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Abstract

The interplay between architecture and the other visual arts in the work and era of Strasbourg artist Wendel Dietterlin the Elder (c. 1550-1599) is the subject of this dissertation. New links between architecture and figural arts such as painting and sculpture emerged in sixteenth-century northern Europe along with the revival of classical culture, the Reformation, and the advent of the printed, illustrated art treatise, sparking volatile debates about the nature of architectural expertise. Scholars have conventionally probed these issues by examining the era’s theoretical literature or the dual careers of painter-architects, leaving period notions of the formal intersections between art and architecture largely obscure. Examining the formal and theoretical aspects of a wider variety of primary sources, this project scrutinizes how Dietterlin’s little-known oeuvre transformed the culture of ornament that defined the relationships between architectural and artistic expertise for early modern northern Europe.

Dietterlin’s *Architectura* treatise—published over three installments in 1593, 1594, and finally in 1598 as an expanded compilation of the previous releases—provides the study’s evidential centerpiece. Drawing on authors such as Vitruvius, Dürer, and Vasari, the sparse text and copious etchings of Dietterlin’s *Architectura* develop an innovative theory of the five canonical Orders of architecture as manners of ornament that can inspire decorative inventions in any medium. This study contextualizes the treatise’s extensive influence on art literature and ornament design to argue that Dietterlin’s precocious, universal theory of ornamental style occasioned a broad re-negotiation of architectural knowledge.

With reference to its first comprehensive catalogue of Dietterlin drawings, the dissertation reconstructs the *Architectura’s* formation, showing how Dietterlin refined and popularized the idea that ornament design in architecture and in art follow distinct technical
rules but obey common protocols of style. It also analyzes how the treatise’s experiments with architectural figuration and its cosmos of classical and Christian symbolism melded the rhetoric of architecture and the figural arts, and inspired new discourses on intermediality, the *paragone*, and the synthesis of the arts. The dissertation demonstrates that Dietterlin revised the Vitruvian ideal of the artistically savvy architect, making architectural expertise likewise indispensable to the formation of the well-rounded artist.
Preface

Several facts related to the preparation and publication of this manuscript must be mentioned here. Unless otherwise noted, all translations are the author’s own. Images of two-dimensional objects are credited to the collection to which they belong. In the occasional cases in which images of three-dimensional objects and architecture have not been composed by the author, the printed source from which the figure derives is noted in the figure caption. It has not been possible to obtain the rights to reproduce the great majority of the images in this dissertation. By the written permission of the Dean of Graduate Studies of Princeton University, the digital version of this dissertation will be published on ProQuest with figure captions, but without images that do not belong to the author. One fully illustrated copy of the dissertation will, however, be available in Princeton University’s Seeley G. Mudd Manuscript Library.
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Introduction

In the dedication of the 1593 Erst Buch that began his serial Architectura treatise (1593-8), Strasbourg artist Wendel Dietterlin the Elder (c. 1550-1599) describes his epiphanic initiation to the work’s main subject: the art of architectural ornament. Having been shown a box with architectural ornaments designed by the dilettante woodworker and Erst Buch dedicatee Conrad Schloßberger, Dietterlin marvels that:

…in the creation of [this object] you, [Schloßberger], were a building-master (Bawmeister), who fatefully showed what kind of work…might be drawn from...the art of the five columns[.] Its dimensions were artfully decorous, …derived from the proper foundations [of architecture]. I had never seen the likes of such a work, so highly praised by those with an understanding of art, among the labors of a carpenter (Schreiner), and so it caused me no small wonder.¹

Schloßberger’s casket incorporates the ornaments of the five canonical Orders of architecture. These were common adornments in the art and architecture of northern Europe during the second half of the sixteenth century, as this similar box in Dresden suggests [Fig. 1].² The ornaments of Schloßberger’s box are moreover devised according to period conventions of architectural correctness, a category then widely known as

“decorum”\(^3\). Along with the approval of well-informed critics, the box’s architecturally decorous ornaments attest to the woodworker’s solid grasp of architectural theory.

Why does Schloßberger’s deft display of architectural knowledge so astonish Dietterlin? In the opening lines of his *De re aedificatoria* (published 1485), Leon Battista Alberti had established a paradigmatic definition of the architect, which excludes woodworkers such as Schloßberger from the architectural profession.\(^4\) “I should explain,” Alberti wrote,

… exactly whom I mean by an architect; for it is no carpenter that I would have you compare to the greatest exponents of other disciplines: the carpenter is but an instrument in the hands of the architect. Him I consider an architect, who by sure and wonderful reason and method, knows both how to devise through his own mind and energy and to realize by construction, whatever can be most beautifully fitted out for the noble needs of man, by the movement of weights and the joining and massing of bodies. To do this he must have an understanding and knowledge of all the highest and most noble disciplines. This, then, is the architect.”\(^5\)


\(^4\) By 1550, Alberti’s definition of the architect was well known in Strasbourg. A Latin version of Alberti’s *De re aedificatoria* was published in Strasbourg in 1541. Theories in *De re aedificatoria* were known to German-speaking audiences of the sixteenth century through the writings of Walther Hermann Ryff. Ryff treats many of Alberti’s ideas in his 1547 *Der funernobisten notwendigsten, der gantzen Architectur angehörigen mathematischen und mechanischen Kunst eygentlicher Bericht und verständliche Unterrichtung*. On Ryff’s appropriations from Alberti, see see Julian Jachmann, *Die Architekturbücher des Walter Hermann Ryff. Vitruvrezeption im Kontext mathematischer Wissenschaften*. Cultural and Interdisciplinary Studies in Art 1, ed. Zita Ágota Ptaki (Stuttgart: ibidem, 2006), 67; and Hans Joachim Dethlefs, “‘Wohlstand’ and ‘Decorum’ in Sixteenth-Century German Art Theory,” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 70 (2007): 149.

Alberti characterizes architecture as a cerebral pursuit. It involves good judgment, a knack for transposing ideas into artful designs, and a handle on the various other fields of knowledge that inform the art of devising monuments, fortifications, and other built works beneficial to society—all qualities absent from the manual labors of the carpenter. Alberti’s argument embodied a new esteem for the intellectual dignity of certain visual arts, a controversial development that would nevertheless gain widespread acceptance by the end of the sixteenth century. His treatise in fact helped give rise to the new, Italian Renaissance architect: a figure who designed monuments, but was not always active at the building site.

Dietterlin’s surprise at Schloßberger’s grasp of architecture registers a clash between the Albertian notion of architectural knowledge and an older model of architectural expertise in which craftsmen can also excel in architectural design. For early modern audiences who increasingly equated the pursuits of the mind with the artist and associated the vocations of the hand with the artisan, the architect and the carpenter practiced different arts.

Generations of readers on both sides of the Alps assimilated Alberti’s compelling picture of

---


8 Pamela H. Smith has observed that theory and practice were distinct but increasingly related categories of artistic knowledge in this period. See Pamela H. Smith, The Body of the Artisan: Art and Experience in the Scientific Revolution (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 17-18.
the architect as a learned inventor of buildings. Throughout the sixteenth century, northern Europe increasingly differentiated between those who devised buildings and those who built them.

Sometimes this manifested in tacit acceptance of Alberti’s architect/carpenter dichotomy. In his 1539 *DIE INVENTIE DER COLOMMEN*, Netherlandish artist Pieter Coecke van Aelst characterizes invention as the architect’s defining work, and even employs the contrast between architecture and carpentry as a metaphor for the distinction between theory and practice. The apparent cleaving of the architectural profession into “artist-architects” and “handworker-architects” in the North is often explained through the rise of an “architectus” family of terms thought to describe the Albertian concept of the designer-architect in northern languages that otherwise employed terms related to “Baumeister” to connote the craftsman who supervised construction. Yet as Dietterlin’s use of “Baumeister” and cases discussed in the next sections will show, theorists did not always distinguish

---


consistently between *architectus* and *Baumeister*, or the artist and the craftsman. \(^{12}\) In contrast to the text of Coecke van Aelst, Dietterlin’s account of the keen grasp of architectural theory displayed in “*Baumeister*” Schloßberger’s wooden box defies the Albertian idea of artist-architect and craftsman-carpenter as an antithetical pair. Leaving intact Alberti’s notion of the architect as a mental laborer, Dietterlin nevertheless suggests that those whose art also involves the mechanical work of crafting need not be excluded from the architect’s ranks. \(^{13}\)

Dietterlin’s professed astonishment at the architectural knowledge displayed in Schloßberger’s box also arises from the painter’s apparent prejudice, shared by many post-Albertian thinkers up to today, that architecture is only “realize[d] by construction” and that its primary end is “the movement of weights…and the massing of bodies,” that is, building. Only those who created *edifices* counted as architects—or so it is often assumed. Yet Dietterlin’s confidence in Schloßberger’s architectural prowess suggests that architectonic works executed in figural media such as wood sculpture could also count as architecture. In asserting that the woodcarver had acted as a *Baumeister*, Dietterlin flouts the notion that only those who plan buildings and supervise construction display architectural knowledge. Rather, any artist who employs the ornaments of architecture, or, as the Dietterlin writes, “the five


\(^{13}\) This orientation accords with the older notion of architecture as an *ars mechanica*, an attitude that remained trenchant in northern Europe long after it had faded from the horizon of Italian architectural theory. On the roots of architecture as an *ars mechanica*, see Stephen Parcell, *Four Historical Definitions of Architecture* (Montreal and Kingston, London and Ithaca: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2012), 40-58.
columns,” must understand architectural design. The knowledge of the figural artist can overlap with that of the architect.

The title page of Dietterlin’s 1593 text elaborates this theory. It shows Amor astride the basket of Labor, which contains symbols of what are now known as the figural arts: the carpenter’s saw, the sculptor’s hammer and chisel, and the painter’s brush, palette and Mahlstick [Fig. 2]. Amor’s flaming arrows burn the beehive of Utility, guarded by Diligence. The image implies that passion for craft conquers the sting of artistic toil and liberates the honey-sweet rewards of art. In depicting the implements of the figural arts but not the tools of architecture, Dietterlin’s design departs from the standard imagery of the title pages and frontispieces of period architectural treatises. The art of architecture instead manifests itself in the monument behind these figures. The title page thus portrays architecture as an entity that encompasses all the arts and artistic virtues. Dietterlin’s carpentry anecdote and his 1593 treatise’s heterodox title page advance the Architectura project’s central thesis: that the expertise and practices of architectural design can pertain to other visual media. The present dissertation examines the power of this idea in the artistic and architectural cultures of Dietterlin’s age.

The Architect and the Architectura in Sixteenth-century Northern Europe

Dietterlin’s Architectura is a richly illustrated guide to devising architectural ornament. It was published in three main installments in 1593, 1594, and 1598, each of which appeared

---


in German and bilingual, Latin/French translations with slightly different text but identical sets of etched images.\footnote{For what has until now been the most complete printing history of Dietterlin’s \textit{Architectura} project, see G. Ulrich Großmann, “Die verschiedenen Ausgaben der ‘Architectura’ des Wendel Dietterlin,” \textit{Anzeiger des Germanischen Nationalmuseums} (1997): 157-173.} With each successive installment of the treatise, Dietterlin recycled etchings and some text from his prior \textit{Architectura} publications, combining all the previously published material with ninety-six new etchings in a final, summative work in 1598. The artist at first planned the work as a series of distinct treatises in the style of Sebastiano Serlio’s \textit{Regole generali} series, only to abandon the plan with the 1598 tract. The evidence for this is detailed in the first complete catalogue and history of all the various versions of the text, to be found in Appendices I and II, and in a transcription of Dietterlin’s heretofore unpublished application for an Imperial printing privilege, contained in Appendix III.\footnote{See Appendix I: “Master List of Versions of the \textit{Architectura}”; Appendix II: “The Publication History of the \textit{Architectura}”; and Appendix III: “Transcription of Dietterlin’s Application for an Imperial Printing Privilege for the \textit{Architectura}”.}

The \textit{Architectura}’s complex publication history has produced several problematic trends in the literature on Dietterlin’s work. Scholars have generally regarded the 1598 edition of the text has as the “complete” version of Dietterlin’s project, with the result that most interpretations of the \textit{Architectura} are based on the content and structure of that work alone.\footnote{The only monographs on Dietterlin and the \textit{Architectura} both adopt this approach. Exceptions are Großmann’s article, which does not discuss the earlier installments of the treatise in depth, and Günter Irmscher’s article, which nevertheless covers only the first two main installments of the three-stage project. See Karl Ohnesorge, \textit{Wendel Dietterlin, Maler von Strassburg. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der deutschen Kunst in der zweiten Hälfte des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts}, Ph.D. Dissertation, Kaiser Wilhelms-Universität, Strasbourg, 1893 (Leipzig: August Pries, 1893); Margot Pirr, \textit{Die Architectura des Wendel Dietterlin 1598}. Ph.D. Dissertation, Berlin, 1940 (Gräfenheinichen: C. Schulze & Co., 1940); Großmann, “Die verschiedenen Ausgaben der ‘Architectura’”; and Günter Irmscher, “OrnamentSinnBild: Ornamentcapricci in Wendel I Dietterlins Architectvra (Stuttgart/Straßburg 1593/1594),” in \textit{Ornament. Motiv-Modus-Bild}, ed. Vera Bayer and Christian Spies (Paderborn: Wilhelm Fink, 2012), 117-148.} And while Dietterlin likely composed and published the German versions of each
installment of the *Architectura* first, some scholars have treated the Latin/French *Architecturas* as the original and authoritative translations.\(^{19}\) The tendency to scrutinize the *Architectura* only through the lens of the final, 1598 text has robbed the scholarship of the opportunity to evaluate the development of Dietterlin’s ideas from the probable inception of the project around 1590 to its conclusion some eight years later. The present dissertation offers the first extended evaluation of the *Architectura*’s conceptual and artistic evolution. By assessing the 1593, 1594, and 1598 installments of the treatise as distinct stages of a long-term project, the study reveals how Dietterlin’s interests and priorities shifted as he developed the work. This involves associating the images of the *Architectura* with their position in the history of the project. The dissertation thus identifies designs primarily with the text in which Dietterlin first published them, detailing their places in any later *Architectura* publications in the notes. In acknowledgment of the language in which the texts first appeared, the dissertation refers to the distinct installments of the *Architectura* with abbreviations of their original, German titles: the 1593 *Erst Buch*, the 1594 *Annder Buch*, and the 1598 *Architectura*. The Latin/French translations are given names that abbreviate their own extended titles: the 1593 *Liber I.*, the 1594/5 *Liber II.*, and the 1598 *Architectra de Constitutione, Symmetria, ac Proportione quinqu[e] Columnarum*.

\(^{19}\) Irmscher’s “‘OrnamentSinnBild’” is one example of this approach. Kimberley Skelton meanwhile notes inaccurately that the translations were published *simultaneously*. Nevertheless, the speed with which translations were produced supports her argument that the *Architectura* departs from the standard early modern practice of publishing a single edition of an architectural treatise and producing translations some years later. See Kimberley Skelton, “Shaping the Book and the Building: Text and Image in Dietterlin’s *Architectura*,” *Word & Image* 23, no. 1 (2007): 25-44, esp. 25-26.
From the beginning of modern scholarship on the *Architectura*, critics have variously interpreted Dietterlin’s work as a painter’s architecture book,\textsuperscript{20} a pattern book for architectural sculpture,\textsuperscript{21} a guide to the art of building design,\textsuperscript{22} an amusing compendium of emblematic images for architecture lovers,\textsuperscript{23} and even a novelistic endeavor.\textsuperscript{24} All are in some way accurate, for Dietterlin devised the *Architectura* to be many things for many different types of readers.\textsuperscript{25} Nevertheless, previous evaluations have neglected the treatise’s major intervention in contemporary architectural theory.

Dietterlin’s work functions simultaneously as a theoretical treatise on the canonical Orders of architecture and a compendium of nearly two hundred distinct etchings that model those Orders as manners of ornament for all media. The summative, 1598 version of the *Architectura* includes an overview of ornament drawing and five sections respectively dedicated to the Tuscan, Doric, Ionic, Corinthian, and Composite modes. Each proceeds from a history of its Order to instructions for devising the Order’s parts, and finally to full-page etchings that display examples of that ornamental manner in the form of architectural


\textsuperscript{22} Albrecht Haupt, *Die Baukunst der Renaissance in Frankreich und Deutschland* (Berlin-Neubabelsberg: Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft Athenaion, 1916), 309.


\textsuperscript{25} Skelton, “Shaping the Book and the Building,” 25-44.
and non-architectural objects: fountains, epitaphs, altarpieces, façade designs, and even small objects such as salteries. Each is understood as a manifestation of the Order at hand. The structure and much of the imagery of Dietterlin’s *Architectura* derives from the architectural ornament treatises of Sebastiano Serlio, Jacques I. Androuet Du Cerceau, and Hans Vredeman de Vries. Still, the *Architectura*’s picture of the Orders as a system for devising all manner of objects projected a radical new vision of architectural ornament as a link between painting, sculpture, and architecture.

The *Architectura*’s seemingly unorthodox picture of architectural theory’s role in the other visual arts engages an ancient discourse about the nature of architectural knowledge. In the opening chapter of his *De architectura libri decem*, Marcus Vitruvius Pollio contends that “the architect’s expertise is enhanced by many disciplines and various sorts of architectural knowledge; all the works executed using these other skills are evaluated by his seasoned judgment.”26 The architect requires a command of geometry, optics, and draftsmanship, as well as familiarity with history, philosophy, physiology, music, mathematics, medicine, meteorology, law, and astronomy.27 Since Vitruvius does not establish the meaning of “*architectura*” as a term, his exposé of the architect’s heterogeneous forms of knowledge acts as his characterization of the discipline at large. The author defines the architect through his


27 Vitruvius, *De architectura*, I.1.4-10.
broad body of knowledge and indeed frames the learning encompassed in De architectura as a comprehensive corpus of that wisdom.\textsuperscript{28}

As the only antique architecture treatise to survive to the Renaissance, Vitruvius’s text exerted a profound influence on early modern definitions of architectural knowledge.\textsuperscript{29} Renaissance readers reworked De architectura’s picture of architectural expertise in diverse ways, often emulating Vitruvius’s strategy of defining the discipline of architecture vis-à-vis the architect’s disparate forms of knowledge. The frontispiece for Walther Hermann Ryff’s 1547 Architectur and the first German translation of De architectura, released by Ryff in 1548, pictures Genius bearing the winged herma\textsuperscript{30} and weights of Hermes, god of invention, and the instruments of diverse visual and liberal arts [Fig. 3]. Devices useful for rendering perspectival constructions, a surveyor, and a book with geometric figures anchor the composition, figuring the mechanical, geometrical, and mathematical knowledge fundamental to architecture, and indeed every other visual art. Some saw Vitruvius’s ideal of the liberally educated architect as a case for including architecture among the liberal arts, or those arts belonging to the formation of a free citizen. Dietterlin refers to “…architecture

\textsuperscript{28} On the universalizing dimensions of Vitruvius’s project, see Indra Kagis McEwan, Vitruvius: Writing the Body of Architecture (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2003), 5.
and its coequal liberal arts and mechanical inventions,” categorizing architecture as one of the subjects vital to the education of a free person while maintaining its connection to the realm of practical skill. A few Renaissance writers downplayed the universal dimensions of Vitruvius’s architectural epistemology. Alberti, for instance, imagined the erudition of the architect as a more circumscribed and pragmatic body of expertise. Other critics of Vitruvius—the only architectural theorist whom Dietterlin mentions by name—elaborated upon De architectura’s picture of architectural knowledge. Dietterlin’s understanding of architectural expertise as an aptitude vital to the work of diverse artisans inverses the Vitruvian vision of architecture as a discipline that draws on various arts.

The idea that certain principles might unite manifold types of artists was a defining feature of sixteenth-century art theory. In Italy, it manifested in Giorgio Vasari’s theories of disegno and in the founding principles of the era’s new art academies, which united the study of painting, sculpture, and architecture under a single roof. These phenomena assumed a

31 “…Architectur, vnd zu derselben mit seiner maß gehörigen freyen Künsten, vnd Mechanischen erfindungen…” Dietterlin, Erst Buch, under, “Ein kurtzer bericht, an den Leser”.
33 Dietterlin praises the breadth of knowledge contained in Vitruvius’s writing, asserting that “…it is not without reason that among [these books] the greatest honor is given to [that of] the universally knowledgeable, and thus most famous and splendid man, Marcus Vitruvius, who is the most honorable, oldest, most experienced, and cleverest of all whom have treated architecture in writing.” / “…darunter gleich wol von allen der sachen verständigen, biß dahereo dem hochberümpten namhaftten und herrlichē Man, Marco Vitruvio, als dem fürtrefflichstē, Altistē, erfärnestē unnd scharpf Sinnigsten vor allē anderen, die von der Architetur, Schrifflich gehandelt, der Preiß und grossest lob nicht unbillich zu geschriben würdt.” Dietterlin, Erst Buch, under, “Ein kurtzer bericht, an den Leser”.
different shape in the lands north of the Alps. In 1525, Albrecht Dürer’s *Underweysung der messung* became the first German treatise to clarify precise mathematic and geometric principles related to all art and design. The author explains that, “the art of measuring is the proper foundation of all painting…”\(^{35}\) but additionally hopes that his guide to geometry “…might benefit not only painters, but also goldsmiths, sculptors, carpenters, and all those who rely on measurement”\(^{36}\) in their art.\(^{37}\)

The North, which in this dissertation is taken to mean the German-speaking lands and the Low Countries with the addition of England and France, also came to appreciate Dürer’s simultaneous fluency in the arts of painting, printmaking, and architectural design as hallmarks of a comprehensive brand of artistic mastery. Lucas Kilian’s 1628 commemorative double portrait celebrates Dürer’s multifaceted contributions to art by aligning the master


with the trappings of anatomical and perspectival representation, architectural composition, and painting [Fig. 4]. By figuring these arts through the compass, ruler, and various other tools of measurement, Kilian presents Dürer’s achievements as products of the artist’s grasp of the geometric principles that link the various media. Of course, no document of the Nuremberg master’s knowledge in these various fields was more prolific than Dürer’s *Underweysung*. The sixteenth century witnessed a significant upswing in the production of treatises on art theory, works that not only disseminated artistic knowledge, but also certified the expertise of their authors.38 Through the example of artists like Dürer, the composition of treatises became the crowning element of comprehensive artistic mastery for sixteenth-century northern Europe. An ode inscribed in a 1599 commemorative portrait of Dietterlin often included in copies of the *Architectura* even exclaimed that the Strasbourg author was “regarded by readers to have smote Apelles”—a reference to Dietterlin’s triumph over the ancient paragon of artistic talent likewise known for composing art literature.39


Relative to the era’s picture of artistic mastery, its image of architectural expertise was more fraught. Dietterlin practiced during a period of transition in the history of the Western architect. In the decades following the end of the fifteenth century, changing building styles and the reception of Vitruvius and Alberti’s writings on architecture as an intellectual profession had given rise to a new type of architect. Across much of Europe, the architect increasingly emerged as a professional who, unlike the stonemason or carpenter, was not necessarily active at the building site, and instead coordinated all aspects of a design. 40 If the history of language is an accurate barometer of such shifts, the terminology used to describe those involved in architecture indicates that the transition did not occur smoothly in the German-speaking lands. There, a plurality of terms—Bawmeister (building master), Werkmeister (work master), Steinmetz (stone mason), and even Architectus (architect)—were all used throughout the sixteenth century to describe the various types of expert involved in the discipline, and were rarely applied in a consistent manner. 41 Ryff’s 1547 Architectur includes a dialogue in which an older architect (Architekt) advises an immature master builder (Baumeister) that “there is a considerable difference between a true architect [Architecto] or master builder [Bawmeister] and a common builder [Werkmeister], or one who merely directs the erection of a building…” 42 Contrary to the modern understanding of

42 “Dann so wir der sachen gründlichen nachtrachten so hat es gar ein mercklichen vnterscheidt zwichen einem wahrhafftigen Architecto, oder Bawmeister, dann einem gemeinen Werkmeister, oder blossen angeber eines Baws…” Walther Hermann Ryff, Der furnembsten notwendigsten, der gantzen Architecutr angehörigen Mathematischen und Mechanischen künst,
Baumeister as the director of building, Ryff’s exchange suggests that the Architekt and the Baumeister both design architecture, and that it is rather the Werkmeister who controls construction. The distinction between Architekt and Baumeister seems to lie in the former party’s greater experience and learning. But Ryff would soon contradict this system in his 1548 Vitruvius Teutsch. While the treatise’s frontispiece [Fig. 3] promotes the Albertian ideal of the architect-intellect, its notes explain that the term “Architekt” means “…the governor of, and party responsible for, those who work on the building.” That the very text that conveyed Vitruvius’s foundational definition of the architect to German-speaking audiences contains these disparate pictures of architectural expertise indicates that the nature of architectural knowledge was a controversial matter for readers in Dietterlin’s world.

43 Kruft observes that because Ryff implies that the knowledge involved in these different pursuits often overlaps, it is unclear which audience his Architectur actually addresses. See Hanno-Walter Kruft, A History of Architectural Theory from Vitruvius to the Present, trans. Ronald Taylor, Elsie Callander, and Antony Wood (London: Zwemmer; and New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1994), 167.

The issue was further complicated by the fact that one could take many paths to achieve architectural expertise. Dietterlin lived between the advent of the design-oriented architect and the emergence of a defined system for forming such individuals. Throughout Europe, one typically became an architect by first learning one of the figural arts. But unlike in Italy, where architecture was discussed informally in art academies, no institutionalized training existed for sixteenth-century northern architects beyond the fold of the masons’ lodge. As long as they remained un-formalized, sixteenth-century northern Europe’s notions of architectural expertise were open to debate. In 1540s Antwerp, artisans and architects clashed over the extent to which the architect should be allowed to participate in construction, and the rights of craftsmen to judge his design—with no firm definition of architectural expertise emerging in the legal verdict. The scope of architecture and its place in the scheme of human knowledge was also shifting during this period. Dietterlin’s treatise appeared just as the science of engineering was developing as a discipline autonomous from architecture in the lands north of the Alps. The prototype for the modern architect had emerged, but his roles were not yet fixed.

How, then, did notions of architectural expertise take shape during this volatile period? Early modern artists’ evolving views of the links between architecture and figural

---

arts such as painting and sculpture offer vivid insights into this story. Authors in sixteenth-century northern Europe—unlike their peers in other regions—increasingly addressed whole architectural treatises to painters and sculptors as well as architects. Façade paintings, cabinetry, and metalwork that incorporated architectural ornament became integral to the region’s architectural culture, and the ornaments pictured in its architectural treatises in turn grew highly figural and pictorial. These developments have largely escaped critical attention because northern architectural treatises that address figural artists are often viewed as curiosities, and because the books’ influence emerged most vividly in the once-unfashionable field of the decorative arts. Still, treatises that engaged figural artists dominated northern literature on architectural ornament, and objects that incorporated architectural motifs were considered proof of broad artistic mastery. Both trends clarify how early modern artists increasingly integrated theoretical knowledge from other fields into their work. By attending to the links between architecture and the figural arts during the sixteenth century, we can form a more complete understanding of the rise of the architect-intellect and the artist-intellect in the early modern period.

To trace the horizons of the vast artistic and theoretical terrain covered by those who pondered the relationships between architecture and the other visual arts in the early modern era, it is necessary to select a vantage point. The justification for this dissertation’s rough geographical and chronological scope—the lands north of the Alps and east of the Pyrenees during the sixteenth century and the first decades of the seventeenth century—will become evident in the course of this introduction. The motivations for casting Dietterlin as its protagonist grow transparent only in the comparative case studies that follow. Here it must suffice to show that this artist’s particular vantage point offers a panorama of the exchanges between architecture and the visual arts in the early modern world. Dietterlin not
only flourished during a transformative period in the history of the architect, but also resurrected and transformed a number of decades-old discourses on architectural expertise. The Strasbourg author furthermore lived in a hotbed of publishing and a hub of bibliographic trade located at the crossroads of the German, French, Italian, and Dutch and Flemish-speaking lands, consuming art and architectural literature from all those locales and publishing his own *Architectura* in German and bilingual, Latin/French editions that likewise engaged readers across Europe.\(^{49}\) As a painter-cum-architectural theorist, Dietterlin embodied the sort of hybrid expert that defined the intersections of artistic and architectural expertise. The artist’s *Architectura* bridged the genres of art treatise and architectural tract, and addressed a mixed audience of figural artists, architects, as well as art and architecture lovers interested in the intersections between those fields of artistic production. In all of these respects, Dietterlin can be regarded as a representative case in the history of early modern transactions between architecture and the figural arts and an apt lens through which we might scrutinize the changing nature of architectural expertise. The ways in which he was also exceptional and indeed pivotal for this history will grow apparent in due course.

The interplay between architecture and the other visual arts in the work and era of Wendel Dietterlin the Elder is the subject of this dissertation. Using a combination of visual and textual primary sources, the project takes Dietterlin’s little-known oeuvre as a window onto the robust culture of ornament that defined the relationships between architecture and the figural arts for early modern northern Europe. In contextualizing Dietterlin’s serial *Architectura* treatise within architectural literature and ornament design from Germany to Peru, the dissertation reveals new aspects of period discourse on artistic knowledge. It argues

that Dietterlin’s experiments with extending theories of architectural ornament to paradigms for devising ornament in the figural arts redefined architectural and artistic expertise for the early modern age.

**The Age of Ornament**

In an aside within his 1578 description of the newly rebuilt Strasbourg astronomical clock—perhaps the most dramatic performance of architectural expertise Dietterlin encountered during his first years in that city—the mathematician Conrad Dasypodius mused that,

> In our times there are also many…noble, delicate, and artistically superior buildings, of silver, gold, stone, precious stone, wood, and whatever else[,] One also has much to wonder at in the arts of building, military fortifications, boxes, tools and other such things[,] Such artworks newly invented in our times are therefore compared to those [once] held high by men of old, such as the temple of Jerusalem, the temple of Ephesus, and the exquisite [cathedrals] of Strasbourg, Vienna, Florence and other places[.] The question thus arises: which are more artful—the [artists] who live in our time and still live, or the ancients? [This query presents itself] particularly because it is evident that many more inventions have appeared in our time…for example, in engines of war, in print, in irrigation, in fortification, in the liberal arts, and in some crafts.⁵⁰

---

⁵⁰ “Zu unsern zeitten seind auch vil vnd mancherley herrliche, zierliche, uñ von Kunst sehr hoch uñ wolgemachte Gebew, von silber, goldt, stein, edelgestyn, holtz, vnd was dann mehr sein mag, so auch sonst kunst im bawen, kreigsrüstungen, büchsen, werkzeugen, unnd anders dessen man sich auch zuverwunderen hat, vnd so solche newlichen zu vnserer zeit erfundene künst, gegen denen gehalten vnd verglichen werden, die man findet bey den alten hoch gehalten seindt, als jetz genennet der Tempel zu Hierusalem, unnd der Tempel Epheso, vndnd die köstliche gebew zu Straßburg, zu Wien, zu Florenz, vnd nd an anderen orten seind, auch andere werk jedes in seiner art mit den anderen würt verglichen, also das wol zu fragen ist, welche die künstlichsten seyen, die zu vnser zeit gelebt, uñ noch lebē, oder aber die gar alten, sonderlichen dieweil es sich ansehen lasset, als das zu unsern zeitē vil mehr künst erfunden seyen, dañ die alten gehabt habē, fūrnemlichē aber in kriegs rüstungen, in Druckerey, in wasserbewen, in vestungen, in freyen künsten, unnd etlichen handtwercken.”

Dasypodius’s query about whether modern cultural achievements had surpassed those of the ancients arises from historical shifts that dramatically severed past from present, making monuments such as Strasbourg’s famed clock seem like emblems of a new age.51

Sweeping upheavals in social, religious, and cultural authority transformed prevailing modes of making and viewing images during the sixteenth century. The rise of print, one of the key developments named by Dasypodius, precipitated many profound shifts in the power structures of European society by invigorating the dissemination of ideas.52 This phenomenon is particularly visible in the sphere of art. The advent of the printed image allowed artists to reproduce and circulate designs as never before, complicating notions of invention and originality, and fostering lively interregional artistic exchange. Often regarded as a product of the emergence of print, the Reformation raised questions about the proper functions of images, prompted widespread iconoclasm, curtailed the market for devotional images, and moved artists to sustain themselves through other forms of art. Dasypodius’s text, for instance, tells of a monument only installed in the Strasbourg cathedral decades after the Reformation iconoclasts of the late 1520s and crafted by artisans like Tobias Stimmer, who had made his career in the design of façade decorations and painted glass

Meanwhile, the rebirth of classical culture—realized in the North largely through the mediating influence of print—prompted a competition between ancient and modern art, inspired art theorists to evaluate ancient sources anew, and gave rise to novel visual forms. Dasypodius’s remarks show such characteristically “Renaissance” concerns. His text also demonstrates how a masterful synthesis of architecture and figural arts such as Strasbourg’s great astronomical clock could seem to embody the new era. The important roles of technical, religious, and cultural trends in defining the decorative arts during this period justify Dasypodius’s sense that such novel forms of ornament signalled the arrival of a modern age. In fact, it was through their manifold effects on the European culture of ornament that the historical developments of the sixteenth century shaped the interplay between architecture and the figural arts.

Ornament is an agent of mediation. Occurring in every artistic medium available in Dietterlin’s day, it has often been the means whereby forms migrate between the arts. By transcending the material and technical idiosyncrasies of specific media, ornament links the disparate visual arts. This phenomenon is perhaps no more apparent than in the artistic culture of Dietterlin’s age. The ogee arches, broken tracery, and cruciform pinnacles of the Censer that the artist’s Strasbourg forebear Martin Schongauer engraved just prior to the year...
1500 could all be found in what are now known as the “decorative arts”, as well as in contemporary building [Fig. 5]. Although the censer’s infinitesimal decorative details suggest its diminutive scale, the motifs nevertheless lend the object an architectonic quality. Such “micro-architecture”, as it is now called, was a fixture of material culture throughout the medieval era, appearing in the form of pulpits, fountains, epitaphs, cenotaphs, vessels, jewelry, and many other genres of object.\(^55\) What Schongauer represents, then, is nothing new. It is how he depicts his censer that sets the image apart from earlier designs, and indeed separates the European culture of ornament in the Middle Ages from that of the nascent modern age. The engraver describes the censer’s chains and vegetal filigree with a level of detail and degree of naturalism theretofore unknown to ornament prints. Schongauer employs tiny contours to represent shadows and textures, highlighting the distinction between the hard, glimmering metal and the soft, matte surface upon which the object sits. This astonishing precision lends the small censer a monumental quality, heightened by its status as the composition’s sole entity. With its dramatic presence and descriptive richness, Schongauer’s *Censer* already displays what would become the prevailing features of printed representations of ornament in Dietterlin’s time.

It has been said that the sixteenth century was Europe’s age of ornament.\(^56\) Discerning something inherently ornamental in the modes of visual production that arose in this era, Erwin Panofsky even named one phase of Dürer’s career after its “decorative

\(^{55}\) Because works such as ceremonial vessels and jewelry with architectonic forms often introduced new architectural motifs, even small objects can be considered “micro-architecture”. See François Bucher, “Micro-architecture as the ‘Idea’ of Gothic Theory and Style,” *Gesta* 15, no. 1/2, Essays in Honor of Sumner McKnight Crosby (1976): 71-89.

style”.

The later sixteenth century, when Dietterlin flourished, likely outstrips all other moments in the early modern period in terms of the geographical range that particular motifs achieved, the diversity of patrons who commissioned ornamental works, and the variety of sacred and profane uses to which they were applied. This flowering of embellishment was long ascribed to the formal impulses of what Max Dvořák and other twentieth-century historians termed “Mannerism”.

Erik Forssman even went so far as to frame his foundational account of the culture of ornament in sixteenth and seventeenth-century northern Europe as a history of Mannerism. Often conceived as a phenomenon that transcends the visual arts, literature, and music, Mannerism has been variously described as a reaction to the Renaissance ideal of harmony, a celebration of the artificial over the natural, and a “stylish style”—an art about art. For critics who regard ornament as an expression of style, the sixteenth century’s explosion of decorative form seemed a natural result of an art primarily concerned with manner. The bounty of self-conscious art-theoretical rhetoric in the work of Dietterlin and his colleagues also appears to support this interpretation. Yet even more than factors like quantity or quality, it was the new artistic

---


58 Irmscher, “OrnamentSinnBild,” 120.


60 See Forssman, *Säule und Ornament*.

techniques, formal conventions, and changing religious and political conditions of artistic production that set sixteenth-century ornament apart.

The advent of print transformed the culture of ornament in early modern Europe. Decorative designs like the ornamental scheme in Schongauer’s Censer had always lent themselves to repetition, and often accommodated the transfer of motifs between media as well. Until the emergence of print, such copying required significant labor and entailed the risk that an unsatisfactory facsimile could be produced. But since Schongauer drew his image from an engraved plate, he could efficiently replicate his design with great fidelity, many times over. Walter Benjamin famously contended that the mechanically reproducible format of works like Schongauer’s Censer print separated the design from the hand of the artist, eroding the object’s aura of made-ness and effacing its claims to originality. It follows from these arguments that the alienation of ornament prints from the hand of the artist gave the early modern viewer greater license in defining how and to what ends mechanically reproduced motifs were used. There is reason to believe that sixteenth-century viewers indeed regarded the designs in ornament prints as inherently open to adjustment. A title page for the suite of etchings that Christoph Jamnitzer published as the Neißer Grotteßken Bucht in 1610 advertises the series’ snail-like forms as a “market” of adaptable models, assuring viewers that “The bug market [is] commissioned for this purpose. Take from it as you

---


63 As Christopher Heuer has pointed out, Benjamin regarded the rise of the mechanically reproduced image as the birth of a class of objects that boasted surpassing creative fecundity, arguing that such works “became authentic…during the succeeding centuries” through the creative interventions of their audiences. See Heuer, The City Rehearsed, 124.
Dietterlin himself promised that by distilling and disseminating ornamental designs in print (in truck), he would guide the artist readers of his richly illustrated _Architectura_ series in “presenting more than what is created through me alone.”

The artist’s grasp of the ornament print as a platform for creative copying is everywhere apparent in the treatise’s nearly two hundred distinct etched designs. An etching first included in the closing pages of Dietterlin’s _Erst Buch_ gathers a smorgasbord of rustication motifs, conveying through its pattern of repetition and variation the print’s manifold possibilities for imitation and emulation [Fig. 6]. The author had in fact derived aspects of the design from one of the era’s earliest printed, illustrated architectural ornament treatises, Sebastiano Serlio’s so-called _Quarto libro_ of 1537. By re-combining and elaborating on Serlio’s rustication scheme, Dietterlin made the ornament print a theater for modeling strategies for inventing ornament, and not just a model for decorative forms.

---

66 This image reappeared in the 1598 installments of the _Architectura_ as Plate 184.
Sixteenth-century ornament prints did not only furnish designs for some future work of art. Period viewers also appreciated their inherent aesthetic qualities. The sixteenth century was in fact the era when ornament, like landscape and still life, definitively emerged as an autonomous subject of art. Early signs of this trend surface in Schongauer’s *Censer*. By rendering the censer and its shadow in transfixing detail, the engraver presented the object as an observed presence with inherent visual interest. While prints and drawings of ornament once served mainly as models for projects in other media, audiences confronted with images like Schongauer’s *Censer* came to value them as finished works as well. As ornament acquired a new status as an autonomous subject of art, the intersections between the artistic media assumed a similar position.

Demand for printed decorative motifs, and later, drawings of those subjects, created an art market in which ornament designers could scratch out a living while leaving it to others to realize their schemes in other media. This new sector of the artistic profession played a leading role in the innovation of visual forms across various media. In his first manuscript for the posthumously-published *Historische Grammatik der bildenden Künste*, Aloïs Riegl even pinpointed the rise of ornament in Dietterlin’s world as the decisive event in the era’s cultural flowering, contending that, “…In Upper as well as Lower Germany decorative

---

Alongside the somewhat murkier evidence for the collecting patterns for ornament prints of this period, the widespread use of such images as wallpaper and decorative appliques for furniture demonstrates that viewers in sixteenth-century northern Europe viewed the ornament print as an artistic accomplishment its own right. On ornament prints as domestic embellishments, see Alison Stewart, “Woodcuts as Wallpaper: Sebald Beham and Large Prints from Nuremberg,” in *Grand Scale: Monumental Prints in the Age of Dürer and Titian*, ed. Larry Silver and Elizabeth Wykoff. Catalogue of the exhibition of the same name, Wellesley, MA, Davis Museum and Cultural Center, Wellesley College, March 19-June 8, 2008; New Haven, Yale University Art Gallery, Yale University, September 9-November 30, 2008; and Philadelphia Museum of Art, January 31-April 26, 2009 (Wellesley, MA: Davis Museum and Cultural Center, Wellesley College; New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2008), 73-84.
and utilitarian objects now assume the simultaneously harmonious and organic forms of the Renaissance. These are the works that one identifies with the so-called German Renaissance.” While Riegl’s assessment does not account for the major role of painting and monumental sculpture in bringing an interest in naturalism and Classicism to the German-speaking lands, it does do justice to the prime role that ornament played in promoting developments associated with Renaissance art in all media. Since decorative forms mediated much of the interplay between the arts in Dietterlin’s age, a major objective of this project is to establish how the novel circumstances of print culture and the new autonomy of ornament shaped exchanges between the media and invigorated artistic production *toute suite*.

The historical developments that invigorated the rise of ornament as an autonomous subject of art and literature unfolded differently on opposite sides of the Alps. In northern Europe, the image controversies of the Reformation fostered a tradition of critical dialogue about the proper role of images and ornament that knew few parallels in Italy until the appearance of reforming texts such as Cardinal Paleotti’s 1582 *De sacris et profanis imaginibus*. Ornament, and particularly ornament prints, offered artists of devotional images devastated by religiously motivated iconoclasm an alternative source of income. Professional institutions of art also differed between the two regions. In the absence of formal art


academies of the kind that flourished in sixteenth-century Florence and Rome, printed texts and images served as the North’s prime vehicles of discourse on ornament and the relationships between the arts. Most of northern Europe also lacked a substantive landscape of classical ruins, so the majority of artists never observed vestiges of ancient ornament in person.\footnote{Major exceptions include Jan Gossaert, Maarten van Heemskerck, and Cornelis II. Floris, all of whom traveled to Rome and subsequently produced art that promoted the proliferation of classical forms. See Ethan Matt Kavaler, “Gossart as Architect,” in Man, Myth and Sensual Pleasures; Jan Gossart’s Renaissance, ed. Maryan Wynn Ainsworth. Catalogue published in conjunction with the exhibition of the same name, New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, October 6, 2010- January 17, 2011; London, National Gallery, February 23-May 30, 2001 (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2010), 31-44, esp. 34-36; Tatjana Bartsch and Peter Seiler, Rom Zeichnen. Maarten van Heemskerck 1532-1536/37. Proceedings of the conference of the same name. Humboldt-schriften zur Kunst- und Bildgeschichte 8 (Berlin: Mann, 2012); Antoinette Huysmans, Jan Van Damme, Carl Van de Velde et al., Cornelis Floris (1514-1575) beeldhouwer, architect, ontwerper (Brussels: Gemeentekrediet, 1996), 12-13. Christopher S. Wood controversially contends that the paucity of remnants from the classical period in northern Europe only became problematic in the sixteenth century, when emerging technologies and the rise of archeological scholarship stripped forgeries of antique works of their power to act as substitutes for authentic relics of the ancient world. See Christopher S. Wood, Forgery, Replica, Fiction: Temporalities of German Renaissance Art (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008).} By the early sixteenth century, prints, illustrated books, and drawings had emerged as substitutes for the firsthand observation of ancient architecture.\footnote{Mario Carpo, “How do you imitate a building that you have never seen? Printed images, ancient models, and handmade drawings in Renaissance architectural theory,” Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte 64, no. 2 (2001): 223-233.} Since they were largely known in northern Europe through indirect means, classical models of ornament boasted a different kind of authority than they did on the Italian peninsula. As Chapter I will demonstrate, northern artists produced broad-ranging interpretations of ancient architectural models, imaginative departures from images that often already seemed to be fantastic projections. The distinct circumstances for the production and reception of ornament in the lands north of the Alps during the sixteenth century do not only make it
possible to speak of a northern culture of ornament, but raise questions that are particular to that culture. This is the premise of the geographical focus of the present work.

**Wendel Dietterlin, “Maler vonn Strassburg”**

In the overview of outstanding German artists contained in his 1609 panegyric, *Teutscher Nation Herligkeitt*, geographer Matthias Quad von Kinckelbach listed Dietterlin and fortification expert Daniel Specklin of Strasbour as the era’s foremost masters of architecture.\(^{73}\) Respectively representing ornament and the more construction-oriented and mechanical art of engineering, the pair embodies the two faces of what had become, by the seventeenth century, the double-sided coin of architectural knowledge.\(^{74}\) A remarkable number those who specialized in architectural ornament also, like Dietterlin, practiced as painters. Artists as diverse as Raphael, Michelangelo, Lambert Lombard, Wenceslas Cobergher, and Joseph Heintz cultivated dual careers as painters and architects. Painter-architects such as Dürer, Serlio, Giacomo Barozzi da Vignola, and Hans Vredeman de Vries additionally published works that address architectural ornament. From the commemorators of Dürer to the admirers of Michelangelo, sixteenth-century critics made much of those artists who excelled in architecture as well as the figural arts. Their comments reinforced the notion that achievement in both spheres evidences artistic mastery that amounted to more, somehow, than the sum of its disparate parts. Still, the extent to which familiarity with painting pertained (or was thought to pertain) to architectural ornament and vice versa


\(^{74}\) Ulrich Schütte argues that the structure and content of early modern architectural literature shows that the scientific and technical expertise of the engineer had emerged as an autonomous facet of architectural knowledge by the early seventeenth century. See Schütte, “Architekt und Ingenieur,” 18-38.
remains an open question.\(^{75}\) Dietterlin’s work offers a particularly multifaceted perspective on the interplay between architecture and the figural arts and its impact on architectural expertise in sixteenth-century northern Europe.

Little is known about the biography and art of Wendel Dietterlin the Elder besides what has been written on the artist’s *Architectura* project. The limited survival of the artist’s paintings and other works has prompted many misunderstandings of his professional activities. Quad’s vague praise for Dietterlin’s accomplishments “in architecture”, alongside the *Architectura*’s widespread impact on period architecture, may have fueled the long-persistent theory that the Strasbourg painter designed specific buildings or monuments. Joachim von Sandrart’s *Teutsche Academie (Academia Todesca)* of 1675-1679 lists Dietterlin as a “Painter and Building Master” (Mahler und Baumeister).\(^{76}\) Historians were still attributing


buildings to the artist as late as the early twentieth century. Nevertheless, there exists no firm evidence to indicate that Dietterlin’s practical experience with architecture ever amounted to more than providing the ornament for a specific architectural project. While also active as a draftsman, etcher, and architectural theorist, the artist only ever identified himself as a painter and citizen of Strasbourg—a pattern visible in correspondence, official documents, and even his own publications, where he merely touts himself as “learned in architecture”. Dietterlin’s biography shows how this multifaceted expertise developed.

The artist who came to be known as Wendel Dietterlin the Elder was born in Pfullendorf, in present-day Baden-Württemberg, with the name “Wendling Grapp.” The inscription on a portrait of the artist printed in 1599, which refers to his death in that year at the age of 49, fixes the probable date of his birth in either 1550 or 1551 [Fig. 7]. The details of the artist’s family, early life, and training are murky. He might have been the son of Bernhard Grapp, a Reformed minister at Lissenheim in Briesgau who immigrated to Strasbourg in 1562. He may also have been the child of Pfullendorf painter Balthasar

77 Haupt attributes to Dietterlin parts of the Frauenhaus in Strasbourg, a spiral staircase of the Stuttgarter Schloss, and the Speier Zehnthof in Esslingen. See Haupt, Baukunst der Renaissance, 309.
78 Ohnesorge noted already in 1893 that Dietterlin is only described in archival records as a painter. See Ohnesorge, Wendel Dietterlin, 1.
80 Dietterlin’s estimated date of birth is based on Karl Ohnesorge’s observation that an anonymous portrait of the artist included in most 1598 copies of the *Architectura* includes an inscription that records his death at age 49 in 1599: “WENDELINVS DIETTERLIN PICTOR ARGENTINENSIS. OBYT Ao : CIC.IC.IC ETAT: IL.” See Ohnesorge, Wendel Dietterlin, 1.
81 See Margot Pirr, Die Architectura, 11.
Gropp (Grapp). In this case, it is likely that Wendel was also related to the glass painter Ulrich Gropp of nearby Ridlingen. The identity of Wendel’s master is unknown. In the event that he belonged to a family of artists, it is not inconceivable that he received his first training at home. Otherwise, the painter Philipp Memberger the Elder (1522-1573) of Constance is considered the most likely candidate. If Dietterlin was in Constance in the years before his 1570 move to Strasbourg, he could have come into contact with a number of Netherlandish artists who also resided in the city at the time, including the painter Franz von Hoore of Mechelen and the sculptor Hans Morink of Horham. Perhaps it was through these figures that Dietterlin first gained his apparent familiarity with Netherlandish decorative motifs and compositional formulae.

A clearer picture of Wendel’s life emerges with his arrival in Strasbourg. It was there that he wed Catharina Sprewer, a citizen of the city and “daughter of the departed Hans Sprewer of Ehrstein” on Sunday, November 12, 1570. During the sixteenth century, artists born outside of the Free Imperial City of Strasbourg did not enjoy easy access to citizenship.

83 Hans Rott, Quellen und Forschungen zur südwestdeutschen und schweizerischen Kunstgeschichte im XV und XVI. Jahrhundert. I. Bodenseegebiet. Quellen I (Stuttgart: Strecker und Schröder Verlag, 1933), 189-190, note 6.
85 According to Martin, a “Maler von Antwerpen, so Clausen Müllers dochter hat” was also in Constance in 1555. On Netherlandish artists active in Constance at the time of Dietterlin’s possible stay in the city, see Martin, “Der Maler Wendel Dietterlin,” 24.
Citizenship was vital to the artisan’s livelihood, for it was a prerequisite for the right to practice as an independent master and indeed the right join the artists’ guild, the Zunft zur Steltz. The outsider’s marriage to Sprewer evidently allowed him to attain new property, rights, and status. Soon thereafter, on February 19th, 1571, Dietterlin purchased the “Haus zum Himmelreich” at Stephansplon. He gained citizenship in Strasbourg the next day. The record of his admission to the citizenry of Strasbourg and subsequent archival documents refer to Dietterlin as a member of the Zunft zur Steltz.

If treatises formed sixteenth-century notions of artistic expertise, artists’ guilds institutionalized and policed them. Guilds had long enjoyed extensive authority over political and social life in northern Europe. The Strasbourg guilds partook in municipal politics from 1332 on, and became an official presence in the city’s governing structure with the constitution of 1482. Artists’ guilds like Strasbourg’s Zunft zur Steltz were responsible for protecting the rights of their craftsmen, bolstering their cities’ reputations as centers of production, and controlling the quality of the works produced in those localities. Only

88 “Wendling Grapp genant Dietterle hat das burgkrecht empfangen von Catharin Spreuerin und dient zur steltzen.” Strasbourg, Archives de la Ville et de la Communauté urbaine de Strasbourg, Bürgerbuch II, 1543 ff., February 20, 1571, fol. 348. See also Rott, Oberhein Quellen I, 235.
89 Ohnesorge, Wendel Dietterlin, 2.
those authorized by a city’s guild could practice a specific art in that place, a principle that prevented unqualified craftsmen from filling the market with mediocre art and rendering the city uncompetitive in regional artistic trade. It was virtually impossible to make a living in a medium in which one was not certified to operate. Artists typically gained this right after completing an apprenticeship in a workshop, a period as a journeyman, and qualifying Meisterwerke. In 1547, Strasbourg’s Zunft zur Steltz stipulated that prospective master painters should create a “…Crucifixion of tempera, with various parts, [with] Mary, John the Evangelist, and other women, and likewise Jews and also people from many foreign nations on horse and foot amidst a good landscape…” as well as an “…image of the Virgin with the child, sitting or standing, rendered in oil colors.” These diverse tasks were designed to assess a painter’s ability to work in various genres as well as his facility with several materials and methods, indicating that authorities in Dietterlin’s milieu prized technical versatility and indeed the aptitude to work in multiple media.

But devised as they were to shore up the existing structures of the art trade in the face of outside competition, Strasbourg’s Zunft zur Steltz and many other artists’ guilds of sixteenth-century northern Europe cultivated a conservative model of artistic expertise based on preserving esteemed paradigms of artistic practice. The 1547 protocols stipulate that while it was once necessary to invent the Meisterstuck from one’s own imagination, it is now

---

92 This phenomenon is explored in greater depth in Chapter V.
possible to draw the design from one’s own genius (ingenio), or from life, or from a print. The new rules reinforce the authority of existing models like nature and art in addition to individual creative will. A painting in the Kresge Museum attributed to Dietterlin shows the Crucifixion arrangement described in 1547 articles [Fig. 8]. The results of the Zunft zur Steltz’s conservative approach to certifying painterly mastery are evident in the composition’s forms. Its figures adopt exaggerated, mannered poses and its drapery billows as if caught by a stark wind, both stylistic features that suggest the work of a painter in the later sixteenth century. Nevertheless, the contorted positions of the thieves and the strategy of representing one cross at a dramatic, oblong angle had been in use since the time of Lucas Cranach and frequently favored by artists of the so-called Danube school of the earlier sixteenth century. The figure’s retardaire dress and the otherworldly glow of the yellow sun amidst navy clouds additionally bring to mind the costumes and saturated palette of Danube school artists such as Albrecht Altdorfer. Eerie lighting schemes were also a favorite device of the long-deceased Rhineland painter Matthias Gothart or Neithardt, now called

---

94 “Wie auch bisher diejenigen, so meister worden, ihre meisterstückh auss eÿgenen köpffen und nicht anders machen sollen, Alss wollen unsere herren ÿetzünd frey gestelt haben, dass die kunftigen majßter ihr probestück auß eigenem Ingenio oder von lebendigen over gestochenen dingen, ohn männlichs intrag abcontrofajên und mahlen mögen. Actum den dreijzehten Augusti Anno CLVii.” Strasbourg, Archives de la Ville et de la Communauté urbaine de Strasbourg, Zunft zur Stelze Nr. 2, Artikel Büchs eÿner Ersamen Gesellschaft der Zünfft zur Stelßen, August 13, 1547, p. 162.


“Grünewald” (c. 1470-1528), whose work Dietterlin likely knew firsthand.97 The artist of the Kresge Crucifixion evidently assimilated motifs, colors, and forms from earlier paintings and prints, but appears to have drawn the composition from his own imagination. The work’s mix of influences registers the era’s clash between progressive, manneristic stylistic impulses and an ideal of artistic mastery based on perpetuating familiar artistic models. Such tension between convention and innovation—a conflict not unrelated to the quarrel of the ancients and the moderns mentioned by Dasypodius—would ultimately shape how Dietterlin grappled with the nature of architectural expertise and exchanges between architecture and the figural arts.

While structured to reinforce the divides between artistic disciplines, Strasbourg’s artists’ guild became ever more interdisciplinary as its governing apparatus changed throughout the sixteenth century. Once called the “Schilter- und Maler Zunft,” or “Image-maker and Painters’ Guild,” the institution’s medieval iteration at first included painters alone. A long process of expansion began with a union with the goldsmith’s guild in 1363, followed by the appropriation of the silversmiths, sculptors, glass-carvers, engravers, typesetters, paper-makers, and all manner of other artists and craftsmen.98 Because the goldsmiths retained the greatest number of posts in the corporation’s ruling council, the


98 When the goldsmiths joined the group, the guild was temporarily re-named the “Goldschmied-Zunft”. See Friedrich Carl Heitz, Das Zunfwen in Strassburg. Geschichtliche Darstellung begleitet von Urkunden und Aktenstücken. Foreword by Ludwig Spach (Strasbourg: Friedrich Carl Heitz, 1856), 52.
Zunft zur Steltz is often discussed as an outgrowth of their original guild.\textsuperscript{99} By the sixteenth century, the Zunft’s governing structure was separated into subgroups: painters accompanied sculptors, and goldsmiths and silversmiths were also classed together until the late eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{100} With the assimilation of the city’s book publishers by 1542, this corporate body encompassed a truly varied collection of art-related trades. It adopted the more universal name “Zunft zur Steltz”, or “Guild at the Stalk”, likely related to a landmark near its headquarters. Booksellers and art dealers were also part of the Zunft by 1600.\textsuperscript{101} Once an exclusive bastion of painters, Strasbourg’s artist’s guild became a diverse conglomeration of art professionals during Dietterlin’s lifetime. Guild authorities constantly re-evaluated who qualified as a master worthy of the institution’s rights and protections, and what constituted artistic expertise. The guild’s article book shows that, in addition to the constant elaboration of protocols for the new groups of art experts entering the Zunft, standards for the painter’s *Meisterstück* were revised in 1516, 1547, and 1630.\textsuperscript{102}

These changes unfolded simultaneously with major shifts in northern masons’ lodges, which since the twelfth century had organized the artisans charged with realizing the region’s large churches. The craftsmen involved in these corporations traditionally answered to the so-called *magister lapidum*, the master-mason or architect who served as the church’s artistic director. The master mason conceived aspects of the design, allocated tasks related to the building and decoration of the project, and supervised the training of other masons. As

\textsuperscript{100} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{102} For a comparative overview of the painters’ articles of the Strasbourg Zunft zur Steltz in the early modern period, see August Schricker, “Ordnungen der Strassburger Malerzunft,” Jahrbuch für Geschichte, Sprache und Literatur Elsaß-Lothringens 3 (1887): 99-105.
such, the lodge played a major role in defining architectural expertise. Among the most authoritative corporations of masons in the region was that of Dietterlin’s home city of Strasbourg, which officially served as the flagship lodge of the Holy Roman Empire.\(^{103}\) Changes in its protocols thus prompted the revision of rules for other lodges in the region. As in many places in northern Europe, the relationship between the Strasbourg masons’ lodge and local artisans’ guilds shifted frequently.\(^{104}\) The lodge stonemasons and city bricklayers of Strasbourg had already formed a common guild in 1332, only for the city council to grant the bricklayers their own guild in 1402.\(^{105}\) The articles of the so-called Regensburg ordinances (1459) and Bruderbuch (1563) successively weakened the institutional separations between the Strasbourg masons and the Zunft zur Steltz. Bricklayers and masons across the Empire subsequently established their own guilds outside the context of the lodges.\(^{106}\) While the northern masons’ lodge had always been a hierarchical association, the artists’ guild was essentially a body of peers.\(^{107}\) As the old power structures of the lodges corroded, architectural expertise—already subject to fewer institutional controls than other realms of art—became an even more indefinite matter. Dietterlin’s activities as an architectural theorist are partly a product of these shifts.

---

\(^{103}\) On the Strasbourg Cathedral and masons’ lodge, see Barbara Schock-Werner, *Das Strasburger Münster im 15. Jahrhundert. Stilistische Entwicklung und Hüttенorganisation eines Bürger-Doms* (Kiel: Kleikamp, 1983).


The freedom of artists in Dietterlin’s age to define their own identities is apparent in the story of his admission to Strasbourg’s art scene. Documents related to Wendel’s entry to Strasbourg’s artists’ guild indicate that, by 1571, the painter had changed his surname to “Dietterlin.”108 In contemporary parlance, “Wendel Dietterlin” translated roughly to “Little, wending line,” or “curlique.” The seemingly strange conceit of identifying oneself with a line was not alien to the artistic culture of Dietterlin’s world. Northern artists had long identified themselves through particular arrangements of lines. Dürer famously employed a linear AD monogram as a way of figuring his idiosyncratic authorial presence in his works, while also differentiating the images from his authorial person.109 The curling, calligraphic contours that often appeared in the Nuremberg master’s graphic designs fulfilled a similar purpose, seeming to record the artist’s signature hand motions. Dietterlin was one of many artists active around 1600 who emulated Dürer’s practice.110 Dietterlin used variations on a similarly interlocking WD monogram to sign his works, emblems that he often adorned with the linear flourishes that had inspired his new alias [Fig. 9]. Yet since the monogram and naming

108 The first appearance of the artist’s new name in the archival record occurs on February 19, 1571. As quoted above and in Strasbourg, Archives de la Ville et de la Communauté urbaine de Strasbourg, Protokolle der Kontraktsube, February 19, 1571, Notar Kügler, fol. 232. “Wendel,” short for “Wendelin,” derived from the name of St. Wendelin, the patron saint of country folk shepherds, and farmers. On the life and veneration of St. Wendelin, see Alois Selzer, St. Wendelin. Leben und Verehrung eines alemannisch-fränkischen Volksheiligen (Saarbrücken: Saarbrücker Druckerei und Verlag, 1936).


engaged the category of identity in distinct ways, the act of naming oneself after a line differed fundamentally from representing oneself through a particular network of contours.

Whereas northern artists’ monograms pointed back to their makers’ specific creative personas, the conceit of Dietterlin’s chosen name engaged contemporary art theory at large. Following the lead of Dürer’s *Underweysung der messung*, writers in Dietterlin’s milieu associated the drafted line with the inventive exercises of design. This idea also informed the theory of *disegno* advanced in Giorgio Vasari’s *Vite*, a book hotly discussed in Strasbourg at the very moment that Dietterlin took his new name. By transforming his name into a punning reference to the wending line, Dietterlin identified himself with the prevailing figuration of artistic *ingenium* for his era, as well as a phenomenon that Vasari argued bound the arts together. To the extent that the curling line counted among the common decorative expressions for the period, the moniker also identified Dietterlin with a form of ornament.

Once Dietterlin gained citizenship in Strasbourg and membership in its artists’ guild, it did not take long for his star to rise. Between 1574 and 1575, the painter decorated the façade and interior of the seat of the Archbishop. The exterior program featured scenes from the Holy Scripture, including a representation of Jacob’s dream recorded in a drawing by the well-known painter Tobias Stimmer. That one of the most prominent façade painters active in the Rhineland during the second half of the sixteenth century took interest

---

111 This discourse is analyzed in depth in Chapter I.
112 Dietterlin’s receipt for the project, discussed in Chapter I, is recorded in François Jospeh Fuchs, *Inventaire des Archives de la ville de Strasbourg antérieures à 1790: Séries VIII et IX (Chartreuse, Saint-Nicolas-aux-Ondes, fonds Wetzlar et ordre teutonique)* (Strasbourg: Archives de la Ville de Strasbourg, 1964), 77, no. 197, fols. 29-31.
in Dietterlin’s design indicates the up-and-coming artist’s waxing importance in the Strasbourg art scene. As a document of one façade painter analyzing the work of another, it also evokes this milieu’s atmosphere of artistic competition. Performances of artistic expertise were a way to accrue commissions and consolidate influence in this environment. In 1579, Dietterlin became a godfather to the children of fellow artists.\textsuperscript{114} Since such forms of patronage were reserved for influential figures, the artist must have already enjoyed a degree of prominence within Strasbourg’s artistic community at that time. His living circumstances were improving as well. In the same year, Dietterlin purchased a house, “zu Lucernen,” near his first residence, wedged between a bakery and a cooper adjacent to the House of the Choir of Strasbourg’s Upper Seminary.\textsuperscript{115} Given its humble location, the purchase may well have accommodated an expanding workshop, allowing Dietterlin’s original property to function as a residence alone. In 1580, the artist dissolved all financial ties to his birthplace and acquired an even nobler home in his adopted city.\textsuperscript{116}

\textsuperscript{116} Nine years after obtaining Strasbourg citizenship, Dietterlin applied for full reimbursement from his parents’ respective estates: “Bürgerm. und rat zu Pfullendorf antwurten m.h. uff ein furschrift, für Wendling Dieterlin, den maler beschehen, ime zu seynem väterlichen und müterlichen erbschaft zu verhelfen, dz sie uff solliche interceßion inen des gewohnlichen aids, by deme in jeder, wieviel er ererbt antzeigen soll, erloßen und seynen einfeltigen worten und antaeig im selben geglaubt und inen mit dem abzug gehalten, dz er zu gutem benugen angenommen…” Strasbourg, Archives de la Ville et de la Communauté urbaine de Strasbourg, Protocols of the Council of XXI, November 1580, fol. 578, no. 28. Quoted from Rott, Oberrhein Quellen I, 235-236.
house lay in the suburb of Krutenau near the river Ill, and boasted a small garden.\textsuperscript{117} Such real estate transactions were a common means whereby artists in sixteenth-century Strasbourg secured a place among the Burgher class.\textsuperscript{118}

By 1580, Dietterlin’s talents were in demand across the region. The protocols of Strasbourg’s Council of Fifteen attest that in 1583, Dietterlin was too busy even to complete façade paintings for a Fugger residence in Schaffhausen. This was because he had already been called to Haguenau in present-day Alsatia around 1581, where he executed a now-lost painting project for a year or two.\textsuperscript{119} Throughout the late 1580s and early 1590s, the artist was constantly occupied with important public and private projects at home and farther


\textsuperscript{118} For another example of a Strasbourg artist who established his place in the social hierarchy in part through property investment, see Brady, “The Social Place of a German Renaissance Artist,” 298-303.

\textsuperscript{119} Isaak Habrecht found himself unable to finish the façade of a Fugger residence in Schaffhausen where the famed Tobias Stimmer had completed an illusionistic program for the exterior of the \textit{Haus zum Ritter} between 1568 and 1570. It appears that Tobias’s brother Abel recommended Dietterlin as a replacement, but the Strasbourg artist, too busy, declined. A record of the Strasbourg Council of Fifteen relates: “…Er habvor dissem einem Hernn Fugger von Augsburg ein Uhrwerck zu kauffen geben unnd Ime versprochen, dasselb in einem viertel Jahrs ausszumachen. Das hab er, als er noch zu Schaffhausen gewesen, mehrentheils gemacht, unnd ein hültzin geheuss dazu mitt sich aus dem Schweizerland macht, so auch zumtheiill gemahlt. Dieweyill er nun itzo keinen Mahler alhie bekommen könne, der Ime solch geheuss im hauss mahlen, und nach seiner gelegenheit, wie sichs nach der kunst erheyscht, köndte aussmahlen, und nach seiner gelegenheit, wie sichs nach der kunst erheyscht, köndte aussmahlen, und nach seiner gelegenheit, wie sichs nach der kunst erheyscht, köndte aussmahlen, und nach seiner gelegenheit, wie sichs nach der kunst erheyscht, köndte aussmahlen, und nach seiner gelegenheit, wie sichs nach der kunst erheyscht, köndte aussmahlen…” Strasbourg, Archives de la Ville et de la Communauté urbaine de Strasbourg, Handwerksachen, Protocols of the Fünfzehnerkammer, October 5, 1583. Here quoted from Ohnesorge, \textit{Wendel Dietterlin}, 9.
afield. He painted a project in Rottweil around 1589.\textsuperscript{120} In the same year he also completed a cycle of now-lost wall paintings for one of late Renaissance Strasbourg’s most important constructions: the \textit{Neue Bau}, now known as the Chambre de Commerce.\textsuperscript{121} Since this was one of the city’s first structures to show the proper superimposition of the Orders from Doric to Ionic to Corinthian, Dietterlin probably learned much about Vitruvian architectural theory in the course of adorning the building.\textsuperscript{122} It was also around this time that the artist first learned how to create etchings, a skill that helped circulate his art to an even wider audience.\textsuperscript{123} Dietterlin’s most prominent commission of this period was his work on the

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{120} In 1589, Dietterlin complained to the Reichshofgericht in Rottweil for payment “…wegen ausstendigen verdienstes…” in Oberkirch in the Schwarzwald. Strasbourg, Archives de la Ville et de la Communauté urbaine de Strasbourg, Protocols of the Council of XXI, June 18, 1589, fol. 317. Quoted from Rott, \textit{Oberrhein Quellen I}, 236.

\textsuperscript{121} Dietterlin complained to authorities in Strasbourg multiple times during the summer of 1589 in order to receive payment for his work on the \textit{Neue Bau}. The records indicate that the project was still in progress at this time. On June 18, they relate that “Bemelter Wendling Dietherlin ubergibt noch ein supplication wegen des Newen bauws, so er aus bevelch der verordneten hem ohn verdig gemalt und nachgehends ein verzeichnus seiner arbeit übergeben, so sich uff 144 lb angeloffen, daruff er 100lb empfangen; am übrigen aber wöll ihme 24 lb abgezogen werden, welches ihme gantz beschwerlich. Begert, ihme die gantzze summ entrichten oder aber die arbeit, deren verzeichnus ubeugt, schetzen und was geschetzt würdt, ihme bezahlen zu laßen.” Strasbourg, Archives de la Ville et de la Communauté urbaine de Strasbourg, Protocols of the Council of XXI, June 18, 1589, fol. 317. Quoted from Rott, \textit{Oberrhein Quellen I}, 236. On August 4, they relate that “Wendling Thietterlins, des malers supplication gelesen, in deren er sich beschwert, das im sein forderung für sein malwerck am Neuwen bau nit will gevolgt werden, so hievor den 18ten juni fur mein herrn kommen…Darauf refereiren her Held und hr. Mathis von Gottesheim…ihr bedencken, das was noch nit ausgemacht, dasselb vollends gefertigt werd.—Erickt ist der hern bedencken gevolgt, doch soll man ihm nichts geben, es sey dann zuvor alles ausgemacht.” Strasbourg, Archives de la Ville et de la Communauté urbaine de Strasbourg, Protocols of the Council of XXI, August 4, 1589, fol. 409. Quoted from Rott, \textit{Oberrhein Quellen I}, 236.

\textsuperscript{122} Pirr contends that depictions of the work in old prints suggest that Dietterlin’s paintings fluidly engaged this Renaissance-style architecture, but also notes that an eighteenth-century reference to the program’s “gothic sculptures” may indicate that Dietterlin’s painted architecture featured medieval-style arches. See Pirr, \textit{Die Architectura}, 12-14.

\textsuperscript{123} See Chapter III.
\end{footnotesize}
Great Hall of the *Neue Lusthaus* in Stuttgart, which he pursued between 1590 and 1592.\(^{124}\) The apparent correlation between the artist’s waxing prosperity and his increasingly peripatetic existence reinforces Martin Warnke’s claim that the physically mobile artist—the master free to flee the constraints of municipal guild systems and seek his fortune between different courts—additionally enjoyed social mobility.\(^{125}\)

Movement was also vital to the formation artistic and architectural expertise. Strasbourg’s 1542 artists’ guild regulations stipulate that travel is essential to true mastery of painting, arguing that “…painting handwork [is a] liberal [art] that one must study, and travel in order to learn…”\(^{126}\) As this dissertation will demonstrate, Dietterlin’s work engages artistic and literary sources from a staggering array of European locales. Yet there is no conclusive evidence that Dietterlin ever traveled beyond his native Rhineland. His education in contemporary art, and indeed contemporary debates about art, must have progressed by other means. As the *Erst Buch*’s dedication attests, patrons shaped the Strasbourg artist’s grasp of architectural expertise. Dietterlin’s links to well-connected humanists such as Strasbourg publisher Bernhard Jobin, a subject of Chapter I, also played a formative role in his work. The painter’s formation as an architecture expert deeply interested in the interplay between the arts also depended on the circulation of objects and images.

