

**HEEMSKERCK'S ROME:
ANTIQUITY, MEMORY, AND THE BERLIN SKETCHBOOKS**

by

Arthur J. DiFuria

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the University of Delaware in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Art
History

Summer, 2008

Copyright 2008 Arthur J. DiFuria
All Rights Reserved

UMI Number: 3337454

Copyright 2008 by
DiFuria, Arthur J.

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform 3337454
Copyright 2009 by ProQuest LLC
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

**HEEMSKERCK'S ROME:
ANTIQUITY, MEMORY, AND THE BERLIN SKETCHBOOKS**

by

Arthur J. DiFuria

Approved:

Bernard Herman, Ph.D.
Chair, Department of Art History.

Approved:

Tom Apple, Ph.D.
Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences

Approved:

Carolyn A. Thoroughgood, Ph.D.
Vice Provost for Research and Graduate Studies

I certify that I have read this dissertation and that in my opinion it meets the academic and professional standard required by the University as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Signed: _____
Linda Pellecchia, Ph.D.
Professor in charge of dissertation

I certify that I have read this dissertation and that in my opinion it meets the academic and professional standard required by the University as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Signed: _____
H. Perry Chapman, Ph.D.
Member of dissertation committee

I certify that I have read this dissertation and that in my opinion it meets the academic and professional standard required by the University as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Signed: _____
David Marshall Stone, Ph.D.
Member of dissertation committee

I certify that I have read this dissertation and that in my opinion it meets the academic and professional standard required by the University as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Signed: _____
Larry Silver, Ph.D.
Member of dissertation committee

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish, above all, to thank Dr. Linda Pellecchia, whose intellectual challenges have stimulated me and whose support of all aspects of my career has been constant since my application to the University of Delaware's Ph.D. program in Art History. Her work on my behalf is immeasurable and priceless to me. She also introduced me to Dr. Allan Ceen, whose seemingly endless knowledge and love of the Eternal City, his generosity, his enthusiasm for Heemskerck's drawings, and his insistence on this project's worth sustained me through several difficult phases. Dr. H. Perry Chapman and Dr. Larry Silver offered early encouragement for this project, despite its ambitious nature. Their read every draft of this project – a thankless, time-consuming task – with unwavering graciousness, detail, and rapidity. Dr. David Marshall Stone has been a generous source of advice and brilliant ideas throughout my time at the University of Delaware. At times, I would have been lost without him. Dr. Joanna Woodall read an early draft of my third chapter. Her suggestion that I pursue the theme of memory became a key to conceptualizing the entire work. Dr. Laura Giles and Dr. John Marciari read my section on Heemskerck's technique and offered substantial expertise and advice on short notice. The Samuel H. Kress Foundation's generous grant of a Travel Fellowship in the History of Art (2005) facilitated research in Berlin, Brussels, Haarlem, London, Besançon, and Rome.

All of my professional friends are also responsible for this achievement. I must first single out Dr. Susan Stewart and Dr. Alan Singer. They brought me to Rome for the first time. I cannot imagine a better introduction to the Eternal City; they showed me its poetry. There is also no way I could have done this without the sympathies, advice, and consideration of my colleagues and students at Moore College of Art and Design. President Happy Fernandez, Dean Dona Lantz, and Moore Federation of Teachers President Steve Sherman arranged an unusual a half-year appointment for me in 2005 – 06 so that I could conduct research without losing my status as Visiting Scholar in Liberal Arts and Curatorial Studies. Dr. Maureen Pelta and Dr. Jonathan Wallis also deserve special thanks: both gave me the room in my schedule to continue making progress on this dissertation while teaching. Dr. Pelta's ceaseless intellectual curiosity – everywhere felt in this dissertation – resulted in an ongoing dialogue about my topic that helped me to formulate my approach and my thoughts in countless ways.

Last, but far from least, the personal and emotional support of my friends and family has forever left its mark on my heart and soul. Maxx Stoyanoff Williams opened his home to me when I was in need of a place to stay in Berlin. Without his generosity, I would not have had the time I needed to examine Heemskerck's drawings in detail. Nancy Wenzel's sympathetic ear, sage practical advice, and unconditional love were inspiring when this project seemed overwhelming. I am a better man than I was before I met her. Finally, my parents deserve the most thanks of all. Their support was constant. So was their belief in my ability to complete this task.

I dedicate this dissertation to the memory of my ancestors and descendants:
the past is all that lies before us.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES.....	x
ABSTRACT.....	xiv
INTRODUCTION.....	1
Chapter	
1 THE PRE-ROMAN NETHERLANDISH CONTEXT FOR HEEMSKERCK’S DRAWINGS OF ROME.....	9
Introduction.....	9
1.1 The Historiographic Implications of Karel van Mander’s Discussion of Heemskerck in Rome.....	11
1.2 Early Netherlandish Romanism and Heemskerck’s Road to the Eternal City.....	26
1.3 Heemskerck in Scorel’s Workshop.....	36
1.4 Conclusion.....	43
2 DRAWING THE ETERNAL: HEEMSKERCK IN ROME.....	45
Introduction.....	45
2.1 Context: Drawing Ruins in the post-Sack Milieu.....	48
2.2 The Eye: Discovering Ancient Rome in the Frame.....	61
2.2.1 Broad-View Panoramas.....	63
2.2.2 Medium View Panoramas.....	68
2.2.3 Single Building Compositions.....	71
2.2.4 Describing Roman Space: Diagonals, Foreshortenings, and Worm’s Eye Views.....	74
2.2.5 Towards Invention: “Vision <i>all’antica</i> ,” Topographical Revisions, and Fictive Juxtapositions.....	80
2.3 The Hand: Articulating the Roman Landscape in a Variety of Media and Techniques.....	84
2.3.1 Heemskerck’s Pure Pen and Ink Process for Drawing Roman Topography.....	87
2.3.1a Pure Pen and Ink Drawings of Low Finish.....	91
2.3.1b Pure Pen and Ink Drawings of Medium Finish.....	93
2.3.1c Pure Pen and Ink Drawings of High Finish.....	96

2.3.2	Uses of Ink Wash and Chalks.....	101
2.4	Conclusion.....	105
3	REMEMBERING THE ETERNAL: HEEMSKERCK’S PICTORIAL MEMORY OF ROME AND HIS SELF-PORTRAITURE	
	Introduction.....	107
3.1	Invention and Memory: Heemskerck’s Use of his Drawings of Rome in his Paintings and Prints.....	109
3.1.1	Allusions, Quotations, and Pure <i>Fantasia</i> : Types of Topography <i>all’antica</i> in Maerten van Heemskerck’s Paintings and Prints.....	118
3.1.1a	Echoes of Roman Buildings.....	120
3.1.1b	Quotations from Drawings.....	123
3.1.1c	Pure <i>Fantasia</i> : Heemskerck’s Vocabulary of Ruins and New Ancient Cities.....	126
3.1.2	Towards Self-Fashioning: Heemskerck’s Cultivation of an Audience for his <i>Fantasia</i>	130
3.2	Heemskerck’s Self - Fashioning as the Netherlandish Master of the Landscape <i>all’antica</i>	133
3.2.1	Coming of Age: Heemskerck’s Rise and mid-Sixteenth Century Netherlandish Romanism	135
3.2.2	Heemskerck’s Identity as a Master of Rome and Hieronymus Cock’s <i>Præcipua aliquot Romanae</i> <i>Antiquitatis Ruinarum</i>	142
3.2.3	<i>Self-Portrait Before the Colosseum</i> ’s Romanist Audience....	147
3.3	Conclusion.....	150
4	A CATALOG OF MAERTEN VAN HEEMSKERCK’S DRAWINGS OF ROME	
4.1	Catalog Guidelines.....	152
4.2	Catalog Key.....	156
4.3	A Catalog of Maerten van Heemskerck’s Drawings of Rome.....	158
4.4	Attributions Problems in Maerten van Heemskerck’s Drawings of Rome.....	259
4.4.1	Appendix A: Drawings of Roman Topography Attributed to Maerten van Heemskerck or his Circle not published by Hülsen and Egger.....	262
4.4.2	Appendix B: Drawings of Roman Topography Deattributed from Maerten van Heemskerck.....	267
4.4.2a	‘Anonymous B’ (Michiel Gast)	267
4.4.2b	‘Anonymous C’	269
4.4.2c	‘Anonymous D’?.....	273

5	Conclusion.....	275
	References.....	281

List of Illustrations

- 1.1 1 – 5: Maerten van Heemskerck, *Nativity, Adoration of the Three Kings, and Annunciation*, 1546, Haarlem, Frans Halsmuseum, Inv. No. 474.
- 1.1, 6: Maerten van Heemskerck, *Triumph of Bacchus*, mid 1530s, Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Inv. No. 990.
- 1.2, 1: Jan Gossaert, *Neptune and Amphitrite*, 1516, Berlin, Gemäldegalerie, Inv. No. 1/727.
- 1.2, 2: Maerten van Heemskerck, *Man of Sorrows*, 1532, Ghent, Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Inv. No. S.53.
- 1.2, 3: Maerten van Heemskerck, *Woman with a Spinning Wheel*, ca. 1530, Castagnola.
- 1.2, 4: Jan Gossaert, *Self-Portrait*, 1515 – 20, oil on wood, Currier Museum of Art, Inv. No. 252.468.
- 1.3, 1: Jan Gossaert, *Colosseum*, 1508 – 09, Kupferstichkabinett, Berlin, Inv. No. 12.918
- 1.3, 2: Jan van Scorel, *Lokhorst Triptych*, 1526 – 27, Centraal Museum, Utrecht, Inv. Nos. 6078a and 7991.
- 1.3, 3: Jan van Scorel, *Adoration of the Magi*, ca. 1530, Dublin, National Gallery of Ireland, Inv. No. 997.
- 1.3, 4: Follower of Jan van Scorel, *Fire of Troy*, ca. 1524 – 1530, oil on wood, 43.5 x 31.2 cm., Utrecht, Centraal Museum, Inv. No. 2374.
- 1.3, 5: Jan van Scorel, *Bethlehem*, ca. 1520, British Museum, London, Inv. No. PD 1928-3-10-100.
- 1.3, 6: Jan van Scorel, *Tower of Babel*, Cà d'Oro, Venice, Galleria dell'Accademia, cat. No. 185.

- 1.4, 1: Maerten van Heemskerck, *Madonna and Child Before a Landscape*, 1530, oil on wood, 90 x 70 cm., whereabouts unknown, Provenance, Dr. R. Clavel Collection up to 1969.
- 2.1, 1: Hermannus Posthumus, *Tempus Edax Rerum*, ca. 1535, oil on canvas, 96 x 144.5 cm., The Princely Collection, Vaduz, Liechtenstein.
- 2.1, 2: “Anonymous B” / Michiel Gast, *Santa Maria Della Febbre*, ca. 1535, Kupferstichkabinett, Berlin, Dahlem 79D2a Album II, 7r.
- 2.1, 3: Polidoro da Caravaggio, *Story of Mary Magdalene*, ca. 1525, Fra Mariano Fetti Chapel, San Silvestro al Quirinale, Rome.
- 2.2.1, 1: Hermannus Posthumus, *Panorama of Rome from the Capitoline*, Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett, Album II, 91v and 92r.
- 2.2.1, 2: Henrick van Cleef, *View of Rome from the Esquiline Hill*, 1583 – 1588 Gabinetto Nazionale dei Disegni e delle Stampe, FN 495.
- 2.2.1, 3: Codex Escorialensis, f. 27v.
- 2.2.1, 4: Anonymous, *View of the Tiber*, ca. 1570, Stuttgart, Staatsgalerie, Inv. No. 5807.
- 2.2.2, 1: Codex Escorialensis, f. 29v.
- 2.2.2, 2: Etienne Dupérac, “Forum Romanum”, *Disegni de le Ruine di Roma e Come Anticamente erano*, 1574, f. 16v.
- 2.2.2, 3: Hermannus Posthumus? *View of the Forum Romanum*, Berlin, Album II, 12r.
- 2.2.2, 4: *North End of the Forum Romanum*, Photograph, Public Domain.
- 2.2.3, 1: Codex Escorialensis, f. 41v.
- 2.2.4, 1: Codex Escorialensis, f. 20r.
- 2.2.4, 2: Codex Escorialensis, f. 28v.
- 2.2.4, 3: Polidoro da Caravaggio, *Genre Study*, ca. 1525, Albertina, Vienna, Inv. No. 398, SCR474.
- 2.2.4, 4.5: Anonymous, *View of the Baths of Diocletian with the Doryphorus and Architectural details*, mid. 16th century.

- 2.2.4, 4: Hermannus Posthumus, *Colosseum Interior Barrel Vault*, Berlin, Album II, 59v.
- 2.2.4, 5: A.L. Ducros, *Villa Medici Gardens from inside the Western Loggia*, ca. 1782, Losanna, Musée Cantonal des Beaux-Arts, Inv. No. D-8884.
- 2.2.4, 6: G.F. Grimaldi, *L'Isola Tiberina, Ponte Fabricio*, ca. 1679, Rome, Gabinetto Nazionale dei Disegni e delle Stampe, Inv. No. FC 125300.
- 2.2.5, 1: Hermannus Posthumus, *Templum Serapidis*, Berlin, Album II, ff. 81v and 82r.
- 2.2.5, 2: Giovanni Antonio Dosio, *Templum Serapidis*, ca. 1550, Uffizi, Florence, UA 2512.
- 2.2.5, 3: Giovanni Antonio Dosio, *Substructures of the Palace of Septimius Severus*, ca. 1550, Florence, Uffizi, UA 2519.
- 2.2.5, 4: Baldassare Peruzzi, *Comic Scene*, ca. 1530, Gabinetto delle Stampe, Uffizi, Florence, UA 242.
- 2.2.5, 5: Francesco Colonna, *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili: the strife of love in a dream*, trans. Joscelyn Godwyn (London: 1999), f. 83v.
- 2.2.5, 6: Antoine Caron, *Massacres of the Triumvirate*, 1566, Louvre, Paris, Inv. No. R.F. 1939-28.
- 2.3.1a, 1: Etienne du Pérac, “Trofei di Mario”, *Disegni de le ruine di Roma e come anticamente erono* (Rome; c. 1574), f. 25.
- 3.1.1, 1: *Landscape with the Abduction of Helen*, 1535 – 36, Baltimore, Walters Art Museum, Inv. No. 37656.
- 3.1.1, 2: *Landscape with Classical Ruins and St. Jerome*, 1547, Lichtenstein Museum, Oil on Wood, 105 x 161 cm., Inv. No. G117.
- 3.1.1, 3: *Ruth and Boaz*, 1551, Hollstein no. 91.
- 3.1.1, 4: *Balaam and the Angel*, 1554, Hollstein no. 77.
- 3.1.2a, 1: *Elisha Receiving Elijah's Mantle*, 1571, Hollstein no. 138.
- 3.1.2b, 1: “Lot and his Family Leaving Sodom”, Hollstein, no. 242.
- 3.1.2b, 2: “The Three Holy Women at the Sepulchre”, Hollstein, no. 301.

- 3.1.2b, 3: “Lot Making Love to His Daughters”, Hollstein, no. 243.
- 3.1.2b, 4: “Job on the Dunghill with his Wife and Three Friends”, Hollstein, no. 160.
- 3.1.2b, 5: *Flight into Egypt*, 1549, Hollstein, no. 304.
- 3.1.2b, 6: *Satan Smiting Job with Boils*, Hollstein, no. 159.
- 3.1.2c, 1: “Jonah Complaining Under the Gourd” (1562), Hollstein, no. 182.
- 3.1.2c, 2: *Habakuk Bringing Food to Daniel in the Lion’s Den*, Hollstein, no. 225.
- 3.1.2c, 3: *Landscape with the Parable of the Good Samaritan*, Hollstein, no. 354.
- 3.1.2c, 4: “Feeding the Hungry”, Hollstein, no. 331.
- 3.1.2c, 5: “Giving the Thirsty to Drink”, Hollstein, no. 332.
- 3.1.2c, 6: “The Servant Forcing a Fellow Servant to Pay his Debt”, Hollstein, no. 340.
- 3.1.2c, 7: “The Burial of St. Stephen”, Hollstein, no. 411.
- 3.2, 1: *Self–Portrait Before the Colosseum*, 1553, Oil on canvas, 42.2 x 54 cm., Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, England, Inv. No. 103.
- 3.2.1, 1: *Landscape with Classical Ruins and St. Jerome* (print), Hollstein, no. 588.
- 3.2.2, 1: Hieronymous Cock, *Baths of Caracalla*, Riggs, cat. no. 20 (fig. 21).
- 3.2.3, 1: *Bullfight in an Ancient Arena*, 1552, Oil on Wood, 75 x 121 cm., Musée de Beaux Arts, Lille, Inv. No. P819.

ABSTRACT

This dissertation offers the first critical study and complete catalogue of Maerten van Heemskerck's (1498 – 1574) unprecedented corpus of drawings of Roman topography. No scholar has studied this landmark group of images as a single body of work since the second decade of the twentieth century, when Christian Hülsen and Hermann Egger annotated and published the two bound albums in Berlin that contain drawings by Heemskerck and others. Hülsen and Egger were primarily interested in identifying the monuments that Heemskerck drew and the hands responsible for the drawings. Questions about the importance of Roman topography for Heemskerck's artistry and his contribution of the Netherlandish vision of Rome have remained unexplored ever since.

In three chapters, I locate the origins of Heemskerck's drawings, the means he deployed to make them, and his later use of them, in a heretofore neglected continuity in the memory of antiquity. My first chapter situates Heemskerck's drawings within the context of the assimilative practices he encountered in his early Netherlandish training. Integral to our understanding of Heemskerck's impulse to draw Rome is a reconsideration of his tenure in the Haarlem *atelier* of Jan van Scorel (1495 – 1560), the Utrecht painter who preceded Heemskerck to Rome and served as Adrian VI's (r. 1522 – 1523) keeper of Vatican antiquities. In a historiographic section, I argue that biographer Karel van Mander's suggestion that

Heemskerck drew Rome in emulation of Scorel has obscured the perceived need for clarifying the origins of Heemskerck's Roman drawings. Subsequent sections describe the pre-Roman Heemskerck as a product of the early Netherlandish interest in antiquity – so-called Netherlandish Romanism. I portray the young Heemskerck as eager to develop a pictorial memory of motifs from the work of his contemporaries, including his artistic predecessors to Rome, Jan Gossaert (also called Mabuse, 1478? – 1532) and Scorel. Although their prime directive was the development of a vocabulary of Italianate motifs, neither artist acquired a substantial lexicon of ruin landscape motifs from drawings they made in Rome. I argue that it was Scorel's assimilation of the motifs he drew in Italian paintings and his *wanderjahr* landscape drawings to post-Roman paintings that engendered Heemskerck's proclivities for antiquity and landscape, thus priming him to conceive a sketchbook filled with Roman ruin motifs.

The second chapter describes how Heemskerck's capacity for assimilation and his aptitudes for antiquity and landscape flourished in Rome's post-Sack culture of the early 1530s. During Heemskerck's Roman stay, fears of a second Sack peaked. I cast his fascination with ruin landscapes as a response to contemporary cultural memories of the Eternal City's past glory and its palpable vulnerability, both embodied in her ruins. Heemskerck traveled in Roman artistic and patronal circles where impulses to collect, preserve, and create the memory of antiquity had coalesced. My contextualization of the formal aspect of Heemskerck's ruin landscape drawings illustrates their kinship with these mnemonic imperatives. I demonstrate that his use of multiple compositional schemes, media, and techniques

evinces his acquisition of the Roman landscape and the devices and methods of his artistic contemporaries. More than a mere pictorial record of Rome, his drawings are a collection of the tendencies he assimilated in the motifs he saw in Rome's landscape and the art he encountered. Thus, in his sketchbook, Heemskerck collected antiquity according to his own vision and experiences.

My third chapter describes how Heemskerck's ruin landscape motifs functioned as mnemonic triggers in his post-Roman work. In paintings like *Landscape with the Abduction of Helen* (Baltimore, Walters Art Museum, 1535 – 36) and numerous prints, the profusion of ruin *fantasie*, new buildings *all'antica*, even entire cityscapes, spring from a commingling of Heemskerck's drawings with his pictorial memory of Rome. For viewers, his inventions sparked memories of the Eternal City; as scenery evocative of Rome, yet never before seen due to its invented status, Heemskerck's ruinscapes imbued their foreground narratives with a timeless universality. After outlining Heemskerck's mnemonic modes of landscape invention *all'antica* – memories of built examples, partial quotations from his drawings, and pure *fantasie* – I contextualize his self-portraiture, which commemorates his time spent drawing the Eternal City's architectural ruins. Analyses of *Self-Portrait Before the Colosseum* (Fitzwilliam Museum, 1553) have never noted that Heemskerck conceived it at the very point in his career when his proliferation of ruin *fantasie* was peaking. As a recollective device, *Self-Portrait Before the Colosseum* celebrates the mnemonic function of Heemskerck's drawings of Rome, their key role in bringing the ancient Roman past into the present.

I conclude with my catalogue, where Heemskerck's drawn collection of pictorial knowledge about the architectural vestiges of ancient Rome emerges in its myriad forms. The catalog contains entries for each drawing of secure or questionable attribution to Heemskerck, copies, and those thought to be copies of lost originals. The catalog's most important function is to provide an extensive description of each drawing's vantage point, subject matter, formal aspect, and its relation to other drawings, prints and paintings by Heemskerck and other artists. By providing thorough analyses of each drawing, I bring to light Heemskerck's pictorial conversation with antiquity and the artistry of his times, mediated by his drawings of Rome in all of their particular manifestations.

INTRODUCTION

Two bound albums residing in Berlin's Kupferstichkabinett comprised of 172 sheets contain most of the extant drawings after the antique that Maerten van Heemskerck executed while visiting Rome from the summer of 1532 to at least the spring of 1536.¹ The contents of the Berlin albums reveal that during his Roman stay, Heemskerck drew ancient sculpture and the Eternal City's ancient architectural aspect in roughly equal amounts.² In total, seventy-eight drawings by or after Heemskerck portray various topographical elements in and around Rome. Of the topographical subjects Heemskerck pursued, the Eternal City's ancient architectural aspect garnered the lion's share of his attention. Most drawings show Rome's ruins *in situ* at medium range. But Heemskerck also executed some close studies of ancient architectural fragments. While he consistently eschewed Rome's medieval elements, often choosing to edit them from his drawings of the vistas before him, he did not limit himself to ancient Roman topographical elements.

¹ The albums in Berlin are Inv. Nos. 79 D2 and 79 D2a, respectively; for a facsimile see Christian Hülsen and Hermann Egger, *Die Römischen Skizzenbücher von Maarten van Heemskerck in Königlichen Kupferstichkabinett zu Berlin*, 2 vols. (Berlin: 1913 – 1916, facsimile ed., Soest: 1975); for information on the beginning and end dates of Heemskerck's stay in Rome, see below, nn. 101 and 102.

² Freestanding sculpture appears on seventy-seven sheets; groups or collections of sculptures without detailed settings in collections, *cortili*, or sculpture gardens appear on seven sheets; relief sculptures appear on eight sheets.

Heemskerck also drew modern buildings *all'antica*, including the unfinished St. Peter's, palace facades, and *cortili*.

While these breathtaking drawings compel us to ask innumerable questions about Heemskerck's artistry and his role in bringing antiquity to the Netherlands, the albums in which they appear also present a host of problems that scholars may never be able to answer satisfactorily. Perhaps assembled in the seventeenth century by French collector Pierre-Jean Mariette (1694 – 1774), the albums came to the Kupferstichkabinett in 1879 when it acquired the collection of French architect Hippolyte Destailleur (1787 – 1852). In both albums, each sheet has been mounted onto a separate folio designed to show both *recto* and *verso*, whether or not both sides contain drawings. We do not know who is responsible for their current configuration. What Destailleur acquired might have already resembled what is now in Berlin. Or he could have augmented Mariette's assemblage or changed the sequence of the drawings. Regardless, we are certain that the Berlin albums do not resemble the "sketchbook" that Heemskerck carried with him through the Eternal City. We are also certain that Heemskerck is not the only artist whose drawings the Berlin albums contain.

Most of the first album contains small rectangular sheets (approximately 130 x 200 mm.), nearly all of which were certainly folios in Heemskerck's Roman sketchbook.³ However, a few of the first album's sheets, nearly the same size, are probably by a hand other than Heemskerck's and thus, were not a part of his

³ Exceptions in the first album are ff. 62 (284 x 207 mm.), 76 (151 x 163 mm.), 77 (141 x 161 mm.), and 78 (113 x 115 mm.).

sketchbook.⁴ In their early twentieth century publication of the albums, Christian Hülsen and Hermann Egger tried to reconstruct the sketchbook's original sequence of drawings on the basis of residue of red chalk (often Heemskerck's medium of choice for drawing sculpture), left behind on any sheet that faced a sheet with a red chalk drawing.⁵ However, their endeavor must remain incomplete since Heemskerck did not draw in red chalk on every sheet. In the sequence Hülsen and Egger propose, the drawings do not suggest that Heemskerck took a specified systematic approach to drawing Rome's monuments.

The second Berlin album is no less problematic. It does not contain sheets from Heemskerck's sketchbook, but is comprised instead of drawings on larger pieces of paper. Many drawings in the second album are by other hands, especially a majority by an artist unknown to Hülsen and Egger, whom they labeled "Anonymous A," and whom Nicole Dacos later identified as Heemskerck's companion in Rome, Hermannus Posthumus.⁶ Several other sheets attributed to

⁴ Ilja Veldman, "Heemskercks Romeinse tekeningen en 'Anonymous B,'" in *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* (no. 38, 1987), pp. 369 – 382 identified Berlin ff. I, 8r, 10r, 15r, as being by an artist other than Heemskerck, whom she dubbed "Anonymous B." The second album also contains drawings that appear to be by this hand. They are ff. II, 2r and 7r. In various publications, Nicole Dacos has suggested that "Anonymous B" is Michiel Gast. Cf., *Roma Quanta Fuit: Ou L'Invention du Paysage de Ruines* (Brussels: 2204), Chapter V.

⁵ For their analysis of the red chalk marks, see Hülsen and Egger, I, pp. V – IX.

⁶ For a discussion of "Anonymous A" that includes a list of the drawings in the second album that are attributed to him, see *Ibid.*, II, pp. XIII – XIX; little is known of Posthumus, whose name has been brought to light in several studies by Nicole Dacos. For Posthumus as "Anonymous A," see Dacos, "L'anonyme A de Berlin: Hermannus Posthumus," in: *Antikenzeichnung und Antikenstudium in Renaissance und Frühbarock* (Mainz am Rhein: 1989), pp. 61 – 81; for a detailed account of

Heemskerck or his circle, drawings living in other European and American collections, round out our extant corpus of seventy-eight topographical drawings described in this dissertation's catalog, and which form the subject of this dissertation.⁷ If we focus on these, what emerges are the remains of an ingenious pictorial act.

That Heemskerck's drawings of Rome seem entirely familiar to our eyes betrays their hitherto neglected innovative aspect. Some of his drawings look like the Roman *vedute* that European artists would not begin producing in significant quantities until the third quarter of the sixteenth century. Others anticipate the *capriccii* that Piranesi would compose in the eighteenth century. Perhaps their close visual kinship with entire species of images that succeeded them has blinded scholars to their position ahead of the curve. Rarely considered is the fact that we know of no single artist before Heemskerck, Netherlandish or Italian, who drew a set of Roman views as expansive and richly varied as his. In addition to their unprecedented quantity and range of subjects, they portray Rome in a variety of compositional schemes that no single predecessor or contemporary matched. While Giuliano da Sangallo's Barberini Codex (last quarter of the Quattrocento) is certainly a vast record of Rome's topography in its own right, Sangallo drew mostly plans and elevations.⁸ Sangallo took a pictorial approach to rendering the city's

attribution questions surrounding Heemskerck's drawings of Rome, see below, Chapter Four, section 4.4.

⁷ For this group of drawings in particular, see below, Chapter Four, section 4.4.1.

⁸ Giuliano da Sangallo, Christian Hülsen, *Il Libro di Giuliano da Sangallo: Codice Vaticano Bareberniano Latino 4424* (Lipsia: 1910).

ancient architectural aspect in perspective views on only a handful of sheets.⁹ The famous Codex Escorialensis, which probably dates from the first quarter of the Cinquecento, shows an interest in Roman topography that expresses itself in pictorial categories closer to those we see in Heemskerck's drawings: capital and cornice studies, single buildings or parts of buildings in perspective or elevation, and interiors.¹⁰ But a number of artists are probably responsible for the drawings in the codex.¹¹ Moreover, it contains only fourteen drawings that we can reasonably call "views" of the city.

Of Heemskerck's contemporaries, only the artists in Rome during the period of his stay –Posthumus, Sieneſe painter / architect Baldassare Peruzzi, Giorgio Vasari, and Francesco Salviati – may have pursued the ancient Roman ruin landscape with a vigor and diligence comparable to Heemskerck's. We have no topographical drawings by Vasari or Salviati. Peruzzi has left behind a large corpus

⁹ Cf., *Ibid.*, ff. 4v, 12v, 34v, 75r.

¹⁰ Hermann Egger, *Codex Escorialensis: Ein skizzenbuch aus der werkstatt Domenico Ghirlandaios* (Vienna: 1906).

¹¹ Competing theories regarding the authorship of the Codex have been put forth, beginning with Hülsen, *Libro Sangallo*, who posits the codex's origins in the Giuliano da Sangallo circle on the basis of similarities with Sangallo's drawings in the Barberini Codex; Egger, *Codex Escorialensis*, attributes the drawings to the Ghirlandaio workshop; Margarita Fernandez Gomez, "El autor del Codex Escorialensis," *Academia*, (vol. no. 74, 1992), pp. 123 – 161 supports Egger's hypothesis; Arnold Nesselrath, "Il Codice Escorialense," in: *Domenico Ghirlandaio, 1449 – 1494: atti del convegno internazionale, Firenze, 16 – 18 Ottobre, 1994* (Florence: 1994), pp. 175 – 198, notes several hands and argues in support of Hülsen's earlier hypothesis.

of drawings of or related to Rome's ancient architecture.¹² But most of them are plans and reconstructions, drawings that had an architectural rather than a pictorial function. Only Posthumus's drawings of Roman topography compare favorably with Heemskerck's. But his interests leaned more towards decorative motifs. Moreover, Posthumus's drawings of Rome do not evince the same care or control that Heemskerck exercised. He did not always choose his vantage points with discretion; buildings sometimes obscure one another, a pictorial problem we never find among Heemskerck's drawings.¹³ Nor did Posthumus push the limitations of his media to communicate the variety of textures found in Rome's topography; unlike Heemskerck, who found a seemingly infinite variety of lines and tones in pure pen and ink, ink wash, and red and black chalks, Posthumus drew Rome almost exclusively with the same pen and ink wash technique.¹⁴ Thus we marvel at the singularity of the achievement in Heemskerck's views of Rome; before and during its time, his corpus of drawings represents a uniquely sustained, exhaustive gathering of pictorial information about the Roman ambient's visual aspect.

¹² For the single most complete presentation of drawings by Peruzzi, see Heinrich Wurm, *Baldassarre Peruzzi: Architekturzeichnungen: Tafelband* (Tübingen: 1984).

¹³ Cf., Hülsen and Egger, II, 12r.

¹⁴ Exceptions, with no ink wash, are *Ibid.*, II, 47r and v (copies after lost Heemskercks), and 82v.

Heemskerck is also without a contemporary peer in his use of his drawings to create a seemingly endless series of invented landscapes *all'antica*, scenery that pervades the paintings and widely circulated prints of his forty-year post-Roman phase. During this prolific period, Heemskerck's drawings of Rome remained so crucial to his identity, and to the Netherlandish vision of Rome, that some twenty years after his return, he executed his unique *Self-Portrait Before the Colosseum* (1553, fig. 3.2, 1), which shows him drawing Rome's famous ruined amphitheater in the 1530s. Thus, Heemskerck's drawings of Rome are artifacts of his astonishing depth of pictorial knowledge of antiquity and much more; they became a fountainhead that he continuously cultivated in highly original ways throughout his career.

However, despite their obvious importance for Heemskerck's oeuvre, and despite their considerable impact on Netherlandish visual culture, no scholar has separated Heemskerck's ruin landscapes from his sculptural drawings and subjected them to a synthetic study. Crucial questions regarding their context, motives, and ramifications remain unexplored. With no precise Netherlandish or Italian precedent, there is no simple explanation for Heemskerck's initial impulse to draw Roman topography in such variety. Likewise, linkages between his use of multiple compositional schemes, media, and techniques and his copious inventions of scenery *all'antica* in his post-Roman paintings and prints have remained obscure to us. Moreover, while Heemskerck's *fantasie* and self-portraiture suggest the increasing and enduring vitality of his Roman drawings, we have yet to ask what cultural circumstances we can reasonably bring to bear on their currency.

The thread that binds the origin, production, and use of his Roman topographical drawings is their role in retrieving, recreating, and thus perpetuating a profound form of cultural memory. In every phase of Heemskerck's career, he and his colleagues made and used drawings to preserve antiquity. Drawings functioned discursively, as tools of assimilation and as devices for the revitalization and continued cultivation of the past. Seen in this light, Heemskerck's landscape drawings of the architectural vestiges of ancient Rome tap an exceptionally rich mnemonic vein and are rife with recollective functions. In the fullest sense, Heemskerck's drawings of Rome functioned in the same general way that Renaissance collections of antiquities functioned for their patrons as described by Richard Goldthwaite: they were "instruments for the creation of culture."¹⁵ They served Heemskerck as a virtual repository of the Roman landscape, a compendium of motifs and methods of imaging, a storehouse of several forms of knowledge at once: historical, pictorial, cultural, and even autobiographical. What follows is an attempt to describe, systematically, this vast, multiplicitous approach to Rome's topography over the course of his entire career.

¹⁵ Richard Goldthwaite, *Wealth and the Demand for Art in Italy, 1300 – 1600* (Baltimore: 1983), p. 5.

Chapter 1

THE PRE-ROMAN NETHERLANDISH CONTEXT FOR HEEMSKERCK'S DRAWINGS OF ROME

1: Introduction

Maerten van Heemskerck's pre-Roman training furnished him with the tools and the inclination to draw Rome's ruins, even if it did not provide him with a precise model for doing so. It is not without reason, however, that scholars have yet to detail such machinations. Historiographic conditions and a lack of material from Heemskerck's pre-Roman period have combined to obscure a nuanced account of the relation between his early training and his interest in Roman ruins. Karel van Mander tells us that Heemskerck's pre-Roman master Jan van Scorel drew ruins before Heemskerck. Scholars since have worked from the notion that Heemskerck drew Rome in emulation of Scorel and have not discussed the topic in depth. Ilja Veldman's description of Heemskerck as "a painter who followed the example of... Jan van Scorel...traveled to Rome...[and occupied] himself in sketching the monuments and interesting details he found in the city" summarizes the current state of thinking on Heemskerck's drawings as the "natural"

product of his Netherlandish Romanist training.¹⁶ Meanwhile, a complete lack of pre-Roman drawings by Heemskerck, his small, contested pre-Roman painted oeuvre, and a near complete lack of *comparanda* complicate efforts to substantiate or move beyond such assumptions.

Careful consideration of the evidence at hand indicates a more complex scenario than writers from van Mander to Veldman have suggested, in which Heemskerck's focus on ruins was a novel extension of Netherlandish Romanist assimilative practices and, more specifically, an expansion of Scorel's use of his own *wanderjahr* landscape drawings in his paintings. Drawings of Roman ruins *in situ* do not appear to have flourished before Heemskerck. The fact that Jan Gossaert's drawing of the Colosseum (fig. 1.3, 1) is the sole extant example of a drawing of a Roman building by a Netherlander before Heemskerck and that a drawing of Bethlehem's ruins (fig. 1.3, 5) is all that we have by Scorel may be due to the loss of their sketchbooks.¹⁷ And perhaps these sketchbooks were indeed as abundant with Roman topography as Heemskerck's. However, with no way of proving this, we should not assume it. The generic-looking topographical elements *all'antica* in Gossaert's and Scorel's paintings suggest that the real reason we have

¹⁶ Ilja Veldman, "Review, *Die Römischen Skizzenbücher von Maarten van Heemskerck* by Christian Hülsen; Hermann Egger," *Simiolus* (vol. 9, no. 2, 1977), p. 110. The full passage asks "what, in fact, could be more natural than that a painter who followed the example of Jan Gossaert and Jan van Scorel and traveled to Rome...should occupy himself in sketching the monuments and interesting details he found in the city in order to provide himself with a pictorial record of his trip (sic)."

¹⁷ Jan Gossaert, *Colosseum*, 1508 – 09, Kupferstichkabinett, Berlin, Inv. No. 12.918; Jan van Scorel, *Bethlehem*, ca. 1520, British Museum, London, Inv. No. PD 1928-3-10-100.

so few topographical drawings by either of Heemskerck's predecessors is because they did not draw Rome as extensively as he did.

Thus, we need to refine our thoughts on how Heemskerck's pre-Roman phase impacted his approach to Rome's *disabitato*. Heemskerck was trained in a Netherlandish Romanist milieu that was in the process of building a vocabulary of Italianate motifs. But before his Roman journey, going to Rome and amassing an extensive sketchbook of Roman topography was not a part of a prescribed program for Netherlandish artists. The lack of a sophisticated pictorial language of Roman topography in the visual culture that nurtured Heemskerck confirms that the conscious acquisition and assimilation of Roman ruin landscapes had not begun in earnest before he went to Rome. As an assistant in Scorel's workshop, Heemskerck saw Scorel use his *wanderjahr* drawings to cater to burgeoning interests in Italianate art and landscape paintings. By drawing Rome's ruins *in situ*, Heemskerck amplified the relation between these complementary interests, already present, but under developed in Scorel's work. With his vast corpus of Roman ruin drawings Heemskerck cultivated a more nuanced pictorial knowledge of antiquity's architectural aspect than his compatriots had yet to achieve.

1.1: The Historiographic Implications of Karel van Mander's Discussion of Heemskerck in Rome

Karel van Mander's ambiguous reading of Heemskerck's Roman sojourn has had a determining effect on modern scholarship.¹⁸ Van Mander's suggestion

¹⁸ Karel van Mander, *Het Schilder-Boek* (Haarlem: 1604), ff. 244v – 247r; all quoted passages from van Mander in this dissertation are my translations unless I

that Heemskerck drew Rome in emulation of Scorel occurs within a larger discussion regarding whether or not Heemskerck was a better painter before he went to Rome, when he learned to paint like Scorel, or after Rome, when he had developed his own manner. Never offering a clear-cut answer, even contradicting himself in places, van Mander uses the question as a device for exploring the effects of Rome on Heemskerck's art. He also eschews a conclusive description of the effects of drawing Rome on Heemskerck's manner, saying only that Heemskerck "had drawn many good things" while in the Eternal City. Van Mander's short assessment of Heemskerck's drawing prowess – that the artist "was very precise in hatching, with a light, free way of handling" – appears at the end of the biography, separate from the main discussion of Heemskerck's art.¹⁹ Such a limited discussion of a body of work as central to Heemskerck's art as his Roman drawings seems a glaring omission. However, subsequent discussions on Heemskerck have yet to identify, let alone critique, the gaps in van Mander's discussion and have thus

cite the authority of Hessel Miedema, *Karel van Mander: The Lives of the Illustrious Netherlandish and German Painters*, 6 vols. (Doornspijk: 1994); for van Mander's effect on modern discourse, see Walter Melion, *Shaping the Netherlandish Canon* (Chicago: 1991), pp. xviii – xix, who elaborates the general notion that "van Mander continues to exert control over the modern study of Netherlandish art" and that "his anecdotes are read as if they were topoi simply, lacking in critical value because they seem unverifiable as documentary evidence."

¹⁹ Van Mander, f. 247r32 – 33. The full passage says "Hy hadde een seer aerdige manier van metter Pen te teyckenen / en seer suyver in't artseren / met een lichte fraey handelinge"; Miedema, *Lives*, p. 246, "He had a very subtle manner in drawing with the pen, and was very precise in shading, with a deft, light way of handling"; Melion, pp. 122 – 123, claims that "van Mander sanctions Heemskerck's drawings," but only cites van Mander's mention of Heemskerck's preparatory drawings for print designs, on Van Mander, *op. cit.* (note 7), 246v25 - 27, which describes Heemskerck as a "goet architect."

perpetuated them, failing to sufficiently address the relation between Heemskerck's pre-Roman development and his drawings of Rome, or offer a synthetic study of their impact on his oeuvre.²⁰

Van Mander's slight, disconnected treatment of Heemskerck's Roman sojourn and drawings is all the more remarkable given his own status as a Haarlemer who, like Heemskerck before him, went to Rome and looked to Italian art as an example. In general, *Het Schilder-Boek* is rife with praise for Haarlem artists, even championing Haarlem's own Hendrik Goltzius, a Heemskerck admirer, as the prime exemplar of Netherlandish artistic excellence.²¹ Thus we would expect Heemskerck to emerge from the pages of van Mander's history as a local hero. However, van Mander's praise for Heemskerck is tempered. Given that he had the opportunity to see Heemskerck's drawings during the period when he wrote *Het Schilder-Boek* and must have had a clear vision of their impact on Heemskerck's

²⁰ Melion, pp. xix – xx, notes that *Het Schilder-Boeck* has not received the same level or amount of critical scrutiny as Vasari's *Vite*: "The scholarly response to Vasari acknowledges his critical and historical sophistication, while an understanding of the historiography and critical categories articulated in the *Schilder-Boeck* is sadly lacking"; Ilja Veldman, *Maarten van Heemskerck and Dutch Humanism in the Sixteenth Century*, trans. Michael Hoyle (Amsterdam: 1977), p. 11, articulates the uncritical view of van Mander's biography of Heemskerck, which she describes as "fairly reliable" because the author consulted Heemskerck's nephew, Jacques van der Heck, and Heemskerck's pupil, Jacob Rauwaert; for van Mander's sources for his biography of Heemskerck, see Henri Greve, *De Bronnen van Carel van Mander voor "Het Leven der doorluchtighe Nederlandtsche en Hoogduytsche Schilders,"* (The Hague: 1903), pp. 149 – 50.

²¹ Van Mander, ff. 281v – 247r.

manner, his less than definitive praise for Heemskerck's art after Rome suggests his awareness of both its favorable and negative aspects.²²

Van Mander situates Heemskerck within the constellation of Netherlandish artists who went to Rome that includes, but is not limited to Gossaert, Scorel, and Frans Floris. Rather than outlining a simplistic progress from one to the next, he provides a critical reading of the strengths and weaknesses in the art of each.²³

From the outset, van Mander frames Heemskerck's artistic life in relation to the role he gives Scorel as the "lantern bearer" and "road builder" for Netherlandish artists.²⁴ Scorel's first appearance in Heemskerck's biography is as Heemskerck's beacon. Van Mander writes that after Scorel's return from Rome, the Utrecht painter

was very famous and had brought with him from Italy an unusual and much more beautiful, novel manner of working which appealed to everyone, and especially to

²² A. Bredius, *Künstler-Inventare*, vol. 7 (The Hague, 1921), nr. 212, p. 83, notes that the sketchbook was among the possessions of painter Cornelis van Haarlem, van Mander's friend and collaborator, when Cornelis died in 1638; G.S. Keyes, *Cornelis Vroom* (Dissertation, Utrecht, 1975), p. 5, notes that Cornelis used Berlin I 22v for the figure of the executioner in his *Massacre at Bethlehem* (1591, Frans Halsmuseum). Thus, we can at least assume that van Mander would have had ample opportunity to view the drawings from the 1590s until he died in 1606.

²³ Melion, pp. 118 – 128, was the first to analyze van Mander's treatment of these Romanists at length. He argues that van Mander presents them as a "closely knit lineage that echoes the progressive scheme of Vasari's third age" in which "Frans Floris... consummates the campaign to assimilate Tuscan models." However, van Mander's discussions of the art of Heemskerck and Floris are too inconclusive to justify the notion that each artist simply surpasses his predecessor.

²⁴ Van Mander, f. 234v01-02, says that Frans Floris and others describe Scorel as "den Lanteeren-dragger en Straet-maker."

Marten, [who] managed to get to this master
in Haarlem.²⁵

In Scorel's workshop, Heemskerck assimilated the master's manner so thoroughly that, according to van Mander, "one could barely distinguish their works from each other."²⁶ Van Mander next tells us that Scorel banished Heemskerck from his workshop "out of envy."²⁷ It is tempting to interpret this episode as signaling Heemskerck's transcendence of Scorel. However, as is so often the case in van Mander, its implications cut both ways. On the one hand, Scorel's envy does suggest that Heemskerck has trumped him. On the other, however, Heemskerck has not yet achieved artistic success on his own terms by developing his own manner, but by imitating the artist who preceded him. Van Mander develops both

²⁵ Ibid., f. 245r13 – 18. "Ian Schoorel seer gheruchtich was / hebbend een onghemeen schoonder nieuw manier van wercken uyt Italien ghebracht / die yghelijck bysonder Marten well bevallen heft / dede soo veel / dat hy te Haerlem by desen Meester is gheraect."

²⁶ Ibid., 18-19. "Hier heeft hy zijn ghewoon neersticheyt van nieuws weder so gheoeffent / dat hy ten lesten den voorloopenden Meester in de Const achterhaelde / datmen hun werck qualijck con onderscheyden: soo eyghentlick de de selve manier aenghenomen hebbende." Van Mander does not refer to specific paintings, but a group of contested panels from the late 1520s corroborate van Mander's claim. For bibliography of the scholarship on these paintings, see below, notes 28 – 31.

²⁷ Ibid., 19-20. "Den Meester foghende zijn erre verminderen mocht (soo eenige meenen) heft zijnen Discipel als uyt afjonsticheyt van hem laten gaen"; Veldman, *Dutch Humanism*, p. 11, cites van Mander's use of phrases like "as I have heard him relate" as evidence that the events he describes are "fairly reliable" because they came from one of Heemskerck's close associates, either Heemskerck's nephew Jacques van der Heck or his pupil Jacob Rauwaert; Miedema, *Lives*, v. IV, p. 72, hypothesizes that van Mander's "serious allegation... must have crept in through coloured accounts from [Heemskerck's] own mouth" and suggests that "van Mander therefore distances himself from the assertion by adding 'some say.'"

implications in his subsequent characterization of Heemskerck's maturation and departure from Scorel's manner.

We read next of Heemskerck's Roman stay, which van Mander frames as a continuance of his emulation of Scorel, but with specific, critical differences. Van Mander describes Heemskerck's artistic pursuits in Rome in language that echoes his description of Scorel's Roman activities. In Scorel's biography, we read that while in Rome, the artist "practiced copying after all antique things, as much after statues and ruins as the art-full paintings of Raphael and Michelangelo."²⁸

Similarly, van Mander tells us that Heemskerck "copied many things, as much after antiquities as after the works of Michelangelo – also many ruins, ornaments and all kinds of subtleties of the ancients which are to be seen in abundance in this city, the painter's academy."²⁹ In addition to the fact that we have no drawings of Rome by Scorel to compare with Heemskerck's, there is no indication in these generic descriptions that van Mander ever saw any drawings of Rome by Scorel. However, the literary reality van Mander has constructed warrants our consideration. The noticeable similarities at the beginning of each passage suggest Heemskerck's debt to Scorel's example, that Heemskerck was following a program set out by his predecessor. But these correspondences give way to telling differences. While van Mander says that both artists drew ruins, he groups Scorel's interest in ruins

²⁸ Van Mander, f. 235v19-21; "...practiseerde conterfeytende nar alle antijcke dinghen so beelden ruwijnen als de constige schilderijen van Raphael, en Michael Agnolo."

²⁹ Ibid., 245v25-27; "...geconterfeyt / soo nar d'Antijcken / als nar Michel Agnolen wercken: Dock veel Ruwijnen / by-wercken / alderley aerdicheden der Anticken / die in dese Schilder-Academische Stadt overbloedich te sie zijn."

together with his interest in ancient sculpture and balances the artist's study of antiquity with his study of contemporary Italian masters. Heemskerck's pursuit of ruins, however, appears alongside appended interests in "by-wercken," taken to denote "ornament," and "aerdicheden," or "subtleties" – items that do not appear among Scorel's interests.³⁰ As we will see, van Mander's interpretation of Heemskerck's post-Roman art unfolds from this specific differentiation in Scorel's and Heemskerck's approaches to learning in Rome.

Van Mander explores Rome's impact on Heemskerck's art through the filter of Heemskerck's *Nativity*, *Adoration of the Three Kings*, and *Annunciation*, the so-called "Draper's Altarpiece."³¹ (1546, figs. 1.1, 1 – 5) First, he raises the question of the quality of Heemskerck's post-Roman manner by having one of Heemskerck's pupils tell his master what the "best painters" have been saying: Heemskerck was a better painter before he went to Rome, when he painted like Scorel. Heemskerck demurs, "son, [before I went to Rome] I knew not what I was making."³² However,

³⁰ Hessel Miedema, *Fraey en aerdigh, schoon en moy in Karel van Manders Schilder-boek* (Amsterdam: 1984), elaborates a description of the prefix "aerdigh" as a cognate with "welstandt," which, when used to describe an art object, means it has an appearance so pleasing that it enchants or fascinates its audience; Idem, "Karel van Mander: Did He Write Art Literature?" *Simiolus* (vol. 22, no. 1 / 2, 1993 – 1994), p. 61, argues further that the prefix, while vague and mutable, suggests "the essence of the thing represented...analogous to the English 'kind' and 'kindly.'"

³¹ Maerten van Heemskerck, *Nativity*, *Adoration of the Three Kings*, and *Annunciation*, 1546, oil on wood, each panel 260 x 122 cm, Haarlem, Frans Halsmuseum, Inv. No. 474; Rainald Grosshans, *Maerten van Heemskerck: Die Gemälde* (Berlin: 1980), cat. no. 55.

³² Van Mander, *op. cit.* (note 7), f. 246r12, "Doe dit hem van een van zijn Jongers worde gheseyt / datmen seyde / dat hy eerst op zijn Schoorels beter dede / als naderhandt doe hy van Room quain / antwoorde hy: Soon / doe en wist ick niet wat

rather than offer affirmative support for Heemskerck's claim, van Mander gives a short, open-ended critical analysis. He proceeds to describe the altarpiece in terms of its overall clutter of "well painted" features. In addition to a variety of faces, bodies, and shiny surface textures, the painting features architectural *fantasie all'antica* that Heemskerck created out of Rome's ruins, preserved in his collection of drawings and cultivated in his pictorial memory. In the closed position, we see an annunciation whose right distant background contains invented ruins with colossal vaults reminiscent of those found in Heemskerck's drawings of the unfinished St. Peter's (e.g. cat. nos. SP1, 2).³³ In the open position, Heemskerck's adoration and nativity scenes also take place before ruin backdrops, with columns, cornices, and springing vaults that remind us of his drawings of the Forum Nervae (cat. no. FN1) and the Baths of Diocletian (cat. no. BD1). All of this prompts van Mander's assessment that these "lavish pictures with many details" reveal Heemskerck's "inclination toward enriching ornament," which contradicts Heemskerck's own credo, "often in his mouth," that "every painter who wants to thrive should avoid decoration and architecture."³⁴

ick maechte"; Miedema, *Lives*, v. I, p. 242, "Son, I did not know what I was doing then."

³³ See also the drawing of an "Unidentified Ruin," Kupferstichkabinett, Berlin, Inv. No. 12306, attributed to Heemskerck in *Fiamminghi a Roma*, ed. Nicole Dacos (Rome: 1995), cat. no. 114.

³⁴ Van Mander, 246r15-16...21 – 24, "twee rijcklicke Historien / met veel wreck... In dit werck sietmen / hoe goet Mester Hemskerck is gheweest / en hoe gheneycht to cieren / teghen t'ghemeen Spreckwoort / dat hy veel in de mondt hadde: Een yeder Schilder die wil bedijen / Vermijde cieraten en metselrijen."

Given the profusion of architectural *fantasie* in Heemskerck's post-Roman oeuvre, it is unlikely that Heemskerck ever espoused avoiding it, van Mander's quotation of him notwithstanding. But by claiming that Heemskerck thought it best to avoid such embellishments, van Mander challenges Heemskerck's response to his pupil; he points out that Heemskerck's post-Roman practice contradicts his alleged post-Roman theory, thus suggesting Heemskerck did not know what he was making *after* his Roman sojourn, not before. By highlighting and grouping the decorative and architectural aspects in the Draper's Altarpiece, van Mander alludes to the difference between his description of Heemskerck's activities in Rome, where he grouped ruins with ornament, and Scorel's, where he did not. These intertextual correspondences are too close to be anything but deliberate. They suggest that van Mander worded his description of Heemskerck's Roman artistic activities according to his judgment of Heemskerck's post-Roman manner rather than his Roman drawings. Moreover, van Mander's description of Heemskerck's post-Roman painting on the same terms that earlier differentiated Heemskerck's Roman activities from Scorel's explains his earlier grouping of Heemskerck's pursuit of "ruins" with "ornament, and subtleties of the ancients," as well as his description of their "abundance" in Rome; it is as if, in van Mander's view, Rome's wealth of antiquities of all sorts overwhelmed Heemskerck. He suggests that Heemskerck has allowed Rome's abundance to render him unable to achieve clarity and focus in his paintings.³⁵

³⁵ Melion, p. 122.

The Italianate painting by Heemskerck that receives the strongest praise from van Mander – “easily the best painting of all there is to be seen following his return from Rome” – is Heemskerck’s stunning *Triumph of Bacchus* (mid 1530s, fig. 1.1, 6).³⁶ Its prominent display of a circular temple and ruined piers invented from Heemskerck’s drawing of the *cortile* of the old Palazzo delle Valle (cat. no. SC5) would seem to merit mention. However, even in this discussion of a praiseworthy painting made after Heemskerck’s exposure to the art of Rome, van Mander does not mention the artist’s Roman drawings. He only cites Heemskerck’s handling of soft flesh tones.

Thus, van Mander’s biography of Heemskerck tacitly establishes a constricting literary starting-point for Heemskerck’s interest in the vestiges of ancient Rome. By suggesting that Heemskerck drew ruins in emulation of Scorel, van Mander compromises the notion of Heemskerck’s agency in the creation of his own drawings. By implicating them as a catalyst for Heemskerck’s misguided departure from Scorel’s manner without offering direct praise for them, van Mander

³⁶ Maerten van Heemskerck, *Triumph of Bacchus*, oil on wood, 56.3 x 106.5 cm, Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Inv. No. 990. Scholars have had considerable difficulty dating the *Triumph of Bacchus*. Van Mander’s phrase “made following his return from Rome” notwithstanding, there is no agreement as to whether Heemskerck painted the *Bacchus* in Rome, or upon his return to Haarlem; Grosshans, cat. no. 24, offers the traditional view, that the painting is a post-Roman work, ca. 1537 - 38; Jefferson Harrison, *The Paintings of Maerten van Heemskerck: A Catalogue Raisonné* (Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Virginia, 1987), pp. 283 – 85, dates the painting to early in Heemskerck’s Roman phase on stylistic grounds, citing “structural and figurative correspondences with...Heemskerck’s earlier Haarlem paintings.” In either case, the painting is clearly inflected by Heemskerck’s Roman experience, after he had begun to draw and absorb the city’s art. Thus, it is essentially a “post-Roman” painting.

likewise offers a tempered appraisal of Heemskerck's development of his own manner after drawing in Rome.

Van Mander's equivocal treatment of Heemskerck's Roman drawings – especially his omission of any direct discussion of his drawings of Roman ruins in landscape settings – may seem puzzling in light of two of *Het Schilder-Boek's* most salient features: attention to the finer details of drawing in the second chapter of Book I, the “Groundwork,” and an argument for, in Walter Melion's words, the “prestige of landscape” throughout the sprawling tome.³⁷ However, if we are attentive to the *Schilder-Boek's* larger concerns, especially its multifaceted and sustained offering of alternatives to the authority of Vasari's *disegno*, then the particular ways in which van Mander discounts Heemskerck's Roman drawings reveal his motives for doing so. Van Mander's choice to praise the technical aspect of Heemskerck's drawings – their display of “precise hatching,” indicative of his “light, free” touch – is consistent with his near-obsessive meditation on technique in his general discussion of drawing in the “Groundwork.” Van Mander's admiring tone where he makes clear that he is discussing Heemskerck's preparatory drawings for prints in particular, is also in keeping with his fixation on hatching, and leads to

³⁷ Miedema, *Lives*, v. 2, pp. 533 – 537, thinks van Mander follows Vasari and articulates a place for landscape that is below figuration in Chapter 8; Melion, pp. 95 – 98, however, is the first to identify van Mander's sustained and pervasive articulation of alternatives to Vasari's figure-based *disegno* throughout the *Schilder-Boek*. Melion's interpretation has raised objections; Cf. Nina Eugenia Serebrennikov, “Review of *Shaping the Netherlandish Canon*,” *Art Bulletin* (vol. 74, no. 4, 1992), p. 685, disputes Melion's claim as “injudiciously forced.” While she notes that Melion takes passages from van Mander out of context, she does not acknowledge that Melion is pointing to the sum of van Mander's comments on landscape, which, in my estimation, is a consistent elevating of the genre on myriad specific terms.

his argument that the practice of drawing is to be thought of in service of the print medium.³⁸ Finally, van Mander's discourse on landscape advocates artists who focus on nature, not antiquity, when rendering the out-of-doors; Brueghel, Herri Met de Bles, Titian, and Muziano earn Van Mander's praise as paragons of landscape.³⁹ By contrast, Heemskerck's lack of interest in the natural landscape is apparent throughout the Berlin sketchbooks and the other drawings that remain from his Roman sojourn.⁴⁰

Since van Mander's biography of Heemskerck has been subjected to minimal critical analysis its omissions have proven incipient in subsequent discourse on Heemskerck. His framing of Heemskerck's development as a painter in relation to Scorel's manner, his lack of discussion of the motives for Heemskerck's drawings of Rome, and his discussion of Heemskerck's drawings separately from his paintings, have all carried into modern scholarship.⁴¹ Where early modern art writers do not repeat van Mander verbatim, we hear the strong echo of his voice.⁴² The nineteenth and early twentieth centuries saw few discussions of Heemskerck's paintings or his prints. No scholar related either body

³⁸ Melion, p. 123.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 98.

⁴⁰ Cf. this dissertation, below, chapter two, sections 2.2.1, and 2.2.5, where I describe aspects of Heemskerck's selective vision, which favors the inclusion of antiquities and the exclusion of their natural and modern urban contexts when rendering ruin landscapes.

⁴¹ Melion, pp. xviii – xix.

⁴² Veldman, *Dutch Humanism*, pp. 17 – 18. Early authors Ampzing (1628), Schrevelius (1648), Sandrart (1675) used van Mander's text liberally and with significant augmentations.

of work to his Roman drawings, which scholars only subjected to archaeological analyses, in order to identify the monuments they portray.⁴³ Max Friedlaender was the first to suggest a pre-Roman identity for Heemskerck by noting that, since Scorel was only three years older than Heemskerck, “Heemskerck was never van Scorel’s apprentice in the proper sense.”⁴⁴ However, far from pursuing the implications in these insights, Friedlaender’s analysis demonstrates the endurance of van Mander’s terms; he measures Heemskerck’s oeuvre against Scorel’s, and is even less forgiving regarding Heemskerck’s post-Roman manner. Friedlaender writes of Heemskerck’s “pursuit of grandeur” over restraint, his “clothes that cling to the body...as though they were themselves ornaments,” and his “noisy and

⁴³ Thomas Kerrich, *Catalogue of the prints which have been engraved after Martin Heemskerck* (Cambridge, England: 1828); Jaro Springer, “Ein Skizzenbuch von Marten Heemskerck,” *Jahrbuch der Königlich Preussischen Kunstsammlungen* (no. 5, 1884), pp. 327 – 333; Idem, “Ein zweites Skizzenbuch von Marten van Heemskerck,” *Ibid.* (no. 12, 1891), pp. 117 – 124; Adolf Michaelis, “Römische Skizzenbücher: Marten van Heemskercks und anderer Nordischer Künstler des xvi Jahrhunderts,” *Jahrbuch des Kaiserlich Deutschen Archaeologischen Instituts* (no. VI, 1891), pp. 125 – 76, 219 – 238; *Ibid.* (no. VII, 1892), pp. 83 – 100; Leon Preibisz, *Martin van Heemskerck: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Romanismus in der Niederländischen Malerei des XVI Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig: 1911).

⁴⁴ Max J. Friedlaender, *Early Netherlandish Painting*, v. XIII (Leyden: 1937, trans. Heinz Norden, 1975), pp. 40 – 46, devalues Heemskerck’s post-Roman work at the outset by placing Heemskerck in a sequence *before* a section on the “Masters of the 1540s,” even though before the 1540s, Heemskerck had yet to produce the bulk of his oeuvre. Friedlaender’s opening comments on Heemskerck describe the need for “distinguishing Heemskerck from Scorel – or rather seeking such a distinction.” In the remainder of the chapter, to the last paragraph, Friedlaender contrasts the aspects of Heemskerck’s art that “differ most markedly from van Scorel.” Heemskerck’s only post-Roman work that garners Friedlaender’s praise is the *Entombment* (1538, Brussels, Musées Royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique), which he deems praiseworthy due to its display of Heemskerck’s return Scorel’s manner. He concludes his chapter on Heemskerck by endorsing van Mander’s view that Heemskerck’s best work was in Scorel’s manner.

blatant compositions.”⁴⁵ Meanwhile, Friedlaender only comments in passing on Heemskerck’s drawings and his use of them in his post-Roman designs.⁴⁶ In subsequent scholarship, paintings from the 1520s so close in style they could be by either Heemskerck or Scorel have sparked discussions that have mostly reified van Mander’s notion of the pre-Roman Heemskerck as a Scorel pupil and imitator.⁴⁷ More recently, scholars have finally begun to identify Heemskerck’s hand in panels previously given by default to Scorel due to his traditionally higher reputation. Unfortunately, none of these panels is securely datable to before 1527. The even-handed tone of Jefferson Harrison’s thorough analysis of Heemskerck’s pre-Roman period in the context of his painted oeuvre is an exception.⁴⁸ Harrison and others have given to Heemskerck paintings that were traditionally thought to be Scorel’s.⁴⁹ Scholars have also attempted to parse out their hands through scientific analyses.⁵⁰

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 43.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 42.

⁴⁷ For the early bibliography on this problem (before 1960), see Miedema, *Lives*, p. 72, n. 52.

⁴⁸ Harrison, *Catalogue Raisonné*, pp. 2 – 34 and cat. nos. 1 – 16.

⁴⁹ Grosshans, *op. cit.* (note 20), takes cat. nos. 3, 4, 8, 10, 11, and 13 from Scorel and gives them to Heemskerck; Harrison, “The Detroit Christ on Calvary and the Cologne Lamentation of Christ: two Early Haarlem Paintings by Maerten van Heemskerck,” *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* (no. 37, 1986), pp. 174 – 194; *Idem*, *Catalogue Raisonné*, pp. 17 – 18, offers a list of paintings he attributes to Scorel ca. 1525 – 30 and paintings he attributes to Heemskerck during the Haarlem period, pp. 21 – 22.

⁵⁰ Molly Faries, “Attributing the Layers of Heemskerck’s Cologne Lamentation of Christ,” in: *Les Dessin sous-jacent dans le processus de creation* (Louvain-la-Neuve: 1995), pp. 133 – 141; *Idem*, Christa Steinbüchel, and J.R.J. van Asperen de Boer, “Maarten van Heemskerck and Jan van Scorel’s Harlem workshop,” in:

However, even these modern studies, which give us more detailed information on Heemskerck's pre-Roman hand, do not explore the context or motivation for his absorption of Scorel's manner.⁵¹ Only Harrison and Rainald Grosshans have examined the possibility that before Rome, Heemskerck possessed artistic sensibilities that extended beyond the scope of Scorel's *atelier*.⁵² Still, no major study of Heemskerck's Roman experience explores how Scorel's studio practices might have shaped his approach to Rome's ruins.⁵³ This particular repeated omission has left intact van Mander's simplistic implication that in drawing Roman ruins, Heemskerck was following a program that Scorel had already established.⁵⁴ Thus, despite the relative scarcity and lack of variety of ruins in Scorel's paintings compared to their frequent appearances in Heemskerck's paintings and prints, no study has attempted to differentiate between their respective approaches to or uses

Historical Painting Techniques, Materials, and Studio Practice: reprints of a Symposium, University of Leiden, the Netherlands 26 – 29, June 1995 (n. p. 1995), pp. 135 – 139.

⁵¹ See also J. Bruyn, "Over Betekenis van het Werk van Jan van Scorel Omstreeks 1530 voor Oudere en Jongere Tijdgenoten," *Oud Holland* (vol. 97, no. 3, 1983), pp. 117 – 124 and (no. 4), pp. 217 – 223, for a recent study that argues for Scorel's "influence" on Heemskerck and others.

⁵² Grosshans, pp. 33 – 35.

⁵³ Goffredo Hoogewerff, "L'ispirazione Romana di Martino van Heemskerck," *Scritti di storia dell'arte in onore di Mario Salmi* (Rome: 1963), pp. 163 – 167; Veldman, "Maarten van Heemskerck en Italië," *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* (no. 44, 1993), pp. 125 – 142; Elena Filippi, *Maarten van Heemskerck, Inventio Urbis* (Milan: 1990), pp. 9 – 10, discusses Heemskerck in Scorel's workshop and in Rome, but draws no relation between the two phases of his career; Dacos, *Roma Quanta Fuit*, p. 63, mentions the presence of Heemskerck and others in Scorel's workshop, pp. 193 – 205.

⁵⁴ Hülsen and Egger offer no thoughts on the matter in their prefaces to either volume; see also the passage from Veldman, "Review", cited above in n. 16.

of topography *all'antica*. Only by stepping outside of the traditionally limited readings of Heemskerck's relation to Scorel and the effects of Rome on Heemskerck's art can we more properly assess the roots of Heemskerck's interest in drawing Rome's ruins.

1.2: Early Netherlandish Romanism and Heemskerck's Road to the Eternal City

The most important factor that propelled Heemskerck into Scorel's workshop and then on to Rome was the Netherlandish development of a vocabulary of motifs *all'antica* initiated by Jan Gossaert's journey to Rome in 1508 – 09. Scorel and Heemskerck both belonged to the first generation of Netherlanders whose earliest training was Romanist inflected, after the advent of Gossaert's Roman sojourn. During the 1510s, the period of their formative years, motifs *all'antica* were rare in the Low Countries, but were becoming increasingly desirable to Netherlandish artists and patrons alike. This facilitated a growing awareness among young artists of the importance of training under artists who had been to Rome before undertaking their own Roman sojourns. Such considerations enable us to recast Heemskerck's pursuit of a situation in Scorel's workshop and his journey to Rome as more than indicators of the authority of Scorel's example. Rather, in their proper context, Heemskerck's movements before and in Rome appear as appropriate responses to the broader context of his Netherlandish Romanist upbringing. Heemskerck's eventual pursuit of Roman ruin landscapes could not have occurred without this framework in place.

Both the art and the fame that resulted from Gossaert's journey to the Eternal City established important markers, aspirations for the next generation of artists.⁵⁵ Asked to be part of a delegation sent to Julius II by Margaret of Austria, Gossaert navigated Rome in the highest patronal circles.⁵⁶ Because he had been to Rome, his development of an Italianate manner had unquestionable credibility. As the first Netherlandish artist who could deploy an Italianate manner of painting, Gossaert could cater to an expanded range of tastes upon his return north.⁵⁷ His knowledge of the antique eventually netted him his greatest patronage under Philip of Burgundy, as well as a considerable amount of notoriety.⁵⁸ Gossaert's so-called "Middleburg Altarpiece" (now destroyed), a commission that resulted from his

⁵⁵ Scholarship has tended to outline the roots of Gossaert's Romanism rather than its impact. Exceptions are Jacqueline Folie, "Les Dessins de Jean Gossart dit Mabuse," *Gazette des Beaux Arts* (XXXVIII / 1, 1960), pp. 77 – 98, which argues for the importance of Gossaert's preparatory sketches for the rise of the Renaissance in the Low Countries; Larry Silver, "'Figure, nude, historie, e poesie': Gossart and the Renaissance Nude in the Netherlands," *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* (no. 37, 1986), pp. 1 – 40; J. R. Judson, "Jan Gossaert and the New Aesthetic," *The Age of Brueghel: Netherlandish Drawings in the Sixteenth Century*, exh. cat. by J. O. Hand, et. al. (Washington, DC, 1986 – 87), pp. 13 – 24.

⁵⁶ Gerardus Geldenhauer, *Vita Clarissimi Principis Philippi a Burgundiâ* (Strasbourg: 1529), reprinted in: J. Prinsen, *Collectanea van Gerardus Geldenhauer Noviomagus Kroniek van het Historisch Genootschap te Utrecht* (S. III, no. 16, Amsterdam, 1901), pp. 18 – 19, 129, 209, and 233, describes the delegation in Rome.

⁵⁷ Ariane Mensger, *Jan Gossaert: die Niederlandische Kunst zu Beginn der Neuzit* (Berlin: 2002), argues in her first chapter that after Gossaert acquired knowledge of antiquity in Rome, he also continued to work in a more traditional Gothic manner, according to patronal demands and preferences.

⁵⁸ For Philip's key role in the importation of the Italianate manner to the Netherlands, see J. Sterk, *Philips von Bourgondië (1465 - 1524), bischop van Utrecht, als protagonist van de renaissance. Zijn leven en mecenaat* (Zutphen: 1980). Philip had also been a part of Margaret's delegation and an antiquarian of some substance.

status as Philip's court painter, even attracted Albrecht Dürer's curiosity and perhaps his admiration.⁵⁹

As the earliest written accounts of Gossaert's art suggest, the Italianate manner that he developed under Philip was primarily figural.⁶⁰ His art bears this out as well. Philip commissioned Gossaert and Venetian painter Jacopo dei Barbari to devise the decorative program for his castle in Suytburg (modern Middleburg). Though Gossaert executed drawings of antiquities while in Rome, he does not appear to have used them as source material for the paintings he executed for Philip, or any of his post-Roman paintings.⁶¹ Rather, the design of Gossaert's *Neptune and Amphitrite* (1516, fig. 1.2, 1), which he painted for Philip, illustrates that in order to acquire some classical motifs for incorporation into his idiom, Gossaert emulated

⁵⁹ Van Mander, f. 225v08.

⁶⁰ Ibid., fol. 225v04-07, offers a synchronic assessment of Gossaert's achievements, saying he "is well een van de eerste / die uyt Italien in Flaender bracht de reechte wijze van te ordineré / en te maken Historien vol naeckte beelden / en alderley Poeterijen / t'welck voor zijnen tijt in onse Landen so niet in gebruyck en was" ("at least one of the first who brought from Italy to Flanders the right manner of composing and constructing stories with naked figures and all kinds of allegorical representations"). For this passage, van Mander apparently reused either Lodovico Guicciardini, *Descrittione di tutti i Paesi Bassi* (Antwerp: 1567 (Eng. ed., London, 1953)), "the first to bring from Italy to [the Netherlands] the art of painting historical and poetical subjects with nude figures," or Giorgio Vasari, *Le Vite de' più eccellenti pittori, scultori, et architetti...*, (Florence: 1568 (ed. Gaetano Milanesi, VII, (Florence: 1906)), p. 584, "Mabuse was almost the first to bring to Flanders from Italy the true method of making scenes full of nude figures and poetical fancy"; for Gossaert in Rome see J. G. van Gelder, "Jan Gossaert in Rome, 1508 – 09," *Oud-Holland* (vol. LIX, 1942), pp. 1 – 11.

⁶¹ Only four *wanderjahre* drawings by Gossaert are known. In addition to the drawing of the Colosseum (see above, n. 17), they are the so-called "Spinario Sheet" (Prentenkabinet, University of Leyden), a sheet depicting the Hermaphrodite (Academia, Venice), and a sheet with a drawing of Hercules (Burlington Collection).

contemporary masters and used printed matter as source material.⁶² The appearance of Gossaert's figures is ultimately indebted to Albrecht Dürer's *Adam and Eve*.⁶³ The painting's topographical elements *all'antica* apparently derive from Gossaert's knowledge of Vitruvius, not the pictorial knowledge he might have gained by drawing the Roman landscape.⁶⁴ Moreover, we have no paintings suggesting that Gossaert ever used his carefully worked drawing of the Colosseum's ruined side (fig. 1.3, 1) in any traceable way.⁶⁵ Thus, although younger Netherlandish artists like Scorel and Heemskerck may have absorbed particular *all'antica* aspects of Gossaert's art, the use of ruin landscape drawings could not have been one of them.

While we cannot measure the impact of impact of Gossaert's art on Scorel's pre-Roman manner because no examples have come down to us, Heemskerck's pre-Roman paintings suggest Gossaert's importance at the same time they reveal Heemskerck's considerable assimilative capacities. Some examples may provide a glimpse of Heemskerck's manner of painting before he entered Scorel's workshop, because they contain tendencies not found in Scorel's work. Rainhald Grosshans

⁶² Jan Gossaert, *Neptune and Amphitrite*, 1516, oil on wood, 124 x 188 cm, Berlin, Gemäldegalerie, Inv. No. 1/727.

⁶³ The painting may have been a collaboration with Jacopo, or influenced by Jacopo's *Mars and Venus* design. Both are ultimately indebted to Dürer's *Adam and Eve*. Unlike Dürer's Adam, Gossaert's Neptune and Jacopo's Mars place their left arm behind Venus. And like Jacopo, Gossaert has chosen a more closed *contrapposto* than Dürer for the female figure.

⁶⁴ Mensger, *Neuzeit*, pp. 81 – 83, identifies ff. 34a, 36b, 37a, and 37b of Fra Giocondo's illustrated edition of *De Architectura* (1511), a copy of which Philip had acquired.

⁶⁵ Due to its finish, the drawing has been thought to have had a display function at Phillip of Burgundy's court. See Geldenhauer, *op. cit.* (note 45), p. 209.

has argued convincingly for the presence of Gossaert's figurative mode in Heemskerck's pre-Roman work.⁶⁶ Grosshans' most compelling example is the figure of Christ in Heemskerck's Ghent *Man of Sorrows* (1532, fig. 1.2, 2), which possesses a corporeality that is common to the figures in Gossaert's paintings, unlike the lithe examples in Scorel's.⁶⁷ Grosshans also points out that Heemskerck's Bicker family portraits reveal his use of foreshortenings like those on view in Gossaert's portraits, also not present in Scorel's work.⁶⁸ We can add to these observations Heemskerck's *Portrait of a Woman with a Spinning Wheel* (fig. 1.2, 3) in Castagnola. Its deftly foreshortened hands resemble those found in several Gossaert portraits, including his self-portrait (fig. 1.2, 4).⁶⁹ Jefferson Harrison likewise identifies an array of quotations and re-fashionings of motifs by Heemskerck that do not appear to have come from Scorel's pictorial vocabulary, and thus may be relatable to Heemskerck's training before Scorel.⁷⁰

Adjunct to facilitating this nascent development of a vocabulary of motifs *all'antica*, Gossaert's fame and success also appears to have initiated a gradual

⁶⁶ Grosshans, pp. 33 – 34; for Heemskerck's pre-Roman oeuvre, see notes 36 – 39.

⁶⁷ Maerten van Heemskerck, *Man of Sorrows*, 1532, oil on wood, 85 x 72.5 cm, Ghent, Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Inv. No. S.53; Grosshans, *op. cit.* (note 20), p. 34 and cat. no. 16.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 35 and cat. nos. 3 – 4.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, cat. no. 5; Jan Gossaert, *Self Portrait*, 1515 – 1520, oil on wood, 43.2 x 31.12 cm, Manchester, NH, Currier Museum of Art, Inv. No. 1951.6.

⁷⁰ Harrison, *Catalogue Raisonné*, pp. 7 – 8, hypothesizes that during his Delft period, Heemskerck used motifs by the Delft Master of the *Virgo Inter Virgines*. See also pp. 21 – 25 for a more general account of the pre-Roman Heemskerck's powers of assimilation.

reorienting of the Netherlandish artistic journeyman phase towards Italy. Roman sojourns like Heemskerck's – directly to Rome without patronal support for the singular purpose of enriching one's artistry – would not become commonplace until after Heemskerck went to Rome.⁷¹ Scorel's road to Rome was much less direct, although it betrays his awareness of Gossaert's example. Van Mander reports that Gossaert's renown induced Scorel to work under Gossaert for a short time immediately prior to embarking on a lengthy itinerant phase that would take him through Germany, to Venice, and the Holy Land before concluding in Rome.⁷² On the surface, Scorel's departure for these extensive travels after having spent time in

⁷¹ Ilja Veldman, "Review," p. 110, describes the Roman journey as "still unusual" for Netherlandish painters of Heemskerck's generation; Groshans, pp. 20 – 21, describes the Roman journey as an "obligation within [artistic] training" far earlier than it actually became obligatory: "Die Reise nach Italien und der damit verbundene Besuch Roms hatte in den Niederlanden eine lange Tradition. Im 15. Jahrhundert war dies durch die engen Wirtschaftsbeziehungen zwischen Italien und Burgund eingeleitet worden. Für Künstler des 16. Jahrhunderts war die Italienreise zu einer Verpflichtung innerhalb der Ausbildung geworden"; Larry Silver, "Review of Rainald Grosshans, *Maerten van Heemskerck: die Gemälde*," *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* (47 Bd., H. 2, 1984), p. 271, points out Grosshans's anachronism.

⁷² Van Mander, f. 235r08 – v29, provides a detailed account of Scorel's travels. Their rambling and extensive nature suggests that Scorel conceived of his journey south as an open-ended artistic exploration on the one hand, and a spiritual pilgrimage on the other. Scorel's route to Italy through Germany was unusual, suggesting that he may have chosen to go through Germany specifically to visit Dürer. Van Mander says that Scorel went to Cologne, Speyer, Strasbourg, Basle, Nuremberg, Regensburg, Steyr, and by 1519, was in Carinthia, where he turned down a comfortable patronage situation. In Carinthia, Scorel painted the *Holy Kinship* altarpiece, signed and dated 1519. While no record of an encounter with Dürer exists, the *Holy Kinship* may contain some influence by Dürer. Scorel reached Venice in late 1519, where he met painters from Antwerp and joined with a group of Dutch pilgrims. Before visiting Bethlehem and Jerusalem in the summer of 1520, Scorel and his fellow pilgrims went to Malta, Rhodes, and Cyprus. He returned to Italy in 1521 and visited several places again, including Venice, before being called to Rome by Adrian VI.

Gossaert's employ suggests that the fruit of Gossaert's travels – the flourishing career that resulted from his Italianism – impressed Scorel to undertake an Italian *wanderjahr*. However, that Scorel left immediately after working under Gossaert could signal that before he ever entered Gossaert's studio, Scorel had subsequent phases of his journey planned. In this more expansive, more Romanist-inflected conception of the journeyman phase, Scorel's time with Gossaert was the first part of his *wanderjahr*.

Comments by van Mander further suggests that prior to visiting Gossaert, Scorel was trained in an environment that impressed upon him the benefits of contact with Gossaert and the importance of travel to Italy. Van Mander mentions other Italianate artists besides Scorel and Heemskerck, including a “Willem Cornelisz,” Scorel's first master, whom scholars have identified as Cornelis Willemszoon.⁷³ Van Mander also names Willemszoon as Heemskerck's first master.⁷⁴ In Heemskerck's biography, we learn that Willemszoon was the father of two artists, “both fairly good painters too, having visited Italy, Rome and other

⁷³ Van Mander, f. 234v14; *Ibid.*, f. 244v42; J. Bruyn, “De Abdij van Egmond also opdrachtgeefster van Kunstwerken in het Begin van de Zestiende eeuw,” *Oud-Holland* (vol. LXXXI, 1966) p. 202; Faries, *Jan van Scorel: His Style and its Historical Context* (Ph.D. dissertation, Bryn Mawr College, 1972); Miedema, *Lives*, vol. IV, p. 273; Harrison, *Catalogue Raisonné*, p. 5 and n. 8; scholars have been unable to securely attribute paintings to Willemszoon.

⁷⁴ Harrison, *Catalogue Raisonné*, p. 6, thinks Heemskerck apprenticed with Willemszoon during the early 1510s, but not for the full three year period due to Heemskerck's impatient father, whom, according to van Mander, cut Heemskerck's training under Willemszoon short; *Ibid.*, n. 7, discounts the notion that Heemskerck and Scorel could have trained under Willemszoon at the same time.

places.”⁷⁵ Willemszoon’s sons, apparently of the same generation as Scorel and Heemskerck, are obscure to us. We do not know when they ventured south. However, if Scorel trained under Willemszoon, as scholars have deduced, then we can trace four Roman sojourns back to the elder master, which indicates a Romanist bent to his training. Reinforcing this notion are the similar paths chosen by Scorel and Heemskerck during the earliest part of their journeyman years; after training under Willemszoon, but before traveling further afield, both pursued situations under masters who had already been to Rome. For Scorel, working with an artist of Gossaert’s stature before entering foreign environments could provide him with an exceptional credential, and perhaps contacts; that Scorel may have visited with Dürer, which occurred after Dürer’s visit to view Gossaert’s Middleburg altarpiece, suggests as much. And of course, Gossaert could give Scorel invaluable practice in the Italianate manner under its leading Netherlandish practitioner, also excellent preparation for his travels.

We should also see Heemskerck’s movement towards Rome through Scorel’s workshop in the larger context of this nascent Romanism. Perhaps Rainald Grosshans over-determines Heemskerck’s adoption of motifs from Gossaert’s art by suggesting that Heemskerck visited Gossaert before he worked

⁷⁵ Miedema, *Lives*, p. 70, hypothesizes that one of Willemszoon’s sons is the “Luca d’Olanda” who worked in Ferrara ca. 1545 – 54, was perhaps dean of the Haarlem guild of St. Luke in 1559, and designer of the altar of the Christmas guild in Haarlem’s St. Bavokerk.

under Scorel.⁷⁶ Regardless of the veracity of Grosshan's hypothesis, Heemskerck's relative maturity by the time he arrived in Haarlem to work with Scorel in 1527 – he was twenty-nine years old and certainly in the journeyman phase of his own career – enabled his development of an unusually sophisticated consciousness of art for a workshop underling.⁷⁷ Accordingly, it is now generally agreed that Heemskerck functioned as an assistant to Scorel, not as a pupil.⁷⁸ That Heemskerck entered into a situation with Scorel in possession of broad practical vocabulary of techniques and motifs, perhaps broader than the young Scorel had prior to his own *wanderjahr*, is evident in Heemskerck's pre-Roman paintings.⁷⁹ Such early adoptions and combinings by Heemskerck are of a piece with the more famous seamless assimilations of Scorel's manner that he would later execute while functioning as Scorel's exponent.

However, while Heemskerck's training before Scorel fostered his assimilative capacities, it also afforded him limited opportunities to accrue genuine

⁷⁶ Grosshans, p. 34, entertains the notion that between 1517 and 23, when Gossaert was in Wijk, near Utrecht, Heemskerck visited him. With no supporting or refuting evidence, such a claim must remain in the realm of speculation.

⁷⁷ Miedema, *Lives*, p. 72; Faries, "Jan van Scorel: Additional Documents from the Church Records of Utrecht," *Oud-Holland* (vol. LXXXV, 1970), pp. 4 – 5, has pinpointed the dates of Scorel's tenure in Haarlem: after April 29, 1527 to September, 1530.

⁷⁸ Harrison, *Catalogue Raisonné*, pp. 9 – 10, gives a concise reading of Heemskerck's status in Scorel's workshop.

⁷⁹ Van Mander, f.245r09-12, suggests Heemskerck's maturity where he describes the interim between Willsemszoon and Scorel, under the completely unknown Jan Lucas in Delft, "daer hy hem weder voeghde aen de Const by eenen Ian Lucas, doende aldaer met teekenen en schilderen so grooten vlijt / dat hy binnen corten tijt in de Const seer heest toghenomen."

pictorial knowledge of art *all'antica* and Italian artistic practices. Before Scorel, Heemskerck only learned enough to make him aware of the benefits of a situation in Scorel's workshop. Thus, for an artist like Heemskerck, maturing in the 1520s and planning to learn in "the academy" of Rome – "which he had long very much wanted to do" in van Mander's words – the best road did go through Scorel.⁸⁰ As the only artist besides Raphael to hold the keys to the Vatican collection, Scorel's reputation among his countrymen was surely unsurpassed upon his return to the Netherlands. He was the unquestioned local authority on the art of antiquity and the most revered Italian artists. Along with van Mander's comment that Scorel's fame drew Heemskerck into his orbit, Scorel's employment of other artists who would go on to Rome and his high productivity during the 1520s indicate that the taste for the Italianate manner among Netherlandish artists and patrons was growing.⁸¹ It must have been clear to Heemskerck that under Scorel, he would learn the most authentic Italianate process available to him from its most authoritative local source in preparation for his own eventual voyage to the Eternal City.⁸²

⁸⁰ Van Mander, f. 245v21-22.

⁸¹ Ibid., f. 227v28r, also says Jan Swart visited Rome in the 1520s and that Swart "reysde in Italien; heest eenighen tijt ghewoont te Venetien / en bracht gelick also Schoorel ook een ander manier van wercken hier te Lande / afghescheyden van de oncierlijcke modern / meer treckende nae d'Italiensche."

⁸² Heemskerck was not alone in making the decision to work under Scorel. Van Mander, f. 230v, also names Antonis Mor as an artist who worked under Scorel; see Dacos, *Roma Quanta Fuit*, pp. 91 – 125 for Hermannus Posthumus and Lambert Sustris, also in Scorel's workshop before going to Rome, where they visited the *Domus Aurea* with Heemskerck.

1.3: Heemskerck in Scorel's Workshop

In Scorel's workshop, Heemskerck expanded his assimilative capacities and learned the mnemonic utility and cultural value of *wanderjahr* drawings. While Scorel's oeuvre does not bear conclusive evidence that he drew Rome's ruins in the same amount or variety as Heemskerck later would, it does suggest that he imparted to Heemskerck the high esteem given to drawings by Italian artists and gave him a model for translating the pictorial data from his *wanderjahr* landscape drawings into his paintings.⁸³ In Haarlem, Scorel used the drawings he brought back with him from his travels to create paintings that catered to growing Netherlandish interests in antiquity, Italianate art, and landscape.⁸⁴ Thus, even though Scorel did not develop a vocabulary of ruins as sophisticated as Heemskerck later did, his *wanderjahr* drawings and his post-Roman paintings presage Heemskerck's intensive focus on drawing Rome's ruins in *situ*.

Scorel likely impressed upon Heemskerck the nearly metaphysical *gravitas* given to drawings by the Italians. Long before Scorel ever worked in Rome, his encounter with Dürer may have brought him into contact with the exquisite figural drawing Raphael had gifted to the German master in 1515.⁸⁵ And during his Roman stay, as he navigated artistic and patronal circles linked to the Vatican,

⁸³ For Scorel's interest in landscape and its possible influence on Heemskerck, see Grosshans, pp. 45 – 50.

⁸⁴ Larry Silver, *Peasant Scenes and Landscapes* (Philadelphia, 2006), pp. 26 – 35, identifies Antwerp as a hub for the emerging taste for landscape in the Low Countries in the first quarter of the sixteenth century.

⁸⁵ Arnold Nesselrath, "Raphael's Gift to Dürer," *Master Drawings* (v. 331, no. 4, 1993), pp. 376 – 389.

countless situations he encountered daily would have made the Italian veneration of drawings vividly clear. But no single event could have suggested the importance of drawings for Italian artists and patrons more plainly than the commission of the Sala di Costantino. The awarding of the work to Giulio Romano and the remaining principals of Raphael's workshop because they had inherited their recently deceased master's drawings for the Sala signaled that possessing Raphael's *disegni* was tantamount to possessing his thoughts, articulated in the *lingua franca* of his workshop.⁸⁶ For Scorel, if Raphael's drawings were rich enough repositories of the master's pictorial knowledge to ensure the Sala's successful completion without him, then drawing from paintings by Italian masters was tantamount to absorbing that knowledge.

It is thus fitting that van Mander begins his biography of Scorel with a meditation on Rome as the place where Italian painters perfected the figure and then praises Scorel for correcting the Netherlandish tendency to paint only from life.⁸⁷

⁸⁶ Scorel remained in Rome after Adrian's death, when work on the Sala di Costantino had recommenced. That Scorel lingered until September of 1524, when the Sala was completed, has led Bert Meijer, "An unknown landscape Drawing by Polidoro da Caravaggio and a note on Jan van Scorel in Italy," *Paragone* (1974), pp. 62 – 73, to hypothesize that he participated in the final stages of the work.

⁸⁷ Van Mander, f. 234r23-28...38-45, "T'is kennlijck / dat vormmael t'hoofd der Stedé / het alder schoonste Room / bloeyende in voorstpoet / en volck-rijck wesende / placht in ghelijck ghetal van Menschen t'overvoeyen / en verciert te wesen van constighe uytnemende beelden / oft om better segghen Marmoren / en Coperen / die door hooge vernuftheyt natuerlijck in uytghekosen alder schoonste Menschen lichamen / in Dieren lijven waren verandert...d'Italianen dus verlicht wesende / hebben vrogher ghetroffen den rechten aerdt en westand der beelden / als we ons Nederlanders / die soo op een secker aenghewende wijze van wercken / met onvolcomen kennis / tot beter en beter doen sradigh en blijtigh hebben ghetracht / hun selben veel met t'gemeen leven te volghen vernoegende / saten (ghelijck of men segghen soude) ghenoech doncker / oft met weynigh lichts / tot Joan van

Scorel's post-Roman paintings everywhere reveal that more than anything else he saw in Italy, it was the figures in paintings by his Italian contemporaries that sparked his pictorial imagination.⁸⁸ Scorel's embrace of Italian *disegno* surfaces in the post-Roman products of his *atelier*, ones that he and his assistants could not have devised without having drawings that Scorel executed of Vatican paintings by Michelangelo and the Raphael circle. The most obvious example of Scorel's assimilation of a Vatican motif is his use of Michelangelo's design of the Sistine Chapel's *Deluge* for his famous *Entry Into Jerusalem* (1526 – 27, fig. 1.3, 2), the central panel of the so-called Lokhorst triptych.⁸⁹ Scorel took his compositional scheme from Michelangelo's painting. The main action takes place in the lower left foreground, on a diagonally inclined piece of terrain. The Holy City beckons in the extreme background. The general composition of Michelangelo's prototype survives in Scorel's design. But differences in the groups of figures walking up the hill towards the foreground in each design are revealing. Many of Michelangelo's figures are quotations and reinventions of sculptures nearby in the Vatican collection. Scorel's figures, on the other hand, bear no statuesque qualities, but appear as variations on Michelangelo's figures instead. Evidently, then, despite having access to the antiquities that were Michelangelo's source, Scorel derived his

Schoorel, hun uyt Italien het wesen van de beste wijze oft ghestalt onser Consten bracht / voor ooghen stelde.”

⁸⁸ Harrison, *Catalogue Raisonné*, p. 28, observes Scorel's interest in Italian paintings over and above the sculptural antiquities he encountered in Rome, and hypothesizes that this may have been due to Adrian VI's disdain for them as pagan artifacts.

⁸⁹ Jan van Scorel, *Entry Into Jerusalem*, 1526 – 27, Oil on wood, 79 x 147 – 166 cm., Centraal Museum, Utrecht, Inv. Nos. 6078a and 7991.

figures from drawings of Michelangelo's fresco, which he brought north with him, not the direct observation of antiquities. Similar is Scorel's Dublin *Adoration* (ca. 1530, fig. 1.3, 3), whose figure groupings are also reinventions from Michelangelo's *Deluge* and the Sala di Costantino's *Battle of the Milvian Bridge*.⁹⁰ Even in the work of Scorel's assistants and followers we find evidence that Scorel collected motifs from Raphael's Vatican paintings. For example, the most prominent figures in a *Fire of Troy* composition by a follower (ca. 1524 - 30, fig. 1.3, 4) are obvious, if awkward, quotations of figures in Raphael's *Fire in the Borgo*.⁹¹

Along with this pronounced interest in painted figures by Italian masters, the landscape drawings that Scorel executed during his travels were also instrumental for composing his post-Roman commissions.⁹² Van Mander confirms a link between Scorel's landscape drawings of Jerusalem and the design of his paintings. He writes that Scorel

[drew] landscapes, views...when he was in Jerusalem...he traveled through all the surrounding countryside...and drew with the pen from life the landscape and the lay of the land. And from this drawing he made, when he returned to the Netherlands, a beautiful

⁹⁰ Jan van Scorel, *Adoration*, ca. 1530, oil on wood, 86 x 106 cm., Dublin, National Gallery of Ireland, No. 997.

⁹¹ *The Fire of Troy* (ca. 1524 – 1530, oil on wood, 43.5 x 31.2 cm, Utrecht, Centraal Museum, inv. no. 2374).

⁹² Faries, "Jan van Scorel's Jerusalem Landscapes," in: *Detail: New Studies of Northern Renaissance Art in Honor of Walter S. Gibson* (Turnhout, Brepols: 1998), p. 123, points out that "it is quite likely that Scorel would have seen Roman ruins on his journey to the Holy Land even before he saw them in Rome."

painting in oils of how Joshua led the children of Israel through there dry-shod.⁹³

Van Mander goes on to state that Scorel used a drawing of Jerusalem (now lost) “many times over” for paintings and cites the drawing as the source for the landscape backdrop of a painting of “Christ heading towards the city on the back of a mule,” the Lokhorst Triptych’s central panel.⁹⁴ Likewise, Scorel’s *Baptism of Christ*, also from his Haarlem period, contains a panoramic landscape that could be based on a *wanderjahr* drawing that is now lost.⁹⁵

Since van Mander says that Scorel drew ruins in Rome and that he used his *wanderjahr* landscape drawings in some of post-Roman designs, it is reasonable to

⁹³ Van Mander, f. 235r39-46. The entire passage says that Scorel drew “Landschappen / ghelichten / Stedekens / Casteelen / en geberghté nae t’leven / seer aerdigh om sien. Tot Hierusalem wesend maeckte kengis met den Guardiaen van t’Clooster tot Sion / die aldaer by den Joden Turcken in grooten aensien is: met desen Guardiaen reysde hy door al dat onligghende Landt / oock op de Jordaen / conterfeytende met der Pen nae t’leven t’Landschap en de gheleghentheydt der selver : en maeckte in Nederlandt gecomen wesende / nae dit betreck een schoon Schilderije van Olverwe / hoe Iosua de kinderen Israels dar droogh voets door leyde.”

⁹⁴ Ibid., f. 235v34-48, “des bleef hy t’Utrecht by een Deken van Oudemunster / geheeten Lochorst, een Hoofs Heer / en groot Const-beminder. Voor desen maeckte hy verscheydé stucken van Water en Oly-verwe: onder ander / daer vosr van verhaelt is / eenen Palmsondagh / te weten / daer Christus op den Esel rijdt nae Jerusalem: hier was de Stadt in nae t’leven: dar waren kinderen en Joden / die boom-tacken en cleederen spreiden / en anderen omstandt”; Jan van Scorel, *Triptych with the Entry of Christ into Jerusalem, Saints, and on the Exteriors of the Wings Founders from the Lokhorst Family* (1526 – 1527, oil on panel, 48 x 32 cm, purchased 1941, Inv. Nos. 6078a and 7991).

⁹⁵ Van Mander, f. 235v45, may be describing this painting where he writes of a Baptism that Scorel made in Haarlem for Simon Sael, “een groot beminder der Const-naers.”

expect his post-Roman paintings to reveal the nature of his study of Roman ruins.⁹⁶ Scorel's exquisite "Bethleen" drawing of ruins in Bethlehem (fig. 1.3, 5), which must give us an idea of what his Roman drawings looked like, proves that he had more than a passing interest in drawing ruins.⁹⁷ The jagged edges and abrupt endings of the wreckage that appears at the center of the drawing inspired his pen to an eloquent poetry of line. Scorel could only have achieved such effects through close looking and deliberation while drawing. However, Scorel does not appear to have translated this acute awareness of the pictorial language of ruins, so evident in the "Bethleen" drawing, into his paintings. While we find ruins in Scorel's paintings suggesting his study of especially important Roman monuments – for example the Dublin *Adoration's* (fig. 1.3, 3) *fantasia*, evocative of the Arch of Constantine – these are rare occurrences. The generic, even tidy looking ruins that

⁹⁶ See above, n. 28. It is perhaps telling that despite van Mander's claim, he does not connect specific Roman ruin drawings to particular paintings by Scorel.

⁹⁷ Scorel's famous drawing of Bethlehem (see above, n. 17) is the single travel drawing whose attribution to Scorel scholars have never doubted. Five drawings attributed to Scorel or his circle, are scattered throughout Europe and America. The most recent study to put forth attributions of Scorel's drawings is still *Jan van Scorel, exh. cat., for., M. Elizabeth Houtzager, intro. G. J. Hoogewerff* (Utrecht: 1955), which has eight 16th century *wanderjahre* sketches. Houtzager and Hoogewerff attribute three to Scorel (cat. nos. 112, 117, 120), award questionable attribution of one to Scorel (cat. no. 116), and give one to his circle (cat. no. 109). Two drawings in Amsterdam (cat. nos. 100 and 104), and one in Cologne (cat. no. 110) are attributed to Heemskerck. A drawing of Jerusalem (cat. no. 98) in a "particular American Collection" is left unattributed. All of these drawings require further investigation to secure either attribution, or date, or both; Molly Faries, in oral communication, believes that the British Museum's drawing of Bethlehem is the only extant *wanderjahr* drawing from Scorel's hand; while the Bethlehem drawing demonstrates Scorel's interest in ruins *in situ*, some have overlooked it; Cf., Martin Stritt, "Helen in Rome: Maarten van Heemskerck's Ruin Landscape." *FMR* (January, 2000), p. 118, says "[Heemskerck was] the first artist to explore the phenomenon of the ruins as landscape"; Faries, "Jerusalem Landscapes," p. 120, suggests that Heemskerck had access to Scorel's sketchbook.

occupy the *Adoration's* distant left background are a much more common sight in post-Roman paintings attributed to Scorel and his followers.

It is also apparent that Scorel sometimes approached topographical motifs the same way he did figures: painted sources were just as useful as genuine antiquities. In describing Scorel's use of Roman sources for the development of the ruin landscape, Nicole Dacos can only raise the possibility that Scorel was influenced by the paintings of Polidoro da Caravaggio in San Silvestro al Quirinale and ancient examples in the *Domus Aurea*.⁹⁸ By the same token, Scorel's *Tower of Babel* (fig. 1.3, 6) more closely resembles the tower in the backdrop of the Sala di Costantino's *Battle of the Milvian Bridge* than any ancient Roman buildings he could have seen and drawn.⁹⁹

Whether Scorel was consulting drawings he had made after the paintings of Italian masters or the ones he executed of the Holy Land, doing so enabled him to imbue his work with an authenticity that his less-traveled compatriots could not achieve. Paintings made in the manner of the Lokhorst Triptych, for example, present the Holy Land as none of his contemporaries yet could: through a first hand knowledge of Italian masters and the real Jerusalem, remembered by drawing both. He had observed paintings by Italian masters and internalized their designs by drawing them. In turn, he was able to breathe into his own works their pictorial thoughts on the most elevated subjects in history. As a pilgrim to the Holy Land,

⁹⁸ Dacos, *Roma Quanta Fuit*, p. 193.

⁹⁹ Jan van Scorel, *Tower of Babel*, ca. 1530, Cà d'Oro, Venice, Galleria dell'Accademia, reproduced in Friedlaender, *op. cit.* (note 33), plate 168.

Scorel had observed the “lay of the land” and had absorbed its visual aspect in much the same way.

1.4: Conclusion

There was little in Heemskerck’s pre-Roman training that could have fully prepared him for the sublime splendor he was about to see in Rome’s *disabitato*. However, his training provided him with the practical inclination to draw the architectural vestiges of the ancient Roman past. His rearing in an artistic culture that was increasingly enamored of the benefits of visiting Rome, hungry for pictorial knowledge of antiquity and the art of its modern Italian exponents, and cultivating a growing interest in landscapes, made him uniquely prepared to draw Roman ruin landscapes. Scorel’s emulation of Italian painters and his lack of an expansive vocabulary of ruin motifs may indeed indicate that he had not been particularly focused on ancient Rome’s visual aspect while in its midst. It is thus understandable that the ruins in Heemskerck’s pre-Roman paintings, for example *Madonna and Child Before a Landscape* (fig. 1.4, 1), which closely resemble Scorel’s, seem to indicate only a glimmering awareness of Rome’s ruins.¹⁰⁰ However, as an enterprising artist who was apparently eager to move through

¹⁰⁰ Maerten van Heemskerck, *Madonna and Child Before a Landscape*, 1530, oil on wood, 90 x 70 cm., whereabouts unknown, Provenance, Dr. R. Clavel Collection up to 1969, Grosshans, cat. no. 9; Maerten van Heemskerck, *Judah and Tamar*, 1532, oil on canvas, 138 x 163 cm., Berlin Staatliche Schlösser und Gärten, Jagdschloß Grunewald, G.K.I2008, also contains the same type of topographical motifs *all’antica* in its backdrop; Dacos, *Roma Quanta* Fuit, p. 194, makes a similar observation regarding the *all’antica* topography Lambert Sustris’s *Holy Family with a Parrot* (private collection, her fig. 67).

workshops and absorb what they had to offer him on his way to the Eternal City, Heemskerck could not have missed the theoretical or practical importance of drawings for the success of Scorel's *atelier*. Nor could their essential role in observing, absorbing, retaining, and reinventing motifs have escaped Heemskerck's notice. Moreover, his pre-Roman assimilation of the manners and devices in paintings by Scorel and others foreshadows his eventual development of a credible, authoritative Italianate manner and, more specifically, his absorption and use of the ruin motifs that he drew from the Roman landscape. Heemskerck's direct path to Rome betrays the focused nature of his Roman stay; just as Rome was the specific reason for his travels, it would also become the object of a drawing program that was unprecedented in its focus on pictorializing antiquity.

Chapter 2

DRAWING THE ETERNAL: HEEMSKERCK IN ROME

2: Introduction

In the early summer of 1532, Maerten van Heemskerck arrived in Rome to find a city still shaken by the horrifying events of April 1527.¹⁰¹ He stayed until at least the spring of 1536, if not later.¹⁰² Being an artist in Rome at this time meant immersion in a post-Sack milieu, when recent threats to the city resulted in a

¹⁰¹ Heemskerck could not have left the Netherlands before May 23rd of 1532, since that is the date of his completion of the first of his two *St. Luke* paintings. Vasari, vol. V, p. 582, says that he met “Martino Hemsckerck, buon maestro di figure e paese” while working for Ippolito de Medici. We know from a letter Vasari wrote to Paolo Giovio that his tenure under Ippolito lasted from December of 1531 to mid-July 1532. Heemskerck and Vasari thus must have met in either June or early July of 1532.

¹⁰² The debate on the length of Heemskerck’s stay has been considerable. Some early scholars followed van Mander, f. 245v36 – 38, who said that Heemskerck was in Rome for three years. Cf. Hermann Egger, “Zur Dauer von Martens van Heemskerck Aufenthalt in Rom,” *Mededelingen van het Nederlands Historisch Instituut te Rome* (vol. V, 1925), pp. 121 – 123 and Friedlaender, p. 40; Michaelis, “Skizzenbucher,” VI, pp. 130 – 31, extended Heemskerck’s stay by two years with his suggestion that Heemskerck’s drawing of the forum (cat. no. FR3) shows it in a state of preparation for Charles V’s procession in April of that year; the discovery by E. S. King, “A New Heemskerck,” *Journal of the Walters Art Gallery* (1945), pp. 61 – 73, of the dates “1535” and “1536” on Heemskerck’s *Landscape with the Abduction of Helen*, a painting with Roman provenance, further suggests a five year stay; Grosshans, p. 22, and Harrison, *Catalogue Raisonné*, p. 39, argue that Heemskerck could have stayed in Rome as late as the spring of 1537 since he is earliest recorded back in the Netherlands in November of that year.

revitalization of efforts to collect and preserve the art and architecture of antiquity. Heemskerck's production of a near encyclopedic corpus of drawings portraying Roman topography in an unprecedented variety of compositional motifs and a vast range of media and techniques was imitative of the collecting impulses he encountered; with each drawing of a ruin landscape, Heemskerck amassed antiquities in the pictorial realm. That he chose to draw sculpture gardens, *cortili*, and sculpture collections (cat. nos. SC1 – 5) – not just the individual sculptures they contained – suggests that he shared the post-Sack consciousness of collecting antiquity. These drawings also confirm that Heemskerck traveled in Rome's highest circles of humanists, collectors, and patrons. For the first two years he was in Rome, Heemskerck probably stayed with Netherlandish Cardinal Willem Enckevoirt (1464 – 1534), an avid antiquarian who had served as Adrian VI's datary and was a close associate of Scorel's.¹⁰³ Heemskerck also associated with Cardinal Rodolfo Pio da Carpi, the patron of his *Landscape with the Abduction of Helen* (1535 – 36, fig. 3.1.1, 1).¹⁰⁴ Rodolfo's collections of antiquities were among Rome's most frequently visited. His generous support of artists and scholars was unsurpassed. At stake in this Roman antiquarian culture, which Heemskerck

¹⁰³ Consensus in all Heemskerck literature is that Enckevoirt is Cardinal mentioned by van Mander, f. 245v23 – 24; for Heemskerck, Rodolfo Pio da Carpi, and *Landscape with the Abduction of Helen*, see below, chapter three, section 3.1.

¹⁰⁴ For a general biography of Rodolfo, see Fabrizio Capanni, *Rodolfo Pio da Carpi: Diplomatico Cardinale Collezionista* (Medola: 2000); *Landscape with the Abduction of Helen* is listed in Rodolfo's inventory. See C. Franzoni, *Gli inventari dell'eredetà cardinale Rodolfo Pio da Carpi* (Pisa: 2002), p. 60; after the publication of Rodolfo's inventory, the first analysis of Rodolfo and his uncle Alberto as collectors and patrons is *Alberto III e Rodolfo Pio da Carpi: collezionisti e mecenati*, ed. Manuela Kahn-Rossi (Carpi: 2004).

frequented, was the memory of Rome, the knowledge that antiquities had to offer in the ongoing bid to regenerate the venerable ancient Roman past. Naturally, the artistic culture that Heemskerck engaged was also deeply invested in knowing the Eternal City. Many of the artists in Rome during the time of his stay were especially interested in translating Rome's architectural antiquities into the pictorial realm. Artists including his fellow Netherlander from Scorel's workshop, Hermannus Posthumus, but also Baldassare Peruzzi, Giorgio Vasari, and Francesco Salviati, all made images of Rome's ruins. As a mature Netherlandish artist with fully developed powers of assimilation and training in landscape and Italianate art, Heemskerck was especially responsive to Rome's ruin landscapes.

Thus, given his environment and his tendencies, Heemskerck was uniquely furnished with the ability to collect a specialized but vast category of information about Roman antiquity: pictorial knowledge of the city's ancient buildings and vistas. With exacting choices of vantage points in relation to the views before him, Heemskerck performed something akin to an archaeological act; it is as if he unearthed the views in his drawings, which had been lying dormant for centuries, awaiting discovery by his transformative pictorializing gaze. At the same time, Heemskerck's drawings index his assimilation of compositional motifs in the art he saw in the Netherlands as well as the art of contemporary Italian masters. Likewise, the media and techniques he chose enabled him to articulate his pictorial insights in a number of voices while also suggesting his mastery of both Netherlandish and Italian representational techniques. A rich compendium of antiquities, motifs, media, and techniques, Heemskerck's drawings of Roman ruins would have

functioned the same way any collection of antiquities did: as demonstrations of artistry for the perpetuation of the past.

2.1: Context: Drawing Ruins in the post-Sack Milieu

In Rome after the Sack, Heemskerck encountered a confluence of political, social, and artistic circumstances that were exceptionally conducive to drawing the city's ruins. His Roman drawings speak eloquently of this post-Sack milieu. The recent memory of a sacked Rome had intensified focus on the city's antiquities. The Vatican and its coterie of humanists, patrons, and artists were just beginning to formulate responses to the disastrous events of 1527.¹⁰⁵ The pervasive consciousness of a historically vulnerable Rome resulted in a renewal of archaeological energies channeled towards collecting, preserving, knowing, and regenerating Roman antiquity. We see in Heemskerck's ruin drawings a pictorial analog of these post-Sack attitudes and activities.

While scholars have established several important themes on the general subject of Heemskerck in Rome, none have synthesized post-Sack conditions in an in depth discussion of his drawings of Roman topography.¹⁰⁶ Assertions that several Italian artists were important for the development of Heemskerck's manner

¹⁰⁵ Kenneth Gouwens, *Remembering the Renaissance* (Boston: 1998), provides a vivid account of the earliest humanist responses to the Sack; André Chastel, *The Sack of Rome*, trans. Beth Archer (Princeton: 1983), pp. 179 – 207, discusses the patronal and artistic response to the Sack in the early 1530s.

¹⁰⁶ See Hoogewerff, "Ispirazione," pp. 163 – 67; Veldman, "Review," pp. 108 – 110; Idem, "Italie," pp. 125 - 126; Grosshans, pp. 35 – 41; Filippi, pp. 16 - 19; Nicole Dacos, *Roma Quanta Fuit*, pp. 35 – 41, 69 – 88, and 152 –159.

– mainly Michelangelo, Raphael, and his descendents – help to establish the eclectic scope of his voracious pursuit of Italianate and ancient Roman classical motifs.¹⁰⁷ But on the specific subject of the conditions in Heemskerck’s Roman experience that precipitated his ruin drawings, only Nicole Dacos and Christoph Thoenes have offered substantial thoughts. Dacos has speculated on the importance for Scorel and Heemskerck of the landscape frescoes in the Domus Aurea.¹⁰⁸ Thoenes has theorized that Heemskerck’s majestic drawings of St. Peter’s (cat. nos. SP1 – 3, 5) show the unfinished church “as a ruin,” reflecting ultramontane anti-papal attitudes.¹⁰⁹ Scholars who think that Heemskerck was in Rome through 1536 also continue to note the possibility that he executed decorations on an ephemeral triumphal arch for Charles V’s entry into Rome on the 5th of April of that year.¹¹⁰ However, none have elaborated a relation between the procession and Heemskerck’s drawings. All of these suggestions, which highlight specific aspects of Heemskerck’s Roman stay, currently appear as disparate strands in the

¹⁰⁷ Harrison, *Catalogue Raisonné*, pp. 47 – 48, summarizes this historiography; for a discussion of the interest in Raphael among foreign painters in Rome, see Alba Costamagna, “Pittori Stranieri a Roma e Raffaello,” *Aspetti dell’arte a Roma prima e dopo Raffaello* (Rome: 1984), pp. 123 – 129.

¹⁰⁸ Dacos, *Roma Quanta Fuit*, pp. 33 – 42.

¹⁰⁹ Christoph Thoenes, “San Pietro come rovina. Note su alcune vedute di Maerten van Heemskerck,” in: *Sostegno e Adornamento*, intro. James S. Ackerman, (Milan: 1998), pp. 135 – 149. Thoenes also cites drawings of doubtful attribution to Heemskerck: Berlin I 8r, attributed to “Anonymous B” by Ilja Veldman and Michiel Gast by Nicole Dacos, and Berlin II 51r, attributed to “Anonymous C” in this dissertation. For a discussion of these drawings and other de-attributions from Heemskerck, see below, chapter four, section 4.4.2.

¹¹⁰ For scholars who think Heemskerck was in Rome for Charles’s procession, see above, note 102.

scholarship on the artist's Roman phase. Taken together, however, they constitute the beginnings of a post-Sack context for his drawings of Rome's topography.

During the entire period of Heemskerck's stay, Rome's ruins stood as a poignant backdrop for a dramatic sequence of events that promoted associations between the city's ancient fall, the Sack of 1527, and the possibility of *renovatio* out of the knowledge of those pasts. In the spring of 1534, the health of the beleaguered Clement VII began a slow decline. In the beginning of July, he was even rumored to have died. By September 25, Clement was dead.¹¹¹ The timing could not have been worse; Romans had endured months of reports that Turkish forces were advancing towards the Italian peninsula.¹¹² Fears that Rome would be sacked yet again peaked during a tense *sede vacante*.¹¹³ The relatively quick election on October 13 of native Roman Alessandro Farnese (Paul III, r. 1534 – 1549) assuaged anxieties somewhat. However, Romans would not feel secure until the following July when Charles V, the very emperor whose troops had shaken Rome's foundations only eight years earlier, engaged the Ottomans at Tunis and halted their advance towards Italy. Charles's famous triumphal procession through Rome, a gift from Paul to honor the victory, was a delicate triangulation of Charles's imperial ambit, the power of the papacy, and the memory of Rome, broadcast via the image

¹¹¹ Ludwig Pastor, *History of the Popes* (London: 1899 – 1908), vol. X, p. 323.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, p. 324.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 327 – 328.

of Charles processing through city's architectural antiquities on his way to the Vatican.¹¹⁴

Bringing this post-Sack context to our reading of Heemskerck's drawings reveals several specific correspondences. Early in Heemskerck's stay, when Rome's security was still in question, the sight of its crumbling ruins doubtless had an immediate currency. Within weeks of Paul's election, the new pontiff began generating rhetoric that galvanized this significance. He equated the health of the Rome's antiquities with the Eternal City's status in the collective Roman memory and expressed the Vatican's rededication to collection and preservation practices that had emerged during earlier papacies.¹¹⁵ Paul appointed a humanist and antiquarian, Latino Giovenale Manetti, as *maestro delle strade* and keeper of the Vatican's antiquities. The new pope's brief on the occasion of Manetti's selection warned of the threats to ancient Roman sites: looting, neglect, and the ravages of time.¹¹⁶ The archaeological bent in the art of Heemskerck and his circle, was not only contemporaneous with Farnese's first actions as pope, but conceptually of a piece with them as well. Ruth Olitsky Rubinstein has cited Hermannus Posthumus's *Tempus Edax Rerum* canvas in Liechtenstein (ca. 1535, fig. 2.1, 1), with its clutter of ruins beset by curious explorers and overgrowth, as a visual

¹¹⁴ For the tension surrounding Charles's procession, see Chastel, *Sack*, p. 209.

¹¹⁵ For Paul III's urbanism and attitudes towards revitalizing Rome and protecting its antiquities, see Allan Ceen, *Quartiere de' Banchi: Urban Planning in Rome in the First Half of the Cinquecento* (New York: 1986), pp. 102 – 106 and pp. 174 – 178.

¹¹⁶ Gaetano Luigi Marini, *Degli Archiatri Pontifici*, vol. II (Rome: 1784), pp. 280 – 283.

analog to Paul's sentiments.¹¹⁷ We also find vivid expressions of ruins as objects of archaeological scrutiny and embodiments of the passage of time throughout Heemskerck's corpus of Roman drawings. A veritable school of archaeologists walk through Heemskerck's ruin landscapes, just as Heemskerck himself did. Frequently, Heemskerck drew tiny figures climbing among the vestiges, as in the sumptuously hatched view from atop the Palatine (cat. no. PT1). We even see figures with pickaxes in Heemskerck's drawing of the Forum Romanum (cat. no. FR3), hacking at the ground near the Arch of Septimius Severus.¹¹⁸ Nearby, two others appear to lug a heavy block of marble. The profusion of such figures throughout Heemskerck's drawings of Rome suggests that it was quite common to see people exploring the ruins.

Heemskerck also frequently accentuated the deteriorating aspect of his ancient Roman surroundings. For example, rendered according to Heemskerck's vision, the northeast quadrant of the dome of Santa Maria della Febbre (cat. no. SP3) sprouts not just a few vines and tendrils but what appear to be fully established, woody shrubs. Heemskerck also made a conspicuous display of the cracks and fissures that took centuries to compromise the rough-hewn wall before the ancient chapel. The same building (fig. 2.1, 2) appears pristine as drawn in the much tidier hand of another Netherlander in Rome around the same time,

¹¹⁷ Ruth Olitsky Rubinstein, "'Tempus edax rerum': A newly Discovered Painting by Hermannus Posthumus." *The Burlington Magazine* (v. 127, No. 988, 1985), pp. 425 – 430.

¹¹⁸ First observed by Michaelis, "Skizzenbucher," p. 130 – 131.

Veldman's "Anonymous B" (Dacos's Michiel Gast).¹¹⁹ Vegetal overgrowth like that on display in Heemskerck's version of Santa Maria della Febbre is a motif that recurs so frequently in his sketchbook that it is a signature of sorts. It seems to creep from sheet to sheet as if threatening to consume not just the ruins Heemskerck drew, but the drawings themselves. The copious amounts of vegetation in Heemskerck's drawing of an overturned capital before the Colosseum (cat. no. CS1) even suggest an analogy of nature to antiquity; arabesque vegetal flourishes sprout from the ground and highest vaults of the Colosseum, mimicking the forms of the capital's beed and reel volutes and acanthus leaves. Such vivid emphases on the epochal aspect of Rome's ruins seem inseparable from post-Sack perceptions of antiquities articulated by Paul at the very same moment, as crumbling and in need of preservation.

When Paul gifted Charles V with a triumphal procession through the city to honor the Emperor's victory at Tunis, the symbolic import of Roman ruins reached its post-Sack zenith.¹²⁰ In the context of Charles's procession, however, it was not their decaying aspect that took center stage, but their significance as embodiments of antiquity's endurance and *renovatio*. Charles asked for a route through the

¹¹⁹ For the drawings of the so-called "Anonymous B / Michiel Gast" see this dissertation's chapter four, section 4.4.2a.

¹²⁰ For Charles's processional route and its apparatus, see Maria Luisa Madonna, "L'ingresso di Carlo V a Roma," in: *La città effimera e l'universo artificiale del giardino; la Firenze dei Medici e l'Italia del '500*, ed. Marcello Fagiolo (Rome: 1980), pp. 63-68; Ceen, p. 54 – 56; Chastel, "Les entrées de Charles Quint en Italie," in: *Fetes et ceremonies au temps de Charles Quint. Ite Congrès de l'association internationale des historiens de la Renaissance (2d Section). Bruxelles, Anvers, Gand, Liège, 2-7 Septembre 1957*, ed. Jean Jacquot (Paris: 1960), pp. 197 – 206; Idem, *Sack*, pp. 207 – 215.

Forum Romanum so that he could “see the marvelous antiquities” therein.¹²¹ Paul ordered renovations for the site, including the demolition of medieval buildings for the sake of a straight path. After passing through the forum, Charles was to process on to the Vatican, but not before passing through an ephemeral arch in Piazza San Marco. The Emperor’s request suggests the collective awareness of the profundity in the very sight of Rome’s ruins. For Charles to see the antiquities while being seen processing through them suggested his link to the Eternal City’s venerable past. Moreover, to process through a new arch made especially in his honor consummated this continuity while suggesting his role in the regeneration of the Eternal City.

According to Vasari, a crew of Netherlanders under the supervision of “un Martino” thought by some to be Heemskerck, and which also likely included Posthumus, helped to decorate the new arch in Piazza San Marco with *grisaille* battle scenes commemorating Charles’s victory.¹²² Whether or not Heemskerck functioned in this particular role, his drawings of Rome remain a product of the same post-Sack moment as the procession. Reading them in that context proves fruitful. By the time of Charles’s arrival, Heemskerck had been drawing Rome’s ruins for four years. He had thus cultivated a unique familiarity with the antiquities on Charles’s route, having drawn so many of them. Heemskerck’s medium view panoramas of the Forum (cat. nos. FR1 and 3), both of which show the antiquities

¹²¹ Ceen, p. 55.

¹²² Vasari, vol. VI, pp. 572 – 73; Dacos, *Roma Quanta Fuit*, pp. 154 – 155, has identified Hermannus Posthumus as the “Ermanno” listed on payment sheets.

beyond the forum, enabled his understanding of the procession's grand scale. His drawing looking towards the Forum through the Arch of Titus (cat. no. AT1) and his view of the Forum from the foot of the Palatine looking north (cat. no. FR3), show the same vistas that Charles would have seen while processing through the space. The latter drawing may show some of the renovations and demolitions that Paul made to the site in order to accommodate Charles.¹²³ Heemskerck's drawing contains too many departures from the site as we know it appeared in the 1530s to be a reliable point of chronological or topographical reference – gone from Heemskerck's drawing are non-antique topographical elements such as the encasement on the arch of Septimius Severus, the *campanile* of Ss. Sergio e Bacco, and San Lorenzo in Miranda. However, these pictorial alterations by Heemskerck are in the same spirit as Paul's renovations and Charles's request. In their own ways, all three focused on the Forum's antiquities above all else. Heemskerck's drawing is thus as Charles wished to view the Forum and as Paul tried to remake it: as a display of antiquities.

In its broadcast of the far-reaching temporal significance of the Eternal City's ruins, Charles procession represented a culminating moment for Rome's artistic heritage, an opportunity for the city's post-Sack artistic culture to reclaim its archaeological inheritance from earlier generations. Artistic interest in the architectural vestiges of ancient Rome had its most authoritative recent pedigree in Raphael. By the 1530s, the late Urbinate artist was himself an emblem of an august

¹²³ We know Paul's renovations to the forum for Charles's procession from the oft cited contemporary account by Marcello Alberini, *Il Sacco di Roma: L'edizione Orano de I ricordi di Marcello Alberini*, intro. Paola Farenta (Rome: 1997), p. 46, which describes Paul's preparations in the forum.

but bygone era. Among the projects left unfinished at the time of his death, perhaps the most ambitious was his intention to channel his interests in Rome's topography into a map of the ancient city.¹²⁴ Drawing Rome's ruins was an important aspect of Raphael's bid to map Rome. While we have no Roman topographical drawings by him, Roman antiquarian Andrea Fulvio tells us that only days before his death, the master was conducting research on the monuments of antiquity by drawing them.¹²⁵ The regret expressed by Venetian emissary Marcantonio Michiel, that Raphael never lived to complete this study of ancient Rome, was likely also felt in the post-Sack antiquarian community that defined Heemskerck's Roman experience.¹²⁶

We can read the efforts to know ancient Roman topography by archaeologically minded antiquarians and artists in Rome during Heemskerck's stay as attempts to fulfill Raphael's unrealized goal. In 1534, Bartholomeo Marliani issued his own attempt to map ancient Rome, the *Topographia Urbis Romae*.¹²⁷ And the Italian artists Heemskerck met were fixated on Rome's ruins, especially Baldassare Peruzzi, but also Giorgio Vasari and Francesco Salviati. All three drew Rome in order to, among other things, amass a vocabulary of pictorial motifs that would enable them to invent in that idiom. Heemskerck's encounters with them would have refined the general notion of Rome as a storehouse of motifs – a notion

¹²⁴ Philip Jacks, "The Simulachrum of Fabio Calvo: A View of Roman Architecture all'antica in 1527," *Art Bulletin* (vol. 72, no. 3), pp. 453 – 481.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 455.

