

## INTRODUCTION

### CLOSE AND EXTENSIVE READING AMONG ARTISTS IN THE EARLY MODERN PERIOD

Heiko Damm, Michael Thimann, Claus Zittel

#### I. *The Artist as Reader: Outlines of Research*

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

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

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

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

---

<sup>1</sup> Damien Hirst in an interview with Jenny Schlenzka, in *Monopol: Magazin für Kunst und Leben* 5 (2009) (38–53) 43.

<sup>2</sup> The recent exhibitions *The Artist's Library* (Centre International d'art et du paysage, Île de Vassivière, 24.02–15.06.2008, curated by Carrie Pilto) and *Versions – Artist's Library* (Galerie für Zeitgenössische Kunst, Leipzig, 26.09.2008–04.01.2009, curated by Edina Nagy) present two typical examples.

and exulting in undermining intellectuality in art, the age-old legitimization of the *pictor doctus*. Of course we do not really know if Hirst actually did read a great number of books. The truth of his remark may have only little relevance for the study of his work. And indeed we would, in the case of an artist such as Damien Hirst, hardly think of reconstructing a history of reception by consulting illustrated art books, although, for the early modern period, this has long determined research on artists as readers. To this day, art-historical research – and specifically the iconological approach – primarily searches for books relevant to images, the erudite text behind the obscurely clever *invenzione*. Taking stock of book titles from artists' inventories, or reconstructing libraries that artists possibly had access to, promised enlightenment on complex iconographies and the work of the learned artist.<sup>3</sup> In contrast, the larger perspective of a history of knowledge and education focusing on artists as readers remains a desideratum for further study.<sup>4</sup>

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

<sup>3</sup> Klein R., "Die Bibliothek von Mirandola und das Giorgione zugeschriebene 'Concert champêtre'", *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 30 (1967) 199–206.

<sup>4</sup> On research of artists' libraries and artists as readers we find a pioneer in Białostocki J.: "Doctus artifex and the library of the artist in XVIth and XVIIth century", in Horodisch A. (ed.), *De arte et libris: Festschrift Erasmus 1934–1984* (Amsterdam: 1984) 11–22. An early attempt to canonize artists' knowledge was through the institution of a library in the Paris Academy, which was founded in 1648. On this topic see Müntz E., "La bibliothèque de l'ancienne académie royale de peinture et de sculpture (Bibliothèque de l'école nationale des beaux-arts) 1648–1793", *Mémoires de la société de l'histoire de Paris et de l'Île de France* 24 (1897) 33–50; Krause K., "Par les préceptes et par les exemples: Überlegungen zur Ausbildung der Maler im Paris des 17. Jahrhunderts", *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 69 (2006) 194–216 [with references to additional archival material]. Bredius A. (ed.), *Künstler-Inventare: Urkunden zur Geschichte der holländischen Kunst des XVIten, XVIIten und XVIIIten Jahrhunderts*, 8 vols. (The Hague: 1915–1922). An outstanding exception for a key study on artists as readers in a larger history-of-knowledge context is still: Duhem P., *Etudes sur Léonard de Vinci: Ceux qu'il a lus et ceux qui l'ont lu* ["Those he read and those who read him"], 3 vols. (Paris: 1906–1913). An important recent reconstruction of an artist's appropriation of literature is Golahny A., *Rembrandt's Reading: The Artist's Bookshelf of Ancient Poetry and History* (Amsterdam: 2003).



Fig. 1. Bookshelf in the studio of the painter Michael Triegel. Leipzig, 2010.

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

<sup>5</sup> See, on this topic, et al., Dempsey C., “Some Observations on the Education of Artists in Florence and Bologna During the Later Sixteenth Century”, *Art Bulletin* 62 (1980) 552–569; De Jongh E., “Over ambachtsman en kunstenaar: de status van de schilder in de 16de en de 17de eeuw”, *Utrecht Renaissance Studies* 2 (1983) 29–33; Levy E., “Ideal and Reality of the Learned Artist: The Schooling of Italian and Netherlandish Artists”, in Brown University (ed.), *Children of Mercury: The Education of Artists in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, exh. cat. Providence/RI (Providence/RI: 1984) 20–27; Fumaroli M., *L'école du silence: Le sentiment des images au XVII<sup>ème</sup> siècle* (Paris: 1994) 71–76; Vignau-Wilberg T., “‘Pictor doctus’: Drawing and the Theory of Art Around 1600”, in Fuciková E. (ed.), *Rudolf II and Prague: The Court and the City* (London et al.: 1997) 179–188; Klingsöhr-Leroy C., *Das Künstlerbildnis des Grand Siècle in Malerei und Graphik: Vom “Noble Peintre” zum “Pictor doctus”* (Munich: 2002); Maringer E., “Schönfeld als ‘Pictor doctus’: Bemerkungen zu seinem künstlerischen Selbstverständnis”, in Zeller U. – Waike M. – Kaulbach H.-M. (eds.), *Johann Heinrich Schönfeld: Welt der Götter, Heiligen und Heldenmythen* (Cologne: 2009) 86–113.



Fig. 2. Samuel van Hoogstraten, *Self Portrait as 'alter Apelles'*, 1649. Pen and brown ink, wash, 143 × 172 mm. Munich, Staatliche Graphische Sammlung.

Reading is apparently the greatest proof of refinement when viewed within the context of the social climb of the visual artist. Only through the cultivation of intellect could artists rise above being considered only artisans. Erudition was the means of imbuing their work with a quasi scholarly and philosophical dignity, and for elevating their status to that of the *poeta doctus* or *poeta eruditus*.<sup>6</sup> It is only as reader that the artist can participate in the exclusive culture of clerics, humanists, rulers and courtiers. But the question is not only whether the *pictor doctus* really existed or not. Rather, we must ask, how did it come about that such a figure was integrated into the general history-of-knowledge context of research on the early modern period. To answer this question it is imperative that a crossdisciplinary

<sup>6</sup> On the figure of the learned poet see Grimm G.E., *Literatur und Gelehrtentum in Deutschland: Untersuchungen zum Wandel ihres Verhältnisses vom Humanismus bis zur Frühaufklärung* (Tübingen: 1983).

comparison be undertaken of all prior rather sporadic studies on artists' reading – of not only books by natural scientists, philosophers, the clergy, legal scholars, but also by craftsmen and the uneducated – in order to outline what artists' reading specifically entails.<sup>7</sup> While the prestige of poets, rhetoricians, philosophers, and theologians was not debated, interestingly enough visual artists developed unique justification strategies by targeting the elevation of their profession from the ranks of an artisanal craft to the status of a liberal art. The process of their social climb was settled temporarily when the academies were founded – in 1563 the inauguration of the *Accademia del Disegno* in Florence took place and in 1593 Federico Zuccari reorganised the Roman *Accademia di San Luca*.

This was a sign that the *pictor doctus* was at least established in Italy as the prototype of the artist. It must be emphasized, however, that such a climb could only materialize concurrent to an increase in opportunities for acquiring knowledge. It was not until the 16th century that, with the invention of printing and a pronouncedly vernacular culture, attempts were made within the book market to conflate knowledge also for the visual-art discipline, to make it available to artists, and draw up rules for all artists to use as orientation through the medium of the book. Printing made the same texts freely available in different cities and countries so that art norms and specific 'artists' knowledge' – in the sense of a body of knowledge familiar to a majority of artists – became widespread, much more so than the face-to-face exchange of knowledge within the workshop situation. All in all, we can safely assume that there was an interaction between practical knowhow acquired as a student and knowledge acquired through independent study and reading (although presumably seldom done systematically). Book collections seemed to take on the function of a collective memory in an externalized form. While they alleviated private memory, they likewise restricted it, which was of more consequence for artists than, for example, theologians.<sup>8</sup> Indeed, the

---

<sup>7</sup> Historico-cultural research on reading practices in the early modern period mostly does not consider those of artists. See, e.g., Chartier R. – Cavallo G. (eds.), *Die Welt des Lesens: Von der Schriftrolle zum Bildschirm* (Frankfurt: 1999); Chartier R., *Lesewelten: Buch und Lektüre in der frühen Neuzeit* (Frankfurt: 1990); Messerli A. – Chartier R. (eds.), *Scripta volant, verba manent: Schriftkulturen in Europa zwischen 1500 und 1900* (Basel: 2007).

<sup>8</sup> See Neuber W., "Memoria", in Weimar K. (ed.), *Reallexikon der deutschen Literaturwissenschaft*. Revised version of the Reallexikon der deutschen Literaturgeschichte (Berlin-New York: 2000), vol. II: H – O, 562–566; id., "Mnemonic Imagery in the Early Modern Period: Visibility and Collective Memory", in Beecher D. – Williams G. (eds.), *Ars Reminiscendi: Mind and Memory in Renaissance Culture*, Publications of the Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies. Essays and Studies 19 (Toronto: 2009) 69–81.



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

## II. *Source Material*

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

<sup>9</sup> Grafton A., "Leon Battista Alberti: The Writer as Reader", in id., *Commerce with the Classics: Ancient Books and Renaissance Readers* (Michigan: 1997) 53–92.

<sup>10</sup> Ames-Lewis F., *The Intellectual Life of the Early Renaissance Artist* (New Haven: 2000).

<sup>11</sup> Heiberg J.L., "Beiträge zur Geschichte Georg Vallas und seiner Bibliothek", *Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* Beiheft XVI (1896) 2–6, 54–103; Kibre P., *The Library of Pico della Mirandola* (New York: 1936); Mugnai Carrara D., *La biblioteca di Nicolò Leonicensio* (Florence: 1991); Grafton, *Commerce with the Classics*; Danzi M., *La biblioteca del cardinal Pietro Bembo* (Geneva: 2005); Leu U.B. – Keller R. – Weidmann S., *Conrad Gessner's Private Library*, *History of Science and Medicine Library* 5 (Leiden-Boston: 2008); Nelles P., "Reading and Memory in the Universal Library: Conrad Gessner and the Renaissance Book", in Beecher D. – Williams G. (eds.), *Ars Reminiscendi: Mind and Memory in Renaissance Culture* (Toronto: 2009) 147–170.

<sup>12</sup> Important material on the habitus of reading and its cultural context can be found in: Schulze S. (ed.), *Leselust – Niederländische Malerei von Rembrandt bis Vermeer*, exh. cat. Frankfurt (Stuttgart: 1993); Hanebutt-Benz E.-M. (ed.), *Die Kunst des Lesens: Lesemöbel u. Leseverhalten vom Mittelalter bis zur Gegenwart*, exh. cat. Frankfurt am Main (Frankfurt: 1985) and Manguel A., *A History of Reading* (New York: 1996).

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

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

<sup>13</sup> Białostocki, "Doctus artifex" 11–22.

<sup>14</sup> Carl D., "Das Inventar der Werkstatt von Filippino Lippi aus dem Jahre 1504", *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz* 31 (1981) (373–391) 388–389, nos. 222–233 in doc. II. This inventory is particularly interesting because it is a valuable document for early modern printing. Without detailed comments, the list comprises twelve volumes that the artist stored in his *scrittoio*: Besides Livy (the only manuscript) and an Ovid written in the vernacular, he additionally owned a bible, Dante's works (*Commedia* and *Convivio*), Petrarch (*Canzoniere*) and Boccaccio (*Ninfale fiesolano* and probably also the *Decamerone*), as well as Poggio Bracciolini (probably the *Facezie*), a "libretto delle Sibille" (considered by Carl to be a treatise by Filippo Barbieri), a "libro da chompagnie" (the statues of a lay brotherhood), and "uno libro di geometria" as the only "textbook".

<sup>15</sup> Duhem, *Etudes*; Reti L., *The Library of Leonardo da Vinci* (Los Angeles: 1972).

<sup>16</sup> Boll W., "Albrecht Altdorfers Nachlaß", *Münchner Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst* N.F.13 (1938/39) 91–102.

<sup>17</sup> The inventory of El Greco's estate was drawn up by his son Jorge Manuel, see Davies D. (ed.), *El Greco*, exh. cat. New York-London (London: 2003) 40, 69–70 and *passim*.

<sup>18</sup> Caturla M.L., "Documentos en torno a Vincencio Carducho", *Arte Español* 19–20 (1968–69) (145–221) 205–209.

<sup>19</sup> Marx B., "Vom Künstlerhaus zur Kunstakademie: Giovanni Maria Nossen's Erbe in Dresden", in Marx B. – Rehberg K.-S. (eds.), *Sammeln als Institution: Von der fürstlichen Wunderkammer zum Mäzenatentum des Staates* (Munich-Berlin: 2006) (61–92) 73–74, 88–92.

<sup>20</sup> Harris J. – Orgel St. – Strong R., *The King's Arcadia: Inigo Jones and the Stuart Court*, exh. cat. Whitehall (London-Bradford: 1973) 63–67, 217–218.

<sup>21</sup> Cellauro L., "La biblioteca di un architetto del Rinascimento: la raccolta di libri di Giovanni Antonio Rusconi", *Arte Veneta* 58 (2001) 224–237.

<sup>22</sup> Hibbard H., *Carlo Maderno and Roman Architecture 1580–1630* (London: 1971) 98, 103–104.

Veri,<sup>23</sup> Durante Alberti,<sup>24</sup> Nicolas Poussin,<sup>25</sup> Diego Velázquez,<sup>26</sup> Francesco Borromini,<sup>27</sup> Alessandro Algardi,<sup>28</sup> Andrea Sacchi,<sup>29</sup> Carlo Maratta,<sup>30</sup> Domenico Guidi,<sup>31</sup> Pieter Saenredam,<sup>32</sup> Jürgen Ovens,<sup>33</sup> Johann Carl Loth,<sup>34</sup> Stefano Maria Legnani,<sup>35</sup> Pier Leone Ghezzi,<sup>36</sup> Matthäus Daniel Pöppelmann,<sup>37</sup> Bernardo Vittone, and Lambert Krahe.<sup>38</sup> In addition to a number of others. However, the reconstructions of libraries belonging to leading artists, such as Pietro da Cortona, Gianlorenzo Bernini or Peter Paul

<sup>23</sup> Sickel L., "Pietro Veri: Ein Florentiner Künstler in Diensten des Herzogs von Bracciano, Virginio Orsini", *Marburger Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft* 30 (2003) 183–209.

<sup>24</sup> Soergel Panofsky G., "An Artist's Library in Rome around 1600", in Fleming V. v. – Schütze S. (eds.), *Ars naturam adiuvans*. Festschrift für Matthias Winner zum 11. März 1996 (Mainz: 1996) 367–380.

<sup>25</sup> Sparti D.L., "La maison de Nicolas Poussin, via del Babuino, à Rome", in *Nicolas Poussin (1594–1665)*. Actes du colloque organisée au musée du Louvre par le Service culturel du 19 au 21 octobre 1994 (Paris: 1996) (45–78) 56–57.

<sup>26</sup> Sánchez Cantón F.J., "La librería de Velázquez", in *Homenaje ofrecido a Menéndez Pidal* (Madrid: 1925), vol. III, 379–406; Ruiz Pérez P., *De la pintura y las letras: La biblioteca de Velázquez*, 1599–1999, exh. cat. Sevilla (Sevilla: 1999); Aterido Á., "The Culture of Velázquez: Reading, Knowledge and Social Connections", in Portús J. (ed.), *Velázquez' Fables: Mythology and Sacred History in the Golden Age*, exh. cat. Madrid (Madrid: 2007) 72–93.