One drawing from the early phase of Dietterlin’s career joins a constellation of copies after Raphael’s 1512 fresco of the prophet Isaiah and *putti* for the funerary ensemble of Johann Goritz of Luxembourg at Sant’Agostino in Rome [Fig. 10]. The Accademia di San

---

\(^{124}\) This project is discussed further in Chapter V.


\(^{126}\) “Dwil glaser und moler handwerck, ein fryhe künst die man lernen und daruff wandern muss…” Strasbourg, Archives de la Ville et de la Communauté urbaine de Strasbourg, Zunft zur Stelze Nr. 2, Artikel Büchs eyner Ersamen Gesellschaft der Zunft zur Stelßen, Zunft Ordnung, 1542, p. LXXiii.
Luca possesses a fresco fragment that likely represents a replica of the Sant’Agostino work from Raphael’s workshop. Some sixteenth-century copies were made after the fragment, which was probably already in the possession of the Accademia at that time. It is possible that Dietterlin drafted his copy of Raphael’s Putto during an undocumented stay in Rome, but more likely that he knew the work through another copy. A drawing from Karel van Mander’s 1574-1577 sojourn in Rome recreates the Accademia fragment’s composition with the plaque from the Sant’Agostino fresco, suggesting that he copied the fragment and the work in situ [Fig. 11]. Hendrick Goltzius’s 1592 engraving of the entire fresco circulated far more widely than this single sheet, but since Dietterlin’s composition repeats only the forms of van Mander’s copy, there is reason to believe the Strasbourg artist made his Putto after the drawing. Van Mander stopped in Vienna, Nuremberg, and Basel on the way back to the Netherlands from Rome in 1577, so it is not inconceivable that he also passed through Strasbourg and there shared the work with Dietterlin. Even if Dietterlin’s Putto did not arise from an actual trip to Rome or from an encounter with the Netherlandish artist and art historian, the work indicates Dietterlin’s interest in the aesthetics of Italian Renaissance

---


128 A drawing in the British Museum (1895-9-15-688) attributed to Annibale Carracci similarly lacks the right hand and pointed foliage. It includes no details from the fresco not also recorded in the fragment, suggesting that it was made after the Accademia San Luca work. See Philip Pouncey and John A. Gere, Italian Drawings in the Department of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum: Raphael and his Circle (London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1962), vol. 1, Appendix III, 176.

129 For a more detailed account of the drawing, see Appendix IV, SB.2.


artists like Raphael. It also shows his curiosity about the intellectual ideals of the sixteenth century’s nascent art academies, such as the study of the nude figure and the use of classical forms and content. Among the most important of these ideals was, of course, the notion of the interconnectedness of the disparate visual arts. It is tempting to imagine van Mander and Dietterlin discussing these matters during a meeting in the formative stage of the Strasbourg artist’s career.\(^\text{132}\)

The transmission of drawings and prints was not the only means whereby Dietterlin garnered a broad knowledge of European art and humanist culture. Interaction with architects and architecture books also exerted a pivotal influence on the painter’s engagement with architectural theory. The *Erst Buch*’s dedication praises Dietterlin’s

\[
\ldots\text{dear and trusted friend Heinrich Schickhardt, princely architect of Württemberg (whose grasp of all the arts belonging to architecture and other considerable gifts and virtues have been regarded with [great esteem] by you, Conrad Schloßberger, and other art lovers).}\(^\text{133}\)
\]

A 1631 lifetime inventory of Schickhardt’s library likewise contains a warm reference to the *Erst Buch* of “Wendel Dieterlein [sic] of Strasbourg, my dear and good friend.”\(^\text{134}\)


close relationship with Schickhardt appears to have had a formative impact on the Strasbourg painter’s late-career turn to architectural theory, and not only because it provided a chance to converse with the architect-engineer. Schickhardt’s library inventory lists nearly 525 different titles, arranged by subject, covering “Architecture, which is adorned with many other noble arts,” and painting and sculpture, as well as topics as diverse as perspective, religion, law, history, alchemy, geometry, fortification, and medicine. His collection of architectural literature alone encompasses a staggering variety of texts, from modern editions of Vitruvius to the works of Serlio, Palladio, Vignola, De l’Orme, Du Cerceau, and Vredeman de Vries, to books by German authors such as Daniel Specklin and Hans Blum. Many of these sources inform Dietterlin’s *Architectura* and its imagery, which the artist began to draft during his stay in the realm of his and Schickhardt’s common patron, Duke Ludwig of Württemberg. While the Strasbourg author could have encountered many such texts in the cosmopolitan publishing center where he lived, the *Architectura*’s timing and its apparent dependence on these books suggest that Schickhardt’s library served as a major point of reference, or even an inspiration, for Dietterlin’s treatise.

---


137 Numerous studies address the reading habits and libraries of early modern artists as sources of artistic knowledge. Foundational is Jan Białostocki, “Doctus artifex and the library of the artist in the XVIth and XVIIth century,” in *De arte et libris. Festschrift Erasmus*
Dietterlin also received guidance and instruction in artistic matters from the Antwerp-born artist Daniel Soreau, who eventually became a still-life painter and architectural advisor to Philipp Ludwig II. von Hanau-Münzenberg.\textsuperscript{138} Their exchanges likely enhanced Dietterlin’s knowledge of Netherlandish painting and architectural trends. The Strasbourg artist himself claimed that Soreau showed him much art, and that the relationship also enriched his understanding of artistic techniques. In the dedication of the 1598 \textit{Architectura}, which is addressed to Soreau, Dietterlin states that,

\begin{quote}
In the relatively short period in which we were acquainted, you did not only show me...all manner of artful things, but also taught me many splendid skills in painting, stonecarving, and indeed the most noble matters related to the foundational science and delightful practice of symmetry and proportion[]...[You] also gave me cause to dedicate to you this present book \textit{Architectura} on the Five Columns and their attributes, such as windows, fireplaces, doors, portals, fountains, and epitaphs.\textsuperscript{139}
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{139} “Inonders günstiger Herr, Die gleichwol wenige zeit, darin E.E. Ich erkandtnuß und kundtschafft bekommen, hat mir nicht allein, dero sonderliche rhümliche neigung, lust annuth, vnd erzygung allerhard künstlicher sachen: als auch, vieler vorneuer stattlichern künsten, in Mahlen, Bossieren, vnd welchs wol das fürtrefflichste zuachten, aller Symmetria vnd Proportion gründtliche wissenschafft, vnd eigene Lustvbung, zu erkennen, Sondern auch vrsach gegeben, derselben gegenwertigs Buch Architecture, von den Fünff Seulen, sampt ihren anhängen, Als Fenster, Camin, Thürgericht, Portal, Bronnen, vnd Epitaphien (welche alle auß einem Fundamento vnd grund entspringen, auch durch dieselbige, so andest das Werck Symetrisch, voll vnd wolständig sein soll, ins Werck vnd sein erheischende zierde müssen und sollen gebracht werden) zudedediciren vnd zuzuschreiben.” Wendel Dietterlin, ARCHITECTVRA von Außtheilung Sym=etria und Proportion der Fünff Seulen, und aller daran= folgender Kunst Arbeit, von Fenstern, Caminen, Thürgerichten, Portalen, Bronnen und Epita=phien. Wie dieselbige auß jedweder Art der Fünff Seulen, grund aufzuzureissen, zuzurichten, und ins Werck zu bringen seyen; Al=len solcher Kunst Liebhabenden, zu einem bestendigen und ring ergreifenden underricht erfunden,
The passage would lead the reader to believe that Soreau’s instruction in painting, stone-carving and architecture influenced Dietterlin to fill his treatise’s final installment with architectonic designs in all media. The statement also has implications for how we are to understand Dietterlin’s concept of artistic and architectural expertise. The author indicates that knowledge of the figural arts is important for architects who wish to design works such as fountains and epitaphs. Dietterlin suggests that where he lacks practical experience—in areas such as sculpture and architecture—Soreau’s firsthand knowledge proves a trustworthy substitute. The dedication moreover casts Soreau’s familiarity with painting, stone-carving, and architecture as an ideal mode of well-rounded artistic and architectural expertise.

Dietterlin’s final *Architectura* may be understood as a guide to achieving that ideal.

Executed in a furor of drafting and etching during the five years following his transformative sojourn in Stuttgart, and finished just months before his death, Dietterlin’s *Architectura* became a testament to the painter’s formidable grasp of the principles of architectural design and his technical skills as a creator of architectural ornament. The work’s status as a monument to Dietterlin’s artistic mastery is suggested by the oversize epitaph in the *Erst Buch*’s title page, which is inscribed “Wendel Dietterlin, painter of Strasbourg”. Dietterlin identified himself as a painter—and nothing more—in the title page of every installment of the *Architectura*.\(^1\) The designation links the books to what was, by the end of the sixteenth century, a prestigious tradition of painter-authored architectural treatises. Yet Dietterlin differed from most authors of this stripe in that he could boast no practical experience in realizing constructions. His authorial signature frames the book as a document

---

\(^1\) For the exact terminology used in each release, see Appendix I.
of the architectural knowledge particular to painters. The *Architectura* meanwhile testifies that mastery of the art of devising architectural ornament is not contingent on the aptitude to design or realize buildings.

This painterly brand of architectural expertise stirred controversy among authors of Dietterlin’s day. While figures like Quad made no great distinction between the forms of architectural expertise involved in the composition of architectural treatises and those entailed in building and fortification design, Philibert De l’Orme argued that patrons should never turn to “…some master mason or master carpenter or to some painter, some notary or some other person who is supposed to be qualified but more often than not has no better judgment than the patron himself.”¹⁴¹ The French architect and architectural theorist condemns not only those without theoretical knowledge of architecture as unfit to devise monuments, but also those who lack practical experience in overseeing a building’s execution. The painter—the personification of unpracticed architects—is as useless in realizing monuments as those who, like notaries, possess no artistic training whatsoever. De l’Orme’s assessment nevertheless leaves unaddressed the case of painters like Dietterlin, who exercise their knowledge of architectural design through treatises. The *Architectura* suggests that the forms of architectural expertise involved in composing an architectural treatise differ from those required for devising a building. The question of how Dietterlin brought his experience in painting to bear on a guide to architectural ornament for figural artists as well as architects will be a primary concern of this dissertation.

Little of Dietterlin’s painting oeuvre survived through the eighteenth century. Except for the paintings in the Hall of the Strasbourg Masons, which this dissertation attributes to Dietterlin, the artist’s panel and wall paintings all succumbed to either the ravages of time or the construction campaigns of a later age. Even the dozen etchings that Dietterlin made outside the context of his *Architectura* project are vanishingly rare, and cannot all be located in present-day collections. The consequences of these losses are several. For a discipline largely formed in the service of the study of painting, this prolific painter long appeared to have almost nothing to offer. Dietterlin has, until recently, remained a poorly understood figure even in the German-speaking world, and largely invisible to audiences beyond it. The poor survival rate of Dietterlin’s paintings precludes the possibility of constructing a truly comprehensive analysis of the artist’s creative output. Since the materials related to the *Architectura* project—its text, its etchings, and an astonishingly rich collection of preparatory drawings—now figure as the most significant evidence of Dietterlin’s artistic career, the treatise is the only natural centerpiece for a study of his contributions to early modern culture. The present dissertation thus documents the aspect of Dietterlin’s oeuvre that has not been adequately catalogued—his drawings—but takes his *Architectura*’s picture of the links between architecture and the other visual media as its main subject.

The project’s focus on the interplay between the arts in Dietterlin’s work and era is also motivated by the fact that it has not been desirable to approach the artist through a

---

conventional “life-and-works” monograph. Karl Ohnesorge already tackled this enterprise in his 1893 Wendel Dietterlin, Maler von Strassburg, collecting the archival evidence related to the artist and establishing an indispensable outline of his biography. Other early literature described the specific areas of Dietterlin’s artistic practice. In 1863, Albert von Zahn summarized the editions of the Architectura and its prints alongside a matching list of the preparatory drawings then held in the Königliche Kunstkademie in Dresden. Gustav Pauli’s brief 1899 article also listed the Architectura drawings and described their general style, laying the groundwork for the dissertation’s significantly expanded catalogue raisonné of Dietterlin’s drawings. Having exposed through archival work the vast dimensions of the artist’s lost oeuvre, these studies inspired more speculative research. In 1954, Kurt Martin worked from the only panel securely attributed to Dietterlin—the Raising of Lazarus (1582 or 1587)—as well as drawings and prints after his lost ceiling pictures to re-construct the artist’s profile as a painter. Yet there was more documentary work to be done. The appendices of the present dissertation are designed to function as the first comprehensive accounts of the Architectura’s formation and Dietterlin’s drawing oeuvre. Appendices I and II offer a complete list of the artist’s Architectura publications and describe how he released the treatise, and Appendix III publishes Dietterlin’s copyright application for the project. Appendix IV furnishes a comprehensive description of Dietterlin’s work as a draftsman. Numerous

143 Ohnesorge, Wendel Dietterlin.
146 Kurt Martin, “Der Maler Wendel Dietterlin,” 14-29. This facet of Dietterlin’s career received further attention in Ulrike Weber-Karge’s monograph on the Neue Lusthaus in Stuttgart, which briefly address his activities as one of the artists in charge of the decoration of the building’s Great Hall. See Ulrike Weber-Karge, “…einem irdischen Paradies zu vergleichen.” Das Neue Lusthaus in Stuttgart. Untersuchungen zu einer Bauaufgabe der deutschen Renaissance (Sigmaringen: Jan Thornbecke Verlag, 1989), 28.
unpublished drawings appear there for the first time. Several drawings are de-attributed in Appendix V. It is partly on the basis of this documentation that the dissertation offers new insights into Dietterlin’s place within contemporary artistic practice.

While largely concerned with the *Architectura*, the dissertation also does not endeavor to serve as an exhaustive account of Dietterlin’s treatise project. The only book-length study of the *Architectura*, a 1940 dissertation by Margot Pirr, already offers an outline of the treatise’s imagery and sources, as well as the theoretical implications of the book’s structure.\(^{147}\) A spate of more recent literature addresses other aspects of the treatise. G. Ulrich Großmann’s excellent (if incomplete) 1997 description of the *Architectura’s* various editions has been instrumental in this trend, for in clarifying the book’s complex translation and publication history, it offered a clearer picture of the various audiences that Dietterlin addressed.\(^{148}\) Kimberley Skelton’s 2007 essay described how the treatise engaged artists, architects, art collectors and architectural patrons by leaving the work’s text and images largely open to the various interpretative devices of its diverse readers.\(^{149}\) Other scholars have explored how the *Architectura’s* heterogeneous subject matter engages disparate facets of scientific and literary culture. In 2011, Axel Gampp explored how the book’s grotesques draw from contemporary anatomical literature.\(^{150}\) Günter Irmscher’s 2012 article interpreted the *Architectura* as a collection of “Ornament Emblems,” connecting its enigmatic designs to the contemporary fascination with arcane meaning and the relationships between text and

\(^{147}\) Margot Pirr, *Die Architectura*.


\(^{149}\) Skelton, “Shaping the Book and the Building,” 25-44.

In 2007, Erik Forssman meanwhile showed how Dietterlin’s background as a painter shaped his *Architectura*’s representation of the Orders as a system for decorative design in the other arts. Authors such as Serlio and Vredeman de Vries had laid the groundwork for this development by representing building fixtures such as ceiling designs and fireplaces as manifestations of the Orders, but Dietterlin was the first to imagine the Orders as a framework of forms that could manifest in objects independent of the building structure and indeed in almost any medium. 

Despite the significant body of literature on Dietterlin, the development of this remarkable idea and the *Architectura*’s place in early modern art theory have, until now, remained obscure. So, too, have the ways in which Dietterlin’s picture of the relationships between architecture and the figurative arts engaged period notions of architectural expertise. The present dissertation sheds light on these phenomena by exposing how Dietterlin variously explored the links between the arts across the *Architectura*’s three main installments. In reconstructing the technical aspects of the treatise’s formation, the project reveals how Dietterlin grappled with the category of architectural expertise through his own artistic practice. In relating the *Architectura* to period art and art writing as well as

---

architectural literature and building, the dissertation shows how the treatise synthesized disparate strains of artistic culture in Dietterlin’s age.

“Orders of Elaboration” engages an increasingly vibrant literature on sixteenth-century ornament, exchanges between architecture and the figural arts, and debates about architectural expertise. Mario Carpo’s *L’architettura dell’età della stampa* (1998) sparked interest in this topic by advancing the influential argument that the printed, illustrated treatises of authors like Serlio were prime vehicles of period discourse on architectural ornament. Taking cues from the subsequent upswing in scholarship on early modern architectural treatises, Alina Payne’s *The Architectural Treatise in the Italian Renaissance* (1999) hypothesized that early modern architectural debates largely centered on the issue of ornament. Payne’s “Materiality, Crafting, and Scale in Renaissance Architecture” (2009) drew on this insight to urge for renewed attention to the intersections of architecture and the figural arts during this period. But her case studies, derived almost exclusively from the architectural culture of the Italian peninsula, offer less fruitful ground for these questions than cases from the North. The present work is in part conceived as a response to Payne’s prompts, but is trained on the region where the architectural inquiries of figural artists were always a main preoccupation of architectural publications.

154 Mario Carpo, *L’architettura dell’età della stampa. Oralità, scrittura, libro stampato e riproduzione meccanica dell’immagine nella storia delle teorie architettoniche* (Milan: Jaca Book, 1998). This edition is cited for the purposes of the literature review. The remainder of the dissertation will refer to the English translation of the work, which the author consulted in preparing this study.


This is not to say that similar questions have not also been posed for the North. Rebecca Zorach’s problematic *Blood, Milk, Ink, Gold: Abundance and Excess in the French Renaissance* (2005) mounts a wide-ranging investigation of the materiality of ornament in the northern Renaissance, but does not address interactions between the media, and stops short of examining the ramifications of her findings for notions of artistic expertise.157 Ethan Matt Kavaler’s *Renaissance Gothic: Architecture and the Arts in Northern Europe* (2012) acutely scrutinizes ornamental motifs and formal devices applied in all manner of media, but does so in the service of developing a new paradigm for the periodization of the arts.158 The present dissertation likewise explores northern concepts of ornamental manner as a historical, geographical, and cultural marker, but additionally investigates how ornamental style was thought to link the arts as well as forms of architectural and artistic expertise.

The interplay between architecture and the figural arts is one theme of Christopher P. Heuer’s excellent monograph on Dietterlin’s Netherlandish painter-architect colleague, *The City Rehearsed: Object, Architecture, and Print in the Worlds of Hans Vredeman de Vries* (2009).159 But like the recent edited volume, *The Notion of the Early Modern Painter-Architect* (2014), Heuer’s work concentrates on a painter with practical experience in architecture, and so does

not scrutinize what forms of architectural expertise were associated with non-architects.\textsuperscript{160} Since both books assesses the hybrid careers of painter-architects by focusing on points of contact between the theories of art and architecture, they do not thoroughly address how material exchanges between the arts also defined architectural knowledge. By attending to phenomena such as intermediality, the migration of design techniques from one medium to another, and the physical synthesis of the arts, the present study sheds light on the interplay between architecture and the other visual media in theory \textit{and} practice. Its emphasis on the mechanics of Dietterlin’s experiments with combining the media engages art history’s ongoing interest in attending to questions about the materiality of art. The dissertation nevertheless differs from many studies representative of the current, so-called “material turn” in art history by interrogating ideas about media and matter with an eye on clarifying historical attitudes about architectural expertise and other aspects of intellectual history.\textsuperscript{161} In adopting this approach, the dissertation confronts a more ambitious set of questions than a life-and-works monograph, conventionally conceived, could tackle: How did architecture and the figural arts mutually shape each other in sixteenth-century northern Europe? And how did these interactions form notions of architectural knowledge?\textsuperscript{2}

Any inquiry into the interplay between architecture and the other media in early modern literature and art demands a mix of texts, images, objects, and monuments as its evidential basis. For architectural history, a classic form of this comparative approach has

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{160} Piet Lombaerde, ed., \textit{The Notion of the Painter-Architect in Italy and the Southern Low Countries}, Architectura Moderna 11 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2014).

\end{footnotesize}
been to align treatise and edifice in a demonstration of the dichotomy between theory (represented by the book) and practice (figured by the building). Dietterlin’s oeuvre cannot sustain such an approach because it lacks built projects. Familiar ways of conceiving the theory-practice dichotomy in early modern architectural culture in fact seem inadequate when we are dealing with the *Architectura* and its peer texts. The book shows that Dietterlin considered the composition and illustration of an architectural treatise a form of architectural praxis as well as an opportunity to contribute to learned architectural discourse. For this reason, the present study does not always assume a clean-cut distinction between theory and practice. The dissertation instead confronts its heterogeneous body of evidence by reading texts and images across and against each other, sometimes through another object or building project. It is a method appropriate to the questions raised by the *Architectura*’s bounty of “ornament emblems”, and an artist who covered his images with references to the Scripture. As a 1594 allegory of Wisdom annotated with such citations shows, Dietterlin conceived of knowledge as a mutually explicating conjunction of text and image [Fig. 12].¹⁶²

In attending to the concordances as well as the contradictions between text and image or object and monument, this project rephrases early modern architectural culture’s theory-practice dialogue as a matter of ideals versus realities.

The present dissertation furthermore does not assume that a text’s theoretical apparatus lies in the written word alone. Dietterlin’s pithy yet lavishly illustrated *Architectura* publications employ images as the prime agents of their argument(s). In asking how Dietterlin defined architectural expertise, this study takes the illustration as a platform for

¹⁶² The symbolism of this drawing is discussed in greater detail in Appendix III KA.8.
theory in the early modern art treatise. It employs disparate strategies to interrogate these images, applying tactics of formal analysis and the reconstruction of technical procedures to scrutinize the *Architectura* drawings and prints, and employing iconographical analysis to assess the rhetorical devices and symbolism of Dietterlin’s ornamental designs. The artist conceived his theory of artistic expertise in terms of the debates that defined this heterogeneous form of knowledge for his age, and indeed presented his argument as part of a wider dialogue. Dietterlin’s *Erst Buch* asserts that its readers will gain a solid “discurs and understanding” of the five manners of columns. The present project thus probes how the artist engaged various artistic discourses, aligning his art and writing with the work of contemporaries. In revealing how Dietterlin’s theories of architecture and ornament engage broad conversations about architectural expertise, it clarifies the shifting roles of the architect in the early modern period.

Each of the dissertation’s five chapters is based on a question that probes what, how, or why notions of architectural knowledge shifted. For instance, how did the architectural expertise of figural artists become a matter of theoretical debate in Dietterlin’s world? Chapter I clarifies what was at stake in Dietterlin’s engagement with this issue by shedding light on the lively but heretofore obscure tradition of German Vasari criticism that flourished in Strasbourg between the 1570s and 1600. Specifically, it analyzes Dietterlin’s grotesque painting cycle for the Strasbourg masons’ lodge (c. 1582) as an ironic response to Vasari’s critique of the “monstrous” German decorative manner, or *maniera tedesca*.

---


Following this introduction to the historical context of Dietterlin’s *Architectura* are four chapters centered on the treatise. This section of the dissertation proceeds generally from questions of form to problems of meaning. Artists in Dietterlin’s milieu often clashed over whether the rules of architectural decorum pertain to architectural design in the figural arts. Chapter II therefore asks: In what ways did architectural theory relate to the practices of the figural artist in sixteenth-century northern Europe? The chapter examines how Dietterlin confronted this question in drafting the *Architectura* etchings by visualizing ways to apply the principles of architectural design to the figural arts. It draws its source material from the dissertation’s catalogue *raisonné* of Dietterlin’s approximately two hundred surviving drawings, a thirteen of which were not previously identified in print as the artist’s work. The question of how the actual medium of the *Architectura*’s etched illustrations shaped the book’s picture of the intersections between architecture and the other arts is also of key concern. Chapter III addresses the ways in which Dietterlin’s *Architectura* etchings engaged the era’s broader fascination with the phenomenon of intermediality, examining how the artist responded to contemporary interest in comparing etching with other media by crafting the etchings to variously resemble drawings or engravings.

Architectural theorists’ interest in addressing painters and sculptors made figural ornament a prime subject of architectural literature in Dietterlin’s world.¹⁶⁵ If the previous chapters reveal the impact of architectural treatises on the figural arts, Chapters IV and V demonstrate the ways in which themes from painting and sculpture likewise infiltrated

architectural culture. The phenomenon raises questions about how architecture incorporated the figural arts’ mechanisms of representation. For instance, what effects did the increasing importance of figural motifs in architecture have on the medium’s rhetorical apparatus?

Chapter IV addresses this query by scrutinizing how the publications of Dietterlin, Vredeman, and woodworker Gabriel Krammer developed a system of anthropomorphic forms of the Orders, called “Termen”. It probes how Termen offered architects and artists manifold possibilities for figuring the characteristic personality of an Order, and thus provided a versatile new means for conveying meaning through architectural designs. An excursus addresses Dietterlin’s engagement with what is now called “auricular ornament”, assessing how the artist employed bodily forms to challenge conventional ideas about architectural structure and to involve architecture in anatomical and nature study—fields of inquiry normally associated with the figural arts.

What made the ability to combine architecture and the other visual media a mark of surpassing artistic knowledge? Chapter V addresses this question by examining the rhetoric of antagonism and accord between architecture and the figural arts, long a forum in which artistic mastery was defined. Whereas the paragone, or comparison between the arts, is a prominent theme of the art and art writing of early modern Italy, its role in the artistic culture of northern Europe has been less clear. The region’s paucity of original writings on

168 Foundational literature on the paragone debate includes John White, “Paragone: Aspects of the Relationship between Sculpture and Painting,” in Art, Science, and History in the Renaissance, ed. Charles S. Singleton (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1967), 43-10; and
the *paragone* has seemed to suggest that this discourse was absent from period literature.\(^{169}\)

Dietterlin’s *Architectura* and the many texts that emulate the treatise nevertheless prove otherwise. Chapter V scrutinizes the ways in which the *Architectura* transformed the *paragone* discourse through its innovative designs for plurimedial altarpieces, facades, and spaces. The chapter also explores how Dietterlin’s woodworker and façade painter followers competed to depict the most ingenious fusions of the artistic media in subsequent architectural publications. It thereby reveals the *Architectura*’s extensive ramifications for period art, architecture, and their literatures. As the Conclusion asserts, the five studies collectively chart how synthesizing the visual media became a definitive act of universal artistic expertise in Dietterlin’s world.

But why do the material and theoretical speculations of an artist known almost exclusively for a book of fantastic architectural images remain relevant today? Why should Dietterlin’s *magnum opus* have re-appeared in three twentieth-century re-prints, become a focus of over a dozen articles since 1997, and continue to serve as the paradigmatic work of German Renaissance architectural theory in the latest survey texts?\(^{170}\)

---


Wilhelm Lübke (coiner of the term “German Renaissance”) called a “witch’s Sabbath” of architectural forms, the *Architectura* serves as an enchanting foil to the rational, idealistic Renaissance portrayed in Jakob Burkhardt’s canonical *Die Cultur der Renaissance in Italien* and its literary progeny.\(^{171}\) But as an editor of Lübke’s foundational *Geschichte der deutschen Renaissance* later contended, it is a mistake to dismiss Dietterlin’s challenging treatise as a transfixing document of some sixteenth-century architectural occult. “[The book] is rather,” the editor wrote, a document of “…the new-formed, highly painterly and world of the German Renaissance…whose possibilities of execution are boundlessly reflected in spirit of this terrifically creative painter.”\(^{172}\) To reject the world of Dietterlin’s work as the antipode

---


\(^{172}\) “Dietterlin’s Werk ist in gänzlicher Verkennung seiner Absicht und seines Zweckes oft als ein wahrer Hexensabbat bezeichnet werden. Jedoch durchaus mit Unrecht. Es ist nur die neugeschaffene, höchst malerische Welt der deutschen Renaissance, die sich hier ohne Grenze, wie sie sonst die Ausführungsmöglichkeit bietet, in dem Geiste eines ungeheuer phantasievollen Malers spiegelt.” Wilhelm Lübke, *Geschichte der Renaissance in Deutschland. 3rd*
of a normative, Italian Renaissance is to make vital strides toward understanding a northern Renaissance on its own terms.

The continuing relevance of artists like Dietterlin has also been attributed to their formative roles in a defining shift in modern architectural culture: the emergence of the architect as a designer of images rather than a practitioner of site- or medium-specific work.\textsuperscript{173} Dietterlin’s \textit{Architectura} project certainly portends these developments, but it also speaks to contemporary artistic practice in another way. As perhaps no artist since Sebastiano Serlio, Dietterlin made the materiality of architecture and print the central subjects of his work. The \textit{Architectura} showcases the staggering variety of materials in which architectural form can occur—stone, wood, and brick, but also metal, ceramic, paint, cloth, and print. It also leverages print’s uncanny aptitude for representing designs that could be executed in any medium to innovatively portray plurimedial projects that seamlessly blur the distinctions between the disparate visual arts. With its drawing- and engraving like etchings, the \textit{Architectura} nevertheless differs from the books of Serlio’s \textit{Regole generali} series in that it also probes the relationships between the arts on the level of form. Dietterlin thus represents an early instance of an artist who practiced according to a principle formulated much later by Marshall McLuhan—the maxim that “the medium is the message.”\textsuperscript{174}

By unlocking the architectural knowledge embodied by Schloßberger’s architectonic box and thereby releasing a deluge of chaotic ornamental designs into the world, the

\textsuperscript{173} Heuer, \textit{The City Rehearsed}, 28.

Architectura poses Dietterlin as the Pandora of sixteenth-century architectural culture. Yet in the late Renaissance world of double or obscure meanings that Dietterlin inhabited, this device and the Architectura’s bounty of ornamental proliferations conceal the treatise’s profound interest in ornament as an expression of order. The categories of order and elaboration that give this dissertation its title encompass the various forces, at turns complementary and contradictory, that propelled Dietterlin’s investigations into the interplay between architecture and the other visual arts. Order, for artists of Dietterlin’s age, was the essential condition of creation, a blueprint to follow and then renovate to different ends. The Architectura’s first installment establishes ground rules for devising architectural ornament, only for its subsequent releases to present the transgression of those protocols as a potent technique of artistic invention. The canonical Orders of architecture provide the theoretical basis for Dietterlin’s paradigm of design, but the treatise reimagines them as a system of manners that pertains to every visual medium. With its paradigm for devising ornament and its model for extending the principles of architectural invention to decorative design in other arts, the Architectura describes orders of elaboration as well as ways to elaborate on the architectural Orders. If order was the basis for artistic generation, the act of developing some prior model of art—the act of elaboration—was the means whereby the artist realized an invention. Ornament was no mere supplementary gesture, but a metaphor for the element of embellishment inherent to any visual production of Dietterlin’s age. By elaborating the theory of architectural ornament into a system that pertains to design in the figural arts, Dietterlin’s Architectura transformed the existing order of architectural expertise.
Chapter I.

German, Gothic, Grotesque? The Reception of Vasari’s Maniera Tedesca and the Problem of Ornamental Style in Dietterlin’s Strasbourg

Among the closing pages of Wendel Dietterlin’s 1594 Annder Buch, readers find a pair of plates that can be joined to reveal a strange monument [Figs. 1a & b]. Doors with rounded arches anchor its lower registers. A pyramid of niches, grand windows, and a giant pilaster mount the portals. All adorn a wall that culminates in pinacles decked with vases. While the smaller door leads to a mysterious interior, the windows incongruously open on to empty space. A tangle of embellishments ensnares the entire façade, its networks of inorganic and vegetal adornments terminating in curling volutes and pointed arches.

With its irrational structure and jumble of grotesques, putti, and foliate ornament, this edifice figures the collision of decorative idioms that shaped the art of Dietterlin’s world. It also reflects a prominent theme of sixteenth-century art writing. This was the idea that the maniera tedesca, or “German manner”, embodies disorderly and retrograde design. The trope thrived in Italian literature as early as the fifteenth century, but reached a broader public after Giorgio Vasari condemned the maniera tedesca, and especially its ornaments, in his 1550 and

---

1 Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, ARCHITECTVR von Portalen vnnd Thürgerichten mancherley arten. Das Annder Buch [hereafter, “Annder Buch”] (Strasbourg: Bernhard Jobin’s heirs, 1594), Stuttgart, Staatsgalerie Stuttgart, Graphische Sammlung, [no inventory number, prints are stored in Kasten 206/7], Pls. 55-56. Dietterlin re-used the plates on the same pages of both versions of the Latin/French translation of the text: ARCHITECTVRA de Postium seu Portalium ornatu vario LIBER II. (Strasbourg: Bernhard Jobin’s heirs?, 1594), Zurich, ETH-Bibliothek, Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule, 1226q; and ARCHITECTVRA de Postium seu Portalium ornatu vario LIBER II. (Strasbourg: Bernhard Jobin’s heirs, 1595), Zurich, ETH-Bibliothek, Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule, Rar 1226q. Dietterlin also reused the plates in the final, summative versions of the Architectura printed during his lifetime: ARCHITECTVRA von Außtheilung, Symm=etria und Proportion der Fünff Seulen (Nuremberg: Hubrecht and Balthasar Caymox, 1598), Zurich, Zentralbibliothek Zürich, Alte Drucke, Rx 12: c,2 | F; and ARCHITECTVRA DE CONSTITVTIONE, Symmetria, ac proportione quinqu[e] Columnarum (Nuremberg: Hubrecht and Balthasar Caymox, 1598), Oxford, Bodleian Library, Oxford University, H 3.3(1) Art, both Pls. 196-197.
Copious research probes sixteenth-century Italian concepts of the *maniera tedesca* as a decorative idiom. The North’s critical reception of Italian discourse on the ornaments of the *maniera tedesca* during the sixteenth century has, meanwhile, received less attention—particularly in the case of the German-speaking lands. The writings of late Renaissance Strasbourg’s long obscure circle of Vasari critics and the contemporary renovation of the Strasbourg masons’ lodge offer fresh insights into the *maniera tedesca* controversy in northern Europe. In responding to Italian literature about the German manner, Dietterlin and his Strasbourg colleagues defined various geographies of ornamental style and honed different understandings of ornament as a vehicle of regional artistic manners. Their contributions to the transalpine discourse about the *maniera tedesca* reveal how theories of style—particularly decorative style—in sixteenth-century northern Europe evolved.

---

References to the *maniera tedesca* occur in several places in the completed, 1568 version of the *Vite*. See Giorgio Vasari, *LE VITE DE’ PIÙ ECCELLENTI PITTORE, SCULPTE, ET ARCHITETTORE* (Florence: i Giunti, 1568), 1:65-68; 2:22, 115; 4:615; and 5:48.

“...strange and difficult pieces, which display much fantasy and contemplation...”

A host of circumstances shaped conversations about regional manners of ornament in Dietterlin’s age. We can observe many of these conditions at play in the 1538 Kunstbüchlin of Strasbourg artist Heinrich Vogtherr the Elder. The Kunstbüchlin is a slim volume of model ornaments and pictorial motifs. It brims with woodcut images of hands, limbs, busts, armor, weapons, architectural fragments, and grotesque candelabra. The final print of Vogtherr’s book depicts a capital adorned with acanthus leaves, bull-formed bucralia, and grotesque masks, which hovers above a polygonal base that bears a cube marked with lines and numerical figures [Fig. 2]. The modern eye identifies the base as a case of what is today termed the “Gothic” style, and the capital as an object that revives the forms of antiquity. Unlike the Kunstbüchlin’s design patterns, this image deals in metaphor. The woodcut is an allegory of artistic style.

It is not surprising that Vogtherr would chose to tackle the complex issue of artistic manner through the genre of the ornament print. As the cases discussed in this chapter will show, viewers in the early modern era, as now, regarded ornament as a potent index of style.

---


5 Heinrich Vogtherr the Elder, Ein Fremdes vnd wunderbarliches Kunstbüchlin, allen Molern, Bildschmörtern, Goldschmörtern, Steinmetzen, waffen vnd Messerschmörtern hochzutragen, Dergleichentlich vor nie neines gesehen, oder in den Truck kommen ist [hereafter, “Kunstbüchlin”] (Strasbourg: Christian Müller, 1572) [re-print of first edition of 1538, which was inaccessible to the author], Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Rar. 693, 55.

6 Present understandings of ornament as a reflection of period- and regional style have been heavily influenced by the work of Aloïs Riegl, and also have important roots in the early work of Heinrich Wölfflin. See, for example, Aloïs Riegl, Stiffragen. Grundlegungen zu einer Geschichte der Ornamentik (Berlin: G. Siemens, 1893); and Heinrich Wölfflin, “Prolegomena zu
Print exerted a particularly strong influence on period conceptions of stylistic idioms. Its mechanically reproducible and portable form enabled artists to disseminate consistent copies of decorative designs to far-flung locales, which then offered models for further artistic productions. Some prints even came to define the stylistic idiom of a given place. But print also spurred artists to adopt forms from distant lands, and thereby dissolved boundaries between regional manners. By making the ornament of all places and times available to collectors as never before, it also offered an unprecedented visual summary of the history and geography of decorative manners. Print became the prime visual medium of interregional discourse about the artistic manners of different times and places, including transalpine exchanges.

Yet the interplay between Gothic and Renaissance stylistic currents in sixteenth-century Strasbourg does not adequately explain Vogtherr’s image, nor does it accurately reflect the notions of style that prevailed in Europe during this age. Northern readers in the

---


9 A prominent example of this phenomenon is the role of print in crystallizing the ornamental style of the so-called “School of Fontainebleau”. See Henri Zerner, L’ecole de Fontainebleau (Paris: Arts et Métier Graphiques, 1969).


decades around 1500 did not possess a mature concept of the “Middle Ages” as a distinct historical phenomenon. The present was regarded as fundamentally contiguous with the past, and classical culture was thought never to have entirely disappeared from the region’s learned circles. An inscription over Albrecht Dürer’s woodcut image of *Philosophia* in Conrad Celtes’s 1502 *Amores* in fact identifies the Germans as the inheritors of the ancient tradition of learning, proclaiming, “The Greeks call me *Sophia* and the Romans *Sapientia* / The Egyptians and Chaldeans discovered me, the Greeks wrote me/ The Romans translated me, and the Germans amplified me.” Many came to regard the North’s prevailing mode of ornament as a successor to the classical idiom, characterizing what is now called the “medieval” or “Gothic” style as the *modern* answer to the antique manner. Describing the cruciform, and beyond: Toward a *thick* description of style,” in *Le gothique de la Renaissance: Actes des quatrième Rencontres d’Architecture Européene, Paris, 12-16 juin 2007*, ed. Monique Chatenet (Paris: Picard, 2011), 47-64.

oblong churches typical of the Middle Ages, Sebastiano Serlio wrote that, “Christendom is full of these temples, particularly modern ones, which in Italy, according to prevailing opinion, are called German work.” But even in areas in which this style of architecture was the norm, the “modern” manner was not always viewed positively. A contract from 1519, for instance, orders Antwerp sculptor Gregorius Wellemans to create a model for the copper screen before St. Martin’s altar in the Utrecht cathedral, “…avoiding everything which is modern and to correct and augment [the existing design] thoroughly in an antique [manner], rich and costly, and above all, artful”. The revival of classical culture caused anxiety about the continued use of the “modern” ornamental mode.

Early modern definitions of regional manner also involved certain intersections between geography and chronology. As Serlio’s comments suggest, the “modern” mode that is now called the “Gothic” was regarded as a northern or “German” form of ornament. The

---

classical manner, in both its original and its Renaissance manifestations, was meanwhile considered an exotic idiom that had recently been imported to the North. This development unsettled the conventional dichotomy between the old and new decorative manners. Dürer’s Underweysung der messung presents classicizing, Vitruvian architectural ornaments as a “new fashion” for the Germans, contrasting it with the region’s traditional, Gothic building forms. The Underweysung’s lesson in lettering design meanwhile introduces the classicizing antiqua as a “Latin” script, and the region’s native, medieval Fraktur as a form that readers are “accustomed to using” [Fig. 3]. Old forms of ornament became new, and what were once regarded as “modern” motifs seemed familiar in comparison.

German architectural incunabula had helped define the image of the northern manner for the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. In 1486, Regensburg author Mathes Roriczer released a guide to devising stonework finials, Das Büchlein von der Fialen Gerechtigkeit. A Fialenbüchlein published around the same time in Nuremberg with the signature “Hanns Schmuttermayer” and Roriczer’s own Geometria Deutsch (1487 or 1488) and Wimpergbüchlein (c. 1486-90) followed with advice on drafting pillars, gables, and other

---

17 Authorities such as Conrad Celtes also claimed that the classical style had been imported to the German lands in ancient times. See Edgar Bierende, “Fremder und heimischer Stil—Humanisten und Künstler auf der Suche nach der eigenen Identität,” in Stil als Bedeutung, 135-159.


19 “So dan die bauleßt auch maler und ander etwan schrift an die hohen gemeßter pflegen zü machen, so thünt not das sie recht buchstaben leren machen, darumb will ich hie ein wenig davon an zeygen, erstlich ein Lateinisch. abc. für schrebyen, dannach ein textur, die zwo schrift man gewonlich zü solichen dingen braucht.” Dürer, Underweysung der messung, fol. Ki’.
ornaments. Arriving on the heels of the first published architectural literature—Leon Battista Alberti’s *De re aedificatoria* (published 1485) and the *editio princeps* of Vitruvius’ *De architectura* (1486)—these stonemasons’ manuals became the earliest architecture books published north of the Alps. Printed in the vernacular by the artisans who created the region’s most prominent ornamental projects, the books celebrate the south German masons’ architectural idiom even as an alternative model of building was consolidating authority in the earliest Italian architectural publications. Unlike fifteenth-century Italian architectural treatises that circulated in printed form, German architectural incunabula also contained illustrations. These prints defined the image of the masons’ knowledge of ornament design techniques by reproducing the visual idioms of south German architectural drawing. For instance, an engraving in Schmuttermayer’s *Fialenbüchlein* divulges how to devise a finial by illustrating the squaring method used to plot its various sections [Fig. 4]. By visualizing the proportions that masons employed to invent their ornaments, it links the forms of northern Europe’s late-medieval stonework to its creators’ expertise in geometry.

---


22 However, Italian architectural treatises that circulated widely in manuscript form did contain images. The most prominent example is the *Libro architettonico* of Antonio di Pietro Averlino (née Filarete), composed some time around 1464. On Filarete’s treatise, see John Onians, *Bearers of Meaning: The Classical Orders in Antiquity, the Middle Ages, and the Renaissance* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988), 158-170.


24 On the fundamental role of geometry in the theory and practice of medieval architecture, see Lon Shelby, “The Geometric Knowledge of the Medieval Master Mason,” *Speculum* 47
Vogtherr’s print revives the geometrical imagery of the south German masons’ manuals. As a quadrilateral form with numerical annotations reminiscent of those that marked the masons’ printed diagrams, the cube set atop his polygonal, woodcut base alludes to the mathematical genius that the masons used to invent such forms. The object’s three-dimensional profile nevertheless differs from the two-dimensional representations of German architectural incunabula. Its volumetric form attests to Vogtherr’s mastery of geometrical perspective, a technology unknown to the old masons’ books. Here, genius for rendering geometrical ornaments remains a primary feature of northern ornament design, but the forms that it takes have evolved. The idea that the northern manner of ornament constituted a coherent but evolving tradition also echoes in the script lessons of Dürer’s Underweysung der messung. The Nuremberg master explains that, “…It used to be that the old textur [Fraktur] was written with certain proportions,” but admits that it is now also necessary to “…write of the other manner in which it is presently made.”

For artists like Vogtherr and Dürer, the northern manner remained a vibrant and ever-changing style even in the face of the North’s of new interest in the classical idiom.


As with architectural ornament, the earliest illustrations of this topic in printed literature were also produced in the North. The 1505 De Artificiali Perspectiva by Jean Pèlerin (called Viator) and Georg Glockendon’s pirated, 1509 German version of the text, Von der Kunst Perspectiva, proliferated knowledge of perspectival construction to Latin and German-speaking audiences. On the reception of Pèlerin’s text in the sixteenth century, see Jean-Pierre Le Goff, “La perspective géométrique dans la tradition française. Jean Pèlerin, dit Viator, et Jean Cousin, dit le Vieux,” in Arts et sciences à la Renaissance, ed. Evelyne Barbin (Paris: Ellipses, 2007), 69-104.

“Die alten textur hat man etwan in solicher mas geschriben, wie wol man sie yeßt einer anderen art macht, das ich auch schreyben will.” Dürer, Underweysung der messung, fol. L vi’.
Another constellation of issues informs Vogtherr’s picture of the antique decorative style. Northern Europe’s remoteness from Rome, the epicenter of classical antiquity for the sixteenth century, gave the revival of classical forms on the far side of the Alps a distinct flavor. Before the later fifteenth century, northern Europe lacked a conspicuous landscape of classical art. Beginning around the 1470s, the revival of antique culture that had long flourished on the Italian peninsula journeyed north. Some Northerners acquired knowledge of classical ornament through travel. Others learned about antique decorative forms from the material vestiges of antiquity—coins, medals, and other small objects—left in the region from the days of the Roman Empire.\(^{27}\) Still, northern Europe’s encounter with antiquity was often a more mediated affair.\(^{28}\) Itinerant objects, texts, and artists—most of whom were Northerners—brought the classical idiom of ornament to prominence in the lands north of the Alps.\(^{29}\) Northern Europe now confronted a new corpus of visual models for decoration, as well as a novel framework for theorizing adornment.\(^{30}\) The advent of an alternative to the native decorative style also stirred northern viewers’ interest in defining regional manners of ornament.

\(^{27}\) See Wood, *Forgery, Replica, Fiction.*
\(^{28}\) Jessen, *Der Ornamentstich,* 39.
An engraving made by Giovanni Antonio da Brescia around 1515 was among the many Italian artworks that helped to spark this phenomenon [Fig. 5]. It depicts a fragmented antique capital and base, as well as a monstrous mask. With its grotesque architectural ornaments, Giovanni Antonio’s image joined a tradition of so-called “fantasy capitals” that had flourished in the sketchbooks of Italian artists since the fifteenth century, and, more recently, in single-sheet engravings. Giovanni Antonio’s print also engages the then-common practice of representing antique ornament in a fragmentary state. By emphasizing the incompleteness the Classical era’s artistic remains, such images mourned antiquity’s irrecoverable loss, but also presented its fragments as the raw material for new inventions.

According to Plato’s *Sophist*, visual art knows two forms of invention: likeness-making, and the fantastic. Likeness-making, or icastic invention, entails the representation of objects observed in nature. This purely mimetic mode contrasts with fantastic invention, which is the procedure whereby an artist rearranges icastic images to form new visual compounds. Fantastic art, Plato argued, “…produces appearance, but not likeness…” Classical literature’s various representations of this idea profoundly shaped the art theory of early modern Europe. Art theorists presented the mimetic image, adapted and reorganized

---

33 Plato, *ΣΟΦΙΣΤΗΣ*, 235c, 236c.
according to the judgment of the artist, as the springboard for pictorial fantasia.\textsuperscript{36} The assumed dichotomy between icastic and fantastic invention proved particularly decisive for the reception of antiquity during this era. In assimilating classical motifs, artists strove variously to reproduce the forms of antiquity, and to surpass those forms by adapting and recombining elements or characteristics of ancient art to form new visual concoctions.

Works like Michelangelo’s 1496-1498 invented “antique” sculpture of Bacchus or Lucas van Leyden’s well-known 1528 engraving of grotesques described in Horace yet never identified in a specific work of ancient art exemplify how this impulse blurred the lines between the antique source material and the modern art derived from it [Fig. 6].\textsuperscript{37} These works’ stylistic ambiguity arises from a refusal to identify themselves as either icastic or fantastic inventions. Giovanni Antonio’s engraving also equivocates between the forms of representation entailed by the icastic and fantastic modes. Its individual subjects display fantastic combinations of


motifs, and the coincidence of the architectural fragments with the grotesque mask produces a whimsical effect. Yet the base is also marked with naturalistic cracks, and is accompanied by an inscription that cites the object’s origins near Rome’s Torre delle Milizie. By reporting such details, so-called “fantasy” engravings of antique ornament often appear to document actual cases of classical adornment. Does Giovanni Antonio’s print describe specific antique objects, or does it represent a modern re-imagining of classical models? Viewers north of the Alps were not in a position to discern the answer. The ambiguity of such records of ancient ornament justified the poetic license that Northerners often applied when adapting these models in new decorative designs.

Because multiple degrees of removal often stood between northern viewers and the actual vestiges of the ancient world, northern artists’ images of the classical idiom often seem less archaeological than aesthetic, or even idealized. For instance, unlike the Italian artists who labeled their studies of ancient ornaments with the names of their origin sites, Hans Sebald Beham used references to Vitruvius’s *De architectura* to portray antique capitals in a 1545 series of engravings as representations of the general classes of ornament described in the text. The image of a Doric capital is inscribed with the words “DAS iii. CAPITEL” and parallel quotes from Vitruvius in Latin and German which describe that Order. Albrecht Altdorfer meanwhile created a reverse facsimile of Giovanni Antonio’s engraving that omits the label that once designated the origins of the capital and base, but adds ornamental flourishes and finer crosshatching [Fig. 7]. The later print’s dark background underscores the objects’ alienation from their original context. 

---

38 The engraving’s full inscription reads: “VITRUVIVS / DAS .iii. CAPITEL. / QVODLIBET HORVM CAPITVM PONI POTEST / AD CORPUVS COLVMNÆ DORICAE / DISSE HAVBTER MAF EINIETLICHES GESECZ WERDEN AVF DEN LEIB DER SEVLN DORICA.” The series is documented in Hollstein III.156.
Giovanni Antonio’s motifs, Altdorfer transforms the design from a depiction of particular artifacts into a set of non-specific models of antique ornament. This mode of representation insists more on its subjects’ adaptability to new ornamental schemes. In other words, Altdorfer’s image encourages fantastic invention.

It was not long before artists in northern Europe came to regard antiquity as a trove of ornaments that might be reassembled and elaborated at will. By the second decade of the sixteenth century, adaptations of Italian designs in the vein of Altdorfer’s print gave rise to another form of antique designs. Instead of merely imitating extant models, Northern artists reconfigured their motifs in novel schemes. Hans Sebald Beham, Augustin Hirschvogel, the Master L.D, and many other northerners printed a host of fantastic antique capitals, bases, and other ornaments over the next decades. Once impoverished of native antique art, northern Europe developed its own economy of classical ornament. Vogtherr’s use of a grotesque capital to symbolize the antique idiom figures a key result of this phenomenon. While sixteenth-century northern Europe associated its native ornamental mode with rational, mathematical creation, its audiences came to link the antique manner of ornament with the fantastic mode of invention.

For viewers in Vogtherr’s day, few motifs epitomized the convergence of the antique manner of ornament and fantastic mode of invention more aptly than the grotesque. Unlike the medieval drollery to which it is sometimes likened, the grotesque composition typically

---

39 Forssman describes the “Mischstil” that resulted from this phenomenon. See Forssman, Säule und Ornament, 47.

40 Early adopters of the trend in Germany also include Daniel Hopfer, the Master NLvM, and Peter Flötner. See Michael J. Waters and Cammy Brothers, Variety, Archaeology & Ornament: Renaissance Architectural Prints From Column to Cornice. Catalogue of the exhibition of the same name, Charlottesville, VA, University of Virginia Art Museum, August 26-December 11, 2011 (Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Art Museum, 2011), 45.
displays some form of symmetry, and is specifically associated with ancient art.\textsuperscript{41} Once a motif virtually forgotten by modern audiences, the grotesque had spread in Italy and then other areas of Europe following the re-discovery of the Domus Aurea’s grotesque wall paintings at the end of the fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{42} It could soon be found not only in frescoes and interior paintings, but also in \textit{sgraffito}, stucco, the so-called “decorative arts”, and print, which constantly circulated new grotesque designs between workshops and across regions.\textsuperscript{43} The modern reception of the grotesque was colored by its dubious reputation in classical texts. Horace’s \textit{Ars poetica} famously asked readers if they could refrain from laughing if they saw the work of a painter who thought to “…join a human head to the neck of a horse, and to spread feathers of many a hue over limbs picked up now here and now there, so that what at the top is a lovely woman ends below in a black and ugly fish…”\textsuperscript{44} Horace defines the grotesque as a product of fantastic invention that mixes ridiculous combinations of forms and consequently produces an ugly appearance. As such, it represents the perils of transgressing artistic norms.

Early modern audiences also regarded the grotesque as an arena of artistic license, using it to subvert the aesthetic values of the ancients.\textsuperscript{45} Lucas van Leyden’s grotesque design, for instance, conveys an image of antique art that does not accord with the classical

\textsuperscript{41} Gombrich, \textit{The Sense of Order}, 278-279.
\textsuperscript{43} For the Renaissance grotesque in German prints, see Carsten-Peter Warncke, \textit{Die Ornamentale Groteske in Deutschland, 1500-1650}, 2 vols. (Berlin: Verlag Volker Spiess, 1979).
\textsuperscript{45} On the grotesque as a vehicle for artistic license during the early modern period, see André Chastel, \textit{La grotesque. Essai sur l’ornement sans nom’} (Paris: Le Promeneur, 1988), 19-37.
ideal of the harmonious combination of forms. As his print shows, the grotesque’s fantastic combination of forms made the motif an emblem of hybridity and monstrosity. Its chimerical composition often brought early modern viewers to treat the grotesque as a symbol of transformation and the perpetual presence of change in the universe. This interpretation aligned the grotesque with the idea of the unfixed nature of matter—a concept key to Dietterlin’s use of the ornament in exploring the relationships between the media.

Yet although grotesques embodied the fickle and absurd, art theorists such as Pirro Ligorio could still claim that they were “not without meaning.” Many of the forms commonly included in grotesque compositions—flora, fauna, vessels, weapons, and other objects—were laden with symbolism for early modern viewers. The grotesque’s mysterious conglomerations of objects thus seemed to conceal a hidden meaning. Both Ligorio and Giovanni Paolo Lomazzo, for instance, likened grotesques to hieroglyphs; Lomazzo additionally compared the form to imprese and emblems. Northern viewers came to attribute a symbolic function not only to the classical grotesque, but also to grotesque imagery writ large. A broadsheet published in 1573 characterized the grotesques adorning a medieval capital in the Strasbourg cathedral as a strangely prophetic, centuries-old protest.

---

48 “Le pitture grottesche de gentili non siano senza significatione.” Pirro Ligorio, Turin, Libro dell’antichità VI, Grottesche, fol. 153v. Quoted from Dacos, La découverte de la Domus Aurea, 165.
49 Ligorio writes: “Onde ad uso di lettere hieroglipthiciche fatte, come per significare in ciò vari avvenimenti...” Ibid. On Ligorio and the hermeneutics of the grotesque, see Morel, Les grotesques, 40-44. On Lomazzo and the likeness between grotesques and hieroglyphics, emblems, and imprese, see Morel, Les grotesques, 44-47.
against Catholic idolatry. Vogtherr's fantastic capital also acts as a meaningful symbol. It incorporates grotesque masks with curling horns akin to those pictured in Giovanni Antonio and Altdorfer's prints as an allusion to, among other things, the assimilation of the antique idiom in northern Europe and the transformations in art occasioned by that phenomenon.

It has been observed that the vigorous assimilation of classical motifs to the region’s existing ornamental vernacular gave rise to a heterogeneous manner of adornment that has aptly been called “Renaissance Gothic.” Yet the arrival of classical motifs to the North did not only produce stylistic hybridity. As in Vogtherr's woodcut, artists also aligned manifestations of the native and imported modes of ornament as separate but coexisting entities. Even as the classical mode permeated the region’s ornamental repertoire, northern audiences often continued to conceive of the native and imported traditions of adornment as distinct categories. Northern artists and authors supported this new regime of stylistic pluralism. One woodcut by Nuremberg artist Peter Flötner shows “Veyt Pildhawer (Sculptor)” accompanied by a verse that advertises how the artist has “carved many attractive images in the foreign (welsch) and German (deutschen) customs (sitten).” Dürer’s dual lessons in classicizing and Gothic architecture and in antiqua and Fraktur advance the same ideal, as does Vogtherr's emblem of the North’s dual decorative styles.

Vogtherr’s *Kunstbüchlin* also promotes both continuity and change within the northern tradition of ornament. It accomplishes this in part through its novel format. In the fifteenth century, model books of ornament and other pictorial motifs existed in manuscript form, safeguarded by the masters and workshops that drew from their images to devise works in various media. The *Kunstbüchlin* joined the region’s first wave of printed pattern books. This innovative form reconciled northern Europe’s model book tradition with the new era of print. It also transformed the genre of the model book by making it accessible to an expanded public—namely, artists and collectors beyond the confines of the workshop. The introduction to the *Kunstbüchlin* reveals Vogtherr’s grounds for publishing his personal cache of motifs. Since “…the recent proliferation of the Holy Word throughout the German nation has greatly diminished all subtle and liberal arts,” he laments, “many [artists] have abandoned them, and now take up other forms of handwork.” The *Kunstbüchlin*, itself an example of this phenomenon, seeks to furnish such artisans with models for such projects.

In his 1924 *Kunstgeschichte als Geistesgeschichte*, Max Dvořák asserted that the separation and eventual compromise between the Catholic and Protestant faiths vanquished the unmitigated “World-affirmation” (*Weltbejahung*) of the Renaissance and precipitated a “spiritual catastrophe” (*geistigen Katastrophe*) with wide-ranging consequences for period art. While Dvořák evaluates the changing ethos of the Reformation period in overly absolute

terms, his assessment of the sea change that the period’s religious movements precipitated in art is accurate. Next to the rebirth of the classical idiom, the Reformation indeed counts as the most transformative development for the culture of ornament in early modern northern Europe. Dvořák discerned rather abstract signs of the anxieties of the age in the strange ornamental confabulations that arose in Reformation Germany, but the phenomenon of the Reformation also made a more concrete impact on the production of ornament. In stymieing the market for devotional images, it moved many masters of “subtle arts” like painting and sculpture to seek their livelihood in the craft of ornament. Ornament printmaking became a particularly attractive pursuit, for such works could sell as luxury objects or as artisans’ patterns for works in other media. The German-speaking realm in fact produced more printed ornament designs during the sixteenth century than any other region of Europe. Vogtherr’s novel form of printed model book took advantage of these new market conditions. Nevertheless, the author also advanced a larger cause. He conceived of his Kunstdbüchlin as a work that might revive German art from this “diminished” state.

Notably, the conventional northern manner of ornament does not play a decisive role in Vogtherr’s scheme for kindling a German Renaissance. The Kunstdbüchlin’s model motifs—armor, weapons, grotesque candelabra, and fantasy capitals—for the most part reflect the antique idiom [Fig. 8]. Their fragmentary forms also suit the fantastic mode of invention then associated with the foreign, antique manner. Vogtherr’s plan for resuscitating German art turns on this mode of artistic design. The author contends that it is through “…strange [frembden] and difficult pieces, which display much fantasy (fantasierens) and

---

57 Ibid. 16.
58 Snodin and Howard, *Ornament: A Social History*, 24
contemplation…[that] enlightened artists will be roused to bring forth even higher and subtler arts…so that art might again ascend and receive its due regard [in Germany], and that we [Germans] might outstrip other nations [in art].”

The argument that fantastic, exotic modes of ornament will revive German art reflects the historical circumstances of Vogtherr’s project. The upheaval of the Reformation would prevent many northern artists from collecting visual models abroad—an experience seen as vital to attaining artistic mastery.

Vogtherr addressed his *Kunstbüchlin* to artists of post-Reformation Germany who lacked the opportunity to travel, offering them a body of motifs that could replace a journeyman’s visual stockpile. His efforts betray a shrewd grasp of current artistic demand, but also register the fear that an immobile artisan class will degrade the quality of art in the German lands. Here Dürer’s idea that modern artists require knowledge of the native and foreign ornamental idioms takes on grander dimensions. While the artist’s exposure to foreign manners of adornment had always been a matter of individual mastery, Vogtherr viewed it as a precondition for the restoration of German art writ large.

---


60 Of course, there are many notable exceptions to this trend, including Hans Vredeman de Vries and even Dietterlin, who both acquired new models for their designs through travel within northern Europe. On the collection of artistic models by northern artists during journeys within their own regions, see Christopher P. Heuer, “On the Peripatetics of the sixteenth-century Sketchbook,” in *The Notion of the Painter-architect in Italy and the Southern Low Countries*, ed. Piet Lombaerde. Architectura Moderna 11 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2014), 149-160.

Read in light of the argument that exotic ornament will revive the realm’s “higher arts,” the final woodcut of Vogtherr’s *Kunstbüchlin* reveals itself as an allegory of the ongoing restoration of German art. The base and cube that anchor Vogtherr’s image figure northern artists’ fundamental aptitude for the esteemed fields of geometry and perspective, as well as the native artistic tradition that Vogtherr seeks to restore. The capital floating above these objects embodies the increasing prevalence of the imported, antique manner in the North, as well as the fantastic mode of invention that Vogtherr regards as vital to sparking the renaissance of German art. The arrival of classical ornament in northern Europe was not perceived as part of a linear process of stylistic evolution. Rather, it was regarded as an event that expanded the region’s already heterogeneous modes of decoration, and as an impetus for reviving the native northern manner—albeit in an utterly different form.

“…a type of works called *tedeschi*…”

The advent of what is now regarded as the early modern theory of style set the tone of the transalpine discourse on the northern manner in the second half of the sixteenth century. The theory first emerged in Giorgio Vasari’s 1550 *Le vite de più eccelenzi architetti, pittori, et scultori italianì*, and took on additional dimensions in his revised and expanded *Le vite de’più eccelenzi pittori, scultori, et architettori* of 1568. These works are also widely agreed to have introduced the genre of the art-historical narrative.62 Vasari’s *Vite* weave a tale of artistic

---

progress, tracing the rinascita (rebirth) of classical artistic principles that first arises in the age of Cimabue and reaches its zenith in Vasari’s own day. The author charts this process through the evolution of maniera, or artistic manner. According to Vasari, the oeuvre of the individual artist as well as the art of entire periods and places displays the development of their respective manners. As Dürer’s treatment of antiqua and Fraktur demonstrates, Vasari’s interest in period and regional styles was not entirely new. Yet by fleshing out a vision of the transformation of artistic manners as historical phenomena with geographical dimensions, his Vite gave the categories of visual style and stylistic development a firm theoretical framework.

Vasari’s Vite portray manner as an index of a culture’s artistic sophistication. The Florentine author deems the style of recent Tuscan art to be the superlative manner, for he holds that it best emulates the classical idiom. Italian writers had also referred to, and even


64 Ibid.


66 The idea that style manifests the relative sophistication of an expression derives from classical writings on rhetoric and their modern interpreters. Among the ancient sources, Cicero and Quintilian express this idea most fully. Cicero describes high, middle, and low manners of rhetoric. Quintilian identifies the correct and balanced application of style as a sign of rhetorical sophistication in and of itself. See Cicero, De inventione, I.7.9; and Quintilian, Institutio oratoria, VIII.1-3.
praised, a northern manner of art from at least the time of Petrarch.\(^67\) However, with the re-emergence of classicizing forms in Italian art, the northern manner fell increasingly out of favor. The author of the *Vite* drew on this atmosphere of criticism to incorporate the art of the north into his broader theory of artistic styles.\(^68\) Like many predecessors, Vasari treats the *maniera tedesca* as a general descriptor for the northern manner, applying permutations of the term to the works of artists thought to be of German or Netherlandish origin, as well as some art by Italians. Only in exceptional cases do Italian artists employ the *maniera tedesca*, for it embodies the antithesis of the modern Italian manner.

Aspects of Vasari’s stance on the *maniera tedesca* emerge in both editions of the *Vite*, but the second, 1568 version addresses the problem in greater depth. This release includes an excursus on Brabantine, Bavarian, Rhenish, and Walloon artists, termed, “Various Flemings” (*diversi fiamminghi*). Most are considered notable because they have assimilated Italian artistic practices. Vasari writes that he “…shall not withhold the names of certain [Flemings]…who have been in Italy...in order to learn the Italian manner; for no less is due to their industry and to the labor endured by them in our arts…” than the other masters in his *Vite*.\(^69\) Vasari praises Dürer for assimilating the Italian manner in the 1568 edition’s life of Marcantonio Raimondi, who notoriously found the northern master’s style worthy enough

---

\(^{67}\) Boase, “The *Maniera Tedesca,*” 94.

\(^{68}\) Ibid.

The author also addresses the dangers of appropriating the *maniera tedesca* in the life of Pontormo, which also first appeared in the *Vite* of 1568. There Vasari laments how Pontormo sought to emulate Dürer by adopting the German manner, with the result that “…there is but a sorry remnant to be seen of that excellence and grace that he had given up to that time to all his figures.”

Vasari reserves his most acid criticism for northern ornament. A substantial diatribe against the northern manner of adornment appears in the summary of the canonical Orders of architecture from the *proemio* to the whole *Vite* of 1550 and 1568. In addition to Rustic, Doric, Ionic, Corinthian, and Composite modes of architecture, Vasari writes,

> We come at last to another sort of works called *tedeschi*, which both in ornament and proportion is very different from the ancient and the modern. Nor is it adopted now by the best architects, but is avoided by them as monstrous and barbarous, and lacking everything that can be called order…

The Germans’ disregard for the framework for good architectural style embodied in the modern canon of classical Orders invites aesthetic disaster. According to Vasari, only architecture that properly employs the Orders displays a “beautiful manner and design” (*bella*...

---

70 Lisa Pon has examined this episode to shed light on the interplay between Italian and German theories of invention and design during the sixteenth century. See Lisa Pon, *Raphael, Dürer, and Marcantonio Raimondi: Copying and the Italian Renaissance Print* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2004), 137-154.


maniera e disegno). The maniera tedesca contradicts the Orders, and thus exhibits a disfigured appearance. Yet the manner’s contrariety to architectural ideals only partly explains its ugliness, for, as Vasari writes, its deformities afflict the Germans’ “other ornaments” (altri loro ornamenti) as well. His comments instead suggest that the maniera tedesca’s hideous appearance results from its fundamentally monstrous nature—that is, from its uncanny mixture of forms. This theory reverses the picture of ornamental styles then dominant in northern Europe. While Vogtherr had portrayed the masons’ manner as the embodiment of the natural mathematical order, and saw the antique as a strange and synthetic idiom, Vasari sees the maniera tedesca as an incarnation of chaos, a depraved form of fantastic design.

Vasari associates the maniera tedesca with the period between the ancient and modern eras, relating how it was first “invented by the Goths” (fu trovata dai Goti) and used during their medieval conquest of Italy. The Vite present the maniera tedesca and the Gothic as overlapping but distinct categories. Not all art from the Gothic period manifests the maniera tedesca, and the maniera tedesca, unlike the art of the Goths, endures into the present day. Still, the two categories serve complementary roles in Vasari’s argument. The Gothic period

---

73 Vasari, Vite (1568), 1:81.
74 Italian criticism for the “German manner” of ornament had long implicated all media. Filarete, for instance, contended that the northern style of building derived from Kleinarchitektur such as censers and tabernacles. See Antonio Averlino Filarete, Tractat über die Baukunst, ed. Wolfgang van Oettingen (Hildesheim and New York: Olms, 1974), 271-272.
75 With this observation, Vasari became the first author to relate the maniera tedesca to the Middle Ages and the art of the Goths. Here he also first names the maniera dei Goti as an artistic phenomenon. See de Beer, “Gothic: Origin and Diffusion of the Term,” 145-149
76 Vasari, Vite (1550), 1:43; Vite (1568), 1:26.
77 Although Vasari often blurs the distinction between the maniera tedesca and the Gothic style, the Vite tend to treat the former as a manner that occurs in all eras from the middle ages onward, and the latter as the style that epitomized the maniera tedesca in the medieval period. Modern art historians’ habit of eliding the terms has been shaped by Panofsky’s treatment of these categories as virtually interchangeable designations in Panofsky, “Das erste Blatt aus dem ‘Libro’ Giogio Vasaris. Eine Studie über die Beurteilung der Gotik in der
separates antiquity from modernity, creating three stylistic epochs. The *maniera tedesca* acts as a foil to the antique and modern (Renaissance) manners, highlighting their relative superiority. As a unity, the Gothic-era *maniera tedesca* synthesizes Vasari’s narrative of antique excellence, medieval decline, and the current renaissance of antique form. He implies that while the rebirth of classicism in modern Italian art represents a fruitful form of artistic revival, the survival of Gothic influences in the present-day *maniera tedesca* constitutes regression. Vasari contends that the fantastic German manner reflects neither the antique mode nor the modern, classicizing manner in which the antique is reborn, and thus derails the progress of the *rinascita*. For this reason, Vasari ends his philippic with an appeal: “May God protect every country,” he implores, “from such an idea and style of buildings! They are so deformed in comparison with the beauty of our buildings that they are not worthy that I should talk more about them...”

**Bernhard Jobin and the Theory of “Ever-circulating Art”**

By formalizing the *maniera tedesca* as a critical term, Vasari altered discourse about the northern manner on both sides of the Alps. Prior Italian authors had addressed the northern manner in manuscripts and in letters. Some, like Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, who eventually became Pope Pius II, evaluated German architecture in a positive light. Piccolomini wrote in his 1457 *Germania* that

> In Franconia on the River Main lies Frankfordia, a place of commerce between Lower and Upper Germans (*Teutones*), and though it is for the most part built of wood, nevertheless one sees it adorned...

Italian writers in subsequent decades tended to adopt a more negative stance on the northern style.\footnote{It should be noted, however, that later Italian writings on other aspects of northern culture did not always present the region in an entirely unfavorable light. Lodovico Guicciardini’s 1567 \textit{Descrittione di tutti i Paesi Bassi, altrimenti detti Germania inferiore} describes the Low Countries as prosperous lands with thriving industries and towns. On Lodovico’s \textit{Descrittione} and his travels in the Low Countries, see Silvia Gaddoni, “Lodovico Guicciardini e il paesaggismo fiammingo,” in \textit{La percezione del paesaggio nel Rinascimento}, ed. Ada Myriam Scanu. Quaderni di Schede umanistiche 8 (Bologna: CLUEB, 2004), 181-202.} Filarete implored readers of his 1464 \textit{Libro architettonico} to “…abandon this modern usage,” adding, “Cursed be those who discovered it! I think that only barbaric people could have brought it into Italy”.\footnote{“Sichè priegho ciascuno, che lasci andare questa usanza moderna; e non ui lasciate consigliare a questi maestri, che usano questa tale praticaccia. Che maladetto sia, chi la truò! Credo che non fusse se non gente barbarca, che la condusse in Italia.” Antonio Averlino Filarete, \textit{Tractat über die Baukunst. Nebst seinen Büchern von den Zeichenkunst und den Bauten der Medici}, ed. Wolfgang van Oettingen (Vienna: Graesser, 1890), 272. Here, as in Antonio Averlino Filarete, \textit{Filarete’s Treatise on Architecture: Being the Treatise by Antonio di Piero Averlino, Known as Filarete}, trans. with an introduction and notes by John R. Spencer (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1965), 1:102.} And, as will be discussed in the next section, a 1518 letter to Pope Leo X often attributed to Raphael contained a mixed, but mostly negative, assessment of the style.\footnote{Another analysis of letter’s critique of the northern manner can be found in Frankl, \textit{The Gothic}, 271-278. For further evaluation of the category of the \textit{maniera tedesca} in Italy during the Renaissance, see Markus Brandis, \textit{La maniera tedesca. Eine Studie zum historischen Verständnis der Gotik im Italien der Renaissance in Geschichtsschreibung, Kunsttheorie, und Baupraxis} (Weimar: DG, Verlag und Datenbank für Geisteswissenschaften, 2002).}
Vasari’s book distilled the era’s burgeoning climate of anti-northern art criticism into a printed form.\textsuperscript{84} This allowed Italian rhetoric about the \textit{maniera tedesca} to reach various corners of northern Europe as never before. The reception of Vasari’s writings among early modern Netherlandish audiences is well documented.\textsuperscript{85} The influence of the \textit{Vite} in the German-speaking lands during the sixteenth century meanwhile remains a murky issue. This lacuna stems in part from the realm’s apparent paucity of sixteenth-century writings on Italian ideas about northern decorative idioms.\textsuperscript{86} The long obscure cluster of books considered here evidently represents the only set of publications on Vasari composed in the German-speaking lands during the sixteenth century. The works have inspired a handful of descriptive essays that perpetuate the texts’ patriotic rhetoric, but which offer no rigorous analysis of the historical phenomenon of northern Vasari criticism.\textsuperscript{87} Despite its apparent

---

\textsuperscript{84} Boase, “The \textit{Maniera Tedesca},” 93-94.

\textsuperscript{85} The main primary sources for this research are Dominicus Lampsonius’s 1565 biography of Lambert Lombard, the series of Netherlandish artists’ portraits and panegyric verses that Lampsonius published in 1572 under the title “\textit{Pictorvm aliquot celebrium germania inferioris effigies...},” as well as Lampsonius and Lombard’s letters to Vasari are the main primary sources for this research. Foundational for the extensive bibliography on the reception of Vasari in the Netherlands is Walter S. Melion, \textit{Shaping the Netherlandish Canon: Karel van Mander’s Schilder-Boeck} (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1991).


\textsuperscript{87} The first study of was conceived as a descriptive commentary to an abridged reprint of the involved texts. See Ludwig Schneegans, “Des Straßburger Buchdrucker Bernhard Jobin’s Vertheidigung deutscher Kunst wider die Geringschätzung derselben von Seiten der Italiéner. Gedruckt als Vorrede zu den im Jahr 1573 durch ihn veröff entlichen Abbildungen der römischer Päbste, nebst einem Auszuge aus D. Specklins Vorrede zur Architectura,” in \textit{Alsatia. Jahrbuch für elsässische Geschichte, Sage, Alterthumskunde, Sitte, Sprache und Kunst}, ed. August Stöber (Mülhausen: Verlag J.P. Rißler, 1852), 6-32. The only twentieth-century studies on this topic reflect an interest in the “German-ness” of German art, and erroneously
uniqueness, the robust culture of Vasari criticism that arose in late-Renaissance Strasbourg shows that Vasari’s *Vite* exerted a far greater influence on sixteenth-century German artistic discourse, and particularly ideas of style, than is presently believed. It also demonstrates that sixteenth-century northern Europe’s reception of the *Vite* was more complex than is currently appreciated.

Publisher Bernhard Jobin was the head of the Strasbourg press that would, one year after his death, eventually publish the second installment of Dietterlin’s *Architectura* with the fantastic portal described at the beginning of this chapter. Jobin also anchored the circle of Strasbourg critics who variously engaged with Vasari’s texts throughout the later sixteenth century. Their responses appear to be based on the content of the 1568 *Vite*. Most concern Vasari’s picture of the *maniera tedesca*. Poet Johann Fischart, the publisher’s son-in-law, used his introduction to a 1576 book of painting models to amend Vasari’s account of the medieval artistic decline. “What was left of all wise learning,” Fischart asks, “when the Goths, Huns, Rugii, Slavs, and other barbaric peoples who ranged through and repressed Italy, Gallia, and Germany? Did they not disappear with and destroy all the paintings and

---


On the culture of such groups of readers in the early modern period, see Roger Chartier, “Communities of Readers,” in *The Order of Books: Readers, Authors, and Libraries in Europe Between the Fourteenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992), 1-23.

Jobin refers at length to Vasari’s life of Arnolfo di Lapo, which occurs only in the 1568 *Vite*. Bernhard Jobin, *ACCURATÆ EFFIGIES PONTIFICVM MAXIMORVM, NVMERO XXVIII: AB Anno Christi MCCCLXXVIII. ad atatem usq. nostrum presidentium, ad vivum ex Romano prototypo expressae: IISQVE SINGVLORVM PONTIFICVM ELOGIA, EORI’M res gestas summatim comprehendentia, ab Onuphrio Panvinio Veronense Fratre Eremita Augustiniano, adiuncta, Germaniceq. interpretata...* [hereafter, “*Accuratæ Effigies*”] (Strasbourg: Bernhard Jobin, 1573), Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Sign. 1an: 2” Rp 4000, fol. ii’.
related artworks for the sake of glorifying the most attractive cities with artful sculptures, panel paintings, columns, and sturdy buildings?”

By arguing that the Goths had debased the art of the German lands and other regions, Fischart distinguishes the German manner from the barbarous Gothic style. It follows that what Vasari calls the *maniera tedesca* in fact resulted from foreign incursion in Germany, and thus does not reflect the true nature of German art. Engineer-architect Daniel Specklin meanwhile disassociated modern German art from the *maniera tedesca*, portraying the realm as a center of artistic innovation. Specklin presented the treatise on new building methods that he released from Jobin’s press in 1589 as evidence against “that Italian” who “…pretends he has in his whole life neither heard of nor seen that the Germans invented something new.”

Jobin himself authored the earliest and most interesting of the Strasbourg Vasari critiques. It appears in the dedication of his 1573 *Accuratæ Effigies Pontificvm Maximorum…*,

---


91 “…hab er sein lebenlang niemalen gehört oder gesehen, daß die vollen Teutschen etwas news erfunden hetten,” Daniel Specklin, *ARCHITECTVRA von Vestungen. Wie die zu vnsern zeiten mögen erbawen werden, an Stätten Schlössern, vñ Clussen, zu Wasser, Land, Berg vñ Thal, mit fren Bolliwerken, Caualiren, Streichen, Gräben vnd Lennf, sampt deren gantzen anhang, vnd nutzbarkeit, auch wie die Gegenwehr zu gebrauchen, was für Geschütz dabin gehörig, vnn wie es geordnet, vnd gebraucht werden soll, alles auß grund vnd deren Fundamenten; Sampt den Grund Rissen, Visierungen, vnd Auffzeigen für Augen gestellt* (Strasbourg: Bernhard Jobin, 1589), Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Res 2/App.mil.99, fol. 5.r.

an adaptation of Onofrio Panvinio’s 1557 series of papal biographies that Jobin presented to Bishop Melchior of Basel. The work contains text loosely translated by Fischart and woodcuts by Jobin and Tobias Stimmer. Jobin thus approaches the problem of Vasari’s critique of the maniera tedesca as an author and an artist. His text takes the subject of portraiture as a point of departure for a broader meditation on the modern cultures of art and art criticism in various parts of Europe. “Just as the Chaldeans, Assyrians, Egyptians, and Greeks clashed over the invention and improvement of the art of painting,” he writes, “…so, too, do the Germans, Italians and French now struggle to lead its progress.” Jobin observes that this competition also emerges in the narration of art history. All three nations, he contends, “…hold the practice of painting in high regard, and wish to impart their fatherlands with similar esteem, and thus maintain that the invention of painting and other arts belongs to their own lands.” Manner is a prime subject of this controversy. Jobin

dem Bischof Melchior von Basel für dessen Gunst dankt…”. Hauffen’s case is not accompanied by any footnotes or other documentary sources. In the absence of conclusive evidence that Fischart fact composed the text (which Hauffen anyway supposes was based on Jobin’s ideas and instructions), the attribution should return to Jobin. For the attribution to Fischart, see Adolf Hauffen, Johann Fischart (Berlin and Leipzig: De Gruter, 1922), 2:166. For an earlier and more authoritative attribution of the Accuratæ Effigies to Jobin, see Jakob Franck, “Jobin, Bernhard,” in Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie, Historischen Kommission bei der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 14 (Leipzig: Druckner & Humblot, 1881), 98–101.

93 Onofrio Panvinio, EPITOME PONTIFICVM ROMANORVM A S.Petro usque ad Paulum III. Gestorum (videlicet) electionisque singularum, & Conclavium compendiarium narratio. Cardinalium item nomina, dignitatum tituli, insignia legationes, patria & obitus (Venice: Jacopo Strada, 1557), Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, 2 P.lat. 1245.

94 “…als den Chaldeern, Assyrien, Egyptiern, und den eigenhümigen Griechen ob erfindung unnd verbesserung der lieblichen und anmütgen Kunst des Gemäls, oder anbldens, angangen, zu inn und müt führet: Der würd sich nicht hoch zübefrembdennoch zuverwundern haben, das auch bey unserer jeßiger Lebzeit deßgleiche zweying zwischen den heutberümtestenVölkern den Teutschen, Italiencern undn Franßosen umb gleiche ursach sich reget... ” Jobin, Accuratæ Effigies, fol. ii‘.

95 ‘Dievel sie namlich gedachte fürtreffliche Malerkunst in so hohen Ehren, Würden unnd achtung halten, das sie vermeinen ihrem Vatterland, neben dem nuß, nicht ein wenig
reports that many compose books to promote their own regional manner, a phenomenon he
terms *Landesart*. Vasari, he complains, even attributes the origins and best practice of the arts
to Italy.

Jobin regards the *Pictorvm aliqvot celebrivm germaniae inferioris effigies*..., authored and
illustrated by Dominicus Lampsonius and published by Hieronymus Cock, as one of the
most noteworthy responses to Vasari’s *Vite*. This series of engravings appeared in Antwerp
in 1572, only one year before Jobin’s *Effigies*, and features portraits of Netherlandish artists
accompanied by biographical verses. Jobin lauds Cock and Lampsonius for celebrating
those Netherlandish painters who “…improved or contributed inventions to ever-circulating
art (*offgerürter kunst*).” Jobin observes that Lampsonius documented the many artists of the
Low Countries who mastered what he defines as the *German* art of printmaking. He adds
that numerous German artists in turn show great aptitude for the Netherlandish art of oil
painting. Both cases refute Vasari’s picture of Italian artistic hegemony and even the idea
that one people might claim exclusive mastery of a given art. Jobin thus contends that while

---

rhühmes und achtbarkeit hiedurch zügehn, was sie die erfindung und den Urheber
derselbigen bey ihnen gewesen sein, erhalten.” Ibid.

96 On Lampsonius’s *Effigies*, see Ignaz von Szykowski, “Sammel-Werke Alt Niederländische
Maler-Portraits von Hieronymus Cock und Heinrich Hondius. Aus der zweiten Hälfte des
Jean Puraye, *Dominique Lampson Humaniste 1532-1599* (Bruges: Desclée De Brouwer, 1950),
64-68; Dominicus Lampsonius, *Dominique Lampson. Les Effigies des Peintres célèbre des Pays-Bas*,
und Kunstlerdarstellung in den Niederlanden im 17. Jahrhundert* (Hildesheim: Olms, 1984), 17-23;
Melion, *Shaping the Netherlandish Canon*, 143-45; Dominicus Lampsonius, *Da van Eyck a
Brueghel: scritti sulle arti di Domenico Lampsonio*, ed. Gianni Carlo Sciola and Caterina Volpi
(Turin: UTET, 2001), 14–15; and Sarah Meiers, “Portraits in Print: Hieronymus Cock,
Dominicus Lampsonius, and ‘Pictorum aliquot celebrium Germaniae inferioris effigies’,”

97 “…ettwas nußliches zu offgerürter kunst oder erfunden oder darinnen erübet und
verbessert gehat... ” Jobin, *Acurate Effigies*, fol. ii'.
only some individuals boast native artistic genius, “…it does not follow that the grace and aptitude which are called the first mother of all creation are kept imprisoned among one people, nor are they hereditarily indentured.” Talent is an inherent trait of artists, but not of places. Thus, the international artistic paragone can produce no absolute victor.

While the theory that art is shaped by geographical circumstance had captivated even ancient authors, the notion that each region of Europe might give rise to a good style was new. Jobin develops his unusual, pluralistic view of regional manners in a number of ways. He asserts that the various modes of art-making that prevail on both sides of the Alps and Rhine all boast a certain merit, even if they are not always equal in quality. Jobin describes how preeminence in art moves between Italy, France, and Germany over time. This introduces the notion that historical forces and interregional exchange each shape a land’s particular artistic authority. Both ideas support the framework of culturally relative aesthetic values, which, it has been argued, would later emerge in the writings of Karel van Mander and other seventeenth-century art theorists of the North.

Jobin’s evaluation of the Netherlandish Effigies is also notable for its picture of contemporary artistic discourse. It shows that the dialogue on Vasari in northern Europe connected authors in the Low Countries and the German-speaking lands even in the Vite’s

98 “Jedoch folget nicht darumb, das solche natürliche anmütung und neigung, so aller geschöpff erst unnd allgemeine Müter heißt, auff ein Volek allein wird gefänglich eingezeugen, oder erblich verpflichtet…” Ibid.
100 Jobin, Accuratæ Effigies, fol. ii’.
101 See Melion, Shaping the Netherlandish Canon, 97. The theory is related to Svetlana Alpers’s contested thesis that the North and the South fostered fundamentally different modes of seeing, and thus developed divergent visual aesthetics. See Svetlana Alpers, The Art of Describing: Dutch Art in the Seventeenth Century (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983).
earliest days. It further reveals the attitude that “Nether-German” and German artistic traditions represent separate components of a broader, Northern artistic heritage. This theory shapes Jobin’s most enterprising contribution to the Vasari debate. Irked by the *Vite* and inspired by the list of Netherlandish masters outlined in Lampsonius’s *Effigies*, Jobin proclaims that the multitude of talented “High German” artists who also populate the North require their own history. He thus divulges plans to set out a “…great Catalogue of our most famous and noble [German] painters, just like the vexing Georgius Vasaris [did].” Jobin’s proposal accords with the historical preoccupations of the era, for a number of sixteenth-century German authors had already created lists of great German artists, often featuring Albrecht Dürer. As a result of Jobin’s project, the North was to possess a more complete set of “Nether-German” and German art-historical narratives, and Germany would finally boast a series of artists’ biographies to rival the one that Vasari gave to Italy.

Jobin never realized this ambitious project. Yet in the sketch of the “Great Catalogue” of German artists outlined in his *Accuratæ Effigies*, he does respond to Vasari’s picture of the *maniera tedesca*. His strategy revolves around reversing the reputation of medieval German art. The author observes that,

As [Vasari] outright admits in the life of Nicola Pisano … around 1267 the German Emperor [Barbarossa] took German painters and sculptors abroad with him, whom thereafter were popular in Italy, and indeed ornamented many churches with their artful work. [Vasari] likewise writes (against

---


104 It was only with the appearance of Joachim von Sandrart’s 1675 *Teutsche Academie* that an inventory of German artists comparable to collection of Italian artists covered in Vasari’s *Vite* became available to early modern readers. On Sandrart’s project, see Michael Thimann, *Gedächtnis und Bild-Kunst. Die Ordnung des Künstlerwissens in Joachim von Sandrarts Teutscher Academie* (Freiburg: Rombach, 2007).
His will) in the life of Arnolfo di Lapo that the art of architecture (in which the Italians pretend to be most experienced) was first improved around the year 1333 through a German named Wilhelm.\(^{105}\)

Here Jobin exposes the contradictions of Vasari’s habit of praising the progressive qualities of some medieval German art while condemning the modern *maniera tedesca* as backwards.\(^{106}\)

Jobin also asserts that the medieval *maniera tedesca* precipitated the current Renaissance. Like the art of Barbarossa’s craftsmen and the architecture of Master Wilhelm, the work of modern German artists like Dürer and Hans Holbein, Jobin writes, gives “…Germans better grounds…[to claim credit for] the reinstallation, expansion, and elevation of painting” than any other people.\(^{107}\)

Yet despite the patriotic motivations behind his writing, the Strasbourg author insists that his challenge to Vasari does not merely aim to prove German artistic excellence. His efforts also serve a grander design. Jobin observes that “…the debate over which nation was responsible for the invention and improvement of painting [and other arts] is most beneficial, because it promotes the mutual jealously that compels all sides to strive to perfect...

\(^{105}\) *Wie er sich dann selber deßhalben in des Nicolai Pisano leben bloß gibt und verredt, da er meldt das die Teutschen Kayser umb das 1267. Jar, wann sie in Welschland züreißen pflegten Teutsche Maler und Bildhauer haben mitgeführt, die sich demnach in Italien wol gebrauchten, unnd etlich viel Kirchen mit ihrer künstlichen arbeit ziereten, Gleich wie er auch wider seinen willen in des Bawhern Arnolfi von Lapo leben schreibet, das die Bawmeisterey (deren sonst die Italianer groß erfahren sein wollen) umb das 1333. Jar von einem Teutschen Wilhelm genant, sey erstlich sehr gebessert wödle...* Jobin, *Accuratæ Effigies*, fol. ii'.

\(^{106}\) Pinette notes that Jobin’s interpretation strategically omits Vasari’s criticism for these works. See Pinette, “Über deutsche Kunst und Künstler,” 11.

\(^{107}\) *...die Teutschen mit viel besserem grund, unnd billicherm schein, dann andere Nationen, die widerstattung, ergänzung uñ auffbringung des Rechten Malens (welches bey manigfältigen zerstötungen der Statt Rom nach Constantini Magni zeiten, in ein abgang gerhiet) züeignen und vendicieren...* Jobin, *Accuratæ Effigies*, fol. iii'.

101
Ultimately, the maniera tedesca controversy—and indeed all antagonism over regional manners—elevates the interconnected artistic culture of Europe as a whole.

**Hans Thoman Uhlberger, Dietterlin, and the Hall of the Strasbourg Masons**

In 1579, Strasbourg architect and master mason Hans Thoman Uhlberger began work on new headquarters for the local masons’ lodge [Fig. 9]. The project became what is now the west wing of the Musée de l’Œuvre Notre-Dame, a complex known in Dietterlin’s lifetime as the “Frauenhaus”. In both function and form, the Frauenhaus engaged the politics of the era’s clashing regimes of ornament. The east wing had served as the headquarters of Strasbourg masons’ lodge since it was first constructed just south of the Strasbourg Cathedral in 1347. It also acted as the seat of Unserer-Lieben-Frauen-Werk, the corporation that raised funds for the construction and maintenance of the church. Officials used the space to debate new schemes for the Cathedral, and to store plans and records of past work on the edifice. Since the institution of the Regensburg Statutes of 1459 (revised at Strasbourg in 1563), the Strasbourg masons’ lodge was officially recognized as the High Chapter of the masons of the Holy Roman Empire, and its Werkmeister acknowledged as the Supreme Judge of the fraternity of masons in this realm. The architecture of the Strasbourg masons thus embodied the entire region’s building culture.

---

While the Strasbourg Cathedral manifested the masons’ artistic mastery, the Frauenhaus stood for their authority as the church’s artistic stewards. If the renowned Cathedral embodied the region’s artistic heritage, the masons’ lodge inside the Frauenhaus represented their influence over which decorative traditions and philosophies of ornament that their realm would embrace.

The older wing of the Frauenhaus faces the cathedral with a plain façade, pitched roof, and stepped gables. Uhlberger gave this medieval hull a modern pendant. His addition mirrors the original wing in scale, structure, and orientation. It differs in its architectural ornaments. Seven stringcourses cross the main façade of the west wing at harmoniously staggered intervals, hinting at the regular distribution of its interior spaces. With its classicizing, fluted pilasters and metalwork-like Beschlagwerk, its gables resemble designs depicted in Hans Vredeman de Vries’s 1577 *Architectura* [Fig. 10]. Vredeman’s treatise praises architects such as Sebastiano Serlio and the expert (Expert) Jacques I. Androuet Du Cerceau for composing buildings with cross windows and other characteristics of the antique Italian manner, but suggests that the small, costly building sites of the Netherlands require another form of architecture. It subsequently lauds “ingenious” (Ingeniae) masters such as Cornelis Floris for accommodating their designs to local conditions and customs to an even greater extent than antique architects had.113 This definition of architectural mastery motivates

---

113 “Vvie vvoll dz der fullermellte Vitruuius, Sebastiaen Serlio vnd der Expert Iacobus Andruceotus Cerceau vnnnd ful anddere meer sortenn der facien, Edifitien, frontes oder genels nach der antiquithett Italienissche manir vnd gebrauch nach dess landnnts artt vvesen vnnnd gebrauch irrer Archectecture vnd gebauvve gestellt habē, also dz vvir befunde inn irre vnnnd meer andren Maysterss, Bucheren vnnnd auch paetronen so befunderr man nur nach dess läts artt vnd vvesen, sonder kreytz funster, vnd besonder gross liecht sennd suchendt, mit noch hoechere verdieffung, dann allain breyt vnd wenig verdieffung, aber in dissen Niderlanden hattman ain anderen condition zuwissen in stoetten vonn grosser negotien, da die ortt khlein vnd theur sein so muess es man allss inn die hoeche suechen vmb ful geriffs
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Vredeman to promote a modern, classicizing style akin to the modern-day Italian idiom, yet tailored to the traditions and needs of the northern context. By giving the Frauenhaus’s old wing a twin that reflected the new northern manner of architecture embodied in works like Vredeman’s 1577 *Architectura*, Uhlberger positioned his project as part of the realm’s broader architectural *renovatio*. While the two buildings’ structural similarities speak to the fundamental continuities in local architectural practice, the contrasts between their ornaments highlight that tradition’s ongoing vitality.

The interior of the west wing also reflects this phenomenon. A remarkable hall of assembly, the hall of the Strasbourg masons, occupies its entire ground floor [Fig. 11]. The room’s unusual ceiling combines the masons’ traditional tracery with fashionable wood coffering, crafted in the Italian Renaissance style. Woodwork adorned with rigorously classical architectural motifs also covers the lower portions of the walls, but the precipitously balanced, broken cornices of room’s carved portals show playful inversions of the classical idiom [Fig. 12]. Inscriptions in the intarsia decorations that flank the room’s east portal...


indicate that the woodwork was finished in 1582.\textsuperscript{115} It must have been around this year that the hall’s walls and ceiling were embellished with a cycle of fantastic paintings that complement and expand the room’s eclectic mix of ornamental manners.

This hall served as the meeting place of the Strasbourg masons’ lodge.\textsuperscript{116} It also likely acted as the setting for encounters between the masons, representatives of Unserer-Lieben-Frauen-Werk, and other local officials. While the exterior of the Frauenhaus communicated the masons’ status and their artistic authority to the outside world, the hall addressed a more select audience of lodge insiders and local officials. The hall stages an impressive summa of the modern maniera tedesca, and advances a resounding response to Vasari. While many northern monuments and interiors from the decades around 1600 probe the idea of ornamental manner through their stylistic heterogeneity, it is not often possible to link such projects to publications on ornamental manner from the same context. Like Jobin’s text, the hall of the Strasbourg masons yields rare insights into how northern artists participated in the maniera tedesca debate and shaped emerging theories of ornamental style.

Both aspects of this discourse emerge in the vault covering the room’s southwestern corner [Fig. 13]. Uhlberger adorned it with curvilinear tracery that resembles a network of slender, pruned branches. Vine-formed Astwerk had flourished in the Rhineland and other parts of northern Europe from around 1470 to 1515, when the influence of Italian Renaissance architecture was first spreading in those lands.\textsuperscript{117} It appears that the trends were

\textsuperscript{115} Forté and Zumstein, Das Frauenhaus-Museum, 15.

\textsuperscript{116} Barbara Gatineau, “Salle de reunion des tailleurs de pierre de la cathédrale dite de la Loge,” in Musée de l'Œuvre Notre-Dame. Arts du Moyen Âge et de la Renaissance (Strasbourg: Musée de l'Œuvre Notre-Dame, 2013), 178.

\textsuperscript{117} Prominent examples include the Wilibaldschor vault in the Eichstätt Cathedral (1471), the Vladislav oratory of St. Veit’s Cathedral in Prague (attributed to Benedikt Ried and Hanns Spiess, 1490-3), the audience chamber of the palace of Ladislaus von Starnberg at Bechyně
linked. While Italian theorists related the modern architecture of their realm to classical monuments, German humanists portrayed Astwerk as a reflection of their own region’s ancient architecture.\(^{118}\) With reference to Tacitus’s account of the ancient German forest and to Vitruvius’s story of the Doric temple’s origins as a wooden framework, these humanists claimed that the Teutonic people once crafted their dwellings from similar networks of branches. Just as Italian theorists had asserted that their architecture, like antique building, reflected the natural order, German authors treated Astwerk as a native version of classical naturalism and its renaissance.\(^{119}\) Many came to view this vegetal ornament as a northern foil to Italian architectural adornments.\(^{120}\)

The idea that Astwerk arose from ancient Teutonic building also moved Italian authors to describe the motif as a form of the maniera tedesca, but the notion that Astwerk reflected Vitruvian models met resistance in Italy.\(^{1}\) The 1518 letter to Pope Leo X frequently ascribed to Raphael admits that the maniera dell’architettura tedesca displays “…some sort of

---

(\(Wendel~Roskopf,~c.~1515\)) and the side chapels of the Liebfrauenkirche at Ingolstadt (\(Erhard~Heydenreich,~c.~1512-20\)). See Kavaler, “Natural Forms,” in Renaissance Gothic, 199-230.


\(^{120}\) The revival of this topos in late eighteenth-century works like Goethe’s 1772 ode to Strasbourg Cathedral, Von deutscher Baukunst, attests to its enduring effect on the image of the ornament of northern Europe. See Kavaler, Renaissance Gothic, 201.
order, for it derives from the forms of trees that have not yet been cut, whose branches were bent over to form pointed arches when bound together.” Still, the author indicates that such constructions are less sound than the earliest Doric buildings. He contends that, “…huts made from fitted beams arranged as columns with gables and a covering roof, as Vitruvius describes with respect to the origins of the Doric order, would be stronger than pointed arches with two centers...” For readers convinced of the Vitruvian dictum that building must be sound, no weak structure could exhibit the classical style. The letter’s author thus deems the maniera tedesca “…most unlike the beautiful manner of the [modern] Romans and the Ancients.”

Uhlberger’s vault exudes the very trait—unsoundness—that Raphael regarded as anathema to good architectural style. Its vines seem improbable supports for the ceiling’s girth. They break after passing through the two boss stones that flank the vault’s apex. The resulting cavity confirms that the ribs serve no real weight-bearing role. As a solid construction that nevertheless undermines the visual logic of Vitruvian tectonics, Uhlberger’s vault also displays the qualities that Vasari maligned in his more recent critique of the German structural aesthetic. While Raphael had disparaged the maniera tedesca for its

---

121 “Pur, questa architettura ebbe qualche ragione peròche nacque dalli arbori non ancor tagliati, alli quali, piegati li rami e rilegati insieme, fanno le lor terzi acuti. E ben che questa origine non sia in tutto da sprezzare, pur è debile, perchè molto più reggerebono le capanne fatte di travi incatenati, er posti a uso di colonne, con li colmi loro et comprimenti, come descrive Victruvio della origine dell’opera Dorica, che li terzi acut, li quali hanno dui centri…” Attributed to Raphael Sanzio, Letter to Pope Leo X, c. 1518 or 1519; Italian text quoted from Vincenzo Golzio, Raffaello nei Documenti nelle Testimonianze dei Contemporanei e nella Letteratura del suo Secolo (Vatican City: Pontifca insigne academia artistica dei virtuosi al pantheon, 1936), 86.

122 “Cominciossi di poi quasi per tutto a surgere la maniera dell’architettura Tedescha, che, come anchor si vede nelli ornamenti, è lontanissima dalla bella maniera delli Romani et antichi…” Ibid.
actual weakness, Vasari condemned the German style of adornment for appearing unstable.\textsuperscript{123} He complained how, “...also on all the facades and wherever else there is adornment,” the Germans

\[
\text{built a malediction of little niches one above the other, with no end of pinnacles and points and leaves, so that, not to speak of the whole erection seeming insecure, it appears impossible that the parts should not topple over at any moment. Indeed they have more the appearance of being made of paper rather than stone or marble. In these works they made endless projections and breaks and corbellings and flourishes that throw their works all out of proportion; and often, with one thing being put above another, they reach such a height that the top of a door touches the roof.}\textsuperscript{124}
\]

Vasari’s argument proceeds from the Vitruvian idea that good architecture will display solid construction, usefulness, and attractiveness.\textsuperscript{125} The maniera tedesca defies these rules with piles of embellishment that threaten to fall at any moment, and with stone adornments that pose as flimsy paper. For Vasari, such effects disfigure the German style and qualify it as a dishonest form. The maniera tedesca’s weak appearance results not from artistic ineptitude \textit{per se}, but from the willful application of a deceitful style.

Many northern viewers disagreed. Structural caprices such as broken tracery, tracery “tied” together with fictive, carved ropes, and stairways and pulpits that appear to float on a supporting wall had long flourished in the region, having experienced a heyday, like Astwerk,

\textsuperscript{124} “...faceuano vna maledizzione di tabernacolini l’un sopra l’altro, có tante piramidi, & punte, & foglie, che non ch’elie possano stare, pare impossibile ch’elie si possino reggere. Er hanno piu il modo da parer fatte di carta, che di pie tre o di marmi, Er in queste opera faceuano tanti risalti, rotture, mensoline, & viticci, che sproporzionauano quelle opera che faceuano; & spesso con mettere cosa sopra cosa andauano in tanta altezza, che la fine d’una porta toccaua loro il tetto.” Vasari, \textit{Vite} (1550), 1:43. The identical passage appears in the Giuntina, that is, the 1568 edition. See Vasari, \textit{Vite} (1568), 1:26. Here, as in \textit{Vasari on Technique}, 83.
\textsuperscript{125} Vitruvius referred to these qualities as \textit{firmitas}, \textit{utilitas}, and \textit{venustas}. They are discussed in Vitruvius, \textit{De architectura} I.3.2. Alina Payne offers a useful introduction to the reception of these categories and to Vitruvius’s related theory of \textit{decor}. See Payne, “Vitruvius,” in \textit{The Architectural Treatise}, 34-51.
around 1500.\textsuperscript{126} Sometimes the two phenomena had even combined in the form of broken Astwerk tracery, as in the early sixteenth-century chapels of the Church of Our Lady at Ingolstadt [Fig. 14], and Uhlberger’s vault for the hall of the Strasbourg masons. As Hubertus Günther and Ethan Matt Kavaler have respectively shown, audiences in northern Europe understood such “deconstructive” conceits as expressions of mastery over materials and techniques, and as critical reflections on the conventional aesthetic of structural necessity.\textsuperscript{127} In this cultural context, Uhlberger’s architectural expertise entitled him to a degree of artistic freedom. The boss stones of the Strasbourg vault reinforce this idea by displaying the linear masons’ marks of Uhlberger and the Strasbourg lodge.\textsuperscript{128} By showing signs of the masons’ artistic authority at the very points that bind the broken ribbing, the vault frames the power to employ unconventional modes of adornment as key aspect of the lodge’s artistic identity. Uhlberger’s vault asserts the masons’ right to propose alternative decorative styles.

Vasari’s argument that the maniera tedesca was “no longer used by experienced architects” has lead some modern-day audiences to regard the manner of architecture embodied in Uhlberger’s broken Astwerk tracery as an intentionally anachronistic form of building. An extensive literature on the flourishing of “Nachgotik”, or “Gothic survival” architecture in the German-speaking lands in the decades around 1600 holds that motifs such as broken tracery and Astwerk acted as historicizing architectural gestures and referred

\textsuperscript{126} See Kavaler, Renaissance Gothic, 231-258.
\textsuperscript{128} Gatineau, “Salle de reunion,” 178.
retrospectively to a bygone architectural style. Present-day viewers convinced of this theory might therefore expect that Uhlberger’s broken Astwerk struck audiences in sixteenth-century Strasbourg as a historicizing conceit. Yet the tracery in the hall of the Strasbourg masons did not necessarily read as a retardaire motif, nor even as a historicizing architectural device. It is more likely that the use of such “Gothic” forms in the decades around 1600 instead served to differentiate the architectural traditions of the North from the Italian Renaissance conventions that had by then become a fixture of architecture in the German-speaking lands. The remarks of Vasari and other Italian critics make clear that such ornaments still abounded in northern architecture, and thus represented the region’s standard contemporary style of building. Uhlberger’s broken Astwerk must have embodied the persistent vitality of the ornamental manner of the North.

The mix of disparate geographical styles present in the hall of the Strasbourg masons meanwhile conveyed other messages. Uhlberger’s use of classicizing architectural ornaments such as pilasters and piers with Composite capitals signals the architect’s familiarity with the foreign manner of architectural ornament. By employing broken Astwerk alongside the hall’s Italianate, Renaissance-style ornaments, Uhlberger made light of Vasari’s disdain for the

---


maniera tedesca’s supposedly retrograde nature. The architectural virtuosity displayed in the vault’s seemingly gravity-defying structure also refutes Vasari’s claim that the German manner is “no longer used by experienced architects.” And if both classicizing, Italianate architecture and instances of the German style of building could be considered current architectural styles, Uhlberger’s interior additionally asserts that various modern manners might co-exist in a single locale. This idea resonates with Vogtherr and Dürer’s pictures of the stylistic pluralism of the culture of ornament in sixteenth-century northern Europe. It also brings to mind Bernhard Jobin’s argument that different yet equally valid artistic traditions might coexist in European art. An alternative interpretation is also possible. Given that the masons’ hall acted as the representative space for the party then regarded as the leading masons’ lodge of the Holy Roman Empire, Uhlberger’s design may well be taken as a manifesto for an a new German architectural style. The hall’s mix of classicizing or Italianate and stereotypically northern forms position the masons as masters of both modern manners of architecture, and the current German style of ornament as the triumphant fusion of the northern and southern idioms. It realizes Vogtherr’s ideal for a fantastic new German art.

The idea that the German manner embodies a mix of disparate forms was well established in Uhlberger and Dietterlin’s day. This hybridity had historically inspired disdain among critics like Vasari. His account of the German manner in fact emulated the well-known diatribe against grotesque painting in Vitruvius’s De architectura. The ancient author had described the evils of grotesque painting in vivid terms:

Reeds are set up in place of columns, as pediments, little scrolls, striped with curvy leaves and volutes, candelabra hold up the figures of aediculae, and above the pediments of these, several tender shoots,

---

sprouting in coils from roots, have little statues nestled in them for no reason, or shoots split in half, some holding little statues with human heads, some with the heads of beasts.\textsuperscript{132}  

Both Vasari’s \textit{maniera tedesca} and Vitruvius’s grotesques are made from absurd combinations of objects. Like Vasari, Vitruvius condemns architectural adornments that do not arise from the Orders as examples of chaotic design. Vitruvius deplores grotesques because, as fantastic inventions, they “…these things do not exist nor can they exist nor have they ever existed.”\textsuperscript{133} Vasari detests the \textit{maniera tedesca} for displaying similarly outlandish configurations of organic and inorganic motifs. And just as Vasari reviles German architecture’s misleading appearances, Vitruvius complains that grotesques posed a threat because “minds beclouded by feeble standards of judgment are unable to recognize what exists in accordance with authority and the principles of correctness.”\textsuperscript{134} By denouncing the \textit{maniera tedesca vis-à-vis} Vitruvius, Vasari lent his attack the authority of this ancient source. And he was not alone in employing this strategy to condemn the German idiom. Echoed also in the letter of Raphael and the writings of humanist Gherardo Spini, the parallels between the German manner and the grotesque was a common theme of early modern Italian art writing.\textsuperscript{135}

\textsuperscript{132} “Sed haec, quae ex veris rebus exempla sumebantur, nunc iniquis moribus inprobantur. nam pinguntur tectorii monstra potius quam ex rebus finitis imagines certae: pro columnis enim straunntur calami striati cum crispis foliis et volutis, pro fastigiis appagineculi, item candelabra aedicularum sustinentia figuras, supra fastigia eorum surgentes ex radicibus cum volutis teneri flores habentes in se sine ratione sedentia sigilla, non minus coliculi dimidiata habentes sigilla alia humanis, alia bestiarum capitisibus.” Vitruvius, \textit{De architectura}, VII.5.3. Here, as in Vitruvius, \textit{Ten Books on Architecture}, trans. Ingrid Rowland commentary and illustrations by Thomas Noble Howe, with additional commentary by Ingrid D. Rowland and Michael J. Dewar (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 91.

\textsuperscript{133} “Haec autem nec sunt nec fieri possunt nec fuerunt.” Vitruvius, \textit{De architectura}, VII.5.4. Here, as in Vitruvius, \textit{Ten Books on Architecture}, 91.

\textsuperscript{134} “quemadmodum enim potest calamus vere sustinere tectum aut candelabrùm ornamenta fastigi, seu coliculus tam tenuis et mollis sustinere sedens sigillum, aut de radicibus et coliculis ex parte flores dimidiataque sigilla procreari?” Vitruvius, \textit{De architectura}, VII.5.4. Here, as in Vitruvius, \textit{Ten Books on Architecture}, 91.

This dimension of the transalpine debate about the *maniera tedesca* finds reflection in
the hall’s mysterious cycle of grotesque paintings. The full meaning of this program is
impossible to discern, for the contents of the wall’s cartouches had already vanished before
portions of the deteriorating painting cycle were recorded in the late nineteenth century. In
addition, no period documents record their author. It is unfeasible to confirm the identity of
the artist on the basis of connoisseurship, for many portions had already been repainted by
1900. Still, a number of arguments support the longstanding attribution of the paintings to
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder. Between 1574 and 1575, Dietterlin decorated the façade and
interior of Strasbourg’s now-vanished *Bruderhof*, the seat of the Archbishop and the property

---

136 Interview with Cécile Dupeaux, Curator, Musée de l’Œuvre Notre-Dame, Strasbourg, November 7, 2011.
137 The attribution of the masons’ hall paintings to Wendel Dietterlin has not been seriously
challenged since the nineteenth century. The debate was often tied up with the question of
who executed the Frauenhaus’s now-destroyed façade paintings. In the middle of the
nineteenth century, the west façade of the Frauenhaus still bore painted architectural
ornaments and a *Last Judgment*, while a wall painting on the second story of the courtyard
adjacent to the hall of the masons depicted an architectural fantasy. Frédéric Piton, the only
historian to publish an attribution of the Frauenhaus’s exterior paintings based on firsthand
study, assigned the exterior paintings to Dietterlin in 1855. In 1890, Adolph Seyboth
attributed the interior paintings to Dietterlin as well. Working from drawings of the exterior
paintings three years later, Karl Ohnesorge later discerned no reason to object to the
attribution of the wall paintings. However, he found the remaining interior paintings too
“thin” (*mager*) for Dietterlin’s taste. Franz Friedrich Leitschuh countered that Dietterlin could
well have applied a lighter-than-usual hand in executing the grotesques to satisfy the
contemporary dictum that interior painting required more delicate figures. See Frédéric
Piton, *Strasbourg Illustre ou Panorama Pittoresque, Historique et Statistique* (Strasbourg: chez
l’auteur; Paris: Dumoulin J.B; Leipzig: chez Mathey et George, 1855), 131; Adolph Seyboth,
*Das Alte Strassburg vom 13. Jahrhundert bis zum Jahre 1870. Geschichtliche Topographie nach den
Urkunden und Chroniken* (Strasbourg: J.H. Heitz, 1890), 153; Karl Ohnesorge, *Wendel Dietterlin,
Maler von Strassburg. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der deutschen Kunst in der Zweiten Hälfte des
sechzehnten Jahrhunderts*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Kaiser Wilhelms-Universität, Strasbourg, 1893
(Leipzig: August Pries, 1893), 54; and Franz Friedrich Leitschuh, *Strassburg* (E.A. Seeman,
1903), 64.
of the Cathedral Canons. A receipt for the project indicates that the painter covered its exterior with “dragon heads” and fictive banners— that is, the stuff of grotesques.

Dietterlin’s experience with creating grotesques for the Cathedral Canons would have made him an obvious candidate to recruit when the Frauenhaus— which the Canons also controlled— required an artist to produce a similar painting cycle. Like his later Architectura treatise, the designs of the hall of the Strasbourg masons reflect Dietterlin’s talent for combining motifs from various ornament prints. One of Dietterlin’s earliest surviving drawings depicts a monstrous mask loosely based on a 1549 engraving by Heinrich Aldegrever [Figs. 15 & 16]. The work confirms that the artist was engaged in adapting printed grotesque designs around the time the Frauenhaus paintings were executed. Roughly


140 Dietterlin and his workshop specialized in grotesque designs. His Architectura abounds with images of the monstrous motifs. All of the known prints of Wendel Dietterlin the Younger also represent grotesques. These include an undated, eleven-part etching series published by Balthasar Caymox in Nuremberg (LeBlanc II:131, no. 2; Hollstein VI.2), a six-part series printed in Lyon in 1614 (Hollstein VI.1), a nine-part Procession of Monstrous Figures from 1615 (Hollstein VI.3), and a fourteen-part series from around 1614 or 1615 (Hollstein VI.4).
equal in size to the masks in the lower part of the composition between the windows on the interior’s north wall [Fig. 17], the drawing may well represent a study for a lost portion of the Bruderhof or Frauenhaus projects.

Dietterlin’s audiences recognized the type of grotesque portrayed in the masons’ hall paintings as an antique mode of ornament first revived by the Italians. Pieter Coecke van Aelst’s 1542 German translation of Sebastiano Serlio’s *Quarto libro* had identified the form as a “practice of the ancient Romans” (”*gebrauch der alten Römer*”) and praised the grotesque designs of Raphael’s Vatican loggia.\(^\text{141}\) Walther Hermann Ryff’s commentary to his 1548 German translation of *De architectura* introduced grotesques as a motif with ancient origins, which modern “…Italian painters call ‘Grotescas’”.\(^\text{142}\) Dietterlin’s paintings portray symmetrical arrangements of flora, fauna, and candelabra typical of antique grotesques. However, most also contain motifs unknown to the ancients, such as auricular ornament and strap-work. By highlighting the intersection of the ancient and modern manners, Dietterlin


showed how contemporary grotesques, like all Renaissance forms, embodied multiple historical styles.

The paintings of the hall of the Strasbourg masons also display regional stylistic diversity. Dietterlin’s masks derive from the prints of Netherlandish artist Cornelis II. Floris. The strapwork motifs also reflect the designs of Floris, as well as prints by Cornelis Bos, Vredeman de Vries, and the French Du Cerceau. The busts of the basket-bearing figures flanking the interior courtyard window [Fig. 18] meanwhile recall the *canéphore* terms pictured in Du Cerceau’s c. 1550 etching series *Termes et cariatides*. They are formed from plump candelabra that resemble designs in Vogtherr’s *Kunstbüchlin*, as well as motifs in single sheets by Aldegrever and other Westphalian artists active during the middle decades of the sixteenth century. Contemporary viewers familiar with the era’s grotesque prints could discern that Dietterlin’s paintings arise from a mix of Netherlandish, French, and German graphic models. Audiences aware of the sources for those prints could furthermore tell that the painted designs represent the terminal links in a chain of influence that lead through northern Europe, back to Renaissance Italy and finally ancient Rome. The program demonstrated Dietterlin’s mastery of many foreign idioms, but also visualized a much grander history of stylistic assimilation. It offered vivid proof of his associate Bernhard

---

143 Dietterlin’s masks derive from the Floris’s series *Pourtraicture ingenieuse de plusiers Facons de Masques* (engraver: Frans Huys; published Antwerp: Hans Liefirinck I, 1555). The series is documented in Hollstein VI.68-85.


Jobin’s theory of the circulation of the arts, and indeed underscored the idea that the northern manner is comprised of several regional idioms.

Dietterlin’s decorations for the Astwerk vault additionally visualized Italian writers’ allusions to the parallels between the maniera tedesca and the grotesque [Fig. 13]. His paintings reinforce the analogy by repeating the vine-like forms of Uhlberger’s Astwerk ribbing. Yet while Italian authors had condemned the similarities between the German manner and the grotesque, Dietterlin used these parallels to defend it. Period art literature attested that ancient Rome and modern Italy abounded with grotesques, despite Vitruvius’s injunction.146 Paraphrasing Serlio, Coecke van Aelst had assured readers that, “...In vaults it is almost acceptable to apply [grotesques] with total free reign, according to what one wants, be it foliage, nests, flowers, animals, birds, and figures of all sorts, combined.”147 By this logic, Uhlberger’s tracery should enjoy exemption from Vitruvian rules. In adorning Uhlberger’s broken Astwerk tracery with grotesques, Dietterlin likened the forms of artistic license condoned by Serlio to the architectural liberties permitted to the Strasbourg masons. The circular, trompe l’oiel windows further validate the German manner’s grotesque tectonics. These false oculi appear to pierce the ceiling at the very point where the tracery seems to break, extending Uhlberger’s deconstructive conceit. As Dietterlin likely learned from Coecke’s references to the work of Mezzolo da Forlì, Andrea Mantegna, Raphael, and

146 See Ryff, Vitruvius Teutsch, fol. CCXXXI; and Serlio, Gemaynen Reglen, fol. 68.
147 “...Soll man dem gebrauch der alten Römer nach geen, welche manicherlay austaylungen pflegten zü machen, nach den subiecten, vnd auch nach der weys der gewelber, darein machtē sy mancherlay fremdigkayten, so man grotesche nennet, welche ding in den gewelē vast wol komen vmb der freyigkayt willen, so man darein machē mag, zūwissen was man will, als bletter, näst, blūmen, theor, vogel, figuren mit allerlay sorten vermengt.” Serlio, Gemaynen Reglen, fol. 68.
Agostino Ghisi, fictive glimpses of sky were a popular device in Italian ceiling painting. By adding Italianate oculi to Uhlberger’s broken tracery, Dietterlin showed that even Vasari’s native artistic tradition sometimes gave rise to architecture that appears dangerously unstable.

Dietterlin also challenged Italian rhetoric about the *maniera tedesca* by exploring the idea of icastic and fantastic invention—categories that, as we have seen, had long been associated with ideas of regional ornamental style. His paintings depict a plethora of plant species and a wealth of birds, bats, and insects. Each shows a degree of individuality at odds with the stylized flora and fauna typical of contemporary grotesque painting. Although combined in impossible configurations, they infuse the cycle with a naturalistic appearance. Dietterlin allegorized the icastic mode of invention that gave rise to such images in a vanished portion of the program recorded in an undated painting from a late nineteenth-century conservation campaign [Fig. 19]. The design shows a bird pursuing grapes set behind a curtain. These objects allude to the story of Zeuxis and Parrhasius from Pliny the Elder’s *Naturalis historia*. Pliny tells how these two painters orchestrate a contest to determine the superior artist. Zeuxis renders a bunch of grapes so convincing that birds try to swoop down and consume the fruit. When he asks Parrhasius to remove the curtain from his own painting, his competitor reveals that the hanging is in fact a painted illusion and thereby proves himself to be the more talented imitator of nature. By referencing Pliny’s parable, Dietterlin reminds viewers that deception—the very crime that Vasari attributed to the *maniera tedesca*—underpins classical paradigms of art as well.

149 Ibid.
149 Pliny the Elder, *Naturalis historia*, 35, 64.6-68.1; Cicero also retold the story. See Cicero, *De Inventione*, II.I.3.
Writers and artists of the early modern period took Pliny’s story as a challenge to surpass prior responses to the problem of representation, and often approached the problem by figuring the anecdote in new ways.\textsuperscript{150} Dietterlin embedded the fruit, fowl, and drapery of Pliny’s story of icastic invention within a fantastic composition. His grapes grow absurdly from a leafy stalk, which forms an uncanny support for the heavy, gold-decked canopy. This reinterpretation advances his stylistic agenda. By showing the subjects of Pliny’s tale of mastery over art and nature in a painting that shares the fantastic, “grotesque” qualities of the maniera tedesca, Dietterlin implies that the German decorative idiom can reflect classical aesthetic values in an alternative form.

Dietterlin’s design establishes a hierarchy between the icastic and fantastic modes of invention which resonates with period art criticism. Another Zeuxis story from the \textit{Naturalis historia} formed the early modern period’s picture of fantastic invention.\textsuperscript{151} Pliny relates how Zeuxis represented the supernatural beauty of Helen of Troy, building his portrait from the choicest features of five maidens.\textsuperscript{152} This story moved early modern art theorists from Leon Battista Alberti to Vasari to argue that the visible world often did not contain any single model adequate to the artist’s needs, and to portray Zeuxis’s method of fantastic invention as a way to overcome the imitations of nature as a model.\textsuperscript{153} Such authors regarded the fantastic image as the representation of an idea rather than the visible cosmos, the product of imagination rather than mimesis.\textsuperscript{154} Their example moved art theorists in Dietterlin’s

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext{150}{See Leonard Barkan, “The Heritage of Zeuxis: Painting, Rhetoric, and History,” in \textit{Antiquity and Its Interpreters}, 99-109.}
\footnotetext{151}{Ibid.}
\footnotetext{152}{Pliny, \textit{Naturalis historia}, 35.64. The story is repeated in Cicero, \textit{De inventione}, II.1.1-4.}
\footnotetext{153}{Panofsky, \textit{Idea}, 25.}
\footnotetext{154}{A number of early modern theorists describe the distinction between the two modes of invention. Vincenzo Danti’s 1567 \textit{Trattato delle perfette proporzioni di tute le cose che imitare e ritrarre}}
\end{footnotes}
milieu to assign the fantastic mode great prestige. Johann Fischart even suggested that only art that transcends icastic representation to engage the spirit boasted any value. “What use,” he asks, “is that which does not enlighten the soul? How should it satisfy a wise man, that Parrhasius can deceive with well-painted grapes?”\textsuperscript{155} In depicting the grapes, fowl, and curtain from Pliny’s parable of icastic creation as elements of a fantastic composition, Dietterlin subordinated the imitation of the observed world to inventions that, like the art of the maniera tedesca, issued from the imagination and thereby invigorated the soul.

One of the piers at the center of the hall of the Strasbourg masons figures the triumph of the fabulous syntheses of the German style over classicism’s idealized naturalism [Fig. 20]. Its shaft is mounted with a modified, Composite capital. Out of this sober form springs a cylinder affixed with a grotesque capital. The upper capital is comprised of strapwork horns bearing pairs of faces within rollwork frames—perhaps portraits of Uhlberger, Dietterlin, and their wives. These likenesses identify the ornament as an emblem of the Strasbourg masons and their artist colleagues. While the composite form of each capital alludes to masons’ combinatory mode of ornamental invention, the capitals’ contrasting appearances attest to the variety of styles that the Lodge’s artistic repertoire encompassed. Just as Vogtherr’s image of a stacked base and capital allegorized the relationship between the native and foreign manners of ornament, Uhlberger’s stacked

\textit{si possano} couched ‘ritrare’, the act of portraying the observed world, and ‘imitare’, the art of portraying a possible reality, as pendant modes of representation. Gregorio Comanini described icastic and fantastic invention as a dichotomy in his \textit{Il Figino} of 1591. In his 1604 \textit{Schilder-Boeck}, Karel van Mander meanwhile compared these forms of invention as imitation of the life, \textit{naer het leven}, and imitation of the spirit, \textit{uyt den gheest}. On these cases, see Claudia Swan, “\textit{Ad vivum, naer het leven}, from the life: defining a mode of representation,” \textit{Word \& Image} 11, no. 4 (October-December 1995): 354-355.

\textsuperscript{155} “Was solln aber für dinst dis haisen, / Die nicht das gmüt auch vnterweisen? / Was solt ain weiser sich dran gnügen, / Das Parrhasius kan betrigen / Mit seinem schöngemalten trauben…” Fischart, \textit{Neue Künstliche Figuren Biblischer Historien}, fol. ii’.
capitals compare the imported and native modes. The naturalistic, antique manner may stand
at the roots of the maniera tedesca, but the German decorative idiom ultimately prevails in the
order of ornamental style. Embodied in the pair of capitals that supports the lodge’s physical
structure, the German manner’s fantastic adaptation of ancient models literally and
figuratively undergirds the masons’ artistic enterprise.

Uhlberger’s fantastic capital also reflects the stylistic eclecticism of the hall that it
upholds. The object shares forms with Dietterlin’s grotesque paintings, but with its large
faces and zoological adornments, it also must have recalled the Cathedral’s medieval
grotesque capitals. The work’s prominent strapwork elements meanwhile reflect
contemporary northern art. By combining these idioms, Uhlberger’s capital unsettles the
boundaries between Strasbourg’s native and imported forms of adornment, as well as its past
and present decorative manners. The work’s synthesis of idioms threatens to disintegrate the
very categories of historical and regional style. Here lies the hall’s most potent challenge to
Vasari’s grand scheme of artistic manners.

Vogtherr’s prediction that fantastic ornament would one day define German art had
come to pass. Between the era of his Kunstbüchlin and Dietterlin’s own day, critics across
Europe came to view the German manner of ornament as a style based on fantastic
invention. But whereas Vasari and his Italian colleagues likened the works executed in the
maniera tedesca to Vitruvius’s subversive grotesques, figures like Jobin, Uhlberger, and
Dietterlin framed the art of the German manner as something more akin to Zeuxis’s Helen.
By combining the best qualities of antique, medieval, and Renaissance manners from north
and south of the Alps as Zeuxis had amalgamated the most excellent features of the five
maidens, Dietterlin and his colleagues forged a new maniera tedesca worthy of esteem by
proponents of local and classical artistic ideals alike.
With its mix of Renaissance-style rounded portals and pointed arches formed from florid *Astwerk*, the monumental façade from the second installment of Dietterlin’s *Architectura* series—a work first released by Jobin’s heirs just one year after the publisher’s 1593 death—allegorizes this eclectic new style [Fig. 1]. Dietterlin’s design also announces itself as an image of the German manner by illustrating Vasari’s nightmare of the *maniera tedesca* almost word for word, showing an uncannily stacked tower of pyramids, points, and leaves, openings, little consoles, and twining vines. The work’s printed form mocks Vasari’s observation that contemporary German ornament appears to be “made of paper” rather than wood or stone. With its diverse combination of motifs, the final response to Vasari’s theory of the *maniera tedesca* to emerge from Jobin’s press frames the modern German manner as a deft confabulation of ornamental idioms.

The culture of Vasari criticism that arose in the texts and ornamental designs of late-Renaissance Strasbourg produced a complex theory of style. Faced with the competing authority of the antique idiom and the native manner, artists and authors in Dietterlin’s world asserted that multiple styles could co-exist in one locale, and that multiple regional or historical idioms could manifest simultaneously in a single work. They also advanced the innovative notions that each land might give rise to a good artistic manner, and that no one decorative idiom boasts absolute aesthetic authority. These ideas extended a profound influence on the artistic culture of northern Europe. By the close of the sixteenth century, the stylistic heterogeneity of the *maniera tedesca* was regarded as one of that manner’s greatest assets, and the aptitude to propose alternative models of good ornamental style had become a vital mark of artistic mastery. This philosophy of decorative idioms inspired the radical new theory of the Orders as styles of ornament applicable to any medium that Dietterlin would ultimately advance in the *Architectura.*
**Chapter II.**

“I did not cleave to the given rules”: Dietterlin’s *Architectura* and the Principles of Ornament Design

In the opening pages of the book that began his serial *Architectura* treatise project, the *ARCHITECTVRA und Aüsstheilung der V. Seüln. Das Erst Buch* of 1593, Dietterlin illustrated design principles then elusive to many artists in northern Europe. One etching shows the geometric figures from which all visual forms are derived, models for composing and enlarging entablatures, and a means to render a set of harmoniously graduated columns [Fig. 1].

Another illustration outlines the parts of a column and tactics for devising a shaft that shows the bulge of entasis [Fig. 2]. Dietterlin describes this pair of prints as an overview of the *Architectura*’s main subject: the art of designing architectural ornament. “These two images,” he explains, are intended for

...young apprentices, and all who have not yet [obtained] a satisfactory...understanding of the art of the five columns, but have a desire and affinity for this art—which many [readers] have lacked or had to snatch under the arm—in order that it again be learned and observed, how the proper, fundamental elements of [architectural ornament] are rendered and used.

Many *Erst Buch* readers had an excellent excuse for their dim grasp of architectural ornament, for the book addresses architects as well as figural artists such as “…painters…sculptors, [and] woodworkers…” The bilingual, Latin/French translation of the *Erst Buch*, the *Liber I.* (1593),

---

1. This print reappeared in the 1598 installment of Dietterlin’s *Architectura* as Plate 4.
2. Dietterlin included this design in the 1598 installment of his *Architectura* as Plate 8.
4. “...bey uns Teutschen under den Werckmeistern, Malern, Steinmeßen, Bildhawern, Schreiner, unnd anderen wenig befunden, die zu grundlicher und rechter erlehrung diser hochnotwendigen nußlichen und lieblichen Kunst so viel zeit müh und Arbeit gelegt haben, als deß grossen unnd scheinbarn nußens halber,” Dietterlin, *Erst Buch*, under, “Ein kurtzer Bericht, an den Leser”.
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even names “rookies in architecture” (Tironibus Architectura), as well as sculptors, stone-carvers, and other craftsmen who did not have much practical experience with inventing buildings as its principal audiences. The Erst Buch’s first plate confirms this orientation. Its pictorial geometry lesson is adapted from Albrecht Dürer’s 1525 painters’ manual. Its set of graduated columns demonstrates how to draw a colonnade in linear perspective, a measurement-distorting mode of representation then commonly used for depictions of architecture in print, drawing, inlay, painting, and relief sculpture, but regarded as useless in plans for building.

All manner of early modern architects and artists required knowledge about architectural ornament. This was in part due to the multifaceted nature of the architectural profession in sixteenth-century northern Europe. The designer of a building was not necessarily the same person who oversaw activities at the building site, and the person in charge of the site did not

---


6 Much geometric and architectural imagery in the Erst Buch is derived from prints in Dürer’s Underweysung der messung. For instance, Plate 3 of the Erst Buch, the second illustration mentioned in the address to the reader, is a backwards copy after fol. Gvi in Dürer’s text. See Albrecht Dürer, Underweysung der messung, mit dem zirckel unricht scheyt, in Linien eben unnd gantzten corporen, durch Albrecht Dürer zisamen geflogë, und zu nuß allêkunstliebhabenden mit zu gebõrigen figuren, in truck gebracht, im jar. M.D.XXv. [hereafter, “Underweysung der messung”] (Nuremberg: s.n., 1525), Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Rar. 610, fol. Gvi.

necessarily produce the work at hand. Encouraged by architecture’s growing status as an esteemed intellectual practice, patrons often helped devise architectural projects, a pursuit that likewise demanded its own modes of architectural expertise. The many forms and media in which architectural ornament could occur also made knowledge of the art of devising architectural decorations a prized commodity among diverse individuals in Dietterlin’s age. Altarpieces, monuments, epitaphs, vessels, jewelry, fountains, furniture, and many other types of objects frequently incorporated architectural ornament. It was during the sixteenth century that architectural perspectives and architectural capricci, or images of fantasy architecture, became popular genres of painting, and the era in which the architectural print—a class of image that often took ornament as its subject—became a valued collectors’ item. Both trends only magnified the period’s broad interest in the image of architecture, making nearly all those who made art responsible for acquiring a basic familiarity with architectural ornament.

---

8 For a useful overview of the division of labor in the architectural project during the Renaissance, see James S. Ackerman, “Architectural Practice in the Italian Renaissance,” Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians 13, no. 3 (October 1954), 3-11.


Changes in the prevailing modes of architectural training and practice intensified demand for architectural expertise among various contingents of artists in Dietterlin’s world. The sorts of artisans whom we might now call “architects” had long been affiliated with the region’s masons’ lodges, but increasingly acted as independent experts in cities and courts.11 Some specialized in fortification and engineering, but many devised and decorated buildings. While the curriculum of contemporary Italian art academies included unstructured lessons in architecture, no formal training existed for northern architects outside of the context of the masons’ lodge.12 Texts and images therefore served as crucial sources of information about architectural design, including the invention of ornament. In fact, with the rise of print, published, illustrated treatises had come to define the principles of architectural ornament for many European audiences.13 As the importance of the masons’ lodges and their apprenticeship systems waned, printed books and ornament prints became the academies of the northern architect.14 Dietterlin’s *Architectura* treatise series, with its copious etchings and brief text, thus mounted a timely response to the growing demand for printed, illustrated guides to architectural ornament.

The multifaceted nature of the architectural profession also manifested in the porous boundaries between the practice of architecture and the other visual arts. Dürer, Hans Vredeman


de Vries, and many other architects created prints and paintings that featured architectural ornament. Wall painters like Dietterlin were often responsible for devising fictive architectural schemes that would complement the brick-and-mortar structures they adorned, as in a design for a painted façade in which Dietterlin coordinated the fictive columns behind the painted figures with the rest of the work’s architectural framework [Fig. 3]. The ubiquity of architectonic objects, art with architectural imagery, and architecture that incorporated painted and sculpted architectural ornament prompted many in Dietterlin’s world to internalize the Vitruvian notion that architecture encompasses all the other arts.

As a result, figural artists were judged for how well they demonstrated architectural expertise. Critics expressed varying levels of confidence in artists’ architectural capabilities. Conrad Dasypodius’s 1580 Heron mechanicus argues that an architect familiar with the Vitruvian principles of firmitas, utilitas, and venustas must guide the various artisan handworkers (opifices) who embellish architectural projects. The praise that Dietterlin heaped on his patron Conrad

15 On the phenomenon of the early modern painter-architect, see the essays in Piet Lombaerde, ed., The Notion of the Painter-Architect in Italy and the Southern Low Countries (Turnhout: Brepols, 2014).
18 “Sit enim quispiam, qui in splendissimo opere suam oftentare uelit magnificentiā: habeat undiquaque collectos operarios, omnisque generis fabros & officinatores, qui artis suæ subtilitate, quæuis fingere, pingere, facereque possint: & mechanico logico, seu quod idem est, bono & probato careat architectos: infinitas sumptuum faciet sine structu, & absque effectu eius quod fieri desiderat, profusiones: operas etiam suas perdent opifices: quod directore, quod pro bato architecto, & industrio mechanico, careant: qui formam, qui symmetriam, qui usum, qui firmitatem, ut necessitas & usus postulant monstret.” Conrad Dasypodius, CVNRADI DASYPODII. Heron Mechanicus: De Mechanicis artibus, ateq disciplinis. Euisdem Horologi astronomici, Argentorati in summo Templo erecti, descriptio (Strasbourg: Nicolaus Vvyriot, 1580), Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Fiche 4 Math.a. 79, fol. D’. The principles of firmitas, utilitas, and venustas are addressed in Vitruvius, De architectura, I.3.2. For a discussion of this passage in Heron Mechanicus, see Günther Oestmann, Die astronomische Uhr des Strassburger Münsters. Funktion und
Schloßberger for crafting an architectonic box with the ornaments of the canonical Orders of architecture meanwhile shows esteem for an artist’s knowledge of architecture.\textsuperscript{19}

To display architectural expertise, figural artists needed to understand the materiality of architecture. For instance, in Dietterlin’s façade drawing, the artist plans how to meld his painting with its structural support by using paint to convincingly imitate the architectural substance of green marble. Figural artists who wished to demonstrate a masterful grasp of architecture also had to know the conventional forms of architectural ornament. Since Schloßberger executed his box in the same material used for much contemporary architecture—wood—it was primarily the object’s small scale that distinguished his sculpture from building proper. The apparent success of Schloßberger’s design lay in what Dietterlin describes as the woodworker’s masterful application of the forms of the Orders.\textsuperscript{20} Yet while Schloßberger and other northern figural artists who used architectural ornament were thought to function “as architects,” most lacked training in that field, and, like many of the region’s architects, turned to books and prints for guidance. This affected how architectural theorists in Dietterlin’s world pitched their writings. The extended titles of


most books on architectural ornament published in sixteenth-century northern Europe name painters and sculptors as well as architects as the works’ intended audiences.\textsuperscript{21}

With the \textit{Architectura}, Dietterlin introduced a guide to the design of architectural ornament geared \textit{primarily} to the needs of figural artists. The \textit{Architectura} abounds with models for paintings, freestanding sculpture, and other objects that incorporate architectural motifs. It prepares painters to integrate architectural imagery with the three-dimensional ornaments of built structures, and shows artists how to devise finely detailed architectural works that can be easily realized in paint, textile, or metalwork, but not in building materials like stone. The tendrils of vegetal matter and ornate garlands depicted in the grotesque designs of Plate 38 of the \textit{Erst Buch} exemplify such designs [Fig. 4].\textsuperscript{22} Dietterlin subsumes all of the diverse works pictured in his \textit{Architectura} under the rubric of the “the five columns”—the canonical quintet of Tuscan, Doric, Ionic, Corinthian, and Composite Orders that served as later sixteenth-century Europe’s foremost paradigm for designing architectural ornament. While other books had variously addressed the Orders as ornaments of architecture that could be used in media like painting or sculpture, Dietterlin’s \textit{Architectura} also classified objects and images as manifestations of the Orders.\textsuperscript{23} Following Dietterlin, authors from Veit Eck, Jacob Guckeisen, and Johann Jakob

\textsuperscript{21} Besides Dürer’s \textit{Underweysung der messung}, these works include Heinrich Vogtherr’s \textit{Kunstbüchlin} (1538), Pieter Coecke van Aelst’s \textit{Die Inventie der Colommen} (1539), Walther Hermann Ryff’s \textit{Architectur} (1547) and his \textit{Vitrivius Teutsch} (1548), Hans Blum’s \textit{Von den fünff Sülén} (1550), Hans Vredeman de Vries’s \textit{Architectura} (1577), and many others.

\textsuperscript{22} This image reappeared as Plate 186 in the 1598 installment of Dietterlin’s \textit{Architectura}.

\textsuperscript{23} Original architectural treatises in Dietterlin’s era (that is, books that were not translations or abridgments of Vitruvius’s \textit{De architectura}) generally fell into one of three categories: construction and fortification literature, books of model building projects, and guides to architectural ornament. Books dedicated to architectural ornament, such as Sebastiano Serlio’s \textit{Quarto libro} (1537), Blum’s \textit{Von den fünff Sülén}, and Giacomo Barozzi da Vignola’s \textit{Regola delle cinque ordini d’architettura} (1562) addressed the design of decorative architectural motifs in a manner accessible to both architects and figural artists. However, they did not devote sustained attention to how the formal circumstances particular to the figural media might affect those practices, or indeed depict a significant number of designs suitable only for execution in painting or sculpture. Art treatises
Ebelmann in Strasbourg to Daniel II. Meyer in Frankfurt, Rutger Kasemann in Cologne and Gabriel Krammer in Prague soon produced books that likewise extend theories of architectural design to the materials and techniques of painting, sculpture, and other figural arts. Dietterlin’s *Architectura* project thus transformed notions of the materiality of architectural ornament and prompted a broad re-negotiation of architectural and artistic expertise in early modern northern Europe.

Ambivalence about architectural decorum—what Dietterlin describes as “how the proper, fundamental elements [of architecture] are used”—complicated how period authors advised figural artists on architectural ornament design. Early modern readers first derived their concern for appropriate architectural design from Vitruvius’s *De architectura*, where it is termed *decor*. Vitruvius wrote that *decor* “…is the refined appearance of a project that has been composed of proven elements and with authority. It is achieved with respect to function, which is called *thematismos* in Greek, or tradition, or nature.” Walther Hermann Ryff introduced the

such as Dürer’s *Underweysung der messung* and Augustin Hirschvogel’s *GEOMETRIA* (1543), Hans Lencker’s *Perspectiva* (1571), and Vignola’s posthumously-published *Due regole della prospettiva pratica* (1583) often represented techniques of perspectival construction through architectural imagery, and therefore could be used as manuals for the pictorial representation of architecture. Nevertheless, they did not address how principles of architectural composition might apply to painting and sculpture. On the architectural treatise in Dietterlin’s milieu, see Ulrich Schütte, “Das Architekturbuch in Deutschland,” in *Architekt und Ingenieur. Baumester in Krieg und Frieden*, ed. Ulrich Schütte, Hartwig Neumann, and Andreas Beyer. Catalogue published in conjunction with the exhibition of the same name, Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, May 5-November 18, 1984. (Wolfenbüttel: Herzog August Bibliothek, 1984), 32-38. On the art treatise in this context, see Julius von Schlosser, *Die Kunstliteratur. Ein Handbuch zur Quellenkunde der Neueren Kunstgeschichte* (Vienna: Kunstverlag Anton Schroll & Co., 1924), 242-246.


concept of decorum to German-speaking readers in his groundbreaking *De architectura* translation of 1548, similarly explaining that *decor* “…is the attractive, noble aspect of a building.”

Ryff, Dietterlin, and their northern contemporaries hold that following the rules of decorum ensures that an architectural project expresses its functions and relative prestige. Most Renaissance authors contend that these qualities become apparent through the proper application of the canonical Orders and their characteristic motifs, symbolism, and proportions. To depart from the decorous forms of the Orders is to risk designing an ugly work that fails to convey the messages that its patron demands it express. Early modern architectural theorists furthermore

---


30 Ulrich Fürst describes how these values evolved in early modern German architectural literature. See Ulrich Fürst, “Die Kategorie der Bedeutung in der deutschsprachigen Architekturtheorie der Frühen Neuzeit und ihr Verhältnis zur baukünstlerischen Gestaltung,” in *Stil als Bedeutung in der nordalpinen Renaissance. Wiederentdeckung einer methodischen Nachbarschaft*, ed.
argue that only the proper application of the Orders guarantees a construction’s apparent and actual structural soundness. The very existence of a building could thus depend on its designer’s obedience to the rules of architectural decorum. But despite the high stakes involved, sixteenth-century standards for architectural decorum were not absolute. Authors advanced varying opinions about when and how architects might stray somewhat from the Orders’ conventional forms. These debates were among the foremost preoccupations of period architectural literature and building, and thus became a vital bridge between architectural theory and practice in the sixteenth century.

When it came to the figural arts, the authority of architectural decorum was entirely unclear. This uncertainty incited power struggles in the era’s artistic institutions, including conflicts among artists in Dietterlin’s native Strasbourg. The city’s stonemasons sued its painters in 1547 for adorning buildings with indecorously flamboyant decorations, but were chided by officials for venturing beyond their area of expertise and understanding (erkandtnuss). In 1571, the woodcarvers’ guild required all entrants to create a masterpiece that would prove their

Stephan Hoppe, Matthias Müller, and Norbert Nußbaum. Sigurd Greven-Kolloquium zur Renaissanceforschung 2 (Regensburg: Schnell & Steiner, 2008), 350-75.


33 “Die maurer, undt ihr ausstreichen belangent, haben ermelte unser herren auss bewegenden und ehehaften ursachen erkant, dass diselbigen fürthien aller hohen farben, alss roth, blau, grün, sonderlichen aber der öhlfarben, zu dem, alles bildt undt laubwerckhs, in ausstreichtung der häusser enthalten, dessen ab- undt müßigstehe, undt in verfassung der thür und fenstergesell, tach und anderer gesimsen, auch der quarteren, sich der darzu gehörenden natürlichen steiffarben gebrauchen, daran benügig sein, und die mahler ferners oder weiters nit bekümmer noch beschweren sollen. Doch ist ihnen den maureren das masswerckh, wie sie es von alter herbracht haben, durch diese erkandtnuss unbenommen…” Strasbourg, Archives de la Ville et de la Communauté urbaine de Strasbourg, Zunft zur Stelze Nr. 2, Artikel Büchs eyner Ersamen Gesellschaft der Zünft zur Stelzen, August 13, 1547, p. 159-60.
knowledge of the architectural Orders, but debated repealing the law when few applicants complied.  

The changing roles of material in perceptions of the arts informed these disputes. The artistic professions had long been defined according to the materials they employed. However, art theorists in sixteenth-century northern Europe increasingly regarded technique and practical and theoretical expertise as an art’s defining traits. Growing awareness that material and medium were overlapping yet distinct categories made questions about the role of architectural decorum in the figural arts more pressing, and potentially different for each trade. Strasbourg’s woodcarvers worked with a substance used in construction. Did this mean that the rules of architectural decorum invariably pertained to their architectonic projects? What about figural artists who created architectural forms with materials not used in construction? While architects observed the rules of architectural decorum in part because it ensured the structural soundness of their projects, sculptors who did not employ building materials such as wood or stone worked under fundamentally different engineering conditions and did not have the same motivation to


36 Modern art history has often elided medium and material. This orientation is perpetuated, among other places, in Clement Greenberg’s influential remarks on medium specificity. Thomas Raff has more recently drawn attention to the need to maintain the distinction between artistic materials and techniques in art-historical analyses, suggesting that further research into the semantics of technique and artistic media might yield insights on the iconology of materials. See Clement Greenberg, “Towards a Newer Laocoon,” Partisan Review 7 (July-August 1940): 296-310; and Thomas Raff, Die Sprache der Materialien. Anleitung zu einer Ikonologie der Werkstoffe (Munich: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 1994), 16.
create architecturally decorous compositions. Painters, whose architectural designs could defy the conventions of building tectonics with little risk to the safety of their audiences, had few practical reasons to render monuments that even appeared sound. Hans Holbein the Younger, Tobias Stimmer, and other sixteenth-century façade painters even delighted in cultivating the illusion that the architecture they painted was pierced with gaping holes, as in the design of Holbein’s lost Haus zum Tanz façade of circa 1520 [Fig. 5], or even that it was about to collapse. Both conceits defied the most basic protocols of architectural decorum.

Disparate messages about the authority of architectural decorum in the figural arts surface in Dietterlin’s Architectura project. The remarkably large corpus of nearly one hundred and seventy-five surviving Architectura preparatory drawings and fragmentary sketches contains designs for over two thirds of the project’s nearly two hundred distinct etchings. Never before discussed as documents of Dietterlin’s architectural theory, the drawings show the author grappling with how architectural decorum applies to representations of architecture in the figural


38 One hundred and sixty-one of the one hundred and sixty-four full-sheet Architectura drawings are held in two albums in the Dresden Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1 and Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2. Besides the works in the Dresden albums, individual Architectura drawings also exist in collections in New York, Berlin, and Bonn. One of the Dresden albums holds an additional five Dietterlin drawings and five fragments of drawings not used for the Architectura, as well as five designs attributed to members of Dietterlin’s circle. The remarkable volume of the Dresden group suggests that it represents the former collection of the Dietterlin atelier. Stamps indicate that before they came to the Kupferstich-Kabinett, the albums were kept in the library of the Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden. The drawings are fully documented in Appendix IV.
arts. Surprisingly, Dietterlin planned few of these etchings according to the rules for correct architectural drafting laid out in the text of his Erst Buch. He instead used the design process to probe ways to manipulate the formal properties of the figural arts to circumvent the tedium of decorous architectural draftsmanship.

Inconsistencies between rule and example abound in the published Architectura treatises as well. Dietterlin’s Erst Buch asserts that its original system for drafting the Orders pertains to all artists. Yet as a result of the author’s architecturally indecorous draftsmanship, most of the Architectura project’s illustrations depict monuments, paintings, and sculptures that flout that system. The Architectura’s many apparent contradictions have prompted critics to dismiss the book as an architectural fantasy. Dietterlin’s stated interest in explaining the “proper, fundamental elements” of architecture nevertheless indicates that the treatise at least purports to serve a pragmatic purpose. The conflicts between the drawings, prints, and text in fact record Dietterlin’s methodical and multidimensional investigation into how architectural decorum might pertain to the figural arts, and when and how different types of figural artists might disregard its rules.


The *Erst Buch* (1593): Drawing Constructions, Constructing Drawings

The initial installment of the *Architectura* was published in 1593, first as the German *Erst Buch*, and then in a bilingual, Latin/French translation, the *Liber I*. While the *Liber I.* was presumably meant to reach a broad, European audience, the *Erst Buch* addresses the needs of Dietterlin’s local architectural culture. Here Dietterlin observes that “among us Germans, there are hardly to be found any architects, painters, stonemasons, sculptors, woodcarvers, and others who have dedicated as much time and effort to thoroughly and properly learning the most necessary, useful, and charming art [of architecture] as they have to grandly and ostentatiously applying it.” And while many German architectural treatises have recently appeared, “architects and artists—and especially young apprentices—who [wish to create] their buildings and other projects according to the proper foundations of the great art [of architecture], and most of all the aspects of architecture long called the art of the five columns…find [those books] too difficult.” Since contemporary German architectural literature offers inadequate instruction on devising ornament, the *Erst Buch* will “extend a supportive, helping hand to developing artists, who do not possess the cleverness to invent…their own decorous and charming ornaments.” Dietterlin’s first treatise is at once theoretical and practical, vernacular and cosmopolitan.

---

41 On the publication history of the *Architectura*, see Appendix II.
42 “…bey uns Teutschen under den Werckmeistern, Malern, Steinmeßen, Bildhawern, Schreiner, unnd anderen wenig befunden, die zu grundtlicher und rechter erlehrung diser hochnotwendigen nüßlichen und lieblichen Kunst so viel zeit müh und Arbeit gelegt haben, als deß grossen unnd scheinbarn nüßens halber” Dietterlin, *Erst Buch*, under, “Ein kurtzer Bericht, an den Leser”.
43 “Ausser ob vermelten Werckmeistern unnd Künstner, sonderlich aber den Jungen angehenden, die doch all ihr gebew Werck und arbeit, nach dem rechté grundt vil berürter Kunst, fürnemlich aber nach diesen der Architectur angehörigen Stuck, so man von alters die Kunst der fünff Seulen nent (regulieren, Anstellen unnd machen sollen) etwas zu schwer duncket, und unerständlich zusein…” Dietterlin, *Erst Buch*, under, “Ein kurtzer bericht, an den Leser”.
44 “Wie ich dann auch eben zu dem End, den angehenden Künstnern (die nicht allesambt der geschicklichkeit, das sie für sich und auß in selber wolstendige unnd anmutige verzierung finden und Bossieren künden) in ihrer Arbeit befüdersame hilfshand zubieten…” Dietterlin, *Erst Buch*, under, “Ein kurtzer bericht, an en Leser”.

136
Part of Dietterlin’s strategy for advancing German architectural literature and reaching figural artists in the process involves engaging the rich tradition of German art literature. Decades before, Dürer’s *Underweysung der messung* had become the first treatise composed in German to illuminate precise mathematic and geometric principles related to art and design. Dürer’s *Underweysung* explains that, “the art of measuring is the proper foundation of all painting...” But it is also pertinent to all the other visual arts. Dürer hopes that his guide to geometry “…might benefit not only painters, but also goldsmiths, sculptors, carpenters, and all those who have to rely on measurement.” The *Underweysung* proves geometry’s status as a common basis for many arts through a combination of theory and diverse practical demonstrations. The treatise’s early sections cover basic geometrical principles. Later parts show the applications of those principles in fields as diverse as typeset design, perspective, and architectural ornament. Dürer’s idea boasted inherent appeal to artists interested in artistic knowledge that could transcend medium-specific practices. As Dietterlin’s copying of the *Underweysung*’s imagery shows, the Nuremberg master’s innovative German-language introduction to Vitruvian principles became a model for the *Erst Buch*’s visual introduction to the composition of architectural ornament [Figs. 6 and 2].

Following the release of Dürer’s treatise, the idea that the so-called “art of measuring” provides a theoretical basis for the visual arts and thus links the artistic media pervaded German

---

45 “Die weyl aber die recht grundt ist aller mallerey, hab ich mir fürgenommen allen künstbegrygen jungen, eyn anfang zustellen, und ursach zugeben damit sie sich der messunge zirkels und richtscheyt, underwinden unnd darauf die warhetyt erkennen unnd vor augen sehen mögen...” Dürer, *Underweysung der messung*, fol. Ai°.


art writing. The title page of Augustin Hirschvogel’s GEOMETRIA (1543) even proclaims, “The book Geometry is my name. All liberal arts first proceeded from me. I bring together architecture and perspective.” Dietterlin also frames the liberal art of geometry as the point of departure for all design and a link between the media. Plate 2 of his Erst Buch [Fig. 1] pictures geometric figures as the ingredients for complex architectural ornaments that might be represented in any medium—imagery and ideas adapted from the geometry lessons of the Underweysung. By drawing on Dürer’s work, Dietterlin situates his treatise within a tradition of art writing familiar to northern readers. The relationship between the Architectura and the Nuremberg master’s guide to the artistic applications of geometry grounds Dietterlin’s design system in an esteemed liberal art. And since Dürer’s Underweysung successfully courted a wide spectrum of artist readers, the Architectura’s borrowings from that canonical text attested to the relevance of Dietterlin’s project to all artists.

The Erst Buch joined a long line of books based in part on Dürer’s writings. Along with the treatise on human proportions that Dürer called the Vier Bücher von menschlicher Proportion (1528), the Underweysung brought an influential, sophisticated new breed of art treatise to the German-speaking realm. Unfortunately, these writings proved too abstruse for many readers.

49 “DAS PVCH GEOMETRIA IST MEIN NAMEN./ AL FREYE KÎST AVS MIR ZVM ERSTEN KÂMEN./ ICH PRING ARCHITECTVRA VNDT PERSPECTIVA ZVSA/MEN.” Augustin Hirschvogel, GEOMETRIA (Nuremberg: s.n., 1543), Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Chalc. 131, title page [http://daten.digitalsammlungen.de/bsb00001758/image_4].
In the wake of Dürer’s books emerged a slew of publications that simplified his theories. Often named some variation of “Kunstbuchlein”, these “small art books”, also addressed a wide range of artisans and apprentices. Many adopted the drawing manual format of the Underweysung and Vier Bücher to explain formulae for perspective and human proportion. Dietterlin’s work applies this tactic to architectural subject matter, using the visual language of the drawing diagram to illustrate his instructions for devising objects such as columns and entablatures [Figs. 1 and 2]. So, while the Erst Buch’s didactic orientation and drawing-centric approach to explaining a system of proportions emulates Dürer’s work, its mission to simplify previous art writing also reflects the goals of the Kunstbuchlein authors who followed the Nuremberg master. But unlike the Kunstbuchlein of prior generations, Dietterlin’s first book also clarifies the writings of Vitruvius and “other” architectural theorists, and advances an original theory of architectural design. In assuming the familiar form of a Kunstbuchlein or drawing manual, the Erst Buch assists northern readers in grasping and applying complex and unfamiliar theories of architectural ornament.

An argument for the consistent application of theoretical rules in the practice of architectural design emerges in the Erst Buch’s very structure. Dietterlin’s Erst Buch encompasses five sections, each of which address one of the canonical Orders of architecture. Each portion of the book proceeds from a description of its Order to instructions for correctly drafting its ornaments, to a visual synopsis of that lesson [Fig. 7], to etchings of capitals, bases, terms, and entablatures that show variations on the standard forms described in the text. Most of the prints

depict architectural ornaments executed in stone, but leave open the possibility that artists could adapt the designs to other materials that may or may not simulate stone. The scale of the pictured works remains indeterminate as well. Almost all of the *Erst Buch*’s ornaments might be incorporated into a monumental building or used to adorn the most diminutive architectonic object. Through this arrangement of rules and examples, Dietterlin seeks to “…bring the most esteemed art of the five columns again to its proper use…”\(^{54}\)—that is, to revive the decorous design practices outlined in the treatises of prior generations.

Dietterlin’s understanding of appropriate architectural design appears to derive from a degree of familiarity with the Latin text of Vitruvius’s *De architectura*.\(^{55}\) Alina Payne usefully describes how, according to Vitruvius’s influential formulation, the categories of *ordinatio*, *dispositio*, *symmetria*, and *eurythmia* constitute the four criteria of *decor*.\(^{56}\) Their interdependent relationships and inconsistent roles in the ancient text somewhat obscures the terms’ precise definitions.\(^{57}\) *Ordinatio*, the correct ordering of the parts of a composition, produces the harmony

\(^{54}\) “…hochgeachtete Kunst der fünff Sculen, wider in ihren rechten brauch und Obsevation zubringen…” Dietterlin, *Erst Buch*, under, “Ein kurtzer bericht, an en Leser”.

\(^{55}\) Walther Ryff had produced a Latin version of the *De architectura* at Strasbourg in 1543, which Dietterlin may have read. This is: Vitruvius, *M. VITRVVII VIRI SVAE PROFESSIONIS PERITISSIMI, DE ARCHITECTVRA LIBRI DECEM, AD AVGVstem Casarem accuratiss. conscriptis: & NV’NC PRIMVM IN GERMANIA QVA patuit diligentia excuse, atq; hinc inde schema tibus non inincundis exornati*, ed. Walther Hermann Ryff (Strasbourg: Egenolph, 1543), Munich, Zentralinstitut für Kunstgeschichte, CA 8/232 R.


of *symmetria*.* Symmetria is a necessary condition of *eurythmia*, the correct and harmonious placement of form. *Eurythmia is in turn realized through the act of proper composition, known as *dispositio*. *Ordinatio, dispositio*, and *distributio*—a category commensurate with invention—can thus be understood as the operations that produce works with the qualities of *symmetria, eurythmia*, and, ultimately, *decor*. For Dietterlin, *symmetria* and *distributio* stand out among the constellation of categories related to *decor*. The artist refers frequently to the “symmetry and distribution” (*Symmetria und Außtheilung*) of architectural ornament, framing symmetry (or proportion) and distribution (or invention) as ornament design’s ruling dyad. Sometimes they act as complementary categories, but in other instances they are opposed.

The lack of consistency in Dietterlin’s understanding of *decor* arose in part from that category’s varied treatment in northern art literature. Dürer, one of the earliest authors to describe *decor* with its sixteenth-century German term “Wohlstand,” provides a nebulous definition

---

58 “*Ordinatio est modica membrorum operis commoditas separatim universeque proportionis ad symmetriam comparatio. haec componitur ex quantitate, quae grece ποσότης dicitur. quantitas autem est modulorum ex ipsius operis e singulisque membrorum partibus sumptio universi operis conveniens effectui.” / “Ordering is the proportion to scale of the work’s individual components taken separately, as well as their correspondence to an overall proportional scheme of symmetry. It is achieved through quantity, which in Greek is called *posotés*. Quantity, in turn, is the establishment of modules taken from the elements of the work itself and the agreeable execution of the work as a whole on the basis of the elements’ individual parts.” Vitruvius, *De architectura*, I.2.2. Here, as in Vitruvius, *Ten Books on Architecture*, 24.

59 “*Item symmetria est ex ipsius operis membris conveniens consensus ex partibusque separatibus universae figulae speciem ratae partis responsus.” / “Symmetry is the proportioned correspondence of the elements of the work itself, a response, in any given part, of the separate parts to the appearance of the entire figure as a whole.” Vitruvius, *De architectura*, I.2.4. Here, as in Vitruvius, *Ten Books on Architecture*, 25.

60 “*Eurythmia est venusta species commodusque in compositionibus membrorum aspectus. haec effectur, cum membra operis convenientis sunt altitudinis ad latitudinem, latitudinis ad longitudinem, et ad summam omnia respondent suae symmetriae.” / “Shapeliness (*eurythmia*) is an attractive appearance and a coherent aspect in the composition of the elements. It is achieved when the elements of the project are proportionate in height to width, length to breadth, and every element corresponds in its dimensions to the total measure of the whole.” Vitruvius, *De architectura* I.2.3, Here, as in Vitruvius, *Ten Books on Architecture*, 25.

across his various writings that connects the quality of architectural correctness with strength and the harmonious interrelation of parts.\textsuperscript{62} Pieter Coecke van Aelst meanwhile introduces \textit{decor} as “…a curiosity (curieusheit) of ornament, whose realization brings [the design] into accord with nature.”\textsuperscript{63} Vitruvius had also asserted that \textit{decor} expresses the natural order, but the idea that this effect was somehow uncanny appeared nowhere in the ancient architect’s treatise. Coecke van Aelst’s formulation reflects an affinity for strangeness characteristic of the culture of ornament that flourished in northern Europe during the sixteenth century. Since even the most decorous architectural scheme was thought to mysteriously reflect the structure of the cosmos, the quality of strangeness never became synonymous with indecorousness in the architectural design of early modern northern Europe. This outlook is everywhere apparent in the architectural \textit{bizzaria} that fill Dietterlin’s \textit{Architectura}, which, despite their fantastic, grotesque appearances, nearly always strike the viewer as organic manifestations of some deeper order.

Vitruvius had regarded the appropriate choice of Order, or genus of architectural form, as an outstanding marker of \textit{decor}.\textsuperscript{64} The theory of the Orders outlined in his \textit{De architectura} perpetuated this idea, in various forms, into the Renaissance.\textsuperscript{65} Yet \textit{De architectura}'s lack of surviving illustrations, as well as inconsistencies between the text and the surviving corpus of classical architecture, also brought Renaissance readers to regard Vitruvius’s account of the

\textsuperscript{62} For an overview of Dürer’s references to the category of \textit{Wohlstand} in his published and unpublished work, see Dethlefs, “‘Wohlstand’ and ‘Decorum’,” 143-146.
\textsuperscript{63} “Decor, dats circaet oft curieusheit, dat volbringmen duer state eñ gewoente eñ nature.” Pieter Coecke van Aelst, \textit{DIE INVENTIE DER COLOMMEN MET HAREN CORONEMENTEN ENDE MATEN. Wt Vitruvio ende andere dienersche Auctoren optcorste vergadert, voor Scilders, beeltsniders, steenhouders, \&c. Eñ allen die gheuenchte hebben in edificien der Antiquen} (Antwerp: Pieter Coecke van Aelst, 1539), Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, A.civ. 53, fol. a8\textsuperscript{v}.
\textsuperscript{65} See Onians, \textit{Bearers of Meaning}. 
Orders as incomplete, and thus open to a degree of elaboration. One particularly influential take on the Orders came from Sebastiano Serlio. In the initial volume of his *Regole generali di architettura*, the so-called “Quarto libro” of 1537, Serlio illustrated a quintet of Tuscan, Doric, Ionic, Corinthian, and Composite Orders schematized from the unruly vestiges of antique architecture and the contradictory accounts of its modern observers [Fig. 8]. His novel use of printed images and systematic depiction of the Orders as manners of building recognizable by their proportions and ornaments shaped the norms of decorum for the later sixteenth century and beyond.

Dieterlin allegorized the modern era’s contrasting theories of the Orders in the *Erst Buch’s* final image, a two-plate composition that shows a pair of façades [Figs. 9a & b]. In the background stands a sunlit monument comprised of Tuscan, Doric, Ionic, Corinthian, and Composite levels, representing the five Orders addressed in the works of Serlio and his followers. A darkened porch formed from the three Doric, Ionic, and Corinthian Orders featured in Vitruvius’s *De architectura* looms in the foreground. This symbol of the ancient paradigm of architectural ornament stands closer to the viewer, suggesting the fundamental importance of grasping the Vitruvian basis for the theories of architectural ornament before moving on to those

---

66 For an account of this phenomenon, see Pauwels, *Aux marges de la règle*.


69 This bipartite composition reappeared in the 1598 installment of the *Architettura* in Plates 187 and 188.
elaborated by Serlio, Dietterlin, and other contemporary authors. The light-bathed structure beyond it represents the modern theory of the five Orders as an enlightened version of the Vitruvian code. As majestic, imposing monuments, these embodiments of the ancient and modern systems of architectural decorum emanate authority. Dietterlin’s image does not, however, unequivocally support either system. By aligning representations of two incompatible regimes of ornament, his print instead frames architectural decorum as an evolving and historically contingent value. The image asserts that paradigms of architectural decorum may exert a certain sway, but also argues that the existence of multiple, valid theories for devising architectural ornament mean that no one system boasts absolute authority. New paradigms of architectural decorum can replace the old, and there is always justification for revising architectural rules that have outlived their time.

For German-speakers in the Renaissance, the practice of decorously devising the Orders’ ornaments was defined by Coecke van Aelst’s 1542 translation of Serlio’s Quarto libro, Ryff’s Vitruvius Teutsch, and the work of Hans Blum. Blum released his Quinque columnarum exacta descriptio and a vernacular version of the text, Von den fünf Sülen, in 1550. The books frame the

---

70 Most secondary literature dates the German text to 1555, but a copy in Munich’s Bayerische Staatsbibliothek bears the date 1550. On the publication history of Blum’s texts, see Thomas Hänsl, “Hans Blums ‘Von den fünff Sülen grundtlicher Bericht’: einige Bemerkungen zu den Quellen und der Druckgeschichte,” Scholion 3 (2004): 181-186. The books are reproduced in Hans Ruf, Die Säulenbücher des Meisters Hans Blum aus Lohr am Main (Lohr a. Main: Geschichts- und Museumsverein Lohr a. Main, 2006). The Munich copy of Blum’s 1550 German text is Hans Blum, Von den fünf Sülen, Grundtlicher bericht vnnnd deren eigentliche contrafeuyng, nach Symmetrischer vsstteilung der Architectur. Durch den erfarnen, unnd der fünff Sülen wolberichten, M. Hans Blümen von Lor am Mayn, ffyssig uß den antiquiteten gezogen, und trüwlich, als vor nie bescheben, inn Truck abgefertigt. Allen kunstrychen Buwherrn, Werckmeisteren, Steinmetzen, Maleren, Bildhaueren, Goldschmiden, Schreyneren, och allen die sich des circkels uñ richtschyts gebruchend, zü grossem nutz und vorteil dienstlich. (Zurich: Christoph Froschauer, 1550), Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Res.2 A.civ. 24 d. The Latin text is Hans Blum, QVINQVE COLVMNARVM EXACTA descriptio atque deliniatio, cum symmetrica earum distributione, con scripta per Ioannem Bluom, & nunc primum publicata. VITILIS est bic liber pictoribus, sculptoribus, fabris ærarijs atq[ue] lignarijs, lapicidis, statuarijs, et uniusrsis qui circino, gnomon, libella, antlioqui
columns of the five Orders as the fundamental units of all architectural ornament. Reconciling the era’s various methods for rendering the columns into a unified set of mathematical ratios, Blum’s work describes and lucidly illustrates a simple procedure for drafting the columns of each Order. Its succinct text and clear woodcut images ignited a tradition of practical “column books” that included the *Architectura* and countless other treatises up to the eighteenth century. Even Giacomo Barozzi da Vignola’s well-known guide to drafting the Orders, the *Regola delli cinque ordini d’architettura* of 1562, can be identified with this trend. Yet perhaps because of Blum’s broad influence, the German-speaking lands produced few books on architectural ornament until Dietterlin’s *Architectura*. When Dietterlin writes that his project will revive the art of the five columns, it is the learning of Serlio, Blum, and Vignola that he seeks to restore.

The introduction to Dietterlin’s *Erst Buch* asserts that the art of devising architectural ornament is based on architectural drawing. After lamenting the complexity of conventional modes of decorous architectural drafting, Dietterlin claims to offer a simpler method for devising the standard column for each Order, here understood as the sum of the base and entablature as well as the shaft and capital. The author instructs readers to divide the height of the total ensemble of base, column, and entablature by a value specific to the given Order: for the Tuscan

certa mensura opera sua examinant (Zurich: Christoph Froschauer, 1550), Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Res.2 A.civ. 24 d.

71 Forssman, *Säule und Ornament*, 76-78.


Order 7, the Doric, 8, the Ionic, 9, and so on.\textsuperscript{75} The Order’s other elements are then built from ratios derived from these units.\textsuperscript{76}

By the second half of the sixteenth century, architectural treatises composed in Italian were increasingly providing instructions for formulating the ornaments of the Orders that involved quantitative formulae rather than geometrical schemes.\textsuperscript{77} Vignola’s \textit{Regola} popularized canonical proportions for each Order that were based on modules derived the author’s measurements of actual ancient monuments, an empirical system that made precise calculation the lynchpin of a design’s visual appeal.\textsuperscript{78} Andrea Palladio’s 1570 \textit{I quattro libri dell’architettura} innovatively provided readers with a numerical module for each Order based on the diameter of the column at the base.\textsuperscript{79} The illustrations of Vignola and Palladio’s treatises generally present buildings and architectural ornaments in orthogonal projection, suggesting that readers could employ the images to reproduce the accurate measurements described in the texts.\textsuperscript{80} It was common in the Italian tradition to regard the bodies of different human types as the source of these measurements—mature man for the Doric, matron for the Ionic, and so on—and therefore to conceive of the origins of these proportions as the divine imagination.\textsuperscript{81} In comparison to

\textsuperscript{75} This technique derives from a division-based strategy already described by Dürer and later explained in Blum. See Margot Pirr, \textit{Die Architecutra des Wendel Dietterlin 1598}. Ph.D. Dissertation, Berlin, 1940 (Gräfenheinichen: C. Schulze & Co., 1940), 28.

\textsuperscript{76} Ohnesorge, \textit{Wendel Dietterlin}, 35.


\textsuperscript{79} Carpo, “Drawing with Numbers,” 456.


these Italian paradigms of architectural composition, Dietterlin’s method of dividing the total desired height of the monument by a set, abstract ratio with no exact relation to esteemed models such as the human body seems somewhat arbitrary, and vests the whims of the architect with immense authority.

Yet the model for the Erst Buch’s system of design does proceed from a hallowed source: the regional tradition of architectural conventions.\textsuperscript{82} As the south German masons’ manuals such as Roriczer’s Geometria Deutsch (1487 or 1488) or Wimpergbüchlein (c. 1486-90) discussed in Chapter I attest, northern architects as well as goldsmiths and other types of craftsmen active in the fifteenth century had long used a system of practical, constructive geometry to compose architectural ornaments.\textsuperscript{83} The masons’ manuals’ instructions departed from conventional, academic geometry in that they were never elaborated with a proof, nor validated through an abstract theoretical or philosophical explanation.\textsuperscript{84} Most of the design lessons described in masons’ incunabula pivot on proportional schemes similar to those related in later German works like Dietterlin’s Erst Buch. In general, the reader begins with a standard form and divides it into proportional modules, repeating the procedure with different shapes as necessary. The resulting units become the building blocks for additions to the design.\textsuperscript{85} The compositional methods commonly observed in German column books of the sixteenth century likewise involve extrapolating units of ornament from a preliminary whole. But whereas other sixteenth-century authors direct their reader to measure the forms of their design relative to the total height of the

\textsuperscript{82} I am thankful to Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann for bringing this point to my attention.


column, Dietterlin and his colleague Hans Blum implicate the entire monument, advising readers to fix the height of the column in relation to the total height of the base, column, and entablature together. Both Dietterlin and Blum also present the fundamental unit of measurement for their Orders in the form of a compass circle. This recalls the stonemasons’ habit of indicating the basic unit of measurement for a given decorative scheme in terms of the shape that is subdivided to produce the various forms of the design. In cleaving to longstanding regional conventions for architectural design, Dietterlin made knowledge of the relatively unfamiliar canon of Orders more accessible to the northern craftsman. He also perpetuated a native tradition of architectural composition, even while promoting the more exotic classical and Italianate ornamental idioms.

Although Dietterlin touts the relative simplicity of his method for drafting the basic forms of an Order, the technique remains a complicated affair. Painters, sculptors, and other figural artists unsure about the relevance of these rules to their work had ample motivation to dispense with such difficult and time-consuming processes. This gave Dietterlin a compelling reason to define the authority of architectural decorum for the figural arts. The author used the very process of crafting the treatise’s images to determine how his standards for composing the Orders should relate to specific techniques for representing architecture in print, painting, sculpture, and other figural arts.

Like many authors in his milieu, Dietterlin used images to maximize his writing’s instructive efficacy. Printed art treatises of the period often promoted the image as a tool for

---

86 Ohnesorge, *Wendel Dietterlin*, 34.
87 Since this “easy” design procedure eschews the then-universal idea that a whole number ratio should exist between the diameter of the column and its height, it in fact complicates decorous architectural composition. For further analysis of Dietterlin’s method of constructing the Orders, see Ohnesorge, *Wendel Dietterlin*, 30-36.
88 The idea that image and text mutually transmit knowledge also pervaded sixteenth-century German writing at large. See Sachiko Kusukawa, *Picturing the Book of Nature: Image, Text, and
elucidating complex artistic theories and techniques, variously claiming that their illustrations boasted didactic powers distinct from those of the accompanying texts. Dietterlin framed his richly etched treatise as a more accessible substitute for previous writings on architectural ornament, and cast its images as lucid representations that might in turn make up for any lack of clarity in his own verbal instructions. The Erst Buch, he writes, portrays

…the first Principles and foundations of symmetrical division in the most easy and comprehensible manner, with short descriptions[,] For the benefit of those who have not yet learned such [principles] from Vitruvius and other books on art, or for whom [these rules] happened to be too difficult to understand, are [also] shown…designs, which serve as guideposts.

In his enthusiasm to simplify techniques of composition through images, Dietterlin often dispenses with text altogether. He wordlessly illustrates alternative methods for tapering columns, and introduces and a technique for devising the Tuscan capital entirely without comment. In fact, only a few of the design techniques covered in the entire Architectura project are addressed in writing. While this visual orientation risked confusing the reader, it also boasted a distinct advantage. Images gave Dietterlin a platform for addressing strategies of ornament design too abstract or even indecorous to describe in writing.

---


90 “…darin gleichwol nun die erste Principia und Fundamenta der Simmetrischen außtheilung, auff das einfeltigest und verständlichest, es, mit solcher Kürtze beschehen mögen, den jenigen die sonst en solches ausser deß Vitruuij und anderer Kunstbüchern noch nicht erlern, und etwan zuergreiffen zu schwer fallen wollen, angezeigt, unnd mit für Augen gestellten, aufrisen ihnen zur wegweisung fürgebildet” Dietterlin, Erst Buch, under, “Ein kurtzer bericht, an en Leser”.

91 Ohnesorge, Wendel Dietterlin, 30.
Dietterlin planned some of the *Erst Buch* designs according to the instructions for decorous architectural drafting detailed in its text.\(^{92}\) One drawing illustrates his method for devising Tuscan columns [Fig. 10]. It features the dotted outline of a basic Tuscan column, another outlined column half-shaded with wash, a more ornate, modeled column, and an anthropomorphic post that represents what the *Erst Buch* describes as the Order’s farmer-like character.\(^{93}\) The outlined columns are accompanied by lines and numbers that refer to the plotting marks that result from Dietterlin’s method for drafting the Tuscan Order. The disparate degrees of embellishment displayed by the basic columns and the human-formed post suggest how designers can elaborate on the rules of composition detailed in the text to produce decorous, anthropomorphic versions of the Orders. The lesson appeals to artists who seek to join figural imagery with a built structure.

Dietterlin appreciated that the formal qualities of the *Architectura* etchings shape how readers comprehend his principles for ornament design. Just as many of the projects illustrated in the treatise can be executed in virtually any medium, the prints themselves seem to assume multiple forms. Dietterlin’s copyright application for the *Architectura* project refers to its images as “printed architectural sketches.”\(^{94}\) The numerical notations, fictive drafting lines, and outlined

---

\(^{92}\) Only eight of the twenty-four non-fragmentary drawings preparatory for the *Erst Buch* etchings were executed according to Dietterlin’s formal standards for drafting the ornaments of the Orders. These are the *Tuscana* drawing and the drawings for Pls. 6, 10, 15, 19, 23, 39, and 40 of the *Erst Buch*.\(^{93}\) “Also würst sie auch, eben ihrer Störck unnd gröbe halben, von vilen *Architectis*, einem groben starcken Bawren verglichen, und etwan auch, das Bewrische Werck genandt…” Dietterlin, *Erst Buch*, under, “THVSCANA”.

\(^{94}\) “…dürch denn Trückh mithetaltten Innwarf…” Wendel Dietterlin, Application for Imperial Printing Privilege, May 11, 1592, Vienna, Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, AT-OeStA/HHStA RHR Impressoria 13-52 (Impressoria Fz. 13), fol. 362r. For a transcription of the application, see Appendix III.
aspects of the *Tuscan* etching indeed read as traces of Dietterlin’s design process [Fig. 7].

Decades earlier, the rise of printed architectural drawings in treatises like Serlio’s *Quarto libro* had made instructions for architectural composition visually reproducible as never before, standardizing, and thereby invigorating, the imitative practices of Renaissance architects. This dynamic is also at work in Dietterlin’s etching. The parallels between Dietterlin’s instructions for drafting the Tuscan Order and *Tuscan*’s notations assure readers that the artist drafted the model image according to the standards of decorous composition detailed in the text, and visually guide artists in applying the procedure in their own designs. Since drawing was then regarded as the manual expression of design in all the visual arts, *Tuscan*’s drawing-like contours certify that projects based on its decorous ornaments could be realized in any medium.

While the *Tuscan* etching’s dotted columns and plot lines can read as strokes of the pen, they also resemble the marks produced in pouncing. In this copying procedure—frequently employed by early modern painters—the artist pierces a sheet along the contours of a design and dusts the paper with particulate pigment to transfer the image to another surface. Pouncing was

---

95 Dietterlin incorporated this design in the 1594 installment of his *Architectura* project as Plate 2, and in the 1598 installment as Plate 6.


98 On early modern notions of drawing as the physical expression of *disegno* or design and the art that undergirds the figural arts and architecture, see Wolfgang Kemp, “Disegno. Beiträge zur Geschichte des Begriffs zwischen 1547 und 1607,” *Marburger Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft* 19 (1974): 219-40; and Catherine King, “Disegno/design,” in *Representing Renaissance Art*, 61-103.
also a common means of replicating printed schemes. Holes in one iteration of the Tuscan print show that viewers took the dots in Dietterlin’s etching as a cue to actually reproduce the printed design with the pouncing technique [Fig. 11]. By depicting the standard column of the Tuscan Order in this way, Dietterlin implicitly condones the mechanical copying of decorous architectural forms. The Tuscan print thereby suggests that a thorough understanding of architectural decorum is not vital to the task of producing decorous architectural ornament. By undermining the idea that a correct architectural composition always evidences true architectural expertise, Dietterlin opens the door for alternative interpretations of architectural knowledge.

Other Erst Buch designs establish a more ambiguous relationship to Dietterlin’s rules for architectural decorum. The draft for Plate 25 incorporates three separately drafted panels, each of which depict tapered terms [Fig. 12]. Dietterlin crafted this work and at least a third of the other designs for his first treatise by physically dissecting sketches, combining the pieces, and further developing the resulting schemes with his quill and brush. Graphite underdrawings in the draft for Plate 25 confirm that the artist drew the work’s individual Ionic terms according to his text’s instructions for devising all Ionic posts. This, however, did not ensure that the assembled composition displays a decorous appearance. Since the Erst Buch’s method for drawing the Orders was based on dividing a post of undefined height into proportional parts, posts drafted as independent compositions could represent the same Order, but assume different sizes. The terms in the design for Plate 25, as well as the four figures ultimately depicted in the final print [Fig. 13], thus indecorously exhibit slightly uneven heights. Not surprisingly, this departure from the Erst

100 Plate 25 reappeared in the 1598 Architectura as Plate 142. The rightmost term in the drawing was used in Plate 33 of the 1593 installment of the Architectura, which became Plate 183 in the 1598 installment of the treatise.
Buch's stated instructions for architectural drafting defies the contemporary Italian convention of executing the components of an architectural design according to precise measurements. But it also contradicts the Gothic convention of deriving all of a composition's ornaments from a single geometric unit—the technique promoted in Dietterlin's architectural drafting instructions. Neither the old nor the new paradigms of architectural decorum survive in the present design.

The creative strategy Dietterlin employs to devise these cut-and-paste designs can be characterized as a form of bricolage—that is, the construction of a work with a heterogeneous array of parts. Both in the early modern period and in the present day, bricolage has been a creative technique with applications well beyond the realm of art. Jacques Derrida has in fact observed that the drawing of disparate elements from an exterior source, tradition, or heritage is common to every form of discourse.101 Bricolage, it has been argued, is a mode of production that can be used to create works in the visual arts as well as literary texts, social situations, and even research, and often involves the assembly of disparate materials as a strategy for meeting a certain challenge.102 Dietterlin employed bricolage to solve the daunting problem of creating the Architectura's scores of new ornament designs, emulating components of classicizing architecture and architecture prints, but always recombining these elements into novel arrangements of form. In so doing, the artist followed a well-established procedure for architectural design. Through printed images that illustrate the constitutive elements of the Orders as standardized, reconfigurable parts, the architectural literature of the earlier sixteenth century had made fantastic

102 This philosophy is developed in Claude Lévi-Strauss, The Savage Mind, anonymous translator (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966).
invention the period’s default mode of architectural composition. Images of individual architectural ornaments that could be taken as potential components of modular, recombinatory schemes also pervade the era’s single-sheet architectural prints and drawings.

Often, these atomized ornaments appeared as ruined fragments disassociated from once-intact monuments—in other words, as spolia. Spoliation, or the use of spolia to compose a new, synthetic work, had been a common practice in Europe for centuries, applied memorably in monuments like the Arch of Constantine. Because the technique frequently produced works that aligned visual forms from different ages, spoliation was often the source of stylistic revivals or the rise of novel decorative forms. This resourceful remixing of architectural and sculptural elements formed tableaux that could refer to the source monument(s) and their historical significance, as well as the spoliator’s power to reappropriate these materials and meanings to new ends. References to spoliation as a strategy for architectural composition abounded in the architectural literature of northern Europe, which had received its models of classical ornament primarily via printed images of architectural ruins such as the broken capitals and bases in Plate

---


14 of Dietterlin’s *Erst Buch* [Fig. 14].

It is not difficult to imagine how the work’s distinct units of ornament might be extracted from Dietterlin’s composition and applied to another *bricolage* design. The capitals and bases are themselves comprised of conglomerations of motifs that readers can variously break down and copy as well. Some even show certain ornaments on only one side, suggesting the very acts of selective atomization, addition, subtraction, and reconfiguration that gave rise to their confabulated appearances. This conceit occurs throughout the *Architectura*. By framing the treatise as a compendium of ornamental motifs to be parsed and recombined in new works, Dietterlin promoted a form of design distinct from the decorous, measured mode of architectural composition explicitly condoned in his *Erst Buch*’s text.

The cut-and-paste techniques that Dietterlin used to construct the drawing for Plate 25 and indeed Plate 14 apply the art of fantastic architectural invention—typically conceived as a mental operation—to the *physical* practice of architectural composition. Dietterlin’s materialized form of *bricolage* architectural design may seem a natural product of his recombinatory architectural aesthetic. However, since the cut-and-paste method does not easily allow artists to devise precisely measured and architecturally decorous ensembles, sixteenth-century architects seldom used this technique to devise building projects. Painters, on the other hand, often cut their drafts to reduce an image or free a design for use elsewhere, pasted sheets together to augment compositions, and layered fragments to correct or otherwise reorganize their works.

By subordinating the rules of architectural decorum to more general artistic principles such as the appropriate selection and coordination of forms, Dietterlin used the cut-and-paste *Erst Buch*

---


drawings to experiment with architectural design from the standpoint of a painter. His investigations produced a surprisingly limited number of architecturally licentious forms. Plate 25 is the sole cut-and-paste design from the *Architectura* that flaunts the errors that result from a painterly and indecorous approach to architectural draftsmanship. Since the introduction of the *Erst Buch* purports that the treatise models correct modes of architectural design, Dietterlin generally obscured his use of indecorous compositional practices in the book’s other *bricolage*-formed images. His tactics for hiding these transgressions clarified what formal conditions might exempt the figural arts from the rules of architectural decorum.

Unlike architecture, the figural arts allow designers to create architectural ornaments divorced from a structural framework. Dietterlin’s draft for Plate 14 probes how the representation of such autonomous ornaments permits figural artists to avoid the onerous task of measuring out their architectural drawings [Fig. 15]. Two of the drawing’s fragmented capitals are rendered on a trimmed sheet appended to the composition. Since the capitals join the design as autonomous objects, they do not interrupt any decorous network of mutually proportional forms. Dietterlin’s dependence on cut-and-paste composition is thus undetectable in the etching [Fig. 14]. Because an architectural ensemble’s proportions can only be judged from the whole, the ostensibly incomplete forms of the etching’s broken capitals further obscure whether the artist followed his own instructions for proper architectural drawing in drafting their forms. Plate 14 thus positions the depiction of architectural fragments as a context in which figural artists can sacrifice proportional accuracy without creating an clearly indecorous architectural composition.

Other aspects of Plate 14 also hide the fact that Dietterlin departed from the *Erst Buch*’s rules for decorous architectural drafting in devising the design. Its ornaments are shaded and staggered in space, introducing vagaries of perspective and modeling that further obfuscate the
objects’ proportions. In his 1443-52 *De re aedificatoria*, first published in 1485 and primarily known to German-speaking readers through the writings of Walther Hermann Ryff, Leon Battista Alberti had described this as the *painterly* form of architectural drawing. Alberti wrote that “…the difference between the drawings of the painter and those of the architect is this: the former takes pains to emphasize the relief of objects in paintings with shading and diminishing lines and angles,” and the latter draws “…according to certain calculated standards.” By employing the painter’s mode of architectural representation, Dietterlin models how painters and other pictorial artists might dispense with the architect’s “calculated standards” while concealing their dependence on architecturally indecorous design practices.

**The Annder Buch (1594): Counterproof Confabulations**

In the *Erst Buch’s* address to the reader, Dietterlin announces that he will compose the *Architectura’s* next installments “…so that others might [create] more…than I describe, and…realize more artful and better work…” The author fulfilled this promise in the

---

109 Kimberley Skelton has observed this phenomenon in many *Architectura* prints. See Skelton, “Shaping the Book and the Building,” 40-1.

110 *De re aedificatoria* was first published in 1485. On Ryff’s appropriation of Alberti’s ideas, see Julian Jachmann, *Die Architekturbücher des Walter Hermann Ryff. Vitruvrezeption im Kontext mathematischer Wissenschaften*. Cultural and Interdisciplinary Studies in Art 1, ed. Zita Ágota Ptaki (Stuttgart: ibidem, 2006), 67; and Dethlefs, “‘Wohlstand’ and ‘Decorum’,” 149.


This treatise also encompasses five sets of Tuscan, Doric, Ionic, Corinthian, and Composite etchings. Most depict the portals mentioned in the *Annder Buch*’s full title [Fig. 16]. Whereas the *Erst Buch* portrays the Orders’ basic elements as single units of ornament, the *Annder Buch* illustrates entire projects that combine those motifs. Dietterlin’s first treatise furnishes readers with the ingredients for the *bricolage* mode of ornament design, but his second book shows the finished works that can result from that procedure. The former text is a model book of ornaments, and the latter is a guide to the process of invention itself.

In offering paradigms for inventing new ornamental schemes, Dietterlin’s *Annder Buch* further probes what conditions might permit architects and figural artists to design architecturally licentious works. The book’s collection of inventive doors owes much to one of the era’s best-known exercises in architectural license, the compendium of unorthodox portals that Serlio published in 1551 as the *Extraordinario libro*. Serlio himself described the designs of the first half of the treatise as “licentious”, justifying their departures from the architectural doctrines that his own *Quarto libro* had helped create by citing the authority of antique works that also defied those rules. Dietterlin employed the licentious portals of Serlio’s *Extraordinario libro* as formal models

---

113 Wendel Dietterlin, *ARCHITECTVR von Portalen vnd Thürgerichten mancherley arten. Das Annder Būch* [hereafter, “*Annder Buch*”] (Strasbourg: Bernhard Jobin’s heirs, 1594), Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Res/2 A.civ. 58-1/2. A Latin edition of the text was printed in the same year: *ARCHITECTVRA de Postium seu Portalium ornatu uario LIBER II.* [hereafter, “*Liber II.*”] (Strasbourg: Bernhard Jobin’s heirs?, 1594), Nuremberg, Germanisches Nationalmuseum LGA Gew Mus. 3391.


for the doors of the Annder Buch, but made a number of significant amendments to the older works. He reworked a portal from Serlio’s book that displays noble Doric ornaments incongruously covered with rustic motifs [Fig. 17] by subtracting its rustication, shortening its columns, and widening the structure to accommodate the new bases [Fig. 16]. For readers familiar with Serlio’s text, the changes Dietterlin made to the original design show how to extrapolate a new composition from an existing work. They also clarify what demands of architectural decorum the Strasbourg author found most stringent. Dietterlin never condones stylistic inconsistency. By eliminating the rustication in Serlio’s door, the Annder Buch portal avoids the clash of rough and refined ornaments that made the Extraordario libro design problematic. At the same time, his door displays proportions that are indecorous for the Doric Order. The artist evidently valued the proper combination of motifs over the correct measurement of forms.

Dietterlin acknowledges the contradictions between the Annder Buch’s etchings and his Erst Buch’s lessons on decorous architectural design. The author tells the reader of his second treatise that

… if he perhaps discerns errors in this book and [sees that] in certain other places that I did not cleave to the given rules [Regul], and thus were to find some cause for rebuke, then he might easily be directed to the first part [the Erst Buch] for those fundamenta and rationes.

116 Dietterlin reincorporated this design in the 1598 installment of the Architectura as Plate 67.
117 In fact, by composing the Annder Buch as a reimagined Extraordario libro, Dietterlin even modeled how authors might emulate extant ornament literature in new treatises.
118 “In gleichem will ich auch den Leser, und menniglichen so sich dieser meiner Arbeit gebrauchen, unnd velliecht in diesen theil an etlichen orten, daß ich bey dieser jeß vorgegebnen Regul nit blieben were, enderung befinden, unnd daher irgand ursach zu tadeln finden würde, freundlich erinnert haben, das, wa er solches befinde, daß er unbeschwerdt in dem ersten theyl nachzuschlagen sein wolte…” Dietterlin, Annder Buch, under, “Kurtzer und einfältiger Underricht zu außtheylung der Portalen und Thürgestöllen”. 159
With this entreaty, Dietterlin indicates that knowledge of the Erst Buch’s instructions equips audiences to amend the Annder Buch’s indecorous forms. He also outlines why it is sometimes appropriate for architects (and figural artists) to depart from the rules of architectural decorum. “Rationes,” in the later sixteenth century, could describe either decorous ratios or sound reasoning. Dietterlin’s use of rationes here engages the then-common idea that designers familiar with the principles of architectural decorum possess the good judgment to stray from those guidelines without going too far. Serlio had argued that “…the liberty of the architect lies in the diminishing or enhancing of parts, whereby he proves his judgment, particularly in his selection of parts…” And Ryff had even written that “…for the experienced architect, [I] lay down no particular objective or rule. As long as he has a good grasp of [my] teachings, he may follow his own judgment.” The cases for architectural license developed in these texts justify Dietterlin’s unruly works. They allow the author to suggest that because his Erst Buch explains good architectural design, its sequels are free to depict architecturally indecorous works.

Interestingly, the Latin term “rationes” occurs only in the Annder Buch, and not the Latin text of the Liber II. Proportion and reason were a central dyad of Renaissance architectural culture. For a foundational account of the relationships between the mathematical ratio or proportion and reason in Renaissance architectural culture, see Rudolf Wittkower, Architectural Principles in the Age of Humanism. Studies of the Warburg Institute 19 (London: Warburg Institute, University of London, 1949).

“Hora qui acáto se dimostrano n figura le sopra dette cornici con li membri suouli quali saran fatti achor d’altra maniera a liberta de l’Architetto, secondo li sugietti, & con quel’dimininur e accrescere di membri…vsando sempre vna certa discretionne, & giudicio in far eletzione di que membrì, che nelle opera habbiamo à tornare più belli a gli occhi” Sebastiano Serlio, IL SECONDO LIBRO DI PERSPESTITA / LE SECONDE LIVRE DE PERSPECTIVE (Paris: Jean Barbé, 1545), Princeton, NJ, Marquand Library of Art and Archaeology, Princeton University, NA2510.S45q, fol. 59v.

“…dem erfarnen Architett, kein gewises zil noch regel gesetzt, sonder so er diser vnser vnterrichtung guten verstand hat, mag er…nach seinem verstand abtheilen” Walther Hermann Ryff, Der furnembsten, notwendigsten, der gantzen Architectur angehörigen Mathematischen und Mechanischen künst, eygentlicher bericht, und vast klare, verständliche vnterrichtung, zu rechtem verstandt der lehr Vitruuij, in dryv furnene Bücher abgetheilet… (Nuremberg: Johan Petreius, 1547), Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Rar. 612, I,4, fol. XLIXv.
Dietterlin exercises his right to architectural license by forming the *Annder Buch*’s images through alternative modes of architectural composition—specifically, techniques of reversal and folding. The artist had experimented with the generative capacities of reversal and folding already in formulating the images of his first treatise. One sheet shows the sole surviving design for the *Erst Buch*’s etched synopsis of the Ionic Order [Figs. 18 and 19].\(^{123}\) Strangely, the *Ionica* draft is oriented in the same direction as the print. While one might expect that it represents a copy after the completed etching, the drawing bears the signal traits of a working draft. It is executed on two panels in Dietterlin’s dynamic quill-strokes and washes. Indentations in the drawing indicate that Dietterlin traced the drawing’s main contours from the recto side of the sheet. Such marks often appear in drawings that have been used to make traced counterproofs. To create a traced counterproof, the artist covers the design with a sheet of paper, traces the drawing’s lines, and then coats the resulting ridges in the cover sheet with particulate pigment. The powdered design is then rubbed to another surface to transfer the image.\(^{124}\) Dietterlin must have made a traced counterproof from the present *Ionica* drawing and used it to render the design in the etching plate. This reversed the direction of the counterproof design, so that the *Ionica* print shares the orientation of the surviving drawing.

By creating a counterproof substitute for the *Ionica* drawing, Dietterlin saved his first invention from the destructive effects of tracing the design to the plate. Yet it appears that the lost *Ionica* counterproof also served another role. Unlike the *Ionica* drawing, the etching shows a dotted column annotated with the ratios proper to its Order. The plan of the Ionic capital at the top of the print displays greater detail than the same figure in the existing drawing, where an alternative capital is also shown. Both embellishments in the print are more extensive than any

\(^{123}\) This plate reappeared in the 1594 installment of the *Architectura* as Plate 13 and in the 1598 installment as Plate 95.

addition that Dietterlin is known to have improvised when transposing his *Architectura* drawings to the etching plate. The draftsman evidently used the lost *Ionica* counterproof to elaborate the design.

A drawing preparatory for the *Erst Buch*’s synopsis of the Corinthian Order is also oriented in the same way as its related etching [Figs. 20 and 21]. Like the *Ionica* drawing, the *Corinthia* draft is a preparatory work: Dietterlin’s graphite plot lines and compass marks are still visible in the design’s rightmost column and above the entablature, where crenellation and a corbel not included in the final print can also be seen. These traits indicate that the drawing also produced a reverse copy that served as the model for the print. The sheet’s water spots, unique among the *Architectura* drawings, suggest that Dietterlin pressed the surviving drawing to a moist sheet to deposit pigment from the original design on the wet paper, a technique known as “offsetting”. *Corinthia* and *Ionica* are the only *Architectura* preparatory drawings that record, albeit indirectly, Dietterlin creating a counterproof on a separate sheet. His apparent use of different techniques to devise each counterproof indicates the experimental nature of the endeavor.

Why make counterproofs of these designs? By using counterproofs to form the *Ionica* and *Corinthia* etchings, Dietterlin ensured that the original drawings would share the orientation of the etched compositions. His students could subsequently compare the drafts with the related “printed architectural drawing” to assess the development of the designs, unimpeded by the distortions of the mirror effect that normally distinguishes the *Architectura* drawings from their related prints. For copyists, a drafted and an etched composition with the same orientation can also illustrate, without the distraction of reversal, the subtle differences between drawing after a drawing and drawing the same design after a print. These models for practicing Dietterlin’s

---

125 This etched design reappeared as Plate 19 of the 1594 installment of the *Architectura* and as Plate 136 in the 1598 installment.
methods of architectural composition inspired further ornamental inventions. One of the master’s followers modified *Corinthia* by eliminating its personification and adding a spiral column [Fig. 22]. By *negating* the reversals of the etching process *vis-à-vis* the counterproof, Dietterlin created a didactic device capable of generating far more designs than he alone could yield.

Dietterlin used the *Annder Buch* drawings to probe the creative aptitudes of folding. Folding—a procedure common among sixteenth-century draftsmen of all stripes—could conceal, double, or reverse drafted images and multiply the sheet’s fields for drawing, and thereby suggested alternative approaches to design. Dietterlin employed the fold to explore the mark-making and invention-hastening potential of paper’s variable surface structure. Most of the drawings for the *Annder Buch* exhibit traces of a fold-based counterproof technique used during the sixteenth century almost exclusively to render symmetrical, ornamental schemes. The least-developed draft for Plate 21 of the *Annder Buch* shows how the artist drew the elevation of half a Doric triumphal arch in graphite on one side of the sheet, and then folded the paper vertically to transfer the graphite in a counterproof reflection of the original design [Fig. 23]. Dietterlin next added alternate schemes in chalk, ink, and wash to each side, elaborating the right half of the composition farther.

To maintain the proportions of an architectural design in the process of creating this symmetrical framework, the artist had to take care to draft exactly half of the composition, to execute the fold precisely where the design terminates, and to fold at an angle exactly parallel to the work’s vertical lines and perpendicular to its horizontal contours. His efforts were not entirely successful. The horizontal components of the earliest known design for Plate 21, for instance,
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126 Dietterlin’s experiments with this counterproof method occur in the drawing campaign(s) for the 1594 and 1598 *Architectura* releases.
127 Gustav Pauli suggested that Dietterlin accomplished this by wetting the verso side of the sheet, folding it, and passing it through a press. See Pauli, “Die Originalzeichnungen Wendel Dietterlins,” 282.
turn up slightly as they extend to the outer edges of the design, somewhat distorting the otherwise regular dimensions of the arch. The strategy of doubling a drafted architectural elevation by folding the sheet to transfer the pigment does not lend itself to rigorously decorous architectural composition. Because the technique tends to distort the proportions of a design, it was problematic both for architects who used the numerical methods for constructing the Orders described in contemporary Italian literature, and for those who employed the older geometrical techniques described in Dietterlin’s treatise. Admittedly, the problem did not necessarily bother architects. “The diminishing or enhancing of parts”—that is, the adjustment of a design’s measurements and proportions—was precisely the aspect of architectural composition that Serlio allowed experienced architects to sometimes ignore. In employing the folded counterproof method, Dietterlin takes this orientation for granted. The frequent lack of correspondence between his Annder Buch designs and the instructions for correctly devising the Orders enumerated in the Erst Buch communicate to readers that adherence to decorous standards of measurement need not define their architectural designs.

Although the folded counterproof technique did not prove a useful tool for decorous architectural composition, it did boast many advantages for those who were not principally interested in devising precisely measured architectural designs. The technique was a commonplace of ornament drawing for figural artists, because it allowed them to swiftly multiply partial elevations to yield a symmetrical work. This saved time and materials, and created a reverse copy of the original scheme with greater precision than freehand drafting could.128 Folded counterproofs were often employed by metalworkers to devise cups, vases, and other vessels.129 A related technique, which involves pricking a folded sheet along the contours of a drawing so

that a pierced reflection emerges on the unfolded sheet, was used by artists such as Leonardo da Vinci for ornament and perspective designs, and explained in texts on ceramics, embroidery, and painting.\textsuperscript{130} Printmakers like Dietterlin made folded counterproofs more rarely, typically to invent decorative and architectural schemes.\textsuperscript{131} This type of drawing produced a compositional inversion similar to the one that resulted when a design was transferred from an inked print matrix to a printed surface. It was therefore useful for predicting how a drafted design would appear in print. Dietterlin evidently appreciated the folded counterproof’s time-saving properties and aptitude for projecting the appearance of the print that would emerge from the drawn forms, for he utilized the technique to create nearly all of the \textit{Architectura}’s roughly symmetrical images. By employing a drafting method used to devise decorative schemes for various media, the artist investigated how a form of ornament composition familiar to diverse figural artists might replace the decorous mode of architectural design described in the \textit{Erst Buch}.

In an age when authors scorned drawings copied through mechanical interventions, the folded counterproof invited criticism.\textsuperscript{132} It has been suggested that artists like Dietterlin reworked folded counterproofs with additional designs to enliven the works’ repetitive appearances and obscure their origins in mechanical drawing procedures.\textsuperscript{133} Yet it is not clear that the folded counterproof actually embodied a deficit of invention. Unlike other types of counterproof, these designs combine the image of a type and an antitype on a single page. The additions that Dietterlin made to his folded counterproof schemes show that the artist took the folded counterproof’s distinctive mix of model and mirror image as a source of inspiration. The second

\textsuperscript{130} Bambach, \textit{Drawing and Painting in the Italian Renaissance Workshop}, 168- 172.
\textsuperscript{132} On the criticism of mechanical copying practices for drawing in the early modern period, see Bambach, \textit{Drawing and Painting in the Italian Renaissance Workshop}, 127-136.
\textsuperscript{133} Fuhring, \textit{Design into Art}, 15.
design for Plate 21 exhibits a counterproof chalk underdrawing partially gone over and embellished with the quill [Fig. 24]. Dietterlin used black and brown ink to give each of the doubled chalk elements alternate ends. A shield and batons on one side of the monument appears on the other side as an armored breastplate. The chalk cannon over the breastplate is reflected in ink in a higher position on the other side of the arch. While the arch’s right half is rendered as a frontal elevation, the left incorporates orthogonals that cast the arch in perspective. Inversions in the ink embellishments likewise indicate that the artist drew ideas for developing his folded counterproofs from their compositional reversals. Dietterlin elaborates one side of the arch with a cannon-formed column, and the other with upturned variations of the cannon post. He ultimately eliminated this detail in the print, having settled on upright cannons as the proper motif.134

In *The Sense of Order*, Ernst Gombrich wrote that, “pattern-making in its most general form may be characterized as an ordering of elements by identity and difference.”135 The conjunction of type and antitype in the folded counterproof performs such an ordering of identity and difference, and thus acts as a potent matrix for generating ornament. By embodying the mirror effect in a single composition, it confronts viewers with a pictorial transformation that inspires further metamorphoses, and gives rise to new ideas for design. The additions that Dietterlin made to the folded counterproof framework in the drawing for Plate 21 indicate how that the transformative potential of compositional reversal inspired novel ornamental schemes.136 The folded counterproof’s idiosyncratic structure made that form of drawing both more convenient

134 Dietterlin reincorporated this etching in the 1598 installment of the *Architectura* as Plate 73.
and more productive than the conventional, decorous architectural drafting techniques promoted in the *Erst Buch*. If it was not always necessary to “cleave to the given rules” in devising architectural ornament, this mode of architectural composition—which was already familiar to diverse figural artists—represented an excellent alternative.

**The 1598 *Architectura*: LIBERTAS**

Dietterlin released the final installment of the *Architectura* project in 1598.137 The German *ARCHITECTVRA von Außtheilung, Symmetria und Proportion der Fünff Seulen* appeared first, followed in the same year by a bilingual, Latin/French translation.138 The work combines the technical text—including the *Erst Buch*’s instructions for decorous architectural composition—and every etching from both the *Erst*- and the *Annder Buch* with a new introduction, dedication, and ninety-six previously unpublished prints.139 Dietterlin again distributes this material over a quintet of Order-themed “books”. Repeating material from the *Erst Buch*, each proceeds from the history of one of the five Orders and instructions for drafting its forms to models of its basic ornaments. Next come images of works that the *Erst Buch* had promised that the finished

---

137 The 1598 treatise is the basis for the project’s three reprints, as well as most interpretations in the critical and historical literature.


139 The title page designs that introduced the five books repeated the title page compositions for the *Erst Buch* and *Annder Buch*, while the whole work received a new title page. With each edition, the *Architectura* prints received new plate numbers. Although this summative installment of the project ends with a plate numbered 209, the finished work in fact encompasses only one hundred and ninety-eight distinct designs. See Irmscher, *Kölner Architektur- und Säulenbücher*, 54-55.
*Architectura* would contain: recycled images of the *Annder Buch*'s doors and epitaphs, as well as new prints that feature windows, fireplaces, fountains, cenotaphs, and other ornaments.

In 1561, Jacques I. Androuet Du Cerceau had published a sequel to his 1559 *Livre d’Architecture*, the *Second Livre d’Architecture*, that likewise shows models for fireplaces, doors, fountains, wells, and sarcophagi [Fig. 25]. These furnishings could adorn the houses illustrated in the previous volume.\(^{140}\) Authors from Alberti to Giorgio Vasari had also addressed such objects as examples of architecture on a small scale—works that came to be known as *Kleinarchitektur*.\(^{141}\) Yet no author before Du Cerceau had made *Kleinarchitektur* the centerpiece of a treatise. As rhetorical flourishes for the homes pictured in the *Livre d’Architecture*, the ornaments and small monuments illustrated in the *Second Livre* display a degree of architectural license akin to that of

---


the portals depicted in Serlio’s *Extraordinario libro*, Du Cerceau’s book instills no doctrine of architectural decorum.

The types of works that Dietterlin added to the 1598 *Architectura* reflect the repertoire of projects covered in the *Second Livre*, and many of its designs are also based on the 1561 book’s models. Dietterlin’s text nevertheless delves more profoundly into the theoretical questions raised by *Kleinarchitektur* and the architectural object or image. Both Du Cerceau’s cenotaphs and Dietterlin’s ship-formed *nef* [Fig. 26] qualify as free-standing, sculpture, but whereas the sarcophagi are comprised of weights and supports that would be plausible in built architecture, the *nef* is borne only by sea monsters and an anchor. Dietterlin’s *Architectura* thus classifies objects that lack a conventional architectonic framework as architectural ornament. Works illustrated in the 1598 *Architectura* also trade the functions of the figural media for those of architecture, and vice versa: vases and urns carry entablatures, and the *nef*, whose delicate forms suggest the fine maneuvers of metalwork, poses as a stone sarcophagus. Many 1598 etchings depict syntheses of architecture and the figural visual arts as well. Figures in the façade design of Plate 147 emerge from a painted architectural perspective [Fig. 27]. Their bodies mingle with the architectural sculpture that surrounds the composition, suggesting the physical conjunction of painting, sculpture, and architecture. Its etched architectural sculpture can also read as painted ornament. Dietterlin’s print thus shows how architecture and painting might join physically in the form of a

---

144 Irmscher, *Kölner Architektur- und Säulenbücher*, 55.
multimedia composition, or combine notionally in the form of fictive architecture. Most of these conceits were largely foreign to the illustrations of sixteenth-century architectural treatises. By deducing his 1598 *Architectura* to architectonic objects as well as works that variously merge the forms and functions of architecture with those of the figural arts, Dietterlin redefined the scope of architectural literature.

Also unlike Du Cerceau, the author of the *Architectura* grounds his augmented vision of architecture in prevailing theories of architectural decorum. Dietterlin does this by representing the *Kleinarchitektur*, small objects, and other compositions pictured in the 1598 prints as manifestations of the canonical Orders of architecture.146 “The five columns,” he explains, not only boast “…accessories such as windows, fireplaces, doorways, [and] portals,” but also “…fountains and epitaphs (which spring from a foundation [of the five Orders], and which, like this basis…should accord with the [building] and the appearance of its ornaments).”147 The Orders might give rise to ornament in any medium, and the “accessories” of architecture, in whatever medium they occur, must in turn display an Order.148 With this theory, the 1598 *Architectura* transformed the five architectural Orders into five universal Orders of ornament. In

---

146 Pirr, *Die Architcutra*, 27.
148 The treatise reinforces Dietterlin’s theory with Tuscan, Doric, Ionic, Corinthian and Composite books that progress from images of their Order’s basic ornaments to models for paintings and freestanding sculpture. Pirr, *Die Architcutra*, 135
showing how the Orders can produce works in any material or medium, Dietterlin radically expanded his era’s prevailing theory of architectural ornament design.

The *Architectura*’s vision of objects as manifestations of the Orders had strange implications for the material logic of architectural decorum. Architectural theorists in sixteenth-century northern Europe regarded the column as an Order’s signal feature, and the formal unit by which the correctness of an architectural project could be measured. It was the column that articulated the tectonic relationships between architectural masses, communicating a structure’s relative solidity and ensuring that its form decorously conveyed its functions.149 Dietterlin himself calls architecture the “art of the five columns,” and frames his lessons on decorous architectural drafting as instructions for devising well-proportioned columns.150 But with designs like the *nef*, he also asserts that objects, which often lack columns, can embody an Order through alternative means—specifically, their iconography. For instance, the *nef*’s crow’s nest [Fig. 26] adopts the basket form that Dietterlin and many other Vitruvian writers claimed to have inspired the capital of the Corinthian Order, which is the Order of *Architectura* section in which this object occurs.151 Nearly all the designs pictured in Dietterlin’s treatises symbolically reflect the character of their Order as described in the text.152 The grotesques in the Composite plinths pictured in Plate 38 of the *Erst Buch* [Fig. 4] embody the Composite Order’s stereotypically fantastic nature.

149 On the emergence of the autonomous column as the benchmark of an Order’s proportions in early modern German architectural culture, see Forssman, *Säule und Ornament*, 76-78.
152 Forssman, *Säule und Ornament*, 162.
with the curling coif featured in an Ionic base in Plate 14 of the same work [Fig. 14] figures the female form often said to have inspired the ornaments of her Order.

Dietterlin’s picture of the Orders as ornamental manners that could manifest in media besides architecture found an enthusiastic reception in period literature. In 1602, Prague woodcarver and Imperial servant Gabriel Krammer published an ornament book under the title of *SCHWEIFF BVECHLEIN*, or “small book of Schweyffwerk”, filled with the flourish-formed motifs for which the work was named. Although no design pictured in the book bears any necessary relationship to architecture, the author labels most of its plates with the name of one of the five Orders [Fig. 28]. As if to emphasize the fact that the *SCHWEIFF BVECHLEIN*’s target audience did not consist principally of architects, Krammer also included in the work pictorial lessons on perspectival construction. A 1612 edition of the book now in a private collection even contains an introduction that addresses the book to “Goldsmiths, painters, stone carvers, woodworkers, embroiderers, and all whom use the compass and ruler.” By elaborating a paradigm for expressing the symbolism of the architectural Orders through non-architectonic motifs, Dietterlin and authors like Krammer gave figural artists a means to employ decorous architectural rhetoric without columns or other conventional architectural forms.

Other aspects of Dietterlin’s *nef* design explore the additional ways in which a freestanding, architectonic object might depart from the norms of architectural decorum. The

---

153 Gabriel Krammer, *SCHWEIFF BVECHLEIN. Manicherlei Schweiff, Laubwerk, RolwerK, perspectiv vnd sonderliche gezijden, zu vilerhand arbit auf dis vorgehende ARCHITECTVR büchlein gerichtet.* (Prague: Gabriel Krammer, 1602), Zurich, Zentralbibliothek Zürich, Alte Drucke, Res 310. Based on the bibliographic literature of the seventeenth century, Irmscher concludes that an edition of the *SCHWEIFF BVECHLEIN* was likely printed in Frankfurt am Main in 1600. A number of the plates included in the 1602 edition, the earliest version of the book for which known examples survive, are dated 1600 and 1601. See Irmscher, *Kölner Architecktur- und Säulenbücher*, 151.

nef’s precarious base indicates that architectural objects need not display sound tectonic relationships, the expression of which was a major premise of the rules of correct architectural composition for Dietterlin’s age. The work’s resemblance to both stone and metal suggests that this principle pertains regardless of the material employed—a key insight for woodcarvers, metalworkers, and other figural artists who wondered if the right to ignore the protocols of architectural decorum hinged on working in materials not used in building.

By minimizing the role of tectonic conventions in the design of Kleinarchitektur and objects, Dietterlin diminished the importance of composing such works with architecturally decorous proportions. This freed his audiences to employ other design strategies. Many of Dietterlin’s 1598 etchings guide readers in reenacting the alternative modes of architectural composition that the artist had probed in drafting the illustrations for the various installments of the Architectura. The cut-and-paste method he employed to devise numerous Erst Buch images is reflected in the 1598 treatise’s interactive prints. Interactive and sculptural prints, which depict parts that the viewer might physically remove and reconfigure in two and three dimensions, had been used for decades as paper instruments, multilayered anatomical models, and as erotic and devotional objects.155 Dietterlin’s 1598 Architectura brought the sculptural print to the genre of the architectural treatise. Plate 79 depicts a well crowned with a pedestal and labeled with the sign of Venus [Fig. 29]. The mark reappears at the feet of a statue of Christ set on a nearby wall. Cutting the figure from his perch and placing him atop the fountain so that the two Venus symbols align

---

produces a new design. A copy of the 1598 *Architectura* in Wolfenbüttel contains etchings that have been reconfigured in this way [Fig. 30]. Dietterlin’s interactive prints evidently moved readers to construct works in a manner similar to the cut-and-paste method he had used to “build” the *Erst Buch* drawings.

The evolution of the two-plate altarpiece design depicted in Plates 204 and 205 of the 1598 text shows how Dietterlin also found a way for his final book to represent the creative operations involved in the folded counterproof technique. As in many *Annder Buch* drawings, the artist formed an early design for this work by drafting a partial elevation, folding and doubling the scheme as a counterproof, and variously embellishing both sides [Fig. 31]. To the left of the work’s central Crucifixion group, he added St. Odilia, St. Paul, and a bishop saint. To the right, he drew Mary Magdalene, and Saints John the Evangelist, Barbara, Ambrosius, and Martin. Nevertheless, the etching shows only the left three-quarters of the altarpiece, with the central Crucifixion scene changed to an Adoration of the Magi [Figs. 32a & b]. By eliminating one quarter of the drafted composition in the print, Dietterlin created a partial elevation that resembles the initial framework of his folded counterproof schemes. The altarpiece’s seemingly incomplete state invites the viewer to “finish” the design. Ornaments to the left of its axis of symmetry establish the shape that such embellishments should assume. Motifs to the right outline

---

156 Dietterlin, *ARCHITEKTUR A von Außtheilung*, Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, A: 10.4.1 Geom. 2’, pp. 153 & 165 [pages are numbered by former owner; images listed respectively correspond to Plate 79 and Plate 122 of normative copies of this edition].

157 Heinrich Geissler first attributed this drawing to Dietterlin and identified its subjects, but hypothesized that the work represents a design for an actual altarpiece, rather than a print in the *Architectura*. The drawing’s strong resemblance to the composition in Plates 204 and 205 indicate that while the drawing may well have served as a model for an altarpiece, it is undoubtedly a design for the *Architectura*. See Heinrich Geissler, *Zeichnung in Deutschland. Deutsche Zeichner, 1540-1640*. Catalogue of the exhibition of the same name, Stuttgart, Staatsgalerie Stuttgart, December 19, 1979-February 17, 1980 (Stuttgart: Staatsgalerie Stuttgart, 1979-1980), 2:32, no. H6. Another drawing for Plate 204 is held in the Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 158. It is discussed in Appendix IV DR.161.
a framework for the viewer’s elaborations, and show ways to modify the models on the left. In
mentally or physically completing the altarpiece, readers mime the inventive procedures that
Dietterlin used to adorn his folded counterproof drawings. Those familiar with the folded,
reworked counterproof drawing could recognize that Plates 204 and 205 evoke a form of
ornament composition common to all media. The image thus presents a mode of architectural
ornament design that figural artists might use in place of the decorous method described in the
Erst Buch.

One façade design in the final Architectura elaborates on the case for architectural license
that Dietterlin set forth in the Annunder Buch [Fig. 33]. The work depicts a woman striding from a
console inscribed “LIBERTAS,” trampling broken chains. Emblems of disorder surround her. A
rooster triumphs over a cat, a boar bears a hunting spear, a bird flees its cage, and a mismatched
couple embraces.158 Dietterlin likens this irreverent figural imagery to licentious architectural
ornament by framing the vignettes in an architecturally indecorous structure. A broken pediment
mounts the center of the window, buttressed only by a floating console. A term poised on the tip
of a vessel absurdly supports an entablature. These tectonically impossible configurations expose
the design as a model for a painted façade, and thus identify the image as an allegory of the

158 This type of “world upside down” imagery abounded in the figural arts of early modern
northern Europe, and was used to variously challenge and reinforce contemporary mores. See
Hanns Swarzenski, “The Battle between Carnival and Lent,” Bulletin of the Museum of Fine Arts 49,
no. 275 (February 1951): 2-11; C. G. Stridbeck, “Combat between Carnival and Lent” by Pieter
Bruegel the Elder: An Allegorical Picture of the Sixteenth Century,” Journal of the Warburg and
Courtauld Institutes 19, no. 1/2 (January–June 1956): 96-109; Dietz-Rüdiger Moser, Fastnacht-
Fasching-Karneval. Das Fest der “Verkehrten Welt” (Graz: Kaleidoskop, 1986); Keith Moxey,
“Hieronymus Bosch and the World Upside Down: The Case of The Garden of Earthly
Delights,” in Visual Culture: Images and Interpretations, ed. Norman Bryson, Michael Ann Holly, and
Keith Moxey (Hanover and London: Wesleyan University Press, 1994), 104-40; Moxey, “The
in the Reformation (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), 101-126; and Wilhelm Fraenger,
Das Bild der “niederländischen Sprichwörter”. Pieter Bruegel’s verkehrte Welt (Amsterdam: Wallstein
Verlag, 2002).
architectural liberties permitted to the figural arts. The work’s outlandish structure drives home why the figural arts enjoy such latitude: their material conditions differ fundamentally from those that govern building. By virtue of their distinct materiality, the figural arts can produce forms prohibited by brick-and-mortar architecture. Working materials, it seems, still sometimes mattered when it came to defining artistic expertise.

Dietterlin’s Architectura promotes decorum in all architectural design, but with certain priorities and caveats. The author condemns the mingling of the canonical architectural modes, scorning artists who, “…with wonderful and profound confusion and the mixing of different manners and genera of the five columns and the decorations proper to them, counterfeit and use their own new manners.”159 Yet he does not reprimand architects who create ill-proportioned works, or those who apply good judgment in straying from the rules. Similar values undergird Dietterlin’s picture of the partial authority of architectural decorum in the figural arts. His Architectura etchings argue that protocols of architectural decorum based on the conventions of building tectonics ultimately bear little relevance for arts besides architecture. However, the stylistic and symbolic dimensions of architectural decorum—principles that concern the communication of a work’s function and status—pertain to all materials and media. The prints outline many cases in which artists might create an architectural image or object with indecorous proportions, but assert that designs must engage their specific Order’s characteristic mood and iconography.

In drafting the images of the Architectura, Dietterlin used the material basis for decorative design in all media, ornament drawing, to research and define the rules of architectural decorum.

159 “Auch ein jeder ihme selbs nach seinem gut beduncken mit Wunderbarlicher und Vöelstendiger Confusion und vermischung der underschidnen Manier und Arten der fünff Seul, uñ jeder der selbigen zugehörigen verzierung ein newe Manier fingiert und braucht hat.” Dietterlin, Erst Buch, under, “Ein kurtzer bericht, an den Leser”.
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for the figural arts. Traces of these drafting experiments in the *Architectura* prints communicate what medium-specific circumstances—variables such as materials, form, and modes of representation—shape the roles of architectural decorum in the various figural arts. The prints also invite figural artists to practice less conventional modes of architectural composition, and suggest ways to obscure the signs of these tactics in works that do not, in Dietterlin’s words, “cleave to the given rules.” The author’s vision of the Orders as a system for design that might pertain to any ornament in any medium meanwhile revises the very category of architectural decorum, and thereby forges a new relationship between architecture and the other visual arts.

When the officials of Strasbourg’s artists’ guild dismissed the stonemasons’ 1547 lawsuit against the façade painters with the remark that painted architectural ornament was beyond the plaintiffs’ knowledge, they treated architectural decorum in the figural arts as a matter of artistic expertise. Dietterlin’s multifaceted engagement with the question of what authority architectural decorum exercises in the figural arts involved the same stakes. By inventing a universal theory of ornament design, his *Architectura* redefined the expertise of architects and figural artists alike.
Chapter III.
Gerissen and Geetz: Dietterlin and the Protean Art of Etching

In the introduction to his *PERSPECTIVÆ. Corporum Regularium.* of 1568, author Wenzel Jamnitzer made an unusual confession. Wishing to publish the work as swiftly as possible, he had scrapped his original plan to print its images “in copper” himself, hiring his Nuremberg colleague Jost Amman to perform the task instead.\(^1\) Evidently anxious about the compromise and the perceived quality of the book’s illustrations, Jamnitzer implores the reader that

…if perhaps in the striations of my work (which I first devised with my own heavy hand, and then had the artful Jost Amman of Zurich draw in copper) a line has gone awry, that you…believe the best, and assess it not as a lack of art, but [as a result] of my age and the haste that the work demanded, for all of [my] age are somewhat confused, and might overlook something…  \(^2\)

Close inspection of the *Perspectiva’s* fantastic, grotesque title page shows that its contours indeed lack exactitude [Fig. 1]. The outlines of its rollwork forms grow inexplicably darker in passages. Elsewhere, they appear to bleed into the fibers of the paper. Yet if the lines that Amman rendered on the designer’s behalf appear erratic, the effect does not so much arise from Jamnitzer’s unsteady hand, as from the volatile nature of the medium in which they are

---


printed. Tighter scrutiny of the fuzzy contours that comprise the title page and the book’s one hundred and twenty geometric forms reveals that these untamed striations register the unruly chemical reactions of etching.

This quick and capricious form of printmaking was an unusual choice of medium for Jamnitzer’s project, and not only because few German books had been illustrated with etching up to that point. With reference to Plato’s *Timaeus*, Euclid’s *Elements*, and the five elements that comprise all matter, the *Perspectiva* clarifies the precise art of rendering Platonic solids in space. Its polyhedra could also model intarsia schemes or amusing *Kunstkammer* sculptures, and its grotesque title pages might serve as designs for painting and metalwork, the author’s own vocation.

---


5 On Jamnitzer’s work as a goldsmith, see Gerhard Bott, ed., *Wenzel Jamnitzer und die Nürnberger Golschmiedekunst 1500-1700. Golschmiedearbeiten-Entwürfe, Modelle, Medaillen, Ornamentsiche, Schmuck, Porträts*. Catalogue of the exhibition of the same name, Nuremberg,
An art treatise and ornament model book project of this nature demanded a particular form. The advent of the printed image in Europe had consolidated specific modes of visual literacy, shaping how audiences perceived the graphic representation of ideas such as the perspectival principles explored in Jamnitzer’s work. The rise of the mechanically reproducible image also formed visual conventions for communicating such information. Early modern printmakers adhered to certain stylistic norms to assert the authority and efficacy of their works as sources of knowledge. Jamnitzer’s contemporaries used woodcut and engraving to cultivate a spare, linear manner for rendering perspective models, and a similarly clean style to illustrate subjects like geometrical and architectural ornament, thereby creating lucid, easily copied forms. If the usefulness of models for perspective lay in their apparent technical accuracy, and the appeal of model ornaments in their clarity of detail, the nebulous quality of the etched line undermined the Perspectiva’s main functions. Since a


book’s authority to convey artistic knowledge was only as robust as the artistic mastery
displayed in its images, the uncontrolled look of Amman’s etched lines indeed threaten to
undermine Jamnitzer’s entire artistic undertaking.\(^\text{10}\)

Dietterlin took a similar gamble when he crafted the etchings of his *Architectura* some
three decades later. Although the text seeks to explain the proper proportions of the five
Orders, the pictorially vague nature of its etched lines does not lend itself to the precise
illustration of such bodies. And while the treatise poses as a compendium of model
ornaments, the diffuse qualities of its etchings’ contours complicate efforts to accurately
copy the designs. Dietterlin evidently perceived some kinship between Jamnitzer and
Amman’s confrontation with etching and his own experiments with this printmaking
 technique. The title page of the final, 1598 installment of the *Architectura* [Fig. 2] revives the
prominent lateral arabesques and vegetal ornament of the *Perspectiva*’s title page, motifs rarely
seen in the leading images of period architectural treatises. Yet while Jamnitzer and Amman
temper the rebellious qualities of etching by individually articulating each subject of their
print, Dietterlin embraces the medium’s liquid temperament, allowing the lines of his
treatise’s opening image to meld together in inky shadows.

Dietterlin lends his engagement with the etched contour a symbolic dimension by
adorning his WD monogram at the base of the page with a halo of wending curls. As
discussed in the Introduction, monograms were a vital marker of identity for sixteenth-

\(^{10}\) Rodney Palmer offers a useful overview of the copious recent literature to address the
authority of the image in illustrated art books. See Rodney Palmer, “Introduction,” in *The
Frangenberg (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2003), 1-22.
century German artists. Albrecht Dürer’s famed lawsuit against printmaker Marcantonio Raimondi pivoted on the fact that the Italian artist had copied his AD monogram, not his compositions. Even the many artists of the period who employed spurious AD monograms did so to articulate how their own art related to that of the Nuremberg master. In embellishing the letters of his name with wending lines that embody the idiosyncratic motions of his hand as it commands the etching stylus, Dietterlin likewise wielded his monogram as a symbol for his art. The gesture is significant for how we are to understand Dietterlin’s attitude toward etching. While Jamnitzer lamented his prints’ imperfections, Dietterlin made the deviant etched line an emblem for the extraordinary nature of his artistic enterprise. The contrast between Jamnitzer and Dietterlin’s respective takes on this printmaking technique thus raises the question: How did northern artists in the later sixteenth century perceive the medium of etching, particularly as a vehicle for representing ornament and for crafting art treatises?

Etching had long occupied a fraught position in the artistic culture of sixteenth-century northern Europe. In fact, its early history has been described as a “series of false

---

11 On the use of monograms as emblems of artistic identity in sixteenth-century German art, see Joseph Leo Koerner, The Moment of Self-Portraiture in German Renaissance Art (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993), 204-209.
The technique of printing from etched plates had emerged by 1500, appearing first in the German-speaking lands. Sixteenth-century etchers crafted their prints by covering a metal plate, usually copper, with an acid-resistant substance, and then drawing the design through the coating with a stylus. When the etcher subsequently bathed the plate in acid, areas exposed by the stylus corroded. The design drawn into the coating thus became a network of uniformly thick ink reservoirs with organic edges and blunt ends. Inked and pressed to paper, the etched plate deposited a reflection of the original design. As a detail from Plate 18 of Dietterlin’s first treatise demonstrates, the printed contours of etching resemble the blunt-ended, uniformly thick and fuzzy-edged lines of the plate’s ink reservoirs, and exude the unrehearsed quality of the stylus mark [Fig. 3].

Years before, a similar print technique had appeared in northern Europe. The printing of images engraved on copper plates first arose in Germany in the 1430s, and reached Italy during the later fifteenth century. Engravers create their prints by using a burin to carve a design into a copper plate, inking the resulting reservoirs, wiping the plate of excess pigment, and pressing it to a surface to deposit the ink in a mirror image of the carved


15 Landau and Parshall, The Renaissance Print, 323.


17 The etcher could increase the depth and thickness of these reservoirs by exposing the plate to acid for a longer time.


scheme. The incised lines of the engraving plate impart the printed, engraved contour with a sharp, sculpted look, a phenomenon clearly visible in this detail of Albrecht Dürer’s *Melencolia I*. [Fig. 4]. Carving a design into the engraving plate demands more force than it takes to draw through the acid-resistant coating of the etching plate, and tends to require more time. Because the engraver moves the burin away from the body when incising the plate, he also exerts less control over the quality of his contours than the etcher does. Engravings thus do not generally capture the same free play of line often displayed in etchings.

Engraving allowed early modern artists to create prints with a degree of linear subtlety unknown to the long familiar technique of woodblock printing. Around the turn of the sixteenth century, Strasbourg artist Martin Schongauer became one the first painters to treat engraving as an enterprise that might rival painting in aesthetic ambition. In intricate prints such as his detailed portrait of a filigreed censer [Fig. 5], the artist leveraged the graphic precision of the engraving medium to create naturalistic images of ornament that could function as autonomous artistic statements or serve as models for emulation by architects, sculptors and metalworkers. By the first decades of the sixteenth century, the artistic bravura of such engravings had cemented the medium’s place as the North’s favored

---

arena for formally enterprising printmaking projects. The degree of precision that engraving brought to the art of print also made it the preferred technique for printing decorative designs. Works like Schongauer’s Censer confronted Dietterlin with a formidable local tradition of ornament printmaking.

In his foundational history of the intaglio print, Arthur Hind contended that, “…the genius of etching is the very antithesis of the formality of line engraving.” Disparities between the two media certainly defined the roles that the younger intaglio technique of etching came to play in sixteenth-century northern Europe. Whereas engraving a plate demands significant force, coordination, and patience, etching stylus work requires little strength and can be performed quickly and fluidly. Correcting an engraved plate is virtually impossible, but the etcher can amend errors simply by covering unwanted stylus marks with additional plate coating and drafting the lines anew. Engraving’s time-consuming, complex, and unforgiving nature made it relatively inaccessible to all but practiced specialists during the early modern era. Etching also permitted detail work far richer than the xylographic print

24 Landau and Parshall, The Renaissance Print, 322.
25 See Alfred Lichtwark, Der Ornamentstich der deutschen Frührenaissance nach seinem sachlichen Inhalt (Strasbourg: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1888); and Peter Jessen, Der Ornamentstich (Berlin: Verlag für Kunstwissenschaft, 1920).
allowed, but was both easier to master and quicker to execute than woodcut or engraving. It therefore became the technique of choice for amateur printmakers.  

Despite these advantages, multiple factors long prevented etching from attaining the kind of esteem that engraving evidently enjoyed in early modern artistic culture—particularly, it seems, in the German-speaking lands. Etching’s blunt, nebulous forms were often inadequate to artists’ descriptive objectives. Its reputation as the métier of the amateur printmaker clashed with the elevated aesthetic and intellectual ambitions of works like Jamnitzer’s *Perspectiva* and indeed Dietterlin’s *Architectura*. Perhaps as a result of these factors, most German artists of the early sixteenth century—including Albrecht Dürer, Urs Graf, and Hans Burgkmair—produced no more than a few etchings before abandoning the technique.  

This situation did not endure. During the middle of the sixteenth century, etching became a popular medium for printing landscapes and attracted some collectors. By the end of the century, it had outstripped engraving as artists’ preferred medium for intaglio printmaking. Yet this did not necessarily earn the technique higher regard.

---


Prominent mid-century etchers such as Hanns Lautensack and Augustin Hirschvogel still tended to identify themselves with other artistic specialties, such as painting and mapmaking.\textsuperscript{32} And when sixteenth-century painters hired printmakers to reproduce their works, they generally employed engravers.\textsuperscript{33} Such patterns of artistic behavior suggest that Jamnitzer’s apology in the introduction to the \textit{Perspectiva} is motivated in part by lingering anxieties about etching’s artistic prestige.

Ornament printmakers like Jamntizer, Amman, and Dietterlin had much at stake in the perceived status of etching, for the technique was increasingly important for their trade. Ornamental imagery had been a major aspect of the etching oeuvres of medium pioneers such as Daniel Hopfer and Albrecht Altdorfer. In the second third of the sixteenth century, a waxing contingent of ornament specialists in France also embraced the technique. Ornament etching flourished at the court of Francis I at Fontainebleau during the 1540s.\textsuperscript{34} Antonio Fantuzzi, Jean Mignon, and the Master I♀ V used the technique to disseminate decorative schemes rapidly within the court atelier.\textsuperscript{35} By the second half of the sixteenth

\textsuperscript{32} Cole and Silver, “Fluid Boundaries,” 11.
\textsuperscript{33} Adam von Bartsch penned the foundational study on the phenomenon of reproductive engraving, introducing the modern idea that the print made by the inventor of the design is “preferable” to the print made by a printmaker after a professional painter by arguing, “L’estampe faite par un graveur d’apres le dessin d’un peintre, peut être parfaitement comparée à un e ouvrage traduit dans une langue différente de celle de l’auteur...les estampes gravée par les auteurs, c’est- à-dire, par les peintres mêmes, ont presque toujours l’avantage sur celles des graveurs, en ce qu’il ne peut s’y trouver rien qui soit contraire aux idées de l’inventeur.” Adam von Bartsch, \textit{Le peintre graveur}, vol. 1 (Vienna: J.V. Degen, 1802), iv. Given that the anxiety about the authorship of a print not produced by the inventor of the design reflects a modern interpretation of reproductive engraving, it is unlikely that Jamnitzner’s professed self-consciousness about the quality of the \textit{Perspectiva}’s etchings stems from the fact that he hired Amman to execute the prints.
\textsuperscript{34} The authoritative work on this phenomenon is Henri Zerner, \textit{Etching and Engraving at the School of Fontainebleau} (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1969).
\textsuperscript{35} On the circulation of printed designs at the court of Fontainebleau and from the court to the broader public, see Yves Metan, “Un graveur inconnu de l’École de Fontainebleau: Pierre
century, ornament etching had attracted a broader public, particularly in France. Hugues Sambin published his 1572 *Œuvre de la diversite des termes* with etched illustrations of three types of terms for each Order of architecture, and Joseph Boillot followed suit with an etched book of animal-formed terms, *Nouveaux pourtraitz et figures de termes...*, in 1592. Jacques I. Androuet Du Cerceau found an audience large enough justify creating around 1700 etched designs, and even edited these works in response to market trends. That this versatile printmaker etched the images for the model books of his *Livres d'architecture* series (1559, 1561, 1576-79) but engraved his more theoretical architecture treatises nevertheless suggests that etching retained its associations with the more informal milieu of the workshop well into Dietterlin’s lifetime.

Dietterlin first learned the art of etching and confronted the medium’s still-tenuous position during the final years of his career. His initial forays into etching show how the artist probed the technique’s expressive capacities and measured them against the qualities of engraving. In the illustrations of his *Architectura* project, Dietterlin sought to elevate esteem for the ornament etching and the etched ornament treatise. With one hundred and ninety-

---


eight different, full-page etched designs, the summative, 1598 edition of the treatise dwarfs most other etching series of the period in scale, and indeed counts among the earliest monumental projects in that medium. Since only a handful of prior books could match its quantity of etched illustrations, the work also represents as a milestone in the history of bibliographic art. Dietterlin used the abundance of designs he created for the *Architectura* project to probe etching’s expressive horizons. The diverse visual effects captured in the treatise’s illustrations demonstrate the artist’s technical mastery, but also testify to the formal malleability of his medium. In positioning his etched *Architectura* as a new benchmark for excellence in the art of printmaking, Dietterlin validated etching as the medium of choice for masterful ornament printmakers and art treatise authors.

**The Ape of Engraving?**

As the relatively accessible technique of etching gained a foothold in European printmaking, it altered the balance of power among artists. Sixteenth-century painters with little experience in printmaking had long hired artists trained in the rarefied art of engraving to reproduce their work, a practice that helped disseminate the inventor’s designs, bolstered his reputation, and generated income for designer and printmaker alike. Dietterlin recruited

---


40 For studies on the reproductive engraving in the Renaissance after von Bartsch, see the essays in Larry Silver and Timothy Riggs, eds., *Graven Images: The Rise of Professional Printmakers in Antwerp and Haarlem, 1540-1640*. Catalogue of the exhibition of the same name, Evanston, IL, Mary and Leigh Block Gallery, Northwestern University, May 6-June 27, 1993; Chapel Hill, NC, Ackland Art Museum, University of North Carolina, August 15-September 26, 1993 (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1993); Landau and Parshall, *The
his fellow Strasbourg artist Matthäus Greuter to create an engraving after his now-lost *Power of Venus* painting in 1587. Greuter also made an engraving after Dietterlin's lost *Ascent of Elijah*, likely a *sotto in su* ceiling painting, in 1589 [Fig. 6]. Joachim von Sandrart featured both the painting and the print in his biography of Dietterlin, noting that “…the manner in which [Dietterlin’s] Elias drives through the heavens with his fiery wagon is especially fantastical and praiseworthy[.] This [image] was also made in copper after his hand.”

Cologne engraver, art publisher and printer Johann Bussemacher acquired Greuter’s *Ascent of Elijah* plate at a later date, changing the inscription. Collaboration with Greuter meant that

---

41 Hollstein XII.213.

42 Early secondary literature indicates that Greuter also made an engraving after a painting by Dietterlin that represented *Fall of Phaeton*—supposedly a pendant to the *Ascent of Elijah*—in 1588. No example of the work is presently known. It has thus been concluded that the first cataloguers of Greuter’s prints misinterpreted the subject of the *Ascent of Elijah* as the *Fall of Phaeton*. See Friedrich W. H. Hollstein and Tilman Falk, *Hollstein’s German Engravings, Etchings and Woodcuts, Vol. XII* (Amsterdam: Menno Hertzberger, 1983), 158.


44 In an example of the first state of the engraving in Vienna’s Albertina Museum (HB 50(3) p. 20), the inscription on the plate reads: “Ignaeus Eliam raptat super allier a currus: / Santa pios, muridi postmala vita beat. / Wendlin Dieterlin inv / Matheus Greuter scul. et excu. / Argentine 1589 .” An example of the print’s second state in Frankfurt’s Städel Museum (N. 150004), by contrast, reads, “Ignaeus Eliam raptat super allier a currus: / Santa pios, muridi postmala vita beat. / Wendlin Dieterlin inv / Matheus Greuter Sculpit / Argentine 1589 . / Johan bussemacher imprimit.” Hollstein’s description of the inscription in the second state fails to note the disappearance of “et excu.” Hollstein also erroneously omits the line “Argentine 1589,” which remains in this later version. See Hollstein XII.4.
Dietterlin did not control the fate of his images, including how many were produced and sold, and who profited from the sale.

Etching’s accessibility to those not formally trained in printmaking made it an increasingly popular way for sixteenth-century artists who wished to disseminate their designs in print to establish autonomy from an engraver. Painters often turned to etching when their engraver collaborators were unavailable. Dietterlin’s move from Strasbourg to Stuttgart in 1590 in order to decorate the Great Hall of Duke Ludwig of Württemberg’s Neue Lusthaus evidently provided such an opportunity. The Fall of Man probably represents the artist’s first etching. The first, unsigned state displays the signature nebulosity of his other early etchings [Fig. 7]. The inscription “W Dietterlin jnv: 1590” in the second state lists the earliest year marked on any Dietterlin print, and indicates the latest point at which he could have learned to etch. The composition has not been connected to any known Dietterlin painting, but, given the low survival rate of his panels and wall compositions, this is perhaps not surprising. The Fall of Man could represent a reproductive print made after one of Dietterlin’s paintings, or even an original design. Either way, in taking up etching, Dietterlin consolidated control over the circulation of his inventions. No Greuter prints after Dietterlin

45 Cole and Silver, “Fluid Boundaries,” 11.
47 The first, unsigned state of the Fall of Man (British Museum 1884,0412.4.) is documented in Andresen II.8; and Hollstein VI.2.
48 The abbreviation jnv, for invent, indicates that the image represents one of Dietterlin’s own designs. It is unclear if the Fall of Man is a reproductive etching, for no record of a Dietterlin painting of this subject exists. Although it is described in Andresen II.7 and Hollstein VI.1, the author has not been able to locate an example of the second, signed state. The first, unsigned state, illustrated here, is described in Andresen II.8; Hollstein VI.2.
paintings postdate the *Fall of Man*. From 1590 on, only Dietterlin and his family members made prints after his original designs.50

Dietterlin used his etching debut to explore the formal possibilities and limits of the medium, and indeed to demonstrate his precocious talent for this unfamiliar printmaking technique.51 An impression of the *Fall of Man* in the British Museum records the artist’s mixed success with these experiments. Vertical striations across the base of the print that must derive from uneven inking or inconsistent wiping of the plate appear to mimic wispy grass, but ink splotches covering the mice in the foreground somewhat mar this interesting effect. Other interventions evidently seek to show etching’s superiority over engraving. Etching had been considered particularly apt at representing transparent form and luminescent effects since at least the time of Dürer.52 While Greuter rendered the clouds and light rays in the *Ascent of Elijah* as strangely solid bodies, Dietterlin sought to give *The Fall of Man*’s meteorological phenomena a more appropriately ethereal quality. Intersecting lines pour from the print’s upper edge, the negative space miming the glimmer of divine light.

---

50 The Berlin Kupferstichkabinett holds an undated print of Wendel Dietterlin the Elder and his son Hilarius Dietterlin’s painting, *The Truth Triumphant*, etched by Wendel the Elder’s grandson, Bartholomäus (Inv. Nr. 620-113). Bartholomäus Dietterlin also etched the *Allegory of the Salvation of Mankind by Christ*, a triptych designed by Wendel and painted by Hilarius. See Hollstein VI.3.


Though strangely solid closer to its source, the glow grows more transparent as it passes over the clouds. The edges of the clouds meanwhile succumb to the dark trace of “foul biting”, the product of dense hatching in the etching plate and slight overexposure to the acid bath. The ink’s unruly bleeding lends their otherwise solid forms liquid margins. Additional foul biting occurs in the composition’s upper right corner. There it appears to portray the space left behind by a fictive fold in the sheet. The conceit suggests that Dietterlin’s etching can alter the very constitution of the printed page.

While the forms of Dietterlin’s Fall of Man probe etching’s technical capacities, its subjects refer to the medium’s recent history. Dietterlin’s wild Eden resembles the etched visions of the primeval German forest produced by Danube school artists throughout the middle of the sixteenth century, such as the dark, untamed wood of Hanns Lautensack’s The Good Samaritan of 1566 [Fig. 8]. For sixteenth-century audiences, this Teutonic arcadia was a site of lust, heroic deeds, and contemplation, as well as a locus of inspiration and creative visions.53 Dietterlin’s use of woodland imagery thus cues the careful viewer to signs of the material transformations that the artist wrought with his etching tools.

Dietterlin allegorizes the process of etching in the Fall of Man’s three narrative vignettes. He begins with the earliest and most prominent episode, the Creation of Eve. Perched in a cloud-formed balcony, God the Father draws Eve from the sleeping Adam. Eve’s supernatural materialization and the tumult of the first couple’s surroundings impart the scene with a dream-like quality that reflects Adam’s own mental state. Here Dietterlin plays on the era’s many pictorial and literary representations of dreaming, particularly the

role of the somnolent condition in generating images. Diverse sixteenth-century artists, authorities on medicine, and natural philosophers regarded dreaming as a mental state relatively free from the constraints of everyday logic and therefore conducive to creative activity. They variously described the dreaming mind as fertile ground for receiving visions and devising images. As the recipient of the image of Eve and God’s vehicle for forging the design of the female anatomy, Dietterlin’s slumbering Adam resembles the intaglio printmaker’s impressionable plate. In removing Adam’s rib to form Eve, God leaves his body outwardly intact. This mode of incision bears a likeness to the cut of the etching stylus, which removes the plate coating but leaves the plate itself whole.

If the Creation of Eve represents the formation of the etched design through the incision of the plate’s coating, the Temptation of Adam in the middle ground refers to the next phase of the etching process. Just as the incised design exposes the etching plate to the

---


corrosive effects of the acid bath, Eve introduces Adam to the corruption of Original Sin. One consequence of the Fall of Man is, of course, the first couple’s emergence as sexually reproductive beings. The expulsion from the Garden portrayed in the background of the print thus symbolizes the moment when plate and design, united in the corruption of the acid bite, are sent out to multiply the etched image in the form of printed impressions.  

Many of the forms in Dietterlin’s first etching—the spring, the female nude standing beside a sleeping male nude, and the wild forest imagery—also appear in Hans Burgkmair’s first and only foray into this printmaking medium [Fig. 9]. Ashley D. West has keenly described how Burgkmair’s *Mercury, Venus, and Cupid* of circa 1520, derived from a plate made through an unusual forging of iron and copper, reads as another a raw essay in experimental etching.  

The design shows Mercury, personification of a prime substance of alchemy, projecting the image of Venus in a dream. By depicting the formation of an image through Mercury’s altered mental state, the print alludes to the artist’s alchemist-like power to transform nature. Alchemy was familiar territory for many early modern artisans, who often used alchemical principles to alter artistic materials and perfect their crafts. Since it involved the chemical transformation of form, early modern etching particularly resembled

---


58 Ibid. 392-395.

this art. The alchemical imagery in *Mercury, Venus, and Cupid* thus presents an apt metaphor for Burgkmair’s manipulation of the etching plate.\(^6^0\)

Dietterlin’s *Fall of Man* builds on Burgkmair’s allegory of the parallels between etching and alchemy by giving the visual rhetoric of alchemy a biblical veneer.\(^6^1\) Sixteenth-century alchemy texts such as Paracelsus’s *De natura rerum* often described the generation and degeneration of form as results of the union and separation of male and female elements—the very event depicted in *The Fall of Man*.\(^6^2\) Understood in alchemical terms, the generation of a design in the etching plate and the degeneration of a plate in the acid bath could be viewed as the consequences of interactions between gendered agents. The separation and corruption of Adam and Eve in Dietterlin’s print thus reads both as a metaphor for the process of etching and as an allegory of the male-female interactions that propel alchemical change. In alluding to the parallels between etching and alchemy, *The Fall of Man*, like Burgkmair’s print, likens the etcher’s capacity to transform matter to the alchemist’s ability to alter creation.\(^6^3\)

---

\(^6^0\) West, “The Practice of Early Etching,” 392-395.

\(^6^1\) I am grateful to Ulrich Pfisterer for suggesting the question of the alchemical dimensions of Dietterlin’s etching practice as a productive avenue of inquiry.


\(^6^3\) For this interpretation of Burgkmair’s *Mercury, Venus and Cupid*, see West, “The Practice of Early Etching,” 392-395.
Yet while *Mercury, Venus, and Cupid* projects confidence in the etcher’s power to control nature, the *Fall of Man* conveys ambivalence. The sleeper in Dietterlin’s image, as in Burgkmair’s print, cradles his head in the fashion of the sitter in Dürer’s *Melencolia I*. [Fig. 10]. Dürer’s engraving has often been interpreted as an allegory of artistic genius. The reading is based in part on *Melencolia I*’s status as one of the three so-called *Meisterstiche*, a trio of prints in which Dürer demonstrated absolute mastery over the art of engraving. If the protagonist of *Melencolia I* embodies the genius of engraving, then the hero of the *Fall of Man* figures the *ingenium* of etching. An ape clutching Adam’s skull—a stark departure from Scripture—registers deep reservations about the inadequacies of this *ingenium*. Long associated with the degeneracy of man, the ape appeared often in early modern depictions of the Fall of Man, though mostly at a safer distance from its human companions. As a debased form of man, the creature aptly symbolizes etching’s corruptive chemical processes and fraught reputation. Apes also stood for the commonplace *ars simia naturae*, or “art is the ape of nature”. While the *Fall of Man’s* divine and alchemical imagery symbolize etching’s power to represent and even control creation, the ape’s grip on Adam speaks to the technique’s occasional imitative impotence. The mixed results of the technical experiments that Dietterlin performed in crafting his first etching had sown doubt about the medium’s

---

67 Ibid. 287-314.
expressive capacities. By tormenting his etched version of Dürer’s engraved genius with a simian captor, Dietterlin entertains the idea that etching is merely the ape of engraving.

**Dietterlin’s First Ornament Etchings**

While it is remarkable that one of the sixteenth century’s most prolific etchers only took up the medium in the last decade of his life, it is perhaps even more noteworthy that he came to ornament etching, the genre that comprises the vast majority of his printed oeuvre, only in the last half-decade. Two unusual drawings in the Kunstmuseum Basel and a series of related etchings indicate that Dietterlin’s intensive engagement with ornament printmaking grew out of his practice as a reproductive etcher. The Story of Abraham [Fig. 11] is executed in quill and brush with layers of wash thickened with body color on paper prepared with grey and blue wash, and is marked with numerous flecks of gold and white heightening. The Story of Jacob and Joseph in Egypt [Fig. 12] incorporates the same materials on sheets prepared with blue and yellow wash. Both Basel drawings are constructed from a central, oval-shaped panel with lateral wings and framed by a pair of arc-shaped panels. The central sheets depict the title scenes, and the framing panels depict related vignettes. In each work, numerous narrative episodes have been masterfully unified through passages of vegetal and architectural ornament, showing a degree of synthesis more typical of Baroque-era compositions than late sixteenth-century draftsmanship. The formal similarities

---

68 The drawing is discussed further in Appendix IV BA.1.
69 This drawing is analyzed in greater detail in Appendix IV BA.2.
between *The Story of Abraham* and *The Story of Jacob and Joseph in Egypt* suggest that the drawings are related works, perhaps parts of a larger cycle of Old Testament narratives.\(^{71}\)

The Basel drawings’ intended functions are difficult to discern. In the central panel of the *Story of Abraham*, the protagonist prepares to sacrifice Isaac with his proper left hand—a reversal of the right-handedness displayed by an overwhelming majority of figures in early modern art. This unusual detail suggests that Dietterlin meant from the beginning to create an etching after the drawing, which would reverse the composition and correct the error. However, the chromatic variety and thickness of the washes visible in the *Story of Abraham* outstrips the range of colors and intensity of pigment in Dietterlin’s other drafts for etchings. The Basel compositions instead share the approximate dimensions, materials, and painterly style of the presentation drawing that Dietterlin used to relate his plans for the *Last Judgment* ceiling canvas he executed for the Great Hall of the New Lusthaus of Duke Ludwig of Württemberg in Stuttgart [Fig. 13].\(^{72}\) The formal parallels between the Basel sheets and the similarly gilded *Last Judgment* design suggest that *The Story of Abraham* and *The Story of Jacob and Joseph in Egypt* were conceived as presentation drawings for paintings, presumably for the House of Württemberg. But why would Dietterlin prepare a backwards presentation drawing for a painting?\(^{73}\)

The reverse orientation and gold highlights of the Basel drawings are consistent with the formal characteristics of drawings for reverse glass painting.\(^{73}\) In the form of glass painting more common in Dietterlin’s Rhineland, pigment was applied directly to the glass.

---


\(^{72}\) See Appendix IV SG.1.

Reverse glass painting involved rendering the design backwards so that the correct orientation of the finished scheme was visible through the glass sheet, often after elements of gold leaf are applied to the glass sheet as highlights.\textsuperscript{74} Gold highlights in the preparatory drawings for these works helped the painter plot the placement of the gold leaf on the glass, and, in the case of the Basel drawings, elevated the sheet’s monetary value and aesthetic appeal.\textsuperscript{75} Any plan for a reverse glass painting could act as a design for an etching as well, for the printmaking medium also involves planning a scheme in reverse.\textsuperscript{76}

Dietterlin took advantage of this property by using the *Story of Abraham* drawing to create a multi-part, reproductive etching [Fig. 14].\textsuperscript{77} The parallels between the format of the *Story of Abraham* drawing and etchings indicate that the draft was planned from the very beginning as a design for a reverse glass painting and a set of etchings. The dual function of Basel drawings as models for paintings and etchings, as well as their role in Dietterlin’s foray into an unfamiliar painting medium suggests that the prospect of circulating his painting designs as etchings now drove the kinds of painting projects Dietterlin developed. While scholars of the Renaissance are accustomed to thinking of the early modern reproductive print as a work made after a painted design, Dietterlin’s Basel projects show that the painting and the print could be equally important products of a single drawing.


\textsuperscript{75} Geissler. *Zeichnung in Deutschland*, 34.

\textsuperscript{76} The Basel drawings are the first and only instance of plans for reverse glass paintings in Dietterlin’s oeuvre.

\textsuperscript{77} Andresen II.9; Hollstein VI.3.
Dietterlin’s multi-part *Story of Abraham* etching is comprised of an oval composition with lateral wings printed in black ink, as well as a pair of removable, framing strips printed in red. Openness to physical re-configuration made Dietterlin’s printed construction a versatile model for ornament. With its round form, the total ensemble could serve as a pattern for a painted glass window or a decorative platter. The frame panels could additionally be used as autonomous models for decorative borders. In fact, the *Story of Abraham* etchings form part of a series of interchangeable, printed modules that allow the viewer to literally re-frame the central panel with a several other Old Testament scenes.\(^78\)

The red frame prints can be replaced with identical images in black ink (one of which is inscribed with the date 1592), or with pairs of strips of the same shape that show other scenes from Genesis [Figs. 15a & b]. Eight alternate frame strips are known, but Dietterlin probably made at least five matched pairs.\(^79\) The modular nature of the series made its individual parts more collectible, for viewers could increase the number of model compositions possible from the prints’ various combinations merely even by purchasing one additional pair of frames. These interactive dimensions also increased the works’ aesthetic appeal. The strategies that viewers might use to manipulate the appearance of Dietterlin’s modular Old Testament print series resemble the cut-and-paste tactics that the artist

---

\(^78\) The second state of the central plate lacked lateral wings. With its regular, rounded form, it, too, could act as a model for a glass window or a decorative plate.

\(^79\) Besides the two pairs of red and black-ink *Life of Abraham* strips, Dietterlin also created pairs of frames that depict the story of Jacob and Joseph in Egypt, as well as the life of Moses. An additional frame shows scenes with Joshua and Judith, while another portrays the life of David. Since the latter two prints are both devised to be placed on the upper part of the ensemble, it stands to reason that Dietterlin also created pendants for them in a form that could frame the lower side of the centerpiece. This would bring the number of matched pairs of designs from this series to at least five. The prints are documented in Andresen II.11-15; and in Hollstein VI.5-9.
employed to devise the first *Architectura* prints (see Chapter II), effectively allowing them to “invent” their own ornament designs.

As plans for reverse glass paintings, the Basel drawings reflect Dietterlin’s longtime specialization in the painting of interior and exterior ornaments. As schemes for ornament etchings, they channel a new artistic identity with broader professional ambitions. Learning to etch had increased Dietterlin’s potential artistic influence by giving him a way to circulate widely his own original designs. In sixteenth-century northern Europe, printing ornament designs was a particularly apt way to give one’s inventions a life of their own. Prints that featured decorative motifs were often purchased expressly as artisans’ models, and, unlike most narrative prints, could give rise to further compositions in almost any medium. The emulative works that arose from such printed model ornaments typically featured new configurations of forms, but maintained the stylistic character of their sources. Dietterlin’s ornament printmaking thus amplified his potential artistic influence to an exponential degree.

Dietterlin’s move to the realm of ornament printmaking also transformed him from an artist who worked mainly on commission, to one who also sold art on speculation—like many other artists in post-Reformation Germany. But unlike most of his colleagues, Dietterlin also appears to have crafted ornament prints on commission. Throughout the late 1590s, he created numerous etchings of the arms of the House of Württemberg, as well as portraits of its family members in which the lavish, decorative frame was the main attraction. Some, like the *Family Tree of Duke Ludwig of Württemberg* that Dietterlin made after a 1585 painting by Württemberg court painter Jakob Züberlin, even assumed a monumental,

---

80 Andresen II.2, 3, 5, 6; Hollstein VI.11, 12, 14, 15, and 16. For more on these designs, see Appendix IV DR.55.
This sophisticated cycle of ornament etchings indicates that the artist’s printmaking practice had begun to alter etching’s formerly modest roles in northern Europe’s culture of ornament. It is probably no coincidence that the commission for the Family Tree of Duke Ludwig of Württemberg came just as Dietterlin published the most ambitious ornament etching endeavor of his career—the Architectura treatise series.

**The Architectura: Drawing to Etching**

In the title page of the first summative, 1598 edition of the Architectura, Dietterlin attests that he “…invented, yielded, etched, and published [the] two hundred pieces”\(^{82}\) that comprise the work. This statement somewhat exaggerates the number of the one hundred and ninety-eight distinct designs actually included in the treatise. It also emphasizes that Dietterlin alone who etched that staggering number of plates.\(^{83}\) For audiences who knew that the Architectura prints had appeared within the past five years, this tally indicates that the

---


\(^{82}\) In German: “…erfunden, in zweyhundert Stück gebracht, / Getzt, und an tag gegeben / Durch / Wendel Dietterlin…” Wendel Dietterlin, **ARCHITECTVRA von Außtheilung, Symmetria und Proportion der Fünff Seulen, und aller darauf folgenden Kunst Arbeit, von Fenstern, Caminen, Thürgerichten, Portalen, Bronnen und Epitaphien. Wie dieselbige auf jedweder Art der Fünff Seulen, grundt auffzurissen, zuzugrichten, und ins Werk zu zubringen seyen; Alſeſſolcher Kunst Liebhabenden, zu einem bestendigen und ring undurchſennden unterricht erfunden, in zweyhundert Stück gebracht, Getzt, und an tag gegeben. (S.l.: s.n., 1598), Nuremberg, Germanisches Nationalmuseum K 481, title page. The title of the Latin/French translation of the work meanwhile emphasizes the execution of the design over the medium employed: “inuenta, ac ducentis figuris artifi / ciosis delineata, atq[ue] con-structa a Wendelino Dietterlin.” Wendel Dietterlin, **ARCHITECTVRA DE CONSTITVTIONE, Symmetria, ac proportione quinqu; Columnarum : AC OMNIS, INDE PROMA- nantis structure artificiosa : vtpoté Fenestrarum, Caminorum, Postium seu Portalium, Pontium, atq[ue]; Epitaphiorum. QVA RATIONE, SCILICET; EX MEtrica ratione quing; Columnarum, ist hac recte deli-nears, cnuenienter constitui, atq, artificiosē absoluiords. IN GRATIAM STV/DIOSORVM AC AMNium buinis artis, recta faciliq[ue]; via ac methodo addicendae inuenta: ac ducentis figuris artificiosē delineata, atq[ue]; con-structa a Wendelino Dietterlin… (Nuremberg: Hubrecht and Balthasar Caymox, 1598), Cambridge, MA, Houghton Library, Harvard University, Typ. 520.98.325, title page.

artist had executed the etchings with phenomenal swiftness. During the early modern period, outstanding artistic productivity was regarded as the sign of a fecund imagination, a skillful hand, and the virtue of diligence. Dietterlin’s claim to have realized this mammoth etching series with such fantastic speed thus positions the *Architectura* as a stunning performance of printmaking *bravura*. The etcher amplifies the gravity of this display by filling the series with images that further demonstrate his technical prowess, for the *Architectura*’s unprecedented scope made it an apt vehicle for probing etching’s formal horizons. While the speed with which the artist realized this prodigious etching series attested only to Dietterlin’s own artistic mastery, the *Architectura*’s visual pyrotechnics affirm the expansive expressive capacities of the etching medium.

Throughout the early modern period, artists had employed different printmaking techniques to imitate the artful qualities of drawing. Engravers in sixteenth-century Italy often styled themselves as practitioners of the art of *disegno*, and frequently cultivated an engraving style that could successfully imitate the swelling and tapering ink marks of the quill. Producers of woodcut prints in the North pursued a similar ideal. A book of trades

---

85 For an overview of this phenomenon in woodcut, engraving, and etching, see David Rosand, *Drawing Acts: Studies in Graphic Expression and Representation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 145-177.
that the bard Hans Sachs released under the title of *Eygentliche Beschreibung aller Stände auff Erden* in 1568 features Amman’s woodcut image of such a *Formschneider*, or sculptor of blocks for woodcut prints [Fig. 17]. The *Formschneider* boasts of his talent for carving woodblock matrices capable of producing woodcut prints that resemble drawings, bragging,

“…whatever one gives me to carve, with the quill on a board, I’ll cut it with my tool. When it’s printed, it’ll be sharp; the [woodcut] image will look like the design (*entwarff*)…”

Here, too, the artist seeks to establish a relationship between his chosen print medium and the art of drawing—and in this case, drawing is understood as a record of the inventor’s vision.

The trend suggests that sixteenth-century viewers associated a given printmaking technique’s likeness to drawing with its aptitude for evoking the creative act of design.

Because the stylus work of etching resembles the mark of the draftsman, it has often been claimed that early modern painter-etchers embraced etching as the printmaking method that most resembled their drawing practices, and even that early modern artists regarded etching as a form of drawing. The apparent likeness between etching and drawing certainly shaped the fortunes of etching in sixteenth-century Germany. At the close of the 1520s,

---

87 “Ich bin ein Formen Schneider gut, / Als was man mir für reissen thut, / Mit der federn auff ein form bret / Das schneid ich denn mit meinem geret, / Wenn mans deñ druckt so sind sich scharff / Die Bildnuß, wie sie der entwarff, / Die steht, denn druckt auff dem papyr, / Künstlich denn auß zusstreichen schier.” Hans Sachs, *Eygentliche Beschreibung Aller Stände auff Erden: Hoher vnd Nidriger, Geistlicher vnd Weltlicher, Aller Künsten, Handwerkcn vnd Händeln, [et]c. vom grösten biß zum kleinesten, Auch von jarem Ursprung, Erfindung vnd gebreuchen* (Frankfurt am Main: Feyerabents, 1568), Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Rar. 1418, fol. Fi’.

88 In the vignette that precedes Sachs’s *Formschneider* poem, a *Reisser*, or draftsman, likewise makes reference to engraving, relating that he “can also print” his design (“auch kann ich diß in Kupffer stechen”). Ibid. fol. Eiv’.

Altdorfer crafted etchings of the primeval German forest with fluid contours that resemble the candid lines of pen drawing [Fig. 18], a motif continued in Lautensack’s etchings [Fig. 8]. Artists such as Dürer had experimented with creating drawing-like etchings before, but it was only with the rise of a market for drawings in the early decades of the sixteenth century that such etchings also attracted a collecting public. In posing as valuable records of the artist’s drafting style, these works stoked new enthusiasm for the medium of etching. Interest in etching as an index of the artist’s drafting style endured well into the later sixteenth century. Dietterlin, for instance, rendered the trees, animals, and even the tendrils of Eve’s hair in his Fall of Man print with frenetic lines that resemble the unrehearsed, inky marks of a pen drawing. The crimson frames of Dietterlin’s Life of Abraham etching likewise mime the look of red chalk drawing—a form of illusionistic printmaking employed earlier by Antonio Fantuzzi of the school of Fontainebleau as well.

Engravers pursued similar ends. Dürer’s so-called “reform” of engraving in the early decades of the sixteenth century brought his followers to amplify the calligraphic qualities of the engraved contour. By filling engravings like his 1514 Adam and Eve with curving, looping lines [Fig. 19], Dürer bent the slow and deliberate mark of engraving to the free movement of the drafted contour. Hendrick Goltzius meanwhile made a career using the swelling and waning effects of taille to capture the varying pressure of the draftsman’s quill on the page, and excelled in intersecting his engraved lines to evoke the effects of

---

90 On the forest landscape as an index of the artist’s personal drafting style in the oeuvre of Albrecht Altdorfer, see Wood, Albrecht Altdorfer and the Origins of Landscape, 275-301.
92 Landau and Parshall, The Renaissance Print, 342-347.
crosshatching. His 1585 *Adam and Eve*, after a design by Bartholomaeus Spranger, allocates even greater space to the blank page, the better to highlight his engraved lines' resemblance to pen-and-ink marks [Fig. 20]. By electing a similar narrative for his own experiments with emulating the forms of pen-and-ink drawing in the *Fall of Man*, Dietterlin engaged intaglio printmaking’s rich *paragone* with drawing from the standpoint of an etcher.

The prestige accorded to drawing during the early modern period derived from the medium’s status as the first, manual expression of the artist’s cerebral work, as well as its capacity to directly index the relic-like mark of the creator’s inventing hand. Printed works that captured the look of hand drawings borrowed both forms of cache. They could also garner esteem by effectively beating drawing at its own game. Printmakers who produced drawing-like works demonstrated their own command of the printed line and attested to the ways in which their chosen print method could masterfully imitate drawing even while retaining other technical capacities inaccessible to the draftsman’s art. Etchers and engravers pursued this ideal with particular enthusiasm. Yet the artistic competitions between these forms of printmaking and drawing did not remain simply bilateral affairs. In

---


96 Catherine King, “Disegno/design,” in *Representing Renaissance Art c. 1500- c. 1600* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2008), 61-103.

variously seeking to emulate and surpass drawing, etching and engraving ultimately contended with each other.  

Dietterlin’s _Architectura_ takes an unusual position in this three-way _paragone_. The artist’s grasp of the relationships between drawing, etching, and engraving can be discerned in his strategies for drafting the designs and transposing them to etched form. Dietterlin was a versatile draftsman, adopting different materials and techniques depending on the purpose of the drawing at hand. Although his approach to composition varied throughout the _Architectura_ project (see Chapter II), his materials and general order of operations for drawing the designs remained consistent. The artist devised the _Architectura_ compositions across multiple sheets. Most of the surviving drawings depict a well-developed design for a single print, roughly the size of the anticipated etching. Few of the artist’s early sketches survive. A rare glimpse of the earliest phase of Dietterlin’s drawing process is visible on the verso side of a _Design for an Elaborate Fountain_, one of the only un-mounted _Architectura_ drawings [Figs. 21a & b].  The sketch is executed in black chalk, and appears to depict a tabernacle. Since chalk rarely occurs in Dietterlin’s more mature drawings, it appears that he employed this malleable, easily erasable medium only to draft first ideas.  

A design for Plate 18 of the 1593 _Erst Buch_ shows Dietterlin’s standard method for drafting his working drawings [Fig. 22]. First the artist formulated the outlines of the design in a graphite or chalk sketch. While Dietterlin sometimes used a straight edge to establish the

---

98 Viljoen, “Etching and Drawing,” 57.
99 The composition depicted on the recto is a design for Plate 82 of the 1598 _Architectura_. See Appendix IV NY.1.
100 If the artist tended to repurpose his more finished sheets as vehicles for testing such concepts (or vice versa), it is possible that sketches for _Architectura_ etchings are hidden on the verso sides of many sheets mounted in the Dresden albums.
major axes of his forms, he otherwise drew freehand. After devising the graphite or chalk scheme, he continued with a quill. Usually he employed black-brown ink, using a darker shade to create depth. Wings attached to the uppermost part of the pilaster second from the right in the early design for Plate 18 have been crossed out in the darker ink that Dietterlin also occasionally utilized to make corrections. The artist also sometimes finished his working drawings by modeling their forms with wash, as in the two leftmost pilasters. He finalized his designs on a third or fourth sheet, which generally shows scant evidence of the artist’s search for the correct lines. Dietterlin created the more developed drawing for Plate 18 with the same succession of media and techniques as the earlier draft, but with more intensive use of wash [Fig. 23]. Layered patches of grey, blue-grey, and brown ink create shadows, while wide, parallel brushstrokes skillfully evoke surface textures. The use of wash rather than line-work to plan shading effects was a common timesaving method among printmakers of Dietterlin’s era. Nevertheless, the intricate brushwork of the more polished drafts for the Architectura etchings, particularly those designs first published in 1593, cannot have been quick to execute. These marks, as well as the vivid chromatic effects cultivated in the draft for Plate 18 and many other Architectura drawings, had little outlet for expression in the etchings. Dietterlin’s interest in amplifying the drawings’ autonomous visual appeal
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103 In the most finished drawings, Dietterlin also used white heightening to make corrections.
104 Ohnesorge, Wendel Dietterlin, 44.
105 Ibid.
106 This raises the possibility that Dietterlin added the wash only after the drawings outlived their usefulness as plans for the prints, perhaps to amplify the drafts’ visual appeal. There is evidence to suggest that this was not always the case. Some drawings bear inscriptions in the artist’s hand that specify changes to be made to the shading at the printing stage. For instance, the following inscriptions appear in Design for Erst Buch Plate 25 (Appendix IV
indicates that he regarded the works as plans for etchings and as finished compositions in their own right.

The majority of Dietterlin’s Architectura prints do not reflect the fluid, dynamic, painterly qualities of the preparatory drawings. Although etching was among the era’s most robust printmaking media for capturing the look of transparent form and indeed the liquid qualities of ink and paint, the lines of prints like Plate 18 of the Erst Buch [Fig. 24] display an almost brittle crispness. This work’s deliberate crosshatching and even sets of parallel lines contain little of the drawings’ dynamic, improvisational verve. The stylistic differences between the fluid drafts and the dry, sharp prints arise only in part from the fact that Dietterlin, like his contemporaries, rendered shadows through line-work only in the design rendered on the plate. The etcher also defined most of its forms with hard outlines, only rarely creating more nebulous silhouettes with evenly terminating, parallel marks.

Dietterlin’s methods for transposing the drafted scheme to the plate created further disparities between the respective styles of the Architectura drawings and prints. The major lines of the later drawing for Plate 18 are impressed into the verso side of the sheet—a phenomenon common among the more developed Architectura drawings. These indentations indicate that Dietterlin traced the outlines of its forms directly into the plate’s

---

DR.19): recto upper left [quill and black-brown ink]: l [with indicator lines pointing to negative space between the figure and the architecture]; recto upper left [quill and black-brown ink]: d [with an indicator line pointing to the figure’s face]. In the final etching, the areas labeled “l” (perhaps signifying light, or “Licht”) have been made lighter, while the areas labeled “d” (perhaps signifying dark, or “dunkel”) have been made darker. Such notes confirm that the wash was applied before Dietterlin executed the related etching.

This design reappeared as Plate 100 of the 1598 installment of the Architectura.

For additional discussion of this drawing, see Appendix IV DR.14.
acid-resistant coating. Although tracing allowed the artist to closely copy the structure of the drafted scheme in the plate, Dietterlin often altered the drafted design at this stage. None of the etchings reproduce the details of the corresponding drawings exactly. While useful for repeating the drawn composition in the etched plate, the technique did not necessarily reproduce the candid look of drawing itself. Dietterlin’s incisive tracing replicated the structure of the design, but it also cancelled the unstudied, spontaneous air of the original drawing. In fact, the technique extinguished the drawing-like quality most prized by contemporary etching collectors.

One will recall that Dietterlin’s copyright application for the Architecture describes the etchings as “printed sketches”. This, as well as his apparent efforts to render diagrammatic aspects of those prints in a form similar to his drafting marks, would seem to indicate that the artist regarded etching as a natural extension of his draftsmanship. Yet the designation of the Erst Buch etchings as “printed sketches” allies the etchings with a mode of architectural printmaking that was widely practiced in woodcut and engraving as well. The stylistic disparities between the Architecture drawings and the vast majority of the treatise’s non-diagrammatic prints in fact show that the artist sought to distinguish his etchings from his—or indeed any—drawing practice. Dietterlin’s efforts to alienate his etchings from his
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109 This was a common means of transposing a drafted design to the etching plate. Signs of damage to many of the drawings, such as the replaced strip in the center of second drawing for Plate 18, indicate that the artist at times applied enough force to pierce the paper. Pauli, “Die Originalzeichnungen Wendel Dietterlins,” 284.

110 Ibid.

111 “…durch denn Trückh mithetailten Innwarf…” Wendel Dietterlin, Application for an Imperial Printing Privilege, May 11, 1592, Vienna, Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, AT-OeStA/HHStA RHR, Impressoria 13-52 (Impressoria Fz. 13), fol. 362r. For a transcription of the application, see Appendix III.

drawing style attest that, contrary to common opinion, early modern painters did not always treat their work with the etching stylus as an expression of their draftsmanship.  

From the early decades of the sixteenth century, audiences in northern Europe appreciated engraving as a form of printmaking with its own, distinct aesthetic appeal. Esteem for etching, meanwhile, was largely based on that medium’s likeness to drawing. As long as etching merely borrowed the prestige accorded to another medium, it could not attain the kind of independent aesthetic regard enjoyed by engraving. Dietterlin’s efforts to extract etching from its filial relationship to drawing put the medium’s idiosyncratic properties in the spotlight. His *Architectura* prints encouraged audiences who already appreciated the autonomous value of engraving to judge etching on its own terms as well.

**Etching as Engraving**

This did not mean that Dietterlin felt inhibited from exploring ways to make etching imitate other arts. The pains that the artist took to nullify his painterly drawing style in the *Architectura* prints in fact allowed him to produce etchings that could pass as engravings. Nearly all of the etchings in the first two installments of the series, and the great majority of the prints in the project’s final installment, are, at first glance, indistinguishable from engraving. Dietterlin captured the sculpted qualities of the engraved line primarily by displaying hard contours and regular networks of hatching and crosshatching. In Plate 25 of the *Erst Buch* [Fig. 25], the intersecting networks of parallel, curving contours articulate the plump forms of the female term’s arm and her craning neck, and recall the marks that

---

113 These findings corroborate Madeleine Viljoen’s more general observations that early modern artists did not necessarily treat etching as a form of drawing. See Viljoen, “Etching and Drawing,” 56.  
Goltzius used to model his engraved bodies.\textsuperscript{115} The \textit{Architectura} prints meanwhile suppress signal features of the etching technique by avoiding effects that were difficult to capture in engraving. Few passages of the \textit{Erst} and \textit{Andner Buch} images display any traces of foul biting, a trait exclusive to etching. Spontaneous fluctuations in line quality and direction—a move difficult to pull off with the engraving burin—are also kept to a minimum. The \textit{Architectura} etchings imitate the characteristics of engraving so well that modern scholarship has, almost without exception, misidentified the 1593 and 1594 installments of the project as engraved works.\textsuperscript{116} The mistake was also perpetuated in the title of a popular reprint of the 1598 \textit{Architectura}, Dover’s \textit{The Fantastic Engravings of Wendel Dietterlin} of 1969.\textsuperscript{117}

Artists had been experimenting with the formal relationships between etching and engraving for decades before Dietterlin commenced the \textit{Architectura}. Lucas van Leyden had finished his etchings with passages of engraving in areas where that required finer detail work.\textsuperscript{118} Artist Dirk Vellert experimented with mixing the two media as early as 1544.\textsuperscript{119} This dichotomy also inflected both print media’s links to drawing. Printmakers associated with publisher Hieronymus Cock, for instance, created prints that mimed the appearance of pen drawing by mixing engraving and etching.\textsuperscript{120} Engraving-like etchings rose to popularity

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{115} Dietterlin reused this design as Plate 142 in the 1598 installment of the \textit{Architectura}.
\textsuperscript{116} For an overview of the various ways in which the medium of each installment of the \textit{Architectura} project has been described, see Großmann, “Die verschiedenen Ausgaben der \textit{Architectura},” 158-159.
\textsuperscript{119} Landau and Parshall, \textit{The Renaissance Print}, 335.
\textsuperscript{120} Ibid. 347.
\end{footnotes}
already during the third quarter of the sixteenth century, at the hands of Antwerp
printmakers Lucas van Doetechum and Jan van Doetechum the Elder. Hans Vredeman de
Vries often hired the van Doetechums to print his designs in this way [Fig. 26].\(^{121}\) Artists in
the German-speaking lands were slower to adopt the technique. Although they did not
necessarily view engraving and etching as antithetical processes, printmakers in this region
tended to cultivate the distinctive formal characteristics of each medium, rather than
assimilate them.\(^{122}\) Dietterlin, an avid emulator of Vredeman’s printed architectural forms,
may well have derived his interest in imitating engraving through etching from observing this
conceit in the Dutch master’s prints.

Many factors moved etchers in Dietterlin’s day to imitate engraving. Audiences
valued this mode of illusionistic printmaking as evidence of artistic wit and even for its sheer
novelty. As Petra Sophia Zimmerman and Christopher Heuer have observed, Matthias Quad
von Kinckelbach’s 1609 history of recent northern art called the technique “an entirely new
and extremely artful manner…which was long taken by experts not as etching, but as pure
engraving.”\(^{123}\) The particular conditions of Dietterlin’s *Architectura* project also made the
conceit an attractive way to represent the book’s ornaments. By miming the form of a long-
prestigious medium, Dietterlin lent the *Architectura* an elevated visual style appropriate to its
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123 “…umb das Jahr 1570 haben zwen gebüder Joan und Lucas van Doetecum eine gantz
newe und überkünstige art von etzzen erfunden, also daß sie allerley Figuren Landtaffeln, mit
allen Schrifften und Littern darin, so rein, geff, lind, und verblasen in Kupffer etzen
kundten und noch kunen, daß es lange zeit von vielen verstandigen fur keine erzung, sonder
 einen reinen Schnit ist angesehen worden.” Matthias Quad von Kinckelbach, *Teutscher Nation
Hertligkeit…* (Cologne: Wilhelm Lutzenkirchen, 1609), Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek,
4. Germ.g. 153, 431. On the van Doetechums’ use of this device, see Petra Sophia
Zimmerman, *Die Architectura von Hans Vredeman de Vries. Entwicklung der Renaissance-architektur
grand scale. The clean lines of the treatise’s engraving-like etchings also supported its function as a set of clear, easy-to-emulate visual models.

Besides using tracing to capture the meticulous air of the burin’s sculpting mark, Dietterlin also tested ways to imitate the engraved line’s variable width. The fissures in the bases of the terms in Plate 25 are one example of these investigations [Fig. 27]. While the engraver can render bulging and tapering ink reservoirs by pressing and lifting the burin’s V-formed tip into the plate through a carving stroke, the etcher’s pointed stylus and acid bath is better suited to producing reservoirs of uniform thickness. Dietterlin nevertheless managed to render the cracks in the bases of Plate 25’s etched pilasters as lines of varying width. The fissures swell and taper as if they index a burin’s slice. Close inspection reveals how the etcher captured the appearance of the variable, engraved line: through overlapping stylus strokes, and perhaps strategic wiping of the inked plate. It is not insignificant that Dietterlin used the image of cuts in Plate 25’s etched stone base to recall the burin’s incision in the engraving plate. In imitating the look of the variable, engraved line through an emblem of the engraving plate fissures that produced this type of contour, Dietterlin identifies the illusion as a triumph over the formal conditions of printmaking itself.

While most of the etchings of the Annder Buch also resemble engravings, Plate 30 stands out [Fig. 28]. Its contours are thicker and darker than those of the other Architectura prints, for they index wide, deep ink reservoirs created by exposing the plate to the acid bath for an extended time. The lines of Plate 30 also terminate more bluntly, and lie at wider, less even intervals—the signs of quick work with a stylus. The print’s bold lines might even be said to resemble the uninhibited marks of a pen-and-ink drawing. These qualities negate

---

124 This image was also incorporated into the 1598 installment of the Architectura as Plate 111.
Plate 30's ability to pass as an engraving. In fact, they impart the print with the hallmark
traits of an etching. Dietterlin allegorizes this abrupt shift in style through the pictorial
content of the design. Plate 30 depicts an Ionic Order portal incongruously adorned with
rustication—a motif that he and many other architectural theorists of the period typically
associated with the Tuscan Order.\(^{125}\) This was a conceit that Dietterlin would have known
from the first half of Serlio’s 1551 Extraordinario libro, which also presented arches and
portals of the more refined Orders adorned with uncouth rustication. For Dietterlin, the
contrast between the refined aspect of the Ionic Order’s volute capitals and the coarse
appearance of the rustication parallel the visual disparity between the Annder Buch’s
engraving-like etchings and the uncouth appearance of the present print. A more obscure
reference to theories of style is embodied in the classical bust pictured in the niche on the
left side of the monument, which sports the laurel wreath traditionally associated with
excellence in poetry. As a master of verbal expression, the figure resembles Cicero, whose
writings supplied the Renaissance with the idea that all rhetoric is characterized by high,
middling, or low style.\(^{126}\) By including a reference to poetry and oratory in the only print
among the (theretofore) published Architectura etchings that actually resembles an etching,
Dietterlin frames the apparent medium of his image as a matter of pictorial rhetoric. The
cruder nature of Plate 30’s etching-like appearance identifies the print as an example of the
“low” style, a designation consonant with the design’s gauche combination of Ionic
ornament and rustication.

\(^{125}\) James S. Ackerman, “The Tuscan/Rustic Order: A Study in the Metaphorical Language
\(^{126}\) On the reception of ancient theories of rhetoric in the visual arts of the Renaissance, see
Caroline van Eck, Classical Rhetoric and the Arts in Early Modern Europe (Cambridge: Cambridge
University Press, 2007). Dietterlin also employs the image of a classical bust in the design for
Plate 24 of the Annder Buch. See Appendix IV DR.27.
The disparities between Plate 30 and the engraving-like *Architectura* etchings arise in part from a change in Dietterlin’s drawing technique. While the artist developed the textures and volumes of most drafts for the *Architectura* etchings in wash, he modeled the objects in the drawing for Plate 30 with crosshatched lines [Fig. 29]. Careful drafting with crosshatched lines is typically associated with drawing for engraving.\(^\text{127}\) Dietterlin’s crosshatching technique can indeed be observed in drawings from the earlier stage of his career that were evidently made after engravings.\(^\text{128}\) However, the feathery, crosshatched contours in the drawing for Plate 30 distinctly resemble the fuzzy lines of an etching. Plate 30 and its preparatory drawing, in other words, resemble each other. Since the painterly manner of the *Architectura* drawings often contrasts with the engraving-like style of the corresponding etchings, Plate 30’s likeness to its preparatory drawing is unusual.\(^\text{129}\) The similarities between the print and the drawing suggest that Dietterlin created this design to explore etching as an expression of his drafting manner. Plate 30 gives thus Dietterlin’s readers an impression of his drawing style.

By interrupting the *Architectura*’s otherwise consistent series of fictive engravings, Plate 30 of the *Annder Buch* also undermined the stylistic unity of the text and gave observant

---


\(^\text{128}\) This crosshatching technique appears, for instance, in Dietterlin’s drawing of a *putto* after Raphael’s *Isaiab* in Sant’Agostino, Rome, which he perhaps copied from a 1574 drawing by Karel van Mander (Strasbourg, Musées de la Ville de Strasbourg, Cabinet des Estampes et des Dessins, CdEedD 77.985.0.867, (réc: 77.R.2011.0103)). The technique also appears in a drawing of a grotesque head that Dietterlin made after an engraving by Heinrich Aldegrever (Strasbourg, Musées de la Ville de Strasbourg, Cabinet des Estampes et des Dessins, CdEedD 77.985.0.868/CE L1, 22, 77.985.0.868 (réc: 77.R.2011.0104)). See Appendix IV SB.1 and SB.2.

\(^\text{129}\) For instance, the drawings for Plates 41 and 42 of the *Annder Buch* were also drafted with sketchy, crosshatched lines, but the corresponding prints do not strongly resemble etchings. See Appendix IV DR.56 and DR.57.
readers grounds to suspect that the other *Architectura* prints released up to that point were not, in fact, what they seemed. The title page of the first circulated German version of the 1598 treatise, with its reference to the numerous *etchings* contained therein, left no doubt.  

Most of the approximately one hundred prints first published in this final installment of the *Architectura* retain the fine appearance of the earlier works, creating stylistic coherence between the older and newer prints assembled in this summative edition. However, the 1598 prints do not negate the characteristic properties of etching as the 1593 and 1594 prints do. The sketchy, tenebrous cast of the title page is only one example of Dietterlin’s ultimate celebration of the formal qualities particular to the etching medium. The space above a fountain in Plate 80 is flecked with bunches of erratic, arching strokes that describe jets of water colliding with the pool below, marks that register the fluidity and playfulness long associated with the etched line [Fig. 30]. In exposing the deception of the earlier treatise’s prints, Dietterlin framed himself as a master of *trompe l’oeil* printmaking and ensured that the *Architectura* could sell as a *tour-de-force* of illusionistic etching. Readers who appreciated the prints as manifestations of the artist’s technical bravado were, after all, better equipped to regard the work as a critical reflection on the art of etching itself.

Dietterlin’s choice of publisher for each of the three phases of the *Architectura* project reflects the etcher’s commitment to highlighting the artistic quality of his books’ prints. No

---

printer is listed in the 1593 *Erst Buch*, which raises the possibility that Dietterlin published the work himself. The 1593 *Liber I.*, the 1594 *Annder Buch* as well as the 1594 and 1595 editions of the *Liber II.* were released by the heirs of the recently deceased Strasbourg publisher Bernhard Jobin (1545-1593). It is nevertheless possible that Dietterlin negotiated this collaboration while Bernhard was still living. Jobin had published the writings of alchemist Paracelsus, jurist Nikolaus Reusner, and philologist/poet Nicodemus Frischlin, and even translations of works by François Rabelais. Dietterlin’s alliance with the Jobin publishing enterprise thus placed the *Architectura* on similar footing with highly esteemed texts and increased the chances that Jobin’s learned customers would acquire copies of the *Architectura*. It also associated the second installment of Dietterlin’s treatise project with a press keenly interested in the artistic quality of its books’ illustrations. Alongside numerous broadsides and single-sheet woodcuts, Jobin had published Tobias Stimmer’s masterpiece of woodcut book illustration: the 1581 *Emblematum Tyrocinia: Sive Picta Poesis Latinogermanica* by Mathias Holzwart. Moreover, the publisher himself had practiced as a *Formschneider*, creating a monumental woodcut of the Strasbourg cathedral as well as dozens of printed papal portraits for his 1573 *Accurate Effigies*...

131 For more on this theory, see Appendix II.
sparked controversy. Some time between 1571 and 1572, publisher Theodosius Richel
complained to Strasbourg authorities that Jobin had overstepped the rightful work of the
book printers.\textsuperscript{135} The fact that the city council dismissed the suit suggests that the art of book
illustration was acquiring growing esteem by the time Dietterlin embarked on his epic
bibliographic project. By releasing his treatises through Jobin’s press, Dietterlin associated
his \textit{Architectura} with a publisher known for fine bibliographic images and courted an audience
of visually savvy readers who were capable of appreciating his etched \textit{trompe l’oeil}
engravings.\textsuperscript{136}

Perhaps because Bernhard no longer sat at the helm of the Jobin press, Dietterlin
chose another publisher to release the last installment of his treatise. The title pages of the
different editions of the 1598 \textit{Architectura} list as their publishers Hubrecht (1554-1601, also
called “Hubert”) and Balthasar Caymox (1561-1635), as well as Balthasar alone.\textsuperscript{137} The
Caymoxes were an established family of Netherlandish émigré publishers active in
Nuremberg during the decades around 1600. Cornelis Caymox the Elder (before 1540-
c. 1590), probably the brother of Hubrecht and the uncle of Bathasar, acted as the Germany-
based agent of Antwerp publisher Gerard de Jode, who had published Vredeman’s 1577
\textit{Architectura}.\textsuperscript{138} Hubrecht joined Cornelis in applying for an imperial privilege for de Jode’s

\textsuperscript{135} The case is described in Jakob Franck, “Jobin, Bernhard,” in \textit{Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie},
vol. 14, Historischen Kommission bei der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften
\textsuperscript{136} On the sophisticated forms of looking occasioned by early modern prints, see Evelyn
\textsuperscript{137} See Appendix II.
\textsuperscript{138} Peter H. Meurer, “De Nürnberger Verlag Caymox und die Kartographie,” \textit{Quarendo} 23,
Speculum Orbis Terrarum on behalf of the Netherlandish publisher in 1574.\textsuperscript{139} A renowned Nuremberg book and art dealer, Hubrecht also published lavishly illustrated books such as Joachim Camerarius’s Symbolorum & emblematum ex re herbaria…\textsuperscript{140} Balthasar specialized in visually rich projects as well, publishing maps by Matthias Zündt, Matthias Quad, and Franz Ritter.\textsuperscript{141} He also released ornament model books such as Johann Siebmacher’s 1597 suite of embroidery patterns, the Schön Neues Modelbuch…\textsuperscript{142} Dietterlin’s move from the house of Bernhard Jobin to the Caymox press constitutes a shift from a humanist-lead enterprise committed to producing luxuriously illustrated texts to a publishing production known for printing visual material both fine and modest. By electing to release the final installment of the Architectura through the well-connected, commercially savvy, and pictorially oriented house of Caymox, Dietterlin positioned his work for success in the international trade of illustrated books. The artist’s choice of publisher also increased the likelihood that the completed Architectura would reach a public equipped to appreciate the technical bravado of his etchings. Such sensitivity to the pictorial quality of bibliographic illustrations would only become broadly important in the years after Dietterlin’s treatise appeared. Frances Haskell has pinpointed the emergence of the so-called “art book,” that is, a volume “devoted to art and not the reproduction of art…which combines text and illustration” to the middle of the

\begin{quotation}


\textsuperscript{141} See Meurer, “De Nürnberger Verlag Caymox,” 29-43.

\textsuperscript{142} Johann Siebmacher, Schön Neues Modellbuch von allerley lustigen Mödeln naczunehem zuwürcken uñ zusticke (Nuremberg: Balthasar Caymox, 1597), Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Rar. 499f.
\end{quotation}
seventeenth century. Dietterlin’s *Architectura*, with its self-consciously masterful etchings, stands as an autonomous aesthetic accomplishment and thus represents a precocious instance of growing interest in the artistic dimensions of book illustration.

In demonstrating the artistic mastery of their creator, the illustrations of Dietterlin’s *Architectura* advance certain claims about etching and its links to the other visual arts. By variously subduing and amplifying the prints’ resemblance to drawing, Dietterlin framed etching as a medium with a malleable connection to the draftsman’s art. The sculpted appearance of the engraving-like *Architectura* prints meanwhile attests that etching can match the older intaglio medium’s technical and expressive capacities. Finally, the refined but distinctly etching-like manner cultivated in the prints that first appeared in the *Architectura*’s final, 1598 installment allow the medium to display its expressive capacities on its own terms, designating etching as a printmaking technique with autonomous value.

The diversity of print and drawing media channeled in the completed *Architectura* project demonstrates etching’s mercurial capacity to assume the guise of almost any medium. For audiences in Dietterlin’s world, this was a significant achievement. Northern art critics at the turn of the seventeenth century valued demonstrations of protean virtuosity—the capacity to imitate the manners of other masters, or the appearance of other media—as sure evidence of surpassing artistic mastery. Celebrating an engraving series in which Goltzius had deftly emulated the engravings and woodcuts of diverse artists, Karel van Mander compared the artist to Proteus, the Greek god of elusive sea change, and Vertumnus, the Roman god of transformation, writing that, “all these things together prove that Goltzius is a

---

144 Melion, “Karel van Mander’s ‘Life of Goltzius’,” 113-133.
rare Proteus or Vertumnus in art, because he can transform himself to all forms of working methods.” Dietterlin demonstrates a similar form of artistic genius by imitating a variety of media through the *Architectura* prints. With this performance of artistic *bravura*, he asserts etching’s superlative ability to display protean virtuosity. The array of media simulated in the prints of the finished *Architectura* project reframes the material fickleness that had frustrated earlier etchers as the very characteristic that makes etching artistically superior to other printmaking techniques.

Dietterlin’s efforts to probe etching’s multiple personalities engage the artist’s more general interest in the links between the visual media. The idea that the forms of one medium could carry over to another also resonates in the *Architectura*’s lessons on architectural ornament for figural artists. Dietterlin explores the connections between architecture and the other arts primarily through the represented content of the treatise’s etchings—for instance, in depictions of painted architecture that merges with the brick-and-mortar facade it adorns. His research on the links between etching and the other arts, on the other hand, happens mostly on the level of form. The *Architectura* etchings unite these parallel investigations through the conjunction of content and form, aligning mutually reinforcing arguments for the porous boundaries between the artistic media. These

---


146 For more on this topic, see Chapter II.
performances also advance the *Architectura*’s specific functions as an ornament treatise. In highlighting the formal parallels between etching and other arts, the prints refer the reader to the possible migration of ornamental motifs between media. The images thereby underscore that the *Architectura*’s designs might be transposed to any number of materials, and attest to the treatise’s relevance to all manner of artists.

The *Architectura* etchings brought a new level of artistry to the illustration of art literature in northern Europe, inspiring high regard and numerous imitators. Many etchings in Daniel II. Meyer’s 1609 and 1612 guides to architectural ornament for painters and woodworkers emulated or outright copied images like Plate 80 of the 1598 *Architectura* [Fig. 31], an influence that the publishers acknowledged in the introduction to the first volume. Artist-authors not only adopted the designs of the *Architectura*, but its medium. By the end of the sixteenth century, most German art treatises, particularly those that addressed the art of ornament, contained etched images. Prague artist Gabriel Krammer published three etched ornament books between 1600 and 1603. Veit Eck of Strasbourg released
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149 These are Gabriel Krammer, *ARCHITECTVRA VON DEN FUVNF SEIVLEN SAMBT IREN ORNMENCTEN VND ZIERDEN ALS NEMLIICH TVSCANA, DORICA IONICA CORINTIA COMPOSITA. IN RECHTER MAS TEILVNG VND PROPORTZION. MIT DEN EXEMPLEN DER BERVMBSTEN ANTIQVTETEN SO
two etched manuals of woodcarving ornaments in 1596 and one in 1600, while his colleague Johann Jakob Ebelmann published seven between 1598 and 1609. Five etched ornament books appeared in Cologne between 1615 and 1630 at the hands of Rutger Kasemann. Wendel Dietterlin the Elder’s son Wendel Dietterlin the Younger, a goldsmith active between Strasbourg and Lyon, published multiple series of grotesque etchings in the opening years of the seventeenth century. An upswing in etched art books occurred around the same time in Italy as well.

Throughout the second half of the sixteenth century, ornament etching transformed from an art form largely employed for visual communication within the workshop, to a


151 These include an undated, eleven-part series published by Balthasar Caymox in Nuremberg (Hollstein VI.2), a six-part series printed in Lyon in 1614 (Hollstein VI.1), a nine-part *Procession of Monstrous Figures* from 1615 (Hollstein VI.3), and a fourteen-part series from around 1614 or 1615 (Hollstein VI.4).

152 According to Cole and Silver, Italy produced a number of etched art treatises at the turn of the seventeenth century. Odoardo Fialetti’s etched *Il nero modo et ordine. PER DISSEGNAR TVTTE LE PARTI ET MEMBRA DEL CORPO HV/MANO appeared in 1608, and Giacomo Franco’s etched *DE EXCELLENTIA, ET NOBILITATE DELINEATIONIS. LIBRO DV’O was published in 1611. The situation in Germany and Italy nevertheless contrasts with that of the Netherlands. Perhaps because of the local abundance of engravers, it was not until 1678, with Samuel van Hoogstraten’s *INLEYDING TOT DE HOOGE SCHOOLE DER SCHILDERKONST*, that an artist produced an etched book on the subject of his own profession. On the status of etching as a means of illustrating art books in the seventeenth century, see Cole and Silver, “Fluid Boundaries,” 28-29.
product respectable enough to illustrate art treatises. By demonstrating etching’s formal versatility, Dietterlin’s *Architectura* played a pivotal role in the ascent of the medium as the prevailing technique for illustrating art treatises, and indeed its emergence as a printmaking method worthy of high regard. In the days of artists like Wenzel Jamnitzer, authors of ornament books tended to hire engravers or more practiced etchers to illustrate their texts. Works in this genre composed in the wake of the *Architectura* almost all consisted of minimal text and numerous etchings executed by the authors themselves. The rise of the etcher-author after 1600 suggests that Dietterlin’s project inspired northern artists to assume more control over their publishing enterprises as artworks, and even moved period viewers to regard etching as a form worthy of circulating knowledge about artistic principles. Etching’s rise as a preferred method for illustrating art literature accompanied a sea change in the medium’s reputation among general audiences as well. By the end of the seventeenth century, etching enjoyed a more esteemed position among European artists and collectors than any other printmaking technique.
Chapter IV.
Anthropomorphizing the Orders: ‘Terms’ of Architectural Eloquence in Dietterlin’s World

“I cannot make myself subtler. Therefore, one compares me with crude things.”¹ So proclaims author Gabriel Krammer, disguised as an anthropomorphic post whose words and image are inscribed in an etching of Tuscan ornaments in the artist’s Architectura treatise [Fig. 1]. Composed in 1598 at the Prague court of Emperor Rudolf II, this master-woodworker’s architectural self-portrait indeed serves a lowly role. His body performs the inglorious work of a weight-bearing column. As a member of the Tuscan Order, he also belongs to the least refined of the canonical architectural modes. Yet for viewers familiar with the commonplace that only artistic genius can produce such an enlivened image, Krammer’s coarse likeness in fact testifies to the author’s superlatively subtle nature.² In suggesting that audiences compare his expressive architectural self-portrait with “crude things” like the rough-hewn


wooden support at his side, the artist conveys a keen insight: architecture best addresses audiences through the human analogy. Through the image of man, authors and artists in sixteenth-century northern Europe made architecture speak.

Figural ornaments, or decorative forms recognizably derived from life, became an increasingly common feature of architecture and illustrated architectural publications in Europe during the sixteenth century. The phenomenon was particularly prominent in the North, where the more tenuous authority of classical models of architectural design gave artists freer range to experiment with unconventional forms. Dietterlin’s *Architectura*, for instance, pictures a triumphal arch with a squid-adorned keystone and columns with spiraling, reed-formed fluting [Fig. 2]. It also shows a crumbling portal adorned with a bear, panther, and unicorn, as well as a fireplace decorated with roasting sausages. The ubiquity of figural ornament in the architecture of Dietterlin’s world reflected the close relationship between architecture and the figural arts in that milieu. Northern architectural treatises and print series used pictorial motifs to court a broad audience of painters, sculptors, and other figural artists. With their abundance of figures and figural ornaments, the designs for architectural projects in Dietterlin’s *Architectura* could often serve just as effectively as models for paintings or sculptures. The pictorialization of architectural ornament in works like the *Architectura* also brought the medium’s representational strategies to more closely resemble those of the figural arts. As the semiotic apparatus of architecture and the figural arts converged, so, too, did their forms of visual persuasion. The figural imagery in Dietterlin’s

---

5 This design, which appeared as Plate 23 in the 1594 installment of the *Architectura*, reappeared as Plate 110 in the 1598 installment of the treatise.
Architectura and other architecture prints and books in sixteenth-century northern Europe transformed the region’s prevailing theories of architectural rhetoric.

Figuration had been regarded as a potent tool for animating expression since ancient times. Roman rhetoricians considered figurative speech a key component of oratory. Quintilian, whose Institutio oratoria describes a sophisticated theory of figurative speech, characterized the visual metaphor as a figura. The figura could manifest either as a representation of a shape, or as “…a purposeful derivation in sense or language from the ordinary or simple form; [a change analogous to] sitting, bending forwards, or looking back.” Figurative language, in other words, occasioned shifts in perspective—the key to its rhetorical power. As Caroline van Eck has noted, figurative language was enhanced by vividness of expression, or enargeia. Quintilian described enargeia as an animating force, contending that, “it is a great virtue to express our subject clearly and in such a way that it seems to be actually seen.” Krammer’s architectural self-portrait shows this principle at work: the etching’s stark visualization of the Tuscan figure’s speech and its vivid representation of his gestures, clothing, and countenance seem to enliven his architectural

---


Krammer and Quintilian both conceive of figuration and the enlivenment it occasions as *ornaments* of expression. The ancient rhetorician wrote that

‘Ornament’ is what goes beyond Lucidity and Acceptability. Its first two stages consist in conceiving and carrying out your intention; the third is the stage that puts the polish on... We must thus count as an Ornament the quality of energeia... because vividness, or, as some say, ‘representation’ is more than perspicuity, since instead of being merely transparent, it somehow shows itself off.\(^9\)

*Figurae*, then, are the final elements of rhetorical composition, the ornaments that transform ordinary speech into compelling oration. Following the lead of Quintilian and other ancient rhetoricians, art and architectural theorists in the early modern period drew parallels between the strategies of figurative verbal expression and the communicative properties of figurative images.\(^11\) Leon Battista Alberti famously treated balanced pictorial composition as a tool of compelling expression, and characterized figuration in architectural design as an instrument of persuasion.\(^12\) Ancient notions of the *figura* as ornament additionally informed developing

---


\(^11\) Georgia Clarke and Paul Crossley summarize the recent scholarship on the analogy between language and architecture in the introduction to an essay collection that demonstrates the variable historical validity of these analogies. See Georgia Clarke and Paul Crossley, “Introduction,” in *Architecture and Language: Constructing Identity in European Architecture, c. 1000-c. 1650*, ed. Georgia Clarke and Paul Crossley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 1-20. Among the ample literature on the relationships between rhetoric and the visual arts in early modern Europe, a particularly useful study is van Eck, *Classical Rhetoric and the Arts in Early Modern Europe.*

theories of architectural rhetoric. Early modern architectural treatises, which often referred
to rhetorical theory to explain concepts such as style, and frequently compared the
architectural design process to the composition of rhetorical speech, presented figural

Renaissance notions of architecture as a vehicle for effectively conveying meaning
also engaged the theories of representation developed in Vitruvius’s \textit{De architectura}. “In all
things,” Vitruvius wrote, “but especially in architecture, there are two inherent categories: the
signified and the signifier. The signified is the proposed subject of discussion; it is signified
by a reasoned demonstration carried out according to established principles of knowledge.”\footnote{“Cum in omnibus enim rebus, tum maxime etiam in architectura haec duo insunt: quod significatur et quod significat. significatur proposita res, de qua dicitur; hane autem significat demonstratio rationibus doctrinarum explicata...” Vitruvius, \textit{De architectura}, I.1.3. Here, as in Vitruvius, \textit{Ten Books on Architecture}, trans. Ingrid D. Rowland, commentary and illustrations by Thomas Noble Howe, with additional commentary by Ingrid D. Rowland and Michael J. Dewar (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 22.} This reasoned demonstration is realized through forms that appropriately express the
signified—an ideal mode of architectural correctness that Vitruvius called “\textit{decor}.”\footnote{On \textit{decor} in \textit{De architectura}, see Payne, \textit{The Architectural Treatise}, 35-41; and Chapter II of this dissertation.} Only the
proper combination of ornaments and well-proportioned forms can communicate a
Following Vitruvius’s example, Dietterlin and other authors in sixteenth-century northern Europe regarded the expression of meaning as a vital ingredient of good architecture, and a fundamental task of the architect. Signaling a project’s purpose or relative prestige was key to projecting their patrons’ desired messages, and crucial to persuading audiences that a design served its roles well.\textsuperscript{17} In the commentary to his 1548 German \textit{De architectura}, the \textit{Vitruvius Tentsch}, translator and editor Walther Hermann Ryff explains that, “The architect is the maker of meaning [bedeuter],”\textsuperscript{18} And since …we do not grasp meanings with universal capability – especially those that relate to the art of architecture – the architect must know…how to represent these things, not only with…comprehensible illustrations of the whole work with regular Figures and Models…but also through reason and intelligent explanations.\textsuperscript{19}


\textsuperscript{19} “...aber das so ich yeßt furgenommen, das ding so bedeutet wirt, wiewol vil ding sich selber bedeuten, wie alles das so wir vor augen sehen, aber solcher bedeutung sindt wir nit alle gleich veig, und sonderlichen deren ding so die kunst der Architectur betreffen. Darumb dem Architecoto von nöten, das er aus sonderlichem verstandt und wol gegrundeter sinnreichkeit wise solche ding furzubilden, nit allein im furreissen und malen, und augenscheinlichen furstellung mit furbildung der ganßen gestalt mit gleichformigen Figuren und musteren so man Model nent, sonder mit sinnreicher uñ verstendiger unterrichtung...” Ryff, \textit{Vitruvius Tentsch}, fol. VII'.
Ryff and many other architecture experts of Dietterlin’s age joined Vitruvius in viewing correctness of form as the key to effectively communicating meaning through architecture, and regarded architectural signification as an art that resembles verbal rhetoric. Decorum, a category borrowed from rhetoric, became the Renaissance version of Vitruvius’s *decor*.

Dietterlin and most other northern architectural theorists of his age portray the five canonical Orders of architecture as the foundations of architectural decorum and, by extension, the basis for coherent architectural rhetoric.20 Their texts almost universally assert that the correct use of the Orders ensures the universal intelligibility of a monument’s representational program.21 Nevertheless, the illustrations in many northern architectural treatises of the later sixteenth century, including Dietterlin’s *Architectura*, are filled with instances of licentious ornament.22 Many of the books depart from conventional models of proper architectural rhetoric by giving the Orders’ mostly abstract forms new, figural images. Dietterlin’s treatise depicts Doric columns as warlike cannon, and represents Ionic volutes as the curling forms of a woman’s hat. Human figurations of the Orders abound in his *Architectura* as well. They assume the shape of weight-bearing caryatids and atalantids, but also appear as freestanding figures—forms more typically associated with painting and sculpture than with architecture.

The figural inventions that filled architectural publications in sixteenth-century northern Europe complicated how the canonical system of Orders operated as a framework for conveying meaning.\textsuperscript{23} The explosion of figural imagery in the architectural print series and printed, illustrated architectural treatises of Dietterlin’s age vastly augmented the range of forms that the Orders could assume, and thus multiplied the meanings that they could embody. The confusing and sometimes contradictory modes of architectural signification that emerged from this trend have moved scholars to interpret Dietterlin’s \textit{Architectura} and numerous other architectural publications of his milieu as parodies of the Orders as a system for eloquent architectural expression.\textsuperscript{24} Many northern architectural treatises and print series of Dietterlin’s era do contain abstruse and irreverent imagery, such as Krammer’s obscure and sardonic self-portrait as a Tuscan post. Yet closer scrutiny of these works reveals that Dietterlin and his fellow architectural theorists also sought to reconcile their figural inventions with the formal conventions that made the Orders an effective framework for intelligible architectural rhetoric.

The groundbreaking theories of anthropomorphic architectural ornament developed in Dietterlin’s \textit{Architectura} and other architectural treatises and print series composed in sixteenth-century northern Europe exemplify this phenomenon. Architectural theorists had long portrayed the Orders as abstract representations of paradigmatic human physiques and

\textsuperscript{23} Julius von Schlosser argued that this literature pursues universal systems of architectural symbolism. Forssman’s related hypothesis that this tradition produced a consistent, legible code of architectural iconography is now contested. Fürst observes that many northern treatises’ text and illustrations contradict each other, and thus provide no such fixed framework. See Julius von Schlosser, \textit{Die Kunstliteratur. Ein Handbuch zur Quellenkunde der neueren Kunstgeschichte} (Vienna: Kunstverlag Anton Schroll & Co., 1924), 367; Forssman, \textit{Säule und Ornament}, 34; and Fürst, “Die Kategorie der Bedeutung,” 363.

personalities. Authors and artists in Dietterlin’s world transformed this tradition in two ways. First, they variously showed how a spectrum of architectonic, human forms (Termen) might also embody a single Order and its various abstract qualities. In first illustrating the different human forms that an Order might assume, theorists additionally gave the era’s prevailing framework for architectural signification a novel, concretely figural dimension.

While these anthropomorphic manifestations of the Orders promised to refine architecture’s rhetorical apparatus, their irregular, organic bodies were difficult to assimilate to prevailing standards of decorous architectural composition. In proposing diverse strategies for embodying the Orders’ metaphorical characters in human form, artists and authors thus weighed the authority of architectural convention against the demand for potent new platforms for architectural expression. Their disparate approaches to anthropomorphizing the Orders show what priorities informed the different theories of architectural signification that arose in Dietterlin’s age. They also demonstrate how interplay between architecture and the figural arts shaped the evolving rhetoric of architectural ornament in sixteenth-century northern Europe.

Some time in the mid-1560s, artist Hans Vredeman de Vries and Antwerp publisher Gerard de Jode released the print series *Caryatidum (vulgus termas vocat)*, or, “Caryatids (called ‘terms’ by commoners)”[26] The work is comprised of an illustrated title page and sixteen additional etchings. Each pictures a handful of ornamental bodies. Mysteriously, not all of these figures resemble the fully anthropomorphic, weight-bearing caryatids mentioned in the series title and described in Vitruvian literature [Fig. 3]. Etchings like Plate 10 also show partially anthropomorphic figures, comprised of a bust, arms, and torso set atop downward-tapering forms—ornaments that ultimately came to be known as “terms.”[27]

While references to caryatids, atalantids and other anthropomorphic architectural posts abounded in *De architectura* and sixteenth-century Vitruvian texts, terms had gone

---


largely unmentioned in northern literature on architectural ornament.\textsuperscript{28} It was the \textit{Caryatidum}'s subtitle, for instance, that first dubbed the motif “Termen” in Dutch.\textsuperscript{29} Because of their minor role in architectural publications prior to the second half of the sixteenth century, no clear formal definition of terms existed when Vredeman released his \textit{Caryatidum}, and they were often confused with caryatids for some time after. Plate 10 shows the variety of forms that could fall under Vredeman’s caryatid/term rubric: a basket-bearing \textit{canephore} ensconced in strapwork, a duo of armless terms that would today be called “herms”, and a standing couple bound so minimally by a geometric band that they fall somewhere between the modern idea of caryatids or atalantids and terms.

Since ancient times, Caryatids had been defined as architectural ornaments. The tapering, base-bound figures that in Dietterlin’s time came to be known as \textit{Termen} had enjoyed a more varied career—especially outside of architecture. In Greek antiquity they served as freestanding sculptures with the head of Hermes, and appeared during the Roman period in grotesque wall painting and as statues of Terminus, the god of boundaries.\textsuperscript{30} After the mid-1530s, ornament prints proliferated images of terms throughout Europe, and artists soon applied the form in many different media.\textsuperscript{31} Terms were an especially popular motif in


\textsuperscript{29} Forssman, \textit{Säule und Ornament}, 141.

\textsuperscript{30} Günter Irmscher, \textit{Kölner Architektur- und Säulenbücher um 1600}. Sigurd Greven-Studien 2 (Bonn: Bouvier, 1999), 81.

\textsuperscript{31} Ibid., 82.
grotesque designs such as the *sgraffito* decorations added to the courtyard at Neuburg Castle in Neuburg an der Donau in 1562, just before the *Caryatidum* was likely released [Fig. 4].

Vredeman accordingly brags that his printed *Termen* are useful models for painters, sculptors, and all manner of craftsmen. Yet in describing “termas” as a version of the architectural caryatid or “Caryatidum,” the title of his print series most highlighted terms’ relevance to architects. Vredeman’s *Caryatidum* thus assimilated a motif once strongly associated with the figural arts to the era’s emerging typology of *architectural* ornament. As ornaments that combine the human figure’s organic shapes with the mainly inorganic forms of the built world, *Termen* indeed embody a marriage of the figural arts and architecture.

Audiences in sixteenth-century northern Europe regarded caryatids as emblems of architectural rhetoric, for the ornament plays a leading role in the anecdote in which Vitruvius explained architectural signification. Caryatids, he relates, derived from the Greek practice of substituting columns with images of the conquered women of Caryae, so that “…the notorious punishment of the Caryate women would be recalled to future generations.” With the caryatid story, Vitruvius reinforced the idea that *decor* is determined by tradition, and that architecture derives its meaning from traditional, canonical forms. Authors in sixteenth-century northern Europe in turn argued that conventional forms promote effective architectural rhetoric. Ryff’s *Vitruvius Teutsch* commends that caryatids “…might also be readily applied by the princes and lords of these times, especially in lovely fortified palaces and princely residences, in order to show their [owners’] valiance and

---

33 “…tot behoef alle Beelt ende Steenhouwers Scrinwerkers Glaesscriuers ende alle Constellicke handwerkers...,” Vredeman de Vries, *Caryatidum*, title page.
manliness.”

Prints in this first, German translation of *De architectura* illustrate models of what Ryff calls “caryatid columns” (*Caryatischen Säulen*), some of which in fact display the tapered bases of terms [Fig. 5]. In later describing terms as a form of caryatid, Vredeman’s *Carytidum* did not only associate terms with the theory of rhetorical conventions in architecture. By adjusting the definition of caryatids to include terms, the work also signaled that the conventions of architecture and the conditions of architectural rhetoric are subject to change.

The waxing presence of anthropomorphic ornaments in the architectural publications of sixteenth-century northern Europe was one symptom of the region’s broader interest in assimilating classical and modern, foreign modes of architectural ornament to local, contemporary tastes. Authors justified their adaptations of these esteemed models by citing the Vitruvian dictum that architecture should suit its present context. Vredeman, for instance, stresses the importance of “…understanding how to accommodate the spirit of architecture to the country’s nature and customs…” For instance, northern Europe experienced a cooler climate than the Italian peninsula, and therefore required a different style of building. Developments such as the rise of Christianity and the invention of

---


239
gunpowder likewise warranted the construction of churches, armories, and other building types not found in ancient architecture.39

Addressing “all those interested in antique ornament,”40 Vredeman’s Caryatidum takes the reinvention of classical architectural conventions as a leading theme. Its bilingual, Latin/Dutch title page employs the distinctions between the two languages to metaphorically contrast ancient, esteemed modes of architectural expression with the architectural rhetoric of the present day. In Renaissance Europe, as Joost Keizer and Todd M. Richardson have noted, vernacular languages like Dutch were regarded as linguistic counterpoints to Latin. Associated with the common people, the vernacular represented an alternative to the language of the Church and classical authors. It could thus serve as an outlet for challenging the authority of these institutions. Latin was international and associated with ancient rules of grammar and composition, but vernacular languages were affiliated with specific regions, and were also constantly changing in ways that classical Latin no longer did. Beginning in the fifteenth century, authors in various parts of Europe championed their respective

39 Ryff cites these climatological conditions and historical developments as grounds for updating the Vitruvian system of architectural design in the introduction to his 1547 Architectur. See Walther Hermann Ryff, Der furnehmsten notwendigsten, der gantzen Architectur angebōrigen Mathematischen und Mechanischen künst, eggentlicher bericht und vast klare, verstandliche unterrichtung, zu rechtem verstand der kehr Vitruijij in drey furnene Bücher abtheilet; Als Der neuen Perspectiu das I. buch Vom rechten gewissen Geometrischen grund ... Weiteren inhalt des II. und III. Buchs der Geometrischen Büxenmeisterey und Geometrischen Messung, sampt den kurtzen Summarien, des gantzen begriffs der selbigten unterschidnen theil findestu hernach nechst der Voorred verzeichnet... [hereafter, “Architectur”] (Nuremberg: Johan Petreius, 1547), Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Rab. 612, fols. 2v-4r. On the roles of local climate and cultural mores in northern architectural theory during the sixteenth century, see Krista De Jonge and Konrad Ottenheym, eds., Unity and Discontinuity, 93-110.

40 “...alle die de Antieckse Compertementsche Cieraet Beminnen...” Vredeman de Vries, Caryatidum, title page.
vernaculars as worthy linguistic traditions. Artists simultaneously began exploring the idea of local forms of visual expression with greater intensity.\(^4\)

Vredeman’s *Caryatidum* belongs to this tradition of inquiry. By describing “termas” as the “vulgar” term for Caryatids, the Latin title of Vredeman’s *Caryatidum* frames *Termen* as the local, *vernacular* manifestation of the classical caryatid. The work’s Dutch subtitle, *Veelderléj dieuerse Termen…*, does not mention Caryatids, perhaps because their Vitruvian architectural rhetoric belongs only to the elevated, classical architectural idiom embodied by the Latin title. By representing *Termen* as a vernacular phenomenon, Vredeman insinuates that the ornament possess the qualities of vernacular language. He implies that they are essentially modern and informal, can challenge the authority of classical ornament, and even change to reflect contemporary mores. In portraying *Termen* as vehicles of sixteenth-century northern Europe’s architectural vernacular, the artist suggests that the ornaments of his *Caryatidum* are ideal for meeting the representational demands of the region’s contemporary architectural patrons.

Renaissance architects in northern Europe did employ *Termen* to this end. Often they incorporated the motif in modern building types not mentioned in Vitruvius’s *De architectura*, such as town halls and modest Burgher homes. The façade of the 1571 Lemgo residence of

---

merchant Hermann Kruwel, for instance, features tapering, leaf-bound anthropomorphic supports in the guises of Adam and Eve [Fig. 6] who are reminiscent of the Termen couples in the tenth plate of Vredeman’s Caryatidum [Fig. 3]. The carved pair flanks an inscription that commemorates the founding of the house, implicating Kruwel’s dwelling in the universal order of God’s creation. Biblical symbolism had played no role in Vitruvius’s description of architectural ornament, but it was a common means for addressing viewers in late-Renaissance Lemgo. As architectural figures that could vividly illustrate themes from the Scripture, Termen were among the most apt vehicles for incorporating such Christian rhetoric into the ornamental apparatus of a modern architectural project.

The ‘Terms’ of the Five Orders: Abstraction and Figuration

Caryatids and Termen were regarded as emblems of architecture’s expressive power in part because they embodied one of the medium’s most compelling analogies: the relationship between the human body and the column. This topos also undergirds the theory of the Orders. Vitruvius’s De architectura establishes the Orders as a system of architectural modes variously suited to certain projects. It recounts how the Doric and Ionic Orders respectively originated in the construction of temples devoted to Apollo and Diana, and how a basket overgrown with acanthus leaves and set atop the tomb of a young maiden inspired the form of the Corinthian Order and its distinctive, vegetal capital. Vitruvius’s treatise also sketches the appearance of each manner by describing the relationships between their

43 “IN GADES NAMEN VNDE CHRISTVS FREDE, HEFT / DVT HVES HERMAN KRWVEL BVET AN DISE STEDE AO 1571.” / “In the name of God and the joy of Christ, Hermann Kruwel built this house on this site in the year 1571.”
44 Rykwert, The Dancing Column, 138.
45 The theory of the Orders and the story of their origins are covered generally in Vitruvius, De architectura, IV.1.1-12.
constitutive parts in terms of specific ratios.\textsuperscript{46} The anthropomorphic imagery of the Orders’ origin stories shapes these rules for decorous architectural composition. Proportions and ornaments associated with the columns of any given Order reflect the physical qualities of the figures to whom its paradigmatic monument was dedicated: proper Doric, Ionic, and Corinthian columns respectively resemble a man, a woman, and a maiden.\textsuperscript{47} In pointing back to the paradigmatic anthropomorphic characters that inspired their architectonic forms, Vitruvius’s Orders also conjure a network of other associations—the manly Doric Order embodies strength, the maidenly Corinthian exudes grace, and so on.\textsuperscript{48} Observing the conventions for devising the Order is vital to maintaining these chains of reference in a monument’s outward appearance. Only by decorously employing the Orders’ standard ornaments and proportions can architecture intelligibly embody abstract meanings and metaphors.\textsuperscript{49}

During the sixteenth century, changing theories of the Orders shaped how their ornaments operated as bearers of meaning.\textsuperscript{50} The initial volume of Sebastiano Serlio’s Regole generali di architettura, the so-called “Quarto libro” of 1537, built on Vitruvius’s system of Orders to illustrate a quintet of Tuscan, Doric, Ionic, Corinthian, and Composite modes that became the dominant scheme of architectural ornament for the early modern period [Fig.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
  \item Vitruvius addresses the proportions of the Ionic Order’s ornaments in De architectura III.5.1-15, the proportions of the Corinthian Order in IV.1.11-12, and the proportions of the Doric Order in IV.3.1-9.
  \item John Onians, Bearers of Meaning, 34-35.
  \item Ibid. 28.
  \item See Onians, Bearers of Meaning, 271-286.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Drawing on the Vitruvian idea that certain architectural manners are appropriate to particular projects, Serlio contends that the Orders are individually suited to specific sorts of patrons. While the Doric is appropriate for the residence of a soldier or “robust or grand persons” (armigeri, & robusti, o gran personaggi), the Ionic suits the homes of “intellectuals and those with quiet lifestyles” (huomini letterati, & di vita quieta). By linking individual Orders with different sorts of patrons, Serlio granted the canonical modes of architecture more multivalent identities. The adornments of a Doric work could now embody vigor and grandeur, and the ornaments of an Ionic monument could now read as signs of scholarliness or the vita contemplativa.

Pieter Coecke van Aelst’s 1539 Dutch translation of the Quarto libro, as well as his 1542 German and French editions of the work, soon spread Serlio’s system of Orders north of the Alps. Along with Vitruvius’s descriptions of the Orders’ paradigmatic bodies, Serlio’s representation of the Orders as complex characters came to shape how northern authors illustrated the anthropomorphic dimensions of these ornamental modes. Hans Blum’s Von den fünff Sülén is among the many northern treatises that took up the Quarto libro’s paradigm of five Orders, but offers more concrete advice on devising their forms. When it appeared in 1550, the book’s influential instructions for architectural drafting prompted northern Europe to view the Orders as synonymous with their characteristic columns.

---


52 Forssman, Säule und Ornament, 69.

53 Serlio, Regole generali, fols. XIX’ and XXXVI’.


55 Forssman, Säule und Ornament, 69.

56 Ibid. 76. As previously noted in Chapter II, Blum released Von den fünff Sülén in the same year as the Latin version of the text, Quinque columnarum exacta descriptio. Most secondary
Blum harbors a vigorous interest in the ways in which the abstract forms of the columns embody the Orders’ anthropomorphic traits. He writes how the Tuscan column is hefty like its namesake, the giant Tuscano, and can be compared with a large, simple farmer. He also relates how the Doric column resembles a strong hero, the Ionic, a brave woman, and the Corinthian, a lovely virgin.\textsuperscript{57} \textit{Von den fünf Sülen} argues that the columns’ proportions and ornaments must figure the physiques of the human types they represent. For instance, it specifies that the Ionic column should display a 1:7 ratio between the width of the column base and the total height from the base to the top of the entablature, and that these proportions reflect the Ionic woman’s slender, yet sturdy figure [Fig. 8]. The Ionic column’s geometric ornaments, Blum writes, should recall the head of its female model with a “…spiral, wrought through a snail-formed line, so that [her] bound-up plait or tresses are shown on the right and left sides.”\textsuperscript{58} For Blum, these geometric figures also convey the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
  \item Irmscher, \textit{Kölner Architektur- und Säulenbücher}, 36.
  \item “...und am Capitäl wirbel oder voluten, oder Schnörckel, durch die Schneckenlinien gezogen gefeßt, damit die ufgebunden zöpff oder harflächten anzüzeigen, auff der rechten und lincken syten.” Blum, \textit{Von den fünf Sülen}, under, “Dem frommen, Erenuestē,
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
metaphorical personality conventionally associated with the Ionic mode. By abstractly embodying the firm, womanly physique said to have inspired its form, the Ionic shaft and volute capital in turn evoke the Order’s abstract qualities of maturity and femininity. Von den fünf Säulen’s descriptions of these mechanisms made reference to the human body by way of the five columns into the northern architect’s prime tool for conveying meaning.

Despite the central importance of the analogy between architecture and man in early modern architectural publications, concrete, figural images of humans had rarely been used in building as manifestations of the Orders. Terms had also never been assimilated to the theory of the Orders in any systematic way—until Vredeman published the Caryatidum. The Dutch subtitle of Vredeman’s print series innovatively identifies terms as “…various Termen of the five Orders of Buildings.” Viewers familiar with the Orders’ symbolic identities can discern that many prints of the Caryatidum indeed depict sets of Tuscan, Doric, Ionic, Corinthian, and Composite Termen, and an extra, basket-bearing canephore, from right to left [Fig. 9]. The Caryatidum’s first plate establishes this pattern by showing the standard embodiment of each Order: a Hercules-formed term who evokes the rough, Tuscan character, a noble hero capped with a Doric triglyph entablature, a matron crowned with the Ionic scroll, a maiden wearing the pleated garment of the Corinthian virgin, and a girl with

59 Vitruvius suggests that caryatids and other anthropomorphic supports might, under certain circumstances, be appropriate substitutes for the columns. However, neither his De architectura nor modern Vitruvian literature had discussed caryatids as parts of the system of Orders. On the relationship between figural supports such as caryatids and columns in ancient times, see Rykwert, The Dancing Column, 133-139. On the roles of caryatids in early modern architecture and architectural literature, see Evamaria Schmidt, Geschichte der Karyatide: Funktion und Bedeutung der menschlichen Träger- und Stützfigur in der Baukunst. Habilitationsschrift, Technische Universität München, Munich, 1978. Beiträge zur Archäologie 13 (Würzburg: Triltsch, 1982), 144-152.

60 “...Veelderley dieuere Termen op de V ordene der Edificien...” Vredeman de Vries, Caryatidum, title page.

61 Forssman, Säule und Ornament, 142-143.
wild tresses that channel the stereotypically licentious nature of the Composite Order. Other plates depict alternative manifestations of the Orders. An armored woman in Plate 14 of the *Caryatidum* bears the attributes of Athena, and reflects the Ionic character because she conforms to Blum’s dictum that the Order is like a brave woman [Fig. 10]. Through such images, Vredeman’s *Caryatidum* portrays Termen as an internally diverse subclass of concretely anthropomorphic figures found within each of the five Orders. The sheer variety of Termen pictured in the series encourages readers to devise new anthropomorphic manifestations of the Orders by inventing their own versions of this motif as well.

Vredeman’s ideas transformed how the Orders functioned as bearers of meaning. Once, the Orders were conceived as representations of canonical human forms. With the *Caryatidum*, human-formed ornaments were likewise understood as embodiments of the Orders. Vitruvius and subsequent authors had long portrayed each Order as a reflection of one paradigmatic human type. Vredeman’s *Caryatidum* conversely demonstrates how any number of anthropomorphic figures might manifest a single Order. And whereas previous artists had engaged the analogy between the Orders and man by abstracting the human body into mainly inorganic, geometric forms, the *Caryatidum*’s Orders possess concretely anthropomorphic shapes. With their lifelike appearances, Vredeman’s *Termen* introduced a vivid new form of architectural rhetoric.

The *Caryatidum* moreover showed how Termen might selectively highlight certain aspects of an Order’s stereotypical personality. The matron depicted in Plate 1 channels the Ionic mode’s characteristic femininity. Plate 14’s Ionic Athena term refers to the goddess’s signal attributes of a plumed helmet and armor to likewise figure the Ionic Order’s associations with female bravery. In embodying the Orders in new ways, Vredeman’s *Termen* also expand the iconographies of each ornamental mode. His armored Ionic Athena term
can, for instance, represent protection and defense—categories not conventionally associated with the Ionic Order in previous works on architecture. In innovating upon the Orders’ standard symbolism, the Caryatidum’s Termen made the visual rhetoric of the Orders more versatile, and more precise.

Architects in sixteenth-century northern Europe accordingly used Termen to convey rather idiosyncratic messages. Paul Francke employed one of the more distinctive forms represented in Vredeman’s Caryatidum in a portal realized in Helmstedt between 1577 and 1578 at the Schola Julia of Duke Julius of Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel, for whom Vredeman also later worked [Fig. 11]. The portal’s bearded, pillow-topped figures derive from the male component of the mixed-gender Composite term in Plate 14 of the Caryatidum. Cicero had once described an ornament similar to Vredeman’s Composite figure as an appropriate adornment for his academy, for the motif joined the images of eloquent Hermes and sage Athena to form an emblem of wise rhetoric. Francke eliminated the female component of Vredeman’s pillow-topped Termen, altering the Ciceronian Hermathena motif to represent the male component alone. The male Termen still signal the Schola Julia’s Hermes-like dedication to artful speech, but without bare-breasted female counterparts, their forms are better suited to the school’s identity as an engine of religious reform. In light of the Composite Order’s associations with the melding of disparate categories, Franke’s Composite Termen also frame the Schola Julia as a place for synthesizing disparate aspects of knowledge.


63 “est ornamentum Academiae proprium meae, quod et Herme commune est omnium et Minerva singulare est insigne eius gymnasi…” Cicero, Epistulæ ad Atticum, I.4.3. This passage is discussed in greater detail in the Conclusion.
Despite their capacity for vividly conveying meaning through diverse artistic and literary references, the Caryatidum’s Termen are imperfect instruments of architectural rhetoric. Their major flaw: they do not display their Orders’ canonical proportions. Only viewers capable of recognizing an Order by its iconography alone can fully appreciate their symbolism. And since the irregular, indecorous forms of the Caryatidum’s Termen do not always coordinate with decorously devised architecture, they can also marr the harmonious appearance of a project’s representational program.

Concern for these issues moved Vredeman to revise his picture of Termen in his 1577 treatise, the Architectura, Oder Bauung der Antiquen [Fig. 12]. Explaining the three small figures floating among the Composite columns in the final plate of this systematic overview of the Orders, he writes,

[Here] I have also incidentally placed a trio of Terms called or termed Phillernen, to be used in the Composite Order in stone, as well as in wood[,] And so that they be a benefit and ornament for a vice-less (unlastbaren) work, and each occur as they should in the Order […] one should advise oneself with the writings and teachings of Vitruvius, and other masters, who have well declared and placed in order all [their] general and particular measurements…

In order to complement a decorous design, terms must display the proportions of their Order. The tops and bottoms of the Phillernen Termen pictured in the illustration to this passage align with points demarcated by horizontal lines on the pair of vertical scales on the

---

64 Zimmermann sees this phenomenon as evidence that the Caryatidum’s terms are not arranged in a regular pattern according to the Orders. Nevertheless, Vredeman’s consistent, if obscure, use of iconography to indicate each term’s Order nevertheless confirms Forssman’s hypothesis that the plates featuring six figures establish such an order. See Zimmermann, Die Architectura von Hans Vredeman de Vries, 142; and Forssman, Säule und Ornament, 142-143.

65 “Wyter so hab ich auch noch hie bey neben gestelt dreyerley Term khocher oder getermde Phillernen, Composita, vmb zu gebrauchen in stain, so woll als in holtz, vnd das zu ainner nutz vnd khunst vmb ain unlastbaren werckh, also ain ieder an der Ordinantz sicht vnd befunden soll, ethwass meer von der Composita, vnd alle die andere fier oorden zusaggen, ist (oder zubewissen), soll sich ain ieder dess verstandts beratten, mitt der schrifft vnd lernung Vitruuij, vnd meer ander maieter, die alle die genneralle vnd particulier mass von allem zu allem, alles woll declarriert vnd in die oorden gestelt haben…” Vredeman de Vries, Architectura, under, “COMPOSITA”.
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left side of the print, which indicate the standard proportions of the Composite Order. This correspondence confirms that the ornaments reflect the ratios of the Composite mode, and might therefore adorn a Composite work without tarnishing its decorous appearance.

Yet although Vredeman’s Philлиlren Termen display Composite proportions, his invention is of limited use. The author never explains how to formulate Phillılren Termen. Nor do Vitruvius or the “other masters” that Vredeman promises can provide instruction on this matter. The Architectura’s Phillılren Termen moreover possess geometric forms. Such “abstract” terms, likely introduced in an undated series of prints by Jacques I. Androuet Du Cerceau released some years before, enjoyed great popularity in late sixteenth-century northern Europe.66 Relative to the Caryatidum’s organic, anthropomorphic Termen, the 1577 Architectura’s regular, abstract Termen can more clearly display correct proportions. Still, due to their inorganic, abstract shapes, they are no better suited to vividly representing specific meanings than the geometric forms of Blum’s ideal columns.67 Neither the evocative yet indecorous Termen of Vredeman’s Caryatidum nor the well-proportioned but generic Termen of his Architectura boast the balanced mix of decorousness and expressiveness vital to impactful architectural rhetoric.

Dietterlin’s Figural Architecture: Allegory and Narrative in Architectonic Form

Dietterlin embarked on his own experiments with anthropomorphic manifestations of the Orders in the 1593 Erst Buoh of his Architectura treatise series. One etching depicts the dotted outline of the Ionic Order’s standard column and entablature, a half-outlined, half-

66 This type of ornament was likely introduced by the prints of Jacques I. Androuet Du Cerceau in the 1560s. On this development, see Forssman, Säule und Ornament, 149.
67 Several of the Architectura’s models for façades pictured anthropomorphic Termen, but those figures bore no outstanding attributes. Their limited symbolic apparatus thus offered few advantages over that of abstract manifestations of the Orders. Zimmermann, Die Architecctura von Hans Vredeman de Vries, 143.
modeled elevation of the Order’s basic column, a more ornate version of the Ionic column, and an anthropomorphic post set atop a base labeled “III IONICA.” [Fig. 13]. Ionica is one of a quintet of Dietterlin’s Architectura etchings that visually summarizes the forms of one of the five Orders. Each of the five sections of the Erst Buch, the 1594 Annder Buch, and the summative, 1598 edition of the Architectura begins with the synoptic print appropriate to its Order.69

In the 1593 and 1598 installments of the Architectura, Dietterlin prefaces his visual synopses of the Orders with brief instructions for decorously drafting the standard column of the mode at hand. The author also introduces each synoptic image with a passage that explains its Order’s history and characteristic appearance. The Tuscan is an “ancient” Order (ein alte Art) that can be “compared to a strong farmer” (einem groben starcken Bauern verglichen).70 The Doric boasts the stature of a “brave hero” and was named after the princely hero Dorus when he built a temple to Juno in that Order.71 The capital of the Corinthian Order was derived from an acanthus-covered basket sitting atop the grave of a young maiden, and, because it is “somewhat more ornate and purer” than the other Orders, is

68 This design re-appeared in the 1594 installment of the Architectura as Plate 13 and in the 1598 installment as Plate 95.  
69 In the re-numbered series of prints that comprise Dietterlin’s 1594 Annder Buch, they became Plates 2, 13, 28, 38, and 50. In the 1598 Architectura, they appear as Plates 6, 46, 95, 136, and 176.  
71 “Die ander Columna oder Seul, Dorica genandt, würdt einem Dapffern Helden, oder Malicher leng verglichen, uñ das darummen, weiln die Bawmeister, So ihn Caria dem Gott Apollini seinem Tempel auffrichteté…Das sie aber Dorica genandt würt, Solle (wie der berümbte Architectus Vitruvius Lib. 4. cap. 1. meldet) daher komen, weil der Held und Fürst Dorus, der Göttin Iunionj, einen Tempel zu Agris, Auff solche damahls new erfundene Dorische Manier hab auffbawen lassen, das sie also nach dem selben Helden Doro, Dorica geheißen worden seye.” Dietterlin, Erst Buch, under, “DORICA”.
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compared to a “sweet, jewelry-wearing virgin.”\textsuperscript{72} The Composite is “even finer and more subtle than the Corinthian,” and embodies a synthesis of the Doric, Ionic, and Corinthian Orders.\textsuperscript{73} Describing the Ionic mode, Dietterlin relates that

\begin{quote}
...after the invention of the Tuscan and Doric columns, the Ionic people in Caria wanted to build a temple to Diana, and intended to use the art of Symmetry or the distribution of [measurements]...to make an even greater ornament and magnificent display. And so they invented a new manner, with a column in which...a volute...drawn in the form of a spiral...is set on either side of the capital ...and from top to bottom adorned with fluting...such that it resembles a woman, with her base like a shoe, and the curls or volute, like a bound-up hairstyle.\textsuperscript{74}
\end{quote}

Like Vitruvius, Dietterlin asserts that the history of an Order informs the appearance of its signature ornaments. The Carian temple to Diana inspired a column that resonates with the dedicatee’s female nature, with fluting that resembles a woman’s pleated gown, and volute capitals that recall a majestic coif. Dietterlin’s account of the Ionic Order, like his histories of


\textsuperscript{73} “Diese Columna, oder Seul, ist noch reiner und Suptiler, dañ die Corinthia, vndn ob wohl inn Vitruuij oder anderer schrifften von der selben vnd warumē sie solchen Namen bekommen gar keine meldung beschicht. So würt sie doch Propriē vnd eigentlichen Composita genandt. Weil sie eine zu setzung, Fügung, oder vermischung ist, der dreyen obgemelten, als Dorischen Ionischen vndnd Corinthischen Seulen, von den Architectis, also Proportioniert, wie deren ar vnd eigenschaft hernach auch kürßlichen angezeigt werden solle.” Dietterlin, \textit{Erst Buch}, under, “COMPOSITA”.

\textsuperscript{74} “Nach erfindung vor gesetzter beider der Tuscanischen und Dorischern Zeulen, als das Junische Volek inn Caria, auch die Göttin Dianæ einen Tempel zu bawen vor hatten, unnd dieser Kunst Sīmetri, oder außtheilung deß Schuhs (wie oben gehört albereit am tag gewesen, haben die Jonishen dem Gebew ein desto grössere zier unnd Herrlicher ansehen zunachen, aber mahlen ein andere Manier erdacht, unnd solcher Seulen im undern Theil des Schäffts, ein Spriam oder Pasim underlegt, am Capitol Voluten oder Schnörkel, durch die Schnecken Linien gezogen, zu beiden seiten gefeßt, auch mit Gesimbs und Encarpis oder festinen geziert, und von oben herab bis unden hinauß gekehlet oder gerippt, daher diese Columna einem Weiblichen Körper oder Frawenbild verglichen, mit den Pasim die Schuch: den Schnörken oder Voluten, die auffgeschlagene zöpff.” Dietterlin, \textit{Erst Buch}, under, “IONICA”.
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the other canonical modes of architecture, furthermore emulates the description of the corresponding mode in Blum’s *Von den fünff Säulen.* Yet while Blum depicts only abstracted representations of the Orders’ characteristic physiques, Dietterlin’s etchings also visualize the Orders in concrete, anthropomorphic form—the form of a term. *Ionica* illustrates a coiffed, female-formed term with pleated garments as an alternative figuration of the Ionic Order’s fluted, volute-crowned column, echoing the imagery of the *ekphrasis* in the accompanying text. Her body exhibits a 1:9 ratio between the width of the base and the height of the post, figuring the dimensions that Dietterlin attributed to the Ionic Order. Thus, like the other personifications shown in the *Architectura’s* synoptic etchings, the Ionic term displays the proportions described in Dietterlin’s instructions for devising the ornaments of her Order.

The *Architectura’s* synoptic etchings suggest that the process of devising architectural ornament is based on the rules of decorum but fully realized with the expression of the Orders’ anthropomorphic symbolism. Annotations in the *Ionica* print visualize steps in Dietterlin’s instructions for correctly composing the Ionic Order. While the image’s half-outlined, half-modeled column evokes the transition between drafted and built form, its more ornate column shows how to elaborate on the conventional Ionic post. *Ionica’s* matronly Ionic term shows the most invention, and most vividly embodies the human type that inspires the proportions and ornaments of the conventional Ionic columns beside her. The figure’s base, capital, and entablature all align with the benchmark measurements inscribed on the standard Ionic column, a device that certifies that her body displays the

---

76 Dotted columns and numerical notations in each synoptic image illustrate Dietterlin’s instructions for decorously drafting the Order at hand. On the author’s strategies for illuminating his system of decorous architectural composition, see Chapter II.
correct proportions of the Ionic Order. Dietterlin’s architecturally decorous, anthropomorphic figure combines the lifelike imagery of the Caryatidum’s human-formed Termen with the formal correctness of the abstract terms of Vredeman’s 1577 Architectura. She thus provides a blueprint for the vivid and intelligible anthropomorphic architectural rhetoric that Vredeman had never quite managed to model.

Dietterlin’s strategy for visualizing decorous, anthropomorphic forms of the Orders derives from a work not typically associated with sixteenth-century architectural culture in the German-speaking lands. In his 1563 The First and Chief Grovndes of Architecture, John Shute summarizes the Ionic order in a print that likewise aligns a drafted and annotated elevation of the Ionic column, a modeled elevation of the Ionic column, and an Ionic caryatid [Fig. 14]. Because she shares the dimensions of the decorous Ionic columns beside her, Shute’s caryatid can also be understood as an architecturally decorous, anthropomorphic manifestation of the Ionic Order. Classicizing robes and a peacock identify the figure as Hera, a mature female goddess who aptly personifies what Shute describes as the Ionic Order’s matronly nature. The figure in Dietterlin’s Ionica print likewise personifies her Order. But by imparting his Ionic post with the bound and tapering form of a term, Dietterlin associates her with a class of anthropomorphic ornament that could also manifest the Orders in myriad other ways. She thus poses as the prototype for a host of further

---

79 The anthropomorphic figures in the Architectura’s other synoptic prints each personify their Order as well. Dietterlin’s treatise illustrates the Tuscan Order as a farmer herm, the Doric manner as a heroic atalantid, the Ionic by a matronly herm, the Corinthian by a virginal caryatid and term. Dietterlin’s Composite herm derives from the representation of that mode in Shute’s First and Chief Grovndes of Architecture, which personifies the Order in the form of Pandora. Ibid. 304-306.
anthropomorphic architectural inventions, such as the mermaids in Dietterlin’s nautical Ionic triumphal arch [Fig. 2].

Dietterlin expands the Orders’ anthropomorphic iconographies in part by representing multiple dimensions of meaning through a single figural ornament. The artist begins these experiments with the personification of the Tuscan Order in the Erst Buch’s first plate [Fig. 15]. In the accompanying text, he observes that

…the first Columna or column, named TVSCANA, is an old manner. Pliny writes in Lib. 36., cap. 23. that the Tusci have their origins in the Greeks; but some Architecti write that the Tuscan Order received its name from the powerful giant Tuscano, who is called a father of the Germans, who are also named after this giant. Due to the [Tuscan Order’s] strength and uncouthness, many Architecti also compare it to a strong farmer.

Dietterlin’s allusion to Blum’s farmer-like Tuscan Order clarifies why the figure in Tuscana sports a country bumpkin’s spoon-adorned hat and rough tunic. Yet by highlighting the contradictions between Pliny and Blum’s texts, Dietterlin also asserts that the Orders’ symbolism is the sum of multiple influences, a tradition open to various interpretations, and even new meanings. Dietterlin takes the competing accounts of the Orders’ iconographies

---

80 This design re-appeared as Plate 2 of the 1594 installment of the Architcutura and as Plate 6 of the 1598 installment.
81 “Die Erst Columna, oder Seul, TVSCANA genand, ist ein alte Art, wie Plinius Lib. 36. cap. 23. daruon schreibt: Das die Tusci, ihren Ursprung von den Griechen haben, etliche Architecti, aber schreiben, Da disse Seul, weil sie under und vor den anderen allen die gröbest un störckeste ist, von dem mechtigen Risen Tuscano (Der ein Vatter der Teutschen genandt worden) Ihren Namen bekommen, unnd ihrer Ströcke halben, nach dem selben Risen, Tuscana genent seye. Also würst sie auch, eben ihrer Störeck unnd größe halben, von vilen Architecti, einem groben starcken Bawren verglichen, und etwan auch, das Bewrische Werck genandt…” Dietterlin, Erst Buch, under, “TVSCANA”.
83 This observation parallels prior architectural theorists’ reflections on the disparities between the formal conventions observable among the remains of classical architecture and the standards of architectural decorum as described in the writings of Vitruvius. Many authors had used the contradictions between ruins and text to portray the Orders’ formal conventions as open to a degree of elaboration. For an account of this phenomenon, see
as grounds to elaborate on their conventional symbolism. While the *Architectura*’s text indicates that the term in the *Tuscan* print can read as a strong farmer or even the giant Tuscano, the figure evokes a number of additional identities as well. Adorned with grapevines, scythes, and a bucket—the implements of cultivating grapes and producing wine—the Tuscan might also embody the vineyard-filled Rhineland region in which Dietterlin’s *Architectura* was composed.84 This visual metaphor engages the idea that the Tuscan Order has a special connection to the author’s region because the Giant for which the Order is named is a “father of the Germans”.

Alternatively, the Tuscan figure’s banded brow, grapevines, and scythes could portray what various classical sources had described as attributes of the Etruscan and Roman god of metamorphosis, Vertumnus.85 The ancient elegist Propertius had represented the Romans’ idol to the God as a speaking statue who brags that the ability to adopt many different guises attests to his persuasive prowess. “My nature,” boasts Propertius’s idol, “...suits any role: turn me to which you please, and I shall fit it well. Clothe me in silks, and I will become a none-too-prudish girl: and who would deny that, wearing the toga, I am a man? Give me a scythe and bind my forehead with a wisp of hay: you will swear that my hand has cut grass.”86 As a result of this expressive flexibility, ancient readers regarded

___________________________

85 Because the Tuscan Order’s name was thought to derive from the same giant who gave the Germans their name (*Teutsch*), the visual summary of Tuscan ornament was an ideal place for Dietterlin’s nod to Rhenish viniculture.
86 The story of Vertumnus is related in Ovid’s *Metamorphoseon* (XIV.623–771) and *Fasti* (VI.410), as well as Horace’s *Satires* (II.7.14), Propertius’s *Elegiae* (IV.2), Horace’s *Epistulae* (I.20.1), and Cicero’s *Orations in verrem* (II.1.154) mention the Romans’ idol to the god. Literary references to Vertumnus also abounded in the Renaissance, but are too numerous to list here.
86a “…opportune meast cunctis natura figuris: / in quacumque voles verte, decorus ero. / induce me Cois, fiam non dura puella: / meque virum sumpta quis neget esse toga? / da
Vertumnus a master of deft expression and a symbol of artistic eloquence.\textsuperscript{87} Vertumnus’s talent for convincing shape-shifting was also known to learned readers of the sixteenth century. Drawing on Propertius’s elegy, a poem by Gregorio Comanini probably delivered to the court of Rudolf II in 1590 also described the God as a protean figure. Comanini’s Vertumnus explains that “I vary from myself, / and thus, so varied, I am one only, and from various things with various countenances I portray resemblances.”\textsuperscript{88} Repeated in Comanini’s more widely circulated \textit{Il Figino} of 1591, the text moved audiences in Dietterlin’s age to regard Vertumnus as a personality who could assume many different forms while nevertheless retaining his essential nature. Propertius’s elegy was also an important source for the painting of Rudolf II as Vertumnus that Giuseppe Arcimboldo conveyed to court around 1590, which was likely accompanied by Comanini’s poem [Fig. 16].\textsuperscript{89} Arcimboldo composed this composite portrait of Rudolf from flowers and fruits like one of the costumes worn by Propertius’s Vertumnus, thereby referring to the God’s multiple guises.

\textsuperscript{87} E.C. Marquis, “Vertumnus in Propertius 4, 2” \textit{Hermes} 102, no. 3 (1974), 500.


and figuring the mercurial god’s talent for simultaneously embodying multiplicity and unity. Comanini’s ode to Rudolf also lauds Arcimboldo’s likeness for this feat:

Worthy, oh worthy are you, of being praised with silence/ More than with tongues, by others; / For it is safer to admire sacred things in silence/ than to babble inadequacies./ Thus like a learned Egyptian, Arcimboldo covered/ Your royal face with a veil of lovely fruits, The most loyal, the best servant/ That consecrates his heart and work to your crown.

Propertius’s treatment of Vertumnus as a paragon of persuasion and rhetorical wit re-emerges in Comanini’s picture of the god as a model for beguiling pictorial expression. In honoring Rudolf in a way that words cannot, Arcimboldo’s Vertumnus portrait embodies an ingenious form of visual eloquence.

Dietterlin’s Tuscana figure also engages the Vertumnus theme on numerous levels. As an anthropomorphic sculpture, the herm adopts a form similar to that of the Vertumnus idol often mentioned in the classical literature. Since Vertumnus was known as an Etruscan, or “Tuscan” deity, the god is a particularly appropriate personification of the Tuscan Order.

Dietterlin’s character plays on this correspondence. His Tuscan figure’s capacity to embody numerous identities—personification of the Tuscan Order, strong farmer, the giant Tuscano, the Rhineland, or Vertumnus—moreover reflects Vertumnus’s aptitude for assuming different guises while retaining his essential identity. Tuscana visualizes Dietterlin’s idea that

91 “Degno o degno sè tu, che col silentio / Via più, che con la lingua altri t’honorì: / Ch’ammirar sacra cosa è più secolo. Sol, che parlando balbettarne il meno. Però qual dotto Egitto hà sotto’l velo / Di sì bei frutti il tuo divin coperto / L’Arcimboldo il più fido, il miglior seruo, / Ch’al tuo diadema il cor sacrasse, e l’opera.” Comanini, Il Figino, 42. Here, as in Comanini, The Figino, 24-25.
93 “Tuscus ego et Tuscis orior,” Propertius, Elegiae, IV.2.3.
an Order’s canonical personality might manifest variously in a single anthropomorphic form, as well as the notion that such architectural figures can encompass multiple levels of meaning. In other words, it allegorizes the semiotic flexibility of Dietterlin’s system of anthropomorphic architectural ornaments. Tuscana’s Vertumus theme also has implications for the Architectura’s picture of architectural rhetoric. If the reader follows Propertius in interpreting the ability to assume numerous guises as a mark of talent in the art of persuasion, the Tuscana figure and indeed Dietterlin’s entire system of anthropomorphic architectural ornaments display surpassing rhetorical prowess.

Dietterlin’s Architectura continues these investigations into the rhetoric of anthropomorphic architectural ornament by exploring how multiple figures might embody the character of a single Order. As personifications of the Orders, the Termen depicted in the treatise’s synoptic plates establish the basic themes from which these alternative manifestations of the Orders draw. The anthropomorphic term in Plate 6 of the Erst Buch displays the aged face, beard, hooves, and laurel crown of Dionysus’s tutor, Silenus [Fig. 17]. This coarse and frequently intoxicated mythological figure aptly channels the Tuscan Order’s rough, base nature. His Dionysian connotations can in turn be projected back on to the multivalent personification of the Tuscan Order in Tuscana. Regarded in light of the novel Tuscan imagery in Plate 6, the grapes and flask that adorn Dietterlin’s personification of the Tuscan Order might also refer to the Dionysian consumption of wine. Thus, the alternative anthropomorphic manifestations of the Orders pictured throughout the treatise could shape the significance of the main personifications of the Orders pictured in the project’s five synoptic plates. Regarded together, the Architectura etchings develop iconographies for the Orders that extend well beyond the imagery in Dietterlin’s brief histories of each manner. Read parallel to each other, the book’s text and images form a circuit of meanings that
functions like the interdependent, verbal and visual components of an emblem. Relatively obscure and arcane forms of pictorial expression thus play an important role in the system of architectural rhetoric sketched in Dietterlin’s *Architectura*.

Dietterlin allegorizes the beauty of these hidden meanings in the imagery of Plate 6—specifically, through the figure of Silenus. Both ancient and modern authors associated Silenus with the emblematic principle that appearances can conceal truth. In Plato’s *Symposium*, Alcibiades compares his lover Socrates to a statuette of the unattractive Silenus, which, when opened, reveals sacred images previously hidden from view. Alcibiades adds that, “if you chose to listen to Socrates’ discourses you would feel them at first to be quite ridiculous… But when these are opened… you will discover that they are the only speeches which have any sense in them; and… that none are so divine, so rich in images of virtue…”

Ugliness, then, can obscure great beauty, and profound meanings can lurk within seemingly ridiculous expressions. In the early modern period, this principle came to be affiliated with the *serio-ludere*, that is, the category of the serious joke. Authors availed themselves of the

95 Alcibiades’s comparison of Socrates to the Sileni occurs in Plato, *ΣΥΜΠΟΣΙΟΝ*, 215A-222C.
97 Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann has noted that such “serious jokes” were a familiar trope in the artistic culture of Europe during the later sixteenth century. See Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, “Arcimboldo’s Serious Jokes: ‘Mysterious but Long in Meaning,’” in *The Verbal
Symposium’s model of Socratic irony when composing their own paradoxes, a genre of literature that flourished during Dietterlin’s lifetime. Revealing that the subject of Arcimboldo’s Vertumnus portrait is Rudolf II, Comanini’s poem quotes the sitter explaining that “…I am like a Silenus, as dear / To the young Greeks as to the old one; / Esteemed by Plato, for on the outside / I seem a monster, and on the inside / I hide a kingly image and / a heavenly resemblance.” Erasmus had already made Sileni Alcibiades a trope in sixteenth-century literature and visual culture when he wrote in the 1508 edition of his Adagia that Silenus statuettes were used by the Greeks with reference to “…some thing which, though on the surface…at first sight looks worthless and absurd, is yet admirable on a nearer and less superficial view…” The imagery of Erasmus’s adage and Comanini’s poem applies to the dichotomy between appearance and truth in Dietterlin’s Architectura. Just as the unattractive Sileni hide precious treasures, the overwrought ornaments of Dietterlin’s treatise conceal a rich system of architectural rhetoric. And just as Socrates’ absurd utterances obscure

---

profound meaning, the preposterous imagery of the *Architectura* masks a sophisticated paradigm of architectural signification.

The contrast between appearance and truth embodied in the Silenus metaphor also factors in the Christian dimensions that early modern authors added to the trope. Listing the various representatives of the Silenus ideal, Erasmus asked, “And what of Christ? Was he not too a marvelous Silenus?...If one has the good fortune to have a nearer view of this Silenus, open...in heaven’s name what a treasure you will find...!” Dietterlin’s Silenus design contains no overt reference to Christ. Nevertheless, biblical imagery incorporated throughout the other *Architectura* etchings lend the treatise and its theory of the Orders a religious dimension never previously visualized in an architectural treatise. The Christian characters and biblical episodes portrayed in Dietterlin’s treatise symbolically expand upon the personalities that its author ascribed to each Order. A fountain featuring the image of St. Christopher carrying the Christ child appears, for instance, in Plate 82 of the Doric book of the 1598 *Architectura*, manifesting what Dietterlin described as the Dorian Order’s “heroic” character. An Ionic epitaph showing St. Helena’s discovery of the true Cross in Plate 127 of the 1598 *Architectura* meanwhile embodies that Order’s matronly virtue. Though images of

---


103 Ibid., 169-170.
episodes from both the Old and New testaments appear across all five books of the summative, 1598 Architectura, the treatise’s religious imagery also follows time-honored typological structures. Old Testament narratives figured in the books dedicated to the baser Orders find parallels in New Testament histories presented in the sections dedicated to the more refined Orders depicted later in the finished Architectura’s numbered sequence of plates. For instance, while a Doric fountain portraying Hagar and Ishmael appears in Plate 78 of the 1598 Architectura, the parallel New Testament parable of Christ and the Samaritan Woman appears in an Ionic fountain in Plate 117 of the treatise.\textsuperscript{104}

Given that Dietterlin lived during an era of intense religious conflict, the presence of Christian imagery in the Architectura invites questions about the treatise’s possible confessional leanings. Noting that the Strasbourg City Council condemned the classicizing design of the Neue Bau, which Dietterlin helped decorate between 1588 and 1589, as “papistisch,” Günter Irmscher has discerned in the Architectura’s licentious, anti-classical architecture distinct anti-Catholic (and anti-Italian) sympathies.\textsuperscript{105} Irmscher observes more concrete evidence for the treatise’s Protestant leanings in an image of an epitaph with a bishop’s miter adorned with two tiny peacock feathers, signs of the deadly sin of luxuria [Fig. 18].\textsuperscript{106} The idea that a sixteenth-century architectural treatise might advance a veiled critique of Catholic authority is not unique. Mario Carpo has argued that Sebastiano Serlio’s 1551 Extraordinario libro invites the architecturally savvy “elect” to remove the excessive ornaments of its “licentious” portals to reveal the ideal Vitruvian forms underneath, and that the book

\textsuperscript{104} The Christian iconography of the Architectura designs and the arrangement of the religious imagery in the treatise are discussed in greater detail in Appendix IV.


\textsuperscript{106} Irmscher, Kölnner Architektur- und Säulenbücher, 62. This design reappeared as Plate 208 in the 1598 installment of the Architectura.
thus promulgates a “crypto-Calvinistic” architectural aesthetic.\textsuperscript{107} Dietterlin’s keen interest in the Extraordinario libro, evidenced by the similar form and content of his own 1594 Annder Buch, raises the possibility that the Strasbourg author may also have sensed Protestant sympathies in Serlio’s text, and even emulated them in his books. Yet the completed, 1598 Architectura can be interpreted neither as a fundamentally Protestant project, nor as an essentially Catholic endeavor. In addition to Protestant-leaning images like the satirical Bishop’s epitaph, Dietterlin filled his treatise with Catholic motifs like the image of the Mass of Saint Gregory, the Immaculata, and even the popular Counter-Reformation symbol of Gabriel casting Satan from heaven, and did so with no apparent trace of irony.\textsuperscript{108} Edits made to the Architectura drawings moreover indicate that the artist often tempered Catholic symbolism in his designs to impart the etchings with a more neutral confessional flavor. For instance, between the drawing for plates 204 and 205 of the 1598 Architectura and the final etchings, Dietterlin erased the image of the Alsatian Saint Odilia, thereby eliminating a detail that endorsed the Catholic practice of venerating local saints.\textsuperscript{109} Dietterlin may well have sympathized with the values of the Reformation in his private life, but the Architectura does not adopt an obvious stance on the era’s religious controversies.\textsuperscript{110} Why go to these lengths to balance the treatise’s Catholic and Protestant imagery? By lending the Architectura’s religious images an inclusive, ecumenical tone, Dietterlin ensured that his treatise would avoid censorship and appeal to the broadest population of readers and art patrons possible.


\textsuperscript{108} These images respectively occur in Plates 91, 207, and 204 of the 1598 Architectura.

\textsuperscript{109} See Appendix IV BE.1 and DR.161.

\textsuperscript{110} Dietterlin’s various encounters with the era’s religious controversies are explored further in various catalogue entries in Appendix IV.
The religious imagery of Dietterlin’s *Architectura* may not promote a discernibly Protestant or Catholic worldview, but it does advance certain artistic claims. In imparting a Christian dimension to the Orders, Dietterlin found a compelling way to improve upon the Vitruvian paradigms of architectural ornament, and gave the classical Orders a distinctively modern character.\(^{111}\) Dietterlin’s apparent interest in combining Christian imagery with classical architectural ornament raises the possibility that many of the treatise’s antique motifs might potentially bear a secret, Christian meaning. For instance, if Dietterlin’s Silenus is anything like Erasmus’s picture of that character, the coarse Tuscan term can also read as a figuration of Christ. The multivalent symbolism of this etching and many of the treatise’s other designs reveal themselves only once the reader looks past the superficial impression that the *Architectura* is merely a book of licentious architectural imagery. Like the true nature of Erasmus’s Sileni Aleibiades, the *Architectura*’s seemingly ridiculous appearances obscure a treasure-trove of profound truth.

As the religious imagery of the *Architectura* demonstrates, Dietterlin’s experiments with using anthropomorphic figurations of the Orders to construct complex meanings did not depend on the figures of terms alone. An etching that first appeared as Plate 9 of Dietterlin’s 1594 *Annder Buch* depicts a man with a tankard and flask, striding through a Tuscan portal [Fig. 19]. The monument is adorned with a cyclops, Polyphemus with his

\(^{111}\) It is notable that the foundational text of early modern Europe’s robust tradition of Solomonic architectural literature, Juan Bautista Villalpando’s 1596 *Ezechielem Explanationes*, appeared almost simultaneously with Dietterlin’s Christian interpretation of the Orders. Co-authored with fellow Jesuit Jerónimo Prado and formerly supported by Emperor Rudolf II’s deceased Habsburg uncle, Philip II of Spain, the text’s second volume works from the prophecies of Ezekiel to reconstruct the Temple of Solomon, infusing its architecture with Vitruvian ornaments. The Solomonic theme re-appears in Krammer’s 1600 *Architectura*, as well as in the architectural treatises of Salomon de Bray and Nicolaus Godmann and Leonhard Christoph Sturm. On the early reception of Solomonic architectural literature in Central Europe, see Pablo Jimenez Diaz, “Spain, Prague, and the Habsburg Ideology: Some Aspects of the Architecture of Rudolf II,” in *Rudolf II, Prague and the World*, 11-15.
pipes, and two human-goat hybrids—perhaps the satyr, Pan, and the faun, Faunus.\footnote{In the re-paginated 1598 Architectura, this image appears as Plate 30.} While the striding man bears the wine associated with Dionysian satyrs and the drunken Polyphemus, the Arcadian creatures that accompany him expand the Tuscan Order’s rustic connotations by invoking the visual rhetoric of the pastoral.\footnote{The cyclops likely refers to the creature in Euripides’s Kyklopēs, which tells the tale of the satyrs under this monster’s command. On the iconography of this image, see Forssman, Säule und Ornament, 163.} By introducing ever more tangential figurations of the Orders across the images of the 1594 and 1598 installments of the Architectura, Dietterlin gave the Orders a new universe of symbolic potential. However, as in the Silenus image demonstrates, this rhetoric was not always transparent. Designs like Plate 9 yield their more obscure meanings only to viewers who read the etchings through the lens of scripture, ancient myth, or vernacular lore.\footnote{Imscher, “‘OrnamentSinnBild,’” 118.} Other figures in Dietterlin’s Architectura designs confound all such exegetical efforts. The nautical imagery of the triumphal arch in Plate 23 of the Annder Buch [Fig. 2] at first seems to bear no relevance to its Ionic Order’s standard iconography. The connection must be purely formal: the curling, wave-like form of the Ionic volute suggests the imagery of the sea, and thus inspires a triumphal arch crowned by Neptune. It is this apparent lack of iconographic consistency that has lead modern critics to mistakenly dismiss Dietterlin’s Architectura as a work that befuddles the conventional symbolism of the Orders and even rejects the ideal of decorous and meaningful architectural expression.

It is true that Dietterlin’s Architectura never explicitly explains how to formulate anthropomorphic forms of the Orders in a decorous manner. The proportions of the figures in etchings like Plate 9 moreover display no concrete relationship to the dimensions of their structural framework. The portal, with its indecorously squat Termen formed from an urn,
log, and piled crockery, is just one of the many designs in the 1594 and 1598 installments of the *Architectura* with figures that flout the formal conventions of their Order.\textsuperscript{115} While the decorously proportioned anthropomorphic *Termen* pictured in Dietterlin’s *Erst Buch* embodied a new platform for clear architectural signification, the indecorous anthropomorphic ornaments illustrated in the later releases of the *Architectura* largely convey arcane meanings. Dietterlin’s inconsistent regard for architectural decorum indicates that he was less interested in showing how to employ anthropomorphic ornament in clear architectural rhetoric than in exploring how the human form can be used to create compelling, multivalent architectural symbolism.\textsuperscript{116}

Allegory, emblem—these were genres often observed in figural arts such as painting and sculpture, but more rarely modeled in northern publications on architectural ornament.\textsuperscript{117} Dietterlin also employs anthropomorphic ornament to probe what it might mean to use the Orders to construct an architectural *narrative*, another function traditionally associated with the figural arts.\textsuperscript{118} Individual images of figures interacting and moving in space, as in Plate 9 of the *Annder Buch*, suggest the chronological dimension of the narrative

\textsuperscript{115} Forssman, *Säule und Ornament*, 162
\textsuperscript{116} Fürst, “Die Kategorie der Bedeutung,” 363
\textsuperscript{117} A notable exception can be found in the oeuvre of Vredeman de Vries. In picturing allegories based on the Orders’ anthropomorphic iconography, Dietterlin drew inspiration from Vredeman’s *Theatrum Vitæ Humanae*. Its six engraved scenes connected the Composite Order with childhood, the Corinthian with youth, the Ionic with womanhood, the Doric with manhood, the Tuscan with old age, and the absence of an Order with Ruin. Hieronymus Wierix engraved the series after designs by Vredeman, and it was first published by Peter Baltens in 1577. See Barbara Uppenkamp, “Hans Vredeman de Vries’s ‘Theatrum Vitæ Humanae’: A Stoic World Theater,” *Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten: Jaarboek* (2002): 142-167; Heuer, *The City Rehearsed*, 127-128, and note 105, 245; and Hollstein XLVIII.435-441.
\textsuperscript{118} For an introduction to the theory of narrative architecture, see Nigel Coates, *Narrative Architecture* (West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons, 2012).
The numbered sequence of *Architectura* plates conveys a narrative as well. Each of the five sections of the final, 1598 treatise proceeds from a plate that personifies its Order to scenes with figures that embody increasingly complex reinterpretations of that Order. The ordered quintet of sections in turn charts a trajectory from the simpler ornaments of the Tuscan Order to the ornate embellishments of the Composite. Collectively, the finished sequence of *Architectura* etchings illustrates a sweeping ornament epic with five subplots or narrative arcs. Dietterlin’s *Architectura* is, in other words, a “novel of development,” a tale in the spirit of the architecture-centric odyssey recounted in the 1499 *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili*. Because Dietterlin’s efforts to expand the anthropomorphic iconography of the Orders arose in part from his interest in the competing stories that shaped their symbolism, it was fitting that his response to those traditions took a narrative form.

Dietterlin’s vision of a narrative architecture inspired strange but engaging constructions. Between 1604 and 1607, the artist’s former patron Duke Friedrich I. of Württemberg erected a gate on the exterior of the wall surrounding Tübingen Castle with

---

119 Jacques I. Androuet Du Cerceau’s interest in creating narrative scenes for architecture appears to have served as a model for Dietterlin’s use of this device. See Irmscher, *Kölner Architektur- und Säulenbücher*, 55.

120 Pirr, *Die Architektur*, 73.


ornaments sculpted by Christoph Jelin [Fig. 20a]. Four Doric columns flank its central portal, which is mounted with a flamboyant tangle of strapwork and the crest of the House of Württemberg. Two gentlemen respectively toting a sword and a rifle stand atop the arch’s outermost columns. The idea for the Tübingen arch derives from Plate 21 of Dietterlin’s Annder Buch, which portrays a gunman beneath a similar monument [Fig. 21]. Yet whereas Dietterlin depicts the rifle-toting man in an idle state, Jelin rendered his gunman as if arrested mid-shot [Fig. 20b]. The sculpted figure aims his weapon menacingly at the spot where one must pass to enter the portal, implicating the viewer in an architectural drama and reinforcing the gate’s imposing rhetoric of defensive prowess.

It has been suggested that Dietterlin’s Architectura was intended to serve primarily as a collector’s compendium of engrossing ornament emblems, and only in the second place as an ornament model book for architects and artists. However, the two functions could and did intersect. By exploring the various traditions that shape the Orders’ anthropomorphic symbolism, the treatise informs artists of the iconographical conventions vital to figuring the Orders in anthropomorphic form. Its images pose as prompts for the reader’s own ornamental inventions as well. In picturing figural allegories that build on the Orders’ core personalities, the Architectura guides artists in generating engaging, if often enigmatic, architectural rhetoric.

124 This image was incorporated in the 1598 installment of the Architectura as Plate 30.
125 Irmscher, Kölner Architektur- und Säulenbücher, 65.
“I cannot make myself subtler…”

The discourse on terms as anthropomorphic figurations of the Orders was invigorated in another corner of northern Europe when Vredeman de Vries entered the service of Emperor Rudolf II in Prague, probably in the year 1596. The ruler fostered a keen interest in architecture, and commissioned many interiors and garden structures for which *Termen* would have been an appropriate ornament. Before leaving Prague around 1599, Vredeman satisfied these tastes by designing fountains for the palace gardens and collaborating with his son Paul on painted architectural perspectives. Interior ornament also fell within the purview of master-woodworker Gabriel Krammer, who served Rudolf between 1587 and his death in 1606. The treatise that Krammer devised while working alongside Vredeman in Prague is indebted to his Vredeman’s 1577 *Architectura*, as well as to Dietterlin’s eponymous treatise, for it summarizes the Orders and models architectural projects that reflect contemporary northern tastes.

---


Krammer began his own *Architectura* no later than 1598, and presented it to the Emperor in 1600. The book’s dedication emphasizes the rhetorical functions of architecture by relating how grand monuments preserve the memory of ancient rulers like Alexander the Great. Krammer also praises Rudolf as a patron “...whom almighty God has blessed and enlightened above all other Kings and Potentates of this era with sublime gifts in architecture...” Given the Habsburgs’ penchant for co-designing the monuments they commissioned, Rudolf may well have cooperated with architects in devising his building projects. The clear instructions for architectural composition that fill Krammer’s *Architectura* would have been ideal vehicles for facilitating conversation between the Emperor and architects as they worked together to develop monuments intended to immortalize the ruler. The treatise’s practical, didactic tone and its preponderance of models for carved altarpieces meanwhile appear to address the artisans of the Imperial workshops [Fig. 22]. The release of Krammer’s *Architectura* on the heels of Dietterlin’s treatise was probably no coincidence, for its treatment of anthropomorphic ornament mounts an implicit critique of the indecorous figures in Dietterlin’s later *Architectura* etchings. Krammer’s efforts to

---

130 The dedication of the earliest known edition of Krammer’s *Architectura* is dated to March 20, 1600, but its title page, also marked 1600, attests that this work is “...improved by Gabriel Krammer...now in Prague.” / “... Gebessert Durch Gabrielen Krammer Von Zürich...Ietzo Zu prag.” This suggests that the 1600 edition is not the first version of the book. Krammer’s Tuscan and Doric Order etchings are generally marked 1598, while its Ionic, Corinthian, and Composite Order etchings are dated 1599. Most pages bear Krammer’s initials, and Plates 12, 13, and 24 are inscribed with an imperial privilege. Irmscher argued that an earlier edition of Krammer’s 1600 *Architectura* was likely printed in Frankfurt am Main, but these details suggest that the *Architectura* etchings first circulated as individual sheets while Krammer resided in Prague. On the publication history of Krammer’s *Architectura*, see Irmscher, “Gabriel Krammer (1564-1606),” 234-244.


132 On the Emperor as an architectural patron, see Muchka, “Die Architektur unter Rudolf II.,” 85-93.

133 Irmscher, “Gabriel Krammer (1564-1606),” 234.
compose a treatise that would reform current modes of figuring the Orders also reflect the conservative impulses of Vredeman’s 1577 *Architectura*. It is likely that the Imperial woodworker sought his painter-architect colleague’s advice while planning his own *Architectura*.134

Like Dietterlin and Vredeman’s *Architecturas*, Krammer’s treatise contains five sections individually dedicated to the Tuscan, Doric, Ionic, Corinthian, and Composite modes, and includes brief instructions for devising the components of each Order. Krammer’s *Architectura* also draws on Vredeman and Dietterlin’s texts to argue that *Termen* are proper substitutes for the columns, and that there is a class of *Termen* for each Order. As such, he contends, *Termen* are subject to the rules that govern architectural decorum for the columns.135 Krammer counsels readers to “…take assiduous care that the correct and due Order or proportion of the columns not be confused…” in the bodies of their *Termen*.136

Krammer’s *Architectura* builds on his colleagues’ treatises by explaining the parts of the anthropomorphic *Termen* and describing how to formulate the figures. It also specifies the exact ratios between each term’s total height and width, which reflect the proportions of their Orders’ standard column.137 Krammer’s summary of the Tuscan Order even details how to devise abstract, or “flat” [*platten*] *Termen* that reflect the proportions of their Order.138 The author reinforces these instructions with a quintet of etchings that the illustrate *Termen* for each individual Order. The Tuscan *Termen* plate [Fig. 1.] is marked with a six-part scale that corresponds to the Order’s 1:6 capital-to-post ratio, and shows a four-part scale to

134 Ibid. 238.
136 “…Jedoch soll man fleissig achtung haben, daß die rechte und gebürliche ordnung, oder proporcion, der Seülen, hierdurch nicht verflört werde…” Krammer, *Architectura*, 5.
137 Ibid. 5-9.
138 Ibid. 5.
represent the 1:4 ratio between the width of the base and the height at which the term should reach its widest point. With these instructions, Krammer’s *Architectura* finally gave early modern readers a clear description of a method for devising *Termen* as architecturally decorous, anthropomorphic (or non-anthropomorphic) forms of the Orders. Krammer boasts that his standards for inventing decorous *Termen* ensure that each figure “…respectively unites and compares with its own Order and Work.” In other words, they allow the architect to achieve the ideal synthesis of figure and monument promoted in Vredeman’s 1577 *Architectura*. The architecturally decorous proportions of Krammer’s *Termen* moreover make their Orders immediately transparent to well-informed viewers. Since the Orders of Krammer’s decorous *Termen* are always legible, the ornaments are also better positioned to advance effective architectural rhetoric.

Krammer’s speaking self-portrait as a Tuscan term, like Dietterlin’s *Tuscan*, allegorizes the expressive power of his treatise’s *Termen* by engaging the Vertumnus theme. Perhaps because of his proximity to a court familiar with Propertius’s elegy, the Prague author’s treatment of the motif is more directly indebted to the ancient text. In addressing readers through the image of an enlivened term, Krammer refers to Propertius’s description of Vertumnus as boastful, speaking statue. By emulating the elegiac Vertumnus while claiming that he “cannot make himself subtler”, Krammer frames himself as a master of eloquent expression and suggests that his anthropomorphic *Termen* can, like the ancient god, “fill any persuasive role”. Showing the Tuscan pointing to the rough, wooden term at his

---

139 Irmscher, *Kölner Architektur- und Säulenbücher*, 137.
140 “Die Termen, so man an stat der Seüle oder columnen pflegt zu gebrauchen, sollen nach jeder ordnung der Seülen ihre rechte proporcion und teilung haben, Damit sich ein jedes, zu seinem eigenen werck und ordnung verainigen, und vergleichen möchte...” Krammer, *Architectura*, 5.
141 See Kaufmann, “Arcimboldo and Propertius” (1985), 117-123. I am grateful to Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann for suggesting this connection.
side, Krammer also alludes to the passage in Propertius’s elegy where Vertumnus reveals that, “once I was a maple stump, by hurried sickle hewn…” and that the sculptor Mammurrius later “…engraved my form in bronze / … [and] had the skill to cast me to fill so many roles…” The contrast between the unpolished wooden term and Krammer’s finely-executed likeness recalls the disparity between the Vertumnus idol’s former and current states and thus reinforces the Krammer’s exhortation to readers to “compare [him] with crude things.” Since the woodworker’s likeness is a self-portrait, perhaps meant to represent a woodcarving, the comparison also attests to his own artistic skill. Finally, the conceit implicates the relationship between Krammer’s Tuscan and Dietterlin’s personification of that Order in the Tuscana print. In comparing his ingenious architectural self-portrait with the crude term as his side, Krammer alludes to the contrast between his Architectura’s well-proportioned Termen and the malformed, indecorous anthropomorphic ornaments of Dietterlin’s text.

Contemporary artists evidently found Krammer’s paradigm for joining Termen decorously to a monument’s visual and representational framework useful for formulating

---

142 “STIPES ACERNUS ERAM, PROPERANTI FALCE DOLATUS, / ANTE NUMAM GRATA PAUPER IN URBE DEUS. / AT TIBI, MAMURRI, FORMAE CALEATOR AËNAE, TELLUS ARTIFICIS NE TERAT OSCA MANUS, QUI ME TOT DOCILEM POTUISTI FUNDERE IN USUS. UNUM OPUS EST, OPERI NON DATUR UNUS HONOS,” Propertius, Elegiae, IV.2.59-64.

143 See note 1.

144 It has been observed that Propertius similarly employs the protean, speaking statue of Vertumnus to display his own stylistic versatility in writing. See Jeri Blair Debrohun, Roman Propertius and the Reinvention of Elegy (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2003), 172.

145 Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann’s study of notions of artistic eloquence at the court of Rudolf II identifies Hermathena, an ancient form that re-appeared in modern times and visually resembled many Renaissance terms, as an emblem of this ideal. Such symbolism likely inflected how Krammer’s herms and terms were regarded as vehicles for architectural rhetoric. See Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, “The Eloquent Artist,” 119-139. For further discussion of Hermathena, see the Conclusion of this dissertation.
eloquent architectural programs. Architect and imperial servant Giovanni Maria Filippi incorporated Krammer’s model for decorously proportioned Termen in one of Rudolfine Prague’s few surviving cases of exterior anthropomorphic architectural ornament [Fig. 23]. For the façade of the town hall that he designed for Prague’s Small Side around 1617, Filippi scaled pairs of male and female Termen featuring Ionic volutes to window frames executed in that Order. The duos reflect Krammer’s unusual theory that the stereotypically feminine Ionic Order also harbors certain masculine qualities. Since “…Ionica possesses a particular delicacy, yet is also strong…” the author explains, “…the ancients…compared this work to the Goddess Diana and the God Apollo.” The delicacy and strength embodied in Filippi’s figures reflect the very mix of qualities that a civic body concerned with judicious and effective government would require its headquarters to project.

Paradoxically, Krammer’s rigid system of proportions for Termen allows artists great freedom of invention. The author in fact assures readers that it is “…permitted to everyone to ornament the Termen according to their own capability and pleasing knowledge.” This is because Termen that display the proportions of an Order can remain legible as embodiments of a specific mode of architecture regardless of their other visual characteristics. The means to embody an Order in a form that bears little resemblance to its more conventional iconography expanded the spectrum of forms that Termen could decorously assume.

Krammer’s framework allows even male Termen belonging to a stereotypically female Order,

---

147 Krammer’s theory may derive from Serlio’s account of the Ionic Order’s origins in temples dedicated to Diana, Apollo, and Bacchus. See Forssman, Dorisch, Jonisch, Korinthisch, 77.
149 “Es ist woll zwar einem jeden erlaubt, die Termen noch můglichster Kunst, und zu wolgefährigem wissen zu zieren…”Krammer, Architectura, 5.
such as the masculine Ionic figures in Filippi’s façade, to represent their manner in a clear fashion. Termen who appeared drastically different from the conventional figurations of their Orders could serve as the basis for clever architectural conceits. For instance, the disparity between Krammer’s sophisticated, ruff-wearing, hat-sporting Tuscan and the Order’s normative image as a simple farmer betrays the figure as an amusing self-portrait.

Artists who responded to the Termen literature of the sixteenth century did not universally adopt Krammer’s standards for decorous, anthropomorphic architectural ornament. One plate in painter Daniel II. Meyer’s 1609 Architectura pictures a cross-armed figure reminiscent of Krammer’s speaking Tuscan self-portrait, as well as a term comprised of fruits and farm implements [Fig. 24]. The latter character simultaneously resembles Dietterlin’s grape-laden Tuscan farmer and the bodies of Arcimboldo’s composite portraits. In constructing his complex ekphrasis of Arcimboldo’s portrait of Rudolf II as Vertumnus, Comanini had engaged in the familiar Renaissance pastime of comparing painting and poetry. Meyer employs the imagery of Arcimboldo’s painting in the context of an architectural ornament to stage a similar comparison between painting and architecture. His Arcimboldesque term asserts that Northern authors’ experiments with architectural figuration enabled architects to manifest the canonical Orders of architecture through almost any figure that might be portrayed in painting.

Yet the term and his companion also attest that Dietterlin and Krammer’s models for reconciling this system of figuration with the protocols of architectural decorum often went unheeded. Both of Meyer’s figures display what was now standard symbolism for the

Tuscan Order, but neither body exhibits Tuscan proportions. This lack of attention to the formal dimensions of architectural decorum probably had something to do with the intended functions of the 1609 *Architectura*. Like the works of Vredeman, Dietterlin, and Krammer, Meyer’s *Architectura* addresses “…painters, sculptors, stonemasons, woodworkers, and all lovers of art,” 151 with models for architectural ornament. It differs, however, in making no pretense to serve architects or offer any rigorous architectural theory. Meyer’s ill-proportioned *Termen* are instead intended for figural artists who are both keen to draw ideas from anthropomorphic architecture and less concerned with the rules of architectural decorum than their architect colleagues.

In their introduction to Meyer’s book, publishers Johann Theodor and Johann Israel de Bry clarify why illustrating architecturally decorous designs was not the artist’s top priority. “The author would like to apologize,” they relate, “that he has not created his figures from the foundation or proportions of the five columns as the departed Mr. Wendel [Dietterlin] did, but has rather searched after Inventiones.” 152 The pursuit of novelty over correctness of form drove Meyer to maintain the iconography of the Orders, yet disregard the formal protocols of decorous architectural composition. When *Termen* returned to the domain of the figural arts, they continued to employ the symbolic vocabulary of architecture, but again spoke with the unruly visual grammar of the grotesque.

151 Daniel II. Meyer, *ARCHITECTVRA, Oder Verzeichniss allerhand Eynfassungen an Thüren, Fenstern und Decken, u. sehr nützlich und dünlich allein Mahlern, Bildhauern, Steinmetzen, Schreinern, und andern Liebhabern dieser Kunst* [hereafter, “*Architectura*”] (Frankfurt am Main: Johann Theodor de Bry and Johann Israel de Bry, 1609), Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Res/2 A.civ. 120.

The use of the human form as a paradigm for architectural decorum gave rise, in sixteenth-century northern Europe, to an anthropomorphic mode of representation that reconciled the authority of convention with the demand for a vivid new architectural vernacular. Dietterlin and other artists variously visualized, elaborated, and thereby reinvented the analogy between architecture and man. Their experiments with figuring the abstract ornaments of the Orders also imported the visual and representational idioms of the figural arts to the realm of architecture. Emblem, allegory, narrative, and even self-portraiture found expression in architectural ornament as never before. By the turn of the seventeenth century, these developments were absorbed back into the realm of the figural arts. The advent of new ways to picture diverse, anthropomorphic variations on the Orders so expanded the possibilities for eloquent visual rhetoric in architecture that figural artists like Meyer came to regard the theory of architecture as a basis for their creations in other media. Treatises spoke of adapting the anthropomorphic inventions of the architect to the purposes of the painter and sculptor. As figuration—a matter traditionally associated with painters and sculptors—gained a firmer place in architectural theory, modes of representation for architecture and the visual rhetoric of the figural arts overlapped more profoundly.
Excursus: 
Auricular Ornament and the Body of Architecture

One of the final plates of Dietterlin’s 1593 Erst Buch shows a blank shield and a quartet of masks, each enveloped in tangled knots of ornament [Fig. 1].¹ These fantastic, grotesque designs are comprised of garlands, rollwork, and other motifs visible throughout the Erst Buch, but they also contain more unusual decorative forms that are otherwise absent in the book. The wings of the cherub mask are framed by curving, scalloped volutes with braided ridges and spiral ends. The crowning element of the lion mask curls over itself like half an oyster shell or the billowing body of a manta ray. Similar forms frame the human face. The grotesque mask at the base of the composition meanwhile sprouts two ruffled arabesques that vaguely recall feathered wings. Its mouth takes the form of a ridged cavity with a spherical uvula and furry, plumed lips. Though none of these forms were entirely new, Dietterlin’s particular treatment of the grotesque fabric as a protean, unstructured entity soon inspired a plethora of northern artists to experiment with ornaments that assumed ever more malleable, indeterminate shapes.²

These nebulous flourishes—some spiny, some globular, tattered, perforated, or ribbed—are today collectively known in German as “Knorpelwerk” or “Ohrmuschelwerk”, and in English as “auricular ornament”.³ Since such forms occurred in every visual medium, and

¹ This design reappeared in the 1598 installment of the Architectura as Plate 185.
since their advent seems to have eclipsed other, older motifs, the literature on this phenomenon also refers to an “auricular style”. These modern designations have colored the critical reception of the kinds of ornaments pictured in Dietterlin’s print in a number of problematic ways. The present terminology classifies the various decorative formations visible in Dietterlin’s mask design as a single and coherent, if heterogeneous, class of forms. Yet writers in the early modern period made no terminological distinction between the forms now known as “auricular ornament” and the grotesque (Gradesca, Gradosco), or even decoration (Zirat, Zierathen, Zieraten) more broadly. Dietterlin’s image confirms that the grotesque and the decorative motifs that are now called “auricular ornament” often coincided. Auricular ornament must therefore be recognized as an artificial genus of forms, and its name regarded as a designation imposed by a discipline that has historically


6 Early modern books and print series that feature “auricular ornament” typically designate their contents as examples of grotesques or decoration. See, for example, Lucas Kilian, Newes Gradesca Bücblæin (Augsburg: 1607), Lucas Kilian, NEWE GRADISCO BVéCH (1632); Nikolaus Rosmann, Erster Theill. Neuw Zirat Bücblæin (1627); Friedrich Unteutsch, Neues Zieratenbuch den Schreinern Tischlern oder Künstlern und Bildbauern sehr dienstlich (1635); Donath Horn, Neues und Wohl Inventirtes Ziraten Buch. allen Liebhabern die sich der Schneid Kunst bedient (Nuremberg: Hoffmann, circa 1650); Simon Cammermeier, Neues Zierathen Buch. Darinnen allerhand schöne Zierathen zu finden (Nuremberg: Paulus Fürst, circa 1670).

Another issue with the modern nomenclature of auricular ornament is its potential to limit our appreciation of the many functions that these nebulous forms served in early modern visual culture. The terms “\textit{Knorpelwerk}” (“cartilage-work”), “\textit{Ormuschelwerk}” (“earlobe-work”), and “auricular ornament” liken the kinds of motifs shown in Dietterlin’s mask print to anatomical forms, excluding other possible interpretations. Particularly in earlier ornament prints, the kinds of forms now known as “auricular ornament” do not always resemble the parts of the human body or even animal tissue. They can emerge from flora such as the acanthus leaf, and even issue from inanimate objects such as strapwork.\footnote{On the relationship between auricular forms and the acanthus motif, see Felicitas Rothe, \textit{Das deutsche Akanthusornament des 17. Jahrhunderts. Zur Frage seiner Selbständigkeit}. Ph.D. Dissertation, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, Munich, 1935. Forschungen zur deutschen Kunstgeschichte 29 (Berlin: Deutsche Verein für Kunstwissenschaft, 1938), 84-85. On the advent of the auricular style in rollwork, see Max Deri, \textit{Das Rollwerk in der deutschen Ornamentik des sechzehnten und siebzehnten Jahrhunderts}. Ph.D. Dissertation, Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg, Halle-Wittenberg, 1906 (Berlin: Schuster & Bufe, 1906), 88-95.}

For instance, the second title page of Christoph Jamnitzer’s innovative 1610 \textit{Neüw Grotesfiken Büch} presents its plethora of auricular grotesques as specimens from a “bug market”; and the third title page refers to a “fantastic gnarled (\textit{Radseco}) tree” that “bears strange fruit,” framing the motifs as vegetable matter [Fig. 2].\footnote{The second title page reads: “Der schnacken Marckt hiefür Bestelt / Nem jeder draüss was Ihm gefelt.” The third title page reads: “Der Fadesekisch Radesco Baum / Deszgleich man}
1587 Feast of the Gods engraving after the painting by Bartholomaeus Spranger assume the shape of auricular ornament. It is these clouds, in fact, that appear to have inspired the auricular silver compositions of Johannes Lutma.¹⁰

Notwithstanding the great diversity of forms in which such ornaments appeared, there is reason to suspect that what is now known as “auricular ornament” came to be regarded as a distinct, if nameless, mode of embellishment around the time that Dietterlin released his Architectura. Among the great diversity of ornament books published north of the Alps during the seventeenth century, a number take auricular ornament as their primary subject.¹¹ This suggests that the forms were increasingly understood as an autonomous category or style of decorative motifs. Dietterlin’s Architectura and the manifold works that emulate its auricular designs in turn offer ample evidence that viewers at the end of the sixteenth century came to associate “auricular ornament” with anatomical forms, and the human body in particular. Dietterlin’s engagement with auricular ornament had a decisive impact on how the Architectura portrayed the relationships between architecture and the figural media, inflecting the treatise’s theories of the materiality of architecture, as well as its portrayal of architectural figuration and rhetoric.

Artists had employed auricular motifs for decades before Dietterlin’s Architectura appeared. This is especially evident in the ornament prints that circulated models of

---

¹⁰ Zülch, Entstehung des Ohrmuschelstils, 55.
decorative forms between Italy, France, the Netherlands, and the German-speaking lands. Forms similar to Dietterlin’s auricular ornaments appear in the prints of Fontainebleau artists such as Antonio Fantuzzi, and in the engravings and etchings of Netherlandish artists such as Maarten van Heemskerck, Cornelis Bos, Cornelis II. Floris, and Hans Vredeman de Vries.12 An image of an auricular cartouche from Veederley Veranderinghe van grotissen ende Compertimenten. Libro Primo, designed by Cornelis II. Floris and published by Jan van Doetechum the Elder and Lucas van Doetechum in 1556, originates from the decade in which the auricular motif first achieved widespread popularity [Fig. 3]. Floris’s cartouche is structured by a cruciform, strapwork frame that splits into splayed bands of rollwork. The cartouche’s voluptuously curving flaps appear soft and malleable in comparison to these rigid, inorganic forms. Three muscular figures are ensconced within the upper chamber of the cavernous cartouche, and two more are encased in curving, ridged flaps that extend from the lower part of its lateral walls. Fruit-bearing garlands adorn the construction’s forked strapwork crown as well as its base, where a snake and a pair of snails slither.

Floris’s design plays with a number of formal and iconographical dichotomies. The print’s strapwork and the nebulous forms that hang from it embody the contrast between structure and superstructure. Seeming to peel apart and uncurl of its own volition, the flayed, auricular cartouche resembles the image’s flora and fauna far more than its lifeless strapwork, suggesting the difference between organic and inorganic matter. Other aspects of the design highlight the auricular ornament’s organic qualities as well. Its arrangement of figures encased within curving chambers resembles seeds in a sliced-open fruit. The cartouche’s combination of a large, upper compartment and unfurling tails meanwhile recalls the body and tentacles of a squid. Such fruits and sea creatures abound in the other designs of

12 For a thorough interpretation of the rise of auricular ornament in sixteenth-century print culture, see W.K. Zülch. Entstehung des Ohrmuschelstiles.
Veederley Veranderinge van grotissen ende Compertimenten, engaging the period taste for unusual forms and reminding viewers of the proximity of Floris’s native Antwerp to the ocean.\textsuperscript{13} Perhaps Floris derived the cartouche’s squid- or vegetal forms from firsthand observation of marine life or exotic fruits, a habit common among Netherlandish artists in this period, and a practice that they sometimes used as the basis for constructing grotesques.\textsuperscript{14} Since only those Europeans who resided in a maritime, trade-oriented city like Antwerp could study such subjects in person, Floris’s cartouche suggests the privileged position of the city’s artists. In embodying the dynamic between opposites, the print’s contrasting categories of ornament—organic and inorganic matter, flora and fauna, and animal and human—meanwhile evoke another form of power, enlivening the design’s flesh-like forms.

A figure similar to Floris’s cartouche appears in the Ionic Order fireplace pictured in Plate 108 of Dietterlin’s 1598 \textit{Architectura} [Fig. 4]. Its lozenge-shaped kernel is encircled with a garland and flanked by a pair of ridged wings with edges that curl over upon themselves and terminate in two spiny prongs, a configuration that also resembles an open ribcage. Here, in Dietterlin’s \textit{Architectura}, what came to be known as “auricular ornament” takes on a more definite resemblance to human anatomy.

Sixteenth-century auricular ornament often seemed to figure exterior parts of the human corpus such as earlobes and lips, but Dietterlin’s \textit{Architectura} abounds with motifs that recall the body’s interior structures. Dietterlin could have learned about the interior forms of the human body from numerous printed sources. His home city of Strasbourg had in fact


\textsuperscript{14} On relationships between nature study and the creation of fantastic imagery in the Netherlands during the decades around 1600, see Claudia Swan, \textit{Art, Science, and Witchcraft in Early Modern Holland: Jacques de Gheyn II (1565-1629)} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).
for decades operated as a center for the publication of anatomical images. The local painter Hans Baldung is credited with creating a number of woodcuts for Walther Hermann Ryff’s 1541 anatomical atlas. The prints feature open skulls with flaps of peeled skin—forms that echo in Dietterlin’s winged lozenge. Strasbourg artist Heinrich Vogtherr the Elder pioneered the genre of anatomical fugitive sheets, or printed images of the human body devised to conceal and display its anatomical structures, with a pair of multi-layer, sculptural woodcut compositions in 1538 [Figs. 5a & b]. One component of the set represents the anatomy of a man, and the other shows that of a woman, then a common method for illustrating the anatomical differences between the genders. The post-lapsarian Adam and Eve who flank the anatomical lozenge in Dietterlin’s design evoke this representational strategy.

These characters also impart the ribcage-like form with meanings beyond its significance as a figuration of the human interior. Genesis tells how God formed Eve from a

---


16 In addition to publishing the woodcuts in his 1541 Des aller fürtrefflichsten, höchsten und adelichsten geschöpf s aller Creaturen..., Ryff also released the images as fugitive sheets in the same year. For the publication history of the cranial woodcuts and an analysis of their didactic functions, see Ronah Sadan, “Study of Mouth and Tongue and Study of Head; Description of the Scalp and Exposure of the Hemispheres of the Brain; Removal of the Pia Mater and Cross-Section of the Brain; Cerebellum and Rete Mirabile,” in Prints and the Pursuit of Knowledge in Early Modern Europe, ed. Susan Dackerman. Catalogue published in conjunction with the exhibition of the same name, Cambridge, MA, Harvard Art Museums, September 6-December 20, 2011 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Art Museums; New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2011), 64-66.

17 These are Anathomia oder abconterfittung eines Mans leib, wie er inwendig gestaltet ist; and Anathomia oder abconterfittung eines Weibs leib, wie er inwendig gestaltet ist. On Vogtherr’s anatomical flap prints in their cultural context, see Suzanne Karr Schmidt, “Art—A User’s Guide: Interactive and Sculptural Printmaking in the Renaissance,” Ph.D. Dissertation, Yale University, New Haven, 2006, 94-114.
rib that he removed from the sleeping Adam.\textsuperscript{18} The conjunction of Dietterlin’s ribcage-like ornament and the image of the first humans recalls this episode and thereby qualifies the fireplace’s decorative ensemble as an allegory of creation. As in Vogtherr’s flap woodcut, the rhetoric of concealing and revealing also informs Dietterlin’s design. While foliage covers the couple’s outward anatomy, Dietterlin’s ribcage lozenge exposes the bodily forms that lie beneath their skin. This revelation evokes the specter of death and physical decay, manifestations of human mortality that resonate in the fate of the fallen Adam and Eve. Yet Dietterlin does not employ biological forms solely to allegorize corporeal life and death. A phoenix rising from the ashes that floats above this ensemble refers to the immortality of the human soul, positioning the auricular ribcage as a material vessel for an immaterial and spiritually transcendent entity.

It was Dietterlin who first explored the forms of auricular ornament at length in the context of an architectural publication. Auricular forms occur in \textit{Architectura} designs of every Order. They appear with the greatest frequency in the epitaph and fireplace designs first published in the 1598 edition of the text, the installment of the \textit{Architectura} treatise that also includes the most copious and complex arrangements of figural ornament. This pattern indicates that Dietterlin’s interest in the motif grew stronger as the artist engaged more intensively with the problems of architectural figuration and iconography. For instance, the ribcage-like form that adorns the mantle in Plate 108 refers to the commonplace that the chest is like the furnace of the body, thereby expressing the fireplace’s architectural function in biological form. As the basis for the creation of Eve, the ribcage also aptly expresses the fundamentally feminine nature of the design’s Ionic Order. Finally, it is the image of the ribcage that forms the physical and ideological center of Plate 108’s allegory of demise and

\textsuperscript{18} Genesis 2:21-22.
rebirth, processes likewise manifested by the hearth and its matter-transforming flames. Through such images, Dietterlin’s *Architectura* innovatively used the resemblance between auricular ornament and elements of the human corpus to construct architectural metaphors and allegories. By introducing the symbolically pregnant forms of the human interior to the visual apparatus of the contemporary architectural treatise, Dietterlin augmented the modes of architectural rhetoric addressed in period literature.

Dietterlin’s seemingly eccentric interest in composing architectural ornaments inspired by the bones and tissues of the human body in fact reflects central preoccupations of contemporary architectural culture. In his *De architectora*, Vitruvius describes at length the resemblance between the parts of a well-formed temple and the parts of a human body.\(^{19}\) The notion that architecture bears a resemblance to the anatomy of man continued to inform architectural theory in Europe during the early modern period, including the sixteenth century.\(^{20}\) Michelangelo had contended that, “…the members of architecture derive from the members of man. Who has not been or is not a good master of the human body, and most of all of anatomy, cannot understand anything of it.”\(^{21}\) Andrea Palladio’s 1570 *I quattro libri dell’architettura* employs the anatomical metaphor to affirm that each part of the building, as in the human body, has its proper place and role.\(^{22}\) These arguments, as well as

---

\(^{19}\) Vitruvius, *De architectura*, 3.1.1-7.  
\(^{22}\) Robert Tavernor has furthermore argued that the clear, and methodically composed woodcuts of Palladio’s treatise reflect the precision of representation and scientific detachedness of Vesalius’s *Fabrica*. See Robert Tavernor, “Palladio’s ‘corpus’: *I quattro libri*
Dietterlin’s use of anatomical forms, also engage the early modern period’s Vitruvian ideals of architectural expertise. *De architectura* had argued that the study of medicine was integral to the education of the architect.\(^{23}\) Since early modern architects often concerned themselves with the imitation of the body, period developments in the study of anatomy and medicine bore direct relevance to the practice of architecture.\(^{24}\) Multiple figures attest to the ongoing authority of this Vitruvian ideal in Dietterlin’s northern context. Vogtherr, the author of the innovative anatomical flap prints of 1538 and the 1538 *Kunstbüchlin’s* grotesque architectural ornaments, personified this dual expertise. So, too, did physician and Vitruvius translator Walther Hermann Ryff. Ryff not only published extensively on medicine and architecture, but, through his 1548 *Vitruvius Teutsch*, introduced the Vitruvian model of the medically knowledgeable architect to the era’s German-speaking readers.\(^{25}\) Perhaps encounters with Vogtherr and Ryff’s ornament and architectural publications piqued Dietterlin’s interest in these versatile authors’ anatomical works.

With its fleshy, scalloped edges and layers of peeled-away tissue, the ribcage motif in Plate 108 also recalls the human trunk presented in the *Octava Musculorum Tabula* of Andreas Vesalius’s well-known anatomy textbook, the *De humani corporis fabrica* [Fig. 6].\(^{26}\) In fact, Axel Gampp has argued that Dietterlin drew ideas for many of the ornaments pictured in the

\(^{23}\) “Disciplinam vero medicinae novisse oportet propter inclinationem caeli, quae Graeci καλύματα dicunt, et aeris et locorum, qui sunt salubres aut pestilentes, aquarumque usus; sine his enim rationibus nulla salubris habitatio fieri potest.” Vitruvius, *De architectura*, I.1.10.


\(^{26}\) Andreas Vesalius, *De humani corporis fabrica libri septem* (Basel: Johannes Oporinus, 1543).
Architectura from representations of anatomical forms in Vesalius’s works. Vesalius published the Fabrica in 1543, and released a more extensively illustrated abridgement, the De humani corporis fabrica librorum epitome, around the same time. The appearance of the Fabrica represents a watershed moment for early modern scientific culture and the history of the book. Vesalius’s treatise radically argued for a hands-on approach to the study of anatomy, eschewing the conceptual speculations of the day’s learned medical authorities for the invasive examinations then relegated to the barber, and replacing the abstract theories of contemporary medical writings with specific observations and experiment. The Fabrica is illustrated with nearly two hundred woodcuts, a corps of images that far outstripped the visual apparatus of previous anatomical publications both in terms of quantity and naturalism. The Fabrica’s prints visualize a canonical human body comprised of a standard repertoire of forms and structures—a concept present in the writings of Galen but never before illustrated in such extensive detail. This rich picture of a homo absolutus defined the

---


31 Sachiko Kusukawa, Picturing the Book of Nature: Image, Text, and Argument in Sixteenth-century Human Anatomy and Medical Botany (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012), 198-227,
anatomical norms that would theoretically present in most actual bodies. The Fabrica’s woodcuts allowed readers to picture Vesalius’s investigations even in the absence of a human subject, transposing the lessons of the anatomy theater to the printed page. Vesalius’s text lent credence to the printed image as a tool of anatomical education, and validated the role of print as an instrument of scientific inquiry.

As the conjunction of flayed body and ruined architecture in the Octava Musculorum Tabula woodcut suggests, the descriptive and didactic concerns of Vesalius’s Fabrica had much in common with the intellectual aims of contemporary architectural culture. Sebastiano Serlio, whose 1537 Quarto libro effectively canonized the images of the Orders, was probably among the many artists involved in formulating the illustrations of Vesalius’s text.  

The relationship appears to have influenced the Fabrica in various ways. Both Vesalius and Serlio explored how the disparate components of the human or architectural corpus fit together to form a whole structure. The Quarto libro’s deft use of printed illustrations to clarify a vast body of architectural material may well have inspired how Vesalius employed printed images to enliven the Fabrica’s complex anatomy lessons. Vesalius’s efforts to canonize the forms of the human body moreover resemble Serlio’s initiative to describe standard forms for architecture. And just as Serlio sought to systemize classical architectural forms through the analysis of ancient ruins, Vesalius supported his endeavor to describe the

esp. 218.

32 Kusukawa, Picturing the Book of Nature, 209.

parts of the human anatomy by turning to the study of antique sculpture. Vesalius’s canonical body allowed readers to discuss anatomy in general terms, and thus made medical aberrations easier to define. Serlio’s suite of standard architectural forms likewise permitted viewers to recognize works that transgressed the “classical” canon of ornaments, and even equipped them to invent variations on those norms.

As a lavishly illustrated guide to the five Orders of architecture composed in emulation of Serlio’s *Quarto libro*, Dietterlin’s *Architectura* also shares the *Fabrica*’s preoccupation with visualizing canonical forms. The *Architectura*’s portrayal of the interior structures of the human body nevertheless engages questions of architectural imitation and naturalism not addressed by Serlio. The forms that inspired Dietterlin’s auricular ornaments could not be known intimately except through the invasive investigations of the anatomist. To render the *Architectura*’s auricular motifs, Dietterlin employed a mode of representation distinct from the style of depiction that defines the book’s more conventional anthropomorphic imagery. Figures such as the images of Adam and Eve in Plate 108 [Fig. 4] could not be mistaken for likenesses of specific, observed human bodies. Their contorted poses are too stylized, too reflective of the image of the body in period art. But even though it is evident that Dietterlin also lifted his auricular forms from art—that is, from printed anatomical images—the anatomical ornaments pictured in his *Architectura* nevertheless claim

35 Kusukawa, *Picturing the Book of Nature*, 221
to derive from observations of nature. The ribcage form at the center of the mantle in Plate 108 displays numerous irregularities that identify the object as a form inspired by an individual human trunk. Its lower prongs curl at uneven angles, its upper termini crease in distinct patterns. Even the edges of the object’s interior ridges are nicked at irregular intervals. Splayed open far wider than any normal, intact ribcage, Dietterlin’s gaping form even seems to record the invasive manipulations of the inquisitive anatomist. The depiction of physical imperfections and the exploded view were two common ways in which contemporary nature and anatomical studies asserted their status as direct and privileged records of the observed subject. The presence of these pictorial conceits in the Architectura allies the text, however loosely, with the robust, sixteenth-century tradition of northern prints that claimed to be made after life. Though often regarded as a manifesto of architectural fantasy and anti-naturalism, Dietterlin’s Architectura takes the imitation of nature at least as seriously as any architecture book of its age.

---


The imitation of nature had long been an important principle for architectural composition. Praising Greek architectural ornament, Vitruvius contended that, “in the proper completion of their works, [the Greeks] expressed everything as it certainly was, drawn from the true customs of Nature, and they approved those things of which the explanations, when examined, can be shown to possess the ground of truth.”\(^{40}\) In other words, truth, imitation, and nature form the bases for decorous ornamental composition.\(^{41}\) Northern authors of the sixteenth century appropriated Vitruvius’s theory with enthusiasm. To illustrate the acanthus plant that had partly inspired the ornaments of the Corinthian Order in his \textit{Vitruvius Teutsch} [Fig. 7], Ryff copied the precise and botanically accurate woodcut image of the species in Leonhard Fuchs’s 1543 \textit{New Kreüterbuch}.\(^{42}\) In emphasizing the importance of modeling built forms after nature (or after extremely accurate images derived from life) Ryff promoted the Vitruvian ideal of naturalistic architectural ornament.\(^{43}\)


\(^{41}\) Payne, \textit{The Architectural Treatise}, 46-47.


\(^{43}\) The caption accompanying the illustration in fact announces the image as an “extremely accurate, lifelike counterfeit image of the true Acanthus, with its growth and the gestalt of the wreathed teeth or basket [of the Corinthian column]” / “Gantz eygentliche lebliche
Other authors adapted Vitruvius’s theory into an argument for adjusting nature. Pieter Coecke van Aelst’s 1539 De architectura abridgment tells how the ancients “…took the elements of nature as a guide, exercising their ingenium more gloriously daily in their inventions, ordering the old into something new and better.”

For the architectural theorists of Dietterlin’s world, the forms of nature were a point of departure for superb architectural inventions. Sixteenth-century architectural publications largely followed the principle that art should improve or perfect nature, presenting the human body in idealized form or as a series of standard physical types in the service of describing a flawless system of architectural proportions.

The auricular ornaments of Dietterlin’s treatise evoke a vision of nature less mediated and perfected than the copious human forms pictured in previous architecture.

---

44 “Maer die menschen wantse van nature aenne mende ende leerlick sÿn, exercerende haer ingenie glorieerden daghelix in huer inuentien, ordinerende alijts wat nieus ende beters…” Pieter Coecke van Aelst, DIE INVENTIE DER COLOMMEN MET HAREN CORONEMENTEN ENDE MATEN. Wi Vitruvio ende andere diuersiche Auctoren optroorste vergalderd, voer Solders, beeldsniders, stienbonders, &c. Ei ën allen die ghenuchte hebben in edifícien der Antiquen (Antwerp: Pieter Coecke van Aelst, 1539), Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, A.civ. 53, fol. b.3’.

books. In contrast to such images, the ribcage lozenge in Plate 108 and the *Architectura*’s other auricular ornaments cannot be said to embody an *ideal* of human anatomy. Yet neither do the motifs pretend to report directly the interior formations of the body with the same accuracy as Vesalius’s *Fabrica* or other contemporary anatomical texts. Nothing quite like the “ribcage” actually occurs in the human corpus—the form splits too widely, and the smooth lozenge at the center of the ensemble bears no resemblance to the mass of organs that occupy the human trunk. Dietterlin instead regards the pictorial contents of Vesalius’s *Fabrica* and other anatomical prints as adjustable models, and ingredients for a novel brand of architectural confection. The artist uses the printed image of anatomical forms to forge new links between architecture and the other visual arts. During the sixteenth century, nature study was practiced primarily in drawing and painting, and rarely observed in architecture. By appropriating the forms of anatomical study to the decorations of architecture, the *Architectura*’s auricular motifs establish a new bridge between the figural arts and architectural ornament.

Dietterlin’s interest in using anatomical ornament to explore the relationships between architecture and the other visual media engaged a lively early modern discourse on the dichotomy between structure and ornament in architecture. Leon Battista Alberti, who variously compares bodies and architecture throughout his *De re aedificatoria*, took human anatomy as a metaphor for the architectural corpus.46 Speaking of the advantages of gracefully-constructed masonry, he wrote that “…within any body, the parts that have grown together and been joined naturally are more difficult to break asunder than those that man has used his strength and skill to force together and fuse.”47 This metaphor continued

47 “Cuneos, quibus arcus ducator, omnes quadrato et, quo ad fieri possit, praegendi velim esse ex lapide. Nam est quidem ciusque corporis pars indissolubilior, quae a natura concreta
in the author’s theory of architectural ornament. Alberti portrayed architecture as a composite entity, comprised of an underlying structural framework and a superstructure of reliefs, panels, and other decorations—much like a skeleton and its skin. He implored readers to “take great care to ensure that even the minutest elements are so arranged in their level, alignment, number, shape, and appearance…that they are an ornament to that body of which they are to be part.”

In one sense, Dietterlin’s anatomical motifs affirm the Albertian notion of ornament as the fleshy armature of architecture. Except for the ribcage form adorning the fireplace in Plate 108 and the occasional, spine-like curve of nubby strapwork, Dietterlin’s anatomical decorations tend to resemble soft, non-skeletal human tissues. For instance, the lower, central portion of the gable mounting the gated portal in Plate 37 of the Annder Buch [Fig. 8], is comprised of concentric, curving rings of ornament that curl up toward a hanging ball—an ensemble that resembles the supple forms of a throat and uvula. The labile auricular ornaments of the epitaph in Plate 90 of the 1598 Architectura [Fig. 9] droop like the flayed skin depicted in Vesalius’s Fabrica.

48 “Quare in primis observabimus, ut ad libellam et lineam et numeros et formam et faciem etiam minutissima quaeque disponantur, ita ut mutuo dextera sinistris, summa infimis, proxima proximis, aquila aequalibus acuatissime conveniant ad istius corporis ornamentum, cuius future partes sunt. Quin et signa tabulae, et quicquid insigne applicabitur, ita coaptentur necesse est, ut inata loci acomodatoribus et veluti gemella videantur.” Alberti, De re aedificatoria, fol. 169v. Here, as in Alberti, On the Art of Building in Ten Books, 310.

49 The form likewise recalls the open mouth of the grotesque mask that Dietterlin first published in Plate 35 of the Erst Buch. Viewed next to this motif, the spiraling ends of the volutes on either side of the gable resemble two eyes, and the gable crowning the monument subsequently takes on the appearance of a fleshy face.
In other regards, the _Architectura_’s anatomical ornaments contradict the Albertian parallelism of architecture and ornament as body and skin. Plate 90’s network of sagging forms seem an improbable support for the donor figures and the _Pietà_ at the center of the epitaph. The orifice in Plate 37’s arch even blurs the distinction between exterior and interior—the fundamental architectural duality on which Alberti’s framework/ornament metaphor was based. In both cases, the _Architectura_’s auricular ornaments also defy the Palladian notion of the architectural corpus as a system of cooperating parts akin to the human anatomy. By ballooning minute anatomical features such as the uvula into substantial presences in his architectural design, Dietterlin furthermore challenged early modern architectural theory’s strong attachment to the categories of proportion and scale. And whereas Palladio had employed the anatomical metaphor to affirm that each component of the building has a specific function, Dietterlin’s anatomical motifs make the roles of framework and ornament interchangeable. By adorning his _Architectura_’s structures with the human anatomy’s inner forms, Dietterlin turned the metaphorical body of architecture inside out.

Such volatile constructions had no place in conventional architecture. In fact, it was only in Germany—one of the only regions of Europe where the sober forms of Palladianism did not dominate early seventeenth-century architecture—that auricular ornament was employed widely in building. The apparent instability of Dietterlin’s auricular designs betrays the author’s interest in describing an architecture free from the tectonic logic of building construction. The auricular ornaments of Dietterlin’s _Architectura_ addressed not architects, but figural artists who might compose images of architecture without heeding the rules of good engineering. Artists who worked in the wake of the _Architectura_’s release eagerly

---

50 Forssman, _Säule und Ornament_, 193.
emulated his example. An epitaph in the Cathedral of Saint Peter in Bremen made in 1625 for Albert von Hespergen employs Dietterlin’s model of nebulous auricular architecture to stage a clever artistic conceit. The structure’s ebony-colored architectonic framework is laden with pink stone ornaments that mime the textures and tones of flesh [Fig. 10a]. The stone is carved with forms that simultaneously resemble bodies and the profiles of faces, as in the curving figure of the putto that juts out beneath the broken cornices on the epitaph’s middle register [Fig. 10b]. A putty-like configuration such as this was an improbable support for the epitaph’s massive forms, but the work’s auricular ornament served a more important purpose. By incorporating the image of animated, moving flesh into this monument for the dead, the artist alluded at once to the corruptibility of the human corpus and to the survival of the soul after the demise of the physical body.

Dietterlin’s auricular architecture also captured the imaginations of architectural theorists well into the seventeenth century. Later authors applied the Architectura’s models of auricular ornament to sculpted and painted constructions that seemed to dissolve the body of architecture entirely. Rutger Kasemann, who practiced as an architect, sculptor, and carpenter, conceived of his auricular ornament-filled architectural treatises as model books for ornamental composition in a wide variety of media, particularly woodcarving. One plate from Kasemann’s 1630 Architectur, first released as a series of individual prints in 1627, shows an altarpiece and half of a billowing banner comprised of auricular motifs that seem to melt onto the printed page [Fig 11]. To the left of this ensemble stands a bulbous

51 Margot Pirr describes the treatment of auricular ornament in Dietterlin’s Architectura as a mere prelude to the complete dissolution of structure and ornament through this motif in later works. See Pirr, Die Architectura, 142.
52 Irmscher, Köllner Architektur- und Säulenbücher, Köllner Architektur- und Säulenbücher um 1600. Sigurd Greven-Studien 2 (Bonn: Bouvier, 1999), 157-158.
53 Rutger Kasemann, ARCHITECTUR, Nach Antiquitetischer Lehr und Geometrischer Auftheilung, allen Kunstreichen Handtwerckeren, Werkmeisern, Goldschmieden Bilthaeneren,
column bearing an ornate entablature. *Knorpelwerk* forms that variously recall palm fronds, peapods, snails, garlands, and a cornucopia cover every inch of the bulging post and its ornate lintel in a dizzying display of *horror vacui*. The figures grow outwards from the center of the column as if bleeding onto the page; the design appears to froth with embellishments.

Auricular ornament did not remain in the realm of architectural design for long, spreading to virtually every visual medium by the second decade of the seventeenth century. Using model books such as Kasemann’s *Architectur* as a point of departure, Rhenish woodworkers constructed countless furnishings, portals, and epitaphs that feature the nebulous motif. Metalworkers also embraced the auricular style. In 1614, Adam van Vianen cast a monumental ewer for the Amsterdam goldsmiths’ guild that remains a renowned example of auricular ornament [Fig. 12]. While monstrous figures support the vessel and bend acrobatically over the top of its handle, the ewer’s undulating surfaces recall the topography of human organs or the formations of a shell. Even Dietterlin’s son, the goldsmith Wendel Dietterlin the Younger, released numerous etchings and model books of grotesques that feature auricular ornaments inspired by the anatomical motifs of his father’s *Architectura*, yet which are often somewhat more plant-like in form [Fig. 13]. With their

---


56 These include an undated, eleven-part series published by Balthasar Caymox in Nuremberg (LeBlanc II:131, no. 2; Hollstein VI.2), and a six-part series printed in Lyon in 1614 (Hollstein VI.1), a nine-part *Procession of Monstrous Figures* from 1615 (Hollstein VI.3), and a fourteen-part series from around 1614 or 1615 (Hollstein VI.4). A re-print of the
wispy, ethereal bodies, Wendel the Younger’s auricular embellishments could be carried out in almost any medium but architecture.

As the example of the Bremen epitaph suggests, auricular ornament also became a vehicle for potent religious rhetoric. Dietterlin sensed this potential early on, employing the form most often in his Architectura’s images of holy histories. On the one hand, auricular ornament’s resemblance to flesh made it an apt symbol for the baser human instincts often dramatized in biblical narratives.57 The visceral anatomical motifs that adorn the fireplace in Plate 108 of the 1598 Architectura refer, for instance, to the physical toil and carnal impulses that defined Adam and Eve’s existence after the Fall.58 Auricular ornament also supplied precisely the kind of gory matter that often fascinated audiences of the early modern devotional image.59 Plate 199 of the 1598 Architectura delivers this transfixing material in the form of a fountain crowned by a statue of the arrow-ridden Saint Sebastian, which drips with auricular flourishes that resemble spurts of the martyr’s blood [Fig. 14].

Yet Dietterlin likewise discerned that the indeterminate, quintessence-like constitution of auricular ornament could evoke the very opposite of the brute physicality embodied in these designs. It could also manifest the immaterial nature of the sacred. The auricular ornaments of the Pietà epitaph in Plate 90 of the 1598 Architectura resemble the wings of the putti that anchor the four corners of the shell-domed niche. Plate 127 shows a Crucifixion in which a band of curling auricular forms surrounding three cherubim arches

fourteen-plate series is available in Wendel Dietterlin the Younger and Carl Koch, Eine Folge phantastischer Radierungen von Wendel Dietterlin der Jüngere (Berlin: A. Frisch, 1928).

57 Forssman, Säule und Ornament, 183.
over the cross, representing the celestial realm that will soon receive the suffering Christ [Fig. 15]. These images do not portray specific components of the human body so much as corporeal materials transformed into extraordinary, ethereal matter. Images of the Passion and suffering saints had inspired conversations about the unusual materiality of sacred bodies since the Middle Ages.\(^6\) The pictorially ineffable qualities of angels and other manifestations of the divine or otherworldly had similarly preoccupied artists in Europe for centuries, attracting particularly intense interest in the years around 1600.\(^6\) Yet architecture had rarely participated in these visual dialogues. The auricular ornament of Dietterlin’s *Architectura* suggested how the medium might engage familiar modes of religious rhetoric. Perhaps as a result of its aptitude for embodying the [im]materiality of the sacred, auricular ornament achieved virtual ubiquity in the ecclesiastical furnishings and interiors in the German-speaking lands throughout the seventeenth century.\(^6\)

What, ultimately, distinguished the strange anatomical ornaments that filled the *Architectura* from the era’s more conventional modes of architectural anthropomorphism? Throughout the early modern period, the columns and other architectural ornaments were widely thought to evoke an ideal architectural naturalism and the appearance of structural integrity through the imitation of the human body’s outward forms. Dietterlin’s anatomical ornaments, by contrast, evoked the inner structures of the human physique, challenging the Albertian analogy between ornament and skin and complicating the Vitruvian comparison between architecture and body. The auricular forms of Dietterlin’s *Architectura* confronted readers with a paradox, for the motif produced an architecture made after life that

\(^{6}\) For a useful introduction to this large topic, see Caroline Walker Bynum, *Christian Materiality: An Essay on Religion in Late Medieval Europe* (New York: Zone Books, 2011).

\(^{6}\) On increasing curiosity in the visual presence of apparitions at the turn of the seventeenth century, see Stuart Clark, *Vanities of the Eye: Vision in Early Modern European Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 204-236.

\(^{6}\) Forssman, *Säule und Ornament*, 183.
nonetheless transgressed deep-seated ideas about how “natural” architecture should look. The treatise’s auricular ornaments also gave audiences a new way to think about what architecture does. In addressing problems of anatomical naturalism and Christian materiality in architectural form, Dietterlin’s Architectura integrated conversations about representation once virtually exclusive to the figural arts into the period’s robust discourses on architectural imitation.
Ensconced in a translucent, white shroud, a figure rises from a rectangular aperture cut into a cliff at a raking angle [Fig. 1a]. A throng of spectators witnesses his emergence. Two men strain against the weight of a stone slab as they lower it from the tomb. A woman in green and yellow garb rushes forward with outspread arms, astounded at the apparition. Behind her, clothed in a red mantle and blue robes, stands Christ. With a gesture of blessing, he calls the shrouded body from its crypt. As the white-clad figure materializes from the darkness, it undergoes a more profound metamorphosis—the transformation from death to restored life.

*The Raising of Lazarus*, the only surviving panel painting unquestionably executed by Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, shows an episode that enjoyed increasing popularity in European art in the decades around 1600. However, this Lazarus’s completely enveloped state is highly unusual for painting from that period. The shroud reduces his body to pure

---


2 According to Martin, this depiction of Lazarus is unique among the paintings from this period in its representation of the character in a fully-swathed state. A similar image of the fully-swathed body of Sarah nevertheless occurs in Johann Hopffe’s 1591-1592 *Burial of Sarah*. I am grateful to Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann for bringing this to my attention. See Martin, “Der Maler Wendel Dietterlin,” 21; and José Kastler, “*Sarahs Begräbnis*,” in *Renaissance im Weser-Raum*, ed. G. Ulrich Großmann. Catalogue of the exhibition of the same name, Lemgo, Weserrenaissance-Museum Schloß Brake, April 22-October 1, 1989 (Munich and Berlin: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 1989), 1:527.
form. Its greyish blue and white palette approximates the appearance of grisaille, a technique in which the painter employs only black, white, and grey tones. Grisaille images had long graced the outer panels of northern Europe’s movable, winged altarpieces, serving as staid counterparts to the colorful panels revealed on only on Sundays and feast days. Since at least the early fifteenth century, painters such as Jan van Eyck and Rogier van der Weyden had used grisaille’s pictorial similarities to stone to represent fictive carved figures. The conceit allowed painters to evoke the visual style of monochrome sculpture without actually forming a graven image. It also became an outlet for artists’ experiments with animating

---


figures in ways that sculpture could not. Grisaille has thus been interpreted as a pictorial device that compares the arts of painting and sculpture.

Dietterlin’s painting uses a single passage of grisaille-like coloring to elaborate this medium-to-medium comparison. Marble-like Lazarus emerges from a wood-framed cavity carved into stone, details that refer to materials and processes of sculpture. The rest of the colorful composition embodies the world of painting. Veiled Martha’s rosy complexion contrasts with the monochromatic visage of the shrouded Lazarus. The mercurial shades of Christ and Mary’s shot-color garments capture the appearance of fabric that capriciously changes color when viewed at different angles, an effect that the materials of painting could imitate far better than those of sculpture could. The shadows of Lazarus’s facial features are just visible beneath his cerements. While sculptors had long used drapery to describe anatomical forms beneath fabric, this particular form of translucence was also an effect more convincingly achieved in painting than in sculpture. Dietterlin’s work pits sculpture against painting, and shows the latter to be the more expressive art.

Amidst the action, a bearded man holding up the right side of the tomb slab engages the viewer with a steady gaze [Fig. 1b]. The figure’s resemblance to the printed likeness of Dietterlin included in many copies of the 1598 Architectura identifies him as the artist’s self-portrait. By vividly picturing himself in The Raising of Lazarus, the painter enters the image’s

---

argument between painting and sculpture, championing painting’s capacity to resemble life.¹⁰

The episode that the painted Dietterlin observes likewise engages the early modern rhetoric of artistic mastery. In the title page for the second, 1568 edition of his Vite and on the verso side of the work’s final page, Giorgio Vasari had included a woodcut showing the Resurrection attended by trumpeting Fama and painting, sculpture, and architecture—an allegory of the glory of the rinascita.¹¹ Dietterlin’s Raising of Lazarus employs similar resurrection imagery to celebrate its own author’s personal artistic greatness. The painter’s skill, embodied in the figure of Lazarus and his adroitly rendered shroud, outlives the artist to impress countless generations of future viewers. The triumph of Dietterlin’s painting grants the artist immortal fame and ensures that he, like Lazarus, will conquer death.¹²

The idea that painting and sculpture engage in a competition, or paragone, had stirred conflict among art critics since at least the second third of the fifteenth century.¹³ Debates

---

about the status of the visual arts relative to liberal arts such as geometry, rhetoric, and music laid the groundwork for these controversies. It was only by establishing the nature of artistic *ingenuum* that the visual arts could claim intellectual parity with the liberal arts. As Dietterlin’s self-portrait in the *Raising of Lazarus* suggests, the *paragone* discourse thus turned on the rhetoric of artistic genius. Leon Battista Alberti’s *De pictura*/ *Trattato della Pittura* (1435) and the writings of Leonardo Da Vinci variously compare the difficulties that the painter and sculptor overcome in their work, the merits of the intellectual labor involved in each pursuit, and the different media’s particular representational capacities. Drawing on a survey of Florentine artists, Benedetto Varchi’s *Due Lezizioni* (published in 1549) dramatized the arguments of painters and sculptors as an epistolary dialogue alongside a reply by

---


14 For instance, on writings that compare painting and sculpture to poetry, see Catharine King, *Representing Renaissance Art, c. 1500-c. 1600* (Manchester: University of Manchester Press, 2007), 32.


Michelangelo. Varchi settled the competition in a draw, “…certain that sculpture and painting in their substance are a single art, and that the one is therefore just as noble as the other”.

In the next year, the first edition of Vasari’s *Vite* contended that painting and sculpture enjoy equal standing, for each proceed from the supreme art of *disegno*. The case reappeared in the 1568 edition of the *Vite* most likely known to Dietterlin’s Strasburg cohort: “…sculpture and painting are in truth sisters, born from one father, that is, design (*disegno*), at one and the same birth, and have no precedence one over the other…” Vasari also incorporated a third medium into the *paragone* discourse: architecture. The *Vite* characterized architecture “…as the [art] most universal and the most necessary and useful to men, and as that for the service and adornment of which the two others [painting and sculpture] exist.” The idea that painting and sculpture operate in concert with architecture

---


19 Citing the disparity between Vasari’s relatively incoherent letter to Varchi and the carefully-argued paragone argument in the *Proemio*, Thomas Frangenberg has raised the possibility that Pierfrancesco Giambullari and Cosimo Bartoli, translators of Alberti’s *De re aedificatoria*, acted as co-authors of the *paragone* debate in the 1550 *Vite* as well as the 1568 *Proemio delle Vite*. See Thomas Frangenberg, “Bartoli, Giambullari, and the Prefaces to Vasari’s *Lives* (1550),” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 65 (2002): 252-255.

20 On the impact of Vasari’s *Vite* in late Renaissance Strasbourg, see Chapter I.


went back to Vitruvius’s *De architectura*, where a chapter “On Finishing” offers ample advice for devising architectural sculpture and wall paintings, as well as guidance on executing marble flooring, wood ceiling coffering, and the other decorative minutiae of architecture.\(^{23}\) Reflecting the spirit of Vitruvius’s comprehensive guide to coordinating the arts in built projects, the *Vite* organized painting, sculpture, and architecture in a unified theoretical framework. Vasari’s concept of three sister arts ushered in a less antagonistic phase of the *paragone* discourse, which focused on the reciprocity between the visual media rather than the animosity between the arts.\(^{24}\) The theory of the three sister arts played a prime role in Western culture until the twentieth century, when architecture came to be regarded as a field autonomous from painting and sculpture.\(^{25}\)

Whereas the *paragone* theme is a prominent feature of the art and art writing of early modern Italy, its role in the artistic culture of northern Europe has been less easy to define. The North’s paucity of original writings on the *paragone* has seemed to suggest that art experts north of the Alps engaged in this discourse through artworks alone.\(^{26}\) Yet comparisons between the arts occurred in diverse fora in this region. Hans Sachs’s 1568 *Ständebuch*, illustrated by Jost Amman, includes an exhaustive catalogue of artistic trades that

---

\(^{23}\) See Vitruvius, *De architectura*, VII.


attributes particular aptitudes to each field.\footnote{Hans Sachs, \textit{Eygentliche Beschreibung Aller Stände auff Erden: Hoher vnd Nidriger, Geistlicher vnd Weltlicher, Aller Künsten, Handwercken vnd Händeln, \textit{et c. vom grösten bis zum kleinsten, Auch von jarem Ursprung, Erfindung und gebreuchen} (Frankfurt am Main: Feyerabents, 1568).} Records of disputes between the disparate factions of artists’ guilds often address the relative excellence of different media as well.

Strasbourg’s painters and finishers decreed in 1516 that prospective masters should “…skillfully apply paint to a carved sculpture of Mary or an angel or another young figure with drapery…and gild it and apply other decorations to it.”\footnote{“Item fur das dritt ein Marienbild, oder Engel, oder sunst ein junges bild mit gewant das gnschnytten ist soll er fassen pronieren, vergulden, und lassieren und andre zierung elenhoch verlieh,” Strasbourg, Archives de la Ville et de la Communauté urbaine de Strasbourg, Protocols for the painters’ Meisterstück, 1516. Quoted from August Schricker, “Ordnungen der Strassburger Malerzunft,” \textit{Jahrbuch für Geschichte, Sprache und Literatur Elsäss-Lothringens} 3 (1887): 99.} Local sculptors sensed that this was a bid by the painters and finishers to earn the right to work as sculptors as well.

Before the town council, one sculptor subsequently defended his colleagues’ exclusive authority to practice their craft by citing sculpture’s elevated status as a “free” or “liberal art” (\textit{freien kunst}).\footnote{“Wan aber die moler und zubereiter vermeynten, bey irem beriempten furnemen zu bleiben, des sie doch nit wißen noch künden und gelernet haben, so begern als wit. die bildhouwer; so vere und aber sie nit wolten dar von ston, das sie sollen machen meister stück der freien kunst des bildhouwes…” Complaint of Veit Wagner against the painters, c. 1520, Strasbourg, Archives de la Ville et de la Communauté urbaine de Strasbourg, G.U.P. 11. Here as quoted from Hans Rott, \textit{Quellen und Forschungen zur Südwestdeutschen und Schweizerischen Kunstgeschichte im XV und XVI. Jahrhundert. III. Der Oberrhein: Quellen I. (Baden, Pfalz, Elsass) [hereafter, “Oberrhein Quellen I”]} (Stuttgart: Strecker und Schröder Verlag, 1933), 269. The 1516 article is discussed further in Michael Baxandall, \textit{The Limewood Sculptors of Renaissance Germany} (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1980), 112-114.} Finally, the published disputes of the Italian \textit{paragone} discourse were well known in northern Europe. Authors in this region had produced translations and abridgments of Italian \textit{paragone} texts since the 1530s—Alberti’s positions on the subject were known through the publications of Walther Hermann Ryff, and Sebastiano Serlio’s remarks on the topic were disseminated through the works of Pieter Coecke van Aelst. Strasbourg’s spirited reception of Vasari’s \textit{Vite} in the later decades of the sixteenth century brought
Northerners’ attention to theories about the links between the artistic media just as Dietterlin’s career in that city was taking off.\(^{30}\)

Dietterlin himself explored the idea of the three sister arts in an unpublished design for a colorful facade [Fig. 2].\(^{31}\) A figural group adorns the space between the building’s two stories and its rightmost windows. With one foot set atop the wheel of fortune, the winged figure of Nemesis bears the dagger of treachery, batons of power, and a cornucopia in the guise of an erect phallus. Personifications of prosperity and hardship flank her to the right and left. Rendered in a bluish-grey grisaille color scheme, the group resembles a collection of stone sculptures. Their garments spill over their stringcourse platform like carvings mingling with their architectural framework. Nevertheless, the painter must have designed their forms to be executed in his own medium.\(^{32}\) With its deceptive convergences of painting, sculpture, and architecture, Dietterlin’s façade masterfully combines Vasari’s three sister arts. Nemesis engages this theme on an allegorical level, referring to the rivalry between the arts as well as retribution against the sort of artistic arrogance then thought to drive the paragone debates. As a goddess of capricious change, she also embodies the material transformations, ambiguities, and illusions involved in combining the disparate visual media.\(^{33}\)

Dietterlin’s façade design expands Vasari’s theory of the three sister arts by engaging a fourth medium—print. The Strasbourg artist had lifted the scheme’s central, winged figure

---

\(^{30}\) On the reception of Vasari’s Vite in late sixteenth-century Strasbourg, see Chapter I.

\(^{31}\) For further discussion of this drawing, see Appendix IV PA.2.

\(^{32}\) Early modern accounts of Dietterlin’s lost wall paintings in fact attest that the artist specialized in fictive sculpture. See Jean Hermann and Rodolphe Reuss, Notes historiques et archéologiques sur Strasbourg avant et pendant la Révolution (Strasbourg: F. Staat., 1905), 41.

from Albrecht Dürer’s 1502 engraving of Nemesis, or The Great Fortune [Fig. 3]. Rendered in black and white, Dietterlin’s Nemesis assumes the appearance of a painted print. The conceit refers both to painting’s aptitude for miming engraving and to period façade painters’ habit of employing prints as models. Since Nemesis can also read as a stone carving, the design likewise establishes an analogy between engraving and sculpture. Dietterlin was hardly alone among northern artists in representing print, which was often regarded as an arena in which northern artists particularly excelled, as a peer of Vasari’s canonical trio of sister arts. While Karel van Mander’s 1604 Schilder-Boeck elevated print, specifically engraving, to the status of painting, Johannes Stradanus’s circa 1590 Nova Reperta positioned copperplate printing as one of the era’s most significant inventions, and a counterpart to other esteemed mechanical and mathematical arts. It has been claimed that nature of a medium only comes into focus when a newer medium supplants it. In sixteenth-century northern Europe, print was the novel artistic medium that that threw all older art forms into sharper relief. The printed image became a vital agent of the paragone discourse in Dietterlin’s world.

Whereas Vasari writes of the arts’ common basis in design, Dietterlin’s facade addresses the paragone by probing the boundaries between the visual media. His Architectura is

---


one of many publications composed in northern Europe around 1600 to explore those frontiers as well. Books produced in Dietterlin’s milieu compared the visual arts by depicting projects that combine disparate materials and techniques—plurimedial works such as altarpieces, painted and sculpted facades, and even perspective pictorial interiors. Objects and monuments that align painting, sculpture, and architecture were no novelty in sixteenth-century Europe, but publications that primarily illustrated such artworks were. Following the release of Dietterlin’s *Architectura*, authors married images of plurimedial art with texts that engage the *paragone* debates to explore and indeed enact the rivalries and rapport between the arts in a widely circulating form. Their representations of the intersections between the various visual media—particularly architecture and the figural arts—shed light on broad trends in several previously obscure *paragone* discourses of early modern northern Europe.

**Painters and Woodworkers; Epitaphs and Altarpieces**

Different artistic trades in sixteenth-century northern Europe frequently sparred over the right to execute lucrative commissions. Conflicting definitions of the qualities particular to each art often moved the disputants employ the rhetoric of the *paragone* debates. When painters in 1560s Augsburg began adorning wood furniture and devising designs on paper to affix to woodwork, the city’s cabinetmakers complained that the painters could not mimic their intarsia, “for objects are inlaid so sharply that no painter could rival [inlay] in colors, since colors do not render [objects] as purely as wood.”37 Practitioners of the art of inlay or

---

marquetry had long competed with painters by incorporating impressive perspectival and architectural constructions into their works, and were, along with painters, prime audiences of the mid sixteenth century’s outpouring of perspective literature. While most woodworkers did not tend to use colors that did not occur naturally in wood, a cabinet in Cologne from around 1600 with bright green foliage shows how they eventually employed unusual polychrome details to rival the tonal variety of the painter’s art as well [Fig. 4]. The Augsburg cabinetmakers may have asserted that paint could not equal the mimetic aptitudes of inlay, but this attitude did not prevent later marqueters from showing that they, too, could wield color with skill. From squabbles between the different crafts emerged new theoretical speculations about the inherent qualities of the media, as well as novel forms of art.

Most arguments about who boasted the authority to perform certain types of artistic work ultimately boiled down to disputes over expertise. Around 1520, sculptor Veit Wagner wrote to the Strasbourg authorities to protest a gross incursion on the “liberal art” (freie künst) of sculpture. Sculptors and painters had long collaborated to create altarpieces with painted elements and sculpted figures linked by a joiner’s framework. Yet painters, Wagner protests, had lately begun carving figures on altarpieces. He worries that this reflects a new attitude (ein nuwerung) on the part of the painters: that they “…had the power to administrate, carve, make, use, and benefit from the panels, sculptures, and the altarpiece’s entire ornamental apparatus (gantze zier).” Wagner evidently senses that the painters’ brazen acts

---


38 It is possible that the perspectival constructions portrayed in Dietterlin’s *Architectura* court this important artist audience. On the use of perspective in marquetry, see Françoise Lévy-Coblentz, *L’art du meuble en Alsace. Tome 1. Du gothique au baroque, 1480-1698* (Paris: Librairie Istra, 1975), 79-83.

39 “…das sie macht haben, tafeln, bilder und ein gantze ziere uf ein altar zu verdigen, schneiden, machen, bruchen, und zu nießen…” Complaint of Veit Wagner against the
result from the era’s increasing regard for painting as a cerebral art akin to fields such as rhetoric and geometry. By describing sculpture as a “liberal art”, the sculptor asserts that his trade involves at least as much intellectual work as the art of painting does, and should therefore enjoy at least as much autonomy as well.

Another clash over altarpieces—the Strasbourg iconoclasms—wrought more radical consequences. Between 1524 and 1530, altarpieces, cult statues, and liturgical objects were removed from the city’s churches, at first in a haphazard fashion, and then in municipally sanctioned cleansings. Histories of this debacle, including chronicles by artists such as miniature painter Sebald Büheler and architect Daniel Specklin, proliferated in Strasbourg during the later sixteenth century. Specklin reports that from 1531 to 1534, even secular objects such as shields, standards, and epitaphs were removed from the cathedral. Many of the Strasbourg iconoclasm narratives attest that the very artists responsible for creating the


41 Specklin writes that in 1531 “…they removed from the cathedral all the shields and standards, of which there were many, and which had to be claimed by every family.” / “Daruff hatt man alle schilt und fendlin auss dem münster gethan, deren sehr vil waren und musst von iedem geschlecht und schilt singen losen.” and that in 1534, “…it was felt that all the epitaphs should be taken from the cathedral. They were covered with sheets (as is still the case).” See Daniel Specklin, Les Collectanées de Daniel Specklin: Chronique Strasbourgeoise du Septième Siècle, ed. Rodolphe Reuss. Fragments des Anciennes Chroniques d’Alsace 2 (Strasbourg: Librairie J. Noiriel, 1890), 529 (no. 2329). Elsewhere Specklin reports that, “…the epitaph of the earliest city Ammeister, Burckhardt Zwinger, that once lay before the pulpit instead [went] outside the door to the mason’s lodge. The cathedral was painted in stone color and the vaults painted and gilded.” / “Domollen wardt erkannt das man alle grabstein aus dem münster datte, und besetzte es mit blatten wie es noch ist, und statt hern Burckhardt Zwingers, ersten ammeisters, stein, so vor der kantszle lage, neben dem thürle auszwendig wan man zur steinhitten gatt, und wardt das münster steinfarv angestrichen und die gewolb gemaldt und vergüldt.” Specklin, Les Collectanées de Daniel Specklin, 531-532, no. 2343.
offending works advocated the removal of images with the greatest zeal. Archival records show the dire effects of the iconoclasms on the arts. Only months after the first instances of iconoclasm, Strasbourg’s painters and sculptors were petitioning the city magistrates and the Council of XXI for help. “Through the word of god,” the artisans relate, “regard for images has fallen markedly and continues to diminish…since we have learned no trade besides painting, sculpture, and the like, we expect no less than eventual beggary and perdition.” Sacred furnishings reappeared in Strasbourg’s churches only when Catholics regained a degree of influence in the city toward the end of the sixteenth century. Their slow reinstatement of epitaphs and altarpieces and the attendant rise in demand for such fixtures reignited strife between the different contingents of Strasbourg’s post-Reformation artists.

42 Büheler, for instance, writes that, “It was also in this 1524 year that a group of 600 burghers comprised of handworkers and other tradesmen rallied at the horse market[,] After much bargaining, the authorities of the City of Strasbourg advised them that the fetishized idols should be removed, but not until nightfall…” / “Auch in disem 1524 jar, haben sich in die 600 burger zusamen gethan von handwercken und sonst allerley hundelmansgnsdt, und seind uff den Rossmarck gezogen, und nach vielen erhahnungen so die Herrn der Statt Strassburg an sie thäten und die ihres eiits, den sie gelobt und geschworen, ermahnetenm noch mögt man sie nit von einander bringen bis in die nacht, und am morgens zogen sie hinaus zu S. Arbogast und in die Carthuas, asen und truncken nach dem besten was sie möchten bekommen.” See Sebald Büheler, “La Chronique de Sébald Büheler,” ed. Léon Dacheux, Bulletin de la Société pour la Conservation des Monument Historiques D’Alsace, 2nd ser., 3 (1888): 73, no. 213.

43 “…durch das wort gottes die achtung der bilder mercklich abgefallen und noch täglich abfellet, des wir, dwyl sie ye mißbraucht worden sint und noch werden, wol zufriiden sint; seitenmal aber wir nichts anders dann malen, bildhowen und dergleichen gelernt haben…das wir nichts gewiessern dan entlichs verderbens und des bettelstabs warten sint.” Strasbourg, Archives de la Ville et de la Communauté urbaine de Strasbourg, undated, c. 1525 supplication of painters and sculptors to the Magistrate and the Council of XXI, V,1 (1412-1537); quoted from Rott, Oberhein Quellen I, 304-305.

44 By the 1590s, these furnishings had become the only material frivolity allowed to the Catholics. See Lévy-Coblentz, L’art du meuble en Alsace. Tome I., 135. On the long quarrel between the Catholics and the Evangelicals in sixteenth-century Strasbourg, see Lorna Jane Abray, The People’s Reformation: Magistrates, Clergy, and Commons in Strasbourg, 1500-1598 (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985).

45 Leatrice Mendelsohn has argued that later manifestations of the paragone discourse were driven more by the religious and political conflicts related to the Reformation-era image
Dietterlin’s 1594 *Annder Buch* capitalized on the changing status of church adornments in Strasbourg by offering artists and patrons models for such works. Nine designs that center on arrangements of heraldic shields are distributed across the book’s five sections. In each case, the works’ individual standards, objects that Dietterlin called “*Wappen*”, combine to form an ensemble that could also serve as an epitaph. The designs therefore embody the class of objects removed in the final iconoclastic cleansings of the Strasbourg cathedral some sixty years before. Ernst Gombrich called Dietterlin’s heraldic images examples of the interplay between sign and design. The adornments of each design indeed reflect the symbolism of Order of the chapter in which it occurs, integrating form and meaning. Plate 49’s Composite heraldic scheme features a pyramid of shields flanked by debates than by the question of the relative prestige of different types of artists. See Leatrice Mendelsohn, “Simultaneität und der Paragone. Die Rechtfertigung der Kunst im Auge des Betrachters,” in *Im Agon der Künste. Paragonales Denken, ästhetische Praxis und die Diversität der Sinne*, ed. Hannah Baader et al. (Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 2007), 294-334.

46 The removal of private epitaphs from Strasbourg’s churches in 1531 was an exceptional manifestation of Reformation iconoclasm, as this form of sculpture in general enjoyed a key role in Evangelical art. On the continuing presence of epitaphs in the Reformed church space of the sixteenth century, see Jeffrey Chipps Smith, *German Sculpture of the Later Renaissance, c. 1520-1580: Art in an Age of Uncertainty* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994), 127.

47 Dietterlin’s application for an imperial printing privilege from 1592 mentions that the artist is planning both a book of “*Wappen*,” or heraldic shields like those pictured in the *Annder Buch*, as well as a book of “Epitaphien,” or epitaphs. While Dietterlin did not stick with his original publication scheme, instead releasing only three books, he did eventually add a number of new epitaph designs to the 1598 *Architectura*. Dietterlin does not name the heraldic designs in his second publication, thus allowing readers to interpret the objects as “*Wappen*” or epitaphs, or indeed as designs for some other form of heraldic work. The application reads, “Zum das Annder Buoch soll khommen allerhandt Portal, Thürrn undd Wappen, aüch mit Ihrem Zierden... Inn das sechst Buoch hab ich gedordert allerhandt Epitaphia, unnd was zu Innselbigem Zirden gehörig.” Wendel Dietterlin, Application for an Imperial Print Privilege, May 11, 1592, Vienna, Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, AT-OeStA/HHStA RHR Impressoria 13-52 (Impressoria Fz. 13), fols. 362v-362r.

modeled unicorns, creatures emblematic of the Order’s eclectic, fantastic nature [Fig. 5].

The ethereal quality of the animals’ hair and the leafy plumage indicate that Dietterlin drew on painting and print—not stone sculpture—to devise the composition, a habit he maintained in inventing the Architectura’s other sculptural designs as well. Thus, the Annder Buch did not only seek to rehabilitate once controversial art forms. It also brazenly asserted that painters might distribute models for sculpture.

What justified the Strasbourg painter’s incursion on the sculptors’ art? Painters and architects had long created printed models for sculpted funerary monuments. After architect Jacques I. Androuet Du Cerceau illustrated numerous cenotaphs in his 1561 Second Livre, painter-architect Hans Vredeman de Vries released an entire series of sarcophagi, the Canotaphiorum, in 1563. Print was an arena in which artists could design works that they were not personally trained or authorized to execute. Since Dietterlin rendered his Annder Buch’s shields and epitaphs in etching alone, he transgressed no laws regarding the division of artistic labor. In framing these Wappen as manifestations of the five Orders, the Annder Buch moreover represents the designs as architecture—an area of artistic practice not tightly controlled by Strasbourg’s guild. The publications of Serlio and Vredeman had provided a precedent for the depiction of para-architectural works such as fireplaces as manifestations of the Orders. Dietterlin’s Wappen innovated on that model by showing the Orders as a

---

49 This plate reappeared as Plate 168 in the 1598 installment of the Architectura.
50 Most of Dietterlin’s sculptural ornaments are derived from contemporary prints, drawings, and paintings, particularly the works of Tobias Stimmer and Jost Amann. See Margot Pirr, Die Architectura des Wendel Dietterlin 1598. Ph.D. Dissertation, Berlin, 1940 (Gräfenheinichen: C. Schulze & Co., 1940), 131.
51 Vredeman’s series is documented in Hollstein XLVII.137-163.
52 Fireplaces are shown in folios XVIII’, XXXVII’, XXXVI’, XLV’, XLVII’, LXI’, LXIII’, LXIV’ of Serlio’s 1537 Quarto libro, and in Plates 7, 8, and 10 of Vredeman’s 1577 Architettura. On Vredeman’s reliance on Serlio in showing fireplaces as manifestations of the Orders, see Krista De Jonge, “Interiors, Chimneypieces and Portals,” in Vredeman de Vries and the Artes
system of forms that could manifest in objects that were not part of the building fabric per se. In presenting epitaphs and shields as examples of the Orders, Dietterlin aligned these objects more closely with an art—architecture—that any trained artist was authorized to practice. The *Architectura’s* unusual theory of objects as expressions of the architectural Orders represents a creative response to the limits imposed on artists by the prevailing division of artistic labor.

Dietterlin’s heraldic designs probe the interplay between the arts on a formal level as well. Plate 49 depicts two and three-dimensional ornaments embedded in a niche, suggesting the coincidence of figural arts and architecture. The design invites the viewer to compare the modes of representation possible in the various arts by aligning a modeled unicorn with a shield adorned with the painted or incised likeness of another unicorn—the technique used to render the second creature’s image is indiscernible. In fact, the etching medium makes it impossible to tell precisely which arts the print actually compares. Plate 49 could represent a design for a sculpted epitaph with painted ornaments, or a design to be executed entirely in paint. The work’s composition and subject matter indeed resemble the pictorial formulae and content of contemporary glass paintings and printed frontispieces. Through the material ambiguities of print, Dietterlin’s etched *Wappen* offer themselves as models for projects beyond the medium of sculpture, and allow painting, sculpture, and architecture to coexist in a single form.

---

Two years after Dietterlin first published the mercurial heraldic designs of his _Annder Buch_, Strasbourg joiner Veit Eck released his 1596 _Kunstbüchlein_ [Fig. 6]. The name of Eck’s work aligns it with the many “little art books” published in the German-speaking lands in the wake of Dürer’s sophisticated art treatises, an orientation also reflected in the _Kunstbüchlein_’s sparse text and twenty-one etchings of model ornaments. Eck’s book proceeds from designs for portals to plans for epitaphs and altarpieces, fireplaces, and other ornaments. The title page advertises that the book will serve “stonemasons and carpenters, and others who love these arts.”\(^5^3\) Eck’s audience presumably included regular sculptors as well. Because they executed figurative works but employed the same tools as joiners, sculptors were regarded as a distinct but related group of artists.\(^5^4\)

If Dietterlin’s _Annder Buch_ annexes the art of sculpture to the expertise of painters, Eck’s _Kunstbüchlein_ stages a sculptor’s incursion on the painter’s métier. Eck’s book contains several models for altarpieces, a type of object that Dietterlin’s treatises had not yet pictured. The _Kunstbüchlein_ etchings were in fact the first German prints to feature altarpieces since the iconoclasms of the Reformation.\(^5^5\) The center field of one altarpiece frame with abstract terms and grotesque masks is left blank, but a plaque inscribed “S. MARGARETA. Virgo et


\(^5^4\) Already in 1427, the joiners of Strasbourg used this case to argue that sculptor Hans Jöuch could join their guild. See Rott, _Oberrhein Quellen I_, 252-4; and Baxandall, _The Limewood Sculptors_, 112.

Martyr” indicates that an image of St. Margaret would suit its Ionic ornaments [Fig. 7].

Through this inscription and its modeled adornments, Eck’s sculpted frame fixes the subject of the altarpiece’s image and thereby asserts the primacy of sculpture over painting.

While Strasbourg’s painters and sculptors had once struggled for artistic control over altarpieces and other plurimedial works, the re-emergence of demand for such projects now created strife in the realm of publishing as well. With its numerous designs for altarpieces and epitaphs, Eck’s Kunstbüchlein joined Dietterlin’s Annder Buch in what was now a competitive market of model books for church furnishings. The interplay between the painter and the woodworker’s texts revived the old contest between the city’s painters and sculptors in a different form. A quarrel over artistic expertise that once unfolded in the workshop, at the work site, or in municipal chambers now played out in print.

---

56 While many altarpieces in this period incorporated intarsia scenes composed of wooden inlay, the image of St. Margaret included in a later edition of the Kunstbüchlein, published in 1596 by Johan Bussemacher in Cologne, evidently depicts a painted design. The altarpiece design in Plate 12, labeled, “S. KATHARINA VIRGO ET MARTYR”, likewise received an image of St. Katharina, and Plate 15 depicts an image of St. Anne. Because Sts. Margaret and Katharina both refused to relinquish their faiths, their presence in Eck and Guckeisen’s models imparts the book with a distinct, Counter-Reformation slant. See Günter Irmscher, Kölner Architektur- und Säulenbücher um 1600. Sigurd Greven-Studien 2 (Bonn: Bouvier, 1999), 106.

57 This reversal of what are now normative concepts of work and by-work, or subject and ornament, was far from atypical in the early modern period. Printed representations of frames had been a common subject of the School of Fontainebleau as well as Netherlandish artists such as Cornelis II. Floris and Hans Vredeman de Vries. See Rebecca Zorach, Blood, Milk, Ink, Gold: Abundance and Excess in the French Renaissance (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), 145-153; and Christopher P. Heuer, The City Rehearsed: Architecture, Object, and Print in the Worlds of Vredeman de Vries (London and New York: Routledge, 2009), 130-134. On the unstable relationships between frame and field in art more generally, see Meyer Shapiro, “On Some Problems in the Semiotics of Visual Art,” Semiotica 1 (1969): 223-242.

58 Eck in fact dedicated the Kunstbüchlein to Johann Enoch Meyer, curator of the Catholic convent of St. Nicolas and potential patron of their carved artworks. The author likely partook in Meyer’s 1586-1592 campaign to renew the furnishings of the chapel of St. Nicholas. See Irmscher, Kölner Architektur- und Säulenbücher, 102; and Lévy-Coblentz, L’art du meuble en Alsace. Tome 1, 131-135.
Eck and Dietterlin compare painting and sculpture by way of their respective links to architecture. If Dietterlin’s *Architectura* embodies the painter’s architectural expertise, Eck’s *Kunstbüchlein* celebrates the architectural genius of the woodworker.\(^{59}\) The work’s extended title refers to its designs as “somewhat architectonic” [*etliche architechtischer*] objects, and the introduction indicates that Eck consulted with joiner and architecture expert Jacob Guckeisen to devise its model projects with architecturally decorous proportions.\(^{60}\) Eck’s efforts to highlight the connections between woodworking and architecture were not far-fetched, for many in sixteenth-century northern Europe regarded carpentry as an extension of the art of building. Joiner Gabriel Krammer’s 1600 *Architectura* even asserts that its author boasts the authority “…to make inquiries [about architectural ornament] because [he] has… practiced, interrogated, and judged the applied art of architecture in the great, subtle labor of *Tischlerhandwerk*…”\(^{61}\) that is, the *handwerk* of carpentry. The monument in the title page of

---


\(^{60}\) Eck writes, “So hab ich doch ihrem so strengen anlangen, entlichen plaß gegeben, und solchs wie es auch sein mag, daß doch auß dem rechten Fundament, uñ mit rechter Juster proportion zugericht sein, ich ohn allen ruhm sagen kan, Mit hilff vnd zuothun M. Jacob Guckeisens, auch Schreyners vnd Burgers allhie…” Veit Eck and Jacob Guckeisen, *Kunstbüchlein*, 2. A later edition of the work also indicates that Guckeisen produced the etchings: “…dz ist durch Jacob Guckeisen vffs veissigst in Kupffer gearbeitet wurde…” Johann Bussemacher, Introduction, in Eck and Guckeisen’s *ETLICHE ARCHITECTISCHER PORTALEN, EPITAPIEN, CAMINEN, VND SCHWEFFEN…* (Cologne: Johann Bussemacher, 1600), Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek, Ra 16 Has 1.

\(^{61}\) “Als Ich aber die gemelte Kunst Architectur, zu meiner groben und zarten Arbeit des Tischlerhandwercks, hochnüßlich und ersprießlich, erkand und befunden. habe ich solche recht zu erkündigen und zu erkleren, mich von jugend auf in steter ubung auffs möglichst beflossen.” Gabriel Krammer, *ARCHITECTVRA VON DEN FVNF SEVLEN SAMBT IREN ORNAMENTEN VND ZIERDEN ALS NEMLICH TVSCANA, DORICA IONICA CORINTIA COMPOSITA. IN RECHTER MAS TEILVNG VND PROPORTZION. MIT DEN EXEMPLEN DER BERVMBSTEN ANTIQVITETEN SO
Eck’s *Kunstbüchlein* goes farther, likening the intellectual pursuits of the woodworker to those of the architect [Fig. 6]. The work’s architectonic composition embodies the vocabulary of forms shared by joiners and architects. Its base depicts the joiner’s apparatus, showing trappings of manual labor such as the hammer and chisel, as well as instruments of the architect’s cerebral work such as a ruler and triangle. A similar ensemble of compass, hammer, and axe is pictured in the roundel adorning the cornice of a 1593 portal from Basel’s Zunft zu Spinnwettern, a guild that encompassed woodcarvers as well as stonemasons and architects [Fig. 8]. The presence of the compass in both designs is significant, for this was the implement that architects used to perform the mental labor of measurement and design, and indeed a tool of the liberal art of geometry. While readers in sixteenth-century northern Europe widely regarded geometry as the common theoretical basis for architecture and painting, the predella of the monument in Eck’s title page frames geometry as the mutual foundation for architecture and joinery as well. Woodworking’s use

---


63 Irmscher, *Kölner Architektur- und Säulenbücher*, 97. A second edition of the project, also printed in 1596, was released under a title that places even greater emphasis on the links between joinery and architecture. The title translates roughly to: “Certain architectonic portals, epitaphs, fireplaces, and flourishes for all stonemasons and woodcarvers”. See Veit Eck and Jacob Guckeisen, *ETLICHE ARCHITECTISCHER PORTALEN, EPITAPIEN, CAMINEN, VND SCHWEYFFEN ALLEN STEINMETZEN VND SCHREINER. N. AVCH ANDERN DISER KVNST LIEBENDN AN. TAG DVRCHE VEIT ECKEN Der STATT STRASSZBURG BESTALTEN VND IACOB GVCKEISEN BEIDE SCHREINER VND BVRGER DA SELBST* (Cologne: Johann Bussemacher, 1596), Zurich, Zentralbibliothek Zürich, Alte Drucke, Rx 12: e | F.
of geometric and architectural principles, it implies, qualifies the trade to assume a position among the liberal arts.

By asserting that its carved objects arise “from a proper understanding and foundation of the five columns,” Eck’s *Kunstbüchlein* reflects Dietterlin’s vision of the Orders as a system for composing ornament in any medium. Still, Dietterlin’s *Architectura* designs exercised scant formal influence on Eck and Guckeisen’s inventions, most of which adopt the dry style of the title page framework instead. 64 Eck also makes no attempt to address the proportions of the Orders, as Dietterlin had. Explaining that his book is intended “for the common good and use,” he dispenses with theory and shows only the concrete results of decorous architectural composition. The straightforward form of the *Kunstbüchlein* stands as a veiled criticism of Dietterlin’s rather abstruse treatise project, with its confusing mix of rigorous instructions for correct architectural composition and fantastic, ill-proportioned portals and epitaphs. 66

Eck’s *Kunstbüchlein* also takes on the *Annder Buch*’s formal explorations of the interplay between the media. The panel mounted on the fireplace in Plate 18 of Eck’s work depicts a painter working at the easel in an open landscape, draped in classicizing garb and attended by a youth [Fig. 9]. The composition represents a reversed adaptation of a scheme pictured in the second fireplace design in Jacques I. Androuet Du Cerceau’s *Second Livre*, where the painter and his assistant are rendered as a sculptural group [Fig. 10]. 67 This imagery channels themes such as the imitation of nature and art, as well as the primacy of

---

64 Rather, they recall the designs of Hans Vredeman de Vries. See Forssman, *Säule und Ornament*, 172.
disegno as the common link between the media.\textsuperscript{68} In citing Du Cerceau’s design, the woodworker proves his knowledge of architectural literature. In transforming the French artist’s model from a sculpture to a painting, Eck realizes the ideal of artful emulation allegorized in the original image. Countering Dietterlin’s foray into inventing etched patterns for sculpture, the joiner additionally asserts his authority to depict designs for paintings within his book’s printed representations of plurimedial works.

Eck’s amendments to Du Cerceau’s invention also predicate a clever visual conceit. The painter and pupil in the \textit{Kunstbüchlein} print each extend a foot beyond the edge of their etched painting, casting shadows over its sculpted frame. Objects that transgress their frames were a commonplace of early modern art, used to demarcate and then masterfully outstrip literal and figurative aesthetic boundaries.\textsuperscript{69} Painters could formulate such transgressive compositions by rendering objects on a frame of illusionistic wood or stone, a convincing imitation of sculpture that figured the painter’s triumph over that art.\textsuperscript{70} Artists could achieve a similar effect by affixing a three-dimensional form to the picture surface, as in the stucco compositions that flourished in the German lands between the decoration of the Landshut \textit{Stadtresidenz} in 1545 and Giovanni Battista Tiepolo’s 1750-3 ceiling for the Würzburg \textit{Residenz}. The scenario that Plate 18 depicts remains ambiguous. While Eck’s design reprises the simultaneous embodiment of disparate media in the \textit{Annder Buch}’s heraldic designs, its image of figures breaching their architectonic frame describes a fusion of disparate media more on the order of the merging of arts depicted in Dietterlin’s \textit{Nemesis} façade.

\textsuperscript{68} Irmscher, \textit{Kölner Architektur- und Säulenbücher}, 101.
\textsuperscript{69} Ernst Michalski, \textit{Die Bedeutung der ästhetischen Grenze in der Methode der Kunstgeschichte} (Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1996).
\textsuperscript{70} Grams-Thieme, \textit{Lebendige Steine}, 16-19.
Dietterlin responded to Eck’s *Kunstbüchlein* by filling his 1598 *Architectura* with a bounty of sculptural ornaments, and by amplifying the carved decorations of its new architectural inventions. The designs depicted across the sequence of numbered plates that comprise the *Architectura* project’s final installment are increasingly dominated by plastic forms, which merge ever more completely with their architectural frameworks. The 1598 *Architetura*’s final, Composite book also features three altarpieces [Figs. 11a & b]. The archaizing *Astwerk* tracery of the altarpiece in Plates 202 and 203 links the *Architectura* to the regional tradition of altarpiece design and positions Dietterlin’s book as a harbinger of the rebirth of the long-defunct genre of the altarpiece print. Its intertwined structures also dissolve the boundaries between architecture and sculpture. Like the treatise’s other altarpiece schemes, the composition is rendered across two plates printed on separate pages, which can be assembled to form a monumental etching that dwarfs the *Kunstbüchlein*’s single-plate designs. This multi-plate form harks back to Daniel Hopfer’s two-sheet altarpiece etching of circa 1518, one of the last altarpiece prints produced before the Reformation became a widespread phenomenon in northern Europe [Fig. 12]. It also recalls the structure of the monumental triumphal arch that Dürer and his assistants realized for Emperor Maximilian in the form of forty-two woodcuts and two etchings in 1515.

---

of paper architecture, the very forms of Dietterlin’s assembly-required altarpiece etchings straddled the divide between the disparate arts of print and building. With these conceits, the final *Architectura* soundly upstaged the *Kunstbüchlein*’s media-melding designs.

Despite its provocative treatment of joinery and sculpture, Dietterlin’s *Architectura* found an avid readership among sculptors and joiners and exerted significant influence on northern stone-carving and woodwork. It was unusual for designers to copy Dietterlin’s schemes wholesale—rather, they tended to adopt individual motifs or combined the treatise’s different ornaments in a novel way. For instance, the lateral terms adorning the 1598 epitaph of Wilhelm Ernst of Waldeck in St. George’s Collegiate Church in Tübingen derive from the Corinthian term first published in Plate 25 of Dietterlin’s 1593 *Erst Buch*, and repeated in Plate 142 of his 1598 *Architectura*. This pattern continued in rural areas far afield from Strasbourg, where Dietterlin’s influence was already apparent by the first decade of the seventeenth century. For example, the high altar and the epitaph for Simon von Hanniwaldt in the parish church of Žórawina in Silesia show numerous motifs from the *Architectura*, perhaps mediated by the images of Gabriel Krammer’s 1600 treatise.\(^7^4\)

Jörg Zürn’s carved high altar for the Münster at Überlingen (1613-1616) [Fig. 13] also takes the illustrations of Dietterlin’s text as one of its main models.\(^7^5\) The columns in

---


the altarpiece’s large lower register emulate the design of the column second from the right in Plate 21 of the Erst Buch,\textsuperscript{76} the entablature of that portion derives from the upper entablature in Plate 17 of the Erst Buch,\textsuperscript{77} and the outermost terms compare with the terms in Plate 193 of the 1598 Architectura.\textsuperscript{78} Zürn’s altarpiece also amalgamates the distribution of columns and figures and the trio of intersecting arches of the altarpiece in Plates 202 and 203 of the 1598 Architectura with the volute-flanked pinnacle of the architectural silhouette shown behind that printed altarpiece, and, like the etched design, exhibits a carved structure that abolishes the distinctions between its architecture and sculpture. Zürn’s awareness of the building profile lurking behind the altarpiece design in Plates 202 and 203 suggests the sculptor’s sensitivity to Dietterlin’s central ideas: that architecture is the organizing framework of ornament in all the arts, that it is an intermediary between painted and sculpted decoration, and that it represents the ideal vehicle for combining disparate visual media. These notions would define the legacy of Dietterlin’s treatise in northern art literature. The Architectura became a model for the deluge of woodworkers’ books that emerged from Central European presses in the first decades of the seventeenth century, many of which also build their lessons on sculptural ornament on the foundations of the five Orders. Yet while Dietterlin’s stylistic influence dominated the region’s epitaph and altarpiece design, it was mostly woodworkers—not painters—who composed the model books that pervaded northern literature on the Orders in the seventeenth century.

\textsuperscript{76} This design reappears as Plate 138 of the 1598 Architectura.
\textsuperscript{77} This design reappears as Plate 99 of the 1598 Architectura.
\textsuperscript{78} Ohnesorge, Wendel Dietterlin, 45.
The rivalry between Dietterlin and Eck produced no clear victory for painters or woodworkers. Their respective efforts to associate painting and sculpture with the esteemed art of architecture played out in a contest over who could use print to meld the forms of figural media with architectural structures more profoundly. The resulting etchings depict schemes that could be executed in either painting or sculpture, and show painting or sculpture and architecture as integrated elements of a unified composition. These images do not so much assert the excellence of woodworking over painting or the primacy of painting over woodworking as demonstrate their authors’ genius for fusing the artistic media.

Dietterlin and Eck’s experiments with melding the figural arts and architecture transformed the *paragone* between painting and sculpture—a competition between the arts writ large—into a contest of individual masters. Amidst this strife, the proper role of architecture as a framework for combining the arts remained an open question. So, too, did the issue of the *paragone* between the figural arts and architecture. Dietterlin’s *Architectura* pursued these lines of inquiry further in the field of art most familiar to the author: architectural façade painting.

**The Painter’s Architecture: Fictive Facades**

Because architecture entailed an array of idiosyncratic formal rules, it was a problematic platform for fusing the visual media. This issue emerges in the history of façade painting in northern Europe, as well as Dietterlin’s contributions to that genre. Painted architecture abounded in the German-speaking lands during the sixteenth century, flourishing under the patronage of Burghers newly empowered by the Reformation. Dietterlin joined colleagues such as Hans Holbein and Tobias Stimmer in an elite and mobile class of façade and interior wall painters who fulfilled prestigious commissions in civic and
court centers. Façade painting thrived in part because it was an apt means for broadcasting religious and political rhetoric. Martin Luther recommended adorning courts and town halls with edifying moral exempla, and extolled the wisdom of decorating churches, cemetery walls, and houses with episodes from the Scripture. “I’d advise the lords and the rich” he wrote, “…that God indeed wants that they have the whole Bible painted upon the interior and exterior of the buildings for all men’s eyes—that would be a Christian work.”

Schaffhausen’s Haus zum Ritter, painted by Dietterlin’s Strasbourg colleague Stimmer between 1568 and 1570, forgoes this advice, instead reflecting the more Zwinglian notion that all images that might be taken as holy histories are inappropriate [Fig. 14]. Instead of sacred narratives, it features scenes from the Odyssey and classicizing architectural ornaments.


Schweikhart and Heckner, “Fassadenmalerei in Deutschland zwischen 1520 und 1570,” 245.


“Es ist ja besser, man male an die Wand, wie Gott die Welt schuf, wie Noah die Arca bauet und was mehr gutter Historien sind, den daß man sonst irgend weltliche und unverschämte Ding mallet; ja wollt Gott, ich kund die herrn und die reychen da hyn bereden, das sie die gantze Bibel ynnwendig und auswendig an den heusern fur ydermans augen malen liessen, das were eyn Christliches werck” Martin Luther, “Von den himmlischen Propheten, von Bildern und Sakrament” (1525), Here quoted from Martin Luther, Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe. Briefwechsel, vol. 8 (Weimar: Böhlau, 1938), 130 ff.

The architectural fantasy was among the most common forms of façade painting in early modern northern Europe, for it could adeptly meet the artistic challenge of organizing a large picture field punctuated by doors and windows. Earlier sixteenth-century artists rarely coordinated painted architecture with the brick-and-mortar structures it adorned, but Stimmer’s *Haus zum Ritter* scheme defied this trend.\(^8^4\) Its painted stringcourses align with the house’s actual windows, and its narrative vignettes occur between these apertures. Still, Stimmer’s design disregards many conventions of architectural decorum. The Composite pilaster at the corner of the house rests absurdly on a pier with ridiculously squat proportions. A red column appears to stand flush with the pilaster at the base but not at the top, where it rises up in front of the lintel borne by the corner post. The rider for whom the house is named appears to spring through an opening in the house’s high gable. While Italian façade painting tended to reinforce the apparent solidity of the built structure with closed compositions and architectural ornaments that appeared rather stable, the strange tectonics of Stimmer’s *Haus zum Ritter* paintings were a ubiquitous feature of façade painting in sixteenth-century northern Europe.\(^8^5\) Here the painted house front was a theater for hubristic performances of artistic genius, and the conceit of painting a façade with gravity-defying architecture was widely regarded as a sign of painterly wit.\(^8^6\) By subverting the conventional aesthetic of architectural stability, such paintings undermined the authority of the built structure and flouted prevailing architectural values. The façades of sixteenth-


century northern Europe thus played host to a spirited *paragone* between painting and architecture.

Northern façade painters’ disregard for architectural conventions also arose from the conditions of regional art literature. Early modern Italian authors as diverse as Serlio, Vasari, Borghini, and Armenini cover theories and techniques for façade painting, including ways to render fictive architecture. But while works like Hans Bocksberger the Elder and Jost Amman’s *Neuwe Biblische Figuren* of 1565 and their *Neuwe Livische Figuren* of 1570 modeled narrative vignettes for façade paintings, few original treatises published north of the Alps during the sixteenth century explain the practical dimensions of this art, much less advise painters on formulating architectural motifs. In the absence of a native literature on this subject, conflicting messages about the authority of architectural theory in façade painting conveyed in northern adaptations of Italian texts were all the more confusing. Paraphrasing the 1540 edition of Alberti’s *De pictura*, Walther Ryff’s 1547 *Architectur* contends that, “It is clear that the art of painting is foremost among all others, a master to them, and its highest and most worthy ornament[,] There is no doubt that the diligent architect received his epistyles, capitals, bases, columns, cornices, and all manner of ornament from the painter.”

---

87 On the Italian literature on façade painting of the early modern period, see Uhle-Wettler, *Kunsttheorie und Fassadenmalerei*, 131-138.
88 It was only in addressing the principles of perspective that works like Albrecht Dürer’s 1525 *Underweysung der Messung* and Hans Lencker’s 1571 *Perspectiva* provided concrete lessons on correcting the distortions that occur when façade design is viewed from below and at a distance. See Ulrich Schütte, “Gemälde an der Fassade. Die deutschen Architekturtraktate und die Fassadenmalerei zwischen 1500 und 1800,” *Münchener Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst* 43 (1992): 113.
89 “Wiewol auch sonst gnugsam bewisen werden mag, das disse kunst garnahe unter allen andern die fûrnembst, und gleich ein Meisterin und Zwingerin ist, oder die höchst unnd werste zier, dan on zweifel hat der fleissig Architectus zu seinem wecr, die Epistilien, Capitel, Basen, Colunen und allerhande zierung der gesymbs von dem Maler entpfangen.” Walther Hermann Ryff, *Der furnembsten notwendigsten, der gantzen Architectur angehörigen Mathematischen und Mechanischen künst, eygentlicher bericht und vast klare, verständliche unterrichtung,
It follows that façade painting falls within the painter’s métier, and that the application of architectural ornament in this context is up to his judgment. But Pieter Coecke van Aelst’s 1542 German translation of Serlio’s *Quarto libro* takes a contrasting position, explaining that decorative endeavors like façade painting are a matter of architectural expertise. “The architect,” it exhorts readers, “should not just attend to the decoration of stone work, but also the work of the paintbrush…” In contrast to the good architect, many façade painters exhibit “scant understanding” of architectural principles and “…would rather show the loveliness of colors and pay no attention to other aspects [of the work] even though they disgrace good [architectural] order and sometimes even spoil it, for they have not considered

---


how to arrange the proper things in the proper places.”

As the Haus zum Ritter attests, Serlio’s criticism of unruly façade painting in Italy also pertained to works in Dietterlin’s Rhineland.

Dietterlin defied his northern colleagues’ disregard for architectural decorum in façade painting. His Nemesis façade [Fig. 2] does not match the architecture of any known building of sixteenth-century Strasbourg, indicating that the design is probably the painter’s own invention. It features a lower level adorned with Doric columns and pilasters, as well as the triglyphs appropriate to that Order. This is mounted by a story with Ionic columns, demonstrating the proper superimposition of the Orders. Despite its profusion of irreverent grotesque masks, the design’s harmonious composition and proportions indicate Dietterlin’s efforts to cleave to the dictums of architectural decorum elaborated in period literature and the text of his own Architectura. The treatise’s 1598 installment addressed the North’s paucity of original guides to façade painting by depicting models for painted facades alongside instructions for decorous architectural drafting. It provided the means, if not explicit instructions, for synchronizing painted architectural ornaments with a decorously built façade. For instance, by adapting Dietterlin’s method for drafting Composite columns, a painter might copy Plate 145’s personifications of Night and Day flanking a Composite pilaster [Fig. 15]. The Architectura’s instructions for formulating, magnifying, and minimizing

91 “aber sunst also ains klaynen verstands, das sy vmb die lieblichayt der farben zů zaygen, vnd kain aufmerken habende auff aynlich ander ding, haben sy wol ettwan aynliche gutte ordnung geschendet, ya etwan gar verderbt, vmb das sy nit bedacht haben, an yedes ort sein recht ding zů setzen” Serlio, Gemaynen Reglen, fol. 67v. In the original Italian: “…per cio che sono stati alcuni pittor, ualentì quanto alla practica, ma nel rimanente di cosi poco giudicio, che per mostrare la uaghezza de i colori, & non hauendo riguardo ad alcuna altra cosa, hann discociato, & tall’hor guasto alcuno ordine, per non haver considerate do collocare le pitture ai luoghi loro.” Serlio, Regole generali, fol. LXIX v.
moldings and its lessons on devising columns that show the swelling effect of entasis could serve façade painters as well.

These models for façade decoration were not only useful for painters. As in the Annder Buch’s epitaph etchings, the printed form of Dietterlin’s façade designs allows for a flexible interpretation of the media represented. Plate 145 is one of many Architectura façade schemes with figures that can be realized in paint, sculpture, or even a combination of both figural media with architecture. The design’s intertwined configurations of body and building also do not specify where and how different media might intersect in the facade. Should the central pilaster in Plate 145 project a painted or a modeled form, and should that shaft engage carved or painted figures? Dietterlin’s print provides no concrete answer, and thus visualizes the total integration of architecture and painting (or sculpture). By showing the figural media and architecture cooperating to produce a unified design, it suggests that each is capable of expressing the same forms. The result is a model for an architecturally decorous mode of façade painting that neutralizes the competition between painting and sculpture as well as the antagonistic dimensions of the genre’s paragone between architecture and painting.

The Architectura’s vigorous engagements of figure and façade spread a dynamic new style of architectural ornament, and not just in painting. With its bulging, grotesque-decked pilasters and corbels, the façade of the Freidrichsbau at Schloss Heidelberg, realized after designs by the author’s Strasbourg colleague Hans Schoch between 1601 and 1607, exemplifies the influence of Dietterlin’s novel architectural manner [Fig. 16]. Sculptors appropriated the Architectura’s compelling configurations of body and building as well.

92 Taken as models for ornately carved facades, these designs continue Dietterlin’s forays into the art of sculpture design, extending the painter’s competition with sculptor-author contemporaries like Eck and Guckeisen.
Whereas Alexander Colin’s 1556 figures for the castle’s adjacent Ottheinrichsbau remain ensconced in their respective alcoves, Sebastian Götz’s likenesses of the ancestors of the House of Wittelsbach burst from the Friedrichsbau’s niches, jutting elbows and swords beyond their built frames.\textsuperscript{93} The Friedrichsbau’s clash of white, red, and pink stones meanwhile probes architecture’s chromatic dimensions, staging another \textit{paragone} between painting and architecture and embodying a colorful alternative to the painting genre that inspired the \textit{Architectura} façades. Dietterlin etched façade designs fueled exchanges between the media more diverse the painter-author ever personally created.

Many \textit{Architectura} façades describe a more fraught encounter between architecture and the figural arts. Two windows in Plate 104 of the 1598 treatise flank a scene framed by an elaborate cartouche [Fig. 17]. The eye roves from the darkened backs of the soldiers in its foreground and up the colonnade at the left, only to plunge along a sharply foreshortened entablature and finally rest on the figure at the center of the composition. The motif is familiar from the opening pages of the treatise, in which Dietterlin shows how to compose a graduated suite of columns that appear to recede into the distance. Fictive apertures like the scene in Plate 104 had long abounded in Rhineland façade painting. The \textit{Haus zum weissen Adler} in Stein am Rhein, painted between 1522 and 1523, features episodes from Boccaccio and the Decameron set against an azure background and encased in illusionistic architecture [Fig. 18].\textsuperscript{94} This ornamental armature grows more ethereal toward the top of the edifice, which as a result seems to dissolve into the actual sky. Two of the façade’s narrative vignettes unfold in receding landscapes framed by triumphal arches. Like the scenes that


\textsuperscript{94} The paintings are attributed to Tobias Schmid. See Baur-Heinhold, \textit{Bemalte Fassaden}, 27.
adorn the *Haus zum weissen Adler*, the image embedded in Dietterlin’s Plate 104 façade describes a world *apart* from that of the structure it graces. It accomplishes this through the illusions of linear perspective.

Perspective, in early modern Europe, was a key nexus of painting and architecture. Painted architectural perspectives had been critical sites of period artists’ earliest experiments with linear perspective. After Jean Pélerin employed images of empty constructions in the first printed, illustrated guide to perspective that he released as the *De artificiali perspectiva* in 1505, art literature often schooled painters and architects in perspectival construction through images, particularly pictures of vacant buildings. Book II of Serlio’s *Regole generali* series, which addresses perspective, even contends that, “perspective would be nothing without architecture, and the architect nothing without perspective.” That is, while painters build their illusionistic worlds in part with the structures of architecture, architects employ the principles of painting to render their ideas in a pictorial scheme.

---


98 Caroline van Eck, “Verbal and visual abstraction: the role of pictorial techniques of representation in Renaissance architectural theory,” in *The Built Surface: Architecture and the
The treatment of scenographic representation in Vitruvius’s De architectura supplied Dietterlin and his colleagues with a theory of the links between perspective and architecture. The treatise identifies *scænographia* as “the shaded rendering of the front and reclining sides as the latter converge to a point”\(^{99}\)—a phenomenon similar to what we now call “perspective”—and designates it, along with *ichnographia* (plan) and *orthographia* (elevation), as one of the three modes of representing monuments. Vitruvius describes *ichnographia* and *orthographia* as the architect’s means for visualizing his building schemes.\(^{100}\) *De architectura* meanwhile portrays *scænographia* as a tool valuable for depicting built architecture, but impractical for planning such constructions.\(^{101}\) The distortions of perspectival construction eliminate the possibility of accurately measuring elements within a scenographic image, rendering it useless as a scheme for building. Vitruvius’s lost manuscript evidently illustrated illusionistic, theatrical scenography as a rare exception to this rule, inspiring Serlio to likewise depict architectural perspectives in his own trio of stage set designs in the second book of

---


\(^{100}\) “*ichnographia est circini regulaeque modice continens usus, e qua capiuntur formarum in solis arearum descriptiones. orthographia autem est erecta frontis imago modiceque picta rationibus operis futuri figura.*” Vitruvius, *De architectura*, I.2.2.

his *Regole generali* treatise series [Fig. 19]. Supplementary woodcuts reveal that the scenes deceive the eye by obscuring the steeply inclined angle of the stage floor. The capricious appearances of perspectival constructions like Serlio’s theatrical sets moved Renaissance architectural theorists to share the Vitruvian conviction that *scenographia* is most appropriate for imitating built forms. One will recall, for instance, Alberti’s familiar observation that perspective distorts the size of a building’s parts, and is therefore appropriate to the painters’ architectural images alone. Dietterlin spent the first decades of his career on the painter’s side of this equation, but in drafting the *Architectura* etchings, he also approached the matter of perspective from the architect’s point of view.

From the staggered assemblages of ornament contained in the *Erst Buch* to the spacious interiors and ranging landscapes visible beyond the portals of the *Annder Buch*, the successive releases of the *Architectura* depict increasingly complex architectural perspectives. Dietterlin’s experiments in this arena culminate in the façade designs of his 1598 *Architectura*. Its perspectival façade designs align painterly and architectural modes of composition. While the built framework of images like Plate 104 [Fig. 17] captures the inventive operations of the architect, the architectural spaces that Dietterlin inserts in this scaffolding witness the architect designing as a painter. Plate 147 of the 1598 treatise shows two perspectival scenes rendered on the wall between the four windows of its etched, Corinthian Order façade: David rending his garments in grief when he learns of the deaths of Saul and Jonathan, and the subsequent stabbing of the messenger who conveys the news and reveals that it was he

---

103 Ibid. 180.
104 See Chapter II.
who killed the mortally wounded Saul [Fig. 20]. This tearing and piercing aptly allegorizes the violence that the perspectival scenes incorporated into the façade designs of Dietterlin’s *Architectura* metaphorically visit on the etched buildings. The figures spill from an architectonic stage that seems to penetrate deep into the printed monument. Their fictive world resembles a yawning wound in the body of the façade.

According to sixteenth-century architectural theory, painting was not supposed to disrupt the façade in this way. Coecke van Aelst’s German translation of Serlio’s *Quarto libro* warns that

> If one wants to paint a façade, it is known that one is not to create an opening that appears transparent, or any landscape. Such things destroy the building and transform it from a proper, corporeal, and whole form into a transparency, rather than a stable and credible presence, like an imperfect or sundered construction...

The façade perspective subverts the apparent solidity of the building with the deceptive appearance of a precarious-looking construction. In jeopardizing the apparent structural integrity of their architectural frameworks, images like the atmospheric landscapes of the *Haus zum weissen Adler* and the framed cityscape of Dietterlin’s Plate 104 stage an antagonistic *paragone* between architecture and painting. Such works assert that while architects are bound to the laws of tectonics, painters can dissolve and corrupt architectonic forms at will. This clash between painting and architecture finds a harmonious counterpoint in Plate 147’s

---

105 The story is related in 2 Samuel 1.1-16.
106 “Deshalben so må ayndiche facciata mit dem bensel zieren will, so ist gewiss, das sich nit geburt ayndiche offenhayt, so ain durchsichtighayt scheyt, zû machê, oder auch kain landschaft, dañ solliche ding zerstôren das gebew, vnd transformieren von ayner rechten leyblichen vnd gantzen form, in ain durch scheynnende, sunder bestendigkayt, wie ain vnperfecten oder zerrbrochnen baw: es gezimbt sich auch kain bildnussen darein zû machen, noch gefarbte their, es were dañ das må ain fenster fingiert, darmh menschen weren, so sollen die doch so gemacht werden, in aynem ruehigen vnbeweglichen, weder in beweglichen bossen.” Serlio, *Gemaynen reglen*, fol. 67r. In the original Italian: “Et perciò havendosi ad ornare alcuna facciata di edificio col penello, certo è, che non seò le conviene apertura alcuna che finta aria, ò i paesi, le quai cose uengono à rompere l’edificio: & d’una forma corporea, & soda, la transformano, in una transparente, senza fermezza, come edificio imperfetto, ò ruinato…” Serlio, *Regole generali*, fol. XI’.
jumbled forms. Architecture overlaps with anatomy, and body engages building. The design’s perspectival scaffolding mingles with the superficial surfaces of the etched façade. A length of drapery tied to a Composite column recedes into the etched scene, its fluid transformation from the plastic to the pictorial embodying the quintessence of pure, undifferentiated matter. Plate 147’s intimate engagements of structure, figure, and illusionistic expanse appear to physically meld the forms of the etched building with its perspectival cavity, notionally merging the disparate realities of surface and space as well. With this conceit, the image pictures the complete synthesis of architecture, sculpture, and painting. By representing the total integration of architecture and the figural media, Plate 147 manifests the theoretical unity of the three sister arts in a concrete, visible form.

Through its media-melding illusions, Plate 147 also confronts the problem of the façade perspective. Serlio had objected to fictive openings in the building front because they corrupt the apparent wholeness of the edifice, as in the disjuncture between structure and framed scene in the façade design of Plate 104. Yet if the perspective in Plate 147 pierces the surrounding architecture, it is impossible to discern exactly where this caesura occurs. The coalescence of architecture, painting, and sculpture portrayed in Dietterlin’s design models an alternative mode of wholeness for the perspectival façade. His solution diffuses the antagonism between architecture and painted aperture, if only on the painter’s terms.

Painters who responded to Dietterlin’s *Architectura* grappled to define their commitment to the dictums of architectural decorum as well. Soon after the ten-year copyright on Dietterlin’s 1598 *Architectura* expired, Frankfurt painter Daniel II. Meyer released his 1609 *ARCHITECVRA, Oder Verzeichnuß allerband Eynfassungen an Thüren*,

---

107 Irving Lavin has interpreted the drapery in Bernini’s *Ecstasy of St. Theresa* in a similar fashion. See Irving Lavin, *Bernini and the Unity of the Visual Arts* (New York: Published for the Pierpont Morgan Library by Oxford University Press, 1980) 1:111.
Meyer’s book contains one hundred etched models for portals, windows, epitaphs, terms, and other ornaments distributed across fifty plates consisting of two half-elevations each. Most of the prints represent models for façade painting, and many emulate Dietterlin’s *Architectura*’s designs. One design for a painted doorway incorporates Dietterlin’s idiosyncratic, oblong scrolls, as well as a soldier reminiscent of the gunman depicted beneath the triumphal arch in Plate 21 of the *Annder Buch* [Fig. 21]. The title page of Meyer’s book indicates that the work is intended for painters, sculptors, stonemasons, and joiners. But unlike the preambles to Dietterlin’s publications, the tract never mentions architects. This was an *Architectura* geared to the needs of figural artists alone.

Publishers Johann Israel and Johann Theodor de Bry acknowledge the book’s reliance on Dietterlin. They characterize the Strasbourg painter’s *Architectura* as a “magnificent” (*herrlich*) production, but complain that “…Dietterlin’s work is not made to be useful to all, for its inventions are somewhat difficult…Not everyone can adopt [them], and not all of [the designs] can even be applied *ad usum*…Moreover, the book is large and expensive; thus, not everyone has the opportunity to keep it by his side.”

Cumbersome dimensions and a prohibitive cost render Dietterlin’s *Architectura* inaccessible to many readers. Its designs are not only too complex for craftsmen to reproduce, but their intricate

---

109 Daniel II. Meyer, *ARCHITECTVR/A, Oder Verzeichnüß allerhand Eynassungen an Thüren, Fenstern und Decken, n. sehr nützlich unnd dinlich allein Mahlern, Bildhauern, Steinmetzen, Schreinern, und andern Liebhabern dieser Kunst* [hereafter, “*Architectura*”] (Frankfurt am Main: Johann Theodor de Bry and Johann Israel de Bry, 1609), Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Res/2 A.civ. 120.
110 “Dieses ist aber darinnen zu betrachten, daß erstlich Wendel Dietterlins Werck nit also beschaffen, daß zu jedernenniglich dienlich seyn könte, die weil die Inuentiones etwas schwer, mühsam unnd voller Arbeit, welche nicht ein jeden annemlichen, auch nicht ein jeder solche ad usum transferieren oder gebrauchen kann. Zum andern, so ist das Werck an ihm sleber groß und hoch am Tax: derohalben nicht eines jeden gelegenheit, diß bey sich zuhaben” Johann Theodor and Johann Israel de Bry, “An den günstigen Leser,” in Meyer, *Architectura*, fol. 3'.
ornaments are often impossible to transpose beyond the printed page. Countless modern readers would eventually judge Dietterlin’s designs as un-buildable architectural fantasies. The introduction to Meyer’s tract suggests that the Strasbourg author’s earliest critics doubted the applicability of Dietterlin’s designs to the figural arts as well. The passage moreover indicates that although Dietterlin sought to assist figural artists with simple lessons in architectural composition, his architectural theory often confounded those readers.

Meyer’s work poses as a more useful and accessible guide to architectural ornament for figural artists. Far slimmer than Dietterlin’s 1598 tome, the 1609 Architectura was easy to keep on hand in the workshop and even traveled well to the project site. The two-for-one format of its half-elevation designs made it a bargain to boot. Other departures from the Strasbourg artist’s Architectura text betray how Meyer’s grasp of the expertise required to paint architectural ornament diverged from Dietterlin’s idea of architectural knowledge. The 1609 book brims with imagery derived from Dietterlin’s biblical, mythological, and grotesque architectural designs, but eliminates architectural theory wherever possible. It lacks any instructions for devising architecture according to the standards of decorum. None of the designs, as the publishers freely admit, display proportions proper to the Orders. The etchings serve figural artists who are interested in architectonic ornament, but uncommitted.

111 Forssman Säule und Ornament, 170.
112 The publishers advertise that “Es ist auch diese gelegenheit in acht zunemen, daß dieses Buch eines leidenlichen Jar, und derowegen umb ein gering Gelt zubekommen: dnn obwol demselbigen nicht mehr als 50. Figuren einverleibt seyn: so hat man doch mehr dann 100. sonderbahre Inventiones: sintemahl ein jedes Kupffer oder druck 2. underschiedliche Inventiones in sich hat, dieweil beyde seyten allezeit einander ungleich sindt.)” Johann and Theodor de Bry, “An den günstigen Leser,” in Meyer, Architectura, fol. 3r.
113 Irmscher, Kölnscher Architectur- und Säulenbücher, 65-66
114 “Der Auctor wil sich darin auch entschüldigt haben, daß sie die Figurn nicht allerdings auß dem Fundament, noch nach der Proporß der fünff Seulen gerichtet findet, als wie weylandt Herrn Wendels seine: sondern es hat der Author fürnemblichen uff die Inventiones gesehen.” Johann Theodor de Bry and Johann Israel de Bry, “An den günstigen Leser,” in Meyer, Architectura, fol. 3r.
to heeding the formal rules of architectural decorum. Meyer’s book frames the dictums of architecture as extraneous to the art of façade painting and other forms of architectural expression in the figural arts.

By excluding the Orders from his survey of architectural ornament, Meyer makes the subject of building a mere premise for decorative flights of fancy.\textsuperscript{115} The result is a formless, pliable architecture, characterized by fantastic conglomerations of plastic and pictorial form. Anthropomorphic figures sprout from rollwork stems in the arch of Plate 2 and weave in and out of each other’s bodies [Fig. 22]. The monument is mounted by an image of Perseus rescuing Andromeda, set within a rollwork frame with a festoon that appears to melt into the portal below. Derived from a tale in Ovid’s \textit{Metamorphoses}, the image allegorizes the material transformations embodied in the arch’s amalgamations of painting, sculpture, and architecture.\textsuperscript{116} Its visual rhetoric of liberation suits the etching’s portrayal of freely mingling media, but also reinforces the theoretical implications of the design. Disregard for architectural convention permits Meyer to fuse the arts with even greater abandon than Dietterlin had.\textsuperscript{117} While the Strasbourg artist had melded painting and architecture to lend his façade perspectives a less fractious, indecorous appearance, the Frankfurt painter employs the device to challenge architectural mores. The synthesis of the media did not always diffuse the antagonistic shades of the \textit{paragone} between the arts in plurimedial compositions.

Figural artists and their audiences evidently enjoyed these perversions of architectural order, for Meyer’s 1609 \textit{Architectura} exercised extensive influence on façade painting and

\textsuperscript{116} The story of Perseus and Andromeda is recounted in Ovid, \textit{Metamorphoses}, IV.668-764.
\textsuperscript{117} Forssman \textit{Säule und Ornament}, 170.
even the woodworker’s architecture books of the early seventeenth century. Yet Meyer’s engagement with the paragone between architecture and the figural arts did not end with this success. The painter produced another book, the *ARCHITECTVRA. von Außtheylung der Fünff Seülen*, in 1612. This was no second edition of his 1609 booklet, but an entirely distinct work comprised of eighty etched plates. Some represent Meyer’s original inventions, but most depict spliced or reversed and minimized copies of designs from Vredeman’s 1577 *Architectura* and Dietterlin’s *Architectura* [Fig. 23]. Meyer’s 1612 *Architectura* also paraphrases the theoretical text of Dietterlin’s treatise, briefly explaining the disposition of the five Orders and offering bare-bones instructions for correctly devising their ornaments. One plate incorporates an original elevation of a column marked with the proportions of the Doric Order, as well as Dietterlin’s illustrations of how to enlarge an entablature and his alternative methods for devising the Doric entablature. Given the 1609 *Architectura*’s disregard for the proportions of the Orders, Meyer’s turn to the subject is an unexpected development. The author explains in the introduction to his second book that “I…have always fostered a great affection for painted architecture and the art of building, which I have studied and practiced, and about which I have already released some tracts. Therefore I have published the present work about this new Manner, and not without great effort…”

---

120 These images were originally published in Plates 2, 5, and 7 of Dietterlin’s *Erst Buch*.
Architectural painting and devising built structures may well be distinct pursuits, but fashionable façade painting now requires knowledge of architectural theory and decorum.

As in the case of Daniel II. Meyer, Dietterlin’s equivocation between architecturally decorous and indecorous models of façade painting registers the period’s broader uncertainty about how architecture should incorporate other media. The Strasbourg artist’s impact on the debate about the role of architectural decorum in façade painting played out most visibly in period facades. One such work is façade and ceiling painter Paul Juvenal the Elder’s scheme for the front of the Meierisches Haus in Nuremberg, decorated around 1614. The lost painting is recorded in a drawing [Fig. 24]. Juvenal’s drafted façade shows two levels of well-proportioned columns, but its long row of portrait busts floats improbably atop a tumultuous battle scene. Juvenal evidently valued decorous architectural ornaments, but not the building’s apparent structural integrity. At the center of his façade’s leftmost bay stands the media-melding image of King David from Plate 147 of Dietterlin’s 1598 treatise, its rightmost column enlivened through the image of a long, slanting shadow. In the face of ambivalence about the relationships between architecture and the figural media, the synthesis of the three sister arts—or a painted image of that phenomenon—blurred the distinctions between the arts and thus nullified the issue.

form bracht, allen kunstliebenden nutz und dienlich. (Frankfurt am Main: Iohann Diedrich de Bry, 1612), Nuremberg, Germanisches Nationalmuseum, K484 f 4v, p. 2.

122 It also channels the age’s widespread ambivalence about the authority of architectural theory in the figural arts, a theme addressed in Chapter I.

123 Baur-Heinhold, Bemalte Fassaden, 35-36, and 46, no. 43.

The Perspective Pictorial Interior and the Synthesis of the Arts

While artists often fused the media to engage in *paragone* discourses, they also did so to explore themes exterior to art theory. Dietterlin found the concrete integration of disparate materials in plurimedial projects a ready instrument for figuring abstract meanings. Like the cornucopia in his *Nemesis* façade design [Fig. 2], the drawing’s couplings of painting and sculpture embody the procreative and productive themes appropriate to an allegory of fortune. Intersections of sculpture and architecture in the Dietterlin's monumental *Astwerk* altarpiece resonate with the marriage of earthly and divine in the coronation of the Virgin portrayed amidst its tangled brambles [Figs. 11a & b]. Among the printed models for plurimedial works produced by Dietterlin and his northern colleagues, the rhetorical potential of the intermingling of the arts is explored most thoroughly in models for interiors.

Dietterlin’s grasp of the broad horizons for compelling pictorial representation in such projects derived in part from his involvement in realizing one of the era’s most formally and symbolically ambitious spaces. In 1619, Friedrich Brentel produced a “True counterfeit image of the room in the princely pleasure palace of Württemberg in Stuttgart” [Fig. 25].125 The print represents the Great Hall of the now-vanished *Lusthaus* that Duke Ludwig of Württemberg commissioned architect Georg Beer to devise for the gardens north of his ducal residence in 1583.126 Its massive barrel vault, which seemed to float miraculously over the cavernous hall without the support of columns, inspired great acclaim in its day.127

---

126 The building was renovated several times between 1750 and 1845, and ultimately destroyed by fire in 1902. On the Neue *Lusthaus*, see Ulrike Weber-Karge, “…einem irdischen Paradeiß zu vergleichen…”. *Das Neue Lusthaus in Stuttgart. Untersuchungen zu einer Bauaufgabe der deutschen Renaissance* (Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 1989).
127 Württemberg court archivist and librarian Johann Jakob Gabelkover wrote that, “…this
Counseled by cartographer Georg Gadner and theologian Lucas Osiander, Ludwig had at first intended to order court painter Hans Steiner to decorate the Great Hall’s ceiling with landscapes and cartographic images.\textsuperscript{128}

Yet in a letter to the Duke from August 6, 1587, Gadner reports that, “It would be against the art of painting to execute landscapes from a particular perspective, that they must be seen from [from underneath]. Such a ceiling should include floating images, clouds, and that which flies, rendered in such a proportion that they appear to be of the same size when viewed from below.”\textsuperscript{129} Ludwig and his advisors subsequently recruited Dietterlin to devise a trio of such images for the Great Hall ceiling some time before June 1590.\textsuperscript{130} Dietterlin’s room, which is the true masterpiece [of the Lusthaus], stretches over the entirety of the building, and yet inside not a single column is to be seen, but rather the stage [interior] or vault is completely hung and decorated with paintings, as the day’s most famous painters in of all Germany, with great cost, difficulty, and labor finished it… / “…und wie dann auch dieser saal, das recht hauptwerk ist, dieses gantzen gebäudes und ungeachtet ermeldeten saal in die völlige länge und breite seines gebäudes sich erstreckt, ist doch darinnen einige säul nicht zu sehen, sondern die bihnen oder gewelb is taller gehengkt und mit gemehlden geziert, so die damals berümtesten maler gantzen Teutschlandes mit großen kosten müh und arbeit verfertigt haben.” Johann Jakob Gabelkover, \textit{Chronica der fürstlichen Württembergischen Hauptstatt Stüttgart}, 1621, Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek, Handschriften, F72 fol. 210\textsuperscript{v}. For period responses to the Great Hall, see Petcu, “A particularly artful artificio,” 56-73.


\textsuperscript{129} “...so were wider der maler Künst Landschaften sonderlich aus der perspecitif, in die hohe zu malen, das sie von under auf gesehen worden muessten. Sondern in ain solche Decke fuegten sich schwebende Bilder, Gewülcke und was fliegt, die khunten in ain solche proportion gestellt werden das sie von under auf in gleicher grosse zu seh.” Letter from Georg Gadner to Duke Ludwig, August 6, 1587, Stuttgart, Hauptsatsarchiv Stuttgart, Hofachsen A20 Bü37a, Acta und Hanndlungen des Maalwercks des newen Lussthaus Baws, 1587–1592, fol. 147e'.

presentation drawing for the Last Judgment [Fig. 26] and a contemporary drawing after his Apocalyptic Vision of the Twenty-four Elders at the Throne of God record two of the designs; the third apparently showed the Creation.\(^ {131} \) Both drawings depict celestial scenes populated with foreshortened figures, represented as if viewed from below.

Dietterlin was not content with this role in the project. By March of 1592, the artist complained to Gadner that it “…would be embarrassing [to him] to earn the same as others who are unequal in art and work…” and that he “…wanted nothing to do with the Court Painter [Steiner]”.\(^ {132} \) Dietterlin was ultimately ceded much responsibility for the further decoration of the interior, inventing and painting the architectural ornament depicted on the Great Hall’s lateral walls and devising the fictive entablature below the hunting scenes before completing his work on the space later in 1592.\(^ {133} \) Gadner records the Strasbourg artist boasting that his “…artful changes to the decoration of the entablature in various ways and forms” was superior to Steiner’s previous design.\(^ {134} \) Brentel’s print reports the results of

---


\(^ {133} \) On Dietterlin’s contributions to the design and execution of the paintings in the Great Hall, see Karl Ohnesorge, Wendel Dietterlin, 15-21, and Margot Pirr, Die Architecutra, 15-17.

\(^ {134} \) “…die Zieren des Gesims auf achterley weg und formen künstlich zuvor ändern…” Notice from Georg Gadner, March 22, 1592, Stuttgart, Hauptsatsarchiv Stuttgart, Hofsachen A20 Bü37a, Acta und Hanndlungen des Maalwercks des newen Lussthaus Baws,
Dietterlin’s coup. A fictive sky joins the painter’s vignettes with the landscapes below.

Painted figures in the hunting scenes mingle with half-modeled bodies, whose garments appear to emerge from the ceiling and drape over the entablature. These hybrid characters cavort with the portal’s sculpted figures, which in turn engage with the doors’ anthropomorphic architecture. By integrating the painting, sculpture, and architecture of the Great Hall, Dietterlin and his colleagues created the illusion of a seamless, self-contained world.

The conjunctions of the arts in Dietterlin’s interior also manifested unions of a more conceptual nature. The mingling of heavenly and earthly spheres in Dietterlin’s Great Hall ceiling described an encounter between Christ’s eternity and Herzog Ludwig’s present. The space’s exhaustive portrayal of Württemberg’s forests alongside the sacred realm of the Creation, Adoration, and Last Judgment additionally reconciled disparate naturalistic and symbolic modes of representation, forming a unified survey of various modes of existence.

Dietterlin’s work frames the fusion of the artistic media staged in the perspective pictorial interior as an ideal platform for embodying the very order of the universe.

Few spaces in late sixteenth-century northern Europe synthesized the three sister arts to such a profound extent, but a number did employ visual devices such as Dietterlin’s perspective pictorial ceiling compositions to create fictive, all-encompassing worlds like the one embodied by the Great Hall in Stuttgart. Perspective pictorial rooms are spaces with a

1587–1592, fol. 53. See also Fleischhauer, “Die Malereien in Stuttgarter Lusthaus,” 328.

135 Stuttgart sculptor Sem Schlör was paid for sculpted portals for the Lusthaus’s interior in 1583 and 1584. See Weber-Karge, “…einem irdischen Paradies zu vergleichen…”, 26 (note 1).


137 Ibid. 124.
ceiling painting that combines aerial and linear perspective in a horizontal perspectival scheme, which is often formally fused with illusionistic wall compositions.\textsuperscript{138} Writers termed this mode of painting \textit{sotto in su}, or what Gadner called, “from below to above” (\textit{von unden auf}). \textit{Sotto in su} designs, which first emerged in Italy in the 1470s, create the illusion of a three-dimensional space on the flat or curving surface of a ceiling, and typically depict an open sky, foreshortened architecture, or a combination of those subjects.\textsuperscript{139} Artists in northern Europe appