemporary artistic language.

His most explicitly heroic landscape, effectively a programmatic statement on the genre, is to be found in this etching showing a stormy scene with two figures on horseback in the center moving towards the viewer. The print is dedicated to Friedrich Schiller. Completed in 1800 and published one year later by Johann Friedrich Frauenholz in Nuremberg, it is an allegory of the friendship between Reinhart and Schiller. The artist expresses this by duplicating all the major elements of the composition: there are two mountains, two cities, two distinctive trees, and two riders who together defy the storm and seem to gallop out of the picture in haste. This movement symbolizes their unruliness and inner freedom, both characteristics of the sentimental artist according to Schiller’s aesthetic theory. The interplay between the riders in their shiny armor and the stormy landscape makes the scenery itself an agent within the composition. The latter is more than just a natural background and the former are more than merely repousoir figures.
Johann Christian Reinhart
1761 Hof – Rome 1847

43. **Rovine cagionate in Tivoli – Tivoli, damaged by the flood of river Aniene** 1826

etching on wove paper; 335 x 445 mm (13 ⅝ x 17 ½ inches)

Andresen and Feuchtmayr 141 second state (of two)

LITERATURE

A superb impression with wide margins.

Reinhart is one of the most important landscape etchers of his time. He lived in Rome from 1789 where he specialized in “real” Italian landscapes in the manner of vedute as well as “invented” scenes in the tradition of the ideal landscape. In the latter category, he seems to have been especially fascinated by the wild drama of nature that had appealed to the artists of the pre-Romantic *Sturm und Drang* movement.

The views of Tivoli usually belong to the vedute category. But this 1826 etching is extraordinary as it realistically illustrates the environment after a storm, combining a veduta with the concept of the dramatic ideal landscape. The print effectively documents the damage caused in Tivoli by the flooding of the River Aniene. Accordingly, Reinhart’s caption below the image is very specific: “Rovine cagionate in Tivoli il di 16. Novembre 1826 dall’escrescenza dell’Aniene” (Ruins in Tivoli caused by the flood of the River Aniene on November 16, 1826). However, there is an underlying link here to the *Sturm und Drang* landscapes: The natural disaster transforms the view of a serene city into a heroic and sublime scene of sorts.

Reinhart was very familiar with the small town east of Rome favored by grand tourists. He stayed there many times and his sketches of the area found their way into numerous etchings. They usually show the pleasant surroundings of the old city with its famous waterfalls and Roman temples. Reinhart was shocked when he heard about the damage to the beautiful town and seems to have been addressing his personal sense of loss in his etching. It therefore takes an exceptional position in his printed oeuvre. (That there was also a significant public demand for such scenes of destruction is also suggested by Luigi Rossini’s large-scale etchings showing the ruins of San Paolo fuori le Mura after a fire had destroyed the early Christian church in the night of July 15, 1823.) The damages in Tivoli were so serious that Pope Gregory XVI decided to partially divert the River Aniene by building a tunnel through the Monte Catillo, a project completed in 1832. The town was thereafter better protected from floods but this feat of engineering somewhat compromised the impressive drama of the famous waterfalls.
Riviere dipinte ad acque-durci e ad intorno cerchi dell'osservatore dell'iscrizione
Johann Heinrich Wilhelm Tischbein
1751 Haina – Eutin 1829

44. Homer nach Antiken gezeichnet – Homer drawn after the Antique
with an accompanying text by Christian Gottlob Heyne

Göttingen: Heinrich Dieterich 1801 (first edition)

five full page etchings and one engraving, several etched vignettes, ornaments, and initials on laid paper; sheet size ca. 521 x 374 mm (20 ⅖ x 14 ⅞ inches)

The full size illustrations show:
- Portrait of Homer (engraving by Raphael Morghen after a drawing by Tischbein)
- Homer Educated by the Muses
- Apotheosis of Homer
- Helena Guided by Paris to his Boat
- Heads of Seven Homeric Heroes
- Nestor Puts the Dead Body of his Son Antilochus on a Carriage

Andresen 21–34; Rümann 2640

WATERMARKS
initials and numbers 6 (or 9?)

PROVENANCE
unidentified collector’s mark (Lugt 3549)

LITERATURE

cat. London 1994, no. 85

Johann Heinrich Wilhelm Tischbein, the so-called “Goethe Tischbein,” arrived in Naples in 1787 in the company of the Geheimrat from Weimar. He became director of the Naples Academy in 1789 and stayed there until 1799 when Napoleon’s troops entered the city. The prints he published during the 1790s are among his best known. Besides the Têtes de différents animaux dessinées d’après nature pour donner une idée plus exacte de leurs characters (1796) Tischbein etched reproductions of Greek vases from the second private collection of Sir William Hamilton (published in four volumes between 1791 and 1795) which, in turn, inspired the artist to continue making etchings after antique vases from his own collection. This latter project was never completed and instead Tischbein began work on a series of illustrations to Homer based on such classical sources as the vases with which he had now become very familiar. But this set, too, remained unfinished when he abandoned Naples in the face of the Napoleonic invasion.
HOMER.

Homer, du Unsterblicher, Dichter der Natur, Zögling der Phantasie, treuer Nachbilder menschlicher unverkünstelter Gefühle; erscheine meinem Blicke, wie dich die bildende Kunst sieht, sie, deine in der vertrauten Umarmung der Phantasie erzeugte
Back in Germany Tischbein published the Homer illustrations in separate sets starting in 1801. The accompanying text was written by Christian Gottlob Heyne, the professor of classical philology at Göttingen University who had worked extensively on the texts of Homer. Tischbein specified that he wanted a commentary not overburdened with academic detail but rather, one intended to educate the reader to become a better human being. It was Tischbein’s belief that the study of ancient art could assist the development of the Greek virtues in the modern reader and he hoped that his reproductions might have a similar impact on his contemporaries. Heyne’s text was meant to provide an interpretative summary for those who had not (yet) read the Iliad and the Odyssey. The publisher Heinrich Dieterich put a lot of effort into this project: he created a highly representative publication, choosing the largest size possible for illustrated books at the time in Germany, and even having a new typeface designed especially for this purpose.

The set offered here is the first one in the series and is dedicated to the Iliad. By 1805 five more sets had been published, with another three to follow in 1821. Our set contains what is arguably Tischbein’s most famous print: the etching showing Heads of Seven Homeric Heroes, probably executed in 1796. It shows Menelaus, Paris, Diomedes, Ulysses, Nestor, Achilles, and Agamemnon, this line-up of seven strict profiles also revealing Tischbein’s interest in physiognomic studies. Heyne accompanied the print with a lengthy explanation that starts with the enthusiastic sentence: “Diese Gruppe ist eines von den schönsten Blättern unsers Hrn. Tischbeins” (This group is one of the most splendid sheets of our Mr. Tischbein). The heads are taken from classical works; the arrangement, however, is entirely Tischbein’s invention. Similarly, the first print of the suite shows the portrait of Homer drawn after a well-known antique bust (Tischbein’s model was the second-century A.D. Roman copy after the lost Greek original, now in the Museo Nazionale in Naples) but put into a new context by Tischbein, who had this plate specially engraved by the widely admired printmaker Raphael Morghen (1758–1833). Both sheets mediate between the language of classical and of contemporary art. Finally, the publication is decorated throughout by vignettes that are purely Tischbein’s creations with no specific reference to antique models.
45. **Zur Farbenlehre – Theory of Colors**

Tübingen: Cotta’schen Verlagsbuchhandlung 1810

A very good copy of the first edition on white paper. (The edition size was 500 copies on white paper and 250 copies on gray paper.)

Bound in two contemporary half-leather volumes with marbled boards; the plates bound in contemporary marbled boards with the original wrappers bound in.

Goethe’s *Farbenlehre* is, together with his tragic play *Faust*, his most extensive work. Yet while the 12,110 verses of the *Faust* are often celebrated as one of the greatest works of German literature, Goethe’s lengthy investigation into the nature of light has, for the most part, been summarily dismissed as an epic diatribe against that other work on the subject, Isaac Newton’s *Opticks* of 1704. This is, indeed, the main emphasis of the study’s second, “polemical” part, but it would represent a grave misunderstanding of Goethe’s work if one were to see it the way most physicists have done ever since, namely as a strictly “scientific” response to Newton in the narrowest sense of the word. Goethe’s opposition is, in fact, of a much more principled character. He is not willing to accept that the world as we experience it with our senses can be fully grasped by calculable laws: “… das ist eben das grösste Unheil der neueren Physik, dass man die Experimente gleichsam vom Menschen abgesondert hat und bloss in dem, was künstliche Instrumente zeigen, die Natur erkennen … will” (it is the greatest disaster of modern physics that the experiments and man have become separated and that one wants to recognize nature only in what the instruments show; Goethe, *Maximen und Reflexionen*, Hamburger Ausgabe no. 664). He insists instead on the subjectivity of all human perception.

More recent interpretations of the book support this view of the work as representing Goethe’s concerns outside the realm of the “hard” sciences. While he picks Newton as his apparent target, it has been argued that his chief intellectual adversary appears to be Immanuel Kant, whose epistemology had created an unsurmountable chasm between man and nature. Goethe’s most concise rebuke of Kant can also be found in one of his maxims: “Alles, was im Subjekt ist, ist im Objekt und noch etwas mehr. Alles, was im Objekt ist, ist im Subjekt und noch etwas mehr” (Everything that can be found within the subject is also in the object, and more. Everything that can be found within the object is also in the subject, and more; ibid., no. 515). This becomes most explicit in the “didactic” first part of the *Farbenlehre*, the one that is hardly ever featured in the Newton-defeats-Goethe footnotes of books on the history of science. Goethe was not only interested in exploring the nature of two classes of dioptric (refracted) colors (pp. 56ff. and 68ff.), or the differences between catoptric (reflected; pp. 142ff.) and epoptric (absorbed) colors (pp. 164ff.). He was as much—if not more—concerned with the “sinnlich-sittliche Wirkung der Farbe” (the sensory-moral effects of color; this is the title of the sixth section of the first part of the *Farbenlehre*, pp. 287ff.).
It is not surprising, therefore, that Goethe’s *Theory of Colors*, while part of a tradition that can be traced back to Leonardo and even Aristotle, was much more positively received by artists than by scientists—and it is in this artistic context that it becomes an especially appropriate addition to this print dealer’s *Neue Lagerliste*. The most important color theorist among Goethe’s contemporaries was Philipp Otto Runge (1777–1810), whose *Die Farben-Kugel; oder, Construction des Verhältnisses der Mischung aller Farben zu einander, und ihrer vollständigen Affinität* was published in the same year by Friedrich Perthes in Hamburg. Goethe had read the manuscript and reprints a letter that Runge had written to him in July of 1806, commenting benevolently that the young artist had in various points advanced even beyond his own considerations (pp. 340ff.). In 1840 Goethe’s work was translated into English by the painter Charles Eastlake (1793–1865), who nevertheless omitted the polemic against Newton since, as Eastlake remarked, the “violence of his objections” might have prevented readers from a fair judgment of Goethe’s other observations. From here it influenced the Pre-Raphaelites as well as Turner (1775–1851), whose nearly abstract circular composition of 1843 was even titled *Light and Colour (Goethe’s Theory) – The Morning after the Deluge – Moses Writing the Book of Genesis* (Tate Gallery, London).