<sup>27</sup> Del Piazzo M. (ed.), *Ragguagli Borrominiani: Mostra documentaria*, exh. cat. Rome (Rome: 1980) 29–35, 162–179.

<sup>28</sup> The estate inventory, dated June 13 to 14, 1654, in Montagu J., *Alessandro Algardi* (New Haven-London: 1985), vol. I, 234.

<sup>29</sup> Sutherland Harris A., *Andrea Sacchi. Complete edition of the paintings with a critical catalogue* (Oxford: 1977) 123–127.

<sup>30</sup> Bershad D.L., "The Newly Discovered Testament of Carlo Maratti and His Wife", *Antologia di Belle Arti* 25–26 (1985) 65–89.

<sup>31</sup> Giometti C., *Uno studio e i suoi scultori: Gli inventari di Domenico Guidi e Vincenzo Felici* (Pisa: 2007) 83–90 and id., *Domenico Guidi 1625–1701: Uno scultore barocco di fama europea* (Rome: 2010) 112–113.

<sup>32</sup> Selm B. van, "De bibliotheek van Pieter Saenredam", *Kunstschrift Openbaar Kunstbesitz* 32 (1988) 14–19; Schwartz G. – Bok M.J., *Pieter Saenredam: The Painter and His Time* (Maarsse et al.: 1990) 181–187.

<sup>33</sup> Schmidt H., *Das Nachlaß-Inventar des Malers Jürgen Ovens*, Quellensammlung der Gesellschaft für Schleswig-Holsteinische Geschichte 7 (Leipzig: 1913). See also below, 60–63.

<sup>34</sup> Lux M., "L'inventario di Johann Carl Loth", *Arte Veneta* 54 (1999) 146–164, on the library see 150–154.

<sup>35</sup> Dell'Olmo M., *Stefano Maria Legnani, "Il Legnanino"* (Ozzano Emilia: 1998) 265–266. On this topic see Huub van der Linden's chapter in this volume.

<sup>36</sup> Dorati da Empoli M.C., *Pier Leone Ghezzi: Un protagonista del Settecento romano* (Rome: 2008) 401–487. See also below, 30–42.

<sup>37</sup> Bächler H., "Die Bücher aus dem Nachlaß Matthäus Daniel Pöppelmanns: Ein Beitrag zu seinem Weltbild", in Milde K. et al. (eds.), *Matthäus Daniel Pöppelmann 1662–1736 und die Architektur der Zeit Augusts des Starken* (Dresden: 1990) 40–50.

<sup>38</sup> Portoghesi P., *Bernardo Vittone: Un architetto tra Illuminismo e Rococó* (Rome: 1966) 248–251; Bibliothek Lambert Krahe, *Kunstliteratur des Barock und des Klassizismus*, exh. cat. Düsseldorf (Düsseldorf: 1990).



Rubens, were based on sources and information that cannot, ultimately, be verified as pertinent to the cases in question.<sup>39</sup>

The situation grows even more complicated if we also regard manuscripts. It is well known that especially transcriptions – and a great many of them too – of Leonardo's treatise on painting were passed on from one artist to another, without them actually owning a copy themselves. Such manuscripts were, of course, not included in inventories. It is generally more difficult to find information on artists' archives than what we are used to finding on scholars' archives.<sup>40</sup> Because more sources have survived from the 18th and 19th century than previous, the situation is, overall, more encouraging. Also in this time frame there was an increase in the heuristic value of library inventories for describing artists' intellectual ambitions. Worth mentioning in this context is the well-documented and therefore rare case of the Danish painter Nicolai Abildgaard (1743–1809). Abildgaard learnt several languages on his own in order to read his books, and he even evacuated his library by himself when Copenhagen was under fire during an attack by the British fleet in 1801.

As Nelson threatened to cannonade the city I evacuated my books, so my room remained empty for six days. During this time I would walk around in it and, again and again, go to pull out a book. I felt as if I had been deserted when I only found the empty shelves. I cannot begin to describe how this filled me with melancholy, so I swore to myself that I would never sell my books.<sup>41</sup>

<sup>39</sup> A book list of about 200 volumes believed to be for Cortona's library is printed in Noehles K., *La chiesa di SS. Luca e Martina* (Rome: 1970) 365–367, doc. 166. See for comments and doubts in regard to attribution: Spati D. L., *La casa di Pietro da Cortona: Architettura, accademia, atelier e officina* (Rome: 1997) 89–103. In Bernini's case, the estate inventory of the engineer, architect, and sculptor Luigi Bernini was published and very probably also includes Gian Lorenzo's books, as he died only shortly before his brother; see McPhee S., "Bernini's Books", *Burlington Magazine* 142 (2000) 442–448. See also Martin F., "Berninis Lektüre oder: Wissen adelt", in Hoffmann A. – Martin F. – Wolf G. (eds.), *BücherGänge: Miszellen zu Buchkunst, Leselust und Bibliotheksgeschichte* (Heidelberg: 2006) 117–125. In the case of Rubens an ideal reconstruction of his library was undertaken that also incorporates the groundwork of earlier studies; see Arents P., *De Bibliotheek van Pieter Pauwel Rubens. Een reconstructie*, De gulden passer 78/79 (Antwerp: 2001); Baudouin F., "Rubens and his books", in De Smet R., *Les humanistes et leur bibliothèque. Actes du colloque international, Bruxelles, 26–28 août 1999 / Université Libre de Bruxelles, Travaux de l'Institut pour l'Etude de la Renaissance et de l'Humanisme* 13 (Leuven: 2002) 231–246.

<sup>40</sup> Hunter M. (ed.), *Archives of the Scientific Revolution: the Formation and Exchange of Ideas in 17th-century Europe* (Woodbridge: 1998).

<sup>41</sup> Translated into English from the German in Lederballe T., "Der Künstler in seiner Bibliothek: 1778 bis 1800", in Howoldt J.E. – Gaßner H. (eds.), *Nicolai Abildgaard: Der Lehrer von Friedrich und Runge*, exh. cat. Hamburg (Bremen-Hamburg: 2009) (77–83) 78. For

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

### III. *The Artists' Library as Fact and Metaphor*

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

---

essential reading on Abildgaard's library and how he saw himself as a *pictor doctus* see Kragelund P., *Abildgaard. Kunstneren mellem oprørerne* (Copenhagen: 1999) 9–120.

<sup>42</sup> On this sheet see *Sergel*, exh. cat. Stockholm (Stockholm: 1990) 141, no. 135, and Josephson R., *Sergels Fantasi*, 2 vols. (Stockholm: 1956).

<sup>43</sup> In this context see Kragelund P., "Abildgaard, Füssli and the first Shakespeare painting outside Britain", *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 73 (2010) 237–254.



Fig. 3. Johan Tobias Sergel, "*La société journalière*": *Abildgaard at the Fireplace, Sergel at the Drawing Board*, 1797. Pen and brown ink, wash, 225 × 358 mm. Malmö, Malmö Museum.

tivised by comparing them with factual knowledge gained through finds in archives. On the other, it is essential that we compare such archival facts with book lists and a recommended canon of literature for artists, such as is presented in the treatises of theoreticians like Giovanni Battista Armenini, Giovanni Paolo Lomazzo, Luigi Scaramuccia, Willem Goeree, Gerard de Lairese or Roger de Piles.

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

<sup>44</sup> See Bialostocki, "Doctus artifex" 20.

<sup>45</sup> Lomazzo Gian Paolo, *Idea del tempio della pittura* (Milan, Paolo Gottardo Pontio:1590) 36–38. Cf. Bialostocki, "Doctus artifex" 20.

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

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

---

<sup>46</sup> [Roger de Piles in] Dufresnoy Charles-Alphonse, *L’Art de Peinture... Traduit en François, Enrichy de Remarques, & augmenté d’un Dialogue sur les Coloris* (Paris, Nicolas Langlois: 1673) 127–129. In his annotations De Piles emphasized that: ‘Par les Lettres, ce n’est pas tant les Langues Grecque et Latine que l’on entend, que la lecture des bons Auteurs et l’intelligence des choses qui y sont traitées: ainsi la plupart des bons livres étant traduits, il n’y a pas un Peintre qui ne puisse prétendre en quelque façon aux Belles Lettres.’

<sup>47</sup> Scaramuccia Luigi, *Le finezze de’ pennelli italiani* (Pavia, Andrea Magri: 1674) 195–196, 217–219. Cf. Białostocki, “Doctus artifex” 20.

<sup>48</sup> Richardson Jonathan, *An Essay on the Theory of Painting* (London, William Bowyer: 1715) 403, cf. 202, 217–218. For Gerard de Lairese’s recommendations, see Christian Tico Seifert’s contribution to this volume, 187–188.

## O SIANO RICORDI.

125

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

**N**ON dourebbe per mio credere applicarsi niuno à questa Professione, che non fosse versato, almeno in qualche parte, nelle buone Lettere, poiche mai potrà esprimere sù le Tele, ne sù le Carte quello che ben non si possiede: ne posseder si puote, se con ogni accuratezza non si studia, e non si essercita la memoria sopra de Libri; In questa forma più che in alcun'altra si potrà imprimere ciò che voglia dire Historia, ò fauoleggiamento Poetico, altrimenti se tù vuoi restringerti à domandar altrui come vadano le facenda, qualunque volta d'vuopo te ne faccia, non bene starassi, poiche oltre il dimenticarti per ogni lieue accidente di quelle specie che poc'anzi vdisti, molto disdiceuole riesce ad vn Pittore che sia di qualche portata, l'andare ad ogn'ora mendicando da altri quello, che far da te stesso si potrebbe con vn poco d'applicatione.

*Quali i Libri più necessarj per gl'eleuati Pittori.*

**S**E poi tù bramassi sapere di quai Libri potresti accompagnarti, sappi, che à mio credere, trà li molti, che frutto recar ti potrebbero, sono li seguenti.

*Tito Livio.*

*Cornelio Tacito.*

*Giusto Lipsio, e simili.*

*Historie  
del Mon-  
do.*

*Il Vigliega de Patriarchi, e Profeti.*

*Giosseffo Historico.*

*Scrittura Sacra, ed'altri tali.*

*Historie  
Sacre.*

*Virgilio.*

*Ouidio.*

*Tasso.*

*Aristote.*

*Marini, ed'altri Poeti Classici.*

*Poesie  
diuerse.*

Bb 2

Moltissi.

Fig. 4. Luigi Scaramuccia, *Le finzze de' pennelli italiani* (Pavia: 1674), p. 195.



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

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

---

<sup>49</sup> 'De Boeken welke een weet-gierig Konstenaar behoorde te doorsnuffelen, bestaan voornamelijk in Vier onderscheidene soorten: namentlijk in verhaal en geheug-schriften, soo van Heilige, als Heidense en Weereldse Historien, die van de Grieken, Romeinen en andere Volken gewag maken. Ten tweeden, in verdichte en opgepronkte vertellingen, soo van Poëten als Philosophen, en diergelijke. Ten derden in die van de aaloude zeden, gebruiken en konsten der oude Volken spreken. En ten vierden, in alle goede Autheuren die van eenige noodige konst, of geagte wetenschap geschreven hebben. Waarom het ook seer voordeel is, in eenige vreemde Taal, als Latijn, Frans en Italiaans ervaren te wesen, om beter eenige Schrijvers, die noch niet in onse Moedersprak overgeset zijn, te kunnen verstaan. Doch hier zijn onse tijden gelukkiger, danze wel eertijds waren.' Goeree Willem, *Inleyding tot de praktyk er algemeene schilderkonst...* (Amsterdam: 1697) 41–42.

<sup>50</sup> Goeree, *Inleyding* 43: '... also moet eenen Jong Schilder van de beginner aan, door gedurige oeffeningen van Lesen, Teikenen, Spekuleeren, Kopiëren, ondervragen, praktiseren en uytvorssen, sijn gemoed met wijsheid zoeken te vervullen; op dat hy namaals uy die opgeleide schatten, eens heerlijke dingen aan de Wereld sou kunnen ten toon stellen.'



Fig. 5. Edwaert Collier, *Vanitas Still Life with books by Flavius Josephus and Guillaume du Bartas*, c. 1664, Leiden, Stedelijk Museum De Lakenhal.

translations.<sup>51</sup> We know from Gian Lorenzo Bernini that, during his stay in Paris, he had someone read this clearly structured and easy-to-read book out loud to him daily, and that he warmly recommended it to his attaché Fréart de Chantelou.<sup>52</sup>

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

<sup>51</sup> Barbieri E., "Tradition and Change in the Spiritual Literature of the Cinquecento", in Fragnito G. (ed.), *Church, Censorship and Culture in Early Modern Italy* (Cambridge/Mass.: 2003) (111–133) 112–113.

<sup>52</sup> Chantelou P., *Journal de voyage du Cavalier Bernin en France*, ed. Stanić M. (Paris: 2000) 134: 'C'était, m'a-t-il dit, le livre de saint Ignace.' On the pioneering role played by the Jesuits in popularizing the *Imitatio Christi* see O'Malley J.W., *Die ersten Jesuiten* (Würzburg: 1995) 312–313.

In order to analyse such phenomena, research on practices in borrowing books must also be undertaken. It can well be assumed that artists, as studies have verified for humanists,<sup>53</sup> were generous in lending their books to one another or even allowing others access to their libraries.<sup>54</sup> It goes without saying that the advantages of research on the reading habits of artists are great. We need only parenthetically call to mind the rich fund of knowledge that we have at our disposal through research on library history and can draw on in art and social history in the Baroque period – documented in Irene Baldriga's study of the Giustiniani brothers' library, Sebastian Schütze's of the Barberini library, or Victoria von Flemming's of Scipione Borghese's.<sup>55</sup> Similar investigations have been undertaken on Vincenzo Borghini, the scholar who advised Giorgio Vasari – as well as the artists of the Florentine Accademia del Disegno – on iconography and drafted iconographic programmes for their paintings.<sup>56</sup> We also know of

<sup>53</sup> Grafton, *Commerce* 103.

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

<sup>55</sup> On this topic see the studies by Baldriga I., "La personalità di Vincenzo Giustiniani nello specchio della sua biblioteca", in Danesi Squarzina S. (ed.), *Caravaggio e i Giustiniani: Toccar con mano una collezione del Seicento*, exh. cat. Rome-Berlin (Milan: 2001) 73–80; Schütze S., "La biblioteca del cardinale Maffeo Barberini: Prolegomena per una biografia culturale ed intellettuale del Papa Poeta", in Mochi Onori L. – Schütze S. – Solinas F. (eds.), *I Barberini e la cultura europea del Seicento*, Kongressakten Istituto Italiano per gli Studi Filosofici/Bibliotheca Hertziana, Max Planck-Institut für Kunstgeschichte (Rome: 2007) 36–46; Schütze S., *Kardinal Maffeo Barberini (später Papst Urban VIII.) und die Entstehung des römischen Hochbarock*, Römische Forschungen der Bibliotheca Hertziana 32 (Munich: 2007) 17–26; Flemming V. v., "Ozio con dignità? Die Villenbibliothek von Kardinal Scipione Borghese", *Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte* 85 (1990) 182–224; Ridolfi R., "La biblioteca del cardinale Niccolò Ridolfi (1501–1550). Nuovo contributo di notizie e di documenti", *La Bibliofilia* 31 (1929) 173–193; Jackson D.F., "A first inventory of the library of Cardinal Niccolò Ridolfi", *Manuscripta* 45/46 (2001/2002) 49–77.