¹²⁶ Michiel, letter to Antonio Marsilio, in Marino Sanudo, *Diarii*, vol. XXVIII (Venice: 1878) col. 424, cited in Jacks, p. 457, n. 29.

¹²⁷ J. B. Marliani, *Topographia Antiquae Romae* (Rome: 1534, and Lyons 1534).

already apparent to Heemskerck from his time in Scorel's workshop – into a more specific focus on the city's ancient buildings and vistas. Heemskerck may have already known about Peruzzi through Scorel; in the early 1520s, Scorel and Peruzzi had both been in Rome working for Willem Enckevoirt.¹²⁸ The high-ranking Cardinal could have easily introduced Heemskerck to the Sieneese painter / architect. Ilja Veldman has already demonstrated Heemskerck's attentiveness to Peruzzi's art by identifying his assimilation of the figure group from Peruzzi's fresco of *Vulcan's Forge* in the Villa Farnesina's *Sala delle Prospettive*.¹²⁹ However, no one has considered how Peruzzi's proficiency with topography *all'antica* may have influenced Heemskerck. As is well known, Peruzzi was at the forefront of efforts to image Rome's ancient architecture.¹³⁰ His image based study of the city's ruins would soon form the basis for the first illustrated books on architecture by Sebastiano Serlio.¹³¹ Peruzzi's panoramic fresco of Rome in the Villa Farnesina's

¹²⁸ For Enckevoirt as Peruzzi's patron, see Sheryl Reiss, "Adrian VI, Clement VII, and Art," in: *The Pontificate of Clement VI: History, Politics, Culture*, ed. Kenneth Gouwens and Sheryl Reiss (Burlington: 2006), pp. 339 – 362.

¹²⁹ Ilja Veldman, *Dutch Humanism*, pp. 21 – 42. Peruzzi himself took the motif from an ancient Roman relief now in the Palazzo dei Conservatori. A *grisaille* composition called *Landscape with Ruins and Vulcan's Forge*, 1538, London, British Museum, 395 x 435 mm., Inv. No. 1949.4.11.93, previously attributed to Heemskerck, contains the same figural motif within a ruin setting (see Veldman, *Dutch Humanism*, fig. 11, and *Fiamminghi*, cat. no. 197; Hülsen and Egger, I, 35r, by Heemskerck, shows drawing of a figure by Peruzzi on the ceiling of the Villa Farnesina's *Loggia di Psiche*).

¹³⁰ For Peruzzi's study of Roman architecture, see Wurm.

¹³¹ The literature on Peruzzi's imaging of architecture and its relation to antiquity and architectural theory is vast. See William Dinsmoor, "The Literary Remains of Sebastiano Serlio," *Art Bulletin* (1942), pp. 55 – 91 and 115 – 154; Howard Burns, "Baldassarre Peruzzi and Sixteenth-Century Architectural Theory," in: *Les Traités*

Sala delle Prospettive shows only antiquities and modern buildings *all'antica*, as do Heemskerck's drawings of Rome in a broad-view panoramic format (cat. nos. PA1 – 4). Moreover, Peruzzi's use of Rome's topography as a source for new pictorial inventions in the ancient manner, especially in his scenographic backdrops, is the clearest precedent for Heemskerck's own inventions of architectural *fantasie all'antica*, so prevalent in his post-Roman oeuvre.¹³²

Just as we can trace Peruzzi's interest in Rome's architectural antiquities from Raphael to his own work, we also identify the roots of Vasari's and Salviati's program of drawing antiquities in the Raphael circle. Vasari's description of Polidoro da Caravaggio's and Maturino da Firenze's drawing practice is a vivid indicator of his views on the importance of drawing antiquities for pictorial invention:

They began to study the antiquities of Rome, copying marble antiques in their grisaille, so that there was not a vase, statue, sarcophagus, relief, or any other thing, whether whole or broken, which they did not design or make use of. By this means they both acquired the ancient style.¹³³

d'architecture de la Renaissance (Paris: 1988), pp. 207 – 226; Christoph Frommel, *Baldassare Peruzzi als Maler und Zeichner* (Vienna: 1967-68); Idem, "Peruzzis Römische Anfänge, von der 'Pseudo-Cronaca-Gruppe' zu Bramante," *Römisches Jahrbuch der Bibliotheca Hertziana* (v. 27/28), pp. 137 – 182; Cristiano Tessari, *Baldassare Peruzzi: Il Progetto dell'antico*, intro., Howard Burns (Milan: 1995).

¹³² See Richard Krautheimer, "The Tragic and Comic Scene of the Renaissance," *Gazette des Beaux Arts* (vol. XC, 1948), pp. 328 – 346; *Baldassare Peruzzi: Pittura scena e architettura nel Cinquecento*, ed. Marcello Fagiolo and Maria Luisa Madonna (Rome: 1987).

¹³³ Vasari, vol. IV, pp. 457 – 458, "Laonde inanimati di ciò, cominciarono sì a studiare le cose dell'antichità di Roma, ch'eglino contraffacendo le cose di marmo antiche ne' chiari e scuri loro, no restò vaso, statue, pili, storie, né cosa intera or rotta, ch'eglino non disegnarono e di quella non si servissero. E tanto

In addition to asserting that Polidoro and Maturino absorbed the ancient manner by drawing antiquities, Vasari suggests that ancient fragments were just as useful as whole ones for composing a work in the ancient manner. Unfortunately, Vasari does not describe their study of ancient architectural ruins. But Polidoro's *Story of Mary Magdalen* (fig. 2.1, 3) suggests that he approached architecture the same way he and Maturino approached sculpture. The painting has long been recognized as an innovation for its compositional emphasis on landscape, perhaps in the ancient manner found in the Domus Aurea.¹³⁴ Richard Turner suggested that Polidoro was more directly indebted to a lost landscape fresco in San Silvestro's garden, a portrayal by Peruzzi of the story of St. Bernard.¹³⁵ At the same time, the painting may also result from Polidoro's own explorations of Rome's ruins. The buildings in the painting's left middle ground seem to be Polidoro's imaginative reinvention of the buildings in the northwest quadrant of the Forum Romanum. Perhaps Polidoro has extended the famous ruined columns and cornice of the Temple of Castor into a full loggia. We also see a circular roof peeking over the temple's cornice, perhaps inspired by the Forum's nearby church of San Teodoro. Heemskerck's view of the forum (cat. no. FR2a), which he drew from the foot of the Capitoline, facing southeast, shows San Teodoro in a similar relation to the

confrequentazione e voglia a tal cosa posero il pensiero, che unitamente presero la maniera antica.”

¹³⁴ Marcia Hall, *After Raphael* (Cambridge: 1999), pp. 76 – 77.

¹³⁵ A. Richard Turner, “Two Landscapes in Renaissance Rome,” *Art Bulletin* (vol. 43, no. 4) p. 280.

ruins in front of it. According to Vasari, he and Salviati implemented a sketching program similar to the one he describes by Polidoro and Maturino. Vasari tells us that he and his fellow Florentine each drew in a different place in Rome by day. Then, in the evening, they would reconnoiter to trade and copy each other's drawings so that they could "have drawings of everything" and "learn more thoroughly."¹³⁶ Such practices may in turn resemble those of Heemskerck and his countrymen. Some sheets in the Berlin albums are thought to be copies by Posthumus of drawings by Heemskerck. Others, which show both artists rendering the same monument from virtually the same angle, may have also resulted from a trade-and-copy scenario like the one practiced by Vasari and Salviati.¹³⁷ It is with this post-Sack climate in mind that we must take a close look at Heemskerck's drawings of Rome. The image of the Roman landscape was of dire importance to Roman culture during the period when Heemskerck drew it. Like his fellow artists in Rome during his stay, Heemskerck was deeply responsive to this post-Sack milieu.

¹³⁶ Vasari, vol. 4, p. 259.

¹³⁷ Cf. my cat. no. BB1, which may be a copy of a drawing of the façade of Palazzo Branconio dall'Acquila; drawings that are perhaps copies by Posthumus of Heemskerck originals are cat. nos. FR1, CS5, PT5, and SP5; a copy of cat. no. SP5 by a more accomplished hand can be found in Sir John Soane's Museum, Margaret Chinnery album. For this drawing, see below, chapter four, section 4.4.1.

2.2: The Eye: Discovering Ancient Rome in the Frame

We begin our close analysis of Heemskerck's drawings by considering the moment of pictorial genesis, when he assessed a scene before him for translation into the pictorial realm. Collectively, Heemskerck's drawings of Rome reveal his critical approach to selecting vantage points for formulating compositions, mediated by a growing vocabulary of compositional schemes in the art he assimilated.

Where the topography offered him the freedom to draw from any number of spots, he often made discriminating choices. For example, consideration of the vantage points from which Heemskerck drew the Forum Romanum (cat. nos. FR3, FB2) reveals his careful selection from a range of possibilities. Where the lay of the land was less cooperative, Heemskerck was apparently undaunted in his pursuit of places with views lending themselves to pictorialization. To make some drawings, such as his views of private sculpture collections (cat. nos. SC1 – 4) or some of his broad-view panoramas from church bell towers (cat. nos. PA1, PA3), he had to gain access to privileged areas. To gain optimal vantage points for others, such as his worm's eye view of an overturned late imperial capital (cat. no. CS1) he must have laid on the ground.

While Heemskerck's variety of pictorial frameworks reveals his exploration of Rome's topography as a conversation with it. While the buildings and vistas within his gaze may have suggested the extraordinary variety of motifs we see in his drawings, his sensitivity to the pictorial nature of the Eternal City's vistas prompted his cultivation of particular pictorial habits, preferences, and even

inventions. For example, the Septizonium alone suggests a number of compositional schemes to the intelligent, observant draftsman. The obvious response to the singular vertical ruin, which forcefully interrupts a relatively uncluttered horizon, is to draw it alone on a vertically oriented page. The asymmetrical fragment's enigmatic nature, which Heemskerck's contemporaries found so evocative of reconstructive imaginings, suggests study from more than one angle. Its proximity to the ruins on the Palatine could also lead one to render the building in context on a horizontally oriented sheet. Heemskerck exercised each of these options (cat. nos. SZ1, SZ2, and PT3, respectively). Beyond this, the Septizonium's visibility from many distant parts of the city also prompted its appearance in the backgrounds of views that are more panoramic in scope (cat. nos. AC2, FB2, and PA1 and 2). We see Heemskerck repeat this archaeological brand of pictorial encyclopedism before much of Rome's ancient topography.¹³⁸

Also pervading the Berlin albums are Heemskerck's pictorial intentions for Rome's vistas. His repeated tendency to eliminate the non-antique elements from the views before him, worm's eye views (e.g. cat. nos. CS1, AC1), extreme foreshortenings (e.g. cat. no. PT5), asymmetrical compositions that challenge the picture plane (e.g. cat. no. PT4), and fictive juxtapositions of monuments in different parts of the city (cat. no. PO1) all show the artist learning how to compose and invent with the visual materials in the vistas before him. While there is no doubt that Heemskerck's pre-Roman training and the Italian art and artists he encountered in

¹³⁸ The Colosseum, the Palatine, the Templum Serapis, the Forum Nervae, and the Pyramid of Cestius also appear in multiple drawings in a variety of pictorial frameworks.

Rome impacted his compositional tendencies, his drawings show no evidence that he borrowed any specific vantage points or compositional schemes from drawings by others.¹³⁹ Instead, Heemskerck incorporated the compositional vocabulary he absorbed by looking at the art of others with his perception of the vistas before him in order to tap into a canon of vantage points readymade in the natural and built features of Rome's topography. We thus see his variety of pictorial devices as a record of his heuristic process of topographical pictorial discovery. With a pictorializing eye, Heemskerck found images that had lain dormant in Rome for centuries.

2.2.1: Broad-View Panoramas

Beholding Rome from a distance, Heemskerck drew four panoramas so wide-angled that they demand classification unto themselves.¹⁴⁰ Each of his broad-view panoramas encompasses a large portion of the Eternal City.¹⁴¹ Only one,

¹³⁹ The only drawings traditionally attributed to Heemskerck in the Berlin volumes that may be copies of drawings by others are his elevations of palace facades. See cat. nos. BB1 and BB2.

¹⁴⁰ See cat. nos. PA1 – PA4. Also meriting mention is cat. no. BL1, a copy after a Heemskerck composition on a large sheet in Berlin's second volume that shows the Vatican Hill in the distance from the Monte Mario. Parts of many of Heemskerck's spatially emphatic drawings (see this chapter below, section 2.2.4) from Rome's high vantage points also show distant buildings in their backgrounds while focusing on buildings nearby. For example, in Heemskerck's foreshortened sketch of the reclining statues before the Conservator's Palace (cat. no. CH2), his Capitoline vantage point afforded him a view of Castel Sant'Angelo and the Pantheon, which appear in the distance at right.

drawn from Monte Mario (cat. no. PA4), does not portray Rome from an exceptionally high vantage point. However, even this drawing shows topography from the Janiculum all the way to the foot of the Quirinal. Heemskerck drew the others from among Rome's highest places: the Aventine, Porta San Pancrazio, and the *campanile* of Old St. Peter's.¹⁴² His views from the Janiculum and the campanile of Old St. Peter's (cat. nos. PA 2 and 3, respectively) are the earliest known drawings of the vistas they portray.¹⁴³

Heemskerck was certainly familiar with the concept of the broad-view panorama before ever seeing Rome. He may have seen the panoramic depiction of Rome in Hartmann Schedel's *Liber Cronicarum*, or Lucas Cranach's appropriation of it for his image of a fallen Babylon in Martin Luther's *September Testament*

¹⁴¹ Despite their encompassing scope, all four of these drawings appear on the small sheets in Heemskerck's sketchbook. If he drew broad-view panoramas on larger sheets, they have not survived. Heemskerck may have placed enough importance on sketching Rome in broad panoramic views to reserve a section of his sketchbook for them. Hülsen and Egger, I, p. IX, in their attempt to reconstruct the sketchbook's original sequence, show the four sheets from PA1 and PA2 on adjacent pages.

¹⁴² Hülsen and Egger, I, pp. 10 – 11. Hülsen hypothesizes that Heemskerck sketched cat. no. PA1 from the *campanile* of Santa Sabina on the Aventine. Egger, *loc. cit.*, I, p. 32, says that cat. no. PA3 was drawn from the "highest point on the Vatican loggia." However, its angle of view suggests a higher point that is further back from the piazza below. The *campanile* of Old St. Peter's is the likeliest place.

¹⁴³ Cat. no. PA1 is from a point on the Aventine near one chosen by the artist of Codex Escorialensis. Cf. Egger, *Codex Escorialensis*, f. 56v; see also the top half of Giuliano da Sangallo's "View of the Ponte Quattro Capi from north of the Ponte Fabriccio" in Hülsen, *Libro Sangallo*, f. 34v; another drawing in Egger, *Codex Escorialensis*, f. 27v, is from the same vantage point as Sangallo's; an anonymous artist produced a comparable view (ca. 1570, Stuttgart, Staatsgalerie, inv. No. 5807); Heemskerck's drawing, cat. no. PA4 is from a vantage point that is comparable to a drawing on two sheets in Egger, *Codex Escorialensis*, f. 7v and f. 8r.

(1522).¹⁴⁴ But his tenure in Jan van Scorel's workshop provided more specific opportunities for considering how to reconcile sweeping panoramic vistas in nature with the four borders framing a sheet of drawing paper or painted surface.¹⁴⁵ According to van Mander, Scorel drew Jerusalem and then used the drawing for his monumental *Entry into Jerusalem* (fig. 1.3, 2).¹⁴⁶ If the painting is an accurate reflection of the now lost Jerusalem drawing, then Scorel drew the Holy City in a broad-view format, like Heemskerck's panoramas of Rome.¹⁴⁷

The suggestion to draw Rome in broad-view frameworks was no doubt encouraged by Rome's inherently panoramic aspect. The city's numerous high vantage points make a panoramic gaze over the antiquities at its interior inevitable. While the low finish of Heemskerck's drawn responses to the Eternal City's boundless vistas may give them a "dashed off" feel, a closer look reveals Heemskerck's knowledge of the Roman landscape, which drove a selective vision

¹⁴⁴ Chastel, *Sack*, p. 72, posits Cranach's appropriation of Hartmann Schedel's image.

¹⁴⁵ For the importance of landscape in Heemskerck's northern training, see this dissertation, above, Chapter one, section 1.3. The most recent discussion of panoramic landscapes in the early 16th century Netherlandish paintings is in Larry Silver, *Peasant Scenes*, pp. 26 – 52.

¹⁴⁶ Van Mander, f. 235r. Scorel may have also drawn Rome in a broad-view panorama, but no drawings survive and we have no paintings by Scorel that appear to have derived from such drawings. *Ibid.*, f. 235v, does not specify, only saying that while he was in Rome, Scorel drew "after all antique things, statues and ruins, as well as the art-full paintings of Raphael, and Michelangelo."

¹⁴⁷ A broad-view panorama of an "unidentified northern Italian town" attributed to Scorel in *Jan van Scorel*, cat. no. 120, does not receive substantial analysis in subsequent studies of Scorel.

favoring the antiquities in his sight.¹⁴⁸ Comparing any of Heemskerck's panoramas with travel companion Hermannus Posthumus's encyclopedic view from the Capitoline (fig. 2.2.1, 1), or Henrick van Cleve's later stipple-riddled view of Rome from the Esquiline (fig. 2.2.1, 2), reveals Heemskerck's selective "vision *all'antica*" (and a concomitant freedom from *horror vacui*).¹⁴⁹ Unlike his compatriots, who tried to draw everything they saw, Heemskerck only rendered the antique portions of urban density before him. Likewise, a comparison of Heemskerck's view of the Tiber from the Aventine (cat. no. PA1) with drawings of the same area in the Codex Escorialensis (fig. 2.2.1, 3) or by an anonymous artist (fig. 2.2.1, 4) also reveals his lack of concern with the non-antique elements of the vista.¹⁵⁰

¹⁴⁸ None of Heemskerck's broad-view panoramas contain relocations of any building to for the sake of making a prettier landscape. In addition to always including the largest most conspicuous topographical elements, Heemskerck was sure to render antiquities and important churches, no matter how small.

¹⁴⁹ The panorama attributed to "Anonymous A" (Hermannus Posthumus) in Hülsen and Egger, II, 91v and 92r, had previously appeared as a Heemskerck in Egger, *Die Römische Veduten* (Vienna: 1911), II, pl. 105. But by the time Hülsen and Egger published the Berlin Albums, they had determined that Heemskerck left Rome in 1534 and reattributed the panorama to "Anonymous A" on the basis of its date, 1535, which appears at far left. See Hülsen and Egger, II, p. XVI, for their re-attribution. Even though other scholars have since determined that Heemskerck stayed in Rome past 1535 (cf. this dissertation, above, nn. 102), the panorama should be given to Posthumus on stylistic grounds. Not only does the artist show the non-antique, vernacular buildings in view, but this drawing's unbroken contour lines and use of ink wash are nearly identical to that of the sheets traditionally attributed to Posthumus (e.g., *Ibid.*, II, 53r, 84r, 89v); Henrick van Cleef, *View of Rome from the Esquiline Hill*, 1583 – 1588, Gabinetto Nazionale dei Disegni e delle Stampe, FN 495.

¹⁵⁰ Egger, *Codex Escorialensis*, f. 27v; Anonymous, *View of the Tiber*, ca. 1570, Stuttgart, Staatsgalerie, inv. No. 5807.

Imaging Rome according to similarly selective parameters had been practiced long before Heemskerck's visit. For example, in representations of Rome by Pietro del Massaio, or the view in the *Weltchronik*, we identify Rome via its most recognizable and important buildings, the ones that dominate the Eternal City's vistas and culture, its antiquities.¹⁵¹ The Italian example most like Heemskerck's panoramas is Baldassare Peruzzi's fresco in the villa Farnesina's *Sala delle Prospettive*, which Heemskerck visited.¹⁵² Peruzzi covered the Sala's four walls with a panorama of Rome showing only antiquities and more modern buildings *all'antica*. For Heemskerck, drawing Rome this way had an immediate utility; he also painted a monumental broad-view panorama near the end of his Roman stay, the famous *Landscape with the Abduction of Helen*, which contains invented topography that is highly reminiscent of Rome.¹⁵³

¹⁵¹ Massaio's map of Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Urb. Lat. 277, f. 131r.

¹⁵² Hülsen and Egger, I, 35r, by Heemskerck, shows a figure from the ceiling of the Villa Farnesina's *Loggia di Psiche*.

¹⁵³ For Heemskerck's use of his broad-view panoramas in *Landscape with the Abduction of Helen* and his post-Roman paintings and prints, see this dissertation, below, Chapter Three, section 3.1.

2.2.2: Medium View Panoramas

In places, Rome's ruins are concentrated in clusters suggesting drawing at a medium distance from the picture plane, as Heemskerck did on eight sheets surviving in the Berlin volumes.¹⁵⁴ The vantage points in these drawings are neither exceptionally high nor low. Compositions focus our attention on buildings in the middle ground and give little emphasis to the extreme foreground or distance.¹⁵⁵ Since objects are not close enough to the picture plane to warrant the portrayal of ornamental details, their proportions and spatial relations to one another are Heemskerck's main pictorial priorities. However, their relative proximity to the picture plane makes the choice of vantage points a subtle affair.

The compositional aspect of Heemskerck's medium-view panoramas bears such a strong resemblance to Scorel's masterful drawing of Bethlehem (fig. 1.3, 5) that we must think the pictorial clarity in Scorel's example (and perhaps others now lost) made a strong impression on Heemskerck.¹⁵⁶ As his master did before Bethlehem's ruins, Heemskerck has chosen vantage points for his medium range

¹⁵⁴ Even though these drawings contain multiple buildings, this format did not necessarily force Heemskerck onto larger sheets of paper. Multiple building drawings and medium view panoramas on small sheets from the sketchbook are: cat. nos. PP1, PT2, and SL1. Heemskerck composed FR3 and SG1 on two horizontally oriented small sheets from the sketchbook laid side by side. In both cases, the left side can stand alone as a successful independent composition. Medium view panoramas on large sheets are: cat. nos. FN1, PT3, and SP4.

¹⁵⁵ For drawings of single and multiple buildings that emphasize the extreme foreground and background, which comprise their own compositional category, see this chapter below, chapter two, section 2.2.4.

¹⁵⁶ Scorel's Drawing of Bethlehem, ca. 1520, British Museum, London, No. PD 1928-3-10-100.

panoramas to show all buildings foreshortened, making them appear in “high relief” from the scenery behind them. As a result, the groups of buildings in Heemskerck’s medium view panoramas never appear as if they occupy a compressed space as they do in the *Codex Escorialensis* (fig. 2.2.2, 1).¹⁵⁷

Heemskerck’s famous double-sheet drawing of the north end of the Forum Romanum (cat. no. FR3) provides an instructive example of his exceptional pictorial intelligence when negotiating a vista in order to discover an optimal vantage point for rendering a group of buildings at medium range. The topography at the northern foot of the Palatine where he stood to compose this view would have allowed him to draw from many spots. Comparisons with other images of the buildings that appear in Heemskerck’s left sheet drawn from slightly different vantage points reveal just how elusive is the legibility that Heemskerck achieved in the Forum. Movements of a few feet in either direction have a significant impact on a drawing’s composition. For example, the ruins of the Temples of Saturn and Vespasian, easily read from Heemskerck’s vantage point, struggle to distinguish themselves from the backdrop of the Tabularium in a print from the Pierpoint Morgan Library (fig. 2.2.2, 2) attributed to Dupérac, even though the artist of the latter example drew from a vantage point near Heemskerck’s.¹⁵⁸ Nor does Heemskerck impose a false order on the Forum’s topography by portraying buildings as if they recede to a single vanishing point, as we see in the Pierpoint

¹⁵⁷ Egger, *Codex Escorialensis*, f. 29v. See also f. 26v and 30v.

¹⁵⁸ Etienne Dupérac, *Disegni de le Ruine di Roma e Come Anticamente Erano* (Rome: 1574), f. 16v.

example.¹⁵⁹ Hermannus Posthumus may have also attempted to overcome the pictorial challenges presented by the north end of the Forum (fig. 2.2.2, 3).¹⁶⁰ From a vantage point very near Heemskerck's, a drawing attributed to Posthumus only shows us part of the ruins of the Temple of Castor because Palatine substructures get in its way. In turn, the temple obscures the Arch of Septimius Severus behind it and blocks our view of the buildings on the Capitoline. Posthumus's vantage point also renders the Temples of Saturn and Vespasian inconspicuous and nearly illegible, tucked away in a clutter at lower left. Meanwhile, the lower right quadrant of Posthumus's drawing is empty, creating an unsettling compositional imbalance. Remarkably, a nineteenth - century photograph of the Forum (fig. 2.2.2, 4) shows that Heemskerck's vantage point required little tinkering for the sake of a successful composition on the left sheet.¹⁶¹ Of the many early modern artists who attempted drawings and prints of this famous vista, Heemskerck is the only one whom we know was able to discover this view of the Forum's north end.¹⁶² The

¹⁵⁹ This pictorial license is apparently in anticipation of the reconstruction of the Forum appearing on the next page, *Ibid.*, f. 17r, in which orthogonal lines dominate and the Capitoline is host to a vanishing point.

¹⁶⁰ Hülsen and Egger attribute II, 12r to "Anonymous A" in their table, II, p. 74. While the ink wash technique is comparable to other drawings by "Anonymous A," the outlines are much less sure handed when compared to several examples. Cf. *Ibid.*, II 84v, 85r, and 87r.

¹⁶¹ The photograph is in the public domain. On the right sheet, Heemskerck did move the Column of Marcus Aurelius to the east in order to ensure its appearance in this drawing. For a more detailed account of such revisions, see this chapter below, section 2.2.5.

¹⁶² Jorg Garms, *Vedute di Roma Dal Medioevo all'Ottocento: Atlante iconografico, topografico, architettonico*, vol. 2 (Naples: 1995), contains a convenient survey of views of the Forum's north end. Cf. figs. C24, C27, C30, C33, C47. Garms attributes fig. C30 to Heemskerck after the attribution in *Artisti Olandesi e*

vantage point he chose displays each ruin in its own pictorial space with such apparent ease that we only realize the subtle difficulty with which he achieved such clarity after looking at the attempts of others.

2.2.3: Single Building Compositions

Eight drawings by Heemskerck present the exterior of one structure occupying most of the frame in perspective.¹⁶³ Naturally, buildings dominating their surroundings such as the Colosseum, the Septizonium, and St. Peter's, suggested the single building format to Heemskerck. In none of these examples, however, did Heemskerck render buildings without surrounding topography as we find on some sheets in the *Codex Escorialensis* or in those attributed to Hermannus Posthumus.¹⁶⁴ Despite the apparent compositional simplicity of the single building

fiamminghi in Italia: Mostra di Disegni del Cinque e Seicento della Collezione Frits Lugt eds. Carlos van Hasselt and Albert Blankert (Florence: 1966), cat. no. 29; See my section 4.4.1 for a reattribution of this drawing to the "Circle of Maerten van Heemskerck."

¹⁶³ Catalog numbers: AT1; CS5; SP1, 2; SZ1, 2; TM1; TV1. I include cat. nos. AT1 and SP1 in two categories; both emphasize single buildings, but both also belong in section 2.1.4 because of their compositional emphasis on foreground / background relationships or extreme foreshortening, to portray Roman space. While Heemskerck's drawing of the Ponte Fabricus (cat. no. PF1) portrays a single edifice, it appears on a sheet with fragmented, summary drawings of other buildings and does not appear to have been the subject of intensive pictorial or technical deliberation.

¹⁶⁴ Egger, *Codex Escorialensis*, f. 27r; Heemskerck drew elevations on only two sheets (cat. no. BB1, which may be a copy of a now lost drawing, and cat. no. BB2). I do not include them in my analysis of Heemskerck's single building compositions because they involve no compositional deliberation. The low number of elevations among surviving sheets traditionally attributed to Heemskerck and

format, we find in these drawings a most subtle form of the pictorial insight that pervades Heemskerck's entire corpus of Roman topography: careful consideration of the relationships between the parts of a building, the picture plane, and the borders of the page when choosing a vantage point.

Compared to Jan Gossaert's drawing of the Colosseum of 1509 (fig. 1.3, 1), Heemskerck's compositional choices from a similar vantage point (cat. no. CS5) represent the amphitheater's colossal gesture and robust proportions more tangibly and with greater fidelity to the building.¹⁶⁵ Heemskerck brings the viewer closer to the ruined amphitheater, which stretches beyond the frame on either side while advancing more dramatically (and thus more convincingly) towards the picture plane at right center. Piers close to the picture plane look sunken and heavy due to Heemskerck's plausible grasp of their shape and their gradual increase in scale as they encroach on the viewer's space. Gossaert, on the other hand, drew from a nearby spot but keeps his viewer at a greater distance from the building, thus flattening it. He has diminished the amphitheater by showing it entirely within the frame. Moreover, Gossaert's near obsessive effort to describe each of the amphitheater's parts forsakes the Colosseum's most salient feature, its enormity.

their careless execution suggest his lack of interest in drawing in elevations. Their lack of calligraphic characteristics resembling those on other traditionally attributed Heemskerck drawings also suggests another hand entirely.

¹⁶⁵ Hülsen and Egger, II, 47r, attribute this drawing to "Anonymous A" (Hermannus Posthumus) as a copy after a lost Heemskerck. We find an anonymous late Quattrocento drawing from this viewpoint in Sir John Soane's Museum (Margaret Chinnery Album, f. 28), and two that are nearly contemporary with Gossaert's from near this viewpoint in Egger, *Codex Escorialensis*: f. 28v, which depicts the Arch of Constantine to the right of the Colosseum, and was thus drawn from further north and east, and f. 41v.

Engaged columns, capitals, and dentils are fully formed multidimensional entities, but each is slightly oversized in proportion to the surface of the building on which it appears, making the Colosseum appear to be toyish. In its apparent consideration of the building's magnitude, Heemskerck's Colosseum composition is more akin to the equally proportion-conscious Italian example in the *Codex Escurialensis* (fig. 2.2.3, 1).¹⁶⁶

Heemskerck's exquisite ink wash drawing of the unfinished St. Peter's from the north (cat. no. SP2) – a splendid discourse on the incomplete church's monumentality and the textures of its demolished and unfinished walls and vaults – also provides a telling example of his exceptionally precise approach to composing when a single building dominates his gaze. For this particular view of St. Peter's, Heemskerck situated himself north of the new church and west of the Bebevedere's west wall to draw Bramante's enormous crossing vaults. In settling on an exact viewpoint, he elected to give his viewer the slightest peek at the east side of the unfinished wall surface of the west vault. From a few steps further west, he would not have been able to see this side of the vault in order to draw it. With this seemingly slight choice, Heemskerck has endowed his drawing with an immeasurably greater interest. This is not merely the addition of another pictorial element that increases his audience's understanding of the unfinished church's appearance. The vantage point he selected dictates a design with a difficult foreshortening, which he has executed effortlessly, that would increase his

¹⁶⁶ Egger, *Codex Escurialensis*, f. 41v.

audience's awareness of the subtlety of his vision and his command of space and proportions.

2.2.4. Describing Roman Space: Diagonals, Foreshortenings, and Worm's Eye Views

Heemskerck composed most of his drawings of Rome in ways that emphasize the spatial aspect of Roman vistas.¹⁶⁷ The compositional aspect of these drawings suggest Heemskerck's (and the viewer's) inhabitation of a vista rather than his view of it from a distance. Dynamic devices such as extreme foreshortenings, diagonal movement from the extreme foreground to the distant background, topographical elements that challenge the picture plane and appear to enter the viewer's space, or extremely low vantage points, bring spatiality to the fore. Typical examples offset a foreground topographical element at left or right with a distant building or group of buildings in the opposite corner (e.g. cat. nos. CH1, CH2), or a group of buildings that recede from left to right or vice versa (e.g. cat. nos. FR2a, b). In some examples we peer through an arch or portico to a vista (e.g. cat. nos. AT1, CS4, FB2) or an architectural backdrop (cat. no. BD1). In others, circular buildings recede dramatically from a point close to the picture plane

¹⁶⁷ Examples are: AC1, 2; AT1; BC1; BD1; CH1, 2, 3, 4; CS1, 2, 3, 4; FB1, 2; FR1, 2a, b; PT1; PN1; PM1; PC1; SP1, 3, 5; VM1; SC2a, 3, 4. Also notable are cat. nos. PA3, which contains a sculpture of Lion's head and an overturned capital before a panorama of Piazza San Pietro, but which may be a fictive juxtaposition of Roman topographical elements (see below, section 2.2.5); PT5, a copy by Hermannus Posthumus after a Heemskerck composition; PT6, a drawing that Heemskerck barely began, but that would have featured a sharp recession into space of the buildings on the Palatine had he completed it.

(e.g. cat. nos. CS3 and SP7). In the most extreme examples, Heemskerck has rendered some objects so near the picture plane that they only partially appear within the frame (e.g. cat. no. AC1), or he has placed his viewer at an extremely low vantage point (cat. no. CS1). Only rarely has Heemskerck altered the topography before him for the sake of a harmonious composition.¹⁶⁸ These are, in the main, vistas in Rome that he discovered and recorded.

During the decades before Heemskerck's departure for Rome, Northern European artists including Scorel produced art and theory that is relatable to Heemskerck's experimentation with foreground / background interplay. However, we find no early sixteenth-century northern European drawings that we can describe as precise analogs to this class of drawings by Heemskerck. Rainald Grosshans has convincingly argued that the gestures out of the picture plane by the sitters in Heemskerck's early portraits of the Bicker family are in emulation of Jan Gossaert.¹⁶⁹ The complementary narratives in the foregrounds and backgrounds of Lucas van Leyden's prints could have contributed to Heemskerck's notion that framing places in Rome with one heavily foregrounded object and another in the distant background was a useful exercise.¹⁷⁰ But since Lucas's concerns were

¹⁶⁸ Heemskerck may have drawn cat. no. AT1 from two separate vantage points, one for the arch, and one for the Forum in the distance. Cat. no. CS1 may or may not document an actual topographical configuration Heemskerck found. For details, see this dissertation's catalogue entries for these drawings in Chapter Four.

¹⁶⁹ Grosshans, pp. 33 – 35. The Bicker portraits are cat. nos. 3 and 4.

¹⁷⁰ Eleanor Saunders, *Old Testament Subjects in the Prints of Maarten van Heemskerck: "Als een Clare Spiegele der tegenwoordige Tijden,"* (Ph.D. Dissertation, Yale University: 1978), p. 75, argues convincingly that Lucas's prints may have had an influence on the compositional motifs in Heemskerck's prints, but

primarily rhetorical while Heemskerck's were formal, the extent to which we consider Lucas's prints as a precedent for Heemskerck's drawings is limited.

In Heemskerck's northern background, Scorel provides the closest precedents for Heemskerck's descriptions of Roman space. However, even Scorel's oeuvre does not contain compositional dynamics precisely like what we find in Heemskerck's drawings that describe Roman space. Scorel's *Entry into Jerusalem* (fig. 1.3, 2), perhaps the touchstone comparative example of a foreground / background composition we know of by Scorel, bears comparison to Heemskerck's drawings for its contrast of figural action in the left foreground with a broad - view panorama of Jerusalem in the distant background. Heemskerck, in turn, perhaps looked to both Scorel and Michelangelo for his similarly composed *Landscape with the Abduction of Helen* (1535-36).¹⁷¹

Scholars have yet to suggest that Heemskerck's probing interest in describing Roman space partakes in early sixteenth-century discourses on perspective. In general, northern European perspective theory was still fledgling in the 1530s. Within this context, northern artists and antiquarians would have viewed

makes no relation to his drawings. Recent studies that discuss Lucas's thematic play of background with foreground are by Liesel Nolan, "Is she Dancing?: a new reading of Lucas van Leyden's Dance of the Magdalene of 1519," in: *Equally in God's Image: women in the Middle Ages* (New York: P. Lang, 1990), pp. 233 – 250, and Bart Cornelis and Jan Piet Filedt Kok, "The Taste for Lucas van Leyden Prints," *Simiolus* (v. 26, no. 1/2, 1998), pp. 18 – 86.

¹⁷¹ H. G. Franz, *Niederländische Landschaftsmalerei im Zeitalter des Manierismus* (Graz: 1969), p. 62, makes a general mention of Scorel's tendency towards asymmetrical compositions in his post-Roman work without connecting it to Heemskerck's more pronounced asymmetries; Jefferson Harrison, *op. cit.*, (note 25), p. 23, attributes Heemskerck's tendency to juxtapose large foreground forms with distant landscape prospects in his paintings to Scorel's influence, but makes no connection to Heemskerck's drawings.

the most emphatically illusionistic drawings by Heemskerck as provocative pictorial experiments. But in a much more specific sense, one of Heemskerck's sheets may be a response to Dürer's theories, published in 1525. The curvatures in the highest parts of the Arch of Constantine as it appears in Heemskerck's heavily foreshortened view (cat. no. AC1) suggest Heemskerck's interpretation of Dürer's ideas on how the beholder sees tall objects.¹⁷² While Dürer's text suggests that the letters on the higher parts of buildings need to be made larger, his diagrams show an imaginary arc between beholder and building that corresponds to the vertical projection of the building's façade, thus suggesting the perception of curvature in its highest parts.¹⁷³

It is clear from the quantity of Heemskerck's emphatically spatial drawings and their frequent fidelity to the Roman landscape as he found it, that places among Rome's ruins encouraged him to experiment with foreground / background interplay. From countless vantage points, one can gaze at an ancient monument at close range while a vista containing antiquities beckons from further away (e.g. cat. no. AT1). By the same token, we may gaze at a distant monument while another that is much closer partially blocks our view (cat. no. PT1) or appears in the periphery. Of course, this visual effect is particularly common where ruins are concentrated, such as in the Forum Romanum and the areas immediately surrounding it, which Heemskerck drew so copiously: the Capitoline and Palatine Hills, the Forum Nervae, and the Forum Boarium. Likewise, nearness to a large

¹⁷² Albrecht Dürer, *Underweysung der Messung* (Nuremberg: 1525), trans. Walter L. Strauss (New York: 1977), p. 258.

¹⁷³ *Ibid.*, pp. 204, 214, 258.

building like the Colosseum, where one can see other distant monuments, also encourages this pictorial arrangement. Not coincidentally, these are the Roman locations that Heemskerck subjected to his “foreground / background” scheme in the greatest numbers.

Since we find this topographical arrangement readymade in so many places among Rome’s ruins, we are surprised to find its pictorialization so underdeveloped in the drawings of Rome by Heemskerck’s contemporaries. Drawings by Italian artists suggest an interest in space like Heemskerck’s. In a drawing of the Arch of Septimius Severus and other nearby monuments in the forum (fig. 2.2.4, 1), the artist of the *Codex Escorialensis* shows the Temple of Vespasian exiting the frame from the right middle ground.¹⁷⁴ He used a similar device in composing a drawing of the area around the Colosseum (fig. 2.2.4, 2), where the Arch of Constantine sits majestically, foreshortened in the right middle ground.¹⁷⁵ However, none of the drawings in the *Codex* suggest a shared space between viewer and foreground objects as we find, for example, in Heemskerck’s furiously foreshortened rendering of Constantine’s Arch (cat. no. AC1). Two drawings by Heemskerck’s Italian contemporary Polidoro da Caravaggio also merit comparison. A genre study in Vienna’s Albertina (fig. 2.2.4, 3) shows two women in the extreme right foreground while two elderly men converse in the background at upper left. Another in Montpellier shows two women at close range washing clothes while Castel Sant’Angelo looms in the distant background. Heemskerck’s travel companion in

¹⁷⁴ Egger, *Codex Escorialensis*, f. 20r.

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, f. 28v.

Rome, Hermannus Posthumus, also explored the possibilities perspective techniques had to offer for the depiction of Roman space, but not as frequently as Heemskerck. Only the Colos seems to have inspired him to use a similar device (fig. 2.2.4, 4).¹⁷⁶

If we perceive Heemskerck's most dynamic perspective experiments as ordinary, it is only because our eyes are so used to such compositional constructions, which attests to their forward-looking quality. Aside from Posthumus's drawings, a view of the Baths of Diocletian (fig. 2.2.4, 4.5) from the mid-sixteenth century is the closest chronologically to Heemskerck's that is comparable for its fictive portrayal of armor, an antique torso, and late imperial piers in the right foreground before the Baths of Diocletian.¹⁷⁷ In his choices of low or close vantage points and sharp recessions into deep space, Heemskerck anticipated Piranesi by roughly two hundred years. We also find framings of distant views with nearby arches, or columns and cornices more frequently in subsequent centuries (figs. 2.2.4, 5 and 6).¹⁷⁸ The composition of Heemskerck's smaller drawing of the Palazzo Madama's sculpture collection (cat. no. SC2a) is comparable to Natoire's mid Settecento ink wash drawing of the portico and *cortile* of the Palazzo Nuovo. The two appear to be reverse orientations of one another.

¹⁷⁶ Hülsen and Egger, II, 59v. See also album II, 71r, 91r.

¹⁷⁷ Garms, fig. D120.

¹⁷⁸ A.L. Ducros, *Villa Medici Gardens from inside the Western Loggia*, ca. 1782, Losanna, Musée Cantonal des Beaux-Arts, Inv. No. D-8884; G.F. Grimaldi, *L'Isola Tiberina, Ponte Fabricus*, ca. 1679, Rome, Gabinetto Nazionale dei Disegni e delle Stampe, inv. no. FC 125300.

2.2.5: Towards Invention: “Vision *all’antica*,” Topographical Revisions, and Fictive Juxtapositions.

Heemskerck also made a few drawings that suggest his inventiveness with topography *all’antica*, which flowered fully in *Landscape with the Abduction of Helen* (1536) and the paintings and prints he composed post-Rome. We have already touched on Heemskerck’s selective “vision *all’antica*” in his broad-view panoramas, wherein he chose to draw the antiquities within his gaze while eliminating non-antique elements.¹⁷⁹ We find such revisions in other drawings as well. A comparison of Heemskerck’s splendid rendering of the nymphaeum known as the Temple of Minerva Medica (cat. no. MM1) with a drawing from the 1590s of the same site by Jacob Franckaert the Elder reveals Heemskerck’s revisions of functioning vernacular architecture near the ancient nymphaeum.¹⁸⁰ He has redrawn them as ruins. Similarly, Heemskerck has left out many topographical elements of medieval vintage in his drawing of the Forum Romanum (cat. no. FR3), including the encasement on the Arch of Septimius Severus.¹⁸¹ Along the same lines as Heemskerck’s pictorial disregard of non-antiquities are movements of buildings to new locations for the sake of a more harmonious composition, or for the more practical purpose of making more buildings visible from his chosen

¹⁷⁹ See the discussion in this chapter above, section 2.2.1, broad view panoramas. Cat. no. FB2, where we cannot see S. Anastasia though it should be visible, may also be an example of Heemskerck’s tendency to favor the antiquities in his field of vision.

¹⁸⁰ Jacob Franckaert the Elder, *The so-called Temple of Minerva Medica* (ca. 1590), Biblioteca Vaticana, coll. Ashby.

¹⁸¹ Compare with Hermannus Posthumus’s view of the same vista, Hülsen and Egger, II, 12r.

vantage point. In the Forum example, Heemskerck relocated the column of Marcus Aurelius east so that it could be seen, even though it was not visible from his chosen vantage point. His composition of the natural and built elements in the low lying area called the *velabrum*, the site of the ancient Roman cattle market called the Forum Boarium, (cat. no. FB1), depicts the Arco Argentari and San Giorgio in Velabro further apart than they actually are. While eliminations of non-antiquities from a vista or the movement of a monument to a new pictorial location are not inventions of topography *all'antica*, they show Heemskerck taking license with Roman topography. Both tendencies are prescient of Heemskerck's paintings containing panoramic views of the city; in *Landscape with the Good Samaritan*, *Landscape with View of Rome*, and *Landscape with the Dioscorii*, Rome appears without vernacular buildings.¹⁸²

We see a stronger indication of Heemskerck's perception of drawings as venues for invention in a drawing from beneath the Arch of Constantine (cat. no. AC2). Though extremely rough, it is nonetheless remarkable for its status as a composition that bridges the gap between a pictorial manipulation of topographical reality and a fictive pictorial invention. The viewer stands beneath the Arch of Constantine and sees the Colosseum to the left and the Septizonium to the right. It is true that if one looks to the left while gazing southeast from beneath the Arch the Colosseum's ruined side would be visible, as Heemskerck has drawn it on this

¹⁸² Maerten van Heemskerck, *Landscape with the Good Samaritan*, ca. 1550, oil on wood, 71.5 x 97 cm., Haarlem, Frans Halsmuseum, cat. no. 156, Grosshans, cat. no. 58; Maerten van Heemskerck, *Landscape with the View of Rome*, c. 1550, transferred from wood to canvas, 125 x 190 cm., whereabouts unknown, Grosshans, cat. no. 59; Maerten van Heemskerck, *Landscape with Dioscorii*, 1546, whereabouts unknown, Grosshans, cat. no. 56.

sheet. The now-destroyed Septizonium may have also been visible to the right. However, the view portrayed in the drawing would have been impossible in one glance.¹⁸³ Perhaps the ubiquity of the Septizonium and the Colosseum, as evinced by their appearance in so many drawings by Heemskerck from so many different locations in the city, suggested their appearance on either side of a view from beneath the arch.

Heemskerck comes closest to creating fully realized topographical *all'antica* inventions on sheets where he has drawn elements from different parts of the city as if they share the same space. His worm's eye view of an overturned composite capital before the Colosseum (cat. no. CS1) is composed of elements appearing elsewhere in the sketchbook that he could have easily combined without visiting the site. Heemskerck has included a foot resembling the sculptural fragment known as the *Piedi di Marmo* in the foreground of his drawing of the Porticus Octaviae (cat. no. PO1) though none is known to have ever been found there.¹⁸⁴ In perhaps his most inventive drawing (cat. no. TS1), Heemskerck shows the Templum Serapidis behind a Crater that was in the *cortile* of S. Cecilia in Trastevere during the 1530s. To date, scholars have not pointed out that Heemskerck's placement of a vaulted grotto beneath the Templum is probably an invention as well. The vaulting does not appear in contemporary views of the Templum by Posthumus or Dosio (figs.

¹⁸³ For a drawing perhaps containing similar device, see the top half of cat. no. PP1, where Heemskerck shows the Muro Torto leading to an unknown gate.

¹⁸⁴ Rodolfo Lanciani, *Ancient Rome in Light of the Recent Excavations* (Boston: 1885), pp. 94 – 95. No sculptural fragment of a foot is known to have ever existed in the area around the Porticus.

2.2.5, 1 and 2).¹⁸⁵ Rather, it closely resembles the substructures of the Palace of Septimius Severus in another drawing by Dosio (fig. 2.2.5, 3).¹⁸⁶

Thus, this small group of drawings represents Heemskerck's first forays into the assimilation of Rome's topographical features into his artistic vocabulary. We do not have to search hard to find theories of assimilation – the core and wellspring of 16th century Italian artistic practice – that are relatable to these drawings.¹⁸⁷ We can pinpoint comparable visual examples in the Italian milieu Heemskerck encountered while in Rome. The topographical imaginings of painter / architect Baldassare Peruzzi were based on identifiable Roman topographical elements in his theatrical backdrops (fig. 2.2.5, 4).¹⁸⁸ Peruzzi's backdrops contain fictive juxtapositions of Roman topographical elements just like Heemskerck's; the Colosseum appears at the end of a densely built city street, an urban clutter that includes palaces and an obelisk, entirely unlike its actual situation. This pictorial tendency also bloomed fully in France in the 1550s, perhaps as the result of Jean Martin's mid-century publication of the enigmatic *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili*, with

¹⁸⁵ The grotto was not in this physical relation to the Templum. For views that are reflective of the topography on the Templum's premises, see Hülsen and Egger, II 81v and 82r and Giovanni Antonio Dosio, *Templum Serapidis*, ca. 1550, Uffizi, Florence, UA 2512. For details on Heemskerck's drawing, see chapter four, section 4.2, cat. no. TS1.

¹⁸⁶ Giovanni Antonio Dosio, *Substructures of the Palace of Septimius Severus*, ca. 1550, Florence, Uffizi, UA 2519.

¹⁸⁷ The most concise description of such assimilation in Italian theory and practice is E.H. Gombrich, "The Style *all'antica*: Imitation and Assimilation," in *Gombrich on the Renaissance* (London: 1966), pp. 122 – 128.

¹⁸⁸ Baldassare Peruzzi, *Comic Scene*, ca. 1530, Gabinetto delle Stampe, Uffizi, Florence, UA 242. For Heemskerck and Peruzzi, see this dissertation, above, chapter two, section 2.1.

its illustrations of imaginary ruins (fig. 2.2.5, 5).¹⁸⁹ The mid-century works of Paris' Antoine Caron (fig. 2.2.5, 6) and Lyon's Jean de Gourmont also portray a reconfigured Rome.¹⁹⁰

2.3 The Hand: Articulating the Roman Landscape in a Variety of Media and Techniques

Heemskerck's drawings of Rome feature an impressive array of media and techniques in varying degrees of finish.¹⁹¹ Each technical turn taken by Heemskerck reveals a different brand of pictorial knowledge, gathered while translating Rome's architectural vestiges into the pictorial realm. For example, while drawings of low finish suggest Heemskerck's grasp of the Roman landscape's spatial affect, his more thorough technique may be in anticipation of his later print practice. To date, this variety has escaped thorough analysis. Though van Mander praised the technical aspect of Heemskerck's drawings, noting that "[Heemskerck] was very precise in hatching, with a light, free way of handling," he refrained from

¹⁸⁹ Francesco Colonna, *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili: the strife of love in a dream* (Venice: 1499), trans. Joscelyn Godwyn (London: 1999), f. 83v; for the French use of ruins for topographical inventions in prints and paintings, see Margaret McGowan, "Visions Transported: The Creative Power of Ruins," in *The Vision of Rome in Late Renaissance France* (New Haven: 2000), pp. 129 – 181.

¹⁹⁰ Antoine Caron, *Massacres of the Triumvirate*, 1566, Louvre, Paris, Inv. No. R.F. 1939-28.

¹⁹¹ While finishes range from the quick and gestural (e.g. cat. no. CH1) to the meticulously worked (e.g. cat. no. CS1), there is little correlation between finish and pictorial type. Heemskerck drew all of his broad view panoramas (cat. nos. PA1 – 5) in a low finish. But other pictorial frameworks accommodated drawings that Heemskerck subjected to varying degrees of finish.

a detailed discussion.¹⁹² In his brevity on the subject, van Mander describes the technique in some – not all – of Heemskerck’s drawings.¹⁹³ Many of Heemskerck’s pure pen and ink drawings contain hatching that can hardly be described as “precise,” but is unruly and overlapping, with thick, heavy lines throughout.¹⁹⁴ Moreover, while van Mander’s use of the word “hatchings” refers to the pure pen and ink technique that Heemskerck used most often when drawing Roman topography and his preparatory drawings for prints, he does not mention Heemskerck’s uses of ink wash and black or red chalk.

Modern scholars have added little to van Mander’s description. Seeing a “uniformity of style” in Heemskerck’s drawings, Christian Hülsen and Hermann Egger only summarize Heemskerck’s process, briefly noting his departures from pure pen and ink.¹⁹⁵ In their discussion of the second album in Berlin, which

¹⁹² Van Mander, f. 247r, for the full passage, see above, chapter one, n. 19.

¹⁹³ Van Mander would have been able to see Heemskerck’s drawings while he was living near Haarlem, writing *Het Schilderboek*. See above, chapter one, n. 22. Van Mander’s generic account of the subject matter in Heemskerck’s drawings, *Ibid.*, f. 245v, “many ruins, ornaments and all kinds of subtleties of the ancients,” suggests that he may have had a limited number of them at his disposal, or did not study them in detail.

¹⁹⁴ While it is tempting to interpret these variations as evidence that Heemskerck refined his technique while in Rome, I agree with the suggestion by Hülsen and Egger, I, p. IX, that Heemskerck arrived in Rome as a fully mature draftsman: “Die Zeichnungen des Skizzenbuches weisen durchweg eine bereits gefestigte künstlerische Individualität auf, wie wir das von dem beim Antritt seiner Reise etwa 34 jährigen Meister erwarten dürfen. Augenfällige stilistische Differenzen, erhebliche Fortschritte vom Schülerhaften zur sicheren Beherrschung der Formen lassen sich nicht erkennen.”

¹⁹⁵ Hülsen and Egger, I, p. IX. They make their stylistic observation in support of their assertion that Heemskerck was only in Rome until 1534: “Die Einheitlichkeit im Stil der Zeichnungen wird auch dadurch verständlicher, daß ihre Entstehung in

contains larger sheets by Heemskerck in a looser, more open stroke, they acknowledge Heemskerck's "wide hatching," noting its execution "with surprising assuredness," but they do not expand on their observations.¹⁹⁶ Ilja Veldman, in her review of the 1975 republication of Hülsen's and Egger's volumes, mentions Heemskerck's "variety of technical approaches" including "ink wash of various shades...and red and black chalk."¹⁹⁷ However, the limited forum of a book review did not allow Veldman an in depth exploration of the subject, which she has yet to revisit.

eine kürzere Zeitspanne fällt, als man bisher angenommen hat. Daß Heemskerck seine italienisch Reise im Sommer 1532 angetreten hat, steht fest...sein Aufenthalt in Rom dauerte, nach K. van Mander ausdrücklicher Angabe, drei Jahre"; for a discussion of the length of Heemskerck's stay see above, nn, 101 and 102; the Hülsen and Egger's summary of Heemskerck's process, *Ibid.*, I, p. V: "Was die technische Ausführung der Zeichnungen anbelangt, so sind sie zum größten Teil mit Feder in bräunlicher Tinte ausgeführt; bei einzelnen Blättern ist Lavierung geschickt und meist sparsam erfolgt. Die Vorzeichnung ist, wo sie je vorhanden gewesen, sorgfältig getilgt; wie es scheint, hat Heemskerck die Konturen mit einem Metallstift vorgerissen (wofür besonders das nicht ganz vollendete Blatt 45 belehrent ist); Vorzeichnung in Rotstift ist nirgends zu erkennen. – Nächst den Federzeichnungen sind am zahlreichsten die in Rotstift, zumeist nach plastischen Werken, weich und gewandt ausgeführt; weit seltener sind Zeichnungen mit schwarzer Kreide (fol. 23v. 45v. 70. 74)."

¹⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, II, p. IV. The full passages say, "Von ihnen müssen wir ausgehen, um gegen die große Zahl der bisher Heemskerck zugeschriebenen, zum Teil auch tatsächlich mit ihm in Zusammenhang stehenden Zeichnungen des II. Bandes die nötigen Kriterien zu erhalten. Es sind – mit Ausnahme von fol. 16v., 22 und 48v. – durchweg Veduten, in denen uns Heemskerck ebenso wie im Skizzenbuch des I. Bandes al seine in jeder Hinsicht gefestigte künstlerische Individualität, namentlich aber als ein Meister der reinen Federzeichnung entgegentritt" and "mit einer breiten, mit überraschender Sicherheit durchgeführten Schaffierung sind alle Schlag – und Selbstschattenpartien durchgeführt, während durch eine sparsame, aber wohlüberlegte Strichelung der belichteten Flächen der Eindruck des Vor – oder Zurücktretens derselben oder ihrer schrägen Neigung beim Beschauer erreicht wird (vgl. Z.B. Taf 130)."

¹⁹⁷ Veldman, "Review," p. 106.

Heemskerck's range of techniques rivals anything we find in the extant drawing oeuvres of his Netherlandish and Italian predecessors and contemporaries. His technical variety suggests his absorption of both Netherlandish and Italian drawing practices. But more than this, the array of effects he achieved through his variety of lines and tones is an indication of his quest to expand his technical lexicon, an important part of his efforts to collect forms of pictorial knowledge while studying in Rome. His hand translated his vision of Roman topography into pictorial motifs, rendering them anew as the artifacts of his gaze combined with his artistry.

2.3.1: Heemskerck's Pure Pen and Ink Process for Drawing Roman Topography

Heemskerck followed standard late fifteenth and early sixteenth century drawing practice in that he applied ink after executing a basic underdrawing.¹⁹⁸ Only a few sheets in Berlin still show heavy traces of underdrawings.¹⁹⁹ Drawn with a free hand in imprecise, often unsteady black or red chalk outlines, these scant

¹⁹⁸ For drawing techniques in the Renaissance see James Watrous, *The Craft of Old-Master Drawings* (Madison: 1957); Carlo James *Old Master Prints and Drawings: A Guide to Preservation and Conservation* (Amsterdam: 1997); Edward Saywell, "Behind the Line: The materials and Techniques of Old Master Drawings," *Bulletin of the Harvard University Art Museum* (vol. VI, no. II, 1998); the most recent description of the fundamental aspects of Netherlandish drawing techniques in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries is found in *Early Netherlandish Drawings from Jan van Eyck to Hieronymus Bosch*, ed. Fritz Koreny (Antwerp: 2004), pp. 10 – 20.

¹⁹⁹ Seven of Heemskerck's Roman topographical drawings in the Berlin albums contain notable traces of underdrawing: cat. nos. CH2, PT3, FN1, FB2, SP3, PO1, TS1 and TV1.

remains are our only evidence of his initial confrontation with the empty page.²⁰⁰ If these marks are typical of Heemskerck's standard procedure, they suggest his concern from the outset with the vista's most general pictorial data: its visible parts and their spatial relations to one another and the frame. For example, in the upper right of Heemskerck's drawing of the Forum of Nervae (cat. no. FN1), above the remains of the *colonnacce*, a ghostly, abandoned underdrawing shows how little concern he had for establishing the plausible appearance of things in this stage. The structure even appears to teeter.²⁰¹ However, even though Heemskerck could not have used this underdrawing as an authoritative guide for inking, it facilitated his initial grasp of the structure's parts and led him to his final placement and description of the antiquity.

Small clues suggest that Heemskerck's inking procedure was flexible and responsive to the particular topographical features on view. His unfinished drawing of the Villa Madama's loggia (cat. no. VM1), which contains bold, hasty outlines but no hatching, must indicate that he sometimes articulated all outlines before

²⁰⁰ Heemskerck's drawing of the Porticus Octaviae (cat. no. PO1) shows black chalk traces of quickly applied underdrawing strokes just below the Porticus' cornice. The sheet with his rendering of the Crater now in the *cortile* of Santa Maria in Trastevere (cat. no. TS1) contains sparingly applied single line underdrawing remnants around the Crater's handles where he was working out their size and shape. He sometimes also made notes to himself during this preliminary phase. His broad view panorama of the few north from the Aventine Hill (cat. no. PA1) contains a faint black chalk letter "A" above the Palatine Hill's apex. A drawing of the area of the Forum Boarium (cat. no. FB1) has similar faint letters, "B" and "A," on either side of San Giorgio in Velabro's *campanile*.

²⁰¹ Similar examples are the underdrawn lines that are still present throughout Heemskerck's view of the southern end of the Palatine and Septizonium (cat. no. PT3) and his fastidious rendering of the southern side of the ancient portico of San Giorgio in Velabro (cat. no. FB2), which still has undulating, free hand red chalk underdrawing around the columns, pilasters, and roof.

rendering any shadows. Had Heemskerck chosen to finish this drawing in pen and ink, it could have ended up resembling his quick, single inking of the Palatine's western slope (cat. no. PT4), which contains similar outlines. Just as easily, however, he could have given this drawing a higher finish, perhaps in ink wash. Then, it would have looked like his subtle reading of the *cortile* of Casa Maffei all' Arco della Ciambella (cat. no. SC1), a space that is comparable to the Villa Madama's loggia. However, articulating strong contours immediately after making an underdrawing could not have been Heemskerck's standard sequence in every case; in highly finished drawings, he only applied strong dark outlines after drawing lighter lines with a drier quill (e.g. cat. no. SC2a). In these examples, we find thin lines beneath thicker ones, which he added later. These subsequent passes increase contrast and give more precise definition and shape to objects.²⁰²

There also appears to be no single answer to the question of how much of each drawing Heemskerck inked while he still had the view within his gaze. The negligible nature of his underdrawings tells us that he required little precise guidance on the page before taking up the quill. Thus, unless he executed more detailed underdrawings than the remaining evidence indicates, examples with one layer of uniformly thick strokes (e.g., cat. no. TM1) were probably inked mostly, if not entirely on site, never subjected to later elaborations. It is more difficult to know if this is also true of more fully worked drawings. They could have resulted from multiple visits to a site to continue enhancing the same drawing. Or

²⁰² For another clear example of this process, see cat. no. FR2a, where three objects receding from the picture plane, from left to right, appear in thick, medium, and thin lines, respectively.