In the twentieth century, both Goethe’s and Runge’s writings on color formed the basis for (among others) the color theories developed and taught at the Bauhaus by Johannes Itten (1888–1967), Paul Klee (1879–1940), and Wassily Kandinsky (1866–1944).
Kolbe lived in Dessau, a town located on the floodplain where the smaller Mulde River flows into the Elbe; the entire area has always been vulnerable to flooding. The swampy landscape nonetheless encourages the growth of the rich vegetation with which Kolbe seems to have been deeply fascinated. Plants play a prominent role in many of his etchings, most famously the so-called Kräuterstücke (foliage sheets) to which both of the prints offered here belong. These works are typically characterized by an extreme, if not surreal, proportional relationship between the plants and the staffage figures, the latter generally tiny in relation to the giant foliage. This effect adds a sense of almost modernist disjunction to these exquisitely rendered images that makes them highly popular among contemporary collectors.

Kolbe’s Kräuterstücke depict an Arcadian world. One of the leitmotifs of such idyllic art since classical times, in poetry as well as in the visual arts, was the love between shepherds and shepherdesses or between any of the other figures inhabiting this mythical Golden Age. It is quite obvious that in our catalogue no. 47 the maiden on the right, who slightly raises the hem of her skirt, is in love with the angler, seen on the left from behind and whose garment has slipped so that his naked back is visible. They are separated, however, by the enormous fleshy leaves of a plant, one that has all the suggestive eroticism of the flowers of Georgia O’Keefe—if we are inclined to make that vast leap in time and culture. This symbol of vital and untamed nature nonetheless finds its antidote in the bower above the girl and the fence in the background behind the angler, both signifying the cultivation and domestication of nature.

The other etching (cat. no. 46) shows two sheep resting below another of those enormous plants. Here nature seems to be in harmony, the leaves providing shelter for the animals. With no humans in sight the element of alienation has not yet been introduced into the realms of Arcadian bliss.

While for now we will have to leave such undoubtedly fascinating foliage unexplored, we can only hope that one day the rampant tendrils of art-historical investigation will extend as far as the actual relationship between the excrescences of Kolbe’s all-over vegetal structures and the plants that grow (or once grew) in the swamps around Dessau (see the comparative illustration on p. 112 for a snapshot from another German swamp: Hombroich near Düsseldorf, October 2014).

LITERATURE
46.  *Kräuterblatt mit Schafen – Foliage Sheet with Sheep* ca. 1820–24

etching; 355 x 460 mm (14 x 18 1/16 inches)

Jentsch 225; Martens 91
47. **Großes Kräuterwerk mit Angler und Mädchen an einer Laube – Foliage Sheet with Angler and Maiden in a Bower** ca. 1820–24

etching; 357 x 462 mm (14 x 18 ¼ inches)

Jentsch 232; Martens 93

In a German swamp (Hombroich, October 2014).
various artists after Franz Gareis
1775 Klosterfreiheit near St. Mariental – Rome 1803


The complete set of 56 lithographs in crayon and pen, some with tone stones, some printed on colored papers with white heightening.

Bound in a nineteenth-century half-leather binding with boards, leather corners, and marbled end-papers; signed “Coremat” on the spine.

Winkler 245 (Gaillot); 248 (Gareis)

LITERATURE

The son of a carpenter, Gareis established his artistic reputation early in his career. When he was a boy, a relative who was a tailor in Dresden gave him engravings that he eagerly copied. Gareis entered the Dresden Academy in 1791 and studied under Anton Graff (1736–1813); Johann Christian Klengel (1741–1824); and Giovanni Battista Casanova (1730–1795), the academy’s director, who became his main tutor in drawing. From 1795 onward Gareis worked in Dresden, painting altarpieces for many churches in the region, and—often together with Graff—received commissions for portraits in both Dresden and Leipzig. His reputation as a teacher encouraged Philipp Otto Runge (1777–1810) to leave Copenhagen and enroll at the academy in Dresden. After Casanova’s death in 1795 Gareis found a new mentor and patron in Countess Benedicta Elisabeth Sievers, herself a painter and the stepdaughter of the Russian Prince Poutjatine. Gareis joined them both on an extensive journey through Russia in 1795 and 1796.

In Dresden Gareis belonged to the circle around Ludwig Tieck (whose daughter Dorothea he painted) and August Wilhelm von Schlegel. In his entry on the artist in Thieme/Becker, Richard Förster even suggests that the hero in Tieck’s influential novel Franz Sternbalds Wanderungen of 1798, himself the prototype of the Romantic genius, is partly modeled on Gareis (cf. Barbara Stempel, “Der ‘treffliche Mahler’: Franz Gareis im Kreis Reichardts und der Frühromantiker,” in: cat. Görlitz, pp. 89f., for her reservations about this appealing theory). The artist left Dresden for Paris in October 1801 and embarked for Rome in the spring of 1803. During the sea journey he fell ill and died shortly after his arrival in Italy.

During his Paris sojourn he painted a portrait of the engineer Brahl as well as one of his major works, Orpheus in the Underworld, completed in 1802 and exhibited in Dresden the following year. He stayed in Brahl’s house and must have left him a portfolio of drawings. It was ultimately through the publication of lithographs based on these sketches that Gareis’s name, especially as a draftsman, is remembered.
Pensées
de
F. GAREIS
Sur la Saxe Saxon
et
Collection d’Esquisse et de sujets gracieux
Coupés des Termes qu’un a fait
Précedé d’une Notice Biographique
à Donne Lettre à M. le Roi de Saxe

J. LEMAITRE

L’année
Ouvrages de l’auteur, rue de Sombre Villemauve. N. 17, près la
beyond the confines of Saxony. The project was initiated and published by H. B. Guffroy, a battalion commander of the corps royal and a friend of the Brahl family. He prefaced it with an appreciation of the artist dedicated to the king of Saxony and dated May 8, 1820. Guffroy’s address is given in pen and ink on the bound-in wrapper of the first issue as 47, rue de Bourbon-Villeneuve. The Prospectus, bound in at the back, advertises the work as published in six issues, each containing eight prints, plus a seventh issue of a yet-to-be-determined number of plates (apparently also eight) that would be offered free to subscribers. (The publisher’s address is given here as 18, rue des Grands-Augustin where the work could be purchased; it was also available at the shop of the furniture and picture dealer Alphonse Giroux in rue du Coq-St.-Honoré.)

The drawings on the stone were most likely all done by Bernard Gaillot (1780–1847); most of the plates show his monogram “B.G.” Godefroy Engelmann (1788–1839), Charles Motte (1785–1836), and Comte Charles-Philibert de Lasteyrie (1759–1849) signed as lithographers.

The numbering of the plates is occasionally mixed up, with some plate numbers appearing twice and others missing. The total number, however, is 56 plates.

According to the aforementioned Prospectus, the edition of these lithographs was small: “Le tirage a été borne à un petit nombre d’exemplaires.” Wenzel and Winzeler mention only two complete sets of the Pensées in Berlin and Dresden, a larger number of individual sheets in Bautzen, and an incomplete set of 21 plates in Görlitz (acquired in 1909). Winkler lists merely five individual plates. We must assume, therefore, that this set, in such complete form and in such fine condition, is of utmost rarity.
49. **Compositionen und Handzeichnungen aus dem Nachlasse von Franz Pforr – Compositions and Drawings from the Estate of Franz Pforr** 1832–34

The complete set of ten prints in two issues; overall size 485 x 400 mm (19 x 15 ¾ inches)

**LITERATURE**

**PROVENANCE**
possibly Alexander Strähuber (1814–1882), Munich
Anton Strähuber (1877–1939), Munich
thence by descent

The first issue contains five etchings by Samuel Amsler, Carl Hoff, Heinrich Merz (2), and Carl Müller, as well as a pen lithograph by Jakob Fürchtegott Dielmann; the second contains three etchings by Heinrich Merz, Carl Müller, and Eugen Eduard Schaeffer as well as a lithograph with tint stone by Louis Josef Kramp; also included are the two letterpress contents sheets. Printed on medium-weight wove paper. Both issues are preserved in their original grayish-green wove wrappers with letterpress titles. In good, untreated condition; showing some foxing throughout.

Very rare in such a complete form. (The contents sheet of the second issue further announces the publication of an engraving by Ferdinand Ruscheweyh to be published the following year [1835]; this print is not part of our set.)

*In 1832 and 1834 the Kunstverein zu Frankfurt am Main published two portfolios with prints after compositions and drawings by Franz Pforr. It was traditionally believed that this project was initiated by Johann David Passavant, a close friend of Pforr since childhood who became Inspektor (director) of the Städelische Kunstinstitut in Frankfurt in 1840. However, a letter by Professor Steingass to Friedrich Overbeck dated July 26, 1832, seems to suggest that it was Pforr’s friend and fellow artist Overbeck who first expressed his hope “dass nämlich die nachgelassenen Handzeichnungen des genialen Franz Pforr herausgegeben werden möchten” (that the drawings in the estate of the ingenius Franz Pforr should be published; the letter was published by Norbert Suhr in cat. Mainz/Nuremberg/Lübeck, p. 157, note 1). Pforr and Overbeck were the leading artists of the *Lukasbund* (Brotherhood of St. Luke) which they founded together with four fellow*
Compositionen
und
Handzeichnungen
aus dem
Nachlaß von Franz Pörr.

Herausgegeben durch den
Kunstverein zu Frankfurt am Main.

ZWEITES HEFT.