<sup>56</sup> Borghini contributed to and was editor for the second, revised edition of Vasari's *Vite*. See Belloni G. – Drusi R. (eds.), *Vincenzio Borghini: Filologia e invenzione nella Firenze di Cosimo I*, exh. cat. Florence (Florence: 2002) 383–392; Belloni G., "Notizia di un nuovo

Giovan Pietro Bellori, antiquarian and writer on art, that he was in possession of a private collection of books.<sup>57</sup> With people such as Bellori we are confronted with libraries of persons who, as patrons, collectors, advisers, and theoretists, were at least in part on friendly terms with artists. With a measure of caution, insights into their book collections potentially lead to conclusions about the intellectual motivations and backgrounds of patrons, or elucidate on the cultural knowledge context of an epoch, or describe the microhistory of an elite intellectual culture such as that of a Roman cardinal's household and entourage. But it is out of the question that we can ultimately conclude that artists who had access to such libraries automatically absorbed the whole intellectual cosmos surrounding the owners thereof.

Focusing on the specific demands of artists, Tom Holert presents in his study on artistic competence in 18th and early 19th century France an epistemologically based examination of artists' knowledge (Künstlerwissen), investigating which books they owned, what and how they read, as well as their academic education and their practical training as the inseparable entities in building the foundations for artistic competence. Because of the fact that Holert takes his examples from Salon art – primarily discussing Anne-Louis Girodet's *Deluge* from 1806 as a planned model painting for the demonstration of artistic knowledge – it is difficult to draw conclusions from the study that are relevant for early modern times, although in a few cases there are obvious reasons to do so.<sup>58</sup> For example, Holert shows us how traditional fields of competence specifically adapted to the needs of the artist were very tightly interlaced, such as anatomy, book and practical knowledge, art-historical pictorial conventions and further visual information. It was the aggregate of this knowledge that

---

documento per la biblioteca del Borghini [...]”, in Ghidetti E. – Turchi R. (eds.), *Il filo della ragione: Studi e testimonianze per Sergio Romagnoli* (Venice: 1999) 181–207; id., “Agosto–Settembre 1580: Libri per S. Lorenzo dalla biblioteca del Borghini”, in Barbarisi G. (ed.), *Studi di letteratura e lingua italiana in onore di Giuseppe Velli* (Milan: 2000) (479–510) 482–488.

<sup>57</sup> Romani V., “Le biblioteche di Giovan Pietro Bellori”, *Nuovi Annali della Scuola speciale per archivisti e bibliotecari* XII (1998) 165–189 and Perini G., “La biblioteca di Bellori: Saggio sulla struttura intellettuale e culturale di un erudito del Seicento”, in De Lachenal L. – Borea E. (eds.), *L'idea del bello: Viaggio per Roma nel Seicento con Giovan Pietro Bellori*, exh. cat. Rome (Rome: 2000), vol. II, 673–685. On the library of Bellori's English contemporary John Evelyn that, according to an inventory from 1687, comprised over 4566 volumes and containing works by Alberti, Leonardo, Vasari, Dürer, Sandrart and Junius, see Wiemers M., *Der “Gentleman” und die Kunst: Studien zum Kunsturteil des englischen Publikums in Tagebuchaufzeichnungen des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Hildesheim et al.: 1986) 223.

<sup>58</sup> Holert T., *Künstlerwissen: Studien zur Semantik künstlerischer Kompetenz im Frankreich des 18. und frühen 19. Jahrhunderts* (Munich: 1997) 23–125.



Fig. 6. Constantijn Verhout, *Man drawing an anatomy after a Vesal illustration*, ca. 1660. Caen, Musée des Beaux-Arts.

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

#### IV. Artists' Libraries?

In the hyperthetical reconstruction of artists' libraries we must also reflect on the term "library". It is tempting to describe a coherent and unchanging



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

Inventories mention 'books' significantly more often than 'libraries' owned by artists. It must not be forgotten, however, that the term 'library' not only comprises ownership of a considerable number of books but also a place reserved for keeping them and study. In the early modern period 'Bibliotheca' could designate an actually existing collection of books as well as be the metaphor for quite a number of forms of ordering knowledge.<sup>59</sup> The library was not just the total sum of written heritage, the locus of memory, and a representation of respective knowledge cultures. In fact, it could itself become an icon of knowledge.<sup>60</sup> It effectively became the location in which knowledge was stored by a compilation of books, structured and ordered in some way, and was presented in the light of a universal science. The order of a library could, like that of a *Kunstammer*, mirror order in nature, or – if this order was considered lost – reestablish it.<sup>61</sup> But a single book could also accomplish the same thing: an encyclopaedia could hold the entire knowledge of a whole library.<sup>62</sup> The encyclopaedia

---

<sup>59</sup> Surprisingly, the term 'library' does not have an entry of its own in either the *Historischen Wörterbuch der Philosophie* or the *Wörterbuch der philosophischen Metaphern*. In the latter it is only mentioned – in the entry "Lesen" (Reading) by Olaf Breidbach in Konersmann R. (ed.), *Wörterbuch der philosophischen Metaphern* (Darmstadt: 2007) (195–207) 205–206.

<sup>60</sup> Breidbach, "Lesen" 205.

<sup>61</sup> Cf. Leinkauf T., "Scientia universalis, memoria und status corruptionis: Überlegungen zu philosophischen und theologischen Implikationen der Universalwissenschaft sowie zum Verhältnis von Universalwissenschaft und Theorien des Gedächtnisses", in Berns J.J. – Neuber W. (eds.), *Ars memorativa: Zur kulturgeschichtlichen Bedeutung der Gedächtniskunst 1400–1750* (Tübingen: 1993) 1–34.

<sup>62</sup> For the most recent literature on the different types of encyclopaedias in the early modern period see Schneider U.J. (ed.), *Seine Welt wissen: Enzyklopädien in der Frühen Neuzeit*, exh. cat. Leipzig (Darmstadt: 2006). Standard reading for the history of concepts, genre and science in regard to encyclopaedias see: Henningsen J., "Enzyklopädie: Zur Sprach- und Bedeutungsgeschichte eines pädagogischen Begriffs", *Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte* 10 (1966) 271–362; Dierse U., *Enzyklopädie: Zur Geschichte eines philosophischen und wissenschaftstheoretischen Begriffs* (Bonn: 1977); Schmidt-Biggemann W., *Topica Universalis: Eine Modellgeschichte humanistischer und barocker Wissenschaft* (Hamburg: 1983); Eybl F.M. – Harms W. – Krummacher H.-H. – Welzig W. (eds.), *Enzyklopädien der*

could present knowledge order itself by exhibiting methodical strategies for finding information, or it could – as a special subject encyclopaedia – be a storehouse for specialist knowledge (such as 16th-century herbal books or Conrad Gesner's books on zoology), or take stock of the entire knowledge of an epoch.<sup>63</sup> Correspondingly encyclopaedias were often metaphorically termed 'Bibliothecae'. Early modern parlance already differentiated between 'Bibliotheca universalis' and 'Bibliotheca selecta', between different models that stipulated what knowledge was to be collected, how it was to be ordered, and where it was to be kept – as well as whether its scope was to be expanded or restricted.<sup>64</sup> Account must be taken of the fact that we can only inadequately ascertain how – in the context of encyclopaedic knowledge orders – scholarly theoretization of the universal library was linked to individual practises of acquiring knowledge by reading books.

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

---

*frühen Neuzeit: Beiträge zu ihrer Erforschung* (Tübingen: 1995); Schaer R. (ed.), *Tous les savoirs du monde: Encyclopédies et bibliothèques de Sumer au XXI<sup>e</sup> siècle*, exh. cat. Paris (Paris: 1996); Schierbaum M. (ed.), *Enzyklopädistik 1550–1650: Typen und Transformationen von Wissensspeichern und Medialisierungen des Wissens*, Pluralisierung und Autorität 18 (Berlin-Muenster: 2009). On the visualization of encyclopaedic models see: Pfisterer U., "Weisen der Welterzeugung: Jacopo Zucchis römischer Götterhimmel als enzyklopädisches Gedächtnistheater", in Büttner F. – Friedrich M. – Zedelmaier H. (eds.), *Sammeln, Ordnen, Veranschaulichen: Zur Wissenskompilatorik in der Frühen Neuzeit* (Muenster: 2003) 325–361. On the relation between universal science and memory see: Leinkauf, "Scientia universalis, memoria und status corruptionis" 1–34. Id., "Systema mnemonicum und circulus encyclopaediae: Johann Heinrich Alsted's Versuch einer Fundierung des universalen Wissens in der ars memorativa", in Berns J.J. – Neuber W. (eds.), *Seelenmaschinen* (Vienna: 2000) 279–307.

<sup>63</sup> Gessner Conrad, *Bibliotheca universalis sive catalogus omnium scriptorum locupletissimus in tribus linguis Latina, Graeca et Hebraica: extantium & non extantium, veterum & recentiorum* (Zurich, Christopher Froschauer: 1545), cf. Müller J.-D., "Wissen ohne Subjekt? Zu den Ausgaben von Gesners 'Bibliotheca universalis' im 16. Jahrhundert", in id., *Mediävistische Kulturwissenschaft: Ausgewählte Studien* (Berlin-New York: 2010) 267–284.

<sup>64</sup> See Zedelmaier H., *Bibliotheca universalis und Bibliotheca selecta: Das Problem der Ordnung des gelehrten Wissens in der frühen Neuzeit*, Beihefte zum Archiv für Kulturgeschichte 33 (Cologne-Weimar-Vienna: 1992).

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



Fig. 7. [COL. PL. 1] Simon Luttichuys, *Vanitas Still Life*, c. 1645. Gdańsk, Muzeum Narodowe.

#### V. *Bibliotheca selecta: The Case of Joseph Werner*

We are confronted with a special case of seemingly reified artists' readings in their designs for series of pictures based on the subject matter of certain

books or illustrations for publications and frontispieces. Here too we find an abundance of possible reading forms. One option was that the client or author stipulated exactly what was to be done and the picture was drawn entirely without the artist reading the book whose subject matter they were to illustrate. Another possibility was that artists literally vied with the book and studied it very closely.<sup>65</sup> And thirdly, it was sometimes the case that a series of illustrations actually implicitly criticized their literary model and are hence documents of a subversive reading within pictorial inventions that explore independent discursive avenues.<sup>66</sup> But there are still examples for palpable and analysable text-and-image relationships that allow conclusions on the impact of reading on artists.

With the Bernese painter Joseph Werner (1637–1711) we are dealing with another kind of case study. Werner pursued his career in a number of European urban centres and could easily count as the prototype of a 17th-century *pictor doctus*. Werner was fluent in a number of languages, which was highly exceptional for painters in the early modern period. His artistic pursuits reveal a penchant for intellectually complex and cryptic pictorial allegories in his miniatures. Werner initially worked in Rome where he presumably studied art under Pietro da Cortona and Carlo Maratta. From thence he then went to the court at Versailles where he was engaged as a miniature painter. Later he was also in Vienna, Bern, Basel, Augsburg and finally Berlin. There he was the founding director of the academy in 1696. A remarkable self-portrait of the 25-year-old painter has survived that is not only a self-reflection of the artist on his occupation as a painter of miniatures but also on the knowledge derived from books as an intellectual theme within a theme [fig. 8].<sup>67</sup>

<sup>65</sup> See Schulze-Altcappenberg H.-Th. (ed.), *Sandro Botticelli: Der Bilderzyklus zu Dantes Göttlicher Komödie*, exh. cat. Berlin (Ostfildern-Ruit: 2000).

<sup>66</sup> See Enenkel K.A.E., "Der Petrarca des Petrarca-Meisters: Zum Text-Bild-Verhältnis in illustrierten *De-Remediis*-Ausgaben", in id. – Papy J. (eds.), *Petrarch and his Readers in the Renaissance*, Intersections. Yearbook for Early Modern Studies 6 (Leiden-Boston: 2006) 91–169. Id. – Papy, "Towards a New Approach of Petrarch's Reception in the Renaissance – the 'Independent Reader'", in Enenkel – Papy, *Petrarch and his Readers* 1–10; Schmidt P., "Literat und 'selbgewachsner Moler': Jörg Wickram und der illustrierte Roman der frühen Neuzeit", in Guthmüller B. – Hamm B. – Tönnemann A. (eds.), *Künstler und Literat: Schrift- und Buchkultur in der europäischen Renaissance*, Wolfenbütteler Abhandlungen zur Renaissanceforschung 24 (Wiesbaden: 2006) 143–194.

<sup>67</sup> London, Victoria and Albert Museum, inv. no. P. 168–1931; Gouache on vellum on wood, 22 × 15,5 cm. On the miniature see Glaesemer J., *Joseph Werner 1637–1710* (Zurich-Munich: 1974) 149, cat. no. 66; Bättschmann O., "Gelehrte Maler in Bern: Joseph Werner (1637–1710) und Wilhelm Stettler (1643–1708)", in Herzog G. – Ryter E. – Strübin Rindisbacher J. (eds.), *Im Schatten des Goldenen Zeitalters: Künstler und Auftraggeber im bernischen*





Fig. 8. [COL. PL. 2] Joseph Werner, *Self-portrait*, 1662. Gouache on vellum. London, Victoria & Albert Museum.

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

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

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

17. *Jahrhundert* (Bern: 1995), vol. II, 165–200; Thimann M., "Ein lieblicher Betrug der Augen: Die deutsche Malerei zwischen 1600 und 1750", in Büttner F. – Von Engelberg M. et al. (eds.), *Barock und Rokoko*, Geschichte der Bildenden Kunst in Deutschland 5 (Munich-Berlin-London-New York: 2008) 538–539.

<sup>68</sup> Quoted after Glaesemer, *Joseph Werner* 86.

<sup>69</sup> Parodi's passion for collecting rare books consumed his earnings and distracted him from his main profession: 'Amante Domenico delle lettere, e delle Scienze, avea speso in libri di molto prezzo quanto gli era riuscito di guadagnare: ed aveasi formato una libreria ricca di settecento, e più, rari volume; intorno a' quali spendeva la maggior parte del tempo, togliendolo alla sua Professione, senza riflettere al discapito, che per più capi gliene veniva. . . .'. Ratti Carlo Giuseppe, *Delle vite de' pittori, scultori ed architetti genovesi*. . . (Genoa: 1797), vol. II, 121. In particular, his experiments in making gold inspired by reading led to his early death. In criticizing the artist's waywardness in his studies and fascination with alchemy in view of its dangers to his health, this passage stands in the

in the 17th century Rubens presumably possessed around 500, Saenredam 470, Borromini 459, and Domenico Guidi 375 books. In such cases we can safely speak of proper collections. A number of inventories list about 250 titles (Pietro Veri 260, Pietro da Cortona 222, Vincente Carducho at least 226); others a few less (Durante Alberti and Carl Loth around 100, El Greco 130, Giovanni Antonio Rusconi 146, Velázquez 154, Bernini 169). In contrast, 54 books sufficed Andrea Sacchi, who was generally regarded as an erudite artist, and there were only 19 books in the household of Nicolas Poussin, who was undeniably ambitious on a theoretical level and had earned the status of a 'philosopher' among his contemporaries. In comparison: The library of a 15th-century Renaissance philosopher such as that of Pico della Mirandola topped more than 1100 books, and the 17th-century humanist scholar Nicolas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc (1580–1637), comparable to Pico in his ambitions, accrued 5402 volumes in his library.<sup>70</sup>

It is hardly conceivable that the 15 volumes in Werner's possession are in some way representative for the painter's power of intellect. Indeed, the assortment of books in no way pretends to be a consistent collection. Instead, it comprises the minimal stock of manuals required by an artist as well as the so-called world literature such as Ovid, Virgil, Homer, Ariosto and Tasso – and these not in the original language but in translation.<sup>71</sup> The books relevant to the actual discipline of the artist were Ripa's *Iconologia* and Cartari's *Imagini degli Dei*. After 1600 they were, so to speak, standard literature in each of the artists' libraries for which we have surviving documents of the holdings. This suggests that Stettler's short but exact list may be a compilation of 'useful' books as a guideline we can follow (and this definitely included the recreational reading of belletristic literature), comparable to the above-mentioned reading recommendations of relevant treatises. The confrontation of the description of the books Werner owned with his evident intellectual powers and aspirations gives a very conventional picture of the artist. However, we cannot

---

tradition of moralising examples in artists' biographies. Here we are reminded of Vasari's Vita of Parmigianino. Even if Ratti's comments have a topical structure, the information about Parodi's exceptional collection of books cannot be entirely fictional.

<sup>70</sup> Kibre, *The Library of Pico della Mirandola*; Grafton A., "Giovanni Pico della Mirandola: Trials and Triumphs of an Omnivore", in id., *Commerce with the Classics* (93–134) 102. Arzano S. – Georgelin Y., *Les astronomes érudits en Provence: Peiresc et Gassendi*, see: [http://lesamisdepeiresc.fr/bibliotheque/conference\\_arzano.pdf](http://lesamisdepeiresc.fr/bibliotheque/conference_arzano.pdf).

<sup>71</sup> Cf. the auction catalogue that was printed in 1667 in Haarlem of Pieter Saenredam's extensive library in Schwartz – Bok, *Pieter Saenredam* 184: 'The most complete category in the sale were the translations from Greek and Latin'.

satisfactorily answer the question of whether Stettler, by restricting the list to a few prominent authors, wished to articulate the very elevated aesthetic ambitions of the artist or was merely pointing out the epigonal nature of the collection. We can find a similar case in regard to the surviving documents on Werner's contemporary Joachim von Sandrart, who, in his *Teutsche Academie der Bau-, Bild- und Mahlerey-Künste* (Nuremberg 1675–1680), left ample evidence of his reading habits and efforts as a compiler of knowledge.<sup>72</sup> However, the fragmentary nature of records on the volumes in Sandrart's library documented his encyclopaedic interest only very inadequately.<sup>73</sup>

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

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

<sup>72</sup> Cf. Thimann M., *Gedächtnis und Bild-Kunst: Die Ordnung des Künstlerwissens in Joachim von Sandrarts Teutscher Academie*, Rombach Wissenschaften. Reihe Quellen zur Kunst 28 (Freiburg im Breisgau: 2007) 43–47.

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

<sup>74</sup> See Zedelmaier, *Bibliotheca universalis* 6.

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

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

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

---

<sup>75</sup> Heraclitus, "Fragment B 40", see Heraclitus, *The Complete Philosophical Fragments*, trans. William Harris, 6 (fragment 40), see: <http://community.middlebury.edu/~harris/Philosophy/Heraclitus.html>.

<sup>76</sup> In a larger context, such a study was undertaken for the holdings of Roman private libraries, see Ago R., "Collezioni di quadri e collezioni di libri a Roma tra XVI e XVIII secolo", *Quaderni storici* 37 (2002) 379–403.



instead start conversely with viewing the picture. On doing this we should tackle the problems that confront us and the questions left open, targeting possible literary sources and possible image-text relationships: From the image to the library, to the manuscript, to the stock of knowledge of the epoch, and back again. Thus not the catalogues listing the stocks of books that were actually at hand are decisive for determining what artists read, but instead the hints we find that point to possible or probable reading on the part of the artist based on the interpretation of pictures. Analogous to developments in literary studies that advanced from source-influence studies to an intertextual approach, we could go a step further and substitute the problematic medium of the 'artist' by directly placing the picture in the universe of texts. And only then proceed with the analysis of the text-image relations. To facilitate such an approach we would have to draft a descriptive apparatus also for art history. This apparatus, abstaining from the use of intentional vocabulary and beginning with the picture, should make it possible for us to describe its interpicture and multimedia references in a differentiated way. Hence we could show how the picture features as a constitutive element in a specific epistemic constellation in which book knowledge, theories, cultural and religious backgrounds, practical and cognitive skills, scholarly and aesthetic modes of perception and their sensual visualisation are combined.

## VI. *Bibliotheca Universalis: The Case of the Ghezzi*

Books in depictions of studios possibly provide insight into how artists used books for their work. But also here we must enquire into what types of staging and lines of tradition belonging to the classical representations of studioli were adopted in each case? Furthermore we must ask if it is feasible to expect any definite insights into concrete reading practices from them under the circumstances?<sup>77</sup> Additionally, we must question in how far the books portrayed in representations of studios describe the real work situation. Or do they, instead, present themselves within the history of imaginary libraries, whose knowledge-history topoi, forms and

---

<sup>77</sup> See Asemissen H.U. – Schweikhart G., *Malerei als Thema der Malerei* (Berlin: 1994) 146–196; Cole M. – Pardo M. (eds.), *Inventions of the Studio: Renaissance to Romanticism* (Chapel Hill-London: 2005); Kleinert K., *Atelierdarstellungen in der niederländischen Genremalerei des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Petersberg: 2006); Waterfield G. (ed.), *The Artist's Studio* (London: 2009).

functions were recently outlined and investigated by Dirk Werle in an exemplary way.<sup>78</sup>

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

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

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

<sup>78</sup> Werle D., *Copia librorum: Problemgeschichte imaginerter Bibliotheken 1580–1630*, Frühe Neuzeit 119 (Tübingen: 2007).

<sup>79</sup> Białostocki, "Doctus artifex" 12–13.

<sup>80</sup> Known for a long time, the complete inventory has now been published together with other documents in Dorati da Empoli M.C., *Pier Leone Ghezzi: Un protagonista del Settecento* (Rome: 2008) 401–487. Ghezzi's own list contained 1150 numbers, but the greater part was already missing at the time stock was taken of the books. Instead some of the stock was inventorized with new numbering. The total proceeds were 2435,80 scudi, whereby sale of the "Libri di Disegni" made up almost half of this amount. See *ibid.*, 475.

<sup>81</sup> See Coen P., "Ghezzi, Giuseppe", in *Allgemeines Künstlerlexikon* (Leipzig: 2007), vol. LIII, 15–18 (with the hitherto completest bibliography and oeuvre catalogue).

The Nationalmuseum in Stockholm houses a red-chalk drawing by his hand. The work belongs to the comprehensive series of artists' portraits that the Roman collector and biographical author Nicola Pio compiled between 1717 and 1724 to illustrate the artists' biographies he had written [fig. 9].<sup>82</sup>

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

Besides Ripa, the sheet therefore references an authoritative text (i.e. Boethius) whose context is constituted in the generously abundantly filled bookshelf in the background.<sup>83</sup> The compact bulk of thick volumes need not be examined on account of what kinds of books they were. In fact already the well-ordered collection of books articulates that we are indeed looking at a library with encyclopaedic aspirations, so that the artist did not bother about adding book titles. Despite the fact that the artist holds a palette in his hand, the self-portrait addresses less the practical side of his work and instead underscores antecedent intellectual activity, understood

<sup>82</sup> Red chalk, 420 × 290 mm, Stockholm, National Museet, inv. no. 3026/1863. A copy of this drawing by Pier Leone Ghezzi's hand is in Windsor, Royal Collection. See Clark A.M., "The Portraits of Artists Drawn for Nicola Pio", *Master Drawings* 5 (1967) (3–23) 13, no. 19; Bjurström P., *Nicola Pio as a Collector of Drawings* (Stockholm: 1995) 26, 95, cat. no. 51. On Pio's compilation of biographies (completed in 1724, Rome, Biblioteca Vaticana, Ms. Cod. Capponi 257, edited by Enggass in 1977) and on the portraits belonging to it, which numbered at least 224, with 149 stemming from the Crozat Collection before they found their way via C.G. Tessin to Stockholm and finally landed in the National Museum, see the introduction in Pio N., *Le vite di pittori scultori et architetti, 1724*, ed. by C. and R. Enggass (Vatican City: 1977) and Peters Bowron E. – Rishel J.J. (eds.), *Art in Rome in the Eighteenth Century*, exh. cat. Philadelphia (London: 2000) 493, cat. no. 338.

<sup>83</sup> Here we can likewise see the bits of cloth that were ripped out of Philosophy's simple dress by the Stoics and Epicureans (*Consolatio* I.3). Cf. the variant first version of the illustration in *Iconologia di Cesare Ripa* (Rome, Lepido Facii: 1603) 164, modified in the Siena edition of 1611, 246. Ghezzi's direct model is clearly the woodcut that was first used in the Paduan edition of 1618, 191. On the variant versions of the illustrations and their relationship to the text see Werner G., *Ripa's Iconologia: Quellen, Methode, Ziele* (Utrecht: 1977) 42, 83.



Fig. 9. Giuseppe Ghezzi, *Self-portrait*, c. 1717–1720. Red chalk on paper. Stockholm, National Museum.



Fig. 10. "Filosofia" in Cesare Ripa, *Iconologia* (Padua: 1618), p. 191.

here literally as his 'learned background'. The old artist himself is the probable author of the Latin caption that emphasizes his poetic talents.<sup>84</sup>

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

<sup>84</sup> The drawing's inscription reads: 'JOSEPH GHEZZIUS PICTOR NEC IN CARMINE VATES / ASCOLANUS NATUS ANNO SALUTIS MDCXXXIII / HONESTE PROVIVIT'. Giuseppe Ghezzi wrote poems in Latin, see De Marchi G., "Giuseppe Ghezzi", in id. (ed.), *Sebastiano e Giuseppe Ghezzi: Protagonisti del barocco*, exh. cat. Comunanza (Venice: 1999) (21–105) 45 and ill. III.4 (copy of a two-page eulogy on his friend the architect Carlo Fontana).



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

<sup>85</sup> On Ghezzi as a painter see Clark A.M., "Pier Leone Ghezzi's Portraits", *Paragone* 165, 14 (1963) 11–21; Lo Bianco A., *Pier Leone Ghezzi pittore* (Palermo-São Paolo: 1985); Martinelli V. (ed.), *Giuseppe e Pier Leone Ghezzi* (Rome: 1990). The eight volumes of caricatures of the 'Mondo nuovo' are kept in the Vatican Library, Codex Ottobonianus latinus 3112–3119; see on this topic Olszewski E.J., "The New Worlds of Pier Leone Ghezzi", *Art Journal* 43, 4 (1983) 325–330, and Loisel Legrand C., "Pier Leone Ghezzi Disegnatore", in Lo Bianco (ed.), *Pier Leone Ghezzi: Settecento alla moda*, exh. cat. Ascoli Piceno (Venice: 1999) 55–69.

<sup>86</sup> Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Codex Ottob. lat. 3117, fol. 15. Caption: 'Ritratto del signor marchese Teodoli cavaliere eruditissimo in moltissime cose, il quale eresse di sua invenzione il Teatro Argentina, e molte altre fabbriche fatte con la sua direzione [...] 26 aprile 1739.'

<sup>87</sup> Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Cod. Ottob. lat. 3116, fol. 91v. Caption: 'Il presente Disegno rappresenta il ritratto del V. Solimene Pittore Napolitano in età di Anni 82 dato da' Me' Cav. Ghezzi nel 1736.' Addendum: 'Solimeni Pittor Napolitano, il quale è Valentissimo uomo, et anche eruditissimo in Letteratura, et è il migliore Professore che



Fig. 11. Pier Leone Ghezzi, *Francesco Solimena*, 1736. Pen and ink on paper. Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Codex Ottob. lat. 3117, fol. 15.

As far as Pier Leone Ghezzi's numerous self-portraits are concerned in which he slipped into greatly various roles during his long career, an early drawing from a private collection deserves special attention in the present context [fig. 12].<sup>88</sup>

Ghezzi drew his portrait *en face*. He has placed his idle left hand on a presumably female head, which appears to gaze out of the picture as if alive. The small scale denotes its artefact character. It is true that the situation depicted in the picture corresponds with that of painting a self-portrait. However, the drawing that is being executed in the picture is not of the artist's face but bears the features of the small bust he has positioned so that he can portray its mirror image. Obviously he must hold it in place because the small head is missing a pedestal. At the same time the draftsman can haptically examine the visual data. As a result we are confronted by the play of successive degrees of mimesis: The picture expresses an intra-pictural relationship between the drawing of his self-portrait, the drawing of the bust, and the drawing of the act of drawing the bust. It is noteworthy that Ghezzi accentuated the simultaneity of observation and writing down, concept and embodiment, that he depicted his own head disproportionately large as he leant forward, intent on the creative act.<sup>89</sup> The strongly emphasized forehead is the sovereign over his hands, and likewise has the command over the measuring instruments lying on the table. They have no practical relevance for drawing a portrait, and are thus to be interpreted, in this context, as metaphors for judgement

---

abbiamo in questo secolo, ed io Cav. Ghezzi Mè ne sono lassato memoria quando fui in Napoli, il dì 8 Aprile 1735.'

<sup>88</sup> Pen and brown ink, 188 x 153 mm. Katrin Bellinger Kunsthandel, London 1988, cat. no. 17, p. 24; Graf D., "Pier Leone Ghezzi vedutista romano", in Sciolla G.C. (ed.), *Nuove ricerche in margine alla mostra: Da Leonardo a Rembrandt: Disegni della Biblioteca Reale di Torino: Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi* (Turin: 1990) (271–287) 277, no. 5; Lo Bianco A., "Settecento alla moda", in ead. (ed.), *Pier Leone Ghezzi. Settecento alla moda*, exh. cat. Ascoli Piceno (Venice: 1999) (5–41) 5; De Marchi, "Giuseppe Ghezzi" 30. For an overview of Ghezzi's self-portrait drawings see Shaw J.B., *The Italian Drawings of the Frits Lugt Collection* (Paris: 1983), vol. I, 185–186 under cat. no. 185.

<sup>89</sup> Probably the distorted the proportions and the undeniably youthful facial features have tempted interpreters to date the drawing as an early work: according to Giulia Mancini we are faced with 'un un suo precoce autoritratto da bambino', and Anna Lo Bianco estimates the age of the draftsman to have been, at the time, 'all'età di circa quindici anni.' But none of Ghezzi's works prior to 1698 can be definitively dated. The costumes and style of drawing speak, however, for a production date of around the first decade of the 18th century. Similar motifs and parallels in styles can be found in his informal *Self-portrait in the Studio* in the Fondation Custodia in Paris (ca. 1705) and in the 1708 portrait of his friend the musician Quirino Colombani (Cod. Ottob. lat. 3112, fol. 59).



Fig. 12. Pier Leone Ghezzi, *Self-portrait as Draftsman*, c. 1700–1710. Pen and ink on paper. Private collection.

and the *docta manus* – the learned hand – of the artist. With the pair of compasses we think of the famous maxim in which Michelangelo warned that an artist should carry ‘the compass in his eyes’ (*le seste negli occhi*). In this context it seems reasonable to suppose that the bust of a female head, held as if it were the insignia of rulers, is a personification of ‘Idea’. This would at least fit in with the scenery in the background, where a reference library is visible behind a curtain that has been drawn aside.



On the only partially visible spines of the tomes we can read 'PET[RAR]CA', 'EUCLI[DE]', 'VETRU[VIVS]' and 'L. VINCI' – a canon that even in its extreme compactness makes the scope of the draftsman's interests known. Whereas the treatises of a more practical kind on geometry, architecture, and painting can be assigned to his active hand, the higher realms of poetry represented by the *poeta laureatus* has been placed at the same level as his head. The personal library, divided into sections according to fields of studies, is a kind of externalized memory, and the curtain that has been pushed aside points out that it is used when required, for *utilitas privata*. In this drawing the motif of the library is only loosely reminiscent of the grand staging of the same in the self-portrait of Ghezzi's father Giuseppe. Pier Leone's sovereignly sketched self-presentation as the *draftsman in his studio* strikes us, entirely without foregrounded allegory, as presenting a personal set of rules for the art of drawing based on observation and speculation while supported by literary erudition.

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

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

<sup>90</sup> Pen and brown wash, 392 × 250 mm, Vienna, Albertina, inv. no. 25336, see Fusconi G., "Da Bartoli a Piranesi: Spigolature dai codici Ottoboniani Latini della raccolta Ghezzi", *Xenia antiqua* 3 (1994) (145–172) 167, no. 3; Birke V. – Kertész J., *Die italienischen Zeichnungen der Albertina. Generalverzeichnis* (Vienna-Cologne-Weimar: 1997), vol. IV, 2455; Rostrolla G., *Il "Mondo novo" musicale di Pier Leone Ghezzi* (Geneva: 2001) 450.

<sup>91</sup> See the standard literature on this topic: Chapeaurouge D. de, "Das Milieu als Porträt", *Wallraf-Richartz-Jahrbuch* 22 (1960) 137–158.





Fig. 13. [COL. PL. 3] Pier Leone Ghezzi, *The Artist's Studio*, 1712. Pen and ink on paper. Vienna, Albertina.

conclude that, besides artistic production also reproduction demands to be acknowledged.

As the artist himself is absent we look to the easel for a protagonist, it being his main piece of equipment for art production. There our curiosity is aroused by the fact that we can only see the canvas that the artist is currently working on from the back.<sup>92</sup> While the empty chair, together with a prepared palette, insinuates a disrupted sitting for a portrait, the horizontal format of the canvas urges us to conjecture that a different genre is concerned here. And the drawing in question is ultimately a combination of an interior, a still life and a landscape. The latter comes into play through the window in the upper part of the wall as a picture within a picture.<sup>93</sup> The interplay of these elements allows us to reconstruct a 'portrait', namely that of the draftsman. It is left up to the viewers of the sheet to fill in the various blanks. They are guided by the concrete references provided by a seemingly careless cumulation of reference works comprising hefty tomes that invite us to read the titles on their spines. The detail that the books are presented in the drawing as *laid out* and not standing – which facilitates reading – underscores their significance by showing that they are in use. The question concerning the assortment need not be asked. What lies at the top is always what is currently being consulted. A regrouping of the pile of books in a different order articulates that knowledge is in perpetual motion.

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

---

<sup>92</sup> On the implications connected to this detail see the fundamental study of Stoichita V.I., *L'instauration du tableau* (Paris: 1993) and, most recently, Bättschmann O., "Zeigen und Verbergen in Bildern", in Krieger V. – Mader R. (eds.), *Ambiguität in der Kunst: Typen und Funktionen eines ästhetischen Paradigmas* (Cologne-Weimar-Vienna: 2010) 93–105.

<sup>93</sup> 'The rules of genre in art restrict subject matter to a specific world and its properties and modes (*modus essendi*). Then, in order to include exceptions, they genre-specifically transform these into an acceptable mode. Therefore a genre is a complementary totality, the multiplication of a unity of its characteristic, closely related and alien elements.' Kemp W., "Beziehungsspiele: Versuch einer Gattungspoetik des Interieurs" in Heck K. – Jöchner C. (eds.), *Kemp-Reader: Ausgewählte Schriften von Wolfgang Kemp* (Munich-Berlin: 2006) 123–138.

times.<sup>94</sup> The assortment of books is rounded off by several treatises on architecture, Italian editions of Dürer's *Four Books on Human Proportion* and *Four Books on Measurement*, as well as Ripa's indispensable *Iconologia*. A skull set on a single book peeps out from the second shelf that is partly veiled by the curtain. The title of the volume is clearly legible, reading 'Euclide'. This fits in nicely with the triangle form of the set square hung above, whereas the extremely topical combination of skull and book seems a distant echo of the symbol-laden *vanitas* still lifes that were popular in the former century. Paradoxically, the macabre prop animates the empty space by gazing in the direction of the easel.

And yet another book lies apart from the staple, further to the right on a small single shelf together with sheets of music, directly under a guitar hanging on the wall. 'Appiano' has been inscribed in mirror writing on the book – certainly not a very canonical author. Appian of Alexandria's *Rhomaika*, surviving only in fragments, is a key source for the history of the Roman Civil Wars. We can safely conclude that, because of the fact that it was in Ghezzi's reference library and in the company of Livy, Josephus, Tacitus and Plutarch, the artist was greatly interested in the historiography of antiquity. Possibly he was even engaged in reading this book at the time he was working on the drawing. Just as the musical instrument that is always at hand – a reference to Ghezzi actually playing an instrument himself<sup>95</sup> – the book fulfills the therapeutic function of a diversion for the artist from the toils of painting, something to pass the time with and banish gloomy thoughts. Taking the interpretation even further, we could also comprehend the stringed instrument, related to Apollo's lyre, as an allusion to the 'ambience' of the neighbouring landscape painting, of the harmonious combination of colours that we, of course, due to it being a drawing, can only imagine.

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

---

<sup>94</sup> The transcription of the book titles remained incomplete in hitherto literature published on the drawing. A very thorough study of the titles produced the following list: From top to bottom, left: META OVIDI / EN[EIDE VIRG]ILIO / TASSO OR[LANDO?] [A]RIOSTO / ALAZAN TEOPT[R]I[K] / TITO LIVI[O] / [illegible] ARCHT / IAC[OPO] B[AROZZI] ARCHT / SER[L]IO ARCIT; right: GIOSEF HISTORICO / GIO[VANNI] PAO[LO] LOMA[ZZO] / FLOS SAN[C]TORUM / CORNELIO TACIT[O] / PROSPET[TIVA] VIGNOLA / ALBERTO SIMETRI[A] / ICONOLOGIA RIPA / PLUTARCO VITE / ALB[ERTO] DUR[ERO] GEOMETR[IA].

<sup>95</sup> Besides other instruments Ghezzi played the violin and the spinet, see Rostirolla, *Il "Mondo novo"* 15–29.

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

### VII. *Book and Books: 'Il libro mio'*

Inevitably the question must remain unanswered as to how 'select' knowledge from books found its way into the heads of artists and was then transposed into pictures.<sup>96</sup> Can reading transform the artistic imagination?<sup>97</sup> Can reading even have a derogatory effect on creativity? Do artists read books in a different way to philosophers and scholars? Did they even have time, in the past, to hunt for books or read at leisure? What significance did the aesthetic character of a book or its monetary value have for their desire to possess books? But an even more basic question would be to ask if there is a methodical and constructive way of describing the connection between owning books, individual reading habits, and the invention

<sup>96</sup> See Schlaffer H., "Der Umgang mit der Literatur: Diesseits und jenseits der Lektüre", *Poetica* 31 (1999) 1–25.

<sup>97</sup> Cf. Johns A., "The Physiology of Reading", in Jardine N. – Frasca-Spada M. (eds.), *Books and the Sciences in History* (Cambridge: 2000) 291–314; id., "The Physiology of Reading and the Anatomy of Enthusiasm", in Cunningham A. – Grell O. (eds.), *Religio Medici: Religion and Medicine in Seventeenth Century England* (Aldershot: 1996) 136–170.

of pictorial ideas that can be utilized for art-historical study of meaning. Research has not yet really considered – at least not systematically – the questions of if artists read books at all, and if so how? And then, if they did read them, were they then engrossed by them, or did they excerpt from books like scholars? And finally, in what form were the topical orders of knowledge that were relevant for scholarly practice also relevant for the concerns of artists?<sup>98</sup> Elizabeth McGrath succeeded in clearly demonstrating how Rubens used his books, and above all those of the Greek and Roman historians, just like an exceptional *pictor doctus* for the generation of ideas for pictures. In his methods he resembled a scholar by making detailed excerpts and confronting these with pictorial *invenzioni*.<sup>99</sup> Thematic choices as well as modes of expression could thereby definitely be indebted directly to a textual experience. Nevertheless it must be emphasized that Rubens undoubtedly was a special case, and we cannot simply take him as a paradigm for making similar conclusions about other artists' study practices even if they also had a humanist background.<sup>100</sup>

But it still remains that the historical situation, too, must be described: that the canon of what was read was often very limited, that books were expensive, that some of the books available could not be read because, especially in the case of artists, the language barrier was insurmountable (and this was particularly true for Latin). This definitely counts for the relationship of the artist to books, to the *one* book, and the way in which he or she may have acquired knowledge stored therein. Of course the sources are mute on the subject of the process of reading or on that of a special individual relationship to a specific book. The title of Pontormo's diary 'il libro mio' is a late conjecture, and can be by no means understood as a contemporary indication of great intimacy toward to this compilation of self-observations, dietary measures, and brief comments on the progress of his own art works.<sup>101</sup> Generally any book with personal notes of any kind could be accepted as 'libro mio' in the 16th century. An especially strong emphasis on and emphatic relationship to printed material ('my Virgil!', 'my Homer!') as we typically know from the era of sentimentalism

<sup>98</sup> For the literary history see Werle, *Copia librorum*.

<sup>99</sup> McGrath E., *Rubens: Subjects from History*, Corpus Rubenianum Ludwig Burchard XIII.1 (London: 1997), vol. I, (55–67) 63–65.

<sup>100</sup> See Maria Berbara's contribution on Hollanda in this volume.

<sup>101</sup> Cf. the notes of the editor in Pontormo Jacopo da, *Il libro mio: Aufzeichnungen 1554–1565*, ed. S.S. Nigro, with an introduction by G. Manganelli (Munich: 1988).





Fig. 14. Domenico Parodi, *Self Portrait with Aeneid*, c. 1720.  
Florence, Uffizi.

is not at all characteristic for artists in the early modern period. [see figs. 14 and 15]

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

<sup>102</sup> Ibid., entry from January 17, 1555. On this topic see Cécile Beuzelin's contribution in this volume, esp. pp. 77–81.



Fig. 15. Anton Raphael Mengs, *Johann Joachim Winckelmann, reading the Iliad*, c. 1771. New York, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Harris Brisbane Dick Fund.

many sonnets and burlesque poems that were praised by professional writers.<sup>103</sup> And it is well-known that the same is true for Michelangelo. In Michelangelo's biography, Ascanio Condivi describes how the artist's study of the classic Tuscan authors inspired his own poetry while writing the 'Divino'.<sup>104</sup> Michelangelo's special affinity to the poet who wrote the

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

<sup>104</sup> Condivi Ascanio, *Vita di Michelangelo Buonarroti* (Rome, Antonio Blado: 1553) chapter XLIV, see, on Michelangelo's study of Dante, also sections XVI and LI.

*Commedia* was such an established fact that Pierfrancesco Giambullari dedicated his *Difesa della lingua fiorentina e di Dante* (Florence 1556) to the artist, and Donato Giannotti had the 'gran dantista' appear as expert in his dialogues on Dante's hell (*De'l sito, forma, & misure dello Inferno di Dante*, Florence 1544), stating that: Nobody knows more about this monumental epic poem ('intenda e possegga'). Giovan Battista Gelli and later likewise Giovanni Battista Guarini said the same of him.<sup>105</sup> The fact that Michelangelo actually identified with his great countryman (and his fate as an émigré) was no secret and the notion of both having a kindred artistic mind was an accepted topos by the mid-Cinquecento at the latest.<sup>106</sup> It is true that the notion is in part based on the successful self-fashioning of an artist who was much admired for his *terribilità* and, already very early in his career, demonstrated exceptional talent. Relevant to the above is the problem of a concept of style spanning the various arts, which necessitates knowing precisely which books were read. Specialized knowledge based on previous and repeated study of a favourite author was obviously very widespread, in particular amongst Florentine artists and artisans. But as yet it has neither been established along which avenues appropriation of such knowledge took place nor the range of literature that was likewise read.

### VIII. Notes in the Margin

With marginal notes and sketches we are entirely dependent on the analyses of a few scattered traces left by the reader. Every now and again they can be verified as being executed by the hand of a certain artist. However, like the legacies of libraries and books, the study of marginalia has largely been restricted to isolated cases. This is astounding, as marginalia are extremely eloquent documents for the knowledge-history assessment of competence in reading and comprehension of artists, if only because they continued the traditional practice among scholars of annotating texts

<sup>105</sup> De Maio R., *Michelangelo e la Controriforma* (Florence: 1978) 69, and recently Emison P.A., *Creating the "Divine" Artist: From Dante to Michelangelo* (Leiden-Boston: 2004).

<sup>106</sup> For Benedetto Varchi, the *tertium comparationis* in his *Lezione della maggioranza delle arti* from 1547 (Barocchi, *Trattati* I, 57) was 'the grand and the sublime'. Lenzone Carlo, *In difesa della lingua fiorentina et di Dante: Con le regole da far bella et numerosa la prosa*, ed. by C. Bartoli (Florence, Lorenzo Torrentino: 1556) 10, noted down: 'Come il Petrarca imparò da Dante et non lo superò, se ben fece divinamente: così Raffaello non ha superato Michelagnolo, se bene paion fatte in Paradiso le sue pitture.' Already Ludovico Dolce reversed this in his *Dialogo intitolato l'Aretino*, (Venice, Gabriel Giolito: 1557) 172 by opposing the rawness of Michelangelo-Dante with the grace of Raphael-Petrarch.

since the Middle Ages.<sup>107</sup> Marginalia are often related to underlined passages, are basically extensions thereof – in a textual framework in which reflection on what is read precipitates itself. Hence they were valuable also in their mnemonic function insofar as they facilitated the finding of passages in some way significant for the reader, or record what the author condoned or disapproved of. As ‘critical apparatus’ such commentaries become part of the book and can be of use to other, later readers. Under certain circumstances they can possibly guide reception, but the appeal of marginalia naturally lies in their often subjective bias and the impulsive character of some comments. Especially Giorgio Vasari renewedly provoked his readers, many of whom were artists, to voice their point of view in the margins of the pages, either to reinforce opinions, to emphatically agree, or disagree with unmerited judgements, or merely correct facts or supplement the content.

The editions of Vasari’s *Vite* in which El Greco and the Carracci left their annotations are surely the most famous examples of a reading practice involving commentary and correction of text on the part of artists. They are highly valuable documents because they pertain to Vasari’s normative categories and judgements. And furthermore, we can recognize their individual art-theoretical positions in their sometimes pointed aphoristic tenor. Thus El Greco’s commentaries, mostly in Spanish, side with primacy of color in opposition to the Florentine ideal of *disegno*. In sporadically sarcastic comments, he also broods on Michelangelo’s Vita, debating the artist’s superiorities and deficits as a sculptor, painter and architect – whereby we can often palpably discern the fruits of the Greek artist’s Venetian schooling and his worship of Titian.<sup>108</sup> The postils of the Carracci emphasize much more polemically the independence of North Italian painting, in particular the tradition of Venetian painting represented by Titian, in contrast to the canon supported by Vasari that was oriented toward Florence and Tuscany.<sup>109</sup> It is noteworthy that the postils

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

<sup>108</sup> De Salas X., “Un exemplaire des ‘Vies’ de Vasari annoté par le Greco”, *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* 69 (1967) 176–180; Marías F., “El Greco’s Artistic Thought: From the Eyes of the Soul to the Eyes of Reason”, in Álvarez Lopera J. (ed.), *El Greco: Identity and Transformation*, exh. cat. Madrid et al. (Geneva: 1999) 165–185; Zeitler K. – Hellwig K., *El Greco kommentiert den Wettstreit der Künste* (Munich-Berlin: 2008) 52–59.

<sup>109</sup> See Bodmer H., “Le note marginali di Agostino Carracci nell’edizione del Vasari del 1568”, *Il Vasari* 10 (1939) 89–127; Dempsey C., *Annibale Carracci and the Beginnings of*

were often by several hands. El Greco's copy of the *Vite* formerly belonged to Federico Zuccari, who made critical comments in the margins on Vasari's views and judgements.<sup>110</sup> In the case of the Carracci the handwriting of seven different authors of marginalia could be discerned, which has to do with the complicated provenance of the volume. The visibility of usage obviously was an added enticement for subsequent readers to also add their observations and opinions, allowing a trail of comments to emerge as a paratext.<sup>111</sup> When attentive and critical readers vocalised their disapproval of the printed content, or likewise demonstrated their superior knowledge, for example, with a scholarly reference, they undoubtedly did so with subsequent readers in mind – readers who might be interested in their annotations and who they sought to win over to their point of view. The marginal notes (postils) were, despite being later supplements, always directed at future generations as a continuous dialogue. Through research of marginalia we can safely anticipate, also in the future, further decisive impetus for our knowledge about artists and their reading practices.<sup>112</sup>

---

*Baroque Style*, Villa I Tatti Monographs 3 (Glückstadt: 1977) 44–45; Fanti M., “Le postille Carraccesche alle ‘Vite’ del Vasari: Il testo originale”, *Il Carrobbio* 5 (1979) 148–164; Fanti M., “Ancora sulle postille carraccesche alle ‘Vite’ del Vasari: In buona parte sono di Annibale”, *Il Carrobbio* 6 (1980) 136–141; Posner D., “Marginal Notes by Annibale Carracci”, *Burlington Magazine* 124 (1982) 239; Dempsey C., “The Carracci Postille to Vasari's *Lives*”, *Art Bulletin* 68 (1986) 72–76; Keazor H., “*Distruggere la maniera?*” *Die Carracci-Postille* (Freiburg im Breisgau: 2002), and finally Zapperi R., “Le postille di Annibale Carracci alle Vite di Vasari: un'apologia della pittura veneziana del Cinquecento”, *Venezia Cinquecento* 20 (2010) 171–180.

<sup>110</sup> It is highly likely that El Greco already met Zuccari while working for Cardinal Farnese during his stay in Rome in the 1560s. But he probably first acquired the book in 1586 when Zuccari visited Toledo. See de Salas X. – Marías F. (eds.), *Las Notas de El Greco a Vasari* (Madrid: 1992) 42, and Davies D., “El Greco's Religious Art: The Illumination and Quickening of the Spirit”, in id., *El Greco*, exh. cat. New York-London (London: 2003) (45–71) 69. On Zuccari's postils see Hochmann M., “Les annotations marginales de Federico Zuccaro à un exemplaire des Vies de Vasari: la réaction antivasarienne à la fin du XVI siècle”, *Revue de l'art* 80 (1988) 64–71.

<sup>111</sup> On the concept of the paratext cf. Genette G., *Paratexte: Das Buch vom Beiwerk des Buches* (Frankfurt: 1989).

<sup>112</sup> A promising undertaking would be a typology of marginalia in art literature and those written by artists. And a synoptical study that goes beyond individual cases of the rich fund of material is a desideratum. However, see the survey in Spagnolo M., “Considerazioni in margine: Le postille alle ‘Vite’ di Vasari”, in Caleca A. (ed.), *Arezzo e Vasari: vite e postille* (Foligno: 2007) 251–271. Furthermore: Lepri N., “Annotazioni di Gaspare Celio a un volume della Torrentiniana”, *ibid.*, 343–379; Collavo L., “L'esemplare dell'edizione giuntina de ‘Le Vite’ di Giorgio Vasari letto e annotato da Vincenzo Scamozzi”, *Saggi e memorie di storia dell'arte* 29 (2005) 1–213; Wood J., “Inigo Jones, Italian Art, and the Practice of Drawing”, *The Art Bulletin* 74 (1992) 247–270; Johnson A.W. (ed.), *Three Volumes Annotated by Inigo Jones: Vasari's Lives (1568), Plutarch's Moralia (1614), Plato's Republic (1554)* (Åbo: 1997); Ruffini M., “Sixteenth-century Paduan annotations to the first edition of Vasari's *Vite* (1550)”, *Renaissance Quarterly* 62 (2009) 748–808; Löhr W.-D. – Thimann M. (eds.),



IX. *Artists' Reading Practices and Volgare Culture*

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

---

*Bilder im Wortfeld: Siebzig Einsichten in die Bibliothek des Kunsthistorischen Instituts*, exh. cat. Berlin (Berlin: 2006) 14–15, 130–131, cat. no. 66.

<sup>113</sup> See, for example, Guthmüller B. (ed.), *Latein und Nationalsprachen in der Renaissance*, Wolfenbütteler Abhandlungen zur Renaissanceforschung 17 (Wiesbaden: 1998). On historical research on reading practises see De Kooker H.W. – Selm B. van (eds.), *Boekcultuur in de Lage Landen 1500–1800* (Utrecht: 1993); Coppens C., "Der Bürger liest – liest der Bürger?", in Storck J. van der (ed.), *Stadtbilder in Flandern: Spuren bürgerlicher Kultur, 1477–1787*, exh. cat. Schallaburg (Brussels: 1991) 210–218; Bouchet F., *Le discours sur la lecture en France aux XIV<sup>e</sup> et XV<sup>e</sup> siècles: Pratiques, poétique, imaginaire*, Bibliothèque du XV<sup>e</sup> siècle 74 (Paris: 2008); Kallendorf C., *The Virgilian Tradition: Book History and the History of Reading in Early Modern Europe*, Variorum collected studies series 885 (Aldershot: 2007); Jensen K. (ed.), *Incunabula and Their Readers: Printing, Selling and Using books in the Fifteenth Century* (London: 2003); Messerli A. – Chartier R. (eds.), *Lesen und Schreiben in Europa 1500–1900: Vergleichende Perspektiven* (Basel: 2000).

<sup>114</sup> On the books owned by Leonardo see Reti L., "Two Unpublished Manuscripts of Leonardo da Vinci in the Biblioteca Nacional of Madrid – II", *Burlington Magazine* 110 (1968) 81–89; id., *The Library of Leonardo da Vinci* (Los Angeles: 1972); Villata E. (ed.), *La biblioteca, il tempo e gli amici di Leonardo: Disegni di Leonardo dal Codice Atlantico = Leonardo's library, times and friends: Drawings by Leonardo from the Codex Atlanticus*, exh. cat. Milan (Novara: 2009).

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

<sup>115</sup> On this topic see Baudouin, "Rubens" 231–233; Arents, *De Bibliotheek*.

<sup>116</sup> Vasari links Rosso Fiorentino's ambitions in regard to education to his decision to leave his homeland and try his luck at the French Court: 'Et avendo apunto, per comparire più pratico in tutte le cose et essere universale, apparata la lingua latina [...]'; Vasari Giorgio, *Le vite de' più eccellenti pittori, scultori e architettori nelle redazioni del 1550 e 1568*, ed. R. Bettarini – P. Barocchi, 6 vols. (Florence: 1966–1987), vol. IV, 485. Also in the case of Nicolas Poussin knowledge of foreign languages is related to cosmopolitanism and extensive literary knowledge that facilitates *invenzione*: 'Doppo haver apreso la lingua latina et havendo acquistato erudition di storie et di favole si dette allo studio della pittura [...] È huomo [...] di aspetto et costume nobile et, quello che importa assai, per l'erudition letterale è capace di qualsivoglia historia, favola o poesia per poterla poi, come fa felicemente, esprimerla con il pennello.' Mancini G., *Considerazioni sulla pittura*. ed. by Marucchi A. and Salerno L., 2 vols. (Rome: 1956–57), vol. I, 261. On Francesco Gessi, a student and assistant to Guido Reni, we can read in his Vita: 'Fu questo pittore anche versatissimo nella Greca, e Latina erudizione [...]'. Gessi joked with a 'certo Gramaticullo Pedante', first presenting himself as an inexperienced admirer, only to shame him in the next moment with his virtuosity in translating into Greek in the presence of prelate; Baldinucci Filippo, *Notizie de' professori del disegno da Cimabue in qua* (Florence, Santi Franchi: 1728), vol. III, 332.

<sup>117</sup> See et al. Guthmüller B., *Mito, poesia, arte: Saggi sulla tradizione ovidiana nel Rinascimento*, Biblioteca del Cinquecento 69 (Rome: 1997); id., "Formen des Mythenverständnisses um 1500", in Boockmann H. – Grenzmann L. (eds.), *Literatur, Musik und Kunst im Übergang vom Mittelalter zur Neuzeit*, Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Philologisch-Historische Klasse 208 (Göttingen: 1995) 109–131; id., *Ovidio metamorphoseos vulgare: Formen und Funktionen der volkssprachlichen Wiedergabe klassischer Dichtung in der italienischen Renaissance*, Veröffentlichungen zur Humanismusforschung 3 (Boppard am Rhein: 1981). See also Ginzburg C., "Tiziano, Ovidio e i codici della figurazione erotica nel Cinquecento", *Paragone* 24 (1978) 3–24; Boschloo A.W.A., "Images of the Gods in the Vernacular", *Word & Image* 4 (1988) 412–421; Frangenberg T., "A Lost Decoration by the Dossi Brothers in Trent", *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 56 (1993) 18–33.

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

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

---

<sup>118</sup> Guthmüller B., "Ovidübersetzungen und mythologische Malerei: Bemerkungen zur Sala dei Giganti Giulio Romanos", *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz* 21 (1977) 35–68.

artists did probably read translations. Even artists who were particularly fond of reading such as Durante Alberti and Pietro Veri owned just about only books in the vernacular. They probably had not learnt Latin and read also literature from other European countries only in translation.

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

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

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

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

<sup>119</sup> On Palissy’s use of the literary form of the dialogue: Céard J., “Relire Bernard Palissy”, *Revue de l’Art* 78 (1987) 77–84; id., “Formes discursives”, in Aulotte R. (ed.), *Précis de littérature français du XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle: La renaissance* (Paris: 1991) 155–193; Shell H.R., “Casting Life, Recasting Experience: Bernard Palissy’s Occupation between Maker and Nature”, *Configurations* 12 (2004) 1–40.

<sup>120</sup> ‘I should have been very pleased to understand Latin and to read the books of these philosophers, to learn from the ones to contradict the others.’ Palissy B., *The Admirable Discourses*, trans. A. La Rocque (Urbana: 1957) 155.

I have had no other book than the sky and the earth, which is known to all, and is given to all to know and to read in this beautiful book. Now, having read in it, I have studied earthly things.<sup>121</sup>

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

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

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

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

<sup>121</sup> Palissy Bernard, *Discours admirables; de la nature des eaux & fontaines tant naturelles qu’artificielles, des métaux, des sels & salines, ... le tout dressé par dialogues lesquels sont introduits la théorie & la pratique*, (Paris, Martin le Jeune: 1580); id., *The Admirable Discourses* 148; id., *Recepte veritable*, ed. K. Cameron (Geneva: 1988); Palissy B., *Recette Veritable*, rev. and ed. by F. Lestringant (Paris: 1996); id., *Les Oeuvres*, ed. by A. France (Paris: 1880).

<sup>122</sup> Palissy, *Admirable Discourses* 27.

<sup>123</sup> Smith P.M., “Art, Science, and Visual Culture in Early Modern Europe”, *Isis* 97 (2006) 83–100; ead., “Giving Voice to the Hands: The Articulation of Material Literacy in the Sixteenth Century”, in Trimbur J. (ed.), *Popular Literacy: Studies in Cultural Practices and Poetics* (Pittsburgh: 2001) 74–93; ead., “Artisanal Epistemology”, in ead., *The Body of the Artisan: Art and Experience in the Scientific Revolution* (Chicago: 2006) 59–93; ead., “Artists as scientists: nature and realism in early modern Europe”, *Endeavour* 24, 1 (2000) 13–21.

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

<sup>125</sup> Smith, “Giving Voice” 76.



Artisanal knowledge was passed on 'by doing and imitation'. She asserts that Palissy's declaration was radical and challenged traditional structures of learning,<sup>126</sup> arguing that his knowledge was, in contrast, productive knowledge because it could be put to use directly. In her eyes Palissy adopted the standpoint of *vita activa* in opposition to *contemplativa*.<sup>127</sup>

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

In the meantime we are constantly confronted with this term in history-of-knowledge literature for the early modern period. Admittedly it is not new, at least as far as the issue it addresses is concerned. For example, the classic studies by Leonardo Olschki,<sup>128</sup> Edgar Zilsel,<sup>129</sup> Ernst Kris,<sup>130</sup> Paolo Rossi<sup>131</sup> and Pierre Duhem long ago investigated the significance of artisans and engineers for a revaluation of learned knowledge. The authors based their research on an extensive fund of historical material, but at no time asserted that skills and knowledge specific to artisans and navigators was knowledge as such. Even if the writings of engineers and technicians were increasingly consulted by scholars and scientists, this does not mean that the observations therein already had the status of knowledge, even in the eyes of the philosopher and propagator of empiricism Francis Bacon.<sup>132</sup>

<sup>126</sup> Ibid., 78.

<sup>127</sup> Ibid., 83.

<sup>128</sup> Olschki L., *Bildung und Wissenschaft im Zeitalter der Renaissance in Italien* (Leipzig-Florence-Rome-Geneva: 1922).

<sup>129</sup> Zilsel E., *Die sozialen Ursprünge der neuzeitlichen Wissenschaft*, ed. W. Krohn (Frankfurt: 1976).

<sup>130</sup> Kris E., "Der Stil 'Rustique': Die Verwendung des Naturabgusses bei Wenzel Jamnitzer und Bernard Palissy", *Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Sammlungen in Wien* 22 (1926) 137–208.

<sup>131</sup> Rossi P., *Philosophy, Technology, and the Arts in the Early Modern Era*, ed. B. Nelson, trans. S. Attanasio (New York: 1970).

<sup>132</sup> Already Charles Webster pointed out that: 'Such figures as Agricola, Palissy and Stevin were willing to bridge the gulf between the scholar and the craftsman; they had exhibited the enormous potentialities of literate technology. On the other hand neither the scholastic philosopher nor their critics could satisfy Bacon that they were sufficiently aware of the need to relate natural philosophy to its natural roots in experience.' Webster C., *The Great Instauration: Science, Medicine and Reform 1626–1660* (London: 1975) 337–338.

What is new in Smith's hypothesis is alone that henceforth not only tradesmen and craftsmen but also artists wished to be considered artisans who were elevated by means of trade-specific knowledge ('artisanal knowledge'), and that this type of knowledge was based purely on empiricism and not on a theoretical frame. For all that, the concept of artisanal epistemology seems to rest on a number of fundamental misunderstandings. But exactly the clarification thereof makes it possible to define the relation between artists' reading practices and knowledge more precisely: Traditionally epistemology is a theory of knowledge that asks what makes scientific knowledge out of knowledge. In the recent French variety of historical epistemology the question was historicized. This leads to a comprehension of epistemology as 'reflection on the historic conditions – *under* which and the means *with* which things are made into objects of knowledge – that trigger the process of gaining scientific or scholarly knowledge and keep it going'.<sup>133</sup> Classical historical epistemologists such as Gaston Bachelard underscore the fact that scholarly or scientific knowledge is constituted against everyday knowledge by abandoning any lifeworld points of reference.<sup>134</sup> In Bachelard's eyes, Palissy would be an example for pre-scientific thought due to the fact that he donned the vestments of empiricism and pretended not to have to integrate his observations into a system of thought in which they would first acquire validity through experience.<sup>135</sup> At crucial points Palissy merely referred to the divine order of nature.<sup>136</sup> From Bachelard's point of view, Palissy should be counted among the group of naturalists who were the 'victims of metaphors', whereas indeed it was the lot of the 'scientific intellect' to 'struggle unrelentingly against images, analogies and metaphors'.<sup>137</sup> The same is true for the concept of empiricism, which cannot be simply legitimized by appealing to appearances, but must be integrated within a theoretical framework in various ways.<sup>138</sup>

<sup>133</sup> Rheinberger H.-J., *Historische Epistemologie zur Einführung* (Hamburg: 2007) 11.

<sup>134</sup> See Bachelard G., "Connaissance commune et connaissance scientifique", in id., *Le matérialisme rationnel* (Paris: 1953).

<sup>135</sup> On this topic see Bachelard G., *Die Bildung des wissenschaftlichen Geistes* (Frankfurt: 1987) 51, 68–69, 84.

<sup>136</sup> Laube S., "Wissenswelten sinnlicher Frömmigkeit: Theatrale Antriebsmomente in der Naturanschauung von Bernard Palissy und Jacob Böhme", in Greyerz K. v. et al. (eds.), *Religion und Naturwissenschaften im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert*, Schriften des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte, 210 (Göttingen: 2010) 215–234.

<sup>137</sup> Ibid., 80.

<sup>138</sup> Detel W., "War Gassendi ein Empirist?", *Studia Leibnitiana* 65 (1975) 178–221.

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

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

<sup>139</sup> Newman W.R., *Promethean Ambitions: Alchemy and the Quest to Perfect Nature* (Chicago: 2004) 145–163. Cf. Céard J., "Bernard Palissy et l'alchimie", in Lestringant F. (ed.), *Bernard Palissy 1510–1590. L'écrivain, le réformé, le céramiste*, Journées d'études 29 et 30 juin 1990, Saintes, Abbaye-aux-Dames (Mont de Marsan: 1992) 155–166.

<sup>140</sup> Smith, "Giving Voice" 84: "science" meant theoretical knowledge that could be ascertained with certainty, usually by deductive means.'

<sup>141</sup> Kemp M., "Palissy's Philosophical Pots: Ceramics, Grottoes and the *Matrice* of the Earth", in Tega W. (ed.), *Le origini della modernità (II)* (Milan: 1999) (71–87) 83. On such self-stylization see Hösele J., "Mythisierung und Entmythisierung in den literarischen Selbstdarstellungen der Renaissance (Cellini, Cardano, Montaigne)", *Neohelicon* 3 (1975) 109–127. On Palissy's mythologization see Fragonard M.-M., "Les meubles de Palissy: La Biographie d'Artiste, Légende et mythes", in Lestringant, *Bernard Palissy* 25–38; Massay J.-L., *Bernard Palissy: Mythe et Réalité* (Saintes: 1990) 137–208; Lecoq A.-M., "Morts et résurrections de Bernard Palissy", *Revue de l'Art* 78, 1 (1987) 26–32; Thauré M., "Bernard Palissy: Le savant derrière le mythe", in Dhombres J.G. (ed.), *Aventures scientifiques: Savants en Poitou-Charentes du XVI<sup>e</sup> au XX<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Poitiers: 1995) 160–171.

of boldness among the gods and demigods of antiquity (such as Daedalus and Vulcan), and, on closer scrutiny, his alleged spontaneity proves to be pure stylization. This attitude certainly makes Palissy radically different to a modern writer such as Montaigne who, with his creative self-confidence, did not need such a construct to underpin the rareness of his talents. Another point of debate is whether we are doing Albrecht Dürer a favour if we, as Smith does, praise him as an artisan. After all, he fought all his life to be recognized *as an artist*. In fact we must generally ask if, when an artist made claims to knowledge, this was recognized within a knowledge culture, and if so, which factors were then relevant? Actually, talk of straight 'naturalism' in face of Palissy's highly artificial art objects<sup>142</sup> appears to be a subsequent illusory construction that interprets a historic text much too literally. For, to unmask the radical nature of Palissy's dictum, we need only mention that the metaphor of 'reading from the book of nature' is in fact ancient.<sup>143</sup> Likewise we must doubt whether here a new kind of empiricism is being propagated.<sup>144</sup> For it is clear that Palissy's constant references to his collection in order to visually evidence what his writings fail to palpably convey has, in the text, an ostentatively polemic function.<sup>145</sup> Moreover, the fact that some of Palissy's ceramic objects were not simply casts from nature but were instead representations and descriptions after examples in books, such as in that of Pierre Belon [figs. 16 and 17].<sup>146</sup>

<sup>142</sup> Cf. Klier A., *Fixierte Natur: Naturabguss und Effigies im 16. Jahrhundert* (Berlin: 2004).

<sup>143</sup> Bono J., *The Word of God and the Languages of Man* (Madison: 1995) 123–98; Curtius E.R., *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages* (New York: 1963) 319–26; Pedersen O., *The Book of Nature* (Vatican City: 1992) 42–53; Blumenberg H., *Die Lesbarkeit der Welt* (Frankfurt: 1981).

<sup>144</sup> Kemp, "Palissy's philosophical pots" 80: 'His cabinet was designed as a didactic tool to bring the viewer face-to-face with empirical reality.'

<sup>145</sup> 'I have set up a cabinet in which I have placed many admirable and monstrous things which I have drawn from the bowels of the earth, and which give reliable evidence of what I say, and no one will be found who will not admit them to be true, after he has seen the things which I have prepared in my cabinet, in order to convince all those who do not believe my writings [or do not wish to otherwise have faith in my writings] . . . in proving my written reasons, I satisfy sight, hearing, and touch, and for this reason defamers will have no power over me; as you will see when you come to see me in my little academy [!].'

<sup>146</sup> Belon Pierre, *La nature et diversité des poissons, avec leurs pourtraictz représentez au plus près du naturel* (Paris, Charles Estienne: 1555); id., *Portraits d'oyseaux, animaux, serpens, herbes, arbres, hommes et femmes d'Arabie et d'Égypte observez par P. Belon du Mans, le tout enrichi de quatrains pour la plus facile cognoissance des Oyseaux et autres portraits, plus y est adjousté la Carte du Mont Attos et du Mont Sinay pour l'intelligence de leur religion* (Paris, Guillaume Cavellat: 1557); On this topic see Amico L.N., *Bernard Palissy, in Search of Earthly Paradise* (Paris: 1996) 25, 64, 181.



Fig. 16. Pierre Belon, *La nature et diversité des poissons, avec leurs portraits* (Paris: 1555), p. 155.



Fig. 17. Bernard Palissy, *Oval bassin with coiled snake, large crayfish, etc. on a smooth white background*, c. 1570–1590. Lead-glazed ceramic. Sèvres, Musée national de Céramique.



It is important to take careful note of the rhetorical or topical construction of Palissy's writings<sup>147</sup> and the said techniques of self-stylization that he used to establish himself within scholarly traditions – and through which he possibly only first was accepted by his contemporaries. Already Duhem recognized that Palissy's alleged unlearnedness was a pose, and tried to prove that Palissy extensively plagiarized Cardano even on issues he criticized the latter for. Duhem therefore even doubted if it were really a fact that Palissy could not understand Latin.<sup>148</sup> Moreover, the body of writings that Palissy consulted grows more extensive daily due to research.<sup>149</sup> Even though we are confronted here with the lucky case of an artist who openly informs us about what he read and what he did not, we unfortunately cannot depend on the information he so freely imparted about himself. Instead we must remain aloof in our judgement thereof and recognize that this information reveals a traditional pattern characteristic for early modern *scholarly* texts, which consisted of eclectic, combinatory, intertextual writing and combining various other text fragments.<sup>150</sup>

<sup>147</sup> Polizzi G., "L'Intégration du modèle: le discours du jardin dans la Recepte véritable de B. Palissy", in Lestringant, *Bernard Palissy* 56–92.

<sup>148</sup> Duhem, *Etudes* 500; id., "Léonard de Vinci, Cardan et Bernard Palissy", *Bulletin Italien* 6, 4 (1906) 289–320. In a similar vein see also: Febvre L., *Le Problème de l'incroyance au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris: 1947) 446–447. Bachelard G., *La formation de l'esprit scientifique* (Paris: 1957) 121. On this topic see Thompson H.R., "The geographical and geological observations of Bernard Palissy the potter", *Annals of Science* 10, 2 (1954) 149–165.

<sup>149</sup> See La Rocque A., Introduction to: "The admirable discourses of Bernard Palissy", in id. (ed.), *The admirable discourses*; Fragonard M.-M., "Bernard Palissy: héritage de la science écrite et transmission des connaissances techniques", in *La transmission du savoir dans l'Europe des XVI<sup>e</sup> et XVII<sup>e</sup> siècles*. Textes réunis par Marie Roig Miranda (Paris: 2000) 27–42; ead., "Introduction", in Palissy B., *Œuvres Complètes*, ed. by M.-M. Fragonard – K. Cameron (Paris: 2010) 11–48. Palissy probably read: Pliny the Elder (in the French translation by Antoine Du Pinet, 1562), Vitruvius (in Jean Martin's edition from 1547), Aristotle (trans. Lefevre d'Etaples, 1516), Plutarch, *Roman de la Rose*, Leon Battista Alberti (trans. Jean Martin, 1553), Serlio (French translation from 1547), Dürer (probably in the Latin translation by Camerarius, 1st publ. 1536), Leonardo, Jacques Androuet du Cerceau, Philibert De l'Orme, Cardano (*Les livres de Hierome Cardanv intitvlés De la subtilité, & subtiles inuentions, ensemble les causes occultes, & raisons d'icelles, traduis de latin en françois, par Richard le Blanc* [Paris: Le Noir, 1556]), Pierre Belon, Philibert Hamelin, Francesco Colonna (French translation by Jean Martin, 1546, 1553), Diocurides, Gebert, Arnold of Villanova, Lullus, Paracelsus, Ambroise Paré (who attended Palissy's lectures and presumably was acquainted with his works), Jean Sleidan, Zécaire, Liébault, Grévin, Houel, La Rivière, and Isidor. Cf. Lestringant F., *Colloque Bernard Palissy: 1510–1590* (Mont-de-Marsan: 1990); Powers A., *Nature in Design* (London: 2001) 100–101; Amico L.N., *Bernard Palissy, in Search of Earthly Paradise* (Paris: 1996).

<sup>150</sup> Cf. Neuber W., "Topik und Intertextualität: Begriffshierarchie und ramistische Wissenschaft in Theodor Zwingers 'Methodus Apodemica'", in Kühlmann W. – Neuber W. (eds.), *Intertextualität in der Frühen Neuzeit*, Frühneuzeit-Studien 2 (Frankfurt: 1994) (253–278) 254.

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

### XI. *The Unexpected in the Library*

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

---

<sup>151</sup> Farrington B., *The Philosophy of Francis Bacon: An Essay on its Development from 1603 to 1609: With New Translations of Fundamental Texts* (Liverpool: 1964); Klein J., "Francis Bacon's Scientia Operativa, the Tradition of the Workshops, and the Secrets of Nature", in Zittel C. – Engel G. – Nanni R. (eds.), *Philosophies of Technology: Francis Bacon and his contemporaries* (Boston-Leiden: 2008) 21–50; Hanschmann A.B., *Bernard Palissy der Künstler, Naturforscher und Schriftsteller als Vater der induktiven Wissenschaftsmethode des Bacon von Verulam. Mit der Darstellung der Induktionstheorie Francis Bacons und John Stuart Mills, sowie einer neuen Erkenntnistheorie, nebst dem Bildnisse Palissys nach dessen eigener Fayence. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Naturwissenschaften und der Philosophie* (Leipzig: 1903).

<sup>152</sup> On this topic see Zittel C., "‘Truth is the daughter of time’: Zum Verhältnis von Theorie der Wissenskultur, Wissensideal und Wissensordnungen bei Bacon", in Detel W. – Zittel C., *Ideals and Cultures of Knowledge in Early Modern Europe. Concepts, Methods, Historical Conditions and Social Impact* (Berlin: 2002) 213–235.

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

---

<sup>153</sup> See Schmidt H., *Das Nachlaß-Inventar des Malers Jürgen Ovens*, Quellensammlung der Gesellschaft für Schleswig-Holsteinische Geschichte 7 (Leipzig: 1913). On Ovens's artistic work see id., *Jürgen Ovens: Sein Leben und seine Werke: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der niederländischen Malerei im 17. Jahrhundert*, Kunstgeschichtliche Forschungen 1 (Kiel: 1922); Schlüter-Götttsche G., *Jürgen Ovens: Ein schleswig-holsteinischer Barockmaler*, Kleine Schleswig-Holstein-Bücher (Heide in Holstein: 1978); Larsson L.O., "Jürgen Ovens und die Malerei an den nordeuropäischen Höfen um die Mitte des 17. Jahrhunderts", in id., *Wege nach Süden, Wege nach Norden: Aufsätze zu Kunst und Architektur*, ed. A. von Buttlar – U. Kuder et al. (Kiel: 1998) 170–184; Djupdræt M.B., "Die Inszenierung der Götter Geschichte durch Jürgen Ovens: Der Zyklus von Historienbildern aus Schloß Götter", *Nordelbingen* 70 (2001) 25–49.

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

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

Crossdisciplinary approaches of this kind have as yet practically not been pursued in the research of artists' reading practices in the early modern period. They would necessitate that the description of individual cases be embedded in knowledge-culture contexts. Also the research field of the early modern period must be closely defined. And, in relation to artist readers, additionally the technologies and facts of book market history must be investigated – such as the suppression of manuscripts by the printing press, a reduction in book prices in the 16th and 17th centuries, and the regional or national and international circulation of stocks of knowledge

in printed books.<sup>154</sup> We must also not forget to consider the phenomenon of a 'belated early modern era' in German-speaking Europe, as has been succinctly described by Heinz Schlaffer for German-language Baroque literature from Martin Opitz to Christian Hoffmann von Hofmannswaldau. Devastated by the Thirty Years' War, German-speaking regions were first decisively shaped by imitation and tentative appropriation of antiquity – the basis of Renaissance humanism and Italian Mannerism – in the 17th century, so that here the reception of literary innovations of 16th-century national Roman literatures was 'delayed'.<sup>155</sup> Schlaffer's thesis was inevitably criticized because it failed to consider the impact of Neo-Latin literature and also because it was based on a notion of literature that was too restricted to do justice to the early modern period. Sufficient evidence does in fact exist to substantiate the phenomenon of 'delayed' reception in the case of art literature and the reception of humanist art theory. Key works were only available relatively late in German translation, as we can observe in the case of Ripa's *Iconologia*, which was first published only very late in 1647, 1659 and 1669 in German translations of various lengths, in individual selections, and varying quality. And what is also noteworthy is that they were not translated from Italian editions but from Dutch translations belonging to German artists.<sup>156</sup> The history of knowledge specific to artists therefore mirrors the general conditions of knowledge mediation through printing, dissemination of books, and translations.

<sup>154</sup> Ivins W.M., *Prints and Visual Communication* (Cambridge: 1969); Eisenstein E.L., *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change: Communications and Cultural Transformations in Early-Modern Europe* (Cambridge-New York: 1997); Chartier R., *The Cultural Uses of Print in Early Modern France*, trans. L. Cochrane (Princeton/NJ: 1987); Johns A., *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making* (Chicago: 1998); Giesecke M., *Der Buchdruck in der frühen Neuzeit: Eine historische Fallstudie über die Durchsetzung neuer Informations- und Kommunikationstechnologien* (Frankfurt: 1998); Messerli A., "Leser, Leserschichten und -gruppen, Lesestoffe in der Neuzeit (1450–1850): Konsum, Rezeptionsgeschichte, Materialität", in Rautenberger U. (ed.), *Buchwissenschaft in Deutschland*, 2 vols. (Berlin-New York: 2010), vol. I, 443–502.

<sup>155</sup> See Schlaffer H., *Die kurze Geschichte der deutschen Literatur* (Munich-Vienna 2002) 35–53: 'Die verspätete Neuzeit'.

<sup>156</sup> On this topic see Sedlarz C., "Frühe deutsche Ripa-Rezeption bei Harsdörffer, Masen und Grefflinger", in Logemann C. – Thimann M. (eds.), *Cesare Ripa und die Begriffsbilder der Frühen Neuzeit, Bilder-Diskurs 2* (Berlin-Zürich: 2011) 311–334; ead., *Der Beitrag Georg Grefflingers zur Rezeption von Ripas Iconologia in Deutschland*, unpublished M.A. thesis, Ludwigs-Maximilians-Universität Munich (Munich: 1989); Thimann M., "epilogue", in *Georg Philipp Harsdörffer: Kunstverständiger Discurs von der edlen Mahlerey, Nürnberg 1652, Texte zur Wissensgeschichte der Kunst 1*, with an epilogue, ed. and annotated by M. Thimann (Heidelberg: 2008) (89–134) 111–114.



With this volume of chapters our goal is to enlighten on the above-mentioned questions relating to the education, reading habits, and knowledge of artists. In keeping with expectations, the chapters here too involve mostly case studies devoted to specific artists, inventories, or art-theoretical problems that foreground reading practices. The editors unanimously decided to not include contributions that alone held the promise of revealing new archival material, or only accept such a chapter under certain prerequisites. Instead we gave preference to contributors who went beyond art history and explored related material from a knowledge-history angle, and, at the same time, increased the latitude of who is considered an artist by also elucidating on the libraries of musicians,<sup>157</sup> architects,<sup>158</sup> and philosophers in their chapters. Furthermore, the selection of contributions that investigate artists' libraries in different countries is designed to offer insight into regional peculiarities as well as complex transnational exchange processes and asynchronous manifestations. Hence the order in which the chapters appear is loosely connected to the chronology of the subject matter.

### *Acknowledgments*

For assistance with translation, the editors would like to thank Christina Oberstebrink for her efficient and sensitive work. In addition, for help with particular issues concerning the editorial work, we would like to thank Vera Koppenleitner, Martin Herrnsstadt, Laurens Schlicht and Marianne Seidig.

---

<sup>157</sup> See Rainer Bayreuther's contribution in this volume.

<sup>158</sup> See Alexander Marr's contribution in this volume. See now also Curcio C. – Nobile M.R. – Scotti Tosini A. (eds.), *I libri e l'ingegno: studi sulla biblioteca dell'architetto (XV–XX secolo)* (Palermo: 2010), containing contributions on the libraries of Francesco Ricchino, Bernardo Antonio Vittone, Bernardo Temanza, Carl Johan Cronstedt, Giacomo Quarenghi and Thomas Jefferson.



Fig. 18. Final vignette of the biography of Guercino from Carlo Cesare Malvasia, *Felsina Pittrice* (Bologna: 1678).

### Selective Bibliography

- AGO R., "Collezioni di quadri e collezioni di libri a Roma tra XVI e XVIII secolo", *Quaderni storici* 37 (2002) 379–403.
- AMES-LEWIS F., *The Intellectual Life of the Early Renaissance Artist* (New Haven: 2000).
- ARENTS P., *De Bibliotheek van Pieter Pauwel Rubens. Een reconstructie*, De gulden passer 78/79 (Antwerp: 2001).
- BAUDOUIN F., "Rubens and his books", in De Smet R., *Les humanistes et leur bibliothèque. Actes du colloque international, Bruxelles, 26–28 août 1999* / Université Libre de Bruxelles, Travaux de l'Institut pour l'Etude de la Renaissance et de l'Humanisme 13 (Leuven: 2002) 231–246.
- BIALOSTOCKI J., "Doctus artifex and the library of the artist in XVIth and XVIIth century", in Horodisch A. (ed.), *De arte et libris: Festschrift Erasmus 1934–1984* (Amsterdam: 1984) 11–22.
- BLUMENBERG H., *Die Lesbarkeit der Welt* (Frankfurt: 1981).
- BOSCHLOO A.W.A., "Images of the Gods in the Vernacular", *Word & Image* 4 (1988) 412–421.
- BOUCHET F., *Le discours sur la lecture en France aux XIV<sup>e</sup> et XV<sup>e</sup> siècles: Pratiques, poétique, imaginaire*, Bibliothèque du XV<sup>e</sup> siècle 74 (Paris: 2008).
- BREDIUS A. (ed.), *Künstler-Inventare: Urkunden zur Geschichte der holländischen Kunst des XVIten, XVIIten und XVIIIten Jahrhunderts*, 8 vols. (The Hague: 1915–1922).
- CÉARD J., "Relire Bernard Palissy", *Revue de l'Art* 78 (1987) 77–84.
- CHARTIER R., *The Cultural Uses of Print in Early Modern France*, trans. L. Cochrane (Princeton/NJ: 1987).
- , *Lesewelten: Buch und Lektüre in der frühen Neuzeit* (Frankfurt am Main: 1990).
- , CAVALLO G. (eds.), *Die Welt des Lesens: Von der Schriftrolle zum Bildschirm* (Frankfurt: 1999).
- COPPENS C., "Der Bürger liest – liest der Bürger?", in Van der Storck J. (ed.), *Stadtbilder in Flandern: Spuren bürgerlicher Kultur, 1477–1787*, exh. cat. Schallaburg (Brussels: 1991) 210–218.
- DEMPSEY C., "Some Observations on the Education of Artists in Florence and Bologna During the Later Sixteenth Century", *Art Bulletin* 62 (1980) 552–569.
- DUHEM P., *Etudes sur Léonard de Vinci: Ceux qu'il a lus et ceux qui l'ont lu*, 3 vols. (Paris: 1906–1913).
- EISENSTEIN E.L., *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change: Communications and Cultural Transformations in Early-Modern Europe* (Cambridge-New York: 1997).
- EMISON P.A., *Creating the "Divine" Artist: From Dante to Michelangelo* (Leiden-Boston: 2004).
- ENENKEL K.A.E. – PAPY J., "Towards a New Approach of Petrarch's Reception in the Renaissance – the 'Independent Reader'", in Enenkel K.A.E. – Papy J. (eds.), *Petrarch and his Readers in the Renaissance*, Intersections. Yearbook for Early Modern Studies 6 (Leiden-Boston: 2006) 1–10.
- EYBL F.M. – HARMS W. – KRUMMACHER H.-H. – WELZIG W. (eds.), *Enzyklopädien der frühen Neuzeit: Beiträge zu ihrer Erforschung* (Tübingen: 1995).
- GIESECKE M., *Der Buchdruck in der frühen Neuzeit: Eine historische Fallstudie über die Durchsetzung neuer Informations- und Kommunikationstechnologien* (Frankfurt am Main: 1998).
- GOLAHNY A., *Rembrandt's Reading: The Artist's Bookshelf of Ancient Poetry and History* (Amsterdam: 2003).
- GRAFTON A., "Leon Battista Alberti: The Writer as Reader", in id., *Commerce with the Classics: Ancient Books and Renaissance Readers* (Michigan: 1997) 53–92.
- , *Commerce with the Classics, Ancient Books & Renaissance Readers* (Michigan: 1997).
- GUTHMÜLLER B. (ed.), *Latein und Nationalsprachen in der Renaissance*, Wolfenbütteler Abhandlungen zur Renaissanceforschung 17 (Wiesbaden: 1998).

- , *Ovidio metamorphoseos vulgare: Formen und Funktionen der volkssprachlichen Wiedergabe klassischer Dichtung in der italienischen Renaissance*, Veröffentlichungen zur Humanismusforschung 3 (Boppard am Rhein: 1981).
- HANEBUTT-BENZ E.-M. (ed.), *Die Kunst des Lesens: Lesemöbel u. Leseverhalten vom Mittelalter bis zur Gegenwart*, exh. cat. Frankfurt am Main (Frankfurt am Main: 1985).
- HOLERT T., *Künstlerwissen: Studien zur Semantik künstlerischer Kompetenz im Frankreich des 18. und frühen 19. Jahrhunderts* (Munich: 1997).
- HUNTER M. (ed.), *Archives of the Scientific Revolution: the Formation and Exchange of Ideas in 17th-century Europe* (Woodbridge: 1998).
- IVINS W.M., *Prints and Visual Communication* (Cambridge: 1969).
- JENSEN K. (ed.), *Incurabula and Their Readers: Printing, Selling and Using books in the Fifteenth Century* (London: 2003).
- JOHNS A., *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making* (Chicago: 1998).
- , "The Physiology of Reading", in Jardine N. – Frasca-Spada M. (eds.), *Books and the Sciences in History* (Cambridge: 2000) 291–314.
- KALLENBACH C., *The Virgilian Tradition: Book History and the History of Reading in Early Modern Europe*, Variorum collected studies series 885 (Aldershot: 2007).
- KLINGSÖHR-LEROY C., *Das Künstlerbildnis des Grand Siècle in Malerei und Graphik: Vom "Noble Peintre" zum "Pictor doctus"* (Munich: 2002).
- KRAUSE K., "Par les préceptes et par les exemples: Überlegungen zur Ausbildung der Maler im Paris des 17. Jahrhunderts", *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 69 (2006) 194–216.
- LEVY E., "Ideal and Reality of the Learned Artist: The Schooling of Italian and Netherlandish Artists", in Brown University (ed.), *Children of Mercury: The Education of Artists in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, exh. cat. Providence/RI (Providence/RI: 1984) 20–27.
- MANGUEL A., *A History of Reading* (New York: 1996).
- MESSERLI A. – CHARTIER R. (eds.), *Scripta volant, verba manent: Schriftkulturen in Europa zwischen 1500 und 1900* (Basel: 2007).
- , "Leser, Leserschichten und -gruppen, Lesestoffe in der Neuzeit (1450–1850): Konsum, Rezeptionsgeschichte, Materialität", in Rautenberger U. (ed.), *Buchwissenschaft in Deutschland*, 2 vols. (Berlin-New York: 2010), vol. I, 443–502.
- NELLES P., "Reading and Memory in the Universal Library: Conrad Gessner and the Renaissance Book", in Beecher D. – Williams G. (eds.), *Ars Reminiscendi: Mind and Memory in Renaissance Culture* (Toronto: 2009) 147–170.
- OLSCHKI L., *Bildung und Wissenschaft im Zeitalter der Renaissance in Italien* (Leipzig-Florence-Rome-Geneva: 1922).
- RETI L., *The Library of Leonardo da Vinci* (Los Angeles: 1972).
- SCHAEER R. (ed.), *Tous les savoirs du monde: Encyclopédies et bibliothèques de Sumer au XXI<sup>e</sup> siècle*, exh. cat. Paris (Paris: 1996).
- SCHIERBAUM M. (ed.), *Enzyklopädistik 1550–1650: Typen und Transformationen von Wissensspeichern und Medialisierungen des Wissens*, Pluralisierung und Autorität 18 (Berlin-Münster: 2009).
- SCHMIDT P., "Literat und 'selbgewachsener Moler': Jörg Wickram und der illustrierte Roman der frühen Neuzeit", in Guthmüller B. – Hamm B. – Tönnemann A. (eds.), *Künstler und Literat: Schrift- und Buchkultur in der europäischen Renaissance*, Wolfenbütteler Abhandlungen zur Renaissanceforschung 24 (Wiesbaden: 2006) 143–194.
- SCHULZE S. (ed.), *Leselust – Niederländische Malerei von Rembrandt bis Vermeer*, exh. cat. Frankfurt (Stuttgart: 1993).
- SHERMAN W.H., *Used Books: Marking Readers in Renaissance England*, Material Texts (Philadelphia: 2008).
- SMITH P.M., *The Body of the Artisan: Art and Experience in the Scientific Revolution* (Chicago: 2006) 59–93.

- SOERGEL-PANOFKY G., "An Artist's Library in Rome around 1600" in: Fleming V. v. – Schütze S. (eds.), *Ars naturam adiuvans*. Festschrift für Matthias Winner zum 11. März 1996 (Mainz: 1996) 367–380.
- THIMANN M., *Gedächtnis und Bild-Kunst: Die Ordnung des Künstlerwissens in Joachim von Sandrarts Teutscher Academie*, Rombach Wissenschaften. Reihe Quellen zur Kunst 28 (Freiburg im Breisgau: 2007).
- VIGNAU-WILBERG T., "'Pictor doctus': Drawing and the Theory of Art Around 1600", in Fuciková E. (ed.) *Rudolf II and Prague: The Court and the City* (London et al.: 1997) 179–188.
- WERLE D., *Copia librorum: Problemgeschichte imaginierter Bibliotheken 1580–1630*, Frühe Neuzeit 119 (Tübingen: 2007).
- ZAPPERI R., "Le postille di Annibale Carracci alle Vite di Vasari: un'apologia della pittura veneziana del Cinquecento", *Venezia Cinquecento* 20 (2010) 171–180.
- ZEDELMAIER H., *Bibliotheca universalis und Bibliotheca selecta: Das Problem der Ordnung des gelehrten Wissens in der frühen Neuzeit*, Beihefte zum Archiv für Kulturgeschichte 33 (Cologne-Weimar-Vienna: 1992).