Heemskerck could have continued working these drawings off site, after having established for himself the basic information about the view. A lack of precise ornamental details, even in his most profusely inked drawings (e.g. cat. no. AC1), suggests considerable off-site inking. So do some particular anomalies. For example, in a multilayered view from atop the Capitoline (cat. no. CH4), the southern pier of Santa Maria in Aracoeli's monastery, contains incomplete hatching. With wide, but uniform intervals between each hatch, Heemskerck provided himself a reliable guide for completing that passage whether he was standing before the monastery or not. We find an even stronger indication of off-site inking in the details of Heemskerck's distant view of the Capitoline framed by the Arch of Titus (cat. no. AT1). Here, the Palazzo Senatori has unfinished horizontal lines and appears to have two *campanile* instead of one. This is a rare example of confusion in ink that would not have occurred had Heemskerck finished this section of the drawing while standing before the buildings.

Thus, it is apparent that once his underdrawing was in place, rather than imposing a uniform method on all of the buildings and vistas he drew, Heemskerck used a flexible process in accordance with his use of a variety of media. This makes the relation between Rome's topography and its life in his drawings less rigid, more fluid; an adaptable process that served an expansive use of more media increased the means for Roman topography's entry into the pictorial realm via Heemskerck's hand. Thus, at the same time that Heemskerck's drawings provide a vast body of information about the buildings they portray, the variety of appearances he gives those vistas also conveys information that is purely pictorial.

A flexible drawing process, resulting in a variety of finishes, conveys more forms of knowledge.

2.3.1a: Pure Pen and Ink Drawings of Low Finish

In fourteen quickly executed topographical drawings, Heemskerck articulated his supreme command of the overall gesture of the Roman topography before him.²⁰³ Thick, loose strokes applied in a single inking phase, inattention to the tonal value conveyed with a variety of stroke width, and prominent summary and incomplete passages define this group. However, despite being the products of the least amount of labor, these drawings are not unresolved. They communicate the proportions, spatial relations, and lighting of ancient Roman topography plausibly. Because they achieve a convincing representation of the vista with so little work, they are as impressive, in their way, as Heemskerck's drawings of higher finishes.

Heemskerck's drawing of the western slope of the Palatine (cat. no. PT2) is but one example of his ability to master the appearance of a Roman vista while using only thick strokes. Both foreground and background appear in thick hatches at wide intervals. Only the deepest shadows of the coffering in the entrance of Palatine's stadium and foreground substructures appear via a slightly bolder stroke.

²⁰³ Drawings of low finish: CH1; MM1; PA1 – 4; PC1; PM1; PT2; PP1; SL1; SP3; TM1; TV1. Also notable are drawings that Heemskerck barely started, which I do not include in my analysis of Heemskerck's technique because they do not appear to have concerned him long enough to warrant technical analysis: cat. nos. AC2; BL2; PA5; PF1; PT6.

The hodgepodge of buildings comprising San Lorenzo Fuori le Mure (cat. no. SL1) appears through a network of medium-width strokes offering little or contrast or detail. His views of the Porta del Popolo and the Muro Torto (cat. no. PP1) appear via similarly uniform, heavy lines.

Though these drawings are quick studies, Heemskerck's grasp of general appearances is so complete that he deceives us into thinking that he has described more detail than is actually present. For example, at first glance, the instantly recognizable shape and the darkly shadowed interior of the so-called Temple of Minerva Medica (cat. no. MM1) suggest a highly finished drawing. But a closer look reveals an omnipresent thick stroke and the swiftness with which Heemskerck has rendered the ancient Roman temple and the surrounding bridges, ruins, and vegetation. Heemskerck has rendered the Porta Maggior and its environs (cat. no. PM1) in a similar fashion. The arc of the undisciplined hatches on the gate's north side (at left in this drawing) betrays his quick application of ink. Many hatches stop midway or overshoot their mark. But his skillful handling of the gate's foreshortening and the shadowed nooks of the background ruins contribute to a convincing vista. Likewise, stepping away from the summarily drawn parts in Heemskerck's Trofei di Mario sheet (cat. no. TM1) reveals that he has recorded the monument's gesture with impressive fidelity to nature. As a result, the drawing's presentation of the monument is as convincing as its more carefully rendered

appearance in a French print published in 1574 attributed to Etienne du Pérac (fig. 2.3.1a, 1).²⁰⁴

2.3.1b: Pure Pen and Ink Drawings of Medium Finish

As the majority in pure pen and ink, this middling group shows Heemskerck's primary technique for articulating Roman topography.²⁰⁵ His drawings of medium finish share characteristics with those of lower and higher finishes. Proportion, space, and light are convincing.²⁰⁶ Most are finished in a single layer of ink. What distinguishes these drawings from their less finished counterparts, and what they share with his drawings of higher finish, is a more deliberate process that conveys more specific forms of pictorial knowledge; in the main objects of the view, Heemskerck executes more precise outlines and a greater quantity of more carefully applied hatches of varying thicknesses, perhaps due to a more careful application of pressure to his quill, or the use of multiple quills. In some passages, he even executes a nominal second layer of ink. He thus begins to show his audience more about the shapes, textures, and shadows of the things that make up the Roman ambient and begins to suggest his own performance by calling attention to his draftsmanship.

²⁰⁴ Du Pérac, f. 25. A hypothetical reconstruction of the monument appears on f. 26.

²⁰⁵ Drawings of medium finish: AF2; AT1; BC1; BD1; CH2, 3, 4; CS3, 4; FB1; FN1; FR2a, 2b; PT1, 3, 4; PN1; PO1; SC2b, 4; SP1; TS1.

²⁰⁶ The misshapen Colosseum in the background of catalogue number PT3 is an anomalous instance of awkward foreshortening.

In places, Heemskerck's drawings of medium finish bear the same hastiness that is the signature of his least finished drawings: heavy, imprecisely applied outlines and hatches at wide intervals describe the peripheral objects on view.²⁰⁷ For example, his portrayal of the hills beyond the Templum Serapis (cat. no. TS1) is summary and gives no indication of on site observation. His medium-view panorama from atop the Palatine (cat. no. PT5) and renderings of the *velabrum* (cat. no. FB1) and the Colosseum's interior (cat. no. CS4) contain rough hatches throughout their foregrounds. The Porticus Octaviae sheet (cat. no. PO1) also contains thick, overlapping hatches on the base of the "colossal foot" sculpture and in the area at left between the foot and the Porticus. However, each of these drawings distinguishes itself from examples of lower finish in passages rendering the main objects on view. Here, Heemskerck approaches van Mander's description of "neat hatchings," elaborating more surface textures in greater detail.

Heemskerck's drawings of medium finish also include examples that contain a remarkably precise application of a single layer of ink and little variation in stroke width. For example, his renderings of St. Peter's (cat. no. SP1), the Forum Nervae (cat. no. FN1), San Giorgio in Velabro's ancient Roman portico (cat. no.

²⁰⁷ We must also classify some of Heemskerck's drawings as medium finish because despite containing some features found in his highly finished sheets, they are incomplete. Heemskerck has not finished the background, or even the horizon line of his Porticus Octaviae drawing (cat. no. PO1). With the exception of a half-finished capital, the entire foreground topography in Heemskerck's view of the unfinished St. Peter's (cat. no. SP1) forever awaits ink. In his view towards the forum from the Capitoline (cat. no. CH4), Heemskerck never finished Santa Maria in Aracoeli's monastery or the base of the Torre dei Santa Francesca Romana. His portrayal of the forum seen through the Arch of Titus (cat. no. AT1) is mishandled, with confusing, incomplete passages in the buildings on the Capitoline.

FB1), the Baths of Diocletian (cat. no. BD1), and the Templum Serapis (cat. no. TS1) begin to articulate the subtleties in the design of Rome's buildings more clearly than any of his drawings of low finish. In these and other examples (e.g., cat. nos. CS3, SC4), we do not need to search carefully for "neat hatchings," which give a clearer sense of surfaces that face the picture plane.

Other examples of medium finish display a deliberately varied stroke-width or a second layer of ink that describes depth more clearly; Heemskerck draws distant background objects with thinner lines (cat. nos. AT1, CH4, CS4, FB1, FR2a, PO1, PT1, SC4, TS1), or foreground objects in a second layer of much thicker outlines (cat. no. AT1, CS4, SC2b, TS1). Some foreground and middle ground shadows receive a second pass in bolder, wider, darker strokes (cat. nos. FB1, FR2a, PO1, PT4) comprised of greater amounts of ink. However, where there are lighter, thinner background lines, they are not of the delicate, carefully applied, convincing variety we find in Heemskerck's drawings of high finish.²⁰⁸ For example, in catalogue number PT1, thinner background lines are not thin enough to effectively communicate contrast with the topography of the middle ground. The thinner strokes describing the distant Aventine seen from the Forum (cat. no. FR2a) only describe the outlines of objects, not shadows. Heemskerck drew San Giorgio in Velabro with lighter background lines (cat. no. FB1), but he has applied them sloppily.

²⁰⁸ See, for example, the strokes describing the Colosseum in the backdrop of cat. no. CS1.

Despite working these drawings to a higher finish, Heemskerck left the minutiae such as architectural ornament and inscriptions unstated. Even his close view of cornice fragments with the Temple of Faustina (cat. no. AF2) portrays the general appearance of the ornament rather than offering precise descriptions of its individual parts. The capitals or the relief sculpture in the foreground of the Forum Nervae sheet (cat. no. FN1) do not show detail either, despite Heemskerck's exceptionally exacting execution of outlines and hatches. The same can be said of the cornice and capitals atop the Pantheon's portico (cat. no. PN1).

2.3.1c: Pure Pen and Ink Drawings of High Finish

Heemskerck worked a select number of his drawings of Roman topography to high finish. Nine sheets belong to this group.²⁰⁹ These examples show Heemskerck's most emphatically performative mode of drawing Rome. We find multiple layers of ink and strokes of varying widths, usually at extremely close intervals. Less varied, looser or thicker strokes, traces of underdrawing, *pentimenti*, and incomplete passages are anomalies in these polished, precise presentations of Roman buildings and vistas.²¹⁰ With their networks of copious, orderly hatches, the technique in the drawings of this group most closely resembles the technique we most often find in fifteenth and early sixteenth century Netherlandish drawings.

²⁰⁹ Cat. nos. AC1; CS1; FB2; FR4; SP4; SC2a, 3; SZ1, 2.

²¹⁰ For example, when viewing Heemskerck's masterfully inked drawing of the Forum Romanum (cat. no. FR4), we may not even notice that some of the Temple of Faustina's columns are double lines, or that others overshoot the ground line.

Heemskerck's convincing command of proportion and space makes Rome's ruins appear as if beneath a patina of hatches that conceal ornamental detail.

The most conspicuous feature of Heemskerck's drawings of high finish is their display of virtuosity. Sure-handed outlines are closely mimetic of nuanced forms such as the tapering of columns (e.g., cat. no. AC1). Hatching shows us the play of light on more complexly articulated surfaces such as like the coffering of the unfinished St. Peter's (cat. no. SP1). For some vertical outlines, Heemskerck eschewed the use of a single line in favor of a series of horizontal hatches brought to a straight edge, which, in sum, create the appearance of a vertical line while providing contour, shadow, and texture. He used this method for the left outline of the nearest column and the arches in his drawing of the Palazzo Madama's sculpture collection (cat. no. SC2a) as well as the pilasters in the niches of the Villa Madama sculpture garden (cat. no. SC3). We also find passages where Heemskerck has deliberately eased or increased pressure to bring his line from thin to wide or vice versa, thus achieving a close approximation of the transition from shadow to light. For example, in his stunning drawing of an overturned capital before the Colosseum (cat. no. CS1), the acanthus leaf on the foreshortened volute closest to the picture plane contains vertical hatches that appear to evaporate into light as they become thinner. They describe the subtle curvature of the leaf towards its stem. This sheet's horizontal hatches on the second level of the Colosseum's broken wall achieve a similar effect. The delicate strokes fade, convincingly mimicking how cracks in a wall do not allow light, creating shadows.

All of Heemskerck's drawings of high finish contain multiple layers of ink in many different kinds of strokes. After completing his first underdrawing, Heemskerck executed a sort of second preparatory sketch in light, delicate pen strokes with a nearly dry quill. Thin lines pervade all objects, from background to foreground. In the background, these thin strokes remain exposed, un-augmented by additional layers of bolder lines, save for the occasional accent. Renderings of the Colosseum (cat. nos. CS1 and AC1) and the tower in the backdrop of Heemskerck's drawing of the Palazzo Madama sculpture collection (cat. no. SC2a) are comprised almost entirely of such thin strokes, making their convincing nature all the more remarkable. In addition to functioning as a first underdrawing in ink, these thin lines create an aerial perspective effect.

The closer objects are to the picture plane, the likelier they are to have bolder accents from subsequent passes. We find a clear example of this foreground layering in the drawing of the Palazzo Madama (cat. no. SC2a). In the right middle ground, Heemskerck only applied one additional layer of thicker lines in darker ink to the outline of the loggia's furthest vault. This vault's column shows one layer of horizontal hatching. But hatching increases as the loggia's vaults and columns approach the picture plane. Heemskerck has inked the closest column with the thickest outline and three layers of hatching; horizontal hatches establish shadow; two sets of diagonal hatches communicate the column's cylindrical shape. In these passages describing objects nearer the picture plane, the faint remains of a thin under drawing are barely noticeable within a heavily inked network of lines.

On the practical level, Heemskerck's precise outlines, neat hatches, and multiple inking phases ensure a convincing articulation of the shapes and proportions of objects. A difficult foreshortened passage describing the molding of the Arch of Constantine (cat. no. AC1) provides an instructive example. The sketchy, uncertain faint lines of the first inking cross and engage one another beneath bolder strokes. We also find this in the outline of the column closest to the picture plane. Though no less energetically applied than lines in the loosest of Heemskerck's drawings, the bolder lines of this later pass impart sure-handedness. The columns in Heemskerck's carefully worked renderings of the Septizonium (cat. nos. SZ1 and SZ2) also contain the thin strokes of the first inking. These lines do not portray the column's outline, or its fluting. Rather they provided Heemskerck with a reference for finishing. Examination of the outlines of arches, columns, pilasters and ornamental elements in other examples (cat. nos. AC1, CS1, and SC3) also reveals thin ink guidelines.

Heemskerck's high finish renderings of the vistas within his gaze are also impressive performances that call attention to his command of draftsmanship itself, his ability to adapt a familiar drawing method to a new subject. He describes Roman topography in his native language of line. His complex networks of precise hatching are aligned more closely with the drawings of Netherlandish tradition than any others in his oeuvre. We find the closest antecedents in drawings by the artists surrounding Hugo van der Goes and Gerard David.²¹¹ The technique in the

²¹¹ *Early Netherlandish Drawings*, cat. nos. 29, 34, 36; Maryan W. Ainsworth, *Gerard David: Purity of Vision in an Age of Transition* (New York:1998). See Ainsworth's introduction for an analysis of David's technique.

famous drawing of the Colosseum (fig. 1.3, 1) by Jan Gossaert – an artist whose pedigree is traceable to the school of Gerard David – is close to the highly performative technique in Heemskerck’s examples of high finish. Like Heemskerck, Gossaert establishes shadows with horizontal hatching, regardless of a particular object’s shape and then applies an additional layer of hatching that conforms to contours. His rendering of the interior of the Colosseum’s barrel vaults is such an example. This is not unlike countless passages by Heemskerck, including his treatment of the Palazzo Madama’s groin vaults (cat. no. SC2a) and the foreground fountain in his rendering of Piazza San Pietro (cat. no. SP1). However, an immediate source for the multiple inking phases of Heemskerck’s drawings of high finish is most likely Jan van Scorel. Though Scorel’s drawing of Bethlehem (fig. 1.3, 5) is not as polished as Heemskerck’s highly finished examples discussed above, it contains multiple inking phases and a variety of stroke widths. Like his pupil after him, Scorel also made *pentimenti* in order to finally arrive at the proper shape and proportion of the topography in his view.

Despite their obvious meticulousness, even these most finished drawings do not articulate the details of objects with mincing exactitude. Only the overturned composite capital (cat. no. CS1) – exceptionally close to the picture plane compared to most objects in Heemskerck’s pure pen and ink drawings – shows ornamental detail. All others show summary, even inattentive renderings of ornament.²¹² This

²¹² Heemskerck’s studies of perhaps the same capital appear on cat. no. AF1 in pen with ink wash and show less detail than cat. no. CS1. Heemskerck draws ornamental details in red chalk in cat. no. AF3.

is not surprising in sheets showing buildings at a distance (cat. nos. FR3, SP1). However, even capitals, keystones, and relief sculpture relatively close to the picture plane fail to show detail upon careful examination (cat. no. AC1).

2.3.2: Uses of Ink Wash and Chalks

Heemskerck often diverged from his pure pen and ink technique. Fifteen surviving sheets record these variations. He used ink wash in combination with hatching, pure ink wash, red chalk, and black chalk. Heemskerck's departures from pure pen and ink enabled him to elaborate more detailed information about the textures of the objects on view, as well as display an expansive grasp of media.

Heemskerck embellished some pure pen and ink drawings with a thin layer of ink wash (cat. nos. AT1, CS3, CS4, FR1, and SC5). These cases are not obvious, but they are effective in complimenting hatching and darkening shadows nearest the picture plane. For example, the vegetation in the left foreground of the Forum Romanum double sheet (cat. no. FR3) contains two layers of hatching and brown ink wash. Likewise, a minimal wash appears in the darkest shadows of his foreshortened view of the Colosseum's exterior (cat. no. CS3). Heemskerck also used the thinnest of brown washes on the foreground rocks in his drawing of the Arch of Titus (cat. no. AT1) in order to articulate their situation between the picture plane and the Arch behind them.

We find a most noticeable combining of ink wash and hatching on a sketchbook sheet containing studies of a composite capital *in situ* (cat. no. AF1).

Heemskerck has darkened the underside and the volute in one study and the acanthus leaves in another. While his shadowing of the bottom of the capital in the upper left corner of this sheet is uneven and too dark, his masterful combination of wash and hatching on the volute above it presented him with a greater challenge, and is thus more impressive. He has navigated the complicated grooves of the acanthus leaves to describe the subtle transition from light to darkness at the point where the foreshortened volute and acanthus leaf meet. This sheet also contains red chalk shadowing in areas without ink wash, increasing the variety of coloristic and textural effects.

These conservative but effective uses of ink wash hardly prepare us for the expert drawings in which Heemskerck eschewed hatching altogether to describe all shadows and surfaces with ink wash within a rubric of pen outlines. Four of the six examples are among Heemskerck's finest drawings.²¹³ In these carefully crafted pieces, Heemskerck describes texture and the effects of light on Roman buildings and vistas with precision and detail that surpasses even the most finished of his pure pen and ink drawings. The large format of Heemskerck's ink wash drawing of the Forum Romanum (cat. no. FR1) demands more attention to than most of his drawings. The ink wash medium enabled Heemskerck to portray the fluting of the Temple of Vespasian's columns and the clamor of relief sculpture on the Arch of Septimius Severus with a clarity we cannot find even in his most finished pure pen and ink examples. One suspects that the rough texture of the unfinished massive

²¹³ Cat. nos. FR1; SP2; SG1; SC1. The others, cat. no. BB2 (a sheet containing two elevations of palace facades) and cat. no. SG2 (of San Giovanni in Laterano's ambulatory) are rendered with little deliberation in low finish.

north walls of the unfinished St. Peter's (cat. no. SP2) inspired Heemskerck's choice of ink wash. No amount of hatching, no line however thin, could describe the wall with the same fidelity as these deftly handled passages. In places on the massive walls, Heemskerck executes hatches with the brush instead of the pen. Most impressive is his use of two slightly varied tones of wash for the shadows of the vaults furthest from the picture plane. Heemskerck also used the ink wash technique effectively for recording the effects of light on smooth contours. His drawing of the Casa Maffei all' Arco di Ciambella's sculpture collection (cat. no. SC1) shows the understated transitions of shadows on the *cortile's* vaulted ceilings and unfluted columns more carefully than the sculpture. This meticulous use of ink wash by Heemskerck, which closely resembles painting, may descend from the use of wash in underdrawings for paintings by artists in the generation before Heemskerck, including Jan Gossaert, Lucas van Leyden, Bernard van Orley, and Pieter Coecke van Aelst.²¹⁴ We must also think that Heemskerck and Hermannus Posthumus, who favored ink wash, noted their master Scorel's use of ink wash for drawing views, as seen in his drawing of Bethlehem.

A study of the Colosseum (cat. no. CS2) is the lone drawing in which Heemskerck attempts to give voice to the dark shadows of the amphitheater's masonry and barrel vaults with black chalk. Pen lines portray the contours, vegetation, and design elements such as pilasters. Chalk appears to stem from the middle spine of the masonry between the two rows of circumferential vaults. It is

²¹⁴ Maryan W. Ainsworth, "Northern Renaissance Drawings and Underdrawings: A Proposed Method of Study," *Master Drawings* (vol. 27, no. 1, Spring, 1989), p. 16.

not surprising that we only have one example by Heemskerck in black chalk.

Unlike ink wash, the chalk medium is unable to provide the contrast that marks Heemskerck's pure pen and ink, and ink wash efforts.

Likewise, we have only two examples of Heemskerck's use of red chalk to render elements of Roman topography. He chose red chalk frequently to draw the smooth surfaces of the ancient Greek and Roman sculptures he encountered in Rome, applying the chalk with subtle variations in pressure to produce nuanced tonal variety and contrast. Perhaps the sculptural qualities of the cornice in the Forum Augustus' Temple of Mars Ultor (cat. no. AF1) and the Palazzo Branconio d'Al Acquila's façade (cat. no. BB1) influenced Heemskerck to draw them in red chalk as well.²¹⁵ Even in the latter example, an imprecise unfinished line drawing that does not portray details, Heemskerck has used the red chalk to emphasize harmonic fluidity in Raphael's façade design. The choice of red chalk here is in marked contrast to Heemskerck's other façade drawings in elevation (cat. nos. BB1 and BB2), for which he chose pen and ink wash to render much more linear architectural designs. The cornice of the Temple of Mars Ultor prompted Heemskerck to use the pointed, blunt, and flat surfaces of his chalk to express the slight curves of the egg and dart pattern and the play of light on the acanthus leaves, volutes, and the negative space between them.

²¹⁵ Numerous sheets in the Berlin albums contain Heemskerck's sculptural studies in red chalk. These are most often, but not always, on the verso sides of the sheets containing drawings of Roman topography. In album I: 8v, 11v, 19v, 31r, 33v, 37v, 43v, 45v, 46v, 47v, 49r, 50r, 50v, 51v, 52v, 56r, 56v, 60v, 61v, 63v, 65v, 71v, and 75v. In album II: 1v.

2.4: Conclusion

In the post-Sack cultural and artistic climate of the 1530s, it would have served several specific purposes for Heemskerck and his fellow Netherlanders to collect images of Rome's ruins, which were so crucial in post-Sack cultural and visual parlance. The very act of amassing such a collection of motifs was the surest way to gain an important form of pictorial knowledge. Having a set of self-produced images at the ready was the surest way to demonstrate that knowledge to established masters with active workshops as well as potential patrons. For artists not planning to put down roots in Rome, producing such a corpus of drawings served the additional function of ensuring a portable knowledge base for future use. Heemskerck's Roman topographical drawings are records of an eye and hand that had acquired a unique pictorial knowledge of Roman space, unsurpassed in its polymathic, timely awareness of both Netherlandish and Italian pictorial trends. The compositional schemes, media, and techniques in his drawings comprise a vast and varied collection of forms of knowledge that falls within the overlapping rubrics of antiquity and art. Because of Heemskerck's convincing grasp of Roman space, even drawings of low finish strike us as truthful renderings in which he uses his considerable gift for representation to make a little labor go a long way. Drawings of higher finish in various media display more specific information about the shapes and textures of things. Their quantity of a variety of quality strokes also brings Heemskerck's presence to the forefront by indicating his meticulous study, his manual labor, and thus his virtuosity. Beyond these intrinsic qualities, his utterly dynamic array of pictorial frameworks and topographical revisions suggests

his mastery of Roman space and even his ability to re-present antiquity in new syntactical configurations. Likewise, the sheer facture of his drawings also conveys to any beholder that he has cultivated his eye and hand to “read and write” fluently in the pictorial language of Rome, to design “new Romes.”

Chapter 3

REMEMBERING THE ETERNAL: HEEMSKERCK'S PICTORIAL MEMORY OF ROME AND HIS SELF-PORTRAITURE

3: Introduction

Heemskerck's drawings of Rome and his related pictorial memory of the city became such an integral part of his art that he fashioned his identity as a master of Roman topography in his self-portraiture. While the variety and wealth of motifs in his drawings suggest his ability to invent settings *all'antica*, his paintings and prints fulfill that suggestion. They evince his development of a rich topographical language *all'antica*, a profusion of *fantasie*, ruin-landscapes, new buildings, and even entire cities that highlight his seemingly infinite capacity for invention.²¹⁶ While still in Rome, Heemskerck had already begun reconfiguring his pictorial memories of the city's vistas for the scenery in his paintings. In addition to the monumental *Landscape with the Abduction of Helen* (1535 - 36; fig. 3.1.1, 1), he may have also painted the small *Triumph of Bacchus* (mid 1530s, fig. 1.1, 6) before

²¹⁶ More than 600 designs for prints traditionally attributed to Heemskerck remain. See F.W.H. Hollstein, *The New Hollstein: Dutch and Flemish etchings, engravings and woodcuts, 1450-1700: Maarten van Heemskerck*, 2 vols., ed. Ger Luijten, comp. Ilja Veldman (Amsterdam: 1994); for catalogues raisonnés of Heemskerck's paintings, see Grosshans, and Harrison, *Catalogue Raisonné*.

leaving.²¹⁷ Both paintings present an imagined antiquity with invented topography that triggers memories of Rome without slavishly imitating the city. These paintings would prove to be augurs of Heemskerck's later work. However, he did not find a readymade audience for images like these immediately upon his return to Haarlem. Only after the mid 1540s, did the scenery in his paintings and prints become increasingly reminiscent of Rome, more reliant on his drawings and memory of the Eternal City.²¹⁸ Heemskerck's *Landscape with Classical Ruins and St. Jerome* (1547, fig. 3.1.1, 2) marks his return to compositions containing copious topographical inventions like the ones in the *Helen* canvas.²¹⁹ Apparently, the Netherlandish interest in Heemskerck's *fantasie* increased rapidly in the years after he painted the Jerome panel. By the early 1550s, he had produced an unrivalled body of paintings and prints with topography *all'antica*. Heemskerck's mastery of antiquity began to gain appreciation among an elite circle of northern European

²¹⁷ For the question of the dating of the *Triumph of Bacchus*, see above, chapter one, n. 36.

²¹⁸ In light of van Mander's comments, f. 247r, "after the fall of Haarlem many of [Heemskerck's] works were taken by the Spaniards, under the pretext that they wanted to buy them, and removed to Spain – not to mention all the outstanding works of art that the senseless iconoclasm shamefully destroyed – so that now, at the present, there is not much by him to be found in this country," we must make conclusions about Heemskerck's artistic development cautiously. However, it is unlikely that mid 1560s iconoclasts selectively destroyed only Heemskerck's works dating from ca. 1537 – 1545. Moreover, with the exception of the "Draper's Altarpiece," what remains of Heemskerck's paintings for churches suggests that they were less of a venue for topographical inventions *all'antica* than paintings for private settings. Cf. Grosshans, cat. nos. 29, 42 – 43, and 47a – c.

²¹⁹ Maerten van Heemskerck, *Landscape with Classical Ruins and St. Jerome*, 1547, oil on wood, 105 x 161 cm., Lichtenstein Museum, Inv. No. G117, Grosshans, cat. no. 57. The publication of a nearly reproductive print followed in 1552. See Hollstein, no. 588.

humanists and antiquarians. We can read his *Self-Portrait Before the Colosseum* (1553; fig. 3.2, 1), in which he shows himself drawing at the foot of the ancient ruined amphitheater, as an appeal to this Netherlandish Romanist audience for the importance of his drawings and his vision of Rome.²²⁰ His self-portrait asserts that his drawings were the wellspring of his memory and his *ingegno*. As such, they were a form of antiquarian discourse that was as important as any written response to antiquity. Moreover, since Heemskerck's drawings were so crucial for perpetuating the memory of Rome and the creation of *fantasie*, they were as important as antiquities themselves.

3.1: Invention and Memory: Heemskerck's Use of his Drawings of Rome in his Paintings and Prints

“He was a very good designer, yes: a man who, in a manner of speaking, filled the world with his inventions, added to which he was also a good architect as all his works make abundantly clear.”²²¹

By describing Heemskerck with the lofty, classically inflected title of “architect,” van Mander highlights the conspicuously invented aspect of the seemingly endless amounts of *fantasie* on display in the artist's paintings and prints.

²²⁰ Maerten van Heemskerck, *Self-Portrait Before the Colosseum*, 1553, Oil on canvas, 42.2 x 54 cm, Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, England, Inv. No. 103.

²²¹ Karel van Mander, f. 246v25 – 27, “Hy was een seer goet ordineerder / ae een Man die de heels Weerelt schier vervult heft met zyn inventien / wesende oock een goet Architect / ghelijk in al zyn dinghen overbodichte sien is.” Van Mander does not use the same words in the passage on f. 246r15 – 16, where he claims that Heemskerck often said, “every painter who wants to thrive should avoid decoration and architecture.” For the full passage, see above, n. 21. There, he uses the word “metselrijen,” translated as “architecture” by Miedema, *Lives*, p. 242.

With their motifs *all'antica* and reminiscences of Rome, topographical inventions like the ones in Heemskerck's *Helen* and *Jerome* paintings, and countless other post-Roman images, signal their own origins in the Roman landscape through the filter of Heemskerck's exceptionally nuanced pictorial knowledge of Rome, which he gained by drawing the Roman landscape. However, modern scholarship has not pursued this relation, except in particular examples, where emphasis has been on one-to-one correspondences between Heemskerck's drawings and the motifs in his paintings.²²² We must expand on their observations, most eloquently summarized by Ilja Veldman, that Heemskerck's Roman drawings "are obviously study drawings...not made specifically as preliminary designs for a painting or print."²²³ Veldman is correct – none of the ruin landscapes Heemskerck drew in Rome reappear *in toto* in a painting or print. Only in rare instances did Heemskerck even quote from parts of them verbatim. But this disconnection between Heemskerck's drawings of Rome and his finished paintings and prints is precisely what is so intriguing about their relation. Moreover, it is precisely the point; Heemskerck's pictorial architectural inventions are a prolific recreation of his vast stock of topographical motifs, ostentatious combinings of the motifs in his drawings and his

²²² Cf., Leon Preibisz, p. 70, and David Cast, "Marten van Heemskerck's *Momus Criticizing the Worlds for the Gods*: a problem of Erasmian Iconography," *Simiolus* (no. 7, 1974), p. 23, who discuss Heemskerck's use of his sketchbook for monuments in the backdrop of Heemskerck's *Momus Criticizing the Gods*, 1561, oil on wood, 120 x 174 cm. Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Inv. no. I 734, Grosshans, cat. no. 93; E. S. King, identifies a range of sources for the motifs in Heemskerck's painting and states that Heemskerck's "sketches...indicate the source of some of [the painting's] features, though none correspond literally with the original Roman monuments."

²²³ Ilja Veldman, "Review," p. 110.

imaginative, regenerative memory of Rome. They are a display of knowledge for an antiquarian audience that would have appreciated them.

Heemskerck's *Landscape with the Abduction of Helen* (1535 – 36) is a demonstration for a learned audience of the encyclopedic inventiveness he acquired by drawing the Roman landscape, a *summa* of his topographical vocabulary in all its varieties, a culminating masterpiece of his Roman stay.²²⁴ However, until recently, scholars have not had the opportunity to fully think through the relation between Heemskerck's drawings of Rome, the painting's landscape, and its audience. The *Helen's* patron, leading Italian humanist Cardinal Rodolfo Pio da Carpi (1500 - 1564), was only recently discovered.²²⁵ Rodolfo's support of Heemskerck indicates the high status of Heemskerck's drawings among prestigious patrons in post-Sack Rome, where the destabilization of artistic and patronal networks had created more opportunities than usual for Netherlandish artists.²²⁶ Heemskerck's drawings were surely instrumental in securing the commission to paint the *Helen* canvas. By 1535, when Heemskerck began the painting, he had been in Rome for four years and was probably in possession of most of the drawings now in Berlin. Also an avid collector of antiquities, Rodolfo allowed

²²⁴ E. S. King, pp. 61 – 73; Grosshans, cat. no. 19, pp. 116 – 119; Harrison, *Catalogue Raisonné*, cat. no. 19, pp. 297 – 312; Martin Stritt, *Die schöne Helena in de Romruinen. Überlegungen zu einem Gemälde Maarten van Heemskercks* (Frankfurt a.M.: 2004).

²²⁵ For bibliography on Carpi, see above, n. 104.

²²⁶ Harrison, *Catalogue Raisonné*, pp. 45 – 46, is most explicit on the subject, insisting that although artistic activity had not yet returned to its early Clementine heights, commissions had not dried up entirely; Silver, *op. cit.* (note 60), p. 272.

Heemskerck to draw the sculptures in his collection, found in his palace on the Campo Marzio and in the sculpture garden of his villa on the Quirinale.²²⁷ Rodolfo, the learned antiquarian and collector, surely would have appreciated Heemskerck's drawings of ruins as a collection of images of the city's architectural antiquities. In their display of a variety of forms of knowledge of the ancient Roman landscape, Rodolfo would have doubtless also recognized their convincing testimony of Heemskerck's status as a consummate imitator, one whose mastery of art and ancient Rome's pictorial affect was supreme. More specifically, the indications in Heemskerck's drawings of his virtuosic capacity for pictorial invention surely figured in the painting's final form; the *Helen* canvas marks the first time Heemskerck used his experience with drawing Rome to create a fantasy on a monumental scale.

The *Helen* painting portrays the event that sparked the Trojan War. Paris has abducted Helen of Troy from the temple of Venus. We see him and his retinue on a knoll in the lower left foreground. They make off with Helen and a golden statue of Venus bearing an apple, an allusion to Paris's earlier judgment of Venus as the most beautiful goddess. Heemskerck's sweeping panoramic landscape occupies the remainder and majority of the monumentally sized canvas. He has invented a circular temple of Venus, which sits in the central middle ground. Before a Rome-like natural topography, we see ruined monuments alongside functioning classical buildings. In this way, the imagined city in the *Helen* canvas is not much different

²²⁷ Hülsen and Egger, I, f. 39v shows the head of Lucius Junius Brutus, which Ulisse Aldrovandi recorded in Rodolfo's collection. See Francis Haskell and Nicholas Penny, *Taste and the Antique: The Lure of Classical Sculpture 1500-1900* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981), cat. no. 14.

than the Rome Heemskerck encountered in the 1530s. The painting also shows the same archaeological searchers we saw poking around in Heemskerck's drawings, bearing torches and entering a grotto in the left middle ground, much like Heemskerck and his contemporaries, Posthumus and Sustris, entered the Domus Aurea.²²⁸ Among Heemskerck's invented monuments, we find what appear to be the ancient wonders of the world that closely resemble the ones that Heemskerck would draw almost forty years later for his *Octa Mirabili Mundi* print series (1572).²²⁹

Much of the scholarship on the painting is concerned with the relation of the *Helen's fantasia* backdrop and its narrative.²³⁰ As scholars have pointed out, aspects of Heemskerck's backdrop are not wholly unrelated to literary precedents. To be sure, a large cityscape of any sort is unusual in depictions of the myth of

²²⁸ Dacos, *Roma Quanta Fuit*, pp. 33 – 42.

²²⁹ For Heemskerck's *Octa Mirabili Mundi*, see Hollstein, nos. 513 – 520; Stritt, "Ruin Landscape," pp. 44 – 50, argues that Heemskerck intended to show the ancient wonders; Ariane Mensger, "Review of Martin Stritt: *Die Schöne Helena in den Romruin*," *Sehepunkte* (v. 5, no. 9, 2005), <http://www.sehepunkte.historicum.net/2005/09/4629.html>, accessed 8 January 2006, points out that only the Colossus of Rhodes can be positively identified.

²³⁰ Cf. E. S. King, p. 63 – 65, Grosshans, pp. 117 – 118, and Harrison, *Catalogue Raisonné*, all of which move seamlessly from one topic to the other without synthetic discussions; Ilja Veldman, in *Fiamminghi*, cat. no. 111, thinks that the ruins presage the outcome of Helen's abduction, the fall of Troy; Joneath Spicer, "Heemskerck's Rainbow: Symbol or Narrative Motif?" in: *Pictura Verba Cupit: Essays for Lubomír Konecny*, ed. Beket Bukovinská and Lubomír Slavicek (Prague: 2006), pp. 151, relates the rainbow in the backdrop to *The Cypria*, a mid seventh century B.C. telling of the story by Stasinus of Cyprus, who says that Hera "stirred up a storm" against Paris and Helen as they sail away.

Helen.²³¹ E.S. King noted that Heemskerck's depiction of the abduction from a Temple of Venus suggests that Guido delle Colonne's *Historia Destructionis Trojae* (1287), a reworked version of Benoît de Sainte-Maure's *Roman de Troie* (1160), both well known in the sixteenth century, was Heemskerck's point of reference. However, noting that Heemskerck's "remarkable metropolis" has no "Cytherean counterpart," King concluded that it "would be useless to consult the texts in order to find a name for it."²³² Expanding our scope beyond the particular incident of the abduction suggests otherwise. As Margaret Scherer has noted, a recurring theme in Benoît's history is the far-flung wonders and exoticism of the Eastern world.²³³ Given the painting's location in the loggia of Rodolfo's palace, near other paintings featuring antiquities and a "torre di Babilonia", the scenery's relation to the narrative would have thus had rich resonance, even a central role, in its original antiquarian context.²³⁴ Heemskerck's inclusion of the ancient wonders

²³¹ Cf. Zanobi Strozzi's portrayal of the same episode, ca. 1450, National Gallery, London, Inv. No. NG591, and the earthenware version by Francesco Xanto Avelli, painted in Urbino in 1534, J. Paul Getty Museum, Inv. No. 84.DE.118.

²³² E. S. King, pp. 63 – 64.

²³³ Margaret R. Scherer, "Helen of Troy," *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* (New Series, vol. 25, no. 10, 1967), p. 368.

²³⁴ Franzoni, "Inventory C," from 1564 lists the *Helen* as item number twenty-three, found in the "loggia" and described as "Un quadro di longhezza di 16 palmi et alto sei colorita in tela a olio tutto di paese dove sono dentro di molte belle et varie fantasie con un pezzo di mare con diverse navi dentro molto bello, dove è la historia in figure piccole di Paris che ha rapito Helena con molte altre fantasie di mano di m.ro Martino Fiamingho." In a nearby room, the "camera della torre" there was a painting, item number twenty-one, described as "Un altro quadro pur di paese dove è una torre di Babilonia." Also in the loggia was a painting of antiquities, item number twenty-five, described as "Un altro quadro pur della medesima grandezza et pur in tela colorito a olio di mano del detto, dove sono molte belle antichità che rappresentano il vicino et il lontano." Item number

was a natural choice; it provided him with an opportunity to display his pictorial prowess and creativity with the architecture of antiquity and portrayed a prominent theme of the literature in his patron's collection. The painting was thus a perfect backdrop for Rodolfo's antiquarian setting, with its old books, manuscripts, prints, and drawings and other cultural artifacts.

Since the episode of Helen's abduction resulted in the destruction of Troy as well as the founding of Rome, Heemskerck's use of his drawings and memory of Rome to invent a new Rome-like city is entirely appropriate, the pictorial analog to the founding of the city. The sheer size of *Landscape with the Abduction of Helen*, its compositional emphasis on its backdrop, and the sheer quantity of motifs therein, invite extended looking and thinking. Its *fantasie*, which confound conventional notions of time and place, imbue its narrative's morality theme with a timeless universality. In its display of almost every kind of pictorial knowledge that appears in Heemskerck's drawings, paintings, and prints – re-workings of the paintings of other masters from his massive pictorial vocabulary, recreations of Rome's natural topography, and architectural *fantasie* – *Landscape with the Abduction of Helen* triggers a range of mnemonic responses for its viewers. Even the compositional scheme would evoke thoughts of artistry in the minds of some: it is reminiscent of Scorel's *Entry into Jerusalem* and, ultimately, Michelangelo's Sistine Chapel *Deluge*.²³⁵ If the natural topography of *Helen* reminded Heemskerck's audience of

twenty-six: “un altro quadro della medesima grandezza pur colorito a olio in tela fatto di paese con molti fragmenti di antichità.”

²³⁵ For Scorel's use of Michelangelo's *Deluge*, see above, chapter one, section 1.3 and n. 89.

the Eternal City it is because they remember seeing Rome from its high vantage points. The natural topographical features in *Landscape with the Abduction of Helen* are an improvised recreation of the appearance of Rome from two high vantage points that Heemskerck drew: the Aventine looking north, and the Janiculum looking east (e.g., cat. nos. PA1 and 2, respectively).²³⁶ From the vantage points of both the Janiculum drawing and the *Helen* painting, water appears in the foreground and recedes to the upper right. The Janiculum drawing shows the Palatine Hill standing in the central middle ground, complimented by the Pyramid of Cestius to its right. This is echoed in the center of the *Helen* painting, where we find a hill and the spiral shaped Pharoas of Alexandria to its right. The patterns of mountains in the distant backdrops of both compositions are also similar, especially the right halves of both compositions. The distant middle ground of the *Landscape with the Abduction of Helen* features a bridge that closely resembles Heemskerck's rendering of the Ponte Fabricio in his panorama from the Aventine (cat. no. PA1), a view taken in by countless visitors to Rome. Topographical inventions out of Heemskerck's broad-view panoramas would become more frequent once he gained an audience for images with scenery *all'antica*. Heemskerck may have also consulted these panoramas for the overall topographic configuration of Rome as he re-envisioned it in *Ruth and Boaz* (fig. 3.1.1, 3) and *Balaam and the Angel* (fig. 3.1.1, 4).²³⁷ Many of Heemskerck's smaller prints also contain panoramas that appear as reconfigurations of these drawings. Heemskerck's 1566 version of

²³⁶ Harrison, *Catalogue Raisonné*, p. 303, has noted this relation.

²³⁷ Hollstein, nos. 91 and 77, respectively.

“Jonah Complaining Under the Gourd” (fig. 3.1.2c, 1) and his magnificent “Fall of Babylon” from 1569 show panoramas of imagined cities that placed the Ponte Fabricio as it appears in his panorama of Rome from the Aventine (cat. no. PA1) in new topographical contexts.²³⁸

The architectural inventions in *Landscape with the Abduction of Helen* are too numerous to recount individually. However, we can identify three general categories of *fantasie* that appear in Heemskerck’s later work: allusions to well-known Roman buildings, quotations from Heemskerck’s drawings, and pure *fantasie*. Everywhere in the *Helen* canvas, we spot buildings that remind us of what we know of Rome’s built topography, even though we know that what we see before us is not precisely like what we remember of Rome. For example, the painting’s middle ground contains a triumphal arch that resembles, but is certainly not, the Arch of Titus; its proportions are much squatter, it contains no inscriptions, and a spiral staircase attaches to its side. Assimilating the pictorial language of the cornices and columns of the Forum Romanum’s Temples of Castor and Vespasian (cf. cat. nos. AT1, FR1 – 3) served as a means for inventing the broken temple in the lower left foreground. At the same time, familiarity with Heemskerck’s drawings helps us to notice areas where they have influenced his landscape – either because he looked at them, or because the act of drawing them implanted the image in his memory. A column like the ones erected by Marcus Aurelius and Trajan appears in the distant background, looking very much as they appear in the backdrop of the right sheet his Forum Romanum drawing (cat. no. FR3). This is

²³⁸ Ibid., nos. 182 and 412, respectively.

also true of the obelisk in the painting's backdrop, like the many Heemskerck saw and drew in Rome. The Capitoline obelisk appears at a similar distance in the same drawing of the Forum Romanum. Heemskerck has also combined the Pyramid of Cestius as it appears in his Janiculum drawing (cat. no. PA2) with his drawing of the Trofei di Mario (cat. no. TM1) for an unusual monument above the painting's temple of Venus: a niche with a small pyramid before it. While these *fantasie* imbue the painting with a Roman ambience, the painting's most conspicuous feature is its pure *fantasie*, which confound our attempts to know their source in Rome's landscape, or their construction out of Heemskerck's drawings. The most obvious example is the spiral tower in the right central backdrop, the Lighthouse of Alexandria.

3.1.1: Allusions, Quotations, and Pure *Fantasia*: Types of Topography *all'antica* in Maerten van Heemskerck's Paintings and Prints

As *Landscape with the Abduction of Helen* clearly demonstrates, the direct impact of drawing Rome on the machinations of Heemskerck's artistry was twofold. On one hand, in a practical sense, he provided himself with a quantity of original motifs for later reference. As the products of his compositional and manual deliberations, Heemskerck's drawings were already at one remove from their built Roman sources. Thus, their potential use for topographical inventions *all'antica* was inherent, even if he chose to quote parts of them. On the other hand, in a much more abstract sense, Heemskerck's cultivation of an eye and hand that were practiced in the art of drawing Rome, an ocular and manual memory of the Eternal

City, was tantamount to becoming fluent in the pictorial language of the Eternal City's buildings and vistas, or, in Gombrich's words, taking "that decisive step from the pastiche to...free mastery."²³⁹ Both of these results ensured that many of Heemskerck's designs for paintings and prints contained an extraordinary variety of buildings and vistas *all'antica*. In hundreds of designs, few topographical motifs repeat.

Heemskerck's work from the late 1540s to the end of his career continues to contain degrees of departure from his built Roman sources and his corpus of drawings. Surprisingly few of his paintings and prints are set in Rome, even as they broadcast his vast archaeological knowledge of the Eternal City.²⁴⁰ Most are set in a fictive classical realm that Richard Krautheimer would describe as a "never and nowhere land evolved from a free interpretation of antiquity."²⁴¹ We often find direct allusions to particular Roman buildings, such as the Colosseum-like amphitheater appearing in *Landscape with Classical Ruins and St. Jerome*

²³⁹ E. H. Gombrich, p. 127.

²⁴⁰ Aside from *Self-Portrait Before the Colosseum* only two of Heemskerck's paintings and a handful of prints explicitly portray places in the Eternal City. They are *Landscape with the Good Samaritan* and the now lost *Landscape with Dioscorii* and *Landscape with the View of Rome* (see above, n. 182). The latter is a marvelous reconstruction of ancient Rome rivaling Ligorio's or Piranesi's and suggests that Heemskerck possessed a sophisticated archaeologically informed vision of antiquity that extends far beyond what we find in his considerable corpus of drawings. As such it raises questions that, while tantalizing, are beyond the scope of this project; two prints in Heemskerck's *Victories of Emperor Charles V* (1555) show the events of the Sack of Rome and feature the Castel Sant'Angelo, the Tiber, and St. Peter's in the distant backdrop. Hollstein, nos. 526 and 527.

²⁴¹ Krautheimer, p. 332.

mentioned above.²⁴² Other topographical motifs in Heemskerck's paintings and prints are nearly *verbatim* quotations of particular motifs in his drawings. But where we find these echoes and correspondences with Rome, we must also account for variations. Even though both types of *fantasie* remind us of Rome, they never share a one-to-one correspondence with their built Roman sources or Heemskerck's drawn records of the Roman buildings they mimic. Many more designs contain scenery that evokes Rome with a much less obvious relation to specific places there. It is only with great difficulty that one can discover any relation between these motifs of pure *fantasie* and Heemskerck's drawings. In this latter group, Heemskerck's capacity for invention, his art, is most apparent. As such, his topographical inventions invite an audience familiar with the Roman landscape to play a sort of mnemonic game; to view them is to engage his considerable powers of invention *all'antica*, his mastery of antiquity, in order to recollect Rome's famous ancient ruins.

3.1.1a: Echoes of Roman Buildings

We can safely associate only a handful of the buildings we see in Heemskerck's hundreds of designs with famous Roman monuments. These

²⁴² Some of Heemskerck's paintings and prints indicate places in Rome that he may have drawn, but the drawings do not survive. Examples include the building in the backdrop of *Momus Criticizing the Gods*, which resembles the Villa Farnesina; the spiral staircase in "The Adoration of the Magi" from the *Clades Judaeae Gentis* series, Hollstein, no. 257, resembles Bramante's spiral staircase in the Vatican palace complex; from the same series, "The Chaldeans Carrying Away the Temple Treasures," Hollstein no. 255, contains a variation on Santa Costanza's interior.

examples are not exact matches for their specific Roman sources, but echo their forms instead. Amphitheaters bearing an unmistakable resemblance to the Colosseum appear in the greatest numbers.²⁴³ For example, the centerpiece of Heemskerck's *Bullfight in an Ancient Arena* (1552, fig. 3.2.3, 1) is a ruined amphitheater with a multi-tiered vaulting system that clearly reminds us of the Colosseum.²⁴⁴ Its broken ends derive from the northwestern break in the Colosseum's vaults, which Heemskerck drew several times (cat. nos. CS1 – 3, CS5). At the same time, close examination is not required to determine that the amphitheater on display in the painting is not the Colosseum in Rome. The building contains extra vaulting that does not exist in its ancient Roman model. It is completely open on one side, which has never been the case with the actual amphitheater in Rome, despite the loss of part of its exterior (cf. cat. no. CS5). The surrounding topography that Heemskerck has painted also differs from Rome's. Moreover, a colossal statue on a circular pedestal appears at the center of the print's amphitheater.²⁴⁵ Even the design of Heemskerck's "Amphitheatrum" print from the *Octa Mirabili Mundi* series, illustrating the inclusion of Rome's Colosseum among

²⁴³ Hollstein, nos. 138, 455, 520, 588, and 590. These last two are prints after paintings, *Landscape with Classical Ruins and St. Jerome* (see above, n. 219) and *Bullfight in an Ancient Arena*, ca. 1552, oil on Wood, 75 x 121 cm., Musée de Beaux Arts, Lille, Inv. No. P819, Grosshans, cat. no. 78.

²⁴⁴ Maerten van Heemskerck, *Bullfight in an Ancient Arena*, oil on Wood, 75 x 121 cm., Musée de Beaux Arts, Lille, Inv. No. P819, Grosshans, *op. cit.* (note 20), cat. no. 78.

²⁴⁵ For the possible significance of the sculpture see C. Malcom Brown, "Martin van Heemskerck, The Villa Madama Jupiter, and the Gonzaga Correspondence Files," *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* (no. 121, July 1979), pp. 49 – 60.

the Wonders of the World, contains similar artful alterations on the amphitheater.²⁴⁶ Heemskerck furthered this variation on the Colosseum in a print of *Elisha Receiving Elijah's Mantle* (1571, fig. 3.1.2a, 1).²⁴⁷ Elisha inherits Elijah's authority before a flooded amphitheater like the one that appeared *Bullfight in an Ancient Arena*, right down to the statue in the center.

Other examples of such unquestionable allusions to specific Roman buildings are more difficult to find. Buildings that obviously derive from the Septizonium appear among the ruin landscapes of Heemskerck's prints of *Ruth and Boaz* (fig. 3.1.1, 3) and *Balaam and the Angel* (fig. 3.1.1, 4) and in the distant background of the print after *Bullfight in an Ancient Amphitheater* (fig. 3.2.3, 1).²⁴⁸ The Septizonium-like building in *Ruth and Boaz* faces the picture plane at the same angle as the Septizonium in Heemskerck's drawing of the Palatine from the south (cat. no. PT3). But Heemskerck has added an extra story to the ruin and arches in the back. Heemskerck's "Triumph of Pride," a generic triumphal arch that looks like either the Arch of Septimius Severus or the Arch of Constantine awaits the allegorical procession's passage. Thus, even with these allusions to specific famous Roman monuments, we begin to approach the purer forms of invention where Heemskerck has quoted parts of his drawings, or consulted them in order to create entirely new structures.

²⁴⁶ Hollstein, no. 520.

²⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, no. 138.

²⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, nos. 77, 91, and 590. In the painting of *Bullfight in an Ancient Arena* the same place in the composition contains a single story edifice that does not resemble the Septizonium.

3.1.1b: Quotations from Drawings

Combined with his tendency to alter the buildings in his designs that resemble famous Roman monuments, Heemskerck's reuse of anonymous portions of his drawings accounts for much of the authentically Roman yet wholly original quality of his scenery *all'antica*. Heemskerck tended to quote parts of his drawings. But he did not do so in a slavish, verbatim fashion. Rather, he explored them for topographical motifs that could serve as points of departure for the topographical motifs in his finished designs. Where we are sure we see a motif from a drawing, it is because enough of it has survived for us to notice the similarity, despite Heemskerck's revisions. For example, his print of "Lot and his Family Leaving Sodom" (fig. 3.1.2b, 1), clearly takes its triumphal arch motif from Heemskerck's drawing of the Arch of Titus (cat. no. AT1). By eliminating the arch's inscription and its encasement, Heemskerck has derived a generic arch from his drawn source.²⁴⁹

Heemskerck's technical means for reusing his drawings of Rome is not entirely clear. In no examples of reuse are the motifs the same size in both drawing and print. Nor do the drawings show any impressions for transfer. In some examples, Heemskerck must have simply redrawn parts of drawings when executing preparatory drawings for prints. Their motifs thus appear in reverse when printed, as in our example of his use of catalog number AT1 for "Lot and His Family Leaving Sodom." Likewise, Heemskerck's consultation with his drawing of

²⁴⁹ Ibid., no. 242.

the Villa Madama's garden terrace (cat. no. SC3) appears in reverse in "The Elders Trying to Seduce Susannah" and "The Three Holy Women at the Sepulchre" (fig. 3.1.2b, 2).²⁵⁰ Variations on the foreshortened exedra from the Palace of Septimius Severus (cat. no. PT2) in a print of "Lot Making Love to His Daughters" (fig. 3.1.2b, 3) and "Tempus" from the *Triumphs of Petrarch* series are also reversed from their source drawing.²⁵¹ However, Heemskerck's print oeuvre also contains motifs in the same direction as their source drawings, which means he drew them in reverse in his preparatory drawings. The Templum Serapidis also appears the same way in Heemskerck's drawing (cat. no. TS1) and the print of "Job on the Dunghill with his Wife and Three Friends."²⁵² (fig. 3.1.2b, 4) The Septizonium-inspired building in *Ruth and Boaz* also appears the same way in both drawing (cat. no. PT4) and print.²⁵³

Heemskerck quoted most frequently from his large drawing of the Forum Nervae in Berlin's Album II (cat. no. FN1). Major elements appear in reconfigured, but recognizable forms in several prints. His *Flight Into Egypt* (1549, fig. 3.1.2b, 5) contains a large bridge with massive, rusticated *voussoirs*, beneath which we see piers and figures.²⁵⁴ This is only a slight alteration from the drawing's more ruined

²⁵⁰ Ibid., no. 219, 301, respectively.

²⁵¹ Ibid., nos. 243 and 495.

²⁵² Ibid., no. 160.

²⁵³ Ibid., no. 91.

²⁵⁴ Ibid., no. 304.

stone bridge, through which we see figures and a columned portico.²⁵⁵ For his print of *Satan Smiting Job with Boils* (1548, fig. 3.1.2b, 6), Heemskerck has also used the *colonnacce* motif that appears in the middle ground and to the right of the stone bridge in the same drawing of the Forum Nervae.²⁵⁶ In both the drawing and the print, the *colonnacce*'s protruding entablatures recede from the picture plane from right to left. But in the print, we see the entablatures from a lower vantage point than in the drawing.²⁵⁷ Heemskerck has also transported the vaulting of the drawing's Temple of Minerva to the print's variation on the *colonnacce*, where it appears above the entablatures, as if springing from them. Moreover, the print shows a freestanding column to the left of the reinvented *colonnacce*, in the same place as a freestanding column from the Temple of Minerva in the Forum of Nervae drawing. Heemskerck also worked a variation on the ruins of the Temple of Minerva into his print of *Samuel Anointing Saul* (1549) with a subtlety that makes it difficult, but not impossible, to detect.²⁵⁸

²⁵⁵ Ibid., no. 304.

²⁵⁶ Ibid., no. 159.

²⁵⁷ Similar alterations of the drawn *colonnacce* appear in the ruinous *Balaam and the Angel* from the following year. See Ibid., no. 77. For other prints containing variations on cat. no. FN1, see Ibid., nos. 239 and 253.

²⁵⁸ Ibid., no. 92.

3.1.1c: Pure *Fantasia*: Heemskerck's Vocabulary of Ruins and New Ancient Cities

Searching Heemskerck's paintings and prints for the motifs that remind us of Roman monuments or mimic parts of his drawings only leads us to a fraction of the topography *all'antica* in his oeuvre. In the remainder, he has designed entirely fictive natural topography, buildings, ruins, and even new cities, which find no precise match in Rome or his drawings. Yet, everywhere in these paintings and prints, the specter of the Eternal City is strongly felt. Heemskerck's inventions of pure *fantasia* most vividly reveal that by looking, drawing, and thinking in Rome, he absorbed the essence of the Rome's ruin landscapes and developed a pictorial vocabulary of the Eternal City. He thus provided himself with innumerable opportunities to set his paintings and prints in environs that are uncannily un-Roman at the same time that they appear to be authentically Roman. The more apparent is Heemskerck's inventiveness with antiquity, the more aroused – and in the same moment confounded – is the viewer's memory of antiquity. Thus, Heemskerck's pictorial knowledge of antiquity and the very authority of antiquity are equally present in his *fantasia*.

Heemskerck's purest examples of *fantasia all'antica* push fidelity to antiquity to its limits. In extreme examples, he breaks those limits; he even based some of his *fantasia* on architectural forms that are entirely foreign to Roman antiquity. For example, in his print from 1566 of "Jonah Complaining Under the Gourd," (fig. 3.1.2c, 1) Jonah gazes at an onion-domed circular church.²⁵⁹ But in

²⁵⁹ Ibid., no. 182.

most examples, his inventions are rooted in ancient Roman precedent, which still leaves immeasurable space for caprice; functional plausibility is not a concern in *Habakkuk Bringing Food to Daniel in the Lion's Den* (fig. 3.1.2c, 2) or the print of *Landscape with the Parable of the good Samaritan* (fig. 3.1.2c, 3).²⁶⁰ Both designs contain ruins that are familiar enough to us because we do find their forms in Rome. Heemskerck used a basic “vocabulary of ruins” that he developed out of his drawings: cracked coffering in broken vaults and arches, freestanding piers, abandoned columns, and fallen cornices in fragments strewn about the ground. But neither design gives us any idea of what kind of buildings these ruins might have been. Not only are we unable to associate them with built entities, or even particular parts of Heemskerck's drawings, their configurations in relation to one another do not conclusively suggest a building type or even a workable reconstruction.

Heemskerck's method for arriving at such *fantasie all'antica* was to expand on his variations of Roman buildings and artful quotations of his drawings. In those examples, he maintained the basic configurations of his sources but departed from them in the details. In his purer examples of *fantasie* Heemskerck executes seemingly endless recontextualizations and new syntactical reconfigurations of smaller and smaller parts of Rome's buildings and his drawings. Observing and absorbing a variety of circular buildings (cf. cat. nos. CS3, CS5, SP1, SP3, TV1) contributed to Heemskerck's formulation of circular temple *fantasie* in many

²⁶⁰ Ibid., nos. 225 and 354, respectively. The print of *Landscape with the Parable of the Good Samaritan*, Ibid., 354 is an entirely different composition than the painting (for the painting, see above, n. 171).

paintings and prints.²⁶¹ For example, his print of “The Removal and Destruction of the chariot and the Horses of the Sun” from the *King Josiah Restores the Law of the Lord* print series features a temple that combines the buttressed exterior of Santa Maria delle Febbre, with the multi-tiered design of the Colosseum and the portico of the Pantheon.²⁶² Likewise, Heemskerck has taken the receding arched substructures from his drawing of the Palatine (cat. no. PT5) and has made them a part of the Temple of Jerusalem in the *Clades Judaeae Gentis* series. He has turned the same motif into a ruin in-the-making in the backdrop of “The Triumph of Fame” from the *Triumphs of Petrarch* series.²⁶³ In the same way, the foreshortened piers and arches of the Colosseum’s exterior (as seen in cat. no. CS3) reappear as the interior of a vaulted structure in the print “Feeding the Hungry” (fig. 3.1.2c, 4) and again as the supports of a bridge in the 1562 print of “Jonah Complaining Under the Gourd.”²⁶⁴ (fig. 3.1.2c, 1)

Heemskerck committed more frequent recontextualizations of this nature – too many ruin motifs to itemize here – with the more generic, anonymous, or smaller forms that he absorbed into his “ruin vocabulary.” His absorption of the affect of a common Roman motif such as heavy rusticated piers (cf. cat. no. CS4), aided in the formulation of generic rusticated exteriors of buildings in several prints,

²⁶¹ Ibid., nos. 181, 220, 224, 250, 254, 400.

²⁶² Ibid., no. 146.

²⁶³ Ibid., nos. 255 and 493.

²⁶⁴ Ibid., nos. 331 and 178, respectively. See also Ibid., no. 303, “The Adoration of the Magi” for another variation on the motif from cat. no. CS3.

for example, “Giving the Thirsty to Drink” (fig. 3.1.2c, 5) and the “Parable of the Wise and Foolish Virgins.”²⁶⁵ In “The Servant Forcing a Fellow Servant to Pay his Debt” (fig. 3.1.2c, 6) and “The Adoration of an Idol of Isis,” Heemskerck’s caprice has allowed him to form “new ruins” by commingling such cornices and columns with ruins like the substructures on the Palatine (cat. nos. PT2 – 4).²⁶⁶ Learning the visual language of rows of columns in loggias and porticoes such as those found in *cortili*, the Pantheon, and even the painted loggia in Peruzzi’s *Sala Delle Prospettive* (cf. cat. nos. SC2a, 2b, SC5, and PN1) helped Heemskerck configure the similarly foreshortened loggia settings of his prints illustrating the proverb “Blessed are they who do Hunger and Thirst After Righteousness,” “St. Peter Healing the Lame at the Beautiful Gate,” and “The Burial of St. Stephen.”²⁶⁷ (fig. 3.1.2.c, 7) The loggias in each of these prints find themselves in a new syntactical configuration, leading onto a vaulted interior or a fictive city rather than the Pantheon or a sculpture collection.

In his most ostentatiously inventive mode, Heemskerck designs *fantasie* that draw attention to their status as inventions. Many designs, including, for example, the print of *Landscape with the Parable of the Good Samaritan*, the painting and print of *Landscape with Classical Ruins and St. Jerome*, and *Balaam and the Angel*, include functionally implausible *fantasie*. However, with their cacophonous mixes

²⁶⁵ Ibid., nos. 332 and 349, respectively.

²⁶⁶ Ibid., nos. 340 and 454, respectively.

²⁶⁷ Ibid., nos. 316, 399, and 411, respectively. See also Ibid, no. 403 for a reversal and recontextualization of the loggia as it appears in cat. no. PN1.

of authentically Roman looking piers, columns, and other assorted motifs *all'antica*, their status as inventions by an artist who had spent long hours drawing intently at the feet of Rome's ruins is hard to miss.²⁶⁸ Thus, it is simplistic to view the structural implausibility of these examples as a lack of architectural knowledge. It is more fruitful to interpret Heemskerck's deliberate, conspicuous display of invention his bid to remind viewers of his *ingegno*.

3.1.2: Towards Self-Fashioning: Heemskerck's Cultivation of an Audience for his *Fantasia*

The dizzying quantity in the examples above highlights how Heemskerck's variety of *fantasia* gradually became more and more common in his paintings and prints, to the point where it became a specialty of sorts. By the 1550s, when Heemskerck painted his *Self-Portrait Before the Colosseum* (1553, fig. 3.2, 1), it must have seemed to antiquarians and artists in the north as if he did indeed "fill the world" with this type of pictorial invention. Perhaps they would even associate such *fantasia* and ruin landscapes with Heemskerck. The mid-1540s witness the beginning of a substantial increase in his cultivation of a *fantasia* vocabulary in his paintings and prints. In 1545, Heemskerck certainly consulted his drawings for the

²⁶⁸ Again, Heemskerck may have used his Forum Nervae drawing, cat. no. FN1, for *Landscape with the Parable of the Good Samaritan*. In this print design, it may be the source for the footbridge in the middle ground. Although the structure above the footbridge is convex, its three tiered construction leading to curved walls strikes one as Heemskerck's invention from the Colosseum as it appears in the backdrop of his exquisite drawing of the Arch of Constantine in cat. no. AC1 below. An equally plausible source, however, is Heemskerck's sheet of the Palace of Septimius Severus, cat. no. PT4.

backdrop of *Venus and Cupid*.²⁶⁹ The figures stand before a splendid ruin *fantasia* that combines the circularity of the so-called Temple of Minerva Medica (cat. no. MM1) with the ruined vaults in the middle ground of his drawing of the Porta Maggiore (cat. no. PM1) and the grotto appearing beneath the Templum Serapidis (cat. no. TS1). The following year finds Heemskerck consulting his drawings of Rome again, for the famed “Draper’s Altarpiece,” which figures prominently in van Mander’s biography.²⁷⁰ While the altarpiece’s topography *all’antica* is secondary to its figuration, it nonetheless contains a remarkable morass of ruined vaults and piers. The *Landscape with Dioscorii*, also from 1546, combines Heemskerck’s knowledge of panoramic views of Rome with his knowledge of the famous sculpture group on the Quirinale.²⁷¹

As he did with the *Helen* canvas, Heemskerck composed the horizontally oriented *Landscape with Classical Ruins and St. Jerome* to emphasize a conspicuous ruin landscape filled with topographical inventions *all’antica* that either remind us of specific Roman buildings or prompt us to marvel at his inventive prowess.²⁷² Jerome toils in the lower left foreground, small in

²⁶⁹ Maerten van Heemskerck, *Venus and Cupid*, 1545, oil on wood, 108 x 157 cm, 1545, Wallraf-Richartz Museum, Inv. No. 875, Grosshans, cat. no. 48.

²⁷⁰ For the so-called “Draper’s Altarpiece,” see above, chapter 1, section 1.1 and n. 31.

²⁷¹ For *Landscape with Dioscorii*, see above, n. 182. We only have drawings by Heemskerck of details of the Dioscorii, in Hülsen and Egger, I, 16v, 35v, 38v, 64r, 64v.

²⁷² Eleanor Saunders, p. 95, suggests Heemskerck’s choice to compose horizontally and with figures in smaller scale for more “expressive” backdrops emerges in the

comparison to the scene behind him, where a valley contains a veritable overgrowth of imagined temples, orphaned columns, piers, and arches. A colossal Flavian amphitheater in the distance at right commands our attention. Seen from its ruined side, Heemskerck surely devised the broken circular building while looking at his 1530s drawings of the Colosseum (e.g. cat. nos. CS2 and PT1).

By the late 1540s, and throughout the 1550s and 60s, Heemskerck devised a steady quantity of topographically emphatic designs containing buildings and vistas motifs invented out of his memory of Rome and his drawings.²⁷³ The most notable examples of prints include his large, double sheet compositions of *Ruth and Boaz* (1551, fig. 3.1.1, 3) and *Balaam and the Angel* (1554, fig. 3.1.1, 4), the *Story of Samson* print series (1560), and the series' known as *King Josiah Restoring the Law of the Lord* (1569) and *Clades Judaeae Gentis* (1569).²⁷⁴ Paintings from this period with topography *all'antica* include the so-called *Meeting of the Gods* (1556) and *Momus Criticizing the Gods* (1561).²⁷⁵

1550s by comparing two series of prints of the *History of Tobias* from 1548 (Hollstein, nos. 183 – 188) and 1556 (Ibid., nos. 189 – 198).

²⁷³ From 1548 to the end of his career, Heemskerck composed sixteen single prints to emphasize *all'antica* topography. All are dependent on his drawings. See Ibid., nos. 77, 84, 91, 92, 127, 138, 159, 160, 225, 304, 354, 455, 510 – 512, and 588. Posthumous and undated prints are Ibid., nos. 411, 590, and 591. Twelve series contain multiple designs emphasizing *all'antica* scenery. See Ibid., nos. 85 – 90, 117 – 122, 139 – 142, 143 – 150, 179 – 182, 237 – 258, 265 – 272, 339 – 342, 482 – 490, 491 – 496, 513 – 520, and 524 – 535.

²⁷⁴ Hollstein, Ibid., nos. 91, 77, 143 – 150, and 237 – 258.

²⁷⁵ Maerten van Heemskerck, *Meeting of the Gods*, 1556, oil on wood, 55.7 x 98 cm., Rotterdam, Museum Boymans-van Beuningen, inv. no. 2964, Grosshans, cat. no. 83. *Momus Criticizing the Gods* (see n. 222).

3.2: Heemskerck's Self-Fashioning as the Netherlandish Master of the Landscape *all'antica*

It is against the backdrop of Heemskerck's overflow of *fantasie* – mnemonic images demonstrating his inventive capacity with Rome's ruins while evoking timelessness – that we must read his *Self Portrait Before the Colosseum* (1553, fig. 3.2, 1). The self-portrait shows Heemskerck standing before a fictive painting of his younger self, drawing the Colosseum during his Roman sojourn.²⁷⁶ Within this *conchetto*, drawing the Eternal City is the key to Heemskerck's artistic knowledge and prowess. But to date, we have no study of the self-portrait's relation to Heemskerck's drawings of Rome or the profusion of antiquities in his paintings and prints. Studies have focused on Heemskerck's expression of his artistic genius, his immortality, or conversely, his representation of a *vanitas* theme, all the while forgetting to ask why he chose to aggrandize his Roman drawing exploration of twenty years before.²⁷⁷

²⁷⁶ Heemskerck reprised the so-called “double-portrait device” in his frontispiece to the *Clades Judaeae Gentis* series of prints (1569), Hollstein, no. 237, in which he shows himself drawing Roman architectural ruins. Almost every print in the series is composed to feature *all'antica* landscapes, scenery, and *fantasia*. We cannot see the fictive painting's edges. Our only clue that the larger figure of Heemskerck stands before a painting is where his torso overlaps an illusionistic *cartellino* at bottom center. It says “Marten van Heemskerck / Ao Ætatis Sua LV / 1553.”

²⁷⁷ Grosshans, cat. no. 79, p. 203; J. Bruyn, “Old and New Elements in 16th-Century Imagery,” *Oud Holland* 2 (1988) pp. 90-112; *Fiamminghi*, cat. no. 113, p. 220; Robert F. Chirico “Maerten van Heemskerck and Creative Genius,” *Marsyas*, XXI (1981-1982), pp. 7-11, argues for the painting's embodiment of a contrast between the *vita contemplativa* and the *vita activa*; Gabriella Szallay, *Contesting the Colossal: Maerten van Heemskerck's Eristic Self-Portrait* (Master's Thesis, Penn State University, 2003), argues that Heemskerck fashions himself in an analogic relation to the Colosseum and to his “rival” Michelangelo.

Heemskerck's self-fashioning around his Roman drawing experience was a particularly appropriate gesture in 1553. By then, interest in Roman antiquity was peaking among his northern European colleagues and Heemskerck's accelerated use of imaginative inventions *all'antica* in his paintings and prints was in full bloom. His drawings had thus gained a newfound importance in Netherlandish visual culture. The most important members of Heemskerck's immediate audience were humanist / engraver Dirck Volkertszoon Coornhert (1522 – 1590), Hieronymous Cock (1510 – 1570), artist, art dealer, and founder of Antwerp's publishing house *Aux Quatre Vents* (At the Sign of the Four Winds), and Antoine Perrenot (1517 – 1586), Bishop of Arras and First Minister to Charles V and Philip II. Coornhert was Heemskerck's first major print collaborator. Cock published Italianate prints, including designs by Heemskerck, engraved by Coornhert, which showcased Heemskerck's vast knowledge of antiquity.²⁷⁸ Perrenot, foremost among northern collectors of antiquities, was a major patron of the *Quatre Vents* from its inception.²⁷⁹ He is also the earliest owner of *Self-Portrait Before the Colosseum*, perhaps its patron. It was for this esteemed audience and their retinue that Heemskerck memorialized drawing as his means for mastering Rome in *Self-*

²⁷⁸ Timothy Riggs, *Hieronymous Cock: Printmaker and Publisher* (New York: 1977), is the definitive study on Hieronymous Cock's *Aux Quatre Vents*.

²⁷⁹ The most extensive publications to date on Perrenot's interest in art are *Les Granvelle et l'Italie au XVIe Siècle*, ed. Jacqueline Brunet (Besançon: 1996), and *Les Granvelle et les Anciens Pays-Bas: liber doctori Mauricio van Durme dedicatus*, ed. Krista de Jonge (Leuven: 2000); for Perrenot's correspondences with artists see Luigi Ferrarino, *Lettere di Artisti Italiani ad Antonio Perrenot di Granvelle* (Madrid: 1977).

Portrait Before the Colosseum. He did so at the very moment when the ancient Roman past had become an essential part of their professional and intellectual lives.

3.2.1: Coming of Age: Heemskerck's Rise and mid-Sixteenth Century Netherlandish Romanism

Heemskerck painted his self-portrait during the years when he and his Netherlandish Romanist contemporaries were coming of age and their careers were flourishing.²⁸⁰ His companions in Scorel's workshop and in Rome, Hermannus Posthumus and Lambert Sustris, served prestigious patrons. Posthumus had been court painter to Louis X, Duke of Bavaria.²⁸¹ Sustris had collaborated with Titian and received portrait commissions from Bavaria's Wilhelm IV, the powerful Vohlin family, and perhaps Antoine Perrenot.²⁸² Anthonis Mor, also a pupil of Scorel's,

²⁸⁰ With few exceptions, studies on the phenomenon of so-called Netherlandish Romanism have focused on Netherlandish artists in Rome instead of their transmissions of the Italianate manner north. The definitive early study is G. J. Hoogewerff, *Nederlandsche schilders in Italie in de 16de eeuw; De geschiedenis van het Romanism* (Utrecht: 1912); major recent studies are Dacos, *Les Peintres Belge à Rom au XVI Siècle* (Brussels / Rome: 1964), *Roma Quanta Fuit*, and *Fiamminghi*.

²⁸¹ For Posthumus called from Mantua to Landshut, Bavaria, see Nicole Dacos, "Hermannus Posthumus: Rome, Mantua, Landshut." *Burlington Magazine* (CXXVII / 988, July 1985), pp. 433 – 438.

²⁸² Sustris has not yet been the subject of a major monographic study. For a survey of Sustris' career, see Vincenzo Mancini, "Aggiornamento su Lambert Sustris," *Saggi e memorie di storia dell'arte* (vol. 24, 2000), pp. 11 – 29; for Sustris in Italy, see Dacos, *Peintres Belges*, pp. 15 – 20; Bert Meijer, "Lambert Sustris in Padua: frescos en tekeningen," *Oud-Holland* (vol. 107, no. 1, 1993), pp. 3 – 16; *Idem.*, "Fiamminghi e Olandesi nella bottega veneziana: il caso di Jacopo Tintoretto," in: *Il Rinascimento a Venezia e la pittura del nord ai tempi di Bellini, Dürer, Tiziano* (Milan: 1999), pp. 499 – 557; For Perrenot's portraits see Pierre Curie, "Quelques portraits du cardinal Granvelle," in: *Les Granvelle et l'Italie au XVIe Siècle*, pp. 159 – 174.

had obtained the patronage of Philip II, Margaret of Parma, and Perrenot among others.²⁸³ Lambert Lombard, in Rome immediately after Heemskerck, founded a school of art in Liège upon his return north.²⁸⁴ Lombard also painted Perrenot's portrait.²⁸⁵ Among Lombard's pupils, was Antwerp's Frans Floris. From his workshop on the Meir, Floris competed with Heemskerck for important altarpiece commissions in Antwerp, Rotterdam, Amsterdam, and Leiden.²⁸⁶ Floris was also instrumental in executing the ephemeral decorations *all'antica* for Philip II's 1549 Antwerp *Blidje Incompst*.²⁸⁷ And like Heemskerck, Floris was a prolific designer of prints in the Italianate manner.²⁸⁸ Given this demand for classical artistic expertise, this competition for commissions among these Netherlandish artists who went to Rome, it should not surprise us that Heemskerck would want to devise a self-portrait that could, through its powerful imagery, instantly and unequivocally align him more closely with Rome than his contemporaries.

The years leading up to and following Heemskerck's 1553 self-fashioning around drawing Rome mark his rise to a new level of prominence among his fellow

²⁸³ Lionel Cust, "Notes on Pictures in the Royal collections – XVIII. On Some Portraits Attributed to Antonio Moro and on a Life of the Painter by Henri Hymans," *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs*, v. 18, no. 91 (Oct., 1910), pp. 2, 5 – 7, 10 – 12; Joanna Woodall, "Patronage and Portrayal: Antoine Perrenot de Granvelle's Relationship with Anthonis Mor," in *Les Granvelle et les Anciens Pays-Bas*, pp. 245 – 277.

²⁸⁴ Dacos, *Peintres Belges*, pp. 31 – 39.

²⁸⁵ Curie, pp. 168 – 170.

²⁸⁶ Carl van de Velde, *Frans Floris (1519/20 – 1570) Leven en werken* (Brussels, 1975).

²⁸⁷ Mark Meadow, "Ritual and civic identity in Philip II's 1549 Antwerp *Blidje incompst*," *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* (no. 49, 1998), pp. 36 – 67.

²⁸⁸ Riggs, cat. nos. 67 – 100.

Netherlandish Romanists.²⁸⁹ From 1548 to 1550, Heemskerck and engraver Dirck Volkertszoon Coornhert produced a staggering 118 prints, if not more.²⁹⁰ Ilja Veldman's supposition that the Haarlemers were also the publishers of these prints seems correct.²⁹¹ Their output includes many of the designs discussed above, which Heemskerck composed in such a way as to showcase his *fantasie* based on his unique Roman pictorial expertise (e.g., figs. 3.1.1, 3, 3.1.2b, 5 and 6).²⁹² Thus, the topographical motifs he had collected by drawing so extensively in Rome had begun to circulate throughout the Netherlands as he integrated them into his print designs.

²⁸⁹ Veldman, *Dutch Humanism* p. 14, n. 35, Heemskerck was a *vinder* ("head man") of Haarlem's Guild of St. Luke from 1551 to 1553 and moved up to *deken* ("deacon") in 1554; *Ibid.*, p. 13, n. 26, that Heemskerck had begun to achieve success in the late 1540s is also indicated in Haarlem Conveyance Register 76/21, fol. 68, March 1549, which records his purchase of a house on Lange Begijnen Straat.

²⁹⁰ We have only six prints from Heemskerck from 1537 – 47, all engraved by Cornelis Bos. See Hollstein, nos. 76, 355, 367, 453, 507, 587. Prints by Heemskerck and Coornhert begin in 1548. See *Ibid.*, nos. 159, 183 – 188, 273 – 302, 356 – 359, 372, 329; prints from 1549 are nos. 8 – 13, 17 – 22, 23 – 30, 35 – 38, 51, 92, 93, 116, 127, 236, 304, 306, 338, 350 – 353, 392, 393, 417, 454, 455, 508, 509, 43 – 50; prints from 1550 are nos. 1, 52 – 63, 91, 174 – 177, 418 – 431, 456 – 459, 460 – 463, 585, 123 – 126. Of these, Coornhert did not engrave no. 329, executed by Cornelis Bos. Compiler Ilja Veldman suggests that either Coornhert or Heemskerck himself engraved nos. 35 – 38.

²⁹¹ Veldman, *Dutch Humanism*, p. 106, bases this supposition on Heemskerck's and Coornhert's 1547 purchase of forty-two reams of paper from Symon Claesz. Bybel, an alleged publisher who was working without a permit in the 1540s. 1547 is the year that marks the beginning of Heemskerck's prolific partnership with Coornhert. In the foreword to Hollstein, she again suggests that Heemskerck's pre *Quatre Vents* print designs "were very probably published by Coornhert, Heemskerck, or both."

²⁹² Cf. Sections 3.1.2a – c. Heemskerck and Coornhert were responsible for Hollstein, nos. 91, 92, 127, 159, 304, and 455, all of which contain ruin landscapes.

Beginning in the early 1550s, Heemskerck's inventive landscapes *all'antica* began to enjoy even wider circulation due to his new association with Antwerp's Hieronymous Cock. A fledgling, ambitious publisher twelve years Heemskerck's junior, Cock founded the *Aux Quatre Vents* publishing house in 1550. Significantly, the earliest known print that Cock published after a Heemskerck design reproduces Heemskerck's first design with a ruin landscape since his return to Rome, the *Landscape with Classical Ruins and St. Jerome* (fig. 3.2.1, 1), after the 1547 painting.²⁹³ The amphitheater in the print resembles Heemskerck's Colosseum drawings more closely than the amphitheater in the painting, suggesting that the drawings themselves were consulted, were integral to the process of making the preparatory drawing to the print, were therefore still vital material in the 1550s.²⁹⁴ Another product of Heemskerck's new association with Cock is the *Landscape with the Parable of the Good Samaritan* (1552, fig. 3.1.2c, 3), with its functionally implausible mishmash of piers, vaults and columns.²⁹⁵ In 1553, Cock published Heemskerck's *Samson and Delilah*, also composed to feature a uniquely

²⁹³ Ibid., no. 588. The print is in the same direction as the painting. For the painting, see above, chapter three, n. 219.

²⁹⁴ The amphitheater in the print's closer kinship with cat. no. CS2 and PT1, suggests that whoever made the transfer sketch had Heemskerck's drawings of the Colosseum nearby. The whereabouts and authorship of the preparatory drawing for transfer are unknown. Cock's signature on the first state of the print, "Cock Fecit 1552," suggests that he executed the preparatory sketch himself. The added second state signature at lower right, of Cock engraver Henrik Hondius, "Hh. ex," suggests the publisher's attempt to squeeze as many prints as possible out of a popular design.

²⁹⁵ Hollstein, no. 354.

Heemskerck-ian tumble of ruins and elements of Roman topography.²⁹⁶

Heemskerck's *Balaam and the Angel* (1554, fig. 3.1.1, 4), engraved by Coornhert, and which Cock published the year after *Self-Portrait Before the Colosseum*, also emphasizes Heemskerck's *fantasie*.²⁹⁷ With its double-plated format and panoramic ruin landscape, *Balaam and the Angel* appears to be a sequel of sorts to the Heemskerck and Coornhert collaboration of *Ruth and Boaz* (1551, fig. 3.1.1, 3), perhaps an attempt by Heemskerck and Cock to duplicate or capitalize on the earlier print's success.

This continuance by Cock of Heemskerck's prints with inventive topography *all'antica* prints also suggests Heemskerck's authority because it indicates that Cock considered the Haarlem artist's output as a model for his own publishing enterprise.²⁹⁸ Cock's publication of designs by Heemskerck was not limited to emphatically topographical designs, but reflected the same variety of

²⁹⁶ Ibid., no. 84. Although the engraver is unidentified, the plate was found in the inventory of Hieronymus Cock's widow. The middle ground's tapering free standing column with a spiral of relief sculpture reveals Heemskerck's observation of the columns of Marcus Aurelius and Trajan, though no detailed drawing of either survives. Heemskerck drew the base of the Column of Trajan in cat. no. AF4. Both columns appear in the distance in the right sheet of cat. no. FR3. The repeating motif of elephant heads on the circumference of the printed column's base is Heemskerck's inventive combination of similarly placed lion heads on the base of the Capitoline obelisk and his drawing of the Villa Madama's elephant fountain. For the Capitoline Obelisk, see cat. no. CH1. For the Villa Madama's Elephant Fountain, see cat. no. PT4.

²⁹⁷ Ibid., no. 77. Possible reference drawings include cat. nos. FN1, FR3, PT3, and SP1.

²⁹⁸ Riggs, pp. 20 - 21, cannot cite any other printing concern of the late 1540s that was as prolific as the possible one by Heemskerck and Coornhert and cannot establish Cock's priority beyond dispute, but convincingly describes the *Quatre Vents* as the only known publishing establishment in the early 1550s.

subjects that Heemskerck and Coornhert were already producing.²⁹⁹ His issuance of prints by the Haarlem duo was thus an underwriting of their pre-existing practice. The *Quatre Vents* output resembles the precedent Heemskerck and Coornhert established in several more specific ways. The majority of the prints Cock published by other artists during first years of the *Quatre Vents* were also in the Italianate manner.³⁰⁰ Cock's often cited revolutionary aggressiveness in the market has its antecedent in the sheer quantity Heemskerck and Coornhert produced.³⁰¹ The Haarlemers also arrived earlier at the idea of marketing prints in serial, a format that Cock later used to great advantage.³⁰² Heemskerck's *Heliodorus Driven Out of the Temple* (1549), based on Raphael's Vatican painting, predates Cock's print of the *School of Athens* (1550) engraved by Giorgio Ghisi.³⁰³ By the same token, Heemskerck's alterations to Raphael's original design for a print audience precede

²⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 309 – 383, provides a handlist of prints published by Cock demonstrating this breadth.

³⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 43 – 50, Riggs describes the *Quatre Vents*' Romanist phase.

³⁰¹ Hollstein, Heemskerck and Coornhert produced fifteen series containing four or more prints, 15 single prints, five of which were comprised of two plates. Their aggressive approach to the market accords neatly with van Mander, f. 246r, who says of Heemskerck that "There would be no end to it if one wanted to relate how many prints have already been published by him." On f. 247r, Van Mander refers to Heemskerck's miserliness and thrift; for Riggs' description of the *Quatre Vents* Romanist years, see pp. 43 – 49; *Ibid.*, p. 20, cites "the energy with which [Cock] pursued [publishing]" as the source of his pre-eminent status in the Netherlands.

³⁰² Saunders, pp. 70 – 151, establishes Heemskerck and Coornhert as innovators in development of the print series.

³⁰³ Hollstein, no. 236.

Ghisi's alterations to the *School of Athens* painting.³⁰⁴ Whether or not Heemskerck and Coornhert sold or circulated as many prints as *Aux Quatre Vents*, they anticipated by almost two years the market for Italianate prints that Cock exploited. Cock's decision to publish prints in the same manner as the ones they had already been making before he even began, and his success in doing so, vindicates their instincts.

In light of Heemskerck's primacy in the 1550s Netherlandish Romanist print boom – and in particular, his seminal role in the manufacture of invented topography *all'antica* – one sees in *Self-Portrait Before the Colosseum* Heemskerck's awareness that his 1530s Roman journey had become supremely important in the 1550s. The Italianate aspect of the prints he and Coornhert circulated from Haarlem, which they continued to circulate through *Aux Quatre Vents*, was entirely predicated on the study of antiquity in Rome. Thus, in its 1550s context, *Self-Portrait Before the Colosseum* speaks of Heemskerck's importance in cultivating an audience for prints that featured the topography *all'antica* he invented from his Roman drawings. Moreover, in a timely fashion, Heemskerck's

³⁰⁴ Michael Bury, "On some engravings by Giorgio Ghisi commonly called 'reproductive,'" *Print Quarterly* (vol. 10, no. 1, 1993), pp. 4 – 19, contests the term "reproductive print" by pointing out the discrepancies between Raphael's *School of Athens* and Ghisi's print. Bury argues that Ghisi alters the design to accommodate the new medium; Riggs, pp. 161 – 162, also points out adjustments made by Ghisi. To date, there is no study of Heemskerck's alterations of Raphael's *Expulsion of Heliodorus*, which are quite a bit more radical than Ghisi's and demand decoding. While maintaining the Italian master's overall compositional scheme, Heemskerck altered the poses of several figures. In the right middle ground is a funerary bier that is absent from Raphael's original. Heemskerck changed the architectural setting to include coffered vaults and fluted pilasters. In the tympanum beneath the furthest arch, he also added the Ten Commandment tablets traditionally signifying "Synagoga." They sit above a choir screen, also absent from Raphael's design.

self-portrait reminds its audience of the only means by which artists could generate the Italianate imagery then gaining popularity in his homeland; like Raphael and the other Italian masters whose designs Cock put before Netherlandish eyes, Heemskerck himself had learned his art by studying in Rome.

3.2.2: Heemskerck's Identity as a Master of Rome and Hieronymus Cock's *Præcipua aliquot Romanae Antiquitatis Ruinarum*

It can also be no mere coincidence that Heemskerck's portrayal of himself drawing a view of a Roman ruin coincides with Hieronymus Cock's enormously popular publications of Roman *vedute*. In 1551, Cock issued his famous *Præcipua aliquot Romanae Antiquitatis Ruinarum*, a set of twenty-five views of the Eternal City's ancient, ruined aspect.³⁰⁵ He followed these with two other series' in the early 1560s, as his association with Heemskerck continued.³⁰⁶ In the context of the self-portrait's image of Heemskerck drawing a Roman ruin, we cannot underestimate the powerful examples Heemskerck's trip to Rome and the topographical drawings he produced there must have provided for Cock's *vedute*. We are aware that Cock, himself a talented draftsman, went to Rome in the late 1540s. While there, he probably made his own topographical drawings. Some of these may have served as source material for his *vedute*. However, only three drawings by Cock of Roman buildings survive. All of these functioned as

³⁰⁵ Riggs, cat. nos. 1 – 25.

³⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, cat. nos. 98 – 109 (1561), and cat. nos. 110 – 130 (1562). Authorship is also problematic in both of the later series. We know of only a few drawings relatable to the 1561 series, and none relatable to the 1562 series.

preparatory sketches for the 1551 series' plates.³⁰⁷ Cock may have only drawn one of these while in Rome.³⁰⁸ This lack of field drawings attributable to Cock combined with the certainty that he had access to Heemskerck's Roman drawings has invited speculation that the Antwerp publisher borrowed Roman topographical source material from the Haarlem artist. However, conclusive evidence to support such claims has been hard to come by.³⁰⁹

Heemskerck's Roman topographical drawings undoubtedly comprised the most complete corpus in the Antwerp publisher's proximity during the 1550s. Shared aspects between the two sets of Roman views suggest that Heemskerck's drawings of Rome did indeed serve Cock as a most useful point of reference.³¹⁰ For

³⁰⁷ Ibid., cat. nos. D – 2, D – 3, D – 4.

³⁰⁸ Ibid., cat. no. D – 4.

³⁰⁹ Hülsen and Egger, II, pp. 56 – 57, suggest that Cock copied Heemskerck drawings that have not survived, but they offer no supporting evidence; M. J. K. Netto Bol's claim in the unpaginated foreword to the facsimile of Ibid., that Cock's *vedute* are "prints after [Heemskerck's drawings]," is unsupported; Idem, *The So-called Maarten de Vos Sketchbook of Drawings After the Antique* (The Hague, 1976), n. 27, p. 12, n. 46, claims that Heemskerck sent his drawings to Antwerp and that Cornelisz. van Haarlem returned to Haarlem with them in 1580; Veldman, "Review," p. 111, calls Bol's hypothesis "far fetched," but thinks that "it can be assumed that Cock was acquainted with the drawings from the two collections now in Berlin"; Riggs, p. 166, offers a carefully reasoned general assessment of Cock's use of Heemskerck's sketchbook: "Maarten van Heemskerck's drawings were definitely a source for other prints of antique art published by Cock, and perhaps a major source. At least two prints derive from known drawings by him." His n. 45 says that these are the "Head of Laocoon" and a view of the Colosseum from the Palatine, based on Hülsen and Egger, I, 40r and II, 74r, respectively. Riggs also says "the dependence of two others on lost drawings by [Heemskerck] is probable." These are Hülsen and Egger, II, 128, 129, not part of any of the *vedute* series.

³¹⁰ We may never know the exact nature of Heemskerck's or Cock's involvement in their formulation. A total lack of signatures on the 1551 *vedute* does not confirm or refute Cock's authorship, or anyone else's. Riggs, cat. nos. 36 – 50, points out that Cock published prints by his brother Matthys and Pieter Breughel without their signatures.

instance, Heemskerck's explorations of the Colosseum and the Palatine over many sheets portraying a variety of views find their echo in Cock's emphases on the same sites. Other physical evidence suggests that Cock devised his *vedute* by consulting his own drawings, Heemskerck's, and those by others, while calling on his skills as a draftsman to make transfer drawings. Such a method would have offered Cock considerable advantages over using only the drawings that he had executed in Rome. He could ensure a more varied and authoritative set of images; the 1551 series' multiple views of the Colosseum and the buildings on the Palatine suggest that this was one of his aims. Moreover, making transfer drawings expressly for print purposes could give Cock's disparate sources coherence as a presentable series. This would explain why the only surviving drawings that correspond directly to the series' prints are preparatory sketches by Cock.³¹¹

While no Heemskerck sheet shares a one-to-one correspondence with a Cock *vedute*, some bear a close relation. For example, Cock's prints of the Baths of Caracalla and the famous northwestern break in the Colosseum's façade (fig. 3.2.2, 1) are close to drawings by Heemskerck.³¹² The 1551 prints are larger than the 1530s drawings, thus eliminating the possibility of direct transfer.³¹³ The prints

³¹¹ Ibid., notes a "fanciful" landscape in cat. no. 13 (fig. 17).

³¹² Ibid., cat. no. 20 (fig. 21), of the Baths of Caracalla, resembles Heemskerck's in cat. no. BC1. Cat. no. 6 (fig. 9), of the break in the Colosseum's northwestern side, resembles Heemskerck's in cat. no. CS2. A possible third correspondence is cat. no. 3, Cock's print of the Colosseum's southwest quadrant, which closely resembles a drawing attributed to Posthumus, not Heemskerck, in Hülsen and Egger, II, 94v. However, Riggs, cat. no. D – 2 shows a preparatory sketch by Cock for this print that may date from his 1540's Roman stay; Hülsen and Egger, II, 47r shows a view of the same side of the amphitheater slightly further north, which Hülsen thinks is a copy after a Heemskerck; Garms, cat. no. C97, publishes a view like II, 47r from ca. 1534 by the obscure C.M. Pomedello, now in Vienna's Albertina.

³¹³ My cat. no. CS2 is 131 x 205 mm.; Riggs, cat. no. 20 (fig. 21) is 302 x 222 mm..

also show the buildings from slightly different angles than Heemskerck's drawings and contain alterations in the natural topography that imbue them with a uniform look.

Further suggesting the importance of Heemskerck's drawings for Cock is the compelling evidence of a *vedute* from the 1561 series. One of Cock's prints derives from Heemskerck's magisterial 1530s view from atop the Palatine looking southeast towards the Colosseum.³¹⁴ In this case, the Heemskerck drawing is larger than the print. Cock has again altered the details of the natural topography to match the overall appearance of the other prints in the series. Moreover, the drawing is one of the only surviving Heemskercks that has been cut down. Its cropping matches the composition of Cock's print. Clearly then, since the Palatine sheet was the source for a *vedute*, it endured a busier afterlife. As one of the only surviving sheets that served as a source for Cock, one that also bears the marks of the extra wear and tear imposed on drawings that functioned as reference material, it strongly suggests that the Heemskerck drawings consulted by Cock are less likely to have survived.³¹⁵ Seen in this light, the very absence of the views appearing in Cock's prints among Heemskerck's surviving drawings may also indicate that they were a point of reference for Cock. This notion finds support in two 1551 *vedute* of a ruin whose identity eludes us.³¹⁶ The groin-vaulted structure culminating in an oculus

³¹⁴ My cat. no. PT1 is 282 x 237 mm.; Riggs, cat. no. 98 is 242 x 329 mm..

³¹⁵ Riggs, in his catalogues of "Prints Etched by Cock," pp. 256 – 287, "Prints after Designs by Cock," pp. 288 – 295, and "Prints perhaps after Designs by Cock, pp. 296 – 302, only finds three drawings whose function as preparatory sketches is beyond doubt.

³¹⁶ Ibid., cat. nos. 22 – 23.

finds a striking echo in Heemskerck's "Adoration of the Shepherds," from his 1569 *Clades Judaeae Gentis* prints.³¹⁷ For the backdrops in the *Clades* series, Heemskerck relied most heavily on his Roman topographical drawings. Thus, even though we have no drawing of the vaulted structure, its appearance in both sets of prints suggests a lost Heemskerck drawing later used for prints by both Cock and Heemskerck. While none of the physical evidence presented here definitively identifies Heemskerck as the "author" of Cock's *vedute*, it does strongly suggest that his drawings were integral in their conception.

Thus, we are also persuaded to view *Self Portrait Before the Colosseum* in the context of Heemskerck's seminal status in the Netherlandish production and consumption of Roman ruin landscapes. His repository of Roman topographical drawings was the preeminent precedent for Cock's *vedute*. It was clearly within the publisher's reach. Additionally, Heemskerck's prints featuring Roman topographical motifs furnished Cock with an authoritative example for the mass production of Roman topographical imagery. Riggs accurately describes Cock's 1551 series as "the first to present views of genuine Roman ruins in the context of picturesque landscapes."³¹⁸ However, upon viewing Heemskerck's 1530s drawings and his emphatically topographical prints, it would be abundantly clear to anyone familiar with ancient Roman topography – as Cock most assuredly was – that Heemskerck invented his *fantasie all'antica* after drawing in Rome. In a sense that Cock himself must have understood, Heemskerck was presenting images of

³¹⁷ Hollstein, no. 258.

³¹⁸ Riggs, p. 168.

“genuine Roman ruins” before he was. As the Maerten van Heemskerck of 1553 stands proudly before an image of himself drawing a view of the Colosseum in the 1530s much like one that Cock had just mass produced, it is apparent that he is demonstrating this very notion.

3.2.3: Self-Portrait Before the Colosseum’s Romanist Audience

Given the currency that Heemskerck’s Roman topographical motifs were enjoying in the late 1540s and early 1550s, it is unlikely that the significance of his self-portrait commemoration of his Roman drawing sojourn was lost on Hieronymous Cock or his *Quatre Vents* associates. Among those in Heemskerck’s and Cock’s circle, we must consider the role of Antoine Perrenot, also known as Cardinal Granvelle, Bishop of Arras, and minister to Charles V and Philip II. Perrenot inherited a passion for Roman antiquity from his father Nicolas (1448 - 1550) who preceded him as Charles’ minister and was among the earliest importers of Roman statuary to the north, the famed Jupiter statue that had once been in the Villa Madama.³¹⁹ The 1550s were years of ascendancy for Antoine Perrenot, just as they were for Heemskerck. The younger Perrenot took over as Charles’ minister upon his father’s death in 1550. He also inherited his father’s collection and took up his voracious collecting habits. Perrenot even attempted in 1550 to acquire Primaticcio’s famous moulds for his magnificent palace *all’antica* in Brussels.³²⁰

³¹⁹ Haskell, p. 4.

³²⁰ Bruce Boucher, “Leone Leoni and Primaticcio’s Moulds of Antique Sculpture,” *Burlington Magazine* (CXXIII / 934, Jan. 1981), pp. 23 – 26; Krista de Jonge, “Le

Antoine Perrenot was a no less avid exponent of his artistic contemporaries, especially those in the retinue surrounding Hieronymous Cock and Maerten van Heemskerck.³²¹ He lent active support to the *Quatre Vents* during its crucial early years, subsidizing or commissioning numerous early publications, including the 1551 series, a set of perspective views *all'antica*, and a sumptuous plan and elevation of the Baths of Diocletian by Sebastian van Noyen.³²² Perrenot is also the first owner of *Self Portrait Before the Colosseum* and Heemskerck's *Bullfight in an Ancient Arena* (fig. 3.2.3, 1), painted the previous year.³²³ The latter painting features an imaginative, Colosseum-like amphitheater with a Jupiter statue at its center resembling the one Perrenot's father had acquired. The exact circumstances surrounding Perrenot's ownership of either painting are unknown. C. Malcom Brown has argued that Perrenot commissioned *Bullfight* from Heemskerck to celebrate his father's ancient Roman Jupiter statue, which was undoubtedly among the brightest jewels in the Perrenot collection.³²⁴ But with no conclusive evidence

Palais Granvelle à Bruxelles: premier exemple de la Renaissance Romaine dans les anciens Pays-Bas," in: *Les Granvelle et les Anciens Pays-Bas*, pp. 341 – 387, brings to light three drawings for the now lost palace and finds affinities to Peruzzi's Farnesina.

³²¹ For Perrenot's patronage, see n. 278 above; Perrenot also commissioned tapestries after designs by Hieronymous Bosch, see Otto Kurz, "Four Tapestries after Hieronymous Bosch," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, v. 30 (1967), pp. 126 – 127.

³²² A definitive study whose primary focus is the relationship between Perrenot and Cock has yet to be written. Riggs, *op. cit.* (note 262), p. 47, finds eight of Cock's publications dedicated to Perrenot in their frontispieces.

³²³ For *Bullfight in an Ancient Arena*, see above, n. 244.

³²⁴ Brown, pp. 49 – 60.

of direct contact between Heemskerck and Perrenot, we must consider the possibility that the paintings came into Perrenot's possession via a third party. Naturally, Hieronymous Cock, also an art dealer, is likeliest to have performed in such a function. Cock could have brokered Perrenot's commission or purchase of Heemskerck's paintings in a number of scenarios; Perrenot may have commissioned both paintings from Heemskerck via Cock; or the Antwerp publisher may have arranged the commission of the earlier *Bullfight* painting, after which, Heemskerck offered Perrenot the smaller self-portrait as a token of his gratitude; Perrenot may have also purchased both via Cock after Heemskerck completed them with no particular audience in mind. While each possibility suggests that Heemskerck devised *Self-Portrait Before the Colosseum* for different reasons, they all suggest a linkage between the two paintings.

That Heemskerck painted *Self-Portrait Before the Colosseum* a year after *Bullfight* and both paintings belonged to Perrenot endows the self-portrait's emphasis on Heemskerck's drawings of Rome with further import. One imagines the two paintings displayed side-by-side in Perrenot's palace, amidst his impressive collection. Displayed next to *Bullfight in an Ancient Arena*, the smaller *Self-Portrait Before the Colosseum* would reveal Heemskerck's method for inventing the larger painting. In the shadow of the colossal ruin, we see a bustling scene of human life, almost Brueghelian in its variety of follies. Flagellants, worshippers in prayer, and quack salesmen all go about their business before the teeming humanity on hand to view the entertainments being staged in the half-wrecked amphitheater. In order to devise this grand genre scene, Heemskerck again used his drawings to

recall the Colosseum's grandeur and yet again reinvented it according to his own vision. He also recalled his experiences in tumultuous 1530s Rome.³²⁵ As an antiquarian and well-traveled contemporary of Heemskerck's who had spent plenty of time in Rome, Perrenot certainly would have enjoyed the painting's erudite architectural creation *all'antica*. Perhaps more stimulating was Heemskerck's clever projection of sixteenth century life in the Eternal City onto an invented backdrop that cannot be placed in the past, present, or future. As a painting that explains Heemskerck's draftsmanship as the cause of such provocative inventions, *Self-Portrait Before the Colosseum* surely had particular resonance for Perrenot. Thus *Self-Portrait Before the Colosseum* is like Velasquez' *Las Meninas* in its appeal to a privileged gaze. Heemskerck tells his patrons, Cock and Perrenot, of the commercial, artistic, and intellectual worth of his twenty-year old Roman drawings and the unique form of pictorial knowledge he gained by making them.

3.3: Conclusion

With *Self-Portrait Before the Colosseum*, Heemskerck highlights the unity of his artistic trajectory, from drawing Rome, to assimilating the Roman landscape in order to invent from it in his paintings and prints. While that unity has perhaps always seemed manifest to us, we must recognize not only the insightful memory the self-portrait's conception required of Heemskerck, but also its foresight.

³²⁵ If van Mander, f. 245v, is to be believed, Heemskerck was the victim of a burglary while in Rome, and was thus intimately familiar with Rome's seedier side.

Undoubtedly, with *Self Portrait Before the Colosseum*, Heemskerck simultaneously describes and bridges a twenty-year gap by acknowledging that his drawings of Rome were the most vital aspect of his artistic past to survive into the 1550s. The choice to show himself drawing the Colosseum is a logical one given its status as a frequently drawn monument, emblematic of Rome and antiquity, not to mention the amphitheater's persistence in varied forms in his oeuvre. Moreover, in his art after the self-portrait, Heemskerck substantiated the claims he makes in his self-portrait. His series of prints commemorating the triumphs of Charles V on the occasion of his retirement from active political life in 1554 – published by Cock, most likely for Perrenot – features images reliant on Heemskerck's knowledge of post-Sack Rome.³²⁶ Additionally, with its inscriptions and its return to the “double portrait” device showing a younger Heemskerck drawing a Roman building, the frontispiece to 1569's *Clades Judaeae Gentis* series not only suggests the instructive capacity of Rome's ruins but also suggests to the viewer that the backdrops they are about to see in the series' prints are the products of Heemskerck's artistry and his authoritative knowledge of Rome.³²⁷ *Self Portrait Before the Colosseum* is thus more than an ingenious manifestation of Heemskerck's unique forms of intellectual and artistic supremacy and the means by which he obtained them. The painting is also prophetic in light of the apparent truth of its claims.

³²⁶ Hollstein, nos. 524 – 535.

³²⁷ *Ibid.*, nos. 237 – 258.

Chapter 4

A CATALOG OF MAERTEN VAN HEEMSKERCK'S DRAWINGS OF ROME

4.1: Catalog Guidelines

I have based my selection of drawings for this catalog on this dissertation's study of Heemskerck's drawings of Roman topography. Drawings included are by Heemskerck or are copies of lost drawings by Heemskerck.³²⁸ In addition to *vedute*, panoramas of varying scope, and drawings of single buildings, I have included drawings of architectural fragments and drawings of sculpture collections where Heemskerck gave equal focus to the sculptures and their settings *all'antica* such as vaulted *cortili* or sculpture gardens with classical niches. I have not, however, included Heemskerck's drawings of individual pieces of sculpture, sculptural fragments drawn without their settings, or sculpture gardens with plain settings.³²⁹

³²⁸ For a discussion of attribution problems in drawings of Roman topography by Heemskerck and artists in his circle, see below, section 4.4.

³²⁹ Cf. Hülsen and Egger, I, 72r, of the Casa Galli sculpture garden, which has only plain walls, no loggia or niches or other classical architectural elements.

I have grouped drawings according to the names of the places in Rome they portray. Thus all of Heemskerck's drawings of the Colosseum are together, as are his drawings of St. Peter's, the Capitoline, the Palatine, and so on. Each drawing has a catalog number comprised of two letters that tell its subject matter followed by a number. For example Heemskerck's only drawing of the Trofei di Mario is catalog number "TM1." His drawings of the Forum Romanum are numbered "FR1" through "FR3." The sequence of numbers within a given group is based on a loose set of criteria that gives priority to the quality of the drawing, its degree of finish, its manner of portraying its subject (i.e. complete views of buildings or vistas come before fragmented ones), and its usefulness to Heemskerck in his post-Roman designs. Copies of drawings by Heemskerck appear at the end of each group. So, for example, Hermannus Posthumus's copy of Heemskerck's drawing of the Colosseum is the last of Heemskerck's five drawings of the amphitheater, assigned "cat. no. CS5." In rare instances, drawings that were barely started, which nonetheless portray identifiable vistas, appear after copies.

I have only departed from groupings based on geographical location in order to bring Heemskerck's broad-view panoramas (cat. nos. PA1 – 5), his drawings of sculpture collections (cat. nos. SC1 – SC5), and his drawings of architectural fragments (cat. nos. AF1 – 4) together into their own groups. Each broad view panorama portrays too much of Rome to be classified by geographical location. Architectural fragments and sculpture collections appear together here because even though we may know where the objects portrayed are located, Heemskerck did not compose these drawings for a pictorial emphasis on their location in the city. Thus,

Heemskerck's drawing of the fragments from the Temple of Faustina is not found in the Forum Romanum section, but is classified as "cat. no. AF3." Likewise, the Villa Madama sculpture garden does not appear in the Villa Madama section, but with other drawings of sculpture collections, as "cat. no. SC3."

All entries include the following: the number assigned to the drawing by Hülsen and Egger, a descriptive title that includes the name of the location, monument, or object portrayed, and physical characteristics such as dimensions, media, watermarks (with Bricquet number if known), and any other special marks such as underdrawing, signatures, inscriptions, or damage. A brief "literature" section follows the physical description. Since Heemskerck's views of Rome are ubiquitous in Italian Renaissance and Baroque architectural histories and *vedute* catalogs, bibliographic listings must ultimately be incomplete. I have attempted to include only those books and articles where scholars have discussed and analyzed Heemskerck's drawings in their own right, while excluding literature that only uses them as illustrations, in lieu of photographs, of Renaissance Rome. The major pre-Hülsen and Egger sources – Springer, Preibisz, and Michaelis – are in the entries by Hülsen and Egger, so there is no need to replicate them here. However, where the thoughts of these early authors depart from Hülsen's and Egger's and impact my discussion, I cite them. I have also cited entries by Elena Filippi from her recent partial catalog of drawings by Heemskerck and "Anonymous A" / Posthumus, though her entries do not depart in any significant ways from Hülsen and Egger.

The text of every entry adheres to the following framework, with variations depending on the contents of particular drawings: first I describe Heemskerck's

vantage point. Then I discuss media and technique. Where appropriate, I discuss the relation of the drawing to others by Heemskerck, those in his circle, or by other artists. I have also cited prints and paintings by Heemskerck containing motifs found in the drawing, if such designs exist. In these cases, I cite all known information about paintings. Where such information is unknown, I cite Rainald Grosshans' *catalogue raisonnée* of Heemskerck's paintings. I cite prints by their *New Hollstein* numbers.

All comments on the physical orientation of buildings to one another are based on first hand observation of the monuments in Rome in the summers of 2003 and 2005.³³⁰ I consult Giambattista Nolli's map for buildings now destroyed. Published approximately three hundred and fifteen years before Heemskerck drew Rome, Nolli's map is the first accurate ichnographic map of the city. The majority of the monuments Heemskerck drew were still present when Nolli published. The now destroyed *Templum Serapidis* and *Trofei di Mario* (a.k.a. *Frontispizio di Nerone*) appear in Nolli's map. The *Septizonium* is the only major monument that Heemskerck drew that was destroyed during the interim between Heemskerck's Roman stay and Nolli's publication of his map in 1748. Unfortunately, if we wish to determine the *Septizonium*'s visibility from nearby vantage points, we must read Bufalini's map (1551), but only with caution. It is not ichnographically accurate.

³³⁰ The first phase of research was facilitated by Dr. Alan Ceen, who, upon hearing of this project, graciously invited me to use his facilities as a research fellow at his *Studium Urbis*, Rome. The second research expedition was funded by the Samuel H. Kress Foundation and again benefited from Dr. Ceen's unsurpassed knowledge of 1530s Rome and Roman urbanism.

4.2: Catalog Key

Catalog numbers dictate the sequence of drawings, not the names of monuments. Thus, for example, Heemskerck's drawing of the Pyramid of Cestius (cat. no. PC1) comes before his drawing of the Porta Maggior (cat. no. PM1), even though "Pyramid" comes after "Porta" in the alphabet. Section 4.2 below is a key of all catalog number prefixes in sequence.

AC: Arch of Constantine

AF: Architectural Fragments

AT: Arch of Titus

BB: Borgo / Banchi

BC: Baths of Caracalla

BD: Baths of Diocletian

BL: Belvedere

CH: Capitoline Hill

CS: Colosseum

FB: Forum Boarium

FN: Forum Nervae

FR: Forum Romanum

MM: So-called Temple of Minerva Media

PA: Broad View Panoramas

PC: Pyramid of Cestius

PF: Ponte Fabricus

PM: Porta Maggiore

PN: Pantheon

PO: Porticus Octaviae

PP: Piazza del Popolo

PT: Palatine Hill

SC: Sculpture Collections, Gardens, *Cortili*

SG: San Giovanni in Laterano

SL: San Lorenzo Fuori le Mure

SP: St. Peter's

SZ: Septizonium

TM: Trofei di Mario

TS: Templum Serapidis

TV: Tivoli

VM: Villa Madama

4.3: A Catalog of Maerten van Heemskerck's Drawings of Rome

Arch of Constantine

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. AC1

South sides of Arch of Constantine and Colosseum

Berlin I 69r

133 x 209 mm.

Pen and brown ink with some black ink

Water Mark: none

Red Chalk traces cover the entire bottom half of the arch and portions of the top edge.³³¹

Literature: Filippi, p. 109.³³²

Seen from a dramatic worm's eye view in Heemskerck's finest technique, the Arch of Constantine recedes from the extreme left foreground to the right middle ground. The break in the Colosseum's south side provides a stark backdrop in contrast to the arch's ornate, decorative surface.³³³ Sharply angled orthogonal lines lead us from lower and upper left to a vanishing point in the lower right third of this sheet. The curved line articulating the top of the Colosseum leads to the arch's impost blocks, which appear in profile.³³⁴ As is often his custom,

³³¹ Hülsen and Egger, I, p. VI, describe "weak" chalk traces: "Und zwar tragen die Blätter...69...nur ganz schwache Spuren."

³³² Hülsen and Egger provide no entry for this drawing, and only a short one for the drawing on the verso side, cat. no. CS4.

³³³ The upper registers of the Arch of Constantine appear in Egger, *Codex Escorialensis*, f. 45r. For a view of the Colosseum from the same angle, see Riggs, cat. no. 17.

³³⁴ Examination of the site and of Nolli's map reveal that this view of the the Arch of Constantine and the Colosseum is possible, unlike the much more hastily executed cat. no. AC2.

Heemskerck has rendered only the beginnings of each column's fluting at the base and top.

This is one of many drawings that Heemskerck composed with an object in the extreme foreground and one in the background.³³⁵ Unlike most of the other examples of that type, this composition is vertical. Because of its ground level perspective, high degree of finish, and emphasis on ornament, this drawing is most closely related to Heemskerck's view of an overturned composite capital.³³⁶

The technique is careful, heavily worked, varied, and virtuosic. Thin lines describing the columns and the archway's molding are the only visible *pentimenti*. It is unlikely that Heemskerck used a straight edge when applying ink.³³⁷ All lines bear the energetic waves of his freehand stroke. This is even true of the straightest lines of the near column's base. The pilaster behind the second column and the lintel's molding arc ever so slightly, approximating the optical distortion that results from looking up at a tall edifice at close range. Heemskerck's rendering of the arch's columns shows their delicate tapering, revealing his sensitivity to the subtleties of design in ancient Roman architecture. He has also lavished more than his usual amount of hatching on surfaces throughout this composition, whether they are in light or shadow. Even the sculpture atop the furthest column is carefully observed and shaded with deliberation. Heemskerck has rendered the most heavily

³³⁵ Heemskerck conducts a similar exercise on the verso of this sheet (cat. no. CS4). For a discussion of the "foreground / background" pictorial type among Heemskerck's Roman sketches, see above, chapter 2, section 2.2.4.

³³⁶ Cat. no. CS1.

³³⁷ Examination of the drawing in June, 2005 revealed no traces of underdrawing.

shaded parts of both edifices and the arch's relief sculpture with black ink and a much thicker stroke. A greater than normal amount of diagonal and vertical hatches appear.

This drawing found no afterlife in Heemskerck's oeuvre. Its finish, and its resemblance in technique to his preparatory sketches for prints suggest that it was a finished design that he may have intended for print production, rather than a drawing containing motifs he could harvest for new inventions.

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. AC2

View from the Interior of Arch of Constantine with Colosseum in left background and Septizonium in far right background

Berlin II 56v

186 x 260 mm

Pen and Brown Ink

Water Mark: Anchor in a Circle (Briquet 586 – 589)

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, II, pp. 34 – 35; Filippi, p. 109 – 110; Thoenes, p. 146.

In a quick drawing, we stand beneath the Arch of Constantine. Though he has rendered this in extreme haste, Heemskerck does show the actual reliefs on the interior of the eastern side of the central Arch. Simultaneously, we glance to our left and to our right, where we see the Colosseum and Septizonium, respectively. The physical relation of the monuments as they appear on this page reflects their true physical situation. However, Heemskerck shows the three buildings in a manner that could not possibly appear to the human eye in one gaze, at the same time. From within the Arch of Constantine, one's gaze cannot encompass the Colosseum and the site of the Septizonium. This sheet therefore ranks as one of the

few to suggest Heemskerck's ability to reconfigure Rome's topography in the pictorial realm.³³⁸

Aside from a drawing from atop the Palatine (cat. no. PT5), this is the only other sketch that shows the Colosseum at the angle Heemskerck used later in his *Self Portrait Before the Colosseum* (1553).

Architectural Fragments

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. AF1

Three Composite Capitals³³⁹

Berlin I 12r

127 x 205 mm.

Pen and brown ink wash and red chalk highlights.

Water Mark: Crossed Arrows (Briquet 6289)

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, I, p. 8.

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. AF2

Architectural details from the Temple of Antoninus and Faustina:

Berlin I 22r

134 x 211 mm.

Pen and brown ink

Red chalk traces over entire right third

Water Mark: none

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, I, p. 13.

³³⁸ For an analysis of the ways in which Heemskerck's drawings of Rome suggest his inventive powers, see this dissertation, above chapter two, section 2.2.5.

³³⁹ Hülsen and Egger, I, p. 8, do not identify these more specifically than the generic label given here, due to lack of evidence of a specific location.

Maerten van Heemskerck
Cat. AF3
Decorative Details from the Forum Augusta

Berlin I 21v
128 x 197 mm.
Red Chalk
Water Mark: none
Literature: Hülsen and Egger, I, pp. 12 – 13.

Maerten van Heemskerck
Cat. AF4
Base of the Southeast Corner of Trajan's Column

Berlin I 17r
136 x 211 mm.
Pen and brown ink wash
Water Mark: none
Literature: Hülsen and Egger, I, p. 10.

Heemskerck's interest in rendering architectural fragments and their decorative motifs in close views was minimal at best. Only four such drawings remain.³⁴⁰ However, they reveal a variety of pictorial approaches and use of media. These drawings also figured in Heemskerck's post-Roman designs.

Heemskerck's drawing of three composite capitals (cat. no. AF1) and details from the Forum of Augustus (cat. no. AF3) are as close as he came to executing capital studies.³⁴¹ In his most pictorial effort portraying fragments of architectural

³⁴⁰ In addition to the four sheets in this catalogue, Heemskerck also drew a column and a bench from San Giovanni in Laterano (cat. no. SG2), the frieze decorations at San Lorenzo Fuori le Mura (cat. no. SL1), and an unidentified grave marker fragment on Hülsen and Egger, I, 4v.

³⁴¹ There are sheets of similarly detailed Composite capitals in the Codex Escorialensis. See Egger, *Codex Escorialensis*, ff. 22r, 22v, and 24r; Hülsen and Egger, I, p. 12, find "completely correspondent" drawings of the capital in cat. no. AF2 in the Codex Coner (f. 132c), the Sketchbook of Giambattista da Sangallo (Uffizi, 1852), and Andrea Palladio's *Architettura*, (I. IV, p. 22, ed. 1570). See also *Ibid.*, II, 9r.

ornamentation (cat. no. AF2), Heemskerck shows a cornice frieze with a griffin, candelabra, and other more generic decorative motifs from the Temple of Faustina lying on a hill. In the upper left corner of the composition, the temple peeks up from behind the objects in the extreme foreground.³⁴² Heemskerck also drew the base of Trajan's column (cat. no. AF4), albeit in an awkward foreshortening, close to the picture plane. At the top of this sheet, we see the wreath at the base of the column.

Only one of Heemskerck's drawings of architectural fragments is in his preferred pure pen and ink technique (cat. no. AF2). Heemskerck's pen and ink drawing of three composite capitals (cat. no. AF1) and his unfinished drawing of the base of Trajan's column (cat. no. AF4) contain ink wash in the shadows.³⁴³ A close examination reveals that Heemskerck also applied red chalk to the parts of AF1 where there is no brown ink, perhaps in order to heighten its coloristic effect. Heemskerck used only red chalk to depict cornice ornaments, half of a frequently rendered capital, and a faintly drawn, unfinished column base (cat. no. AF3).³⁴⁴

³⁴² Hülsen and Egger, I, p. 13, say these fragments are from the west corner of the temple's ante-room.

³⁴³ Apparently, the base of Trajan's column did not hold Heemskerck's interest long enough for him to bring his drawing of it to a high finish. We find a great variation between areas of finish and detail (the cornice, the festooning of the south plinth), and a quick, summary handling in both line and wash (the wreath at the base of the column). The right side of the composition is less finished, but Heemskerck has applied the ink wash to this side just as heavily. The festoon on the east plinth contains ink wash details without the support of lines.

³⁴⁴ Heemskerck's drawing of Sixtus IV's tomb is also in red chalk. See Hülsen and Egger, I, 71v.

Heemskerck pays greater attention to detail than usual in this drawing. Given the customary use of red chalk for a precise portrayal of the smooth contours in drawings of sculpture, Heemskerck's choice of the medium to depict the nooks and crags of cornice and capital fragments is a surprising, yet effective one.

Many of Heemskerck's finished designs are relatable to these drawings.³⁴⁵ The angle of view and the hint of a wreath near the top border of Heemskerck's drawing of the base of Trajan's column served as references for the structure at the center of Heemskerck's Frontispiece to the *Clades Judææ Gentis* (1569).³⁴⁶ The base and column behind the figures to the right in *Momus Criticizing the World of the Gods* is a variation of cat. no. AF4.³⁴⁷ The capitals in AF1 are like the one Heemskerck juxtaposes with the Colosseum in cat. no. CS1 and may have provided source material for that drawing.

³⁴⁵ For designs containing architectural fragments that do not match these drawings precisely, see Hollstein, nos. 62, 63, 77, 90, 171, 271.

³⁴⁶ For the Frontispiece, see Hollstein no. 237. The preparatory sketch for this print is in Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett, pasted into album I. See Hülsen and Egger, I, 1r; Veldman, *Dutch Humanism*, pp. 144 – 155, and Eleanor Saunders, pp. 224 – 226, identified the structure leaving the top of the sheet in the frontispiece as an obelisk and tried to link it to the obelisk Heemskerck designed for his father's grave. However, neither Veldman nor Saunders note the wreath at the base of whatever vertical edifice is present, and its kinship to the wreath in this drawing.

³⁴⁷ For Heemskerck's *Momus Criticizing the Gods*, see above, n. 222.

Arch of Titus

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. AT1

Arch of Titus Framing the Forum Romanum

Berlin II 56r

269 x 195 mm.

Pen and brown ink with some ink wash

Water Mark: Anchor in a Circle (Briquet 586 – 589)

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, p. 34; Filippi, p. 109.

This is a large sheet from the second Berlin album that served as a reference for a print design over thirty years later.

Heemskerck records the appearance of the Arch of Titus within its medieval encasement, as it remained until Valdier's alterations of 1822.³⁴⁸ He has written the attic story's dedication to Titus in his own handwriting, showing only the first word, "S E N A T V S," as it actually appears on the arch, in the Roman font.³⁴⁹ A figure walks through the arch towards the Forum Romanum.

Within the arch, from left, we see the Temples of Castor, Saturn, and Vespasian. The Column of Phocus sits in front of the church of Ss. Sergio e Bacco. Unlike FR4, this drawing shows the church's *campanile*. Heemskerck therefore must have executed this before Paul III's demolitions in preparation for Charles V's triumphal entry of April 1536. Half of the Arch of Septimius Severus is visible

³⁴⁸ Rodolfo Lanciani, *The Ruins and Excavations of Ancient Rome* (New York: 1967), p. 201.

³⁴⁹ Heemskerck's writing is faithful to the inscription as it reads on the Arch of Titus, which says: SENATVS POPVLVS QVE ROMANVS DIVO TITO DIVI VESPASIANI F(ILIO) VESPASIANO AVGVSTO ("The Senate and People of Rome (dedicate this) to the divine Titus Vespasianus Augustus, son of the divine Vespasian.").

next to Ss. Sergio e Bacco. Above the forum, on the Capitoline, are the Palazzo Senatori, Santa Maria in Aracoeli, and the Capitoline Obelisk.

Heemskerck uses mostly hatching in this drawing. He renders the buildings in the forum with a tighter, subtler, thinner stroke than the looser, much larger strokes he uses for the arch. Exceptional are the inking of the arch's coffering – with such thick lines, heavy strokes and so much ink, that Heemskerck has weakened the paper – and the application of brown ink wash without any gradations to the foreground, the left pier of the arch, and the hills in the middle ground.

The buildings of the Capitoline appear in a garbled form that we cannot fully explain. We can only conclude that Heemskerck never satisfactorily completed his underdrawing of this portion.³⁵⁰ Two towers extend from the Palazzo Senatori.³⁵¹ The crenellated tower on the right resembles the Palazzo's tower, but appears too far to the right. Below this tower, a structure resembling the buttress on the Tabularium's southeast corner appears with only one crenellation, which is partially obscured by a passage of wavy lines that may represent a flag.

Heemskerck has drawn a tunnel to the left of the palazzo where none existed. He has also drawn buildings with eaves against the wall of the Tabularium where it had

³⁵⁰ Observation of the drawing in June 2005 showed no traces of under drawing.

³⁵¹ No other drawings of the Palazzo by Heemskerck or anyone else show it this way because it never had two towers. C.f. my cat. nos. FR4 and C1, Louvre 11028, and Michaelis, "Michelangelos Plan Zum Kapitol und Seine Ausführung," *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst*, N.F. II (1891), p. 189, which shows a print by Jan or Lucas Duetecum from a lost 1548 drawing by Hieronymous Cock. Only Alessandro Strozzi's map (1474) represents the Palazzo with two towers. In the Strozzi map, the second tower appears to be an exaggeration of the Tabularium's crenellated southeast corner.

none. Most puzzling are the unfinished horizontal lines extending from the left side of the right tower. Directly below is a passage of unfinished lines and shading. These incomplete portions suggest that Heemskerck applied ink to this sheet only after leaving Rome, without having the Capitoline as a point of reference. Oddly, it also indicates that he did not consult his own drawings of the Capitoline in order to finish this one.³⁵²

Some of the ambiguities in Heemskerck's rendering of the Capitoline may have resulted from its execution from different vantage points.³⁵³ To render the exterior of the Arch of Titus, which appears in elevation except for its foreshortened keystone and interior, Heemskerck must have stood about twenty feet south east of the arch, on the elevated ground near the Torre Cartularia.³⁵⁴ But observation of the site reveals that Heemskerck shows more buildings in the forum than are visible from this spot. He would have needed a closer view, and may have even walked through the arch to draw the parts of the vista he could not see. If he had drawn some parts from each vantage point, their appearance in relation to one another would have become confused.

This view of the Arch of Titus was the basis for Heemskerck's design of "Lot and His Family Leaving Sodom" in the *Clades Judaeae Gentis* series

³⁵² Cat. no. FR3 is from a similar angle.

³⁵³ Hülsen and Egger, p. 34. Hülsen does not suggest two vantage points, but implies it where he says "Auf dem Kapitol...links der Senatorenpalast mit Turm (Die Zeichnung dieser Gebäude scheint Heemskerck korrigiert zu haben, daher links noch ein zweiter Turm mit hohen anschließenden Bauten)."

³⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 33.

(1569).³⁵⁵ The arch in the print is reversed from the sketch. However, the designs do not correspond in size. While Heemskerck did not transfer the sketchbook drawing for his print design, he retained several of the sketchbook drawing's elements in its translation to a print: the spandrel Victory figures, composite capitals, frieze, and cornice all appear in both. The cracks to the right of the arch's right column occupy in the corresponding spot on the print's left column. In other places, Heemskerck has reworked elements from the original drawing for the print. Where the sketch shows a missing piece in the cornice, the print shows the flames of the city of Sodom. He has translated the cracks in the arch as well, placing them at more regular intervals in the print design. Heemskerck's sketchbook drawing of the "spoils relief" on the arch's interior only shows one horse, a few lances, and one figure. He has further simplified the relief in the print, eliminating all extraneous elements to show a single horse and lance. Likewise, Heemskerck's sketch reduces the arch's coffering from seven rows to five, while the print shows two rows. Heemskerck has also combined and enlarged the Temples of Castor and Vespasian. Finally, the lines created by the hill in front of the sketchbook's arch and at the foot of the Palatine reappear in the print as a torrent of flames and fallen cornice.

Comparable to: C.E. fol. 47r (Egger text p. 120): "tjto euespasiano" Arch of Titus. This is in perspective, but it is from directly in front of the Arch of Titus. Only the word "SENATVS" appears in the inscription above, and the medieval encasement is not shown).

³⁵⁵ Hollstein, no. 242.

Borgo / Banchi

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. BB1

Right half of the Elevation of Palazzo Branconio dall'Acquila

Berlin I 55v

122 x 201 mm

Red Chalk

Water Mark: none

Heemskerck's signature appears in the left column on the first floor.

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, I, p. 31; Filippi, pp. 104 – 105.

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. BB2

Half Elevation of Banco di Santo Spirito / Half Elevation of Unidentified Palace in Borgo³⁵⁶

Berlin I 68r

135 x 210 mm.

Pen and brown ink wash

Water Mark: none

The elevation on the right appears to be slightly raised, as if the artist folded this sheet.

There are Vertical red chalk traces on right third.³⁵⁷

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, I, p. 35; Filippi, pp. 104.

³⁵⁶ Hülsen and Egger, I, p. 35, identify the building on the right as Palazzo Costa, which they say also appears in perspective Anonymous A's II 3r. However, the facades do not match. Heemskerck's shows two sets of bases for pilasters on the piano nobile while Anonymous A's shows only one. In verbal communication, Alan Ceen also disagrees with the identification of the palace on Heemskerck's sheet as Palazzo Costa, recommending Palazzo Palma instead. No exact match is to be found, however. See Paul Marie Letarouilly, *Édifices de Rome moderne, ou. Recueil des palais, maisons, églises couvents et autres monuments publics et particuliers les plus remarquables de la ville de Rome* (Princeton, NJ, Princeton Architectural Press, 1984), pl. I, 1. Other possibilities include: I, 23 (Elevation d'un palais Piazza della Pace), I, 49 (Palazzo Linotte Vicolo dell'Acquila), I, 106 (Palazzo Vicolo dell'oro).

³⁵⁷ Hülsen and Egger, I, p VI, do not identify these marks in their effort to reconstruct the sketchbook's original sequence by analyzing traces of red chalk.

These are the only two sheets among Heemskerck's Roman sketches containing architectural elevations.³⁵⁸ There has been speculation that the half-elevations of BB2 are copies.³⁵⁹ As for BB1, if Heemskerck did not render the long destroyed Palazzo Branconio dell'Acquila on site, no drawing presents itself as the unquestioned source for his copy. An unlikely but not impossible candidate is Parmigianino's drawing of the palace, also elevation in chalk. While Parmigianino was not in Rome after the Sack, an artist from his Roman circle may have possessed his elevation of Raphael's palace and shown it to Heemskerck.³⁶⁰ If Heemskerck copied Parmigianino's drawing, he departed from the Italian source by rendering the palace in more elegant, attenuated proportions and by placing sculpture in the *piano nobile's* second and third niches from the right.³⁶¹ Heemskerck's undetailed rendering of the *piano nobile's* decorations might resemble the swirling gestures in Parmigianino's drawing more closely than it resembles the palace's reliefs. But

³⁵⁸ "Anonymous A" / Hermannus Posthumus drew similar elevations. See Hülsen and Egger, II, 3r.

³⁵⁹ Hülsen and Egger, I, pp. XIII, 35, hypothesize that both of the elevations on BB2 are copies after original sketches by Antonio da Sangallo the Younger, but they offer no accession numbers for a specific drawing by the Italian architect.

³⁶⁰ For a discussion of Heemskerck's encounters with Italian artists in Rome, see this dissertation, above, chapter two, section 2.1.

³⁶¹ Hülsen and Egger, I, p. 31. Hülsen and Egger think Heemskerck's proportions are more accurate than Parmigianino's.

without a palace for reference and only one other less detailed drawing to consult, no safe conclusion is at hand.³⁶²

Both sketches are of a much lower level of craftsmanship than is usual for Heemskerck. The dearth of plans and elevations among his sketches and the poor technique suggest his lack of interest in the scientific methods of rendering buildings emerging among the architects he may have met in Rome. The lesser technique on these sheets could also indicate that Heemskerck copied from a technically inferior source.

On both sheets, Heemskerck has abandoned his customary hatches. Raphael's richly sculpted façade may have prompted Heemskerck to draw with red chalk, a medium he usually reserved for detailed studies of sculpture, decorative elements, or capitals at close range.³⁶³ Heemskerck has completed the outline of all the building's parts. But this drawing is unfinished. Many outlines are faint and there is a minimum of shading. Only the capital of the first floor's left column and the bases the *piano nobile's* middle colonnettes hint at the level of finish Heemskerck might have achieved. However, even these passages lack the sharpness of Heemskerck's other red chalk studies. BB2 is one of only a few containing brown ink wash instead of hatching.³⁶⁴ These half-elevations appear via

³⁶² Giovan Battista Naldini's view of the Palazzo, ca. 1560 (Firenze, Uffizi, Gabinetto Disegni e Stampe, n. 230 A r) shows less detail than either Parmigianino's or Heemskerck's.

³⁶³ For a decorative study, see cat. no. AF1 and Hülsen and Egger, I, 65v. For sculpture in red chalk see *Ibid.*, I, 11v and 75v.

³⁶⁴ For Heemskerck's drawings in ink wash, see this dissertation, above, chapter two, Section 2.3.2.

imprecise lines. This is especially true of the silhouette of the rustication of the palace at right. We also see an unconvincing, tentative beginning to a perspective rendering of the Banco's cornice. Only fleeting passages – the pilasters and the arched pediment of the palace at right – remind us of Heemskerck's sure hand. The smudge in the Banco's entrance, which spills into the *voussoirs* above it, is also rare among Heemskerck's sketches, which are mostly meticulous in their neatness.

These drawings apparently had no afterlife in Heemskerck's post-Roman oeuvre.

Baths of Caracalla

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. BC1

View North with Terme di Caracalla in Foreground and S. Stefano Rotondo in Right background.³⁶⁵

Berlin I 58r

130 x 200 mm.

Pen and brown ink

Water Mark: none

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, I, p. 32.

This drawing is yet another example of Heemskerck's careful choice of angle of view for the purposes of constructing a composition that shows us a view straight through the Terme's vaulting, while opening up onto a distant background

³⁶⁵ Hülsen and Egger, I, p. 32, identify the ancient sculptures on the other half of this sheet as having been in the gardens of the Villa Madama at the time of Heemskerck's Roman stay. For a drawing of the Baths of Caracalla attributed to Heemskerck in the Bibliothèque Nationale, see below, section 4.4.1.

at right.³⁶⁶ Rising above and to the left of the baths is a fragmented pier whose vaults spring to incompleteness. To its right are fragmented walls. The composition then gives way onto a vista that gives a distant view of San Stefano Rotondo.

Hieronymus Cock published a view of the Baths like this one, but with a greater emphasis on foreground's natural topography. San Stefano Rotondo does not appear in the background of Cock's *vedute*, either.³⁶⁷

The foreground pier and vault with vegetal onset appears in reverse in the second pier of a ruined row of Colosseum-like piers in reverse in a print of "Mary, Mother of Christ," from Heemskerck's 1560 series of *Exemplary Women from the Old and New Testament*.³⁶⁸ Heemskerck may have turned to this sheet for a similar motif in the backdrop of "The Burial of Samson" from his *Clades Judaeae Gentis* series of 1569.³⁶⁹

³⁶⁶ Heemskerck apparently favored such views. See cat. no. BD1 for a similar composition of the Baths of Diocletian.

³⁶⁷ Riggs, cat. no. 20.

³⁶⁸ Hollstein, no. 271.

³⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, no. 249.

Baths of Diocletian

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. BD1

Perspective View of the Baths of Diocletian³⁷⁰

Berlin I 7r

134 x 207 mm.

Pen and Brown Ink

Water Mark: Asterisk and arrowheads (Upper half of Briquet 6289)

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, I, p. 6.

As in cat. no. BC1, we gaze through a series of colossal bath vaults.³⁷¹ From Heemskerck's chosen vantage point, the furthest arch is barely visible behind a middle ground pier while the engaged column in the distant central vault nearly escapes the upper left corner of the page. Heemskerck's chosen an angle of view emphasizes the ruined state of the baths because the rhythm of the arches should continue in the nearest vault, but cannot, due to decay.

Heemskerck shows the ruins in a medium finish. He has rendered architectural details only summarily, thus creating ambiguities; coffering at the top of the structure on the right blends with the shadows where cavities in the structure appear and even with the shadow caused by an interior cornice. However, perspective, proportions, and shapes are precise.

³⁷⁰ Hülsen and Egger, I, p. 6, identify these as rooms in the northwestern part of the Baths of Diocletian complex, with a view through the northern Palaestra. They base their identification on the appearance of the interior space and a comparison with Posthumus's drawing in *Ibid.*, II 83v. However, they do not mention its more revealing connecting piece, the perspective view of II 81r, which looks northeast at the ruins of the southwest corner.

³⁷¹ Hieronymus Cock published a print of a different part of the Baths of Diocletian with a similar receding series of arches. See Riggs, cat. no. 101.

The central right backdrop of Heemskerck's undated "Adoration of the Magi" contains vaulting that may be indebted to the right pier of the main arch in this drawing.³⁷² In a much more general sense, Heemskerck may have brought experience of rendering these particular forms to bear on his design for the *fantasie* of springing vaults in the backdrop of the Draper's altarpiece (fig. 1.1.1 – 4).

Belvedere

Copy after Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. BL1

Landscape with Belvedere Exterior from the Monte Mario

Berlin II 36r

269 x 408 mm

Pen and brown ink wash

Water mark: none.

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, II, p. 25 – 26; Filippi, p. 104.

We stand on the ancient via Triumphalis (the modern Strada di Monte Mario) and gaze south.³⁷³ This sheet records the northern portion of the Vatican complex before Paul III and Pius IV built their walls. The tower to the right is a vestige of the medieval walls, parts of which were demolished in order to build the Vatican palace under Nicolas V. The building to the right of the tower is unidentified.³⁷⁴

³⁷² Hollstein, no. 303.

³⁷³ Heemskerck may have gazed east from this spot to draw PA4, a panorama including Borgo, Castel S. Angelo, the Pantheon, and the Torre dei Conti, in I 16r. A panorama from the Vatican Palace to Torre dei Conti is found in Egger, *Codex Escorialensis*, f. 7v and f. 8r.

³⁷⁴ Unidentified buildings do appear in this area on Nolli's map.

This is either autograph or a copy after a Heemskerck original.³⁷⁵ In the present volume, we wish to submit this as a copy from Heemskerck's circle. While a monogram like the one on cat. no. SC2a appears in the lower right corner, it is of different ink and may have been added later.³⁷⁶ Watermarks do not provide conclusive evidence.³⁷⁷ This sheet is also bigger than the large sheets in Berlin's album II containing autograph Heemskercks.

Some technical aspects argue against Heemskerck's hand. There is no hatching anywhere on this sheet. The artist uses an ink wash to describe all shadows. Only five sheets traditionally attributed to Heemskerck contain ink wash instead of hatching.³⁷⁸ In those, ink wash appears within outlines. On this sheet, however, objects are defined entirely by ink wash that is free of any outlines. The technique here is closest to Heemskerck's drawing of San Giovanni in Laterano

³⁷⁵ Like Preibisz before them, Hülsen and Egger, II, p. 26 express uncertainty on the matter; accordingly, their table on p. 74 lists this as a Heemskerck, but the "Kopie nach Heemskerck" symbol followed by a question mark appears in parentheses next to their attribution.

³⁷⁶ It is also like the monogram that appears on numerous prints after Heemskerck's designs, combining the letters "M" "V" "H" and "K." Cf. Hollstein, no. 76.

³⁷⁷ Hülsen and Egger, II, p. 26, Egger says he finds the same watermark on the present sheet as the one found on II, 40 (cat. nos. PM1 and PA5, respectively), which is securely attributed to Heemskerck. He describes it as "two crossed arrows and at the top between them an 8-radial star." The present sheet showed no visible watermark when I examined it in the summer of 2005. My examination of II 40 found only the two arrows of the bottom half. Several sheets in the Berlin volumes contain two crossed arrows: I 12, 13, 20, 25, and 43. I found no watermarks with more than six pointed stars among the sheets in Berlin: I 6, 27, 30, 45, and 72, and II 9.

³⁷⁸ E.g. cat. nos. BB2, FR1, SP7, SG1, and SC1.

(cat. no. SG1), which has much more nuanced tonal variety, however. By comparison, the present sheet lacks tonal subtlety; in the foreground vegetation, the artist has applied an extra layer of ink to indicate deeper shadows; figures throughout the left third appear in thicker, darker ink than figures in any of Heemskerck's securely attributed drawings.³⁷⁹

Few, if any of Heemskerck's post-Roman designs are relatable to this drawing. Structures resembling the buildings at the north end of the Belvedere appear in some of Heemskerck's prints, but never in anything approaching a *verbatim* form.³⁸⁰

Maerten van Heemskerck
Cat. BL2
Unfinished elevation of *cortile* del Belvedere

Berlin II 36v
404 x 257 mm.
Pen and Brown Ink and Red Chalk
Water Mark: Two Crossed Arrows (Briquet 6292)

Literature: Michaelis, I, p. 160; Hülsen and Egger, II, p. 26.

The drawing is so unfinished that it is difficult to say with certainty if it is truly an elevation of the *cortile* del Belvedere. It may be a palace facade.³⁸¹ One should view this drawing by making the recto's top side the right side. Then we see the right side of what appears to be a facade elevation, in red chalk. Hülsen and Egger must surmise that this is an elevation of Bramante's *cortile* because of

³⁷⁹ Cf. cat. no. FR2a.

³⁸⁰ Hollstein, nos. 102, 169, and 512.

³⁸¹ Michaelis, *op. cit.*, no. VI, p. 160, only calls it "Andeutung einer drestöckigen Architektur."

Heemskerck's depiction of the Belvedere from the Monte Mario on the recto side of this sheet, though they do not state this explicitly. At the lowest level we see pilasters next to the end of the composition. A horizontal flaw (vertical on the recto side) – where the paper maker has conjoined two smaller sheets and where the watermark occurs – interrupts the second floor, and the artist has articulated no bays here. In the top region of the vertical sheet, the artist has rendered the base of a pilaster in pen. It may be the beginnings of the third floor of the building (in which case we are not looking at an elevation of Bramante's *cortile*). But if it is, then it is entirely out of proportion with – much bigger than – the first floor.

Capitoline Hill

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. CH1

Capitoline Obelisk, Palazzo Senatori, and Palazzo Conservatori

Berlin II 72r

208 x 263 mm.

Pen and Brown Ink

Water Mark: none

Literature: Michaelis, p. 11; Hülsen and Egger, II, pp. 41 – 42; Filippi, pp. 100 – 101.

We see the Campidoglio before Michelangelo's mid century alterations, from a unique vantage point among images of this space.³⁸² Heemskerck stood at

³⁸² Two mid-sixteenth century images show the Capitoline from the northwest, slightly east of the iconic view depicted by du Perac in 1569. C.f., Louvre 11028, dated 1544 by Cesare D'Onofrio in *Gli Obelischi di Roma* (Rome: 1965), pl. 98; Adolf Michaelis, "Michelangelos Plan Zum Kapitol und Seine Ausführung," *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst*, N.F. II (1891), p. 189, shows a print by Jan or Lucas Duetecum from a lost 1548 drawing of the Capitoline by Hieronymous Cock.

the eastern corner of Santa Maria in Aracoeli's south wall and gazed southwest.³⁸³ In the extreme left foreground is the Capitoline Obelisk, which was moved to Villa Celimontana shortly after this.³⁸⁴ On the obelisk's base, Heemskerck has written "*teneijt gesprenkelt*," words that continue to puzzle art historians.³⁸⁵ The Palazzo Senatori and Palazzo dei Conservatori sit left and center respectively. At far right, a freestanding column draws the scrutiny of two figures. The reclining ancient Roman sculptures then in front of the conservator's palace, a subject Heemskerck rendered in detail on other sheets (cat. nos. CH2 and CH3), appear here in bold, imprecise lines.³⁸⁶ Louvre 11028 shows that by the mid 1540s, Michelangelo had moved them to their current place in front of the Palazzo Senatori. He had also built a wall through the spot where the column at right stands in the present sheet and had installed the Marcus Aurelius equestrian. Given the angle of view, the background to the left of the Conservator's palace must show the Tarpean rock while the Janiculum with San Pietro in Montorio appears to the right of the palace.

Minor topographical and pictorial errors appear. Heemskerck did not foreshorten the middle ground stairs leading from the Aracoeli to the Capitoline's

³⁸³ Cat. no. CH4 is sketched from nearly the same vantage point while gazing south.

³⁸⁴ Cesare D'Onofrio, pl. 98.

³⁸⁵ Hülsen and Egger, II, p. 42. Hülsen claims he is revising the reading of this inscription offered by Petrus Hofstede de Groot. However, Hülsen offers no translation by de Groot, cites no bibliography, and does not specify oral communication with his Dutch contemporary; Veldman, "Review," p. 109, calls this the "mystifying inscription on the obelisk on the Capitoline Hill."

³⁸⁶ For Heemskerck's detailed drawings of these sculptures, see Hülsen and Egger, I, 45r, and I, 61r.

Piazza. Instead, he has portrayed them as if they run parallel to the façade of the Conservator's palace. The figures before the freestanding column at right might be too small in scale. If they are not, then the figures near the column in cat. no. CH2 are too big.

This drawing is one of a significant number in Berlin's Album II displaying a loose, almost careless stroke. The half of the Palazzo Senatori behind and to the left of the obelisk is unfinished.³⁸⁷ Despite being in the foreground, the obelisk does not receive a detailed treatment either.

Heemskerck was apparently more concerned with composition than a meticulous rendering. This drawing's main compositional device – a prominent foreground object and a dramatic recession into the background – results from a self-conscious choice of angle of view. Such compositions are common among his drawings.³⁸⁸

No part of this drawing finds anything close to a *verbatim* replication in Heemskerck's prints and paintings. But his design for the "Tower of Babel," the third scene of 1569's *Clades Judaeae Gentis* series, is framed by a foreground vertical to the left and a middle ground vertical to the right, much like this drawing.³⁸⁹

³⁸⁷ The Lions at the foot of the obelisk, and some of its hieroglyphics appear in Cat. nos. CH4 and CH4a.

³⁸⁸ For a discussion of Heemskerck's "foreground / background" compositions, see this dissertation, above, chapter two, Section 2.2.4.

³⁸⁹ Hollstein, no. 240.

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. CH2

View looking northwest from the porch of the Palazzo dei Senatori

Berlin I 45r

133 x 209 mm.

Pen and Brown Ink

Water Mark: Star and Arrows (Briquet 6289)

Faint black chalk underdrawing articulating loggia of Palazzo Conservatori

Literature: Michaelis, I, p. 146. Hülsen and Egger, I, p. 24; Thoenes, p. 144.

This is another of Heemskerck's spatially emphatic foreground / background compositions. To our left, and close to the picture plane, we have the sculpted head of Commodus, the column with Lion sculptures appearing on another of the Berlin sheets, and reclining statues of the Tiber and the Nile.³⁹⁰ As the composition moves to the right, objects recede, with Castel S. Angelo in the far center background, and Pantheon in the right background. Examination of the original reveals that Heemskerck intended to show the Palazzo dei Conservatori's facade, but did not follow through on these intentions. A row of columns in faint black chalk, the Palazzo dei Conservatori's loggia, is visible.

³⁹⁰ The lion's head statue appears on Hülsen and Egger, II, 50r, deattributed from Heemskerck's oeuvre below, Section 4.4.2b.

Maerten van Heemskerck
Cat. CH3
View looking east from Palazzo dei Conservatori

Berlin I 61r
134 x 210 mm.
Pen and brown ink
Red chalk traces throughout³⁹¹
Water Mark: none

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, I, p. 33

In a medium finish, Heemskerck opposes a foreground vista with objects in the deep background. We see the river gods in front the point of view of the Palazzo Conservatori's portico. In the extreme right background is the Palazzo Senatori. The Obelisco Capitolino appears in the left background.

Maerten van Heemskerck
Cat. CH4
Capitoline Obelisk and Colosseum

Berlin: I 11r
135 x 215 mm.
Pen and Brown Ink
Red chalk in upper left corner
Water Mark: none

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, I, pp. 7 - 8.

This is the superior of two drawings in Berlin showing nearly the same vista.³⁹² Heemskerck stood northeast of the Palazzo Senatori, perhaps atop Santa Maria in Aracoeli's steps, and gazed southeast over the Forum Romanum. An "emptied out" composition, most of the drawing occupies the left and lower thirds

³⁹¹ Hülsen and Egger, I, p. 33.

³⁹² See my discussion of attribution problems below, section 4.4.2.

of the frame. We see Heemskerck's customary flair for compositional dynamics; extreme foregrounding at left or right contrasts with objects in the distance.

Santa Maria in Aracoeli's monastery appears unfinished in the far left foreground, where figures provide scale. The Capitoline Obelisk frames the left foreground, as in CH1, but in greater detail than on that sheet. Heemskerck has drawn the hieroglyphs on its authentically Egyptian top half.³⁹³ The strong diagonal of the Capitoline's retaining wall frames the buildings of the Forum and beyond. The Basilica of Maxentius partially blocks the Colosseum. To their right, peaking just above the retaining wall, are S. Adriano's pediment and the Arch of Septimius Severus' medieval tower. Further into the distance are the Torre dei Santa Francesca Romana, which Heemskerck has left unfinished, the Arch of Titus within its with Medieval encasement, and the Torre Cartularia. In the furthest distance, to the amphitheater's left, we see the aqueducts near the Porta Maggiore. A series of hills including the Celian and the Aventine are in the furthest right backdrop.

While not in Heemskerck's finest hand, some passages reveal impressive subtlety and technical versatility. Three thicknesses of line describe foreground, middle ground, and background. The obelisk receives the boldest lines and convincing contrast, especially at its decayed base. A single hatch of its shaft exceeds its limit, and uncertainty is evident in the outlines half way up. Soft hatches describe the Basilica of Maxentius' plain surfaces and vegetal onset, while bolder lines emerge behind it to describe the shadows created by the Colosseum's

³⁹³ Some of the symbols Heemskerck drew near the top of the needle are consistent with the hieroglyphs on the actual obelisk now on the grounds of the Villa Celimontana.

busier exterior. The distant background contains stippling for aerial perspective, unusual for Heemskerck.

Heemskerck may have referred to this sheet when composing *Habakuk Bringing Food to Daniel In the Lion's Den*; both are based on a strong diagonal declining from left to right, a circular structure in the central distance, and a cluster of buildings to its right that includes a *campanile* and an arch in a thick encasement.³⁹⁴ To a lesser degree, this may also be true of *Elisha Receiving Elijah's Mantle*, which is composed in the opposite, with a strong diagonal declining from right to left, a foreground obelisk, and a Flavian amphitheater in the central background.³⁹⁵

Colosseum

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. CS1

Overturned Composite Capital with view looking east towards Colosseum

Berlin I 28v

135 x 211 mm.

Pen and Brown Ink

Water Mark: none

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, I, p. 17; Filippi, pp. 99 – 100.

In his most masterful technique, Heemskerck has devised a dynamic composition. Sitting at an oblique angle in the extreme right foreground is an exquisitely rendered late imperial composite capital replete with unbroken acanthus leaves, vegetal volutes, egg and dart, and bead patterns. The Colosseum's ruined

³⁹⁴ Hollstein, no. 225.

³⁹⁵ Ibid., no. 138.

southwest quadrant provides a backdrop to the left. As in AC1, the Colosseum's ruined starkness offsets a lavish, ornamental display in the foreground.

It is not certain if Heemskerck drew this particular juxtaposition of capital and Colosseum from life. He rendered the Colosseum from a spot south of the Arch of Constantine.³⁹⁶ The capital might be a remnant of the Tempio del Divo Claudio, which occupied the area where Heemskerck sat to draw the Colosseum.³⁹⁷ Lanciani reports that Michelangelo used a capital from Claudius' temple to complete his renovation of the Baths of Diocletian.³⁹⁸ This accords neatly with Hülsen's observation that Heemskerck's overturned capital is "almost exactly like" those in the main hall of the Baths of Diocletian.³⁹⁹ The capitals Heemskerck drew in ca. no. AF1 suggest that he found a capital, studied it from a few different angles, and then used it later in this composition. On both sheets, capitals lay overturned amidst vegetation with the shaft of a colonnette nearby. Heemskerck drew the capitals in AF1 in enough detail to confirm that they share all of the same

³⁹⁶ The drawing shows a lone second floor interior vault also found twice in the second Berlin album: II 47r, a copy after Heemskerck, according to Hülsen and Egger, II, p. 74, and II, 94v, which they attribute to 'Anonymous A'.

³⁹⁷ We are certain the Tempio del Divo Claudio was extant between 203 – 211, C.E. because it appears on the Forma Urbis.

³⁹⁸ Rodolfo Lanciani, *Destruction of Ancient Rome* (New York: Benjamin Blom, 1967), p. 208. Despite its appearance on the Forma Urbis, known in the 16th century, the Tempio del Divo Claudio does not appear on Bufalini's map.

³⁹⁹ Hülsen and Egger, I, p. 17. "Ein umgekehrt am Boden liegendes kolossales Compositakapitell, fast genau stimmend zu denen des Hauptstaales der Diocletiansthermen." Hülsen cites Desgodetz' *Édifices de Rome*, p. 313, pl. V. Though Hülsen describes the capital as "kolossales," we are ultimately unable to determine its scale given its close proximity to the picture plane, and a lack of evidence that would enable us determine its distance from the Colosseum.

decorative elements with the capital in the present sheet.⁴⁰⁰ Heemskerck could have just as easily created a fictive juxtaposition of Colosseum and capital by using a capital on the nearby Arch of Septimius Severus, an even closer match with the overturned one in this composition.

This drawing may have been meant for display, presentation, or conversion into a print. Even if this drawing is *naer het leven*, its worm's eye view, extreme perspective, and other pictorial manipulations suggest a function besides documenting the area near the Colosseum. Heemskerck has distorted the capital's proportions. Turning the sheet to view the capital right-side-up reveals its attenuation compared to its closest matches on the arch of Septimius Severus and cat. no. AF1; Heemskerck has stretched the area between the acanthus leaves and the horizontal bead pattern. He may have lengthened the capital's shaft because achieving a harmonious composition was more important than rendering the capital with precise fidelity to its actual proportions.⁴⁰¹

Also suggesting a presentation or display function is this sheet's finish, which is of the highest order. Hatching even suggests the possibility of print reproduction. Only this and a few other Roman sketches contain hatching that so closely resembles the system Heemskerck used in his preparatory drawings for

⁴⁰⁰ Hülsen and Egger, I, p. 8. Hülsen notes their similarity to the capital on the present sheet, but does not suggest that they are also from the Baths of Diocletian or that these are the source for the capital in this drawing.

⁴⁰¹ There is only one light pencil trace on the upper right edge of the capital. Since the drawing is so highly finished, and no lead traces remain, we do not know if Heemskerck corrected the capital's proportions during the course of executing this drawing.

prints. Heemskerck's hatches vary from the dark thick lines beneath and directly behind the capital to the adroitly applied thinner strokes describing the breaks in the furthest portions of the Colosseum's upper story. These slight lines show the subtle play of light and shadow in fractures of the Colosseum's walls.

Apparently, Heemskerck never returned to this drawing to mine its motifs for his subsequent designs for prints or paintings. While an overturned composite capital appears in the foreground of his 1572 print of the "Temple of Diana" from his *Octa Mirabili Mundi* series, that capital is viewed from above, much further from the picture plane, and much smaller in relation to its frame.⁴⁰² Of course, the Colosseum and *fantasie* inspired by it appear in numerous works from Heemskerck's post-Roman period. But in all of those examples the amphitheater appears from a higher angle of view and a vantage point further north than the one Heemskerck shows here.

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. CS2

Close view of Northwestern break in Colosseum's vaults

Berlin I 70r

131 x 205 mm.

Pen and Black ink and black chalk

Water Mark: none

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, I, p. 36.

The famous break in the northwestern quadrant of the Colosseum advances on the viewer in a veritable tidal wave of vaults and piers. There is a mound in front of the break in the vaults that is consistent with views of this part of the

⁴⁰² Hollstein, no. 517.

Colosseum in the Codex Escorialensis and published by Hieronymous Cock.⁴⁰³ In the left background, we see a barely visible series of arches, perhaps belonging to the Baths of Titus.

Heemskerck has rendered this view in black pen and charcoal. This is the only known drawing of a building in which Heemskerck used charcoal rather than hatching or ink wash to describe shadows. The ink lines are stark, often not blended with the charcoal, which is soft by contrast. The two media do not blend and in Heemskerck's rendering of contours and shadows on the second level, the media seem to fight each other, resulting in an almost abstract composition. Thus it is not surprising that this combination of media is unique among Heemskerck's sketches.

The angle of view nearly makes a cross section. We face the sheer side of each of the Colosseum's circumferential walls as it rounds the northwest corner to the building's ruined side. Due to Heemskerck's choice of vantage point, the amphitheater's exterior wall at left is in stark silhouette, with no charcoal. Heemskerck uses the chalk to show us the subtle lighting effects created by the play of light, coming in through the arches, on the soft curve of the vaults. Through careful observation, Heemskerck assimilated the formal language of the Colosseum's vaulting, piers, and broken arches in several post-Roman designs showing the ruined sides of Colosseum-like amphitheaters.⁴⁰⁴ This may be the drawing that was most important for his *Self-Portrait Before the Colosseum*.⁴⁰⁵

⁴⁰³ Egger, *Codex Escorialensis*, f. 24v and 28v; Riggs, cat. no. 6.

⁴⁰⁴ Hollstein, nos. 138, 455, 520, 588, and 590.

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. CS3

Northwest side of Colosseum in extreme foreground and Trajan's baths in left background

Berlin I 69v

125 x 199 mm

Pen and brown ink with some ink wash

Water Mark: none

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, I, p. 36.

Perhaps Heemskerck conceived this drawing as a pendant of sorts to the one on the *recto* of this sheet, which depicts the Arch of Constantine in the extreme left foreground and the Colosseum in the distant background.⁴⁰⁶ However, in technique, Heemskerck has not matched the virtuosity of that *tour de force*. On this side, he has composed the sweeping curve of the Colosseum's exterior to lead us from the right foreground to a left background showing the mottled ruins of the Baths of Trajan.⁴⁰⁷ At far right, in the deepest shadows, we see the Colosseum's interior through the fragmented arch of its ruined northwest side. Three figures wander from center to lower left, perhaps towards *via Sacra* and the Forum Romanum beyond. Anonymous A / Posthumus sketched a comparable view from beneath the Colosseum's ruined vaults, from a quadrant further east.⁴⁰⁸

⁴⁰⁵ See above, chapter three, Sections 3.1.1a, 3.2.1, and 3.2.2.

⁴⁰⁶ See cat. no. CS1 and my analysis of Heemskerck's use of foreground and background dynamics above, in Chapter Two, Section 2.2.4.

⁴⁰⁷ Egger, *Codex Escorialensis*, f. 28v, shows the same ruins.

⁴⁰⁸ Hülsen and Egger, II, 91r.

Pen and ink hatching is the sole means of describing shadows, except for a passage of light brown ink wash at right depicting the Colosseum's darkened interior. Throughout, hatches are primarily horizontal, at medium to wide intervals. Unlike the *recto*'s technical variety, most lines here are thick, whether they are hatches or outlines describing foreground or background objects. The most noticeable difference between the two sides appears in Heemskerck's treatment of the background buildings; the Baths of Trajan appear on this sheet with much less precision and focus than the *recto*'s Colosseum backdrop, which is rendered with extreme subtlety. Heemskerck's foreshortening of the graceful curve of the Colosseum's exterior is for the most part masterful. Each abacus atop its Doric capital turns gradually to face the picture plane and both cornices widen convincingly as they approach. Difficulties appear in his encounters with the arches. The molding of the third arch from right yawns open awkwardly and is too short in relation to its neighboring arch to the right. Telltale *pentimenti* appear in the molding of each arch.

Post-Rome, Heemskerck apparently found this drawing useful. Foreshortened circular structures near the frame appear frequently in his print designs. A near *verbatim* appropriation appears in the print "Feeding the Hungry," from the *Last Judgment and Six Works of Mercy* series.⁴⁰⁹ In "Mary, Mother of Christ," from the *Exemplary Women* series, a ruined, broken arch springing from a Colosseum-like pier "exits stage right" like this sheet's broken arch at extreme

⁴⁰⁹ Hollstein, no. 331.

right. Other designs appear to have benefited from general consultation with this drawing.⁴¹⁰ The piers of the bridge in the painting and the print of “Jonah Complaining Under the Gourd” may have benefited from consultation with this drawing as well.⁴¹¹

Maerten van Heemskerck
Cat. CS4
View through the Interior of the Colosseum.

Berlin I 3r
134 x 211 mm
Pen and brown ink with some ink wash
Water Mark: none

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, I, p. 3.

We gaze through two massive arched piers on the Colosseum’s second floor in the northwestern quadrant, close to its ruined side.⁴¹² In the foreground at far left, Heemskerck gives a glimpse of a barrel vault leading to the building’s exterior. Its foreshortened arch advances beyond the left frame. The arch left of center is parallel to the picture plane. The right arch, approaching the frame’s right edge at roughly forty-five degrees, frames a radiating barrel vault leading to the seating area. Beyond the foreground vaults, the Colosseum’s interior beckons. Two

⁴¹⁰ Ibid., nos. 181, 303, 402, and 448.

⁴¹¹ Ibid., no. 178; Grosshans, cat. no. 91.

⁴¹² We also gaze through two arches on the *verso* of this sheet, depicting the *cortile* of the Casa Maffei. Hülsen and Egger, I, p. 3, cite Lanciani, Plan Bl. 21 for their claim that we are looking at the Northwestern quadrant. The appearance of the upper wall in the backdrop confirms it.

miniscule figures at lower right walk on the proscenium. Vegetation grows over the left lintel, and throughout the seating area.

Heemskerck has chosen a challenging viewpoint for yet another of his many studies of the picturesque foreground and background interplay that pervades Roman topography.⁴¹³ This sheet bears closest comparison with AT1, which shows the forum through the Arch of Titus. Sketching from the precise spot where the ridge of the Colosseum's highest wall is visible just under the left arch, Heemskerck has rendered the myriad angles of the Colosseum's interior in mostly virtuosic fashion. In the gradually changing angles of the seating area, substructures curve elegantly into the distance from left to right. The only difficulty appears in the radiating vault at right, where the retaining arch does not recede in conformity with the foreshortening of the vault or the wall from which it springs.

Foreground hatching appears at wider intervals than in Heemskerck's more meticulously inked examples.⁴¹⁴ Apparently, the simple forms of the right barrel vault did not inspire Heemskerck; an awkward passage of straight diagonal hatches struggles to describe the vault's curved transition from wall to arch. Elsewhere, however, Heemskerck has worked to achieve nuance and finish. Lines become more delicate as they recede into the distance, but not at the expense of contrast. Even the heavy masonry at left contains thin hatches describing shadows. Likewise, heavy dark passages punctuate the backdrop's slight lines to show the

⁴¹³ For Heemskerck's foreground / background compositions, see above, chapter two, Section 2.2.4.

⁴¹⁴ Compare with cat. no. CS1 above.

stark contrast created by the tunnels leading to the seating area. A light ink wash on this sheet's upper right hand corner and bottom edge combines with hatching to approximate the more acute sense of texture resulting from greater proximity to the viewer.

In subject matter, this drawing, one attributed to Heemskerck in Darmstadt, and a views of the Colosseum's performance area by Hermannus Posthumus are ahead of their time; we know of no other known details of the Colosseum's interior until Hieronymus Cock's publications of the early 1550s, which obsess on the subject with no less than five interior views.⁴¹⁵ Although this drawing does not find a *verbatim* counterpart among Heemskerck's finished designs, many of Heemskerck's prints appear to have benefited from general reference to it, or others like it now lost. Heemskerck frequently designed prints with rusticated walls foreshortened towards print's edge.⁴¹⁶

⁴¹⁵ For the Darmstadt drawing, see below, section 4.4.1, "Appendix A"; Christian Hülsen, "Unbekannte Roemische Zeichnungen von Marten van Heemskerck," in: *Mededeelingen van Het Nederlandsch Historisch Instituut te Rome* ('s-Gravenhage: 1927), pp. 83 – 96; Hermannus Posthumus's drawings are in Hülsen and Egger, II, 59v, 72r, and 91r; for Hieronymus Cock's views of the Colosseum, see Riggs, cat. nos. D-3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9.

⁴¹⁶ Examples include Hollstein, nos. 9, 14, 15, 256, 332, 359, and 465.

**Copy after Maerten van Heemskerck (by Hermannus Posthumus?)
Cat. CS5
Close view looking east at Colosseum in perspective**

Berlin II 47r
209 x 318 mm
Pen and Brown Ink
Water Mark: none

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, II, p. 29; Thoenes, p. 143.

This drawing shows the artist in deep meditation on the ruined side of the Colosseum. The composition emphasizes the successive foreshortening of the bays as they radiate from the center of the circular Flavian amphitheater. The draftsman, probably Hermannus Posthumus, uses only hatching to articulate shadows.⁴¹⁷ A signature, “M. Heemskerck,” in different ink than that of the drawing, appears at lower right.⁴¹⁸

From a closer vantage point than Jan Gossaert’s famous view of 1508 (fig. 1.3, 1), or Dupérac’s of 1585, Heemskerck’s composition is closest with drawings by C.M. Pomodello and Hieronymus Cock.⁴¹⁹ Along with views of the Colosseum

⁴¹⁷ Hülsen and Egger, in their table in II, p. 74, indicates that both sides of this sheet (the other side is cat. no. PT5) are copies after Heemskerck by “Anonymous A,” later determined to be Hermannus Posthumus by Nicole Dacos in “L’anonyme A”; Hülsen and Egger, II, p. vii, say the technique here is comparable to that of sheets II, 52 and 53. The technique is very close to some examples traditionally attributed to Heemskerck executed with precision (Cf., cat. no. FN1) and high finish (Cf., cat. nos. AC1 and CS1). But the hatches on this sheet tend to be longer, straighter, and at closer intervals than Heemskerck’s. Only some sheets by Posthumus, who favors ink wash for shadows, contain a technique similar to this (e.g. II 82r). The lack of a precise match in technique may be the result of Posthumus’s hand copying a precisely rendered Heemskerck very closely.

⁴¹⁸ Hülsen and Egger, II p. vii, incorrectly say this signature is on the verso.

⁴¹⁹ Dupérac, plate 24; for the images of the Colosseum by Heemskerck, Posthumus, Pomodello and Cock, see above, n. 312.

in cat. no. AC2 and CS2, Heemskerck's original of this drawing may have served as a reference for the Colosseum as Heemskerck composed it in *Self-Portrait Before the Colosseum*.

Forum Boarium

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. FB1

“The Four-sided Arch” (Arco Argentari), and the Fontana di S. Giorgio in Velabro, and figures:

Berlin I 29r

126 x 203 mm.

Pen and brown ink

Water Mark: none.

Faint black chalk or charcoal traces on the arch, the letter's “B” and “A” to the left and right of the *campanile*, and smudges obscuring the details of the arch.

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, I, 17.

Heemskerck has again chosen his angle of view with exceptional deliberation in this unique view of this area of Rome, tucked away in the low lying area between the Tiber, the Palatine, the Capitoline, and the Circo Massimo, an ancient Roman cattle market known as the Forum Boarium, which artists drew less frequently than other nearby ancient sites.⁴²⁰ From west of the spring known to ancient Romans as the *velabrum*, we gaze slightly northwest along the Arco Argentari's north / south axis. Heemskerck thus shows the arch's south façade in perfect parallel to the picture plane, in elevation, with its vault in perspective, and its vanishing point at the center. We can therefore see the interior of all four of the arch's vaults. San Giorgio in Velabro, in the right background, is similarly

⁴²⁰ See cat. no. FR2a.

composed so that we are able to see the row of columns of its portico receding into space while its west end is parallel the picture plane. Other views of this area, from other vantage points, suggest that Heemskerck has portrayed a greater distance between the arch and the church than was really the case.⁴²¹

Technically speaking, this drawing bears some high finish characteristics, such as a second layer of darker ink in the foreground and a light touch in the middle ground. Ultimately, however, we classify it as a medium finish drawing because the heavy-handed application of the hatching in the foreground.

Rare for Heemskerck is the inclusion of genre content, the laying out of clothes to dry after having been laundered in the ancient *velabrum*'s waters. More figures populate this view than any other that Heemskerck drew of Rome.

This drawing apparently had no afterlife in Heemskerck's post-Roman designs.

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. FB2

View looking south from within Forum Boarium

Berlin II 45r

209 x 318 mm.

Pen and brown ink

Water Mark: none

Brown ink mark in center of sheet.

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, II, p. 29.

⁴²¹ Cf. Dupérac, *Vestigii*, fs. 9v and 12v and Dosio, Florence, Uffizi, UA 2502 and 2503.

In a stunning, high finish, Heemskerck portrays the Forum Boarium with yet another composition emphasizing dramatic recession from foreground to background. In the left foreground, the ancient portico attached to San Giorgio in Velabro occupies most of Heemskerck's attention. The Palatine's western side provides a graceful sloping backdrop, which offsets and complements the strict angularity of the foreground portico.⁴²² The Baths of Caracalla and further on, the Septizonium, appear in minimal outline in the far right background. As in so many examples, Heemskerck has sprinkled figures sparingly through his composition, this time, at the apex of an arched form in the distant ruins of the Palatine. The church of St. Anastasia should appear in the middle ground from this vantage point, but it does not.⁴²³

Heemskerck shows the ancient portico in a mostly single layer of precisely applied ink hatches. Only the shadows beneath the portico and some layers of the cornice receive a second layer of hatches. The technique is most comparable to that of the more famous drawing of the Forum Nervae (cat. no. FN1), which is also on a large sheet like this one. The hatching at the base acts as a series of orthogonal lines. He has gone to the trouble to vary the direction of the hatching on the inside of the arch to show us the different pilasters, despite their dramatic foreshortening. The vanishing point leads directly to the ruins on the west side of the Palatine,

⁴²² For the Palatine's Western Slope, see cat. no. PT4.

⁴²³ Hülsen and Egger, II, p. 29, say that the portico blocks our view of the church, but given the church's size, this seems unlikely. Whether by choice of vantage point, or simply by choosing not to draw it even though he saw it, this is another example of Heemskerck's habit of favoring the ancient Roman antiquities in his field of vision.

which we view through the portico. We see these same ruins from a vantage point that is further south and facing east in cat. no. PT4.

No post-Roman designs are directly relatable to the motifs in this drawing. Several prints, however, contain porticoes designed like the one on the front of San Giorgio in Velabro, seen here in foreshortening, to the left of the ancient portico in the foreground.⁴²⁴

Forum Nervae

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. FN1

View looking north in Foro Nervae with Temple of Minerva and Albani Puteal

Berlin II 37r

210 x 287 mm

Pen and brown ink

Water Mark: Briquet no. 50

Black chalk underdrawing above the *colonnacce* at right

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, II, pp. 26 – 27; Filippi, p. 98.

On a large sheet, Heemskerck has executed one of his most virtuosic performances of an ancient site, which ranks among those most frequently drawn by sixteenth-century artists.⁴²⁵ All other examples are from nearly the same vantage point as Heemskerck's, each with slight adjustments.

⁴²⁴ E.g., Hollstein, nos. 347, 398, and 505.

⁴²⁵ Egger, *Codex Escorialensis*, f. 57v, shows the only known example that is securely dated as earlier than Heemskerck's and a contemporary double-sheet view by Hermannus Posthumus in Hülsen and Egger, II, 82v (left) and 84r (right); a sheet previously attributed to Heemskerck, but de-attributed in this dissertation (see below, section 4.4.2, Appendix B), appears in Hülsen and Egger, II, 50r; The backdrop of Jan van Hemessen's *Unmerciful Servant*, c. 1550, University of Michigan Museum of Art, Inv. no. 1959/1.108, contains a view of ruins closely

Heemskerck shows us the facade of the temple parallel to the picture plane while the elaborate cornice construction to the right is in three quarters view. Figures appear in the middle ground beneath the rusticated arch of the bridge. The bridge leads us from the temple and the tower at the center of the composition to the *colonnacce* at right, which in turn leads to the heavily foregrounded Albani Puteal. The figures correspond to the sculpted ones (both free standing and in relief) in their scale and poses. An architectural fragment in the foreground contains an inscription, the first line of which reads “P E D I,” the second of which reads “M H....k.” This may or may not be a signature.

Technically speaking, this is a *tour de force* performance in a single layer of ink. Only the darkest shadows of the Temple of Minerva and its surrounding natural topography have received a second pass.

Heemskerck’s uses of this drawing are most conspicuous. It thus appears to be among the most useful in Heemskerck’s post-Roman oeuvre. The *colonnacce* and bridge motif at right appear in several prints.⁴²⁶ Variations on the Temple of

based on the Forum Nervae from the vantage point in this drawing; Hieronymous Cock published a print of the Forum Nervae closely related to this drawing in 1551. See Riggs, cat. no. 22; Mathijs Bril probably copied Cock’s print in the 1580s for a drawing now in Paris, Louvre, Cabinet des Dessins, inv. no. 20.958; the Dosio circle produced two drawings of the Forum ca. mid-century (Florence, Uffizi, UA 2583 and a copy on UA 2514); around this time, so did Cornelis Cort (Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. no. 1992.7); in the 1580s, the Forum Nervae also appeared in Dupérac, *Disegni*, ff. 17v and 18r.

⁴²⁶ E.g., Hollstein, 77, 159, 239, 253, and 304, and 591; Thoenes, p. 138, draws a comparison between the ruins in *Balaam and the Angel*, Hollstein no. 77, and Bramante’s Genazzo ninfeo, but this drawing is a closer match to that print.

Minerva appears in Heemskerck's "Drunkenness of Noah" print, from his *Clades Judaeae Gentis* series.⁴²⁷

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. FR1

Forum Romanum from Southwest Foot of the Capitoline Hill

Berlin Kupferstichkabinett no. 6696

216 x 554 mm.

Pen and brown ink with brown ink wash.

Water Mark: two crossed arrows (similar to Briquet 6281)

Signature "M. Heemskerck 1535" foreshortened in central foreground, on the wall of Ss. Sergio e Bacco.

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, II, pp. 54 – 55; *Fiamminghi*, cat. no. 116.

This large sheet presents a stunning view of the forum from a vantage point, at the north end. We look south and view the Forum in the opposite direction from view on two sketchbook sheets (cat. no. FR3). Perhaps Heemskerck sketched from within the Tabularium or up the south slope of foot of the Capitoline. Regardless, his choice of vantage point facilitates a display of several monuments in the forum and beyond. Unlike that drawing, this one shows non-antique topographical features such as the medieval encasement on the Arch of Septimius Severus and the church of Ss. Sergio e Bacco.

In technique, this sheet resembles Heemskerck's masterful ink wash rendering of St. Peter's from the north (cat. no. SP8). A drawing of such high

⁴²⁷ Hollstein, no. 239.

finish on such a large sheet must have had a display purpose. Heemskerck's travel companion in Rome, Hermannus Posthumus, copied this drawing closely.⁴²⁸

⁴²⁸ Hülsen and Egger, II 79v and 80r.

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. FR2a

Temple of Castor, Temple of Divine Augustus, and San Teodoro

Berlin II 38r

210 x 287 mm

Pen and brown ink wash

Water Mark: Anchor (Briquet no. 749) top third only, in lower right corner

Red chalk marks across bottom edge

Literature: Egger, I, fig. 111; Hülsen and Egger, II, p. 27.

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. FR2b

Temple of Divine Augustus and San Teodoro

Berlin II 38v

210 x 287 mm.

Pen and brown ink

Red Chalk marks throughout upper margins and lower right hand corner

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, II p. 27.

Sheet 38 from Berlin's Album II contains two drawings of the buildings on the west side of the forum Romanum, pendants sketched from opposite vantage points.

On the *recto* (cat. no. FR2a), we gaze southwest from a spot approaching the north foot of the Palatine, less than fifty feet north of the location where Heemskerck drew FR4 below. Three buildings in the forum move us from foreground left to the distant Aventine in background right. The top of each building leads to the next in a strong diagonal from upper left to lower right. At far left are the three remaining columns and the cornice of the Temple of Castor, which recede towards the brick structure of the Temple of Divine Augustus in the central middle ground. Peeking out from behind Augustus' Temple is the circular church of San Teodoro. Pairs of figures move us towards the background. Two figures

before the Temple of Augustus walk towards two others crossing a bridge spanning the spring known to ancient Romans as the *Lacus Curtius*. These famously persistent waters flow into the Forum Boarium's fountain called the *Acqua Juturna* or the *Velabrum*.⁴²⁹ In the middle ground, a figure near the Forum Boarium's northern ridge appears to gesture in the direction of two others who walk up the Aventine where Santa Sabina seems to sit precariously. The Savelli tower is conspicuously absent.⁴³⁰

For the *verso* side drawing, Heemskerck stood approximately two hundred yards further west and looked east by southeast. The composition recedes from right foreground to left background. Beyond San Teodoro and Augustus' Temple, we see the Temple of Castor, and in the distance, the Torre dei Conti.

Hülßen and Egger deem both worthy of inclusion among Album II's larger sheets displaying Heemskerck's "completely matured technique."⁴³¹ The *recto* drawing contains a slight reduction in stroke width from foreground to background. It is not without its flaws. The Temple of Castor's nearest column contains crooked fluting.⁴³² Many of its vertical hatches cross the ground line. Double lines reveal an

⁴²⁹ The latter name is also given to the nearby church of San Giorgio. For drawings of the area near the *Acqua Juturna*, see catalogue nos. FB1 and FB2.

⁴³⁰ The Savelli tower appears in cat. no. PA2.

⁴³¹ Hülßen and Egger, II, p. IV say that the drawings on II, 22v, 37r, 38r, and 38v are in "seine Technik vollständig ausgereift."

⁴³² Heemskerck has uncharacteristically drawn all of the fluting on the Temple of Castor's nearest column. The second and third columns receive the more typical treatment, in which Heemskerck shows only the end of the fluting near the top of the column's shaft (see I 69r and II 21v for example).

unsure handling of the furthest column's tapering. However, Heemskerck appears to have taken an interest in the silhouette of this cornice, which he has rendered with a sure precision. The *verso* displays significantly less contrast and width of stroke, and thus imparts less depth. San Teodoro and the Torre dei Conti have nearly equal value. Ruined structures behind San Teodoro receive only a summary treatment despite their proximity to the picture plane. The *verso* drawing, however, contains no *pentimenti*.

The central middle ground of the *Ruth and Boaz* print contains a circular temple derived from San Teodoro.⁴³³ In the left backdrop of Heemskerck's print design for *The Burial of St. Stephen* contains a circular temple more closely resembling the *verso* side drawing of San Teodoro.⁴³⁴ The *verso* side's Temple of Divine Augustus is echoed in the backdrop *fantasia* of the *Landscape with the Parable of the Good Samaritan* print.⁴³⁵

⁴³³ Hollstein, no. 91.

⁴³⁴ *Ibid.*, no. 411.

⁴³⁵ *Ibid.*, no. 354.

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. FR3

Forum Romanum looking north from the Northern foot of the Palatine

Left Sheet: Berlin I 6r

133 x 209 mm.

Pen and brown ink with some brown ink wash

Water Mark: none

Right Sheet: Berlin I 9r

135 x 209 mm.

Pen and brown ink

Water Mark: none

Red chalk traces on lower and upper right edges

Literature: Michaelis, p. 131; Hülsen and Egger, pp. 5 - 6; Winner, 1967, cat. No. 15; Filippi, p. 98.

This polished drawing on two sheets of Heemskerck's sketchbook is among his most famous. From a vantage point at the northern foot of the Palatine, some of the forum's buildings face the picture plane while others sit at angles revealing rhythmic displays of receding columns.

Heemskerck's chosen viewpoint enables him to show seventeen monuments, fourteen of which appear on other sheets in closer views. Beginning at left are the remaining columns and cornices of the Temples of Castor, Saturn, and Vespasian. Ss. Sergio e Bacco, the Column of Phocas, and the Arch of Septimius Severus occupy the central middle ground. Directly behind and above the Temple of Vespasian are the Tabularium and the Palazzo Senatori, while Santa Maria in Aracoeli and the Capitoline Obelisk sit directly above the Severan arch.⁴³⁶

Unidentified medieval buildings are at the extreme right of the left sheet. The right sheet begins with the south wall of the church of S. Adriano, built from the Roman

⁴³⁶ Heemskerck depicts the Capitoline Obelisk in Berlin I, 11r, II 50v, and II72r. The obelisk appears again at extreme right with Santa Maria in Aracoeli, in, II, 16r.

Curia. To its right, in the distance, we see the columns of Marcus Aurelius and Trajan. In the middle ground, Heemskerck shows the medieval housing that was then on the site of the Basilica Amelia. Moving right, the Temple of Faustina and the Divus Romulus gradually advance to the foreground.⁴³⁷ In the right background, the ruined pediment of the Templum Serapidis on the Quirinal pierces the sky above the cornice of the Temple of Faustina. Further right, the Forum Nervae's Temple of Minerva is nestled behind the Temple of Faustina and the Divus Romulus. In the most distant right background, the Trofei di Mario sits high atop its Quirinal perch. Quickly rendered figures can be seen scattered throughout the forum. In the area before the Arch of Septimius Severus, two figures swing pickaxes while two others appear to be lugging something heavy, perhaps a block of marble.

We notice several departures from the forum as it appeared in the early 1530s.⁴³⁸ Heemskerck did not draw the medieval encasement on the Arch of Septimius Severus. In place of the *campanile* of Ss. Sergio e Bacco is a monolithic object with no windows or roof. San Lorenzo in Miranda has vanished from within the columns of the Temple of Faustina. Heemskerck has also "moved" the column of Marcus Aurelius to the east so that it is visible between the Curia and the

⁴³⁷ Hieronymus Cock published a print showing this part of the Forum, with the Basilica of Maxentius and Constantine in the right backdrop. The print is not a precise match to Heemskerck's drawing, but may have provided a reference. See Riggs, cat. no. 16.

⁴³⁸ Hülsen and Egger, I, p. 5, was the first to observe this; "Um diese Durchblicke zu ermöglichen, hat sich Heemskerck mancherlei Abweichungen von der Wirklichkeit gestattet (die Zeichnung II, 12 ist treuer), z. B. ist die in den Faustinatempel hineingebaute Kirche gänzlich ignoriert, die Häuser jenseits S. Adriano weggelassen, die Marcussäule etwas nach rechts gerückt u.a."

Column of Trajan. Had he not taken this slight liberty, the column would have remained hidden behind the Capitoline because it is actually much further west than its location in this drawing. The façade of Santa Maria in Aracoeli does not appear, though it could have been seen from this angle, projecting above the church's nave.

It has been suggested that Heemskerck shows the forum in a state of preparation for Charles V's Joyous Entry into Rome on April 5, 1536.⁴³⁹ While Heemskerck was almost certainly in Rome as late as 1536, his pictorial alterations to the forum's topography make this drawing an unreliable point of reference for empirical speculation.⁴⁴⁰ However, Heemskerck and Paul III both removed post-antique buildings from the forum. Their respective approaches are in the same spirit as Charles' initial request for a processional route through the forum so he could see "la meraviglia della antichitate."⁴⁴¹ Heemskerck may have also revised the forum in anticipation of a Netherlandish audience more interested in images displaying Roman antiquities than medieval buildings. His choice of a vantage point presenting as many ancient Roman buildings as possible suggests as much.

This sheet offers an exemplary version of Heemskerck's pure pen and brown ink technique. Of all of Heemskerck's extant drawings, it is closest in

⁴³⁹ Michaelis, "Skizzenbucher," VI, p. 131; also suggested by Veldman, *Dutch Humanism*, p. 12.

⁴⁴⁰ For the length of Heemskerck's stay in Rome, see above, nn. 101 and 102.

⁴⁴¹ Francesco Cancellieri, *Storia de' Sollenni Possessi de' Sommi Pontefici: detti anticamente processi or processioni dopo la loro coronazione dalla basilica vaticana alla lateranense* (Rome: 1802), pp. 94 – 103, 502; Ceen, pp. 57 – 65.

technique to Jan van Scorel's drawing of Bethlehem.⁴⁴² Thicker lines portray major antique monuments in the foreground and middle ground. Thinner more delicate strokes show the mostly medieval background topography. Neat, rhythmic, uniformly spaced horizontal hatches describe nearly all shadows. Only the shadows of the tree in the left foreground contain a slight ink wash. The orderliness of Heemskerck's hatches does not yield precise detail upon close inspection. Even the capitals of the Temple of Castor appear in shorthand. In the *mélange* of vegetation and planar wall surfaces on the hill between the Curia and Santa Maria in Aracoeli, Heemskerck's hatches achieve near abstraction.

Though none of this drawing's motifs reappear *verbatim* in Heemskerck's later designs, it shares fundamental aspects with them. This angle of view leaves the central foreground clear, as in countless print designs in which architecture *all'antica* provides a distant backdrop for foreground figures on hilltops.⁴⁴³ In many print designs, Heemskerck shows obelisks and freestanding columns in the distance just as they appear in the present sheet.⁴⁴⁴ The group of columns and cornices in the temples at far left may have served as a point of reference for numerous inventions in later print designs as well.⁴⁴⁵ *Landscape with the Abduction of Helen* features many of these motifs, including a triumphal arch in the foreground at nearly the same angle as the Arch of Septimius Severus appears in this drawing. A near

⁴⁴² British Museum, inv. no. 1928.3.10.100. For a discussion of Scorel and Heemskerck, see above, chapter one, sections 1.1 and 1.3.

⁴⁴³ Hollstein, no. 177, 178.

⁴⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, nos. 14, 177, 178, 331, 332, 338, 484.

⁴⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, no. 92.

replica of the Severan arch appears in Heemskerck's design for "The Triumph of Pride," in opposite form.⁴⁴⁶ Heemskerck's use of two horizontal sheets together also anticipates the prints he composed in the late 1540s and early 1550s, which are abundant with inventive sketchbook quotations.⁴⁴⁷ In those prints, as in this composition, the left sheet is a more abundant design that could stand alone if necessary.

Temple of Minerva Medica

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. MM1

Landscape with the Nymphaeum known as the Temple of Minerva Medica.

Berlin II 49v

202 x 275 mm.

Pen and brown ink

Water Mark: none

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, II, p. 30.

Heemskerck shows the nymphaeum from the open side, and with a view through the central arch, looking towards the same line of aqueducts that he draws in his view of the Porta Maggiore (cat. no. PM1). In the far distance, to the right, one sees the silhouette of Mt. Testaccio. Heemskerck's signature shorthand vegetation is on display here even as it appears in the most refined drawings (e.g. cat. no. FR3). A later drawing of the same vista from a further vantage point by Jakob Franckaert the Elder suggests that this one by Heemskerck contains revisions

⁴⁴⁶ Ibid., no. 484.

⁴⁴⁷ Ibid., nos. 77 and 91.

of the landscape, possible exclusions of vernacular domestic architecture and additions of ruins.⁴⁴⁸

The technique here, is again, much less aggressive in its pursuit of precision but gives the appearance of detail. Heemskerck draws objects quickly here, while still maintaining convincing shape, proportion, shadows the placement of objects in spatial relation to one another.

Circular temples with openings onto interiors appear in some Heemskerck prints, but none match this drawing precisely.⁴⁴⁹ Heemskerck's painting *Venus and Cupid* (1545) contains a ruined structure that appears at least partially indebted to this drawing.⁴⁵⁰

⁴⁴⁸ Jacob Franckaert the Elder, *The so-called Temple of Minerva Medica* (ca. 1590) Biblioteca Vaticana, coll. Ashby.

⁴⁴⁹ Hollstein, nos. 147, 225, 515.

⁴⁵⁰ For Heemskerck's *Venus and Cupid*, see above, n. 269.

Broad-View Panoramas

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. PA1

Panorama looking north from Aventine

Left Sheet

Berlin I 18r

123 x 204 mm.

Pen and brown ink

Water Mark: none

Right Sheet

Berlin I 55r

135 x 208 mm.

Pen and brown ink

Water Mark: none

Red chalk traces above the Aventine, as well as a faint black chalk letter 'A'.

Literature: Michaelis, I, pp. 149, 154; Hülsen and Egger, I, pp. 10 – 11.

We gaze north, from a high point on the Aventine hill.⁴⁵¹ The left sheet is more carefully drawn than the right, contains more identifiable monuments, and could function as an independent drawing. In the left foreground is the Ripa Grande. Moving up the Tiber, we see the Ponte Rotto. Beyond, the Ponte Fabricio spans the Tiber in the foreground. The Pantheon dominates the horizon line in the center of this sheet. To its left are the dome and *campanile* of Sant Agostino. At extreme left is the summit of the Janiculum. Beyond, the *campanile* of Old St.

⁴⁵¹ Hülsen and Egger, I p. 10. Hülsen hypothesizes that Heemskerck drew this from the *campanile* of Santa Sabina, but we may be further west than this. For a drawing from comparable vantage point, see Egger, *Codex Escorialensis*, f. 56v. Giuliano da Sangallo's *View of the Ponte Quattro Capi from north of the Ponte Fabricio* (ca. 1480, Biblioteca Vaticana, Codice Barberini, 4424, f. 34v, top half) shows this same section of the Tiber from a lower vantage point. Another drawing in Egger, *Codex Escorialensis*, f. 27v, is from the same vantage point as Sangallo's. An anonymous artist produced a comparable view (ca. 1570, Stuttgart, Staatsgalerie, inv. No. 5807).

Peter's plays peek-a-boo. To the Pantheon's right is the Column of Marcus Aurelius.⁴⁵²

The treacherous southwestern side of the Capitoline with the Tarpean Rock forms a bare mound that is split between both sheets, sitting in the central middle ground of the two-sheet composition. In the middle ground we see the Septizonium and to its right, the substructures of the Paetina. To the left and behind the Palatine we see several of the monuments on the east side of the Forum Romanum and the Torre dei Conti. The Basilica of Maxentius stands between them.

Even a panoramic view like this shows Heemskerck's keen attention to architecture's situation within its landscape. Though he does not portray any buildings with exceptional sharpness, he does maintain his usual attention to the proportions of buildings and their spatial relationships to one another.

Of all of the extant panoramas in Heemskerck sketched in Rome, this may have been the one that was of most use to him in composing *Landscape with the Abduction of Helen*. Also composed from a bird's eye view, the large canvas' imaginary Rome-derived city centers on a snaking river spanned by a bridge very much like the Ponte Fabricio. The panoramic print of *Ruth and Boaz* appears to be indebted to this sketch for the same reasons.⁴⁵³ The view of the Tiber in this drawing also appears to have influenced the disposition of the river that wends its

⁴⁵² Between them is a tower that Hülsen and Egger tentatively identify as the medieval tower of the Porta del Popolo. Consultation with the Nolli map reveals that it would be visible to Heemskerck in this location, between the Pantheon and the column.

⁴⁵³ Hollstein, no. 91.

way through the panoramic backdrop of the 1566 design for “Jonah Complaining Under the Gourd.”⁴⁵⁴

Maerten van Heemskerck
Cat. PA2
Panorama Looking East from Janiculum

Left Sheet: Berlin I 72v
132 x 209 mm.
Pen and brown ink
Water Mark: none

Right Sheet: Berlin I 18v
134 x 209 mm.
Pen and brown ink
Water Mark: none

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, I, pp. 40 – 41.

Heemskerck must have taken in this view, on two sheets of his sketchbook, from the Porta San Pancrazio, the highest point on the Janiculum Hill. From there, he would have been able to see the remains of the Aurelian wall, just as they appear on this sheet, foreshortened at lower left.

In the far left distance, we recognize the Colosseum, summarized with a few deft, quick strokes. Various monuments in the area of the Forum Romanum and the Palatine are also identifiable; exploration of the middle ground before the Colosseum reveals the little circular church of San Teodoro. The Palace of Septimius Severus sits atop the Palatine, and next to it is the Septizonium. Tucked behind the Palatine is the Celian Hill, with San Stefano Rotondo barely visible in the distance. At the center of the composition is the Aventine Hill, its northern side

⁴⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, no. 182.

largely in shadow. Aside from the tower of the Savelli stronghold, which appears at the Aventine's apex, no buildings appear clearly enough for positive identification.⁴⁵⁵ To the right of the Aventine are the Pyramid of Cestius and Monte Testaccio. The pediment of San Francesco a Ripa is visible in the foreground.⁴⁵⁶ The city's south walls snake from right foreground all the way past the Aventine and beyond the Celian in the distance. Heemskerck has sketched the mountains east of the Eternal City in lines so thin they nearly evaporate.

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. PA3

Panorama Looking East from Old St. Peter's *Campanile* (with Capital and Lion's head)

Berlin I 58v

123 x 193 mm.

Pen and Brown Ink

Water Mark: none

Red chalk traces in the shape of torso fragments.

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, I, p. 32; Thoenes, 146.

Sketching from the *campanile* of Old St. Peter's, Heemskerck composed using the Via Alessandrina, which cut west through Borgo, as his central

⁴⁵⁵ Hülsen and Egger, I, p. 40. Hülsen says that Santa Sabina is visible next to the Savelli stronghold, but its distinctive *campanile* is not clear. Lines do not match seamlessly where the two sheets would meet. However, my examination of Album I in the summer of 2005 revealed no evidence of cutting, and these pages are of average size for the sketchbook.

⁴⁵⁶ Ibid., p. 40. The foreground also presents identification problems, but Hülsen sees the little church of S. Omobuono "between the Palatine and the River."

orthogonal.⁴⁵⁷ Borgo and the old city serve as a backdrop for an almost completely empty middle ground and a heavily foregrounded composite capital and lion's head.⁴⁵⁸ Major topographical elements appear throughout this view. At left we see the wall that provided Clement's escape to the Castel Sant 'Angelo. The Column of Marcus Aurelius, Sant Agostino's *campanile*, the Pantheon, and the Column of Trajan lead us to the far right. The Ponte Sant 'Angelo crosses the Tiber at center. As Egger points out, we see the unmistakable silhouette of the recently installed statue of St. Peter on the East bank of the Tiber.⁴⁵⁹ The Ospedale di Santo Spirito is in the right foreground.

Maerten van Heemskerck
Cat. PA4
Panorama looking south from Monte Mario

Berlin I 16r
126 x 207 mm.
Pen and Brown Ink
Water Mark: none
Slight red chalk traces above horizon line above *campanile* on far left.

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, I, p. 10.

⁴⁵⁷ Hülsen and Egger think Heemskerck drew this view from the “highest point on the Vatican loggia” (“Panorama vom obersten Geschosse der vatikanischen Loggien”). However, the Vatican loggia was three stories high and the angle of view suggests a much higher point. The *campanile* of Old St. Peter's, which appears in other drawings around the site (e. g. cat. no. SP1), is the likelier vantage point.

⁴⁵⁸ Hülsen and Egger, I, p. 32. Egger suggests that the capital is from the building of the new St. Peter's.

⁴⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, I, pp. IX, 32.

Heemskerck probably stood about halfway up the southern slope of the Monte Mario, near the villa Madama and gazed south. The Codex Escorialensis contains a view from a comparable vantage point on two sheets.⁴⁶⁰ Heemskerck's panorama brings together locations as distant from one another as the Column of Marcus Aurelius (second vertical on the left) and the Janiculum Hill (far right). From left, the major monuments we can identify are the *campanile* of Sant Agostino, the Column of Marcus Aurelius, the Mausoleum of Augustus, and the tower of the Palazzo Senatori.⁴⁶¹ The Castel Sant 'Angelo anchors the composition at center. We expect to see San Giovanni dei Fiorentini to the Castel's immediate right, but it was not yet finished.⁴⁶² A series of thick jagged vertical strokes in the horizon line may describe construction of the Florentine church's nave. Further right, in shadow, is the *campanile* of San Pietro in Montorio. Closer to the picture plane are the Ospedale di Santo Spirito and the Vatican Hill.

⁴⁶⁰ Egger, *Codex Escorialensis*, ff. 7v and 8r. comprise an unfinished panorama.

⁴⁶¹ Hülsen and Egger, I, p. 10.

⁴⁶² Julia Viciose, "La Basilica di San Giovanni dei Fiorentini a Roma: individuazione delle vicende progettuali," *Bollettino d'arte* (vol. 77, no. 72, March - April, 1992), pp. 73 – 114.

Maerten van Heemskerck
Cat. PA5
Unidentified Panoramic View

Berlin II 40v

195 x 266 mm.

Pen and Brown ink

Water Mark: Crossed Arrows (bottom half of Briquet no. 6292)

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, II, p. 28.

Heemskerck reoriented this sheet, making the top of the *recto* the bottom of this side. Perhaps he did not want the heavy marks on the *recto* side to interfere. We might be looking at a sketch of the view south beyond the Porta Maggior, but it is ultimately difficult to say. It is as if the signature, formulaic way Heemskerck rendered nature in so many other drawings has overtaken an entire large sheet.⁴⁶³ This hasty landscape is Heemskerck's only known attempt at a nature landscape, and evinces his relative lack of interest in vistas containing only natural topography compared to artists whom van Mander praised for their interest in landscape, such as Pieter Brueghel or Herri Met de Bles.⁴⁶⁴

⁴⁶³ Cf. the natural topography in cat. nos. CS3 or TS1.

⁴⁶⁴ Melion, p. 98.

Pyramid of Cestius

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. PC1

Top: Looking East at Pyramid of Cestius with Aurelian Walls

Bottom: Panorama looking west from Aventine with Pyramid of Cestius in left foreground, Aurelian (?) walls in background, and Mt. Testaccio to the right.

Berlin II 54v

150 x 300 mm.

Pen and Brown Ink

Water Mark: none

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, I, p. 34.

In two incomplete drawings in low finish, Heemskerck shows us the east and west sides of the Pyramid of Cestius on the same sheet.⁴⁶⁵ In the top composition, Heemskerck has summarized the pyramid's inscription rather than showing it completely: top line, "C C E S I E I V M I O D R ..." and bottom line, "O T R M V N V M."⁴⁶⁶ A figure stands at the North base of the pyramid, which is in shadow. In the bottom drawing, Heemskerck foregrounds the pyramid against the heavily foreshortened receding wall. The tiniest arches in the distance continue to describe the wall convincingly, while two figures stand in stark silhouette on a line meant to represent Mount Testaccio. This is the only view Heemskerck drew of the Pyramid of Cestius from close range, comparable to the view in the *Codex Escorialensis*.⁴⁶⁷ The pyramid appears in Heemskerck's panorama from the

⁴⁶⁵ The only other known sheet on which Heemskerck shows two views of the same landscape is cat. no. PP1.

⁴⁶⁶ The inscription on the pyramid says: "C. CESTIVS. L. F. POB. EPVLO. PR. TR. PL. / VII. VIR. EPLVLONVM.

⁴⁶⁷ Egger, *Codex Escorialensis*, f. 45v.

Janiculum (cat. no. PA2). Pyramids appear in several of Heemskerck's post-Roman designs.⁴⁶⁸

Ponte Fabricus

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. PF1

Ponte Fabricus (and Ponte Rotto (or Pons Aemilius?)) with so-called Temple of Vesta) / Towered structure with steps.

Berlin I 42v

127 x 204 mm.

Pen and brown ink

Water Mark: none

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, I, p. 23.

Porta Maggiore

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. no. PM1

View looking north with Porta Maggiore with Aurelian wall

Berlin II 40r

Pen and Brown ink

Water Mark: Crossed Arrows (bottom half of Briquet no. 6292)

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, II, p. 27 - 28.

Again Heemskerck has chosen a picturesque angle of view, rather than drawing a structure with its façade parallel to the picture plane. The Porta Maggiore stands to the right, foreshortened, leading us to a backdrop of the

⁴⁶⁸ Hollstein, nos. 91, 92, 177, 231, 305, 510. No 513, "Piramides Aegypti" from the *Octa Mirabili Mundis* series of prints, does not appear to have been derived from Heemskerck's observation of the Pyramid of Cestius, but his drawings of Obelisks.

Aurelian wall with what might be a ruined circular building attached.⁴⁶⁹ The inside of the Aurelian wall is to the left in the distance, and closer towards the Porta, is an aqueduct, which is part of the wall.

Heemskerck uses a pure pen and ink technique but brings this drawing to a low finish. Although it is much less exacting in its rendering of both line and shadow, with hatching appear further apart and with wider strokes, Heemskerck maintains proportional and perspectival relationships, and gives us the sensation we are see more detail than is actually present.

Ruins like the one in the background of this drawing appear in the upper left background of *Landscape with the Abduction of Helen* and several of Heemskerck's post-Roman designs.⁴⁷⁰

Pantheon

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. PN1

Close view looking east at Pantheon Portico

Berlin II 39r.

205 x 239 mm

Water Mark: "Agnus Dei" (Briquet no. 50)

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, II, p. 27; Veldman, 1987, p. 374 - 379; Filippi, p. 99.

Heemskerck has drawn the Pantheon's portico from the outside, while looking in the same direction. This enables a view of the portico's ruined west

⁴⁶⁹ The Porta Maggior and the Porta del Popolo (cat. no. PP1) are the only Roman gates to be found among Heemskerck's remaining drawings.

⁴⁷⁰ See also Heemskerck's, *Venus and Cupid*, above, n. 269; Hollstein, nos. 251, 304, 340, and 353.

cornice, an aspect of this view, which has occupied more of Heemskerck's attention than the capitals. However, Heemskerck's biggest concern here is his vantage point, which he has selected to show us as many columns in full view as possible. The pilasters to the right of the composition show more fluting than in other examples (e.g. cat. no. AC1), but less than others (e.g. FR2a) and do not extend the length of the pilaster. Figures occupying the foreground indicate scale. The infill between the portico's west columns (nearest the picture plane) is higher than the figures standing before it. Between the two left columns is a structure with a window.

Heemskerck's technique here is in a medium finish. Passages to the right are incomplete as are some passages in the cornice. He has not applied the multiple layers of hatching used to show columns in half light that we find in drawings of high finish (e.g. cat. no. SC2a). But he has applied multiple layers of ink to the shadows in the ceiling. The result is a high contrast, which is natural given the vantage point.

This drawing may have served as a point of reference for Heemskerck's post-Roman designs showing columnated interiors and porticoes.⁴⁷¹ The receding pilasters at right in this drawing may have served as a reference for the preparatory sketch of Heemskerck's print of Mary Magdalen, in his *Exemplary Women* series of prints (1560).⁴⁷²

⁴⁷¹ Hollstein, nos. 251, 399, 403, 404, and 411.

⁴⁷² *Ibid.*, no. 252.

Porticus Octaviae

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. PO1

Sculpture of a Foot with view looking northeast at Porticus Octaviae and figures in left background

Berlin I 32r

134 x 211 mm.

Pen and brown ink

Water mark: none

A faint black chalk mark appears just below the Porticus' cornice.

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, v. I p. 19. Filippi, pp. 110 – 111.

The southern half of the Porticus Octaviae is in perspective in the left background.⁴⁷³ Within, Heemskerck's customary summarily rendered figures mingle around a canopied market table. The extreme right central foreground shows an unidentifiable sculptural fragment of a foot in a sandal.⁴⁷⁴ This drawing may be unfinished. There is no backdrop other than the Porticus, and the entire right quarter of this sheet is blank.

The closest known match for the foot is the Pie di Marmo. But Hülsen rejects this identification because this sheet shows a right foot, and the Pie di Marmo is a left foot. So this might be a drawing of the Pie di Marmo in reverse. Hülsen points out that 'Anonymous A' provides a closer match in Berlin's Album

⁴⁷³ This is the Octavian structure's only appearance among Heemskerck's Roman sketches. The Codex Escorialensis also contains a partial view of the right side of the pediment of the Porticus Octaviae. See Egger, *Codex Escorialensis*, f. 38r and p. 107.

⁴⁷⁴ Hülsen and Egger, I, p. 19, assume that the scale of the foregrounded object is "colossal." However, since the foot is unidentifiable, and the drawing offers no certain distance between the foot and the porticus, there are no grounds for this assumption.

II.⁴⁷⁵ The foot on the present sheet may also be a composite that Heemskerck based on his sketches of other sculptures of sandaled feet.⁴⁷⁶

This juxtaposition of foot and portico probably does not document Roman topography as Heemskerck found it. For these objects to appear in this physical relation, the foot would have to be at the southwestern end of the Jewish ghetto, near the banks of the Tiber. No records indicate that any such sculptural fragment ever occupied that part of the city. However, it is clear that Heemskerck intended the foot and the Porticus to appear as though they share the same physical space rather than simply appearing on the same page. He drew the sculpture's base as if it is in front of a marble slab before the Porticus' right pilaster. In the lower left corner, Heemskerck used horizontal hatching to blend the sculpture's ground line with the middle ground.

The deliberate choice to show only half of the Porticus suggests Heemskerck's concern with placing the ancient gate in a composition.⁴⁷⁷ This drawing's somewhat summary technique also suggests that pictorial concerns were a higher priority than detail or finish. While there is evidence of a second darker inking phase in the shadows of the portico and the combination of thin and thicker strokes of the foot, the thicker lack subtle variations, and appear at wide intervals. Heemskerck's attention to design and shape, however, is precise throughout. In particular, he has captured the proportions of the Porticus convincingly. Thus, a

⁴⁷⁵ Hülsen and Egger, I, p. 19.

⁴⁷⁶ Ibid., I, 48v, contains two red chalk drawings of feet in sandals; I, 52r shows a foot in an open toed sandal; I, 53v shows sculptures of a left and right foot.

⁴⁷⁷ There is no physical evidence that this sheet was ever cut down.

collection of hastily applied lines seems to give us more precise details than are actually present because they appear contained within the context of an authoritative design.

The right foot from a sculpture of Nero appears twice in Heemskerck's post-Roman oeuvre: in the left foreground of his design for the "Amphitheatrum" print of 1572's *Octa Mirabili Mundi* series, and in the left foreground of the painting *Triumph of Bacchus*.⁴⁷⁸ Porticus-like structures appear in the backdrops of Heemskerck's print designs for "Jezebel Stealing the Forged Letters" from *Ahab*, *Jezebel and Naboth*, and "The Departure of the Angel" from his *Story of Tobias*.⁴⁷⁹

Piazza del Popolo

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. PP1

Muro Torto with Santa Maria del Popolo / Porta del Popolo with Santa Maria del Popolo

Berlin I 7v

128 x 199 mm.

Pen and brown ink

Water Mark: Asterisk and arrowheads top half (of Briquet number 6289)

Red Chalk marks in lower left corner.

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, I, p. 7.

⁴⁷⁸ Hollstein, no. 520. For an analysis of Heemskerck's "Amphitheatrum," see Lise Dulcaux, "Dessins de Martin van Heemskerck," *Revue du Louvre et des Musees de France* (XXX/5-6, 1981), pp. 375 – 380; for Heemskerck's *Triumph of Bacchus*, see above, n. 36.

⁴⁷⁹ Hollstein, nos. 107, 133, 198.

Heemskerck sketched the area near the Porta del Popolo, from inside and outside the gate.⁴⁸⁰ These are the earliest known drawings of the Muro Torto and the Porta del Popolo. Later, they became popular subjects, especially the latter. As the point of entry to the Eternal City for northern pilgrims, the gate and its surroundings may have held special significance for Heemskerck. Moreover, his visit fell just after major events in its century-long revitalization.⁴⁸¹

For the view in the upper register, Heemskerck stood about 200 yards north of the city's north wall on a small hill that is now in the Borghese gardens. At far left is an unidentifiable gate.⁴⁸² Left of center, the Muro Torto bursts forth in a cacophony of vegetation, reticulated brickwork, and skewed angles, much as it appears today. Behind and to the right of the craggy wall are the domes of Santa Maria del Popolo's apse and Raphael's Chigi Chapel. The rough bastions of the Porta del Popolo bracket the composition at far right.

For the lower half of this sheet, Heemskerck stood in the Piazza del Popolo's southwestern corner near the entrance to Leo X's via di Ripetta. At center is the rusticated arch of the Porta del Popolo as it looked before Vignola executed

⁴⁸⁰ This is one of only two sheets by Heemskerck showing the same site from two vantage points. The other is PC1. This sheet and II 40r are the only ones by Heemskerck of Rome's gates.

⁴⁸¹ The gate's bastions and Santa Maria del Popolo are by Sixtus IV. In 1518, Leo X built via di Ripetta, the street used by pilgrims to reach the Vatican upon their arrival in Rome. Bramante and Raphael had recently made alterations to Santa Maria del Popolo.

⁴⁸² While the Porta Pinciana is in this direction, it would not be visible from here. And although Heemskerck sometimes drew monuments that were not visible, but were in the direction of his peripheral vision, this gate does not resemble the Porta Pinciana. Bufalini's map shows a "V. di Bononiae" in this direction.

Michelangelo's alterations in the early 1560s. The low-slung gate appears in need of digging out, but all of Santa Maria del Popolo's steps appear.⁴⁸³ As was frequently his custom, Heemskerck has drawn silhouetted figures walking through the gate.

Neither drawing is of refined technique. However, their apparent lack of painstaking care makes the subtle tonal variations and complete lack of *pentimenti* especially impressive. In the upper half drawing, Heemskerck has executed passages of subtle contrast out of the Muro Torto's varied textures. Beyond, Santa Maria del Popolo appears via a tighter, thinner hatch, while bolder lines announce the gate beyond. The lower half drawing is particularly notable for its angle of view, which presents the church and the gate in a picturesque manner.

Palatine Hill

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. PT1

View from Palace of Septimius Severus towards the Colosseum

Berlin II 55r

282 x 237 mm

Pen and Brown ink

Water Mark: none

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, II, p. 34.

Heemskerck surmounted the Palatine and sketched a complex view to the southwest. This difficult angle of view demands a dexterous rendering of a series of confusing forms, from an oblique, asymmetrical point of view. Curves in the

⁴⁸³ In Tempesta's map of 1593, the gate appears taller than in Heemskerck's drawing. The arch is higher above the ground line.

foreground lead to the composition's furthest background objects gradually rather than suddenly; Heemskerck's grasp of contour, proportion, and space lend the sketch a convincing appearance despite little attention to detail. Heemskerck's customary figure within an arch appears in the central foreground. Beyond, the Severan ruins provide a setting in which for other figures to investigate. Though it is at a great distance, this is the angle of the Colosseum that Heemskerck uses in 1553's *Self Portrait Before the Colosseum*, in which we see the Colosseum's double vaulted interior because of the break in the end of its preserved northern side. This drawing's awkward handling of the Colosseum's circular shape is an exceedingly rare lapse in Heemskerck's supreme command of proportion and spatial relations.⁴⁸⁴ Heemskerck has rendered the Arch of Constantine – nestled between the furthest end of the Palatine and the Colosseum – plausibly enough to be recognized as such. Hieronymus Cock published a *vedute* in his 1561 series of views of Rome that is based on this sheet.⁴⁸⁵

⁴⁸⁴ The Colosseum also appears from this angle in cat. no. AC2. See also Hollstein, no. 588, based on *Landscape with Classical Ruins and St. Jerome* (see above, n. 219).

⁴⁸⁵ Riggs, cat. no. 98.

Maerten van Heemskerck
Cat. PT2
Western Slope of the Palatine

Berlin I 20r

134 x 211 mm.

Pen and Brown Ink

Water Mark: Lower Half of Briquet 6289 (Crossed Feathers)

Prominent red chalk traces on bottom right and upper left corners of verso in the shape of a torso.

Literature: Hülsen and Egger pp. 11 – 12.

Standing on the Via dei Cerchi, Heemskerck drew the Palatine's western face. From a vantage point at lower left, we gaze up at the substructures of the Palace of Augustus, where two small figures explore. Above and beyond the figures, crowning the hill from left to right, are the exedra of the Palace of Augustus, the coffered arches of the Palatine Stadium's west entrance, and the ruined vaults of the Palace of Septimius Severus.⁴⁸⁶ Two silhouetted figures stand atop the substructures of Severus' Palace. Heemskerck has scattered a few other figures across the Palatine's slope. All wall surfaces facing west are free of shading, indicating that Heemskerck drew this in the late afternoon as the sun shone directly on the palatial ruins.

The dynamic diagonal composition, convincing proportions, space, and light suggest that Heemskerck conceived this drawing with care and deliberation.

However, he applied his ink in loose, uniformly thick strokes.⁴⁸⁷ Broad outlines

⁴⁸⁶ For a plan of the ancient Palatine, see Filippo Coarelli, *Guida Archeologica di Roma*, 5th ed., (Milan: 1989); Hieronymus Cock published a print from a vantage point to the northeast of Heemskerck's, looking south, with the arc of the exedra foreshortened in the left foreground. See Riggs, cat. nos. Q-1 and 100.

⁴⁸⁷ No traces of under drawing remain on this sheet.

describe the edges of buildings near and far, as well as their deepest shadows.⁴⁸⁸

The hatching of the foothills in the central foreground is even, but here, too, the strokes are thick, and appear at wide intervals. Hatches also overlap sloppily in places. *Pentimenti* appear in some passages of the substructures in the lower left foreground.

Heemskerck used this sketch to compose part of the backdrop in his design for “Lot Making Love to His Daughters,” from 1569’s *Clades Judææ Gentis* series of prints.⁴⁸⁹ The Augustan Palace’s exedra and the wall above it reappear almost verbatim in the print. They are in the reverse of the sketch, but their differences in size preclude the possibility of a direct transfer from the Roman sketch to the print design. Heemskerck has added two rows of niches to the exedra, neatened the large arched window, and reduced the number of smaller windows in the wall. Objects in the area around the exedra make their way into the print design in more loosely reinterpreted forms. Heemskerck has transformed the vertical shadow of wall and vegetation to the left of the exedra in the Roman sketch into a ruined column and vault inspired by structures in his drawing of the Forum Nervæ (cat. no. FN1). This structure’s barrel vault appears to have been inspired by the coffered vaults of the sketch’s stadium entrance. Two arches to the right of the sketched exedra

⁴⁸⁸ See cat. no. FR3, where the ancient Roman monuments in the Forum Romanum appear in a thick line while the buildings behind them on the Capitoline appear in a much thinner line.

⁴⁸⁹ Hollstein, no. 243. Though the sketch’s size is comparable to the print’s, the exedra in the sketch is much larger than one in the print, disqualifying the possibility of direct transfer from sketch to print. Nor does the drawing contain any physical evidence of direct transfer.

reappear to the left of the exedra in the print. However, the printed arches face the same direction as in the sketch, unlike the exedra. Heemskerck's print of "Tempus" from his *Triumphs of Petrarch* series also contains a variation on the exedra.⁴⁹⁰

Maerten van Heemskerck
Cat. PT3
View looking northeast at Palatine

Berlin II 14r
205 x 246 mm
Pen and Brown Ink
Water Mark: none.

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, II, pp. 12 – 13.

Heemskerck looks to the northeast to draw Severan ruins to the left, the Septizonium in right middle ground, and SS Giovanni e Paolo's apse in far right background. The substructures in the foreground are of the seating of the Circus Maximus. Figures are scattered throughout. No known drawings or prints of this part of Rome are composed precisely like this one by Heemskerck. However, Hieronymus Cock published similar views of this vista.⁴⁹¹

This drawing's finished form differs radically from its underdrawing; the Septizonium's underdrawn lines are story higher; the hills in the right foreground are also much lower than the underdrawn part. Technically speaking, Heemskerck has given us one of his more hastily rendered pieces. Only the Septizonium at far

⁴⁹⁰ Hollstein, no. 495.

⁴⁹¹ Riggs, cat. nos. 12 and 13.

right and the Severan vaults to the far left receive slightly higher finishes. The vaults at far left may have served as the inspiration for the vaults that Heemskerck portrays himself drawing in the frontispiece for the *Clades Judaeae Gentis* series of prints, published in 1569.⁴⁹²

Maerten van Heemskerck
Cat. PT3
View looking northeast at Palatine

Berlin II 14r
205 x 246 mm
Pen and Brown Ink
Water Mark: none.

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, II, pp. 12 – 13.

Heemskerck looks to the northeast to draw Severan ruins to the left, the Septizonium in right middle ground, and SS Giovanni e Paolo's apse in far right background. The substructures in the foreground are of the seating of the Circus Maximus. Figures are scattered throughout. No known drawings or prints of this part of Rome are composed precisely like this one by Heemskerck. However, Hieronymous Cock published similar views of this vista.⁴⁹³

This drawing's finished form differs radically from its underdrawing; the Septizonium's underdrawn lines are story higher; the hills in the right foreground are also much lower than the underdrawn part. Technically speaking, Heemskerck has given us one of his more hastily rendered pieces. Only the Septizonium at far

⁴⁹² Hollstein, no. 237. The preparatory sketch for this print is in Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett, pasted into Album I. See Hülsen and Egger, I, 1r.

⁴⁹³ Riggs, cat. nos. 12 and 13.

right and the Severan vaults to the far left receive slightly higher finishes. The vaults at far left may have served as the inspiration for the vaults that Heemskerck portrays himself drawing in the frontispiece for the *Clades Judaeae Gentis* series of prints, published in 1569.⁴⁹⁴

Maerten van Heemskerck (Copy by Hermannus Posthumus?)

Cat. PT5

View looking northwest at Palatine South:

Berlin II 47v

198 x 308 mm.

Pen and brown ink with some black ink

Water Mark: none

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, II, p. 29.

Heemskerck gazed south from the northern foot of the Palatine to compose a grand drawing in Berlin's Album II of the ruins palace of Septimius Severus that resulted in this sheet, a copy by Hermannus Posthumus.

The left middle ground shows a series of arched substructures perched halfway up the Palatine and extending to the left background. Vegetation growing in the foreground is hatched with thick lines at wide intervals in black ink. Like the composition on this sheet's recto side (cat. no. CS5), this composition appears to be Heemskerck's. The extreme foreshortening in the chosen vantage point is a common characteristic in the drawings traditionally attributed to him. The technique on display appears to belong to a hand other than Heemskerck's that has copied his signature hatching; even the careless handling of the vegetation in the foreground is signature among Heemskerck's recurring motifs. Some pure pen and

⁴⁹⁴ Hollstein, no. 237. The preparatory sketch for this print is in Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett, pasted into Album I. See Hülsen and Egger, I, 1r.

ink examples by Posthumus contain the longer, thinner lines we see in this drawing.⁴⁹⁵

The absence of any other drawings from a similar vantage point on a sheet traditionally attributed to Heemskerck also suggests this drawing as his *conchetto*, as do prints with vaulting resembling the substructures that recede from the picture plane in the center of this drawing.⁴⁹⁶

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. PT6

View looking south on Palatine towards the Palace of Septimius Severus in right background

Berlin II 45v

202 x 270 mm.

Pen and Brown Ink

Water Mark: none

Minimal red chalk traces in upper right corner

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, II, p. 29.

This is an unfinished drawing. The above identification of a vantage point may not hold under careful scrutiny, because the arched form in the right central foreground may be the Palatine substructures seen through the portico on the recto side of this sheet (cat. no. FB2).

⁴⁹⁵ Cf. Hülsen and Egger, II, 82r.

⁴⁹⁶ Hollstein, nos. 255 and 493.

Sculpture Collections, Gardens, and Cortili

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. SC1

Cortile of Casa Maffei all'Arco della Ciambella

Berlin I 3v

180 x 210 mm.

Pen and Ink Wash

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, I, pp. 3 – 4; Filippi, p. 97.

Here, Heemskerck shows us the antiquities in the small courtyard of a house belonging to Benedetto Maffei (and then his nephew, Girolamo) in the Rione Pigna near the Arco della Ciambella and next to SS. Quaranta de Calcarario. Both Benedetto and Girolamo traveled in papal circles, but not much else is known about them.⁴⁹⁷ Surely, their sculpture collection is what attracted Heemskerck to their house. However, we have no remaining drawings by Heemskerck showing detailed studies of any of the sculptures on display here.⁴⁹⁸

This drawing shows a greater interest in the space and the light than the sculpture. It is clear that Heemskerck has chosen an optimal angle of view for describing the space. Heemskerck has chosen a point of view that does not allow for the rendering of the sculptures in detail. He renders torsos quickly, and reliefs summarily. The *cortile's* arches, extremely close to the picture plane, extend to the left and right edge of the sheet, framing our gaze. The rigid diagonals of the

⁴⁹⁷ Only one study of the Maffei family exists. See José Ruyschaert and Roberto Ridolfi, *Recherche des deux bibliothèques romaines Maffei des XVe et XVIe siècles* (Florence: 1959).

⁴⁹⁸ Hülsen and Egger, I, pp. 3 – 4, identify each of the sculptures in the Casa Maffei *cortile*, and trace their provenances.

stairway are complimented by the graceful arcs of its supporting vaults, providing a backdrop that leads us from lower left to upper right.

Heemskerck applied outlines with a free hand, as usual, but with precision, showing a masterful grasp of spatial relationships. Contours thus could have served as the framework for one of Heemskerck's many hatching essays. However, Heemskerck uses ink wash to describe the behavior of light in the *cortile*. Along with ink wash drawings of the Forum Romanum (cat. no. FR1) and the unfinished St. Peter's (cat. no. SP2), this may be one of Heemskerck's most deliberate applications of ink wash to articulate shadows. He gives see equal attention to the subtle gradations of shadow in the vaults, walls, columns, ceiling, and the floors.

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. SC2a

Looking west at sculpture collection in Garden of Palazzo Medici (called Palazzo Madama after 1540)⁴⁹⁹

Berlin I 5r

179 x 213 mm

Pen and brown ink

Water Mark: Circle enclosing a shield with three crescents.

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 4 – 5; Filippi, pp. 97 – 98.

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. SC2b

View looking east in Palazzo Medici - Madama Garden Court at sculpture collection

Berlin II 48r

214 x 293 mm.

Pen and brown ink

Water Mark: none

Red chalk traces in upper right quadrant

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, II, p. 29 - 30; Filippi, p. 98.

Heemskerck drew two views of the Medici family's Palazzo Madama garden court, home to an impressive sculpture collection that would shortly be subsumed into the Vatican's more vast holdings.

Our first view is found on a smaller sheet in the original sketchbook. Heemskerck chose a vantage point from which the eastern most column of the *cortile's* loggia is nearest to the picture plane, splitting our gaze. In the middle ground of the left third of the composition, we see the fountain of the Palazzo

⁴⁹⁹ This is the site that became the Italian Senate building in 1871. It has been altered considerably since Heemskerck's drawing. For a building history, see *Senato della Repubblica: Guida alle Sedi*, intro., Franco Borsi (Rome: 1994); *Facciata di Palazzo Madama*, intro. Franco Borsi (Rome: 1994); Elena Fumagalli, "La Facciata Quattrocentesca del Palazzo Medici in Piazza Madama: Un Disegno e Alcune Considerazioni," *Annali di Architettura* (vol. 3, 1991), pp. 26 - 31.

Madama's cortile, and a backdrop of ancient and medieval buildings. Hülsen and Egger identify the structure in the left background as the Torre dei Crescenzi and the nearby ruins as the hot springs of Agrippa.⁵⁰⁰ To the right of the column, we peer down the Palazzo's groin vaulted loggia which houses a collection of various sculpture fragments.

A superior version of Heemskerck's pure pen and ink technique describes the shadows and the contours of the forms. He has lavished his most detailed attention on the smooth, rounded surfaces of the loggia's columns and vaults, and the fountain in the left middle ground. This is a rare instance in which Heemskerck has rendered the shaded side of the columns with diagonal and horizontal hatches. The sculptures are a considerable distance from the picture plane, and Heemskerck has not rendered any of them with as much detail.⁵⁰¹ While Torre dei Crescenzi and the hot springs of Agrippa receive the lightest of lines due to their distance from the picture plane, Heemskerck has paid diligent attention to their proportions, and the rough texture of the Torre's decaying exterior.

As in the smaller drawing, the larger drawing's dominant motif is the loggia, this time looking at it from the west, with the fountain in the foreground. At far right, in the *cortile's* loggia, Heemskerck shows a figure amidst the sculpture. This

⁵⁰⁰ Hülsen and Egger, II, p. 4. At the time of the publication of their 1912 volumes, Hülsen and Egger claimed that the walls in the distant background still existed. However examination of the site around the current Palazzo Madama reveals no such configuration. They identify the sculptures in this drawing on pp. 4 - 5.

⁵⁰¹ For a study of the Palazzo's sculpture collection, see Teresa M. Russo, "Appunti su Palazzo Medici e sul suo Proprietario," in: *Strenna dei Romanisti* (1989), pp. 485 - 500.

is the most detailed figure to appear amongst his Roman sketches; Heemskerck shows him wearing a waist length overcoat, boots, and a hat. Figures also appear atop the loggia, though not in as much detail.

Despite Hülsen's and Egger's assessment of this drawing as displaying "a strong artistic individuality in every respect," technically speaking, it is not as sure handed as catalogue number SC2a. The column 3rd from left shows double lines on either side. Heemskerck has foreshortened only the ionic volutes of the first two capitals. The others receive a quick, flat rendering. The fountain at left has a much thicker outline than we are used to from Heemskerck. We are able to see a red chalk under drawing in the capital and vaults furthest to the right.

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. SC3

Villa Madama Garden Terrace with sculpture in niches

Berlin I 24r

136 x 211 mm.

Water mark: none

Red chalk fingerprint in lower right quadrant

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, I, pp. 13 – 14; Filippi, p. 107.

Heemskerck has chosen his composition in order to leave an emptied right side and thus it is as if he is creating a backdrop, or a scene, before which figures can act. The primary focus is in the left foreground, where a Jupiter sculpture fragment sits before a richly textured architectural backdrop and niche.

Heemskerck has chosen his vantage point so that the arches of two sculptural niches behind the Jupiter spring from each of his shoulders, leaving his head framed by them.

This is one of Heemskerck's most finely rendered drawings. Neither the statue nor the architecture behind it has received more finish. The whole composition, that is, the relation of the sculpture to the architecture and the disposition of the entire space, is the point of this pictorial exercise. While close examination reveals an unusually light hatching technique, even on middle ground objects, Heemskerck has rendered the cornice above the Jupiter statue with straight-edged precision. The vertical edges of the pilasters are not described by a line, but by the illusion of a line created by bringing light horizontal hatches to a straight edge. Jupiter's drapery shows subtle attention to light and shadow. Once again, Heemskerck shows figures in the background for scale. As in catalog numbers FR3 (left sheet), PP1, and SP2, figures appear beneath arches or doorways.

The backdrops for Heemskerck's prints of "The Elders Trying to Seduce Susannah" and "The Three Holy Women at the Sepulchre" are based on this drawing.⁵⁰²

Maerten van Heemskerck
Cat. SC4
Palazzo Cesi in Borgo Sculpture Garden

Berlin I 25r

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, I, p. 14; Filippi, pp. 107; Zocca, pp. 342 - 346.

Heemskerck has composed this sketch the same way he composed his drawing of the sculpture garden at the Villa Madama (cat. no. SC3). The left side advances towards the foreground while the right side is empty. The contrast here is high, and the hatching technique is the usual one. The architectural backdrop is

⁵⁰² Hollstein, no. 219, 301, respectively.

rustic, and minimally rendered. Behind the statues in the left foreground, no wall appears at all.

Maerten van Heemskerck
Cat. SC5
Court of Old Palazzo della Valle

Berlin II 20r
164 x 226 mm.
Pen and brown ink wash
Water mark: none

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, II pp. 15 – 16; Filippi, p. 108.

We see the loggia in the Palazzo della Valle's *cortile* parallel to the picture plane. The frieze of the cornice is unfinished. In the foreground is a colossal mascherone.

The handling of pen is surprisingly loose and imprecise, even compared to Heemskerck's drawings of low finish and suggests another hand. Lines lack subtlety and sure-handedness. Ink wash is not applied with the subtlety that we find in Heemskerck's other ink wash examples (cat. nos. AF1, FR1, SG1, and SP2). Hatches beneath the arches struggle to articulate their foreshortening. The artist has neglected to erase the merging lines of the piers, which are visible through the sarcophagus.⁵⁰³

Nevertheless, the artist of this drawing has handled the perspective of the vaulting behind the piers rather ably. While the sloppy, thick-lined handling of the

⁵⁰³ In their intro to Album II, Hülsen and Egger, II, p. v, explain the sloppy technique in this sheet only by saying that Heemskerck must have added the ink later: "...ist es nicht ausgeschlossen, daß die Lavierung erst nachträglich hinzugefügt worden ist."

relief sculpture on the sarcophagi in the right middle ground may seem rare among Heemskerck's sketches, even drawings in Heemskerck's more virtuosic technique (e.g. cat. no. FN1) contain this kind of treatment of relief sculpture when it appears at some distance from the picture plane.

Moreover, the mascherone on the floor in the foreground is present in altered form in Heemskerck's post-Roman painting of St. Luke.⁵⁰⁴ His print of "Tamar and Abnon" also contains floor decorations before a loggia in a *cortile*.⁵⁰⁵ Heemskerck has used the cloven-hoofed atlantae on each pier for the piers in the left backdrop of his *Triumph of Bacchus* painting.⁵⁰⁶ The sarcophagus at right in this drawing is relatable to the one in Heemskerck's print of "Susannah" (1563).⁵⁰⁷ Though Heemskerck's preparatory sketch shows the sarcophagus in the opposite position, they are at the same angle and distance from the picture plane. Both contain similar wave pattern designs on their long sides. So if this drawing is not an autograph Heemskerck, it is very likely that he possessed it and referred to it when making new designs.

⁵⁰⁴ Maerten van Heemskerck, *St. Luke Painting the Virgin*, 1545 – 50, Rennes, Musée des Beaux-Arts, Inv. No. 801.1.6.

⁵⁰⁵ Hollstein, no. 114.

⁵⁰⁶ For Heemskerck's *Triumph of Bacchus*, see above, n. 36.

⁵⁰⁷ Hollstein, no. 270.

San Giovanni in Laterano

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. SG1

View with San Giovanni in Laterano, Remains of Lateran Palace, and Equestrian of Marcus Aurelius

Left: Berlin I 71r

127 x 208 mm.

Pen and brown ink wash

Water mark: Asterisk (Upper Half of Briquet 6289)⁵⁰⁸

Right: Berlin I 12v

136 x 210 mm.

Pen and brown ink wash

Water mark: Crossed arrows (Lower Half of Briquet 6289)

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, I, pp. 8 and 36 – 39; Fehl, 1974, pp. 362 – 367; Filippi, pp. 100.

We look south at the San Giovanni in Laterano complex of buildings, on two sketchbook sheets. As with other medium view panoramas (e.g. cat. no. FR3 and SP4), Heemskerck has chosen a vantage point that shows buildings at various angles from the picture plane, as if on display. The spot he has chosen also shows the statue of Marcus Aurelius in silhouette against a blank sky, and in an iconic, near profile view.⁵⁰⁹

Heemskerck's ink wash technique is of the highest order, comparable to catalogue numbers FR1 and SP2: sharp pen lines articulate contours and ink wash describes shadows and texture convincingly. In addition to being a technical *tour de force*, this drawing provides a valuable document of the Lateran's appearance

⁵⁰⁸ Not noted by Hülsen and Egger, I, p. 39.

⁵⁰⁹ The equestrian statue appears at a similar angle in the Codex Escorialensis. Cf. Egger, *Codex Escorialensis*, f. 31v.

before its renovations.⁵¹⁰ The topography it portrays, however, has no afterlife in Heemskerck's post-Roman oeuvre.

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. SG2

Bench with Lion's feet and volutes / Column with grotteschi / Interior of S. Giovanni in Laterano

Berlin I 70v

125 x 201 mm.

Pen and Ink wash

Water Mark: none

Red chalk traces on the left edge⁵¹¹

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, I, p. 36; Malmstrom, 1973, pp. 247 – 251.

Hülsen and Egger originally identified the interior shown here as San Stefano Rotondo. However, in 1973, Ronald Malmstrom convincingly argued that it shows a view from Nicholas IV's ambulatory of San Giovanni in Laterano, looking across the basilica's transept towards the entries of its north side aisles.⁵¹² Heemskerck has not provided much detail, but the plausible treatment of light is extraordinary for such a quickly executed sketch. Heemskerck's articulation of the sudden

⁵¹⁰ For speculation on the drawing and the topography around the Lateran see Hülsen and Egger, pp. 36 – 38 and Silvia Maddalo, "Ancora sulla Loggia di Bonifacio VIII al Laterano: Una proposta di ricostruzione e un'ipotesi attributive," *Arte Medioevale* (vols. 12 – 13, 1998 – 99), pp. 211 - 230.

⁵¹¹ Hülsen and Egger, I, pp. vi – vii, describe these as "weak," but they are quite conspicuous.

⁵¹² Ronald Malmstrom, "A Drawing by Marten van Heemskerck of the Interior of S. Giovanni in Laterano," *Römisches Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte* (XIV, 1973, pp. 247 – 251, uses Carlo Rainaldi's 1646 survey plan of the church (Alb. It. Az. 373) and a cross section of the same entry by Borromini's workshop (Alb. It. Az. 381) to corroborate his hypothesis.

transition from the darkness of the ambulatory to the brightness of the transept's interior is convincing.

San Lorenzo Fuori le Mura

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. SL1

View with San Lorenzo Fuori le Mura / Decorative motifs from the frieze of San Lorenzo Fuori le Mura⁵¹³

Berlin I 21r

134 x 206 mm.

Pen and Brown ink with sparing use of ink wash

Water mark: none

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, I, p. 12; Filippi, p. 101.

In another handsome medium view panorama (despite a low finish), Heemskerck stood facing northeast to draw San Lorenzo Fuori le Mura at an oblique angle that shows the portico's profile. He wrote "S. Laurenzio" in the same ink he used for the drawing at bottom center. At bottom right, another inscription reads "A. S. Lorenzo" in red chalk. His Heemskerck used the same reddish-brown ink wash he used in his drawing of composite capitals (cat. no. AF1). Overall, the hatching technique is more vertical and applied with much less precision than we have seen in Heemskerck's other pure pen and ink drawings.

⁵¹³ These frieze motifs also appear in the Codex Escorialensis, Egger, *Codex Escorialensis*, f. 43v.

St. Peter's

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. SP1

New St. Peter's South Transept and SM della Febbre with unfinished south Transept Arm in Foreground.

Berlin II 54r

170 x 312 mm

Pen and Brown ink wash

Water Mark: none

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, II, p. 34; Thoenes, p. 142 – 43; Veldman, 1987, pp. 370 - 72; Filippi, p. 103.

Among the larger sheets in Berlin's second album, this drawing's attribution to Heemskerck was once questioned. But it has since been returned to him as autograph.⁵¹⁴

Heemskerck's vantage point, south of the new St. Peter's unfinished crossing, reveals the new church's complex spaces around a de-centered vanishing point. More than a mere drawing of a building, this sketch communicates the sheer physicality of the massive, sprawling disarray of Bramante's "immeasurable *concetto*."⁵¹⁵ The curvature of the transept's south arm, a *tour de force* of pictorial space, advances to intimacy with the viewer only to recede dramatically towards the

⁵¹⁴ Wolfgang Metternich thought that this could not be by Heemskerck because he found documents regarding the construction of St. Peter's suggesting that parts of the building appearing on this sheet were not built until the late 1530s or early 1540s, at least two years after Heemskerck left Rome. However, Christoph Thoenes determined that the documents in question refer to the restoration of these parts, which had been built by Bramante. Metternich and Thoenes left the publication of these findings to Ilja Veldman, "Anonymous B," pp. 370 – 72.

⁵¹⁵ Giorgio Vasari, cited in Thoenes, p. 140.

apse at left, and Santa Maria della Febbre to the right.⁵¹⁶ Heemskerck gives us an unhindered view of Santa Maria della Febbre's conic roof and two of its bays. The top of the Vatican Obelisk punctuates this passage. The nave of the Old St. Peter's appears above the circular church. At left, the crossing's unfinished south vault looms large despite its apparent distance from the picture plane. Its underside marks the drawing's point of deepest shadow. The mixture of curves and straight lines in the vault's arch, *voussoirs*, coffering, and apex combine to provide a transition from the circular passages at center and right to the relatively angular apse at left. The church's unfinished east and west walls appear mostly in shadow, as opposed to the sheer side of the vault, which must be illumined by the afternoon sun. The foreground remains unfinished, and the beginnings of a composite capital appear.

Of his larger sheets, this ranks as one Heemskerck's most technically masterful. Lines vary from thick and bold to delicate. Heemskerck inked with extreme precision nearly everywhere. Few *pentimenti* are visible, despite no apparent use of a straight edge. Heemskerck's virtuosic command of St. Peter's shape, proportion, and situation in space hides his shorthand approach to detail.

This drawing may have been helpful to Heemskerck when he designed the ruins in the backdrop of the Draper's Altarpiece's *Annunciation* panel.⁵¹⁷ prints for "Judah" and "Solomon Building the Temple," which show unfinished vaulted

⁵¹⁶ Compare this masterful display of foreshortening with the awkward handling of this same view in a drawing attributed to "Anonymous A?" by Hülsen and Egger, II, 1r.

⁵¹⁷ Grosshans, cat. no. 55.

structures like this.⁵¹⁸ The latter print also shows a semicircular arched niche supporting a wall with retaining arches resembling the exposed wall facing the picture plane in this drawing's left middle ground. Ruined walls with attenuated retaining arches like these also appear in the left backdrop of Heemskerck's enigmatic design for the "Adoration of the Magi" from the *Clades Judaeae Gentis* series.⁵¹⁹ Heemskerck may have consulted the passage at right with Santa Maria della Febbre and the Vatican in several prints. It appears in reverse in the backdrop of "Tobit Blinded by Sparrow's Droppings" and "St. Peter Preaching in Jerusalem."⁵²⁰ This same passage receives more liberal variations in "The Third Excuse: The Man who Married A Wife" from the series *The Parable of the King who Prepared a Wedding*, "The Flagellation of Christ" from the *Seven Bleedings* series, and "St. Mark" from the *Four Evangelists* series, all of which feature circular temples next to obelisks or other vertical, attenuated structures.⁵²¹ Vaults parallel to the picture plane like the ones appearing here and in cat. no. SP5 appear in altered form in the backdrops of several prints by Heemskerck.⁵²²

⁵¹⁸ Hollstein, nos. 52 and 120.

⁵¹⁹ Ibid., no. 257.

⁵²⁰ Ibid., nos. 183 and 397.

⁵²¹ Ibid., nos. 346, 379 and 414.

⁵²² Ibid., nos. 77, 84, 107, 253, 317, 527.

Maerten van Heemskerck
Cat. SP2
Bramante's vaults for the New St. Peter's

Berlin I 13r
135 x 210 mm.
Pen and brown ink wash
Water Mark: Crossed Arrows (Lower half of Briquet 6289)

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, I, pp. 8 – 9; Filippi, p. 102; Thoenes, p. 121.

Heemskerck has chosen an angle that will show three of the crossing vaults. We peer through the south vault, which rises above a ruined wall with two oculi. The Obelisco Vaticano and SM della Febbre appear in left background. The vantage point, north of the vaults and west of the Belvedere, is comparable to the one chosen by 'Anonymous B' and the author of a drawing from Hieronymous Cock's 1561 series of *vedute*.⁵²³ However, Heemskerck makes the slight, but significant choice to stand further east, so that we may see a foreshortened glimpse of the east vault.

Heemskerck departs from his conventional hatching technique, presenting a masterful ink wash rendering of shadows and texture. He only hatches to show retaining masonry and *voussoirs*. Ink wash and short pen strokes combine to effectively describe the rough texture of the walls on the south side of the unfinished structure, particularly the wall facing south on the east pier of the vault. Vegetation springs from the west pier of the south vault as well as the cornice on the north side of the apse. We see the ruins of a column from Old St. Peter's. The distant backgrounds of Heemskerck's prints portraying the Sack of Rome and the

⁵²³ The view of St. Peter's by 'Anonymous B' is in Hülsen and Egger, I, 15r. See below, section 4.4.2a; for Hieronymous Cock's print, see Riggs, cat no. 109.

captivity of Clement VII show St. Peter's in an unfinished state, as in this drawing.⁵²⁴

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. SP3

Close view looking west at Obelisco Vaticano in front of SM della Febbre.

Berlin II 22v

285 x 209 mm

Pen and brown ink

Water Mark: none

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, II, p. 18; Filippi, p. 103.

The Vatican Obelisk stands nearly at the center of this composition, and SM della Febbre is behind. On the far right, we see the south vault of the crossing of the New St. Peter's. Two figures appear in the foreground, one to the far left, and one to the far right, in an arched doorway leading into the southern wing of the old Vatican complex.

The seemingly awkward vantage point, in which the Vatican obelisk appears to block SM della Febbre, is a common one, from which 'Anonymous B' and Dosio also drew.⁵²⁵ Dosio's drawings are from further back, and show a wall to the south that may have prevented a more strategic vantage point.

⁵²⁴ Hollstein, nos. 526 and 527.

⁵²⁵ The drawing of this area by 'Anonymous B' is on Hülsen and Egger, II, 7r. See below, section 4.4.2a; Dosio's drawings are in Florence, Uffizi, US 2535 and 2536.

This drawing is in a low finish resembling the portrayal of the Trofei di Mario (cat. no. TM1).⁵²⁶ It is thus notable for the precision and economy with which Heemskerck has achieved a convincing portrayal of his vista. The obelisco's right side appears via the thinnest of lines, one of the few in all of his drawings that he rendered with a straight edge. We only find *pentimenti* in the zones below and above the finished ink of the obelisk's orb. Heemskerck uses thick lines sparingly for contours, where edges meet with shadows (as in the far right buttress of SM della Febbre), or where an object is silhouetted against the sky (the far left buttress of SM della Febbre). Even where the window of SM della Febbre merges with the shadowed side of the obelisco, Heemskerck alters the direction of his hatching instead of using a thick line to differentiate between them. Yet he manages to achieve contrast by using cross hatching selectively, only in the darkest shadows.

The structure of SM della Febbre, particularly its exterior buttresses with windows between them, may have inspired the appearance of some circular buildings in his post-Roman designs.⁵²⁷

⁵²⁶ Hülsen and Egger, II, p.IV, note the sure-handedness of these two drawings as well as the more highly finished cat. nos. FN1, and FR2b.

⁵²⁷ E.g. Hollstein, nos. 414, 442, and 454.

Maerten van Heemskerck
Cat. SP4
Piazza San Pietro

Vienna, Albertina # 49.897
276 (L), 263 (R), x 623 mm
Pen and brown ink
Water mark: not visible due to mounting

Literature: Egger, 1911, Taf. 17; Hülsen and Egger, II, pp. 68 – 73, Taf. 130;
Dunbar, pp. 195 – 204.

This virtuosic medium view panorama of Piazza San Pietro in high finish is the largest of all known drawings traditionally attributed to Heemskerck. It is one of four drawings executed in the mid-1530s portraying the piazza and the Vatican Palace from the east. All are thought to be products of the circle of artists associated with Heemskerck.⁵²⁸ This one by Heemskerck is the only one to show the entrance façade of Old St. Peter's unadorned, without decorations for Charles V's Triumphal Entry on April 6, 1536.⁵²⁹ Heemskerck's vantage point is carefully chosen to show St. Peter's entrance façade and *campanile* parallel to the picture plane. The vaulting of the unfinished New St. Peter's peeks over the pediment of the old church, and the roof of the Sistine Chapel emerges above the Vatican entrance and behind the Vatican palace, which recedes subtly to the right. The ancient Roman walls run from the center of the composition to the right, slightly

⁵²⁸ Two views are in the Duke of Devonshire's Collection, Chatsworth, England. See this dissertation's Appendix B for the drawing in Chatsworth that has been attributed variously to Jan Brueghel the Elder, Heemskerck, and 'Anonymous B'. A third is in the Nelson Atkins Museum of Art, Kansas City, MO. See Burton Dunbar III, "A Rediscovered Sixteenth Century Drawing of the Vatican with Constructions for the Entry of Charles V into Rome," *Sixteenth Century Journal* (vol. 23, no. 2, Summer, 1992), pp. 195 – 204.

⁵²⁹ Chastel, *Sack*, pp. 197 – 206.

foreshortened to advance towards the picture plane. On either side of the path leading to the Vatican's entrance at right, soldiers stand in formation as a figure on horseback rides in procession towards Borgo, followed by an orderly retinue on foot. In the lower right foreground, a figure dips his hands in the piazza's fountain, which Heemskerck has taken the trouble to render with flowing water.

Copy After Maerten van Heemskerck (by Hermannus Posthumus?)
Cat. SP5
Old and New St. Peter's: looking west at nave interior of Old

Berlin II 52r
222 x 272 mm.
Pen and brown ink wash.
Water Mark: none

Literature: Egger (1911), p. 28; Hülsen and Egger, I, p. 32 – 33; Filippi, p. 103; Thoenes, p. 147.

This drawing and one like it in Sir John Soane's Museum, London, are believed to be copies of a lost original by Heemskerck.⁵³⁰ This one is probably by Hermannus Posthumus. This sheet's technique is close match with Posthumus's copy of Heemskerck's large drawing of the Forum Romanum (cat. no. FR1). Heemskerck stood in the center of the nave of Old St. Peter's and drew Bramante's vaults head on. Such a vantage point gives us the earliest known glimpse of the St. Peter's complex during its transition into the present day basilica.

⁵³⁰ For the London drawing, see below, section 4.4.1.

Septizonium⁵³¹

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. SZ1

Perspective view Septizonium

Rome, Gabinetto Nazionale delle stampe, Inv. no. 3381 - 492.

295 x 160 mm.

Pen and brown ink with slight minimal ink wash

Water Mark (see notes from your visit to the Gabinetto)

Literature: Egger, 1911, Tafel 93; Hülsen and Egger, II, p. 55.

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. SZ2

Perspective view of Septizonium

Rome, Gabinetto Nazionale delle stampe, Inv. no. 3381 - 491

295 x 170 mm

Pen and Brown Ink

Water Mark: See notes from your visit to Gabinetto.

Inscription on first floor frieze: "MARTIN HEMSKERCK (sic.) DE H" (meaning "of Haarlem").

Literature: Egger, 1911, Tafel 92; Hülsen and Egger, II, p. 55.

On two splendid drawings of high finish, Heemskerck portrayed Septimius Severus's now destroyed ruin at the end of the via Appia from two different angles. SZ1 shows the south façade parallel to the picture plane, a rare choice of vantage point for Heemskerck. SZ2 shows the building from an oblique angle from a vantage point slightly east.⁵³² The shadowed areas of SZ2 contain greater contrast. Structures resembling the Septizonium appear in several of Heemskerck's post-

⁵³¹ For the Septizonium in drawings that include other buildings, see cat. nos. AC2; FB2; PA1, 2; and PT3.

⁵³² For views of the Septizonium from a vantage point further north and west, see Dosio, Florence, Uffizi, nos. UA 1774, 2524, and 2525.

Roman designs.⁵³³ Some contain buildings akin to speculative reconstructions of the Septizonium by contemporaries.⁵³⁴

Trofei di Mario

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. TM1

View looking south at Trofei di Mario

Berlin II 49r

212 x 287 mm.

Pen and Brown ink

Water mark: none

This is one of Heemskerck's quick drawings, though he has again captured the general shape and proportion of the monument, and has captured the light and shadow with veracity. In its three bay configuration, it is more comparable to the *Wijngartdranken* impresa that Veldman attributes to Heemskerck than anything else in the sketchbook.⁵³⁵

⁵³³ Grosshans, cat. nos. 58 and 59; Hollstein, nos. 77, 91, and 590.

⁵³⁴ Hollstein, nos. 153 and 154; See also Dupérac, *Disegni*, ff. 20v – 21r.

⁵³⁵ Veldman, *Dutch Humanism*, pp. 124 – 121; Hollstein, no. 585.

Templum Serapidis

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. TS1

Templum Serapidis (or Frontispizio di Nerone) in the Giardino Colonna With Crater from S. Cecilia in Trastevere in Foreground

Berlin I 36r

135 x 210 mm.

Water Mark: none

Black chalk traces around the Crater's right handle, right side, left handle, and bottom left side.

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, I, pp. 20 – 21.

The famous, often reproduced Crater from the courtyard of Santa Cecilia in Trastevere appears in the extreme foreground.⁵³⁶ It is one of two craters Heemskerck is known to have drawn while in Rome.⁵³⁷ Behind is the ancient Roman Templum Serapidis (or Frontispizio di Nerone) on its Quirinal perch. Heemskerck has placed a figure before the Templum's altar, perhaps revealing its scale, suggesting that the sculpture on the frieze was life size. A site of frequent 16th century scrutiny, the Templum was a part of the Palazzo Colonna in Heemskerck's time.⁵³⁸

⁵³⁶ Heemskerck also drew this crater in profile, deftly foreshortening the spiral handles, on sheet 31v. Giuliano da Sangallo shows this crater on Hülsen, *Libro Sangallo*, f. 71v; the Crater also appears on Andreas Coner's f. 141r (vol. 115, Sir John Soane's Museum); Giuseppe Vasi, *Delle Magnificenze di Roma Antica e Moderna*, Book VIII (Rome: 1758), pl. 145, shows a view of the *cortile* of S.Cecilia in Trastevere, in which this crater appears; Giovanni Battista Piranesi published a print of the same Crater out of context in his *Vasi, Candelabri, Cippi...* Book I, (Rome, 1778), pl. 37.

⁵³⁷ A similar crater appears on Hülsen and Egger, I, 37r.

⁵³⁸ See Hülsen and Egger, II, 81v and 82r; for Giuliano da Sangallo's Renaissance archaeological activity on the Quirinal, see Cammy Brothers, "Reconstruction as

Heemskerck has again made two objects share pictorial space – created the appearance that they are in physical proximity to one another – by blending the foreground line with the middle ground and the background object. However, the objects he has juxtaposed were never in the same part of Rome, let alone in this particular physical relation to one another.⁵³⁹

Scholars have not noted that Heemskerck has perhaps also invented the placement of the vaulted grotto and its attached wall, which appear to be oddly constructed beneath Nero's altar. A view of the Templum by Hermannus Posthumus, also from this vantage point, shows more of the altar's uphill approach, but no grotto where Heemskerck shows one. An ink wash drawing of the altar by Dosio also shows no place for a grotto and resembles Posthumus's drawing more closely than this one by Heemskerck.⁵⁴⁰ Heemskerck did not draw the buttresses that are visible in Posthumus's and Dosio's views. Another drawing by Dosio of substructures on the Palatine shows a grotto somewhat like the one Heemskerck has drawn here.⁵⁴¹

These objects in the same scale with their parts aligned to one another, suggesting this drawing as a study of perspective, proportion, scale, and design; the

Design: Giuliano da Sangallo and the 'Palazzo di Mecenate' on the Quirinal Hill," *Annali di Architettura* (vol. 14, 2002), pp. 55 – 72.

⁵³⁹ For a synthetic analysis of Heemskerck's fictive juxtapositions of objects from different parts of Rome see this dissertation, above, Chapter Two, section 2.2.5.

⁵⁴⁰ Giovan Antonio Dosio, *Frontespizio di Nerone*, 190 x 174 mm, Gabinetto delle Stampe, Uffizi, Florence, UA 2512.

⁵⁴¹ Giovan Antonio Dosio, *Rovine di Palazzo Maggiore*, 170 x 230 mm., Uffizi, Florence, UA 2519.

base of the crater corresponds with the ground line beneath the temple, the curves of the crater's bottom half respond to the arches of the vaulted grotto beneath the temple, the crater's bottom half ends at the same height as a small wall in front of the temple, and its shaft extends to the same height as the temple's main wall. The crater's scrolled handles and the temple's cornice are also at the same latitude.

Heemskerck made use of this sheet in a print design. "Job on the Dunghill with his Wife and Three Friends" contains a backdrop with a temple that is clearly based on the Templum as it appears in this sketch.⁵⁴² He has changed the angle of the grotto. The Templum is not reversed in the print, so it is possible that Heemskerck wanted it to be recognizable. Heemskerck may have improvised a natural rock formation from this grotto in his print of "The Diligent Worker Aspiring to the Righteousness of the Lord."⁵⁴³

Tivoli

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. TV1

Close view of Temple of "Vesta" (Tivoli), in perspective.

Berlin II 21r

266 x 208 mm.

Pen and brown ink

Water mark: none

Remnants of underdrawing in red chalk at lower left of rusticated base, vegetation, and capital of the left column engaged by concrete infill.

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, II, pp. 16 – 17; Filippi, p. 99.

⁵⁴² Hollstein, no. 160.

⁵⁴³ Ibid., no. 503.

Heemskerck has chosen a vantage point from below that allows us to see the temple's most complete side and as many of its parts as possible, including the coffering above the ambulatory. To the left is a free - standing column that was originally a part of the temple. The columns on the left of the complete portion of the temple are engaged by concrete infill. To their left, Heemskerck gives us a glimpse of the temple's interior, which we can see because of the temple's ruined state. Figures appear next to the temple at right, and on its base.

The technique here is summary and of low finish. Contours and hatching are in a thick stroke, at wide intervals. In some places, such as in the column furthest to the right, the hatching does not describe the shape of the column. In the central column closest to the picture plane, Heemskerck has shown us the beginnings of its fluting, just as he has in cat. no. AC1.

Tholos-plan temples appear in several of Heemskerck's designs for paintings and prints. We find three in *Landscape with the Abduction of Helen* (1536) and one Heemskerck's *Triumph of Bacchus* (1537 – 38) and a print after the *Bacchus* painting.⁵⁴⁴ Other prints contain similar inventions displayed less prominently in their backdrops.⁵⁴⁵

⁵⁴⁴ Hollstein, no. 507.

⁵⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, nos. 77, 139, 140, 232, 386, 472, 492, 493, 511, and 548.

Villa Madama

Maerten van Heemskerck

Cat. VM1

Eastern Half of the Southern Loggia of the Villa Madama

Berlin I 9v

122 x 201 mm.

Pen and brown ink

Water Mark: none

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, I, pp. ix, 7.

To the left, we view the interior stairway leading to the Villa Madama's Southern Loggia. To the right, we view the unfinished loggia and the Tiber beyond. Heemskerck abandoned this drawing after completing his outlines. He may have intended to shade this drawing with the same technique as in his sketch of the *Cortile* of casa Maffei all' Arco di Ciambella, with an ink wash (cat. no. SC1). The lines of both have a similar unfinished, imprecise quality.

This abandoned drawing did not have much of an afterlife in Heemskerck's post-Roman oeuvre. But composing a drawing that is split between interior and exterior spaces may have been instructive for Heemskerck. Many print designs showing multiple narrative episodes in different rooms or inside and outside of palaces utilize similar compositional schemes.⁵⁴⁶

⁵⁴⁶ Hollstein, nos. 95, 154, 190, 194, 239, and 348.

4.4: Attributions Problems in Maerten van Heemskerck's Drawings of Rome

The last time Heemskerck's drawings of Rome were published in a comprehensive catalog was in 1913, when Christian Hülsen and Hermann Egger issued a facsimile of two bound albums that Berlin's Kupferstichkabinett, purchased in 1879 from the collection of the Paris architect Hippolyte Destailleur.⁵⁴⁷ The title of their publication, *Die Römischen Skizzenbücher von Maerten van Heemskerck in Königlichen Kupferstichkabinett zu Berlin*, is misleading for several reasons. While the majority of the drawings in the first Berlin album come from a sketchbook Heemskerck had with him in Rome, the Berlin albums also contain drawings by Heemskerck that are not from his sketchbook.⁵⁴⁸ Hülsen's and Egger's facsimile also included drawings of Rome by Heemskerck that are not kept in Berlin.⁵⁴⁹ A significant number of drawings in the second album are by other hands. Hülsen and Egger themselves attributed 56 drawings to another artist whom they called "Anonymous A." Over the course of the twentieth century, more drawings have

⁵⁴⁷ Hülsen and Egger, v. I, p. III.

⁵⁴⁸ These sheets are all approximately 130 x 200 mm.. Ibid., I, pp. VII – X, describe the sketchbook's physical characteristics in detail and attempt to reconstruct the sequence of the original sketchbook on the basis of the residue from Heemskerck's red chalk drawings on the sheets facing them. Some red chalk tracings are so legible that can be matched precisely to a Heemskerck drawing. Most, however, are weak. Moreover, Heemskerck did not draw on red chalk on every sheet. Therefore, efforts to reconstruct the original sketchbook must ultimately remain incomplete.

⁵⁴⁹ Cf. cat. nos. SZ1 and SZ2, in Rome's Gabinetto delle Stampe, and SP4, in Vienna's Albertina.

surfaced which bear a Netherlandish technique and portray Rome in the 1530s, and thus, scholars have attributed them to Heemskerck.

Despite Hülsen's and Egger's expressed awareness of multiple hands in the Berlin albums, a republication of their facsimile in 1975 repeated the use of the original title.⁵⁵⁰ Since then, Nicole Dacos has convincingly identified "Anonymous A" as Heemskerck's companion in Rome, Hermannus Posthumus.⁵⁵¹ Ilja Veldman took five drawings from Heemskerck in 1987.⁵⁵² In the course of conducting research for this dissertation, particularly while examining the Berlin volumes, I developed an understanding of Heemskerck's hand that has led me to deattributions of my own. It is hoped that sections below provide a convenient source of reference regarding the muddled attribution history surrounding Heemskerck's name. Section "4.4.1: Appendix A" lists drawings of Rome that have been attributed to Heemskerck but were not published by Hülsen and Egger. Most of these are in collections besides Berlin's Kupferstichkabinett. Section "4.4.2: Appendix B" is comprised of entries for drawings that I, and others, have deattributed from Heemskerck.

⁵⁵⁰ For a review of the 1975 republication, see Veldman, *op. cit.* (note 5), pp. 106 – 113.

⁵⁵¹ Dacos, "Anonymous A," pp. 61 – 81.

⁵⁵² Veldman, "Anonymous B," pp. 369 - 382.

4.4.1: Appendix A: Drawings of Roman Topography Attributed to Maerten van Heemskerck or his Circle not published by Hülsen and Egger

Drawings are listed in alphabetical order by subject matter.

Attributed to Maerten van Heemskerck

Baths of Caracalla

Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris

Literature: Nesselrath, 1996.

Notes: Shadows contain more cross-hatching than we are used to seeing in comparable drawings by Heemskerck (cf. cat. no. FN1).

Attributed to Maerten van Heemskerck

Casa dei Crescensi

Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris

Literature: Nesselrath, 1996.

Notes: See Baths of Caracalla, above.

Maerten van Heemskerck?

Castel Sant'Angelo

Private Collection

Literature: Burg, 1944.

Notes: Burg notes that the sheet in question contains the initials JPM (Jean Paul Mariette) and is mounted in the same manner as the drawings in Berlin's Album I. On this basis, he suggests that it is a Heemskerck that "once belonged to volume I." However, the sheet is roughly 40 mm's shorter on its long side than the sheets belonging to the sketchbook.

Moreover, the drawing contains a larger, looser, more spontaneous stroke, of the variety we are used to seeing from Northern European artists in the Seventeenth century. So it is not surprising that this drawing (and the drawing on its verso containing an unidentified landscape with ruins and a church) were originally thought to be by Claude Lorrain. But the technique is closer to Lucas Valkenborch's than Claude's (see Garms, 1995, E16). So while it may have belonged to Mariette and he may have included it in the collection that became Berlin's Album I, its size shows that it was not a part of Heemskerck's sketchbook and the technique also suggests it was not by him.

Attributed to Maerten van Heemskerck
Colosseum Interior
Landesmuseum, Darmstadt

Literature: Hülsen, 1927.

Notes: As an image of the interior of the Colosseum, this drawing is comparable to prints of the Colosseum published by Hieronymus Cock in 1551 (Cf. Riggs, figs. 7 and 8). 'Anonymous A' / Hermannus Posthumus drew a similar set of vaults and arches from a more foreshortened angle (Cf. Hülsen and Egger, II 59v). Equal attention is given to natural topography in the foreground. This is uncharacteristic of Heemskerck. Cross hatching in the shadows is unlike Heemskerck's handling of similar areas of shadow

(e.g. cat. nos. CS4 FN1) and suggests comparison with the drawings of the Baths of Caracalla and the Casa Crescensi, presented by Nesselrath in 1995.

Attributed to Maerten van Heemskerck
Forum Nervae
Uffizi Inv. Nr. 11.252 S.

Literature: Bol, 1976, n. 46, p. 12.

Circle of Maerten van Heemskerck
North end of the Forum Romanum from Atop the Palatine
Fritz Lugt Collection, Paris

Literature: Hasselt and Blankert, p. 48; Garms, cat. no. C30.

Notes: Carlos van Hasselt and Albert Blankert attributed this sheet to Heemskerck in 1966. However, a nearly uniform thin stroke, attenuated proportions of buildings, and an awkward vantage point argue for another hand. In drawings where Heemskerck's stroke is of a uniform width, it is usually thicker than this. This may be the right sheet of a lost two-sheet composition. The artist drew from a higher vantage point than in FR4.

Attributed to Maerten van Heemskerck
Piazza San Pietro

Duke of Devonshire Collection, Chatsworth

Literature Hülsen and Egger, II, pp. 68 – 73; Shaw, p. 41; Veldman, pp. 378 – 80; Dunbar, pp. 195 – 204.

Notes: Shows the entrance of St. Peter's with decorations for Charles V's Triumphal Entry into Rome on April 6, 1536. Therefore, scholars who doubt that Heemskerck remained in Rome through the beginning of 1536 do not give this drawing to Heemskerck. In light of the discovery of Heemskerck's signature and the date "1536" on *Landscape with the Abduction of Helen*, a painting with a provenance traceable to old Roman collections, James Bryan Shaw attributed the drawing to Heemskerck. Veldman gave this to 'Anonymous B', but Burton Dunbar's observation of this drawing's "somewhat freer handling of line" argues convincingly against her attribution.

Maerten van Heemskerck?

Interior of the Nave of Old St. Peters and Crossing of New St. Peter's
Margaret Chinnery Album, Sir John Soane's Museum, London

Literature: Egger, 1911; Hülsen and Egger.

Notes: This was thought by Egger (1911) to be an autograph Heemskerck that was the source for the drawing in Berlin (cat. no. SP5). But Hülsen and Egger (1913 – 16) describe both as copies of a lost original by Heemskerck. Ink wash is applied more carefully than its Berlin replica, but also with more care than in traditionally attributed Heemskerck drawings using ink wash for shadows, cat. nos. FR1 and SP2.

Maerten van Heemskerck
Transept of St. Peter's
National Museum, Stockholm

Literature: Thoenes, 1998.

Notes: Contains an "MVHK" insignia identical to the one added later to
cat. no. BL1.

Maerten van Heemskerck
Unidentified ruins
Kupferstichabinett, Berlin, Inv. no. 12306

Literature: *Fiamminghi a Roma*, cat. no. 114.

Notes: The technique matches sheets of medium finish traditionally
attributed to Heemskerck. A structure in the backdrop of the right panel of
Heemskerck's *Annunciation* from the Draper's Altarpiece (1546, Grosshans,
cat. no. 55) is similar to the structure Heemskerck portrayed in this drawing,
as is a ruin in the backdrop of Heemskerck's print of "Saul meeting the two
men at Rachel's Sepulchre" (1549, Hollstein no. 91).

Attributed to Maerten van Heemskerck
Veteres Aedes Columnensium
Kunstakademie, Düsseldorf

Literature: Hülsen, 1927.

Notes: This drawing of the Colonna family's medieval palace behind the
Templum Serapidis (a.k.a. "Frontispizio di Nerone") is comparable to
Dupérac's view in *Vestigii*, f. 41). Not previously noted by scholars is that
the drawing of the same structure by Lambert Sustris, identified by Nicole

Dacos (1995, fig. 69), shows the structure in reverse and a portico with what appears to be four caryatids, while this drawing shows six columns.

4.4.2: Appendix B: Drawings of Roman Topography Deattributed from Maerten van Heemskerck

4.4.2a: ‘Anonymous B’ (Michiel Gast)

Hülsen and Egger noted that the sheets listed below are not part of the original sketchbook Heemskerck had with him in Rome. While this alone does not mandate that the drawings on these sheets are not by Heemskerck (several drawings in Berlin’s Album II are on larger sheets that were not a part of Heemskerck’s “Roman sketchbook”), Wolfgang Metternich’s observation of structural elements portrayed in Berlin I, 15r that were not built until 1538, after Heemskerck’s stay, prompted Ilja Veldman’s analysis (“Heemskerck’s Romeinse tekeningen en ‘Anonymous B’,” *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek*, vol. 38, 1987, pp. 369 – 382). She noted that the drawings below share a tighter more cautious stroke and figures rendered with much greater detail than any found in drawings traditionally attributed to Heemskerck. Finding no suitable candidate for attribution, Veldman followed the tradition established by Hülsen and Egger and named the artist “Anonymous B.” Bibliographic citations below are in addition to Veldman (1987). For the suggestion that Anonymous B is Michiel Gast, of Heemskerck’s circle, see Dacos (2004), Chapter V.

Pantheon Facade

Berlin I 10r

133 x 200 mm.

Pen and brown ink

Water Mark: none

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, I, p. 7; Filippi, p. 98.

Notes: For a comparable view, see Egger, *Codex Escorialensis*, f. 43v.

Interior of Pantheon Portico looking Southeast

Berlin II 2r

134 x 197 mm.

Pen and brown ink

Water mark: none

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, II, pp. 3 – 4; Filippi, p. 98.

Santa Maria della Febbre, Obelisco Vaticano, and New St. Peter's Transept

Berlin II 7r

128 x 201 mm.

Pen and Brown Ink

Water Mark: none

Literature: Egger (1911), p. 30; Hülsen and Egger, I, p. 7; Filippi, p. 102 – 103.

Notes: Comparable to cat. no. SP3. Was the source for Pieter Saenredam's

Church of Santa Maria della Febbre (1629, oil on panel, 37.8 x 70.5, Inv.

no. 1961.9.34).

Nave of Old St. Peter's and transept of New St. Peters

Berlin I 15r

128 x 200 mm.

Pen and brown ink

Water Mark: Bottom half of a shield (not in Briquet).

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, I, p. 9; Filippi, p. 102.

Notes: Comparable to a *vedute* published by Hieronymous Cock in 1561 from nearly the same vantage point (see Riggs, cat. no. 109).

New St. Peter's from beneath South side-aisle arch

Berlin I 8r

134 x 208 mm

Pen and brown ink

Water Mark: none

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, I, p. 6; Filippi, p. 102; Thoenes, p. 146.

4.4.2b: 'Anonymous C'

I propose the addition of 'Anonymous C' to the list of hands found in the Berlin Albums. Three sheets in Album II contain drawings with common characteristics that separate them from those traditionally attributed to Heemskerck, 'Anonymous A' / Hermannus Posthumus, 'Anonymous B', and the artist I name 'Anonymous D' below (Hülsen and Egger, II 16, 50, and 51). Drawings by 'Anonymous C' contain problems with foreshortening and perspective not seen in even the most quickly rendered sheets traditionally attributed to Heemskerck, or those by the other unknown hands listed above. 'Anonymous C' also drew nearly vertical hatches for shadows (as opposed to Heemskerck's primarily horizontal hatch stroke), much longer than Heemskerck's, and due to a uniformity of stroke width, did not achieve the level of contrast we find in drawings attributed to Heemskerck et. al.. In trying to determine who besides Heemskerck may have authored these drawings, there are candidates, albeit unsatisfactory ones. Michiel Coxcie, Jan Cornelis Vermeyen, Lambert Lombard, and Cornelis Bos were in

Rome during the 1530s. However, none of the drawings traditionally attributed to them are close matches to this hand.

Forum of Nervae, Temple of Minerva in perspective

Berlin II 50r

210 x 282 mm

Pen and brown ink

Water Mark; Crescent (similar to Bricquet 5202)

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, II, p. 31.

Notes: As with the other drawings in the ‘Anonymous C’ group, we find a stroke lacking confidence and an overall approach showing less contrast between light and shadow than in drawings by Heemskerck. Mistakes in proportion and perspective are apparent in the three columns in the right foreground. The capital of the middle column shows awkward foreshortening, which reveals the artist’s problems show how this group of columns recedes from the picture plane. The bases of the three capitals do not follow a common orthogonal (for an able handling of perspective and proportion, even in drawings of low finish, see cat. nos. CH1; TM1; PT5; SP6; PP1; MM1; PM1; PC1; SL1; TV1).

Panorama looking North at Old and New St. Peters

Berlin II 51r

258 x 407 mm.

Pen and Brown Ink

Water Mark: Lily Branch (not in Briquet)

Literature: Hülsen and Egger (II, pp. 31 – 32); Thoenes, 1998; Veldman, 1987; Filippi.

Notes: Given to ‘Anonymous C’ for its poor handling of perspective in the Benediction Loggia, the pediment of Old St. Peter’s, and the New St. Peter’s transept arm. The thin hatching and lack of contrast (which makes Bramante’s vaulting virtually illegible in this example), which are present in other drawings I have attributed to ‘Anonymous C’, are present here, too.

Santa Maria Aracoeli with Capitoline Obelisk.

Berlin II 16r

186 x 266 mm.

Pen and brown ink

Water Mark: none

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, II, p. 13; Filippi, p. 100.

Notes: The vantage point does not offer the compositional dynamism found in so many sheets securely attributed to Heemskerck. While hatches throughout this sheet are horizontal, like Heemskerck’s, they are also uncharacteristically long, thin, and at closer intervals resulting a pervasive lack of contrast that is uncharacteristic of traditionally attributed drawings by Heemskerck, et. al.. Moreover, the drawing on the verso of this sheet contains the thin, nearly vertical hatching common to the other sheets in this group. Also uncharacteristic of Heemskerck – but common to Berlin II 50 and 51 – is an unsure handling of shape; the western façade appears to teeter awkwardly to the left, the nave is bent midway, and the left column of the monastery’s loggia tilts to the right. ‘Anonymous C’ handles details in ways that are not found in the drawings by Heemskerck et. al.; the western façade contains summarily rendered windows and an ambiguous vertical line. Clerestory windows appear via coarse vertical hatches and single outlines.

Shadowed windows on the transept appear with even less articulation, through hatches of inconsistent lengths. *Pentimenti* appear at the top of the stairs, where a horizontal line confuses the top stair with the top of the right railing. ‘C’ is also guilty of poor planning, also unusual for Heemskerck, et. al.; the figures interrupt the completion of lines describing the second transept buttress. Also arguing against Heemskerck’s hand in particular, this drawing had no afterlife in his post-Roman oeuvre. While medieval churches occasionally appear in the backdrops of his prints, they are based on observation of northern Gothic churches; none resemble Santa Maria in Aracoeli, and their parts do not appear to have resulted from consulting this sheet (Cf. Hollstein, *op. cit.*, nos. 208, 210, 366, 442).

View looking southeast from Capitoline over Forum Romanum Towards the Colosseum:

Berlin II 50v

198 x 272 mm.

Pen and brown ink

Water Mark: Crescent on bottom edge of sheet (not in Briquet)

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, II, p. 31.

Notes: Attribution to Heemskerck of this sheet from Berlin’s second album has never been questioned, but it might be a copy after CH4. Hülsen says that Heemskerck’s point of view is “a little higher” here than in cat. no. CH4. The obeslisk is closer to the picture plane and more of the Colosseum’s east side is visible suggesting a vantage point further east as well. The drawing of the bottom half of Santa Francesca Romana’s

campanile is unfinished just as it is in CH4, suggesting that the sheet was not executed from direct observation, but by looking at CH4 instead. However, there is too much ambiguous topographical information to conclude that this is either from a higher vantage point, or a copy of CH4; the retaining wall is missing, as is CH4's circular fragment next to the obelisk; in the middle ground, the arch next to Santa Francesca Romana is too close to the picture plane to be the Arch of Titus, but no other arched structure in that area of the forum that presents itself as a possible alternative; a passage of vegetation appears to be behind the Colosseum on its first and second level, but on the third level, the same vegetation appears to be in front of the Colosseum and behind the Basilica of Maxentius. Buildings of questionable identification appear next to Santa Francesca Romana's *campanile*.

4.4.2c: 'Anonymous D'?

View with Ruins of Dutch (?) church

Berlin I 14r

127 x 194 mm.

Pen and Brown ink

Water mark: Lower Half of an Eagle (not in Bricquet)

Literature: Hülsen and Egger, I, p. 9.

Notes: Of all the drawings in the two Berlin albums, this drawing perhaps holds the most mystery. Hülsen and Egger were mostly concerned with identifying the structure, which they could not do to their own satisfaction. Though they attribute the drawing to Heemskerck, their description of the

drawing as containing a “transitional style” (übergangsstile) suggests their awareness that it might be by someone else. A close look reveals that the technique does not belong to Heemskerck or the other anonymous hands identified in the Berlin albums. The pervasive wide, flat stroke found on this sheet is unique to the Berlin albums. Also anomalous are overlapping lines throughout, which form a weave not seen in any of the other Berlin sheets. The thickness of hatching used for the foreground objects is unmatched in the remainder of the Berlin folios (even thicker than the ink in the foreground of cat. no. FB2, so thick, in fact that it compromises the paper). The artist used vertical hatching on the surfaces of walls, very different than the usual horizontal technique seen in so many examples (see 11r). Heemskerck’s usual emphasis on outlines is nowhere present. Nor is his usual horizontal hatching.

Chapter 5

CONCLUSION

In the preceding pages I have attempted to describe aspects of Maerten van Heemskerck's drawings of Rome's buildings, vistas, and ruin landscapes that scholars have thus far neglected. While it is true that scholars have paid attention to Heemskerck's Roman phase, the rich, indexical relation of these drawings to the context that circumscribed them has thus far eluded them. It is my hope that I have been able to describe the ways in which their astonishing formal aspect broadcasts the various contextual particulars of their genesis as well as their regenerative mnemonic functions. Heemskerck's drawings of ruins had determining effects on his post-Roman oeuvre and the course of his career, effects that are not to be underestimated. Thus, I also hope that this study has illuminated the ways in which the drawings that remain are crucial for the field of Netherlandish Romanism, a field that has thus far received short shrift in the history of art.

The finer points of the relation of Heemskerck's ruin landscapes to his time in Scorel's workshop have always been obscure in Heemskerck scholarship. I take up Grosshans' suggestion that Scorel's interest in landscape is not to be overlooked in considerations of Heemskerck's approach to Rome's buildings and vistas.⁵⁵³ If

⁵⁵³ Grosshans, pp. 45 – 50.

Scorel's ruin vocabulary was not as developed as Heemskerck's eventually would be – and it probably was not – he did inflect Heemskerck's practice with a propensity for landscape and a working notion of the value and function of drawing for the development of an Italianate manner. Thus, without a sophisticated ruin vocabulary in place, Heemskerck left Scorel's workshop and headed for Rome with at least a glimmer of awareness that an intensive study of the Roman landscape would be a valuable asset to his own art and livelihood, if not a profound contribution for his Netherlandish Romanist milieu and future generations.

With a more nuanced understanding of the finer distinctions between Scorel's and Heemskerck's interests in Roman topography, we seek the reasons for Heemskerck's unprecedented full-scale development of a ruin vocabulary in the vast difference between Scorel's Rome and Heemskerck's Rome: Scorel was in Rome before the Sack, Heemskerck, after. While Rome's ruins were certainly a point of interest among architects, they were not as important to the painter's vocabulary in Scorel's Rome. We recognize the importance of the pre-Sack interest among Italian painters in landscape painting in general, and ancient landscapes with architectural *capricci* in particular. Polidoro and Peruzzi are especially crucial to such a discussion. Certainly, their paintings were an important part of the pictorial vocabulary that Heemskerck absorbed, as were Peruzzi's capricious reconstructions of Roman antiquity for theatrical backdrops. The balanced nature of Peruzzi's interests in painting and architecture made him especially suited for the translation of architectural antiquities into the pictorial realm. However, the pre-Sack work of

these masters is not emphatic in its display of ruination. They only suggest the kind of focus on ruins that we see in Heemskerck's drawings and his subsequent imagery. It was only after the Sack that Rome's architectural ruins emerged in the pictorial realm. Heemskerck's emphatic attention to them, his willingness to scrutinize them in a number of ways shows through in his drawings.

Since Heemskerck was so able to assimilate Scorel's manner before ever leaving for Rome, it should not surprise us that he also possessed a fully developed ability to assimilate motifs *all'antica* into paintings before he ever left Rome. However, my study of Heemskerck's assimilations of the Roman landscape into his finished works – his “use” of his drawings – risks missing indications in his finished works, particularly in his prints, of drawings that have not survived. Certainly, Heemskerck's famous “Adoration of the Magi” print from his *Clades Judaeae Gentis* series of prints, with its clear appropriation of Bramante's spiral steps in the Vatican complex, suggests that Heemskerck drew the monument.⁵⁵⁴ Moreover, not all of the topography in his post-Roman images came from his sketchbook. Prints such as *People of Niniveh Repenting Upon Hearing the Prophecies of Jonah* suggest Heemskerck's use of received knowledge as well as pursued knowledge; the scenery's similarity to Sebastiano Serlio's Scenographic backdrop for tragedy is unmistakable.⁵⁵⁵ Other prints also suggest that Heemskerck owned a copy of Serlio and consulted it the same way he would have consulted his

⁵⁵⁴ Hollstein, no. 257.

⁵⁵⁵ Hollstein, no. 175.

drawings: with repeated looking in order to stock his pictorial memory with motifs for later use as inventions.

My third chapter's analysis of Heemskerck's use of his drawings for fantastic scenery points out the need for further study of the meaning of Heemskerck's ruins as they appear in the backdrops of his paintings and prints. I have concentrated on the intrinsic significance of the painted ruins, which holds from image to image; regardless of their pictorial context or their status as ruins or reconstructions, the motifs in each example are deliberate mnemonic triggers, reminders of Roman antiquity. As *fantasie*, however, they also encourage different ways of thinking that are prompted by artistry itself. Thus, Heemskerck's ruin landscapes and *fantasie* highlight the cultural and historical significance of their own travel and transaction. They call attention to their own manufacture, the role of art in consciousness, and its role in relating the present to deep historical pasts. Such meanings were crucial in the Roman milieu that prompted the *Landscape with the Abduction of Helen*. This was probably even truer of Heemskerck's northern context, geographically removed as it was from the Eternal City, where Roman antiquity would have taken on a greater mystique, as would an artist's ability to convey information about antiquity's visual aspect.

Further systematic study into the iconographic meaning of the topographical inventions in Heemskerck's paintings and prints is would have to grapple with their unsystematic appearance across his oeuvre.⁵⁵⁶ The meaning of his Rome-inspired

⁵⁵⁶ Grosshans, pp. 38 – 39, offers a useful but brief overview of Heemskerck's use of ruins in his paintings.

scenery seems mutable according to its changing appearance and a shifting set of culture-driven categories. The ubiquity and variety of landscape motifs in the backdrops of his allegories, portraits, biblical narratives, and classical mythologies point in a sprawling number of interpretive directions at once. For example, the appearance of a crumbling Colosseum knockoff in the backdrop of a print depicting *The Dangers of Human Ambition* – where figures falling from the great heights they have attained embody the pitfalls of hubris – is surely a *vanitas* commentary.⁵⁵⁷ But the ancient amphitheater’s unaltered appearance in Heemskerck’s *Self-Portrait Before the Colosseum* (1553, fig. 3.2, 1) may have personal *vanitas* overtones and much more. Meanwhile, the reconstructed Colosseum-like amphitheater in *Elisha Receiving Elijah’s Mantle* (1553, fig. 3.1.2a, 1) is not so easily read; both its placement behind an Old Testament story and its status as a pictorial reconstruction of a ruin change the finer points of the amphitheater’s meaning.⁵⁵⁸ By comparison, the vast backdrop of the *Landscape with the Abduction of Helen*, which juxtaposes countless topographical inventions with Virgilian lore, is more daunting still. Thus, we proceed towards a holistic understanding of Heemskerck’s *fantasia* iconography with caution.

Finally, while I have located Heemskerck’s drawings of Rome at the core of his oeuvre, their status as the element of his Roman artistic program that determined the affect of so many of his images – the wellspring of his pictorial memory – only raises further questions about his artistic practice. For starters, the object nature of

⁵⁵⁷ Hollstein, no. 455.

⁵⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, no. 138.

the Berlin albums is a study unto itself. Among the most intriguing aspects of the albums is their containment of multiple hands. This suggests a much more tantalizingly discursive enterprise, which I have only hinted at in my second chapter. There is a strong possibility of trading and copying between Heemskerck and Posthumus, and perhaps others. After Hülsen, Egger, Veldman, and Dacos, I have added to the number of hands therein, while taking away from Heemskerck. But who assembled these volumes? While we know that Cornelis van Haarlem possessed Heemskerck's drawings at the turn of the seventeenth century, we do not know which drawings he possessed. Thus, it is fair to ask: how much of what we have received was collected by Heemskerck himself? How and when did the drawings of Hermannus Posthumus, who was much more interested in decorative motifs, end up in albums alongside Heemskerck's? We know that there was trading and copying between the two of them, but did Posthumus give Heemskerck these drawings? One suspects a much more fluid traffic of drawings between an even greater number of individuals, and over a much longer period of time, than we have identified thus far. The assemblage the Berlin albums may have been a gradual accrual that began with Heemskerck himself. Considering such notions invites us to reorient our thinking about the role of drawings for traveling artists and in antiquarian culture.

References

- Alberto III e Rodolfo Pio da Carpi: collezionisti e mecenati.* Edited by Manuela Kahn-Rossi, Carpi: 2004.
- Artisti Olandesi e fiamminghi in Italia: Mostra di Disegni del Cinque e Seicento della Collezione Frits Lugt.* Edited by Carlos van Hasselt and Albert Blankert, Florence: 1966.
- Baldassare Peruzzi: Pittura scena e architettura nel Cinquecento.* Edited by Marcello Fagiolo and Maria Luisa Madonna, Rome: 1987.
- Early Netherlandish Drawings from Jan van Eyck to Hieronymus Bosch.* Edited by Fritz Koreny. Antwerp: 2004.
- Facciata di Palazzo Madama.* Introduction by Franco Borsi, Rome: 1994.
- Fiamminghi a Roma.* Edited by Nicole Dacos. Rome: 1995.
- Les Granvelle et les Anciens Pays-Bas: liber doctori Mauricio van Durme dedicatus.* Edited by Krista de Jonge. Leuven: 2000.
- Les Granvelle et l'Italie au XVIe Siècle.* Edited by Jacqueline Brunet. Besançon: 1996.
- Jan van Scorel.* Exhibition catalogue. Forward by M. Elizabeth Houtzager. Introduction by G. J. Hoogewerff, Utrecht: 1955.
- Senato della Repubblica: Guida alle Sedi.* Introduction by Franco Borsi, Rome: 1994.
- Ainsworth, Maryan W.. "Northern Renaissance Drawings and Underdrawings: A Proposed Method of Study." *Master Drawings*. Vol. 27, no. 1, Spring, 1989, pp. 5 – 38.
- _____. *Gerard David: Purity of Vision in an Age of Transition.* New York: 1998.
- Alberini, Marcello. *Il Sacco di Roma: L'edizione Orano de I ricordi di Marcello Alberini.* Introduction by Paola Farenta, Rome: 1997.

- Bol, Netto. *The So-called Maarten de Vos Sketchbook of Drawings After the Antique*. The Hague, 1976.
- Boucher, Bruce. "Leone Leoni and Primaticcio's Moulds of Antique Sculpture." *Burlington Magazine*. CXXIII / 934, Jan. 1981, pp. 23 – 26.
- Borinski, K.. *Die Antike in Poetik und Kunsttheorie*. 2 vols. Leipzig: 1914 -24.
- Bredius, A. *Künstler-Inventare*. vol. 7, The Hague, 1921.
- Brothers, Cammy. "Reconstruction as Design: Giuliano da Sangallo and the 'Palazzo di Mecenate' on the Quirinal Hill." *Annali di Architettura*. Vol. 14, 2002, pp. 55 – 72.
- Brown, C. Malcom. "Martin van Heemskerck, The Villa Madama Jupiter, and the Gonzaga Correspondence Files." *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*. No. 121, July, 1979, pp. 49 – 60.
- Bruyn, J. "De Abdij van Egmond also opdrachtgeefster van Kunstwerken in het Begin van de Zestiende eeuw." *Oud-Holland*. Vol. 81, 1966, pp. 197 – 227.
- _____. "Over Betekenis van het Werk van Jan van Scorel Omstreeks 1530 voor Oudere en Jongere Tijdgenoten." *Oud Holland*. Vol. 97, 1983, pp. 117 – 124 and no. 4, pp. 217 – 223.
- _____. "Old and New Elements in 16th-Century Imagery." *Oud Holland*. Vol. 102, 1988, pp. 90 – 112.
- Burns, Howard. "Baldassarre Peruzzi and Sixteenth-Century Architectural Theory." In: *les Traités d'architecture de la Renaissance*. Paris: 1988, pp. 207 – 226.
- Bury, Michael. "On some engravings by Giorgio Ghisi commonly called 'reproductive.'" *Print Quarterly*. Vol. 10, no. 1, 1993, pp. 4 – 19.
- Cancellieri, Francesco. *Storia de' Sollenni Possessi de' Sommi Pontefici: detti anticamente processioni or processioni dopo la loro coronazione dalla basilica vaticana alla lateranense*. Rome, 1802.
- Capanni, Fabrizio. *Rodolfo Pio da Carpi: Diplomatico Cardinale Collezionista*. Medola: 2000.
- Cast, David. "Marten van Heemskerck's *Momus Criticizing the Worlds fo the Gods*: A problem of Erasmian Iconography." *Simiolus*. No. 7, 1974, pp. 22 – 34.
- Ceen, Allan. *Quartiere de' Banchi: Urban Planning in Rome in the First Half of the*

- Cinquecento*. New York: 1986.
- Chastel, André. “Les entrées de Charles Quint en Italie” in *Fetes et ceremonies au temps de Charles Quint. Ite Congrès de l’association internationale des historiens de la Renaissance (2d Section). Bruxelles, Anvers, Gand, Liège, 2-7 Septembre 1957*. Edited by Jean Jacquot, Paris, 1960, pp. 197 – 206.
- Chastel, André. *The Sack of Rome*. Translated by Beth Archer, Princeton: 1983.
- Chirico, Robert F.. “Maerten van Heemskerck and Creative Genius.” *Marsyas*. Vol. XXI, 1981-1982, pp. 7-11.
- Coarelli, Filippo. *Guida Archeologica di Roma*. Fifth edition, Milan: 1989.
- Colonna, Francesco. *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili: the strife of love in a dream*. Translated by Joscelyn Godwyn. London: 1999.
- Cornelis, Bart and Kok, Jan Piet Filedt. “The Taste for Lucas van Leyden Prints.” *Simiolus*. Vol. 26, no. 1/2, 1998, pp. 18 – 86.
- Costamagna, Alba. “Pittori Stranieri a Roma e Raffaello.” *Aspetti dell’arte a Roma Prima e dopo Raffaello*. Rome: 1984, pp. 123 – 129.
- Cust, Lionel. “Notes on Pictures in the Royal collections – XVIII. On Some Portraits Attributed to Antonio Moro and on a Life of the Painter by Henri Hymans.” *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs*. Vol. 18, no. 91, October, 1910, pp. 2, 5 – 7, 10 – 12.
- D’Onofrio, Cesare. *Gli Obelischi di Roma*. Rome: 1965.
- Dacos, Nicole. *Les Peintres Belge à Rom au XVI Siècle*. Brussels / Rome: 1964.
- _____. “Hermannus Posthumus: Rome, Mantua, Landshut.” *Burlington Magazine*. CXXVII / 988, July, 1985, pp. 433 – 438.
- _____. “L’ anonyme A de Berlin: Hermannus Posthumus.” In: *Antikenzeichnung und Antikenstudium in Renaissance und Fruhbarock*. Mainz am Rhein, 1989, pp. 61 – 81.
- _____. *Roma Quanta Fuit: Ou L’Invention du Paysage de Ruines*. Brussels, 2004.
- Dinsmoor, William. “The Literary Remains of Sebastiano Serlio.” *Art Bulletin*. 1942, pp. 55 – 91 and 115 – 154.
- Dosio, Giovanni Antonio. *Roma Antica: e I disegno di architettura agli Uffizi*.

- Rome: 1976.
- Dulcaux, Lise. "Dessins de Martin van Heemskerck." *Revue du Louvre et des Musees de France*. Vol. XXX / 5 – 6, 1981, pp. 375 – 380.
- Dunbar III, Burton. "A Rediscovered Sixteenth Century Drawing of the Vatican with Constructions for the Entry of Charles V into Rome." *Sixteenth Century Journal*. Vol. 23, no. 2, Summer, 1992, pp. 195 – 204.
- Dürer, Albrecht. *Underweysung der Messung*. Nuremberg: 1525 (English translation, New York: 1977).
- Dupérac, Etienne. *Disegni de le Ruine di Roma e Come Anticamente erano*. Rome: 1574.
- Egger, Hermann. *Codex Escorialensis: Ein skizzenbuch aus der werkstatt Domenico Ghirlandaios*. Vienna: 1906.
- _____. *Die Römische Veduten*. Vienna: 1911.
- _____. "Zur Dauer von Martens van Heemskerck Aufenthalt in Rom" *Mededelingen van het Nederlands Historisch Instituut te Rome*. Vol. V, 1925, pp. 121 – 123.
- Faries, Molly. "Maarten van Heemskerck and Jan van Scorel's Harlem workshop." In: *Historical Painting Techniques, Materials, and Studio Practice: reprints of a Symposium, University of Leiden, the Netherlands 26 – 29, June 1995*, n. p., 1995, pp. 135 – 139.
- _____. "Jan van Scorel: Additional Documents from the Church Records of Utrecht." *Oud Holland*. Vol. 85, 1970, pp. 4 – 5.
- _____. *Jan van Scorel: His Style and its Historical Context*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Bryn Mawr College, 1972.
- _____. "Attributing the Layers of Heemskerck's Cologne Lamentation of Christ." In: *Les Dessin sous-jacent dans le processus de creation*. Louvain-la-Neuve: 1995, pp. 133 – 141.
- _____. "Jan van Scorel's Jerusalem Landscapes." In: *Detail: New Studies of Northern Renaissance Art in Honor of Walter S. Gibson*. Turnhout, Brepols: 1998, pp. 113 – 134.
- Ferrarino, Luigi. *Lettere di Artisti Italiani ad Antonio Perrenot di Granvelle*. Madrid: 1977.

- Filippi, Elena. *Maarten van Heemskerck, Inventio Urbis*. Milan: 1990.
- Folie, Jacqueline. "Les Dessins de Jean Gossart dit Mabuse." *Gazette des Beaux Arts*. XXXVIII / 1, 1960, pp. 77 – 98.
- Franz, H. G.. *Niederländische Landschaftsmalerei im Zeitalter des Manierismus*. Graz: 1969.
- Franzoni, C.. *Gli inventari dell'eredetà cardinale Rodolfo Pio da Carpi*. Pisa: 2002.
- Friedlaender, Max J.. *Early Netherlandish Painting*. Translation by Heinz Norden, Vol. XIII, Leyden: 1975.
- Frommel, Christoph. *Baldassare Peruzzi als Maler und Zeichner*. Vienna: 1967-68.
- _____. "Peruzzis Römische Anfänge, von der 'Pseudo-Cronaca-Gruppe' zu Bramante." *Römisches Jahrbuch der Bibliotheca Hertziana* (v. 27/28), pp. 137 – 182.
- Fumagalli, Elena. "La Facciata Quattrocentesca del Palazzo Medici in Piazza Madama: Un Disegno e Alcune Considerazioni." *Annali di Architettura*. Vol. 3, 1991, pp. 26 – 31.
- Garms, Jorg. *Vedute di Roma Dal Medioevo all'Ottocento: Atlante iconografico, topografico, architettonico*. 2 vols., Naples: 1995.
- Geldenhauer, Gerardus. *Vita Clarissimi Principis Philippi a Burgundià*. Strasbourg: 1529, reprinted in: J. Prinsen, *Collectanea van Gerardus Geldenhauer Noviomagus Kroniek van het Historisch Genootschap te Utrecht*, Vol. III, no. 16, Amsterdam, 1901.
- Gelder, J. G. van. "Jan Gossaert in Rome, 1508 – 09." *Oud-Holland*. Vol. 59, 1942, pp. 1 – 11.
- Goldthwaite, Richard. *Wealth and the Demand for Art in Italy, 1300 – 1600*. Baltimore: 1983.
- Gombrich, E.H.. "The Style *all'antica*: Imitation and Assimilation." In: *Gombrich on the Renaissance*. London: 1966, pp. 122 – 128.
- Gomez, Margarita Fernandez. "El autor del Codex Escorialensis." *Academia*. Vol. no. 74, 1992, pp. 123 – 161.
- Gouwens, Kenneth. *Remembering the Renaissance*. Boston: 1998.
- Greve, Henri. *De Bronnen van Carel van Mander voor "Het Leven der*

- doorluchtighe Nederlandtsche en Hoogduytsche Schilders.* " The Hague: 1903.
- Grosshans, Rainhald. *Maerten van Heemskerck: Die Gemälde.* Berlin: 1980.
- Guicciardini, Lodovico. *Descrittione di tutti i Paesi Bassi.* Antwerp: 1567 (English edition, London: 1953).
- Hall, Marcia. *After Raphael.* Cambridge: 1999.
- Harrison, Jefferson. "The Detroit Christ on Calvary and the Cologne Lamentation of Christ: two Early Haarlem Paintings by Maerten van Heemskerck." *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek.* no. 37, 1986, pp. 174 – 194.
- _____. *The Paintings of Maerten van Heemskerck: A Catalogue Raisonné.* Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Virginia, 1987.
- Haskell, Francis and Penny, Nicholas. *Taste and the Antique: The Lure of Classical Sculpture 1500-1900.* New Haven: 1981.
- Hollstein, F.W.H.. *The New Hollstein: Dutch and Flemish etchings, engravings and woodcuts, 1450-1700: Maarten van Heemskerck.* 2 vols., Edited by Ger Luijten, compiled by Ilja Veldman, Amsterdam: 1994.
- Hoogewerff, G. J.. *Nederlandsche schilders in Italie in de 16de eeuw; De geschiedenis van het Romanism.* Utrecht: 1912.
- Hoogewerff, Goffredo. "L'ispirazione Romana di Martino van Heemskerck." *Scritti di storia dell'arte in onore di Mario Salmi.* Rome: 1963, pp. 163 – 167.
- Hülßen, Christian, and Egger, Hermann. *Die Römischen Skizzenbücher van Maarten van Heemskerck in Könighschen Kupfershtichkabinett zu Berlin.* 2 vols.. Berlin: Bard, 1913 – 16 (facsimile ed. Soest: Davaco Publishers, 1975).
- Hülßen, Christian. "Unbekannte Roemische Zeichnungen von Marten van Heemskerck." In: *Mededeelingen van Het Nederlandsch Historisch Instituut te Rome.* 's-Gravenhage: 1927, pp. 83 - 96.
- Jacks, Philip. "The Simulachrum of Fabio Calvo: A View of Roman Architecture all'antica in 1527." *The Art Bulletin.* Vol. 72, no. 3, pp. 453 – 481.
- James, Carlo. *Old Master Prints and Drawings: A Guide to Preservation and Conservation.* Amsterdam: 1997.
- Judson, J. R. "Jan Gossaert and the New Aesthetic." *The Age of Brueghel:*

Netherlandish Drawings in the Sixteenth Century. Exhibition Catalogue
Edited by J. O. Hand, et. al., Washington, DC, 1986 – 87, pp. 13 – 24.

Kerrich, Thomas. *Catalogue of the prints which have been engraved after Martin Heemskerck*. Cambridge, England: 1828.

Keyes, G.S. *Cornelis Vroom*. Dissertation, University of Utrecht, 1975.

King, E. S.. “A New Heemskerck.” *Journal of the Walters Art Gallery*. 1945, pp. 65 – 73.

Krautheimer, Richard. “The Tragic and Comic Scene of the Renaissance.” *Gazette des Beaux Arts*. Vol. XC, 1948, pp. 328 – 346.

Kurz, Otto. “Four Tapestries after Hieronymous Bosch.” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*. Vol. 30, 1967, pp. 126 – 127.

Lanciani, Rodolfo. *The Destruction of Ancient Rome*. Rome: 1905 (English translation, New York: 1967).

_____. *The Ruins and Excavations of Ancient Rome*. Rome: 1887 (English translation, New York: 1967).

_____. *Ancient Rome in Light of the Recent Excavations*. Boston: 1885.

Letarouilly, Paul Marie. *Édifices de Rome moderne, ou. Recueil des palais, maisons, églises couvents et autres monuments publics et particuliers les plus remarquables de la ville de Rome*. Princeton: 1984.

Maddalo, Silvia. “Ancora sulla Loggia di Bonifacio VIII al Laterano: Una proposata di ricostruzione e un’ipotesi attributive.” *Arte Medioevale*. Vols. 12 – 13, 1998 – 99, pp. 211 – 230

Madonna, Maria Luisa. “L’ingresso di Carlo V a Roma.” In: *La città effimera e l’universo artificiale del giardino; la Firenze dei Medici e l’Italia del ’500*. Edited by Marcello Fagiolo, Rome: 1980, pp. 63-68.

Malmstrom, Ronald. “A Drawing by Marten van Heemskerck of the Interior of S. Giovanni in Laterano.” *Römisches Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte*. Vol. XIV, 1973, pp. 247 – 251.

Mancini, Vincenzo. “Aggiornamento su Lambert Sustris.” *Saggi e memorie di storia dell’arte*. Vol. 24, 2000, pp. 11 – 29.

Mander, Karel van. *Het Schilder-Boek*. Haarlem: 1604.

Marini, Gaetano Luigi. *Degli Archiatri Pontifici*. 2 vols. Rome: 1784.

- Marliani, J. B.. *Topographia Antiquae Romae*. Rome: 1534. Lyons: 1534.
- McGowan, Margaret. *The Vision of Rome in Late Renaissance France*. New Haven: 2000.
- Meadow, Mark. "Ritual and civic identity in Philip II's 1549 Antwerp *Blidje incompst*." *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek*. No. 49, 1998, pp. 36 – 67.
- Meijer, Bert. "An unknown landscape Drawing by Polidoro da Caravaggio and a note on Jan van Scorel in Italy." *Paragone*. 1974, pp. 62 – 73.
- _____. "Lambert Sustris in Padua: frescos en tekeningen." In: *Oud Holland*. Vol. 107, no. 1, 1993, pp. 3 – 16.
- _____. "Fiaminghi e Olandesi nella bottega veneziana: il caso di Jacopo Tintoretto." In: *Il Rinascimento a Venezia e la pittura del nord ai tempi di Bellini, Dürer, Tiziano*. Milan: 1999, pp. 499 – 557.
- Melion, Walter S.. *Shaping the Netherlandish Canon : Karel van Mander's Schilderboeck*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.
- Mensger, Ariane: *Jan Gossaert: die Niederlandische Kunst zu Beginn der Neuzeit*. Berlin: 2002.
- _____. "Review of Martin Stritt: *Die Schöne Helena in den Romruin*." *Sehepunkte*. Vol. 5, no. 9, 2005), <http://www.sehepunkte.historicum.net/2005/09/4629.html> (accessed, 5/25/08, 11:02 am).
- Michaelis, Adolf. "Michelangelos Plan Zum Kapitol und Seine Ausführung," *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst*, N.F. II, 1891, p. 189.
- _____. "Römische Skizzenbücher: Marten van Heemskercks und anderer Nordischer Künstler des xvi Jahrhunderts." *Jahrbuch des Kaiserlich Deutschen archaeologischen Instituts*. 1891, no. VI, pp. 125 – 76, and pp. 219 – 238; 1892, no. VII, pp. 83 –100.
- Miedema, Hessel. *Fraey en aerdigh, schoon en moy in Karel van Manders Schilder-boek*. Amsterdam: 1984.
- _____. "Karel van Mander: Did He Write Art Literature?" *Simiolus*, vol. 22, no. 1 / 2, 1993 – 1994, pp. 58 – 64.

- _____. *Karel van Mander: The Lives of the Illustrious Netherlandish and German Painters, from the first edition of the Schilder-boeck (1603 – 1604)*. Introduction, translation, and edited by Hessel Miedema, 6 vols. Doornspijk: Davaco Publishers, 1994.
- Nesselrath, Arnold. "Raphael's Gift to Dürer." *Master Drawings*. Vol. 331, no. 4, 1993, pp. 376 – 389.
- _____. "Il Codice Escorialense." In: *Domenico Ghirlandaio, 1449 – 1494: atti del convegno internazionale, Firenze, 16 – 18 Ottobre, 1994*. Florence, 1994, pp. 175 – 198.
- Nolan, Liesel. "Is she Dancing?: a new reading of Lucas van Leyden's Dance of the Magdalene of 1519." In: *Equally in God's Image: women in the Middle Ages*. New York: 1990, pp. 233 – 250.
- Olitsky – Rubinstein, Ruth. "'Tempus edax rerum': A newly Discovered Painting By Hermannus Posthumus." *The Burlington Magazine*. Vol. 127, No. 988, 1985, pp. 425 – 430.
- Pastor, Ludwig. *History of the Popes*. London, 1899 – 1908.
- Piranesi, Giovanni Battista. *Vasi, Candelabri, Cippi....* Rome, 1778.
- Preibisz, Leon. *Martin van Heemskerck: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Romanismus in der Niederlandischen Malerei des XVI Jahrhunderts*. Leipzig, 1911.
- Reiss, Sheryl. "Adrian VI, Clement VII, and Art." In: *The Pontificate of Clement VI: History, Politics, Culture*. Edited by Kenneth Gouwens and Sheryl Reiss, Burlington: 2006, pp. 339 – 362.
- Riggs, Timothy. *Hieronymous Cock: Printmaker and Publisher*. New York: 1977.
- Russo, Teresa M.. "Appunti su Palazzo Medici e sul suo Proprietario." In: *Strenna Dei Romanisti*. 1989, pp. 485 – 500.
- Ruysschaert, José and Ridolfi, Roberto. *Recherche des deux bibliothèques romaines Maffei des XVe et XVIe siècles*. Florence, 1959.
- Sangallo, Giuliano da and Hülsen, Christian. *Il Libro di Giuliano da Sangallo: Codice Vaticano Bareberniano Latino 4424*. Lipsia, 1910.
- Saunders, Eleanor. *Old Testament Subjects in the Prints of Maarten van Heemskerck: "Als een Clare Spiegele der tegenwoordige Tijden,"* Ph.D. Dissertation, Yale University, 1978.

- Saywell, Edward. "Behind the Line: The materials and Techniques of Old Master Drawings." In: *Bulletin of the Harvard University Art Museum*. Vol. VI, no. II, 1998.
- Scherer, Margaret R.. "Helen of Troy." *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin*. New Series, Vol. 25, no. 10, 1967, pp. 367 – 383.
- Serebrennikov, Nina Eugenia. "Review of *Shaping the Netherlandish Canon*." *Art Bulletin*, v. 74, no. 4, 1992, pp. 683 – 686.
- Silver, Larry. "'Figure, nude, historie, e poesie': Gossart and the Renaissance Nude in the Netherlands." *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek*. no. 37, 1986, pp. 1 – 40.
- _____. "Review of Rainald Grosshans, *Maerten van Heemskerck: die Gemälde*." *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte*. 47 Bd., H. 2, 1984, pp. 269 – 280.
- _____. *Peasant Scenes and Landscapes*. Philadelphia, 2006.
- Spicer, Joneath. "Heemskerck's Rainbow: Symbol or Narrative Motif?" In: *Pictura Verba Cupit: Essays for Lubomír Konecny*. Edited by Beket Bukovinská and Lubomír Slavicek. Prague: 2006, pp. 146 – 152.
- Springer, Jaro. "Ein Skizzenbuch von Marten Heemskerck." *Jahrbuch der Königlich Preussischen Kunstsammlungen*. no. 5, 1884, pp. 327 – 333.
- _____. "Ein zweites Skizzenbuch von Marten van Heemskerck." *Jahrbuch der Königlich Preussischen Kunstsammlungen*. no. 12, 1891, pp. 117 – 124.
- Sterk, J.. *Philips von Bourgondië (1465 - 1524), bischop van Utrecht, als protagonist van de renaissance. Zijn leven en mecenaat*. Zutphen: 1980.
- Stritt, Martin. "Helen in Rome: Maarten van Heemskerck's Ruin Landscape." *FMR*. January, 2000, pp. 111 – 123.
- _____. *Die Schöne Helena in de Romruinen. Überlegungen zu einem Gemälde Maarten van Heemskercks*. Frankfurt a.M.: 2004.
- Szallay, Gabriella. *Contesting the Colossal: Maerten van Heemskerck's Eristic Self – Portrait*. Master's Thesis, Penn State University, 2003.
- Tessari, Cristiano. *Baldassare Peruzzi: Il Progetto dell'antico*. Introduction by Howard Burns, Milan: 1995.

- Thoenes, Christoph. "San Pietro come rovina. Note su alcune vedute di Maerten van Heemskerck." In: *Sostegno e Adornamento*. Introduction by James S. Ackerman, Milan: 1998, pp. 135 – 149.
- Turner, A. Richard. "Two Landscapes in Renaissance Rome." *Art Bulletin*. Vol. 43, no., pp. 275 – 287.
- Vasari, Giorgio *Le Vite de' più eccellenti pittori, scultori, et architetti*. Florence: 1568 (Edited and Annotated by Gaetano Milanesi, Florence: 1906).
- Vasi, Giuseppe. *Magnificenza*. Book VIII, Rome: 1758.
- Velde, Carl van de. *Frans Floris (1519 / 20 – 1570) Leven en werken*. Brussels: 1975.
- Veldman, Ilja. "Review, *Die Römischen Skizzenbücher von Maarten van Heemskerck* by Christian Hülsen; Hermann Egger." *Simiolus*. Vol. 9, no. 2, 1977, pp. 106 – 113.
- _____. *Maarten van Heemskerck and Dutch Humanism in the Sixteenth Century*. trans. Michael Hoyle, Amsterdam: Gary Schwartz, 1977.
- Veldman, Ilja. "Heemskercks Romeinse tekeningen en 'Anonymous B.'" *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek*. No. 38, 1987, pp. 369 – 382.
- _____. "Maarten van Heemskerck en Italië." *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek*. no. 44, 1993, pp. 125 – 142.
- Viciose, Julia. "La Basilica di San Giovanni dei Fiorentini a Roma: individuazione delle vicende progettuali." *Bollettino d'arte*. Vol. 77, no. 72, March – April, 1992, pp. 73 – 114.
- Watrous, James. *The Craft of Old-Master Drawings*. Madison: 1957.
- Wurm, Heinrich. *Baldassarre Peruzzi: Architekturzeichnungen: Tafelband*. Tübingen: 1984.