1834.
artists on July 10, 1809 in Vienna. The members of the Brotherhood distanced themselves from the Vienna Academy and what they deemed its mindless teaching routine, searching instead for truth and what they called “individual character.” “Indeed, the two were linked for them, as they felt truth could only be arrived at through sincere individual expression … It was this combination of a spiritual ideal with honest description that they found in the works of the early German masters Dürer, Cranach and Holbein.” While Overbeck dedicated himself to religious works, Pforr “painted scenes from the time of the Middle Ages, when the full force of human dignity was still manifest.” There was also a strong political undercurrent to this aesthetic movement. The Lukasbund was founded four days after Austria had suffered a decisive defeat against Napoleon's troops in the Battle of Wagram, one that must have clearly contributed to a “longing for peace and security.” For Pforr in particular, this “disappointment at the misfortunes of the present and his own powerlessness became a further incentive to submerge his passionate longings in an adulation of the heroism of the Middle Ages” (William Vaughn, *German Romantic Painting, New Haven/London 1980*, pp. 168–170), a period when, Romantic artists believed, the world had still been in a state of harmonious order.

Pforr developed a drawing style characterized by clear outlines, influenced by early engravings and silverpoint drawings, and a tendency toward abstraction. In his paintings he breaks up the unity of the perspectival space and in his drawings he sometimes seems to “unlearn” his drawing skills. This was clearly recognized by contemporary critics: Johann Heinrich Meyer, for example, Goethe’s spokesman for artistic matters, remarked on Pforr’s distinctive Kunstlosigkeit (artlessness; cf. Werner Hoffmann, *Das entzweite Jahrhundert. Kunst zwischen 1750 und 1830*, Munich 1995, pp. 18 and 622). This does not, however, negate the seminal importance of drawing for Pforr, Overbeck, and the other German artists in Rome at the beginning of the nineteenth century.

Between his arrival in Rome in June 1810 and his premature death in nearby Albano in June 1812, Pforr created only one important work, the diptych *Shulamith und Maria* that was finished in the fall of 1811. His oeuvre as a whole nevertheless had a lasting influence and, arguably, provided the crucial impetus for the formation of what would soon become known as the Nazarene movement (cf. Martin Sonnabend, “Franz Pforr in Rom,” in: Margaret Stuffmann and Werner Busch [eds.], *Zeichnen in Rom 1790–1830*, Cologne 2001, pp. 45–62). Pforr’s death at the age of 24 undoubtedly contributed to the near-mythical adoration of his fellow artists and, ultimately, this publication can be seen as a late manifestation of it. The brief introduction on the first contents sheet states accordingly: “Ohne Zweifel würde Pforr jetzt neben diesen [Overbeck and Cornelius] und andern, ihm mit seltener Anhänglichkeit zugethanen Freunden eine bedeutende Stelle als Künstler einnehmen, wenn nicht schon am 16. Juni 1812 ein Brustübel seinem Leben inmitten der vollsten Entwicklung seines schönen Talentes zu Albano eine Gränze gesetzt hätte. Wie hoch sein Verdienst im Verhältniss zur damaligen Zeit anzuschlagen sey, was die Kunst an ihm verlohren habe, werden die Nachbildungen von Compositionen und Handzeichnungen aus seinem Nachlasse … am bessten zeigen” (Without doubt Pforr would today take up an important position as an artist next to Overbeck, Cornelius, and others who all showed such otherwise rare attachment to him as friends—had not his chest illness cut his life short in Albano in the middle of the fullest development of his beautiful talent. How great his contributions were to this time and what art has lost in him will be best shown by these reproductions of his compositions and drawings from his estate).
The selection made for these two portfolios, each of them containing compositions that count among the most important of the Nazarene movement, is no less significant. The first plate of the first issue shows Dürer and Raphael kneeling before the altar of Art, with views of Nuremberg and Rome visible in the background. The contents sheet describes it as “eine allegorische Composition, wodurch der Künstler andeuten wollte, was er für die Aufgabe der neueren Kunst hielt, nämlich: Verschmelzung des Alteutschen und Alttitaliänischen” (an allegorical composition through which the artist wanted to indicate what he believes the purpose of a new art has to be: the fusion of early German and early Italian art). The halo and the rays of light surrounding the seated female figure suggest either the Holy Virgin or, more generally, an allegory of religion. Overbeck would develop this aspect further in a conceptually comparable drawing of ca. 1810 (now in the Albertina) that shows Dürer and Raphael dedicating their works to a figure whose attributes clearly characterize her as Religion.

The second issue contains a tone lithograph depicting Pforr’s Allegory of Friendship. It reproduces a now-lost wash drawing of 1808 that was meant as a monument to the friendship between Overbeck, Passavant, and Pforr (their initials “POP” can be seen on the wall below the window). The latter gave the drawing to Overbeck as a gift. Martin Sonnabend has analyzed how Pforr derived the composition from Dürer’s famous Melencolia I engraving of 1514. In Pforr’s interpretation “Melencolia is no longer alone; her friend joined her and takes her consolingly into her arms” (Sonnabend, ibid., p. 58). Other scholars see the two women as both Shulamith and Maria and, therefore, the composition as the ur-model for Pforr’s last work and as allegories of Italia and Germania and hence as the seed for Overbeck’s famous painting of 1828 in the Neue Pinakothek in Munich (e.g. Margret Stuffmann in her entry on the outline drawing of the subject at the Staedel in: “Von Kunst und Kennerschaft.” Die Graphische Sammlung im Städelischen Kunstinstitut unter Johann David Passavant 1840 bis 1861, exhibition catalogue, Städelisches Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt, 1994–95, p. 180, no. Z89). The process of historiographic allegorization between Pforr and Overbeck thereby comes full circle.

The portfolios further incorporate a total of four drawings (three in issue 1, one in issue 2) that illustrate scenes from Goethe’s Sturm und Drang drama Götz von Berlichingen, first published in 1773. Pforr started to work on them as outline drawings in Vienna in 1809. In the spring of 1811 he went back to them but now began to distance himself from the simplicity of the contours alone, striving instead for Ausführung (execution in the sense of expanding on the initial sketches). Those sensitively but very densely drawn pencil drawings were transferred into highly finished engravings by Amsler, Merz, Müller, and Schäffer. However, as Sonnabend notes, “a satisfying translation into print which preserves the quality of the drawings can hardly be imagined nor was it accomplished later” (op. cit., p. 53). Yet even if the subtlety of Pforr’s originals could never be matched in intaglio, we might still marvel at the skillful delicacy of the engravings, each of which was, interestingly enough, executed by a different printmaker.
Friedrich Köpcke
active Berlin, ca. 1800


five engravings for

various sizes, the sheets 220 x 130 mm (8 ⅝ x 5 inches)

Rümann 2178 first edition; Träger 259–263
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Werner Busch, Petra Maisak, and Sabine Weisheit, *Verwandlung der Welt. Die romantische Ara-

A very nice copy on uncut sheets; with only slight foxing; modern half-leather in the style of a nineteenth-century binding with marbled boards; the errata sheet bound in at the back.

Runge met Ludwig Tieck in 1801 and their friendship decisively informed his Dresden years. He stayed in the Saxon capital from 1801 to 1804 and studied at the academy there with Anton Graff; he also met Caspar David Friedrich, and, during a trip to Weimar in 1803, Johann Wolfgang Goethe. Tieck's selection of two hundred *Minnelieder* was based on the *Codex Manesse*, the most comprehensive collection of medieval German songs, dating from the beginning of the fourteenth century. The “Swabian era” of the title refers to the dynasty of Hohenstaufen emperors originating in the German region of Swabia. Emperor Heinrich VI (1165–1197) is represented as the most noble figure among the singers in the manuscript's illuminations. The collaboration between Tieck and Runge began in early 1803; Runge's now lost *Reinzeichnungen* (final preliminary drawings) were transferred by Köpcke into engravings.

Tieck had also introduced Runge to the writings of the German mystic Jacob Böhme (1575–1624) and they were to become an important influence on Runge's aesthetic ideas. The third illustration of the book shows that Runge actually drew directly on motifs from illustrations to Böhme's publications. It shows a young boy holding a rose from which a tiny putto, symbolizing earthly love, emerges; a halo formed by a multitude of putti heads also surrounds the Hebrew word Jehovah. The figure seated on what appears like a curved segment of the earth can also be found on the engraved title-page of Böhme's book *Alle de Theosophische of Godwijze Werken* (Amsterdam 1686). Runge's design further functions as a prima idea for his opus magnum as a graphic artist: the Hebrew word Jehovah forms the center of the upper margin of the *Morning* print in the artist's cycle showing the four *Tageszeiten* (Times of Day) of 1805; the ouroboros, the serpent eating its own tail in the other full-page illustration in this group, reappears in the lower
Minnelieder
aus
dem Schwäbischen Zeitalter
neu bearbeitet und herausgegeben
von
Ludwig Fieck.

mit Kapsern

Berlin 1805.
In der Realschulbuchhandlung.
margin of the *Morning* plate; and the embracing and kissing putti of the title-page are seen again in the lower part of the *Evening* plate. The artist seems to be preparing the public for the new, highly idiosyncratic allegorical language that will characterize the *Tageszeiten*. A comparison of the two sets points to the ways the artist clearly rehearses several of the elements that will come together in the monumental and complex larger cycle two years later. Indeed, Runge described his *Minnelieder* illustrations in a letter to his brother of April 6, 1803 as a “Vorahnung oder Prolog für das Publicum zu den grossen Radirungen” (premonition or prologue for the public for the large etchings; quoted in Michael Breitbach’s informative entry on the book in cat. Frankfurt/Hamburg, p. 117).
Johann Nepomuk Strixner
1782 Alten-Oetting – Munich 1855

51. _Albrecht Dürers Christlich=Mythologische Handzeichnungen – Albrecht Dürer’s Christian-Mythological Border Decorations_ 1808

**PROVENANCE**
possibly Alexander Strähuber (1814–1882), Munich
Anton Strähuber (1877–1939), Munich
thence by descent

first edition, first issue; Munich: Alois Senefelder 1808

lithographed frontispiece depicting Dürer’s famous self-portrait of 1500, lithographed title-page and two pages _Vorrede_; originally issued in seven installments; the letterpress contents sheet for the plates bound in, followed by 43 numbered plates printed in red, green, sepia, and violet (plates 10 and 16 bound in twice, each time printed lighter and darker); bound in a contemporary full-leather binding; sheet size 354 x 250 mm (14 x 10 inches)

Winkler 831 sub-numbers 13, 14, and 16, the latter with list of all 43 plates, in this edition first states (of three)

**LITERATURE**
cat. London 1994, no. 125

Strixner was introduced to the new process of lithography, invented in Munich by Alois Senefelder during the last years of the eighteenth century, by the director of the ducal collection at the Bavarian court, Johann Christian Mannlich. Strixner had been given the post as draftsman there and ultimately became one of the most prolific early practitioners of lithography. Most of his lithographs were carefully rendered reproductions after early Netherlandish and German paintings and drawings. Foremost among the latter were these facsimiles of the _Prayerbook of Emperor Maximilian_. This was a book of hours compiled by the emperor himself and printed on vellum by the imperial court printer Johann Schönsperger the Elder in Augsburg in late 1513 in an exclusive edition of only ten copies (six of which survive), using a font especially designed for the purpose by the emperor’s secretary, Vinzenz Rockner. One copy was left unbound and groups of the printed vellum sheets were sent by Konrad Peutinger, an Augsburg humanist and important counselor of Maximilian, to the leading artists of the period. They were asked to decorate the margins with elaborate pen-and-ink drawings. The template was provided by Albrecht Dürer who decorated the book’s first ten quires in 1514–15; the other artists—Hans Burgkmair and Jörg Breu in Augsburg, Albrecht Altdorfer in Regensburg, Hans Baldung Grien in Freiburg, and the Saxon court painter Lucas Cranach in Wittenberg—were supposed to follow Dürer’s model.
Albrecht Dürers
Christlich = Mythologische
Handzeichnungen.
Like so many of the ambitious artistic commissions during the final years of Maximilian’s reign (he died in 1519), the project remained unfinished. Today the illuminated pages are split between Besançon and Munich.

All of Dürrer’s 45 drawings for the project survived, however, in the royal library in Munich (now in the Staatliche Graphische Sammlung) and it was those that Strixner published—omitting the typeface on each sheet to focus solely on the Dürrer’s draftsmanship. Strixner’s lithographs were extremely accomplished. They display a high level of accuracy and—at least in the first issue offered here—even emulated the green, red, and violet inks of the original drawings. Senefelder, in his autobiography, credits Strixner’s book, which counts among the first entirely lithographed books ever printed, with having “fixed the reputation of our establishment; for, even those who hitherto had not entertained a favourable opinion of the new art, were convinced by his work, that it was not so unimportant an invention as they supposed” (A Complete Course of Lithography, London 1819, p. 62; here quoted from cat. London 1994, p. 190).

While modern scholarship is quick to point out the loss of the original interaction between text and image, the publication of the prints made these drawings by Dürrer, virtually unknown at the time, available to a wide public and caused nothing less than a sensation. Germany’s grand arbiter of taste during this period, the Geheimrat Goethe, who was sent the first two issues at Weimar by his friend, the writer and philosopher Friedrich Heinrich Jacobi, thanked him profusely: “One could have given me as many ducats as required to cover these pages, but the gold would not have given me as much pleasure as these works” (letter of March 7, 1808, quoted here from cat. London 1994, p. 190). The prints also changed the way Dürrer’s art was seen. Goethe and Johann Heinrich Meyer, who signed as “Weimarische Kunst-Freunde,” (Weimar Friends of Art), remarked in their review in the Jenaische Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung of March 19, 1808, that Dürrer appears in these drawings “freier als wir gedacht, anmutiger, heiter, humoristisch und über alle Erwartung gewandt in der … Wahl seiner Motive” (more free than we thought, more graceful, cheerful, humorous and skillful beyond all expectation in the choice of his motifs; quoted from cat. Frankfurt/Hamburg, p. 73).

We can also offer here:

the first edition, second issue; Munich: Alois Senefelder 1808
the same, but the frontispiece bound after the title-page and without the contents sheet; printed in black throughout; bound in contemporary boards

Winkler 831 sub-numbers 13, 14, and 16, the latter with list of all 43 plates, in this edition second states (of three)

the first English edition: Albert Dürrer Designs of the Prayer Book
London: Rudolph Ackermann 1817
copies of Strixner’s plates and eight pages of letterpress containing “Advertisement,” “Introduction,” and “List of Plates”

mentioned by Winkler on p. 29
52.  

**Vorlagen für Landschaft-Zeichner – Model Sheets for Landscape Draftsmen**

1805 / 1823

lithographic title-page and set of 20 lithographs on wove paper; sheet size 337 x 250 mm (13 ¼ x 10 inches)

fourth edition, published Munich: Lithographische Kunstanstalt an der Feyertags-Schule 1823

Winkler 897 sub-numbers 60 and 61

**PROVENANCE**

Joseph Dreher (see note below)
possibly Alexander Strähuber (1814–1882), Munich
Anton Strähuber (1877–1939), Munich
thence by descent

contemporary leather binding

Wagenbauer was a prolific draftsman and landscapist. In his watercolors as well as in his paintings after 1810, he developed a realistic view of the landscape that he studied intensively on his journeys through southern Germany. He was an important and influential early exponent of the Munich School of landscape painters. Wagenbauer first trained with Johann Jakob Dorner the Elder and Johann Christian von Mannlich at the drawing academy in Munich. From 1801 he was awarded an artist’s pension by the Bavarian court and appointed Hof- und Kabinettszeichner the following year. In 1815 he was appointed Inspektor of the Royal Paintings Gallery.

From as early as 1800 Wagenbauer was among the very first artists to practice the newly invented technique of lithography. This book is a representative example of the various drawing manuals he created between 1805 and 1824 and which are one of the reasons for his influential role in the Munich School. In his manuals, Wagenbauer typically takes advantage of the way in which lithography can reproduce the character of drawn pencil, pen, and chalk lines in printed form. The first five plates show different types of trees, each one showing a stage in their development from tentative outline to fully described motif; there are a further four horizontally divided plates with landscape details and 11 plates depicting full-page landscape scenes.

The manual was first published as Anleitung zur Landschaft Zeichnung in 1805; a second edition of 1810 contained some new and different plates (Winkler sub-nos. 15 and 16). The latter is identical to the third edition of 1816 (Winkler sub-nos. 54 and 55) and to the present, fourth edition of 1823. These manuals were used in drawing schools, especially in southern Germany, and hence exerted a lasting influence on the next generation of artists. (Winkler [p. 311 under sub-no. 55] mentions another edition of “ca. 1825” published in Hanau, which shows that Wagenbauer’s manuals were not confined to Bavaria.)
The artist’s preface makes explicit reference to his excursions *en plein air*; in it he writes that these are “Zeichnungsvorlagen … [die] aus meinen in der letzten Zeit gesammelten Studien nach der Natur hervorgegangen … sind” (model sheets here derive from the studies after nature that I have collected in recent years). He further provides in the briefest possible form an outline of what he considers an ideal way to teach the art of landscape drawing: the student should start with the model sheets in this collection; move on to first copying the etchings of Herman van Swanevelt and Ferdinand Kobell; and then, as a next step, those of Antoine Waterloo. Once the student has achieved this—and only then—should he “endlich zum Studium nach der Natur selbst … schritten” (finally move on to the study of nature herself), since without it he would risk becoming a mere copyist of the great masters.

* 

The flyleaf in the front has a pen-and-ink inscription stating that the book was given as a first prize for history drawing at a Munich Gymnasium in 1823: “1ter Preis zuerkan[n]t. Joseph Dreher Schüller der IIIten Gymnasial-Klasse aus der Historien-Zeichnung. / München d. 28ten August 1823 / Xaver Beiber [?] Gymnasial-Zeichnungs-Meister.”
Johann Anton Ramboux
1790 Tier – Cologne 1866

53. **Aeusere Ansicht der roemischen Baeder zu Trier – Exterior View of the Roman Baths in Trier** 1824

54. **Ansicht des roemischen Amphiteaters bey Trier – View of the Roman Amphitheatre near Trier** 1824

lithographs on wove paper; ca. 380 x 500 mm (ca. 14 ¼ x 19 ¾ inches)


The two lithographs here are plates 7 and 8 from the series *Malerische Ansichten der merkwürdigen Alterthümer und vorzüglicher Naturanlagen im Moselthale bey Trier* (Picturesque Views of the most Remarkable Antiquities and the most Excellent Natural Settings in the Mosel Valley near Trier), each containing four lithographs and published in 1824, 1826, and 1827, accompanied by a text by Ramboux’s brother-in-law Johann Hugo Wytttenbach (1767–1848), the leading antiquarian of the Trier area and its Roman history. These views depict some of the most imposing Roman remains in northern Europe, found in and around Ramboux’s native town. In line with the interests of the German Romantics, the project was originally also intended to cover Trier’s medieval buildings. However, only a few subscribers signed up and the substantial costs of the project were shouldered by Ramboux alone. It was, therefore, probably a lack of funds that prevented the completion of the ambitious project.

Ramboux went to Rome in 1815 where he came into close contact with the German Nazarenes. Like them, he discovered and admired the art of the early Italians. It was clearly under this influence that he began to work on the preliminary drawings for the *Malerische Ansichten* immediately upon his return to Trier in 1822. The memory of the Italian art, light, and landscape were obviously still fresh in his mind when he embarked on his project to record some of the remnants of the Roman world after his return to German soil. All the lithographs are far superior to the preliminary drawings and Ramboux went all the way to Munich to draw the final designs on the stone himself in the workshop of Joseph Anton Selb (1784–1832). As Antony Griffiths notes, this “was unusual at this time: lithography was still underdeveloped, and most artists were happy to leave specialists like Strixner or Piloty to perform this tricky task ... Ramboux felt quite differently, and even drew attention to this role: each print is lettered ‘Drawn from nature and on the stone by J.A. Ramboux’” (cat. London, 1994, p. 201).

In spite of the artist’s efforts, the prints achieved little commercial success. As a result, even individual plates are rare and sought after today. They are now recognized as the masterworks of an artist whom Thieme/Becker call “one of the strongest albeit least acknowledged talents of the Nazarene artists’ generation.”
55. The Spectacle Seller ca. 1646–52

etching; 100 x 87 mm (3 15\(\frac{1}{16}\) x 3 7\(\frac{1}{16}\) inches)

Bartsch 29, Godefrey second or third state (of six)

WATERMARK
(part of) phoenix in a laurel wreath (cf. Godefrey nos. 33–36)

PROVENANCE
Karl Eduard von Liphart, Bonn and Florence (Lugt 1687);
his sale, C.G. Boerner, Leipzig, April 9ff., 1894, lot 1057
Thomas Graf, Berlin (Lugt 1092a)
Dr. H. Fleischer, Berlin (Lugt 1362b with a different stamp; this one now listed online as Lugt 4578)
C.G. Boerner, Neue Lagerliste 40, Düsseldorf 1965, no. 93
S. William Pelletier, Athens, Georgia (Lugt 4193), acquired in January 1966;
his sale, Sotheby’s, London, December 2, 2004, part of lot 102
C.G. Boerner, Düsseldorf/New York
private collection, Germany

LITERATURE

A fine impression; trimmed within the platemark but showing the borderline all round. The distinguished provenance of the sheet can be traced back to the nineteenth century.

The dates suggested in the literature for this plate range from 1646 to 1652. The subject’s iconographic connotations are equally disputed. While Ostade was intrigued enough by the subject to revisit it in both a drawing and a watercolor (Schnackenburg, nos. 223f.), he does not supply us with any identifying subscript nor with any obvious symbolic elements that would help to decipher an underlying meaning. Leonard Slatkes points out that the “popular Dutch saying of the period, *iemand brillen verkopen* (to sell someone spectacles) associates this activity with deception” and that already in the sixteenth century “Netherlandish painters associated buying and wearing eyeglasses with foolishness and even moral or religious blindness.” In the same catalogue, however, William Pelletier observes that the “friendly rapport between the spectacle merchant and his customer separates this print from those of the period that carry negative overtones” (Pelletier/Slatkes/Stone-Ferrier, pp. 160f.).
Paulus Potter  
1625 Enkhuizen – Amsterdam 1654

56. **The Plough Horses** 1652

etching; 159 x 242 mm (6 ¼ x 9 ¾ inches)

Bartsch 12, Hollstein second state (of three)

**WATERMARK**

foolscap with five-pointed collar, pendant numeral 4, and three roundels below

**PROVENANCE**

John Barnard, London (Lugt 1419);
sale, Thomas Philipe, London, April 16 ff., 1798, 3rd day, part of lot 66, described as: *Five of horses - very fine and scarce*, £1.16.0 to
John Woodhouse (who had no mark);
sale, Mr. Christie, London, January 22 ff., 1801, 2nd day, part of lot 47, described as *Five - horses - exceedingly scarce, and fine beautiful impressions*, £8.0.0

A fine impression, printing with subtle tone; a fine printer’s crease at upper left and a hardly noticeable vertical fold, otherwise in very good condition; thread margins all round.

Potter’s prints are very rare, and this beautiful impression is in the second state, before the edges were cleaned up (only one impression—in the British Museum, London—of the unfinished and as yet unsigned first state is cited in Hollstein).

The artist, who died very young, can be seen as a precursor of George Stubbs, in the sense that the animals he depicts in his small oeuvre of etchings are the sole focus of his attention, are “portraits,” as they are in his paintings; except in two plates, which include a cowherd and a shepherd, humanity is absent, and there is no narrative content.

The set of five prints, to which this plate belongs, may represent, in an unsentimental age, the gamut of the existence of this essential beast. The first, more pictorial, more “romantic” than the others, is of a dappled Frisian grey, with a long, beautifully brushed tail and a braided and beribboned mane. The Neighing Horse and its companion are in a state of nature; The Cropped Horse is for riding, The Plough Horses, no longer in the prime of life, have been put to work; and The Worn-out Horse, in poor shape, lingers near a dead companion, while two scavenging dogs or wolves circle nearby.
Nicolaes Pietersz. Berchem
1620 Haarlem – Amsterdam 1683

57.  *La Vache qui pisse – The Pissing Cow*

etching; 207 x 265 mm (8 ¼ x 10 7⁄16 inches)

Bartsch 2; Dutuit and Hollstein third state (of five)

**WATERMARK**

Seven Provinces (similar to Churchill 109, dated 1656)

**PROVENANCE**

Neville Davison Goldsmid, The Hague (Lugt 1962); his sale, Clément, Paris, April 25–27, 1876

Berchem’s famous print shows a shepherd family sleeping between the animals in front of their cottage. It is the type of idealized Arcadian image that was cherished by art collectors in the busy urban centers of the seventeenth-century Netherlands. They might even have bought them to compensate for their loss of daily connection to nature and rural life, as some scholars have suggested. (Psychotherapy had not been invented back then.)

The most prominent motif in the center of this composition, however, is that of a pissing cow. Needless to say, the stuffy academic art critics of Berchem’s day largely disapproved of such tasteless and undignified images. Rembrandt’s two small etchings “A Man Making Water” and “A Woman Making Water” (Bartsch 190–191), both dated 1631, are among the other notorious examples of this pictorial tradition. Berchem’s print is even worse: here it is actually an animal that violates the fine sensibility of the viewer. However, this blatant infringement on decorum hardly seems to have prevented art lovers and connoisseurs from buying the print at the time. On the contrary.

Further, prints of this kind had a considerable influence on the work of anti-academic artists in late eighteenth-century Germany. Berchem’s *La Vache qui pisse* in particular was widely admired by these artists and his prints clearly inspired the scenes of shepherds surrounded by their animals in the work of the Bad Kreuznach-born Friedrich Müller (called “Maler Müller”; 1749–1825).
58. The Bag Pipe Player

etching; 173 x 240 mm (6 ½₁₆ x 9 ⅜ inches)

Bartsch 4, Dutuit and Hollstein 4 third (final) state (with the artist’s name added)

WATERMARK
foolscap with seven-pointed collar (as called for by Hollstein)

Eighteenth-century collectors expressed their admiration for this print by giving it the nickname “The Diamond.”
Hendrick Kobell
1751 – Rotterdam – 1779

59.  **A Large Farm House by the Sea by Day and by Night (a pair)**  1768

etchings on laid paper; each 192 x 322 mm (7 ¾ x 12 ⅝ inches)

Nagler 1 first and second states (of two)

PROVENANCE
Dr. Carl von Guérard, Elberfeld (Lugt 1109)
Eduard von Asten, Eupen (annotated in pencil on the verso with the date 1949; not in Lugt)

A most unusual example of the radical reworking of a plate.

Hendrik Kobell’s father was a merchant in Rotterdam and expected his son to follow him in this trade. Since the young Hendrik showed great artistic talent he was nevertheless allowed to take drawing lessons. Away from his father, during a business trip to England, Hendrik ultimately decided to become an artist and first exhibited at the Free Society in London in 1770. Returning to the Netherlands he lived for two years in Amsterdam before going back to Rotterdam in 1772, quickly achieving fame for his drawings and paintings of seascapes. Johann Heinrich Wilhelm Tischbein, who met him in Amsterdam and whose artistic ideals could not have been more different, was thrilled when he saw Kobell’s drawings and watercolors on the Battle of Lepanto.

Nagler lists merely 12 etchings for the artist, most of them seascapes. Our print shows a large farm house with an adjacent shed close to the sea. This unspectacular, everyday subject had, of course, a long tradition in Dutch art since the seventeenth century. What is highly unusual here, however, is that Kobell intensely reworked the plate in the second state, thereby transforming the composition into a night scene with a full moon visible behind the clouds over the sea. The artist shows considerable humor here, too: he has, for example, eliminated the chickens that pick about the yard during the daytime—at night they have literally gone home to roost (bar the one that was roasted for dinner).

The most famous example of such a day-to-night reworking of a printing plate is surely Rembrandt’s *Entombment* of ca. 1654 (Bartsch 86). While Rembrandt did not, in fact, alter the time of day, he did transform the brightly lit vaulted interior of the first state into a somber scene illuminated by a single lantern. Other models for this idea can be found in seventeenth-century *Times of Day* cycles, the most famous one probably being the four prints by Jan van de Velde the Younger (1593–1641) of ca. 1620 (Hollstein 71–74), although the different times of day here are represented in a series of completely different landscapes. Yet another variation on the day-to-night theme is the *Night* plate in Van de Velde’s second *Times of Day* cycle (Hollstein 75–78). The night landscape here is an exact copy—in reverse—of the *January* plate in his *Twelve Months* cycle (Hollstein 34–45) only that in the latter the scene is shown in daylight.
Georg Friedrich Schmidt
1712 Schönerlinde – Berlin 1775

60. Selbstbildnis mit der Spinne am Fenster – Self-Portrait with the Spider in the Window 1758

etching, burin, and drypoint; 232 x 178 mm (9 ⅛ x 7 inches)

Heller/Andresen 53 second (final) state; Wessely 103 third (final) state; Le Blanc 104 third (final) state

LITERATURE

cat. London 1994, no. 16

A very good impression; the top-left corner diagonally cut off beyond the platemark, otherwise in good condition with thread margins all round.

Georg Schmidt belongs to the late-eighteenth century German movement known as Hollandismus. Its artists admired the art of the Dutch Golden Age of the previous century and tried to emulate it. Their intention, however, was not simply to copy but to create works that evoked the style and spirit of that age. Not surprisingly, Rembrandt was among the artists held in highest regard and his handling of light and shadow had a considerable influence on the artists of the later German movement.

Schmidt had etched a first self-portrait in 1752 (Heller/Andresen 54) but it is this Self-Portrait with the Spider, made six years later, that is still considered the most iconic German example of a “Rembrandtesque” print. Its obvious model is Rembrandt’s Self-Portrait Etching at a Window of 1648 (Bartsch 22; New Hollstein 240)

Schmidt took a five-year leave of absence from his position as principal engraver to Frederick II, King of Prussia, when he was invited to go to Russia in 1757 to engrave a portrait of Empress Elizabeth. The latter is dated 1761 (Heller/Andresen 28). He stayed on to organize an engraving school within the Imperial Academy in St. Petersburg. And the landscape visible through the window in this 1758 etching is indeed Russian.

Yet the most striking motif here is that of the spider spinning its web in the window. Its symbolic significance is complex. In Schmidt’s self-portrait, the spider is most likely a melancholy symbol of the artist’s self-imposed exile, far from his Berlin home and family, in pursuit of fame. But a spiderweb can also be understood as a memento of the unstoppable passing of time, or stands for diligence, endurance, patience, creativity, and artistry. It is fascinating to note, however, that these connotations are by no means merely historic. They are still very much alive, as a look at contemporary tattoo culture, for example, confirms (http://style-revolution.net/style/tattoo/die-bedeutung-der-spinne-als-tattoo-motiv).
Johann Christoph Erhard
1795 Nuremberg – Rome 1822

61. Der Maler Hoffmann – The Painter Hoffmann 1815
etching on laid paper; 95 x 95 mm (3 ¾ x 3 ¾ inches)
Apell 176 fourth (final) state

PROVENANCE
Ernst Sigismund Arnold, Dresden (inscribed in pencil verso; cf. Lugt 4365)
Eduard von Asten, Eupen (annotated in pencil on the verso with the date 1949; not in Lugt)

LITERATURE
G. Ulrich Großmann (ed.), Johann Christoph Erhard (1795–1822). Der Zeichner, exhibition catalogue, Germanisches Nationalmuseum Nuremberg, 1996, p. 80, no. 7 (for a drawing by Erhard showing Hoffmann en face)

Erhard joined the Städtische Zeichenschule in Nuremberg in 1805 at the age of ten. Four years later he trained as a printmaker under Ambrosius Gabler (1762–1834). Among his fellow-pupils were Johann Adam Klein (1792–1875) and Johann Georg Hoffmann (1792–1849). Erhard’s first prints date from 1811. In 1815 he etched this touching portrait of his friend and fellow-artist, showing him on a day when he began working en plein air for the first time. We know this from a note that Erhard wrote on the preparatory drawing for this highly unusual, square print that in itself is the main reason that Hoffmann is known today. Hoffmann worked for only a short time as an artist and he escaped the attention of Thieme/Becker. The biographical note given by Apell in his catalogue raisonné on Erhard’s prints is still the best summary of his life. Born in Unter-Ferrieden between Nuremberg und Neumarkt, Hoffmann worked as a painter for a while after he had finished his studies and before joining a tobacco shop. He found this job an easier way of making a living and ultimately stopped painting altogether. He died in 1849 in Nuremberg in the age of 57.

Hoffmann was a person of restricted growth and in his day, when he was most likely often mocked as a “dwarf,” life could not have been easy. Contemporary prejudices of this kind are condensed in the disturbing but nonetheless sublimely beautiful Lied by Franz Schubert, set to Mäthäus von Collin’s ballad Der Zwerg. Intriguingly, the song about a dwarf who kills his queen out of unrequited love was written in the mid-1820s, within a decade of the creation of our print. Erhard does not seem to have been touched by any of these stereotypes. He repeatedly drew Hoffmann in full figure and his print stands as a sympathetic monument to his friend, not least since it does not focus on Hoffmann’s physical disability but on his artistic endeavor. In Erhard’s oeuvre it also stands at the beginning of a series of Freundschaftsbilder (friendship portraits) that he began to produce after he and Johann Adam Klein had arrived in Vienna in 1816.

The plate was only fully realized in this third and final state. Only once the background has been filled out by a hill created through a loose web of hatchings does the figure of Hoffmann develop a subtle luminosity, the sunlight reflecting on him as he sits at the foot of a tree.
Adolph von Menzel
1815 Breslau – Berlin 1905

62. *Die schlafende Näherin am Fenster (Menzels Schwester Emilie) – The Sleeping Seamstress at the Window (The Artist’s Sister Emilie)* 1843

etching with extensive additions in pen and ink on wove paper; 215 x 170 mm (8 ½ x 6 ¾ inches)
Dorgerloh 1381; Bock 1134 first state (of five)

provenance
Georg Weiner, Vienna, New York, and Switzerland (his stamp, not in Lugt)

The earliest proof impression of this charming print, extensively retouched by the artist in pen and ink, thereby preparing for changes he would make to the plate in the next state(s).

Bock gives the following census for the proof impressions:
first state—three impressions (Berlin, Bremen, and Dresden); according to Bock the impression in Dresden has rough corrections (“mit groben Korrekturen Menzels”), probably very different from the delicate and accomplished retouchings of our impression; second state—three impressions (Berlin [2] and Bremen); third state—four impressions (Berlin [3] and Bremen); fourth state—two impressions (Berlin and Bremen).

All proof impressions known today are kept exclusively in the print rooms of Berlin and Bremen, with the exception of one single retouched first state in Dresden. It is therefore unlikely that another comparable impression will ever again appear on the market.

* Most examples in the small group of Menzel’s female portraits show his younger sister Emilie Charlotte Amalie. She was born in 1823 and died two years after her brother in 1907. In 1859 she married the royal music director Hermann Krügar. Adolph and Emilie were very close; they lived together in the same house and she looked after him as well as after their sickly younger brother Richard (1826–1865). She ran Adolph’s household after the death of their mother in 1846 and continued doing so even after her marriage. When her husband died in 1880 Adolph became a sort of substitute father for her children, Margarethe and Otto, born in 1860 and 1861 (Sigrid Achenbach [ed.], *Adolph Menzel. Zeichnungen, Druckgraphik und illustrierte Bücher. Ein Bestandskatalog der Nationalgalerie, des Kupferstichkabinets und der Kunstbibliothek Staatliche Museen Preußischer Kulturbesitz*, Berlin 1984, p. 328).

Menzel repeatedly used both sister and brother as models and for inspiration. This print is one of the earliest examples, contemporaneous to the many drawings in the sketchbooks of the 1840s. The artist also often shows them asleep, partly because the sketches might have been executed in the evenings, but also because the subjects’ stillness provided him with an opportunity for intense and close observation. The figures themselves, in fact, become objectified, part of their surroundings.

Hardly any of the depictions of this family are portraits in a classical sense. If they are not “still lifes” they are genre scenes, studies of behavior, or illustrations of specific situations. Here, Emilie has not dozed off in the evening but while sitting at an open window in the sunlight of a warm summer day. In her lap she holds the clothes that she has been working on; the sewing kit is on the table next to her; and on the windowsill stands a vase with roses. All of these elements evoke the fairy tale of Dornröschen (Sleeping Beauty). What first appears as a simple, realistic genre scene thus gains an additional dimension: Emilie is not merely a sleeping seamstress but has become a beautiful character in a fairytale.
63. **Mestre** ca. 1740

etching; 298 x 428 mm (11 ¾ x 16 ⅞ inches)

Meyer and DeVesme 3, Bromberg 3 first state (of two)

**PROVENANCE**
private collection, Europe
Pace Master Prints, New York
private collection, New York (acquired in 1989)

A brilliant impression in a truly superb state of preservation, untreated and unpressed, with small margins all round.

The print is from a series of 31 etchings titled *VEDUTE Altre prese da I Luoghi alter ideate*. Canaletto started work on the set sometime after 1735. He dedicated the Vedute to Joseph Smith, the British Consul in Venice, and they therefore must have been published after Smith’s appointment in June 1744 and before the artist’s departure for England in 1746.

Canaletto’s etched views of Venice and its environs on the Terra Ferma are a hymn to the beauty of the Serenissima. Canaletto was Giovanni Battista Piranesi’s (1720–1778) elder by 23 years; they were both born in the Veneto and knew each other’s work well. Still, their approach to their chosen subjects (in the case of Piranesi the views of modern [i.e. Baroque] Rome and its ancient ruins) could not have been more different. Piranesi’s prints were strong and dense, the copper-plate deeply etched as if it had been forcefully attacked by the artist’s needle. Canaletto’s prints, by contrast, are all Venetian serenity, delicately capturing the interplay between the buildings, the water, and the sky. It is intriguing to see that he depicted both the sky and the water with the same short parallel hatchings, making no true distinction—as if for him both elements were of the same substance.

These qualities can only be appreciated, however, in such superb and well-preserved impressions as the one offered here. It shows a view of *le Barche* in Mestre, the landing place for the boats that shuttle between Mestre and Venice. The canal is lined by a variety of different buildings. In the left foreground an inn is marked by a coat of arms and a sign. To the right one can make out a stable and a coach-house beneath an arched portico. The largest part of the plate, however, is made up by the wide expanse of the sky. The print vividly projects the unique light of the Venetian lagoon on a sunny day.
Antonio Canal, called Canaletto  
1697 – Venice – 1768

64.  Le Porte del Dolo  ca. 1740

etching; 300 x 433 mm (11 ⅞ x 16 ⅞ inches)

Meyer and DeVesme 6, Bromberg second state (of three)

WATERMARK
letters fv (Bromberg 40)

PROVENANCE
P. & D. Colnaghi & Co., London (their stock no. in pencil at lower right C 28436)
Pace Master Prints, New York
private collection, New York (acquired in 1996)

A fine impression; with wide margins all round.

Dolo is a city in the center of the Riviera del Brenta on the Terra Ferma west of Venice and east of Padua. Canaletto made various etchings showing views of the town, including one with the main church of San Rocco (Bromberg 4). In his Le Porte del Dolo he focuses on the oval-shaped basin that belongs to a lock in the River Naviglio del Brenta that flows through Dolo. Unlike the San Rocco print this is not a classic veduta but instead a view that would surely have been of little interest to tourists. The architecture is unspectacular and the mechanics of the lock might possibly draw the attention of engineers if nobody else.

Canaletto uses the apparent plainness of the view, however, as a foil to show the play of light and shadow on the walls and to demonstrate the amazing subtlety and versatility with which he handles the etching needle. While the foreground remains in deep shadow, the sky is bright and the facades of the houses on the right gleam in the sunlight. The staffage figures—a butcher, a fruit-vendor, a woman making pillow-lace—are shown at work, adding a sense of the experience of everyday life to the serene scene.
65. **Nocturne** 1879–80

etching and drypoint, printed in dark-brown ink on laid paper; 199 x 290 mm (7 13⁄16 x 11 7⁄16 inches)

signed with the butterfly and inscribed *imp* in pencil on the tab; signed again on the verso with the butterfly and inscribed *selected proof* and *Ex*–; another early pencil annotation verso: *Marked by Whistler “selected proof” and signed by him. His “Ex.” means extra fine.*

Kennedy 184 fifth (final) state; Glasgow 222 ninth (final) state

**PROVENANCE**
Frederick Keppel & Co., New York (his code in pencil on the verso)
Kennedy Galleries, New York (their stock no. in pencil on the verso a44254)

**LITERATURE**

The plate belonged to Whistler’s “First Venice Set,” published in 1880 by the Fine Art Society under the title *Etchings of Venice*. Venetian night scenes like this one reflect the artist’s longstanding preoccupation with the subject; one of his earliest etchings, *Street at Saverne* of 1858 (Kennedy 19), is just such a scene, and he continued to develop the theme in his paintings of the 1870s as well as in an 1878 lithograph, *Nocturne: The River at Battersea* (Spink/Stratis/Tedeschi 8).

Robert Getscher calls it “the most dramatic etching” in the “First Venice Set.” Due to a first-state impression at the University of Glasgow inscribed “Venice 1879” we know that the print must have been made within the first months after Whistler’s arrival in the city in September 1879 (cat. Oberlin, p. 95).

As Ruth Fine notes, “Of all the Venice etchings, Nocturne is printed with the greatest kind of variation between impressions. Indeed, depending upon the quality of the tonal wiping, the time of day appears to range from dusk to midnight to dawn” (cat. Los Angeles, p. 133). The etching work on the plate seems to have been finished in one stage; later developments in the image were to a large extent devised solely through the use of plate-tone and drypoint. It is not surprising, therefore, that the English critics of the time were unprepared for such a radical interpretation of what a print (that was ultimately topographically conceived) could be. A review of the show at the Fine Art Society, published in *The British Architect* on December 10, 1880, reads: “‘Nocturne’ is different in treatment to the rest of the prints, and can hardly be called, as it stands, an etching; the bones as it were of the picture have been etched, which bones consist of some shipping and distant objects, and then over the whole plate ink has apparently been smeared. We have seen a great many representations of Venetian skies, but never saw one before consisting of brown smoke with clots of ink in diagonal lines” (quoted in cat. Oberlin, p. 97).
The critic’s objections might easily have been directed to an impressions like the one offered here. It is an exceptionally richly inked example of the final state in which the drypoint work has lost most of its burr. The artist did not consciously remove it, however, but instead allowed it to fade away. The result is a very high level of abstraction, further enhanced in our impression by the strong plate tone. The composition as a whole does indeed—to quote from the University of Glasgow’s online catalogue—“appear to have dissolved in nocturnal mist.”

The artistic intentionality of this effect is also made clear by Whistler’s own careful annotations, marking this impression as an outstanding example.
James Abbott McNeill Whistler
1834 Lowell, Massachusetts – London 1903


etching and drypoint printed in dark-brown ink on off-white laid paper;
298 x 201 mm (11 ¾ x 7 ⅞ inches)

trimmed by the artist just outside the platemark all round; signed in pencil with the butterfly
and inscribed imp on the tab

Kennedy 202 before first state (of eight); Glasgow 200 intermediary state between the first and
the second (of 12)

WATERMARK
crowned shield with hunting horn and pendant letters wp

PROVENANCE
Frederick Keppel & Co., New York (their stock no. in pencil on the verso a10068)
Mrs. John D. Rockefeller
Mr. and Mrs. John D. Rockefeller III
Dr. and Mrs. James W. Nelson
Linda Papaharis, New York
private collection (acquired in 1988)

LITERATURE
Robert H. Getscher, The Stamp of Whistler, exhibition catalogue, Allen Memorial Art Museum,

A superb impression with carefully modulated tonal wiping; in impeccable condition.

Before the row of small vertical strokes in the water immediately below the wall of the left palace,
to the left of the patch indicating the doorway's reflection. These strokes are already visible in
Kennedy's first state but not yet in the second state described in the Glasgow catalogue. However,
Glasgow's second state does show a vertical band of short horizontal lines along the left edge of
the shadow cast on the water by the bridge. These horizontal strokes are clearly missing in our
impression, therefore making it an intermediary state between Glasgow's first and second states.
The first state in the Freer Gallery of Art in Washington, D.C. is annotated by the artist 1st state
1st proof; while the composition is basically finished, it lacks any of the tonal wiping characteristic
for this print and was never trimmed to the platemark. Apart from this unique “proof,” the present
sheet can therefore be considered as the earliest-known impression pulled from the “finished” plate.

Published from Glasgow's sixth state onward as part of A Set of Twenty-Six Etchings, also known
as the “Second Venice Set,” by Messrs. Dowdeswell and Dowdeswell in 1886.
James Abbott McNeill Whistler
1834 Lowell, Massachusetts – London 1903

67. Ponte del Piovan 1879–80

etching and drypoint, printed in dark-brown ink on laid paper; 225 x 154 mm (8 7/8 x 6 inches)

trimmed with the platemark still just visible all round; signed in pencil with the butterfly and inscribed imp. on the tab; annotated on the verso in pencil 9975. SMS., 2nd state, and No 39

Kennedy 209 fourth state (of six; this impression illustrated); Glasgow 220 fifth state (of six)

watermark partial crowned shield with fleur-de-lis (cf. Spink/Stratis/Tedeschi, watermark nos. 284f.)

literature
Ruth E. Fine, Drawing Near: Whistler Etchings from the Zelman Collection, exhibition catalogue, Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1984–85, no 62

Published in the fifth and sixth states as part of A Set of Twenty-Six Etchings, also known as the “Second Venice Set,” by Messrs. Dowdeswell and Dowdeswell in 1886.

An extremely fine impression, with rich plate-tone, especially in the lower part of the composition, and with much burr on the drypoint work added for this state. Our impression must surely predate the printing of the edition. The latter quickly shows considerable wear in the drypoint lines—to the extent that Kennedy thought the worn impressions constituted a new state.

Ruth Fine observes that Ponte del Piovan is neither a sweeping vista nor an intimate enclosed view. “In its spatial compression and reliance upon drawn surfaces and reflections rather than on plate tone to modulate the image, it moves toward the Amsterdam views of 1889” (cat. Los Angeles, p. 137)

The Ponte del Piovan still looks today very much the way Whistler depicted it in his etching which, incidentally, is one of the few topographically titled Venetian works. His viewpoint is from a boat on the Rio de Ca’ Widman; looking north toward the Palazzo Widman is the Ponte del Piovan detto del Volto (cf. Alastair Grieve, Whistler’s Venice, New Haven/London 2000, p. 88).
James Abbott McNeill Whistler
1834 Lowell, Massachusetts – London 1903

68.  **J.H. Woods’ Fruit Shop, Chelsea**  1887–88

etching and drypoint, printed in dark-brown ink on laid paper; 96 x 132 mm (3 ¾ x 5 ⅛ inches)
trimmed along the platemark all round; signed in pencil with the butterfly and inscribed *imp.* on the tab; signed again with the butterfly on the verso and numbered 1

Kennedy 265 second state (of two); Glasgow 327 second state (of four)

**WATERMARK**
partial arms of Amsterdam (cf. Spink/Stratis/Tedeschi, watermark nos. 12ff.)

After Whistler’s return from Venice at the end of 1880, the streets and houses of Chelsea, where he lived on Tite Street, became the new and often-explored subjects of his paintings as well as his prints. Since he had made *Fruit Stall* in Venice in 1879–80 (Kennedy 200) he had become increasingly fascinated by shopfronts. His images of them all share the same characteristics: unposed figures going about their daily business; the facades set parallel to the picture plane; and usually also an asymmetrical imbalance in the overall composition that creates a certain visual movement and counters the spatial parallelism.

According to Margaret MacDonald’s catalogue raisonné (on the University of Glasgow website), Joseph Henry Wood had a greengrocer’s shop at 1 Park Walk in Chelsea in 1887 and moved to nearby 391 Fulham Road the following year. Since the print is dated in the literature to 1887–88 it is not clear which of these two locations Whistler depicted here.

A fine impression of the second state, in excellent condition. In the next state, heavy shading was added around the woman in the center, and the heads of the figures to the left and right of that woman are more defined.

This plate was never published. Impressions are of utmost rarity. MacDonald has not been able to trace more than four impressions in public collections (plus two whose whereabouts are unknown). Our print must be added to this small number.
The Embroidered Curtain, or The Lace Curtain 1889

etching, printed in brown ink on laid paper; 240 x 159 mm (9 3/8 x 6 1/4 inches)

trimmed by the artist on the platemark all round; signed in pencil with the butterfly and inscribed imp on the tab

Kennedy 410 first state (of seven); Glasgow 451 first state (of seven)

WATERMARK
Pro Patria

PROVENANCE
Robert Rice, his mark (not in Lugt) on verso of backing sheet
David Tunick, Inc., New York (his code in pencil on verso of backing sheet DT …)
Gordon Cooke Ltd., London
private collection (acquired in 1989)

LITERATURE
Ruth E. Fine, Drawing Near: Whistler Etchings from the Zelman Collection, exhibition catalogue, Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1984–85, no. 90

The print depicts a group of late seventeenth-century buildings at 52–54 Palmgracht in the Jordaan district of Amsterdam. The strictly frontal view and the absence of any perspective foreshortening as well as the cropping of the image together create a highly abstract effect. The overall ornamentation of the embroidered curtain in the window right off the center, to which Whistler’s title refers, can be transposed onto the composition as a whole. What we see is a carefully structured interplay of light and dark areas filled with an intricate web of lines. The squares of the window panes are the predominant geometric forms in this scheme, encased in the upright rectangles of the windows that themselves become framed by the similarly proportioned upright rectangle of the plate.

“The Embroidered Curtain … is probably the best known of the Amsterdam etchings. Fully composed and showing no evidence of the artist’s tendency toward a vignette image, it is also the most intricately worked of the group and, its use of surface manipulation, possibly the most fully developed of all of Whistler’s etchings.” Ruth Fine further observes that the print “is best seen in the earlier states … the later ones displaying a coarsening of line from repeated exposure to the acid” (cat. Los Angeles, p. 181).

Our impression is, like the Nocturne: Palaces (cat. no. 66), one of the earliest pulled from the plate. The artist’s deft handling of the drypoint needle a decade earlier has now given way to a most delicate touch that can only fully be appreciated in fine impressions like this one. Since none of the Amsterdam plates were ever published, they are rare and highly sought after, with the Glasgow online catalogue listing a total of only 27 impressions.
James Ensor
1860 – Ostend – 1949

70. Buste, pointe sèche – Bust, drypoint 1887

drypoint on simili Japan paper; 129 x 88 mm (5 3/16 x 3 1/2 inches)
titled, signed, and dated in pencil; countersigned on the verso

Provenance
Dr. Frédéric Trüssel (1873–1965), Berne (with his mark, not in Lugt);
his sale, Die Ensor-Sammung Dr. Trüssel, Bern, Galerie Koller, Zurich, November 7, 1974, lot. 2891

The plate is entirely worked in drypoint. Since drypoint lines wear away fairly quickly, only a very limited number of impressions could be pulled, making the print rare (Tavernier categorizes it as “RR”). The subject is a bronze bust that decorates the chimneypiece in the drawing room of Ernest Rousseau, a professor at the University of Brussels to whom Ensor had been introduced by Rousseau’s brother-in-law, the art critic Théo Hannon. In 1887 he made a stunning portrait of Rousseau (Tavernier 11), again foregoing his preferred technique of etching for pure drypoint. Rudy Chiappini suggests that the bust is most likely by the sculptor Jef Lambeaux (1852–1908) who had been commissioned to create a portrait-bust of Rousseau (James Ensor, exhibition catalogue, Museo d’Arte Moderna, Lugano, 1999, no. 18).
71. *L'Orage – The Thunderstorm* 1889

etching on *simili* Japan paper; 80 x 120 mm (3 ⅛ x 4 ¾ inches)

signed in pencil; titled on the verso

Delteil and Croquez 70, Elesh and Tavernier second state (of three)

PROVENANCE
Dr. Frédéric Trüssel (1873–1965), Berne (with his mark, not in Lugt);
his sale, *Die Ensor-Sammung Dr. Trüssel, Bern*, Galerie Koller, Zurich, November 7, 1974, lot. 2943

This is one of Ensor’s most intriguing printmaking experiments. Rather than coating the plate and immersing it in an acid bath, he brushed the sulphuric acid directly onto the plate. The resulting effect is one of amorphous clouds over a dark horizon signaling an oncoming storm. Since the horizon is set very low, the sky seems virtually to overwhelm the little houses below. In spite of the print’s modest size, Ensor thus creates here a remarkable sense of the power of nature.
Edgar Degas
1834 – Paris – 1917

72.  *La Toilette (La Cuvette) – The Toilette (The Chamber Pot)*  ca. 1877–85

monotype on laid paper; 380 x 278 mm (14 x 11 inches)

not known to Janis

**WATERMARK**

shield with letters (?) surmounted by a crown

**PROVENANCE**

estate of the artist (Lugt 657);
Ambroise Vollard, Paris
Henri M. Petiet, Paris (Lugt 2021a)

**EXHIBITED**


This striking print belongs to the legendary group of “large black” monotypes Degas made in the late 1870s or early 1880s. This technique, to which Degas was introduced by Vicomte Ludovic Lepic, probably in the summer of 1876 (the dating of Degas’s monotypes still remains open to discussion; here we are following the most recent research but also mention previous suggestions for reference), allowed utmost freedom in the manipulation of an image on a metal plate before committing it to a sheet of paper. Degas’s own description of it is simple and straightforward: “dessins faits à l’encre grasse et imprimés” (drawings made with greasy ink and then printed). He developed such an enthusiasm for his printing experiments that the artist Marcellin Desboutin (1823–1902) wrote jokingly in a letter to Léontine De Nittis on July 4, 1876 that “Degas … is no longer a friend, a man, an artist! He’s a zinc or copper plate blackened with printer’s ink” (quoted in Degas, exhibition catalogue, Grand Palais, Paris/National Gallery of Art, Ottawa/Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 1988–89, p. 258). At the third Impressionist exhibition of 1877 he submitted no less than three separate sets of monotypes that, unfortunately, were not further specified in the catalogue.

In addition to the first experiments and some individual works, the artist’s monotypes fall into four main categories: the brothel scenes from 1877 onward (Janis nos. 61–118, there dated 1879–80); the illustrations for Ludovic Halévy’s *La Famille Cardinal* stories from ca. 1876–88 and thematically related works (Janis nos. 195ff.); the nudes in the dark-field manner from the late 1870s and early 1880s (Janis 119–168, there dated 1880–90); and, finally, the landscapes from the early 1890s (Janis nos. 263ff.).

The *scènes intimes*, showing one or more female nudes in a dark interior, are the most painterly and, in their abstracted abbreviations, formally the most advanced and enigmatic of these works.
Working in the dark-field manner, Degas used at least six different formats for these “black nudes”: The smallest measure ca. 280 x 310 mm, the larger ones ca. 280 x 380 mm; there were also two more narrowly proportioned, oblong plates measuring ca. 200 x 420 mm and 240 x 450 mm; finally, there were two even-larger plates of 550 x 680 mm and 420 x 580 mm, apparently used for monotypes that were always intended to be reworked in pastel. Our print belongs to the “normally” proportioned large group measuring ca. 280 x 380 mm. Only some of the nudes in these black monotypes retain a more traditional elegance—*Nude Woman Combing Her Hair* (Janis 156) is probably the most appealing example and was therefore, not surprisingly, used both as a chapter frontispiece and for the back-cover of the catalogue accompanying the recent, seminal Boston/Paris exhibition, *Degas and the Nude*. The women in these monotypes are, however, never individualized. None of them show distinctive facial features, and where they do, they are caricatured, or, perhaps most extremely in *Woman in a Bathtub* (Janis 119), even show “physical signs of mental deficiency … that Degas attributed to certain prostitutes” (Xavier Rey in X.R., Anne Roquebert, and George T.M. Shackelford, *Degas and the Nude*, exhibition catalogue, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston/Musée d’Orsay, Paris, 2011–12, p. 97). Early on critics therefore saw images like these as evidence of Degas’s aversion to women. Even such ardent defenders of the artist as the novelist Joris-Karl Huysmans spoke in the early 1880s “of the ‘attentive cruelty’ and ‘patient hatred’ that the [artist] evinced in works showing women. … From then on, Degas’s attitude regarding women would be seen as going well beyond the ordinary misogyny of an unequal society.” Xavier Rey, however, has put forward a more nuanced view: “Above all, Degas’s brutally frank approach to his models is more the result of naturalist principles … than of antipathy.” He quotes Octave Mirbeau, who explains of the artist’s dancers “that Degas rendered with ‘tenacity in observation and cruelty in execution, [their] forms, whether graceful or voluptuous.’” Rey therefore concludes that “Degas appears less as a torturer than as a pitiless interpreter of a torturing modern world” and that the artist’s “transcriptions of modernity in his work cannot be dissociated from his technical research into new methods of expression” (ibid., p. 103f.).

These prints were made mainly but, as more recent research suggests, by no means exclusively, for a private context. Four of them are even dedicated to Philippe Burty, Lepic, Michel Lévy, and a certain P. Rossana, their names scratched into the ink on the plates. Still, the artist’s reworking of the cognates demonstrates the extent to which he seems to differentiate between private experimentation and works meant for a wider public. It is noticeable, then, that in the reworked cognate of the aforementioned *Woman in a Bathtub*, the figure’s abnormally shaped ear and her sloping forehead have been “prettified,” effectively eliminating her distorted features. Yet while quite a few of Degas’s erotic prints were known and treasured by connoisseurs, the true extent of this corpus of work was not revealed until the sale of the prints from his estate in 1918.

Our monotype was included in this sale but it was not illustrated; its whereabouts remained unknown until very recently and it was thus not included in the checklist by Eugenia Janis that accompanied her pioneering *Degas Monotypes* exhibition catalogue of 1968. It was not exhibited until 2011–12 in the Boston/Paris show. The composition has all the boldness of Degas’s most explicit images, especially the small brothel scenes. This similarity has most recently been used to suggest a considerably earlier dating of the single nude monotypes. Janis had originally considered them as dating from 1880–1890, then moved them, on stylistic grounds, to as early as 1877 (Eugenia Parry Janis, “Degas and the ‘Master of Chiaroscuro’” in: *The Art Institute of Chicago: Museum Studies*, vol. 7, 1972, pp. 52–71). Michael Pantazzi has continued to re-examine the chronology and stresses the “typological connection between the single nudes and the brothel
scenes” and hence “a closer relationship than is generally noted.” While he concedes a “great stylistic difference that separates dark-field monotypes from the freely drawn light-field works,” he proposes that “the difference ultimately may be ascribed less to the distance in time that might separate them than to the technique employed” (cat. Paris/Ottawa/New York, p. 259). In fairness, though, it should be noted that early on Janis had already observed that: “The black and white impressions appear, formally and spatially, far more ‘advanced,’ in the sense that abstractness and ambiguity suggest, to our eyes, modernity. Without knowledge of their pastel-covered cognates, which are easily dated on stylistic grounds, one would be tempted to assign to these pure dark field manner monotypes a much later date than the 1880s” (Janis, p. xxiii).

An image depicting a woman passing water into a chamber pot leaves nothing (much) to the imagination. What remains, however, is an oft-noted ambiguity: Is this a genre scene in the tradition of Rembrandt’s 1631 etching of a Pissing Woman (Bartsch 191) or are we simply observing a nude model? If a washing basin and tubs were available as props in Degas’s studio, why not also a chamber pot? The frilly cap would point to a bourgeois interior—but why is the woman not wearing a nightgown? The choice of subject matter brings us back to Xavier Rey’s point about Degas’s “naturalist principles” and these are what seem to be at work in these extraordinary images. The figure here is no dainty beauty. With her huge thighs, beefy arms, droopy breasts, and large stomach this woman could not be more remote from Degas’s La Petite Danseuse de Quatorze Ans. Gone is the flush of youth. Degas shows us a woman of a certain expansiveness in the most natural of all acts—it is almost animalistic. She is ultimately presented in a manner that has been decidedly de-eroticized. In exposing the woman to his acute and precise observation he effectively, if not intentionally, shields her from the sexualized male gaze (thanks for this interpretation is due to my beloved wife, Catherine Bindman—AK).

The French journalist and art critic Hélène Parmelin describes a visit to Picasso in 1958 at his villa La Californie in Cannes with her husband, the painter Édouard Pignon, and how “Picasso showed us some monotypes by Degas he had just bought. Magnificent. This is a Degas we didn’t know. Not the Degas of the laundresses, or the drawings, or the dancers. A Degas we’ve never seen before” (quoted in Elizabeth Cowling’s chapter in: E.C. and Richard Kendall, Picasso Looks at Degas, exhibition catalogue, Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute, Williamstown/Museu Picasso, Barcelona, 2010–11, p. 211). Picasso scholars have often wondered how early the artist might have known Degas’s maison close monotypes, some even suggesting that they might have already influenced his masterwork on this subject, Les Demoiselles d’Avignon of 1907. We know definitely that Picasso did not own La Cuvette but Cowling concludes that “it was very likely through Vollard that the young Picasso discovered Degas’s brothel scenes” (ibid., p. 213)—the same Vollard who was the first owner of our print after the sale. Let us now fast forward half a century: Seven years after the privatissime viewing at La Californie, Picasso painted his large La Pisseuse of 1965 (Centre Pompidou, Paris), a work that has, in turn, been seen as an inspiration for the women in Willem de Kooning’s “Door Series” of 1964–65 (see Lauren Mahony, “Starting over in Springs,” in: John Elderfield, De Kooning: A Retrospective, exhibition catalogue, Museum of Modern Art, New York, 2011, p. 360). Ultimately, then, Degas’s monotype becomes a link in a pictorial tradition that starts with Rembrandt and is followed by the sujets libres of eighteenth-century pillow books, but needs the artistic daring of Degas as a catalyst to project it on to Picasso—a trajectory culminating in a series of paintings by De Kooning that count among the most controversial and celebrated artworks of the second half of the twentieth century.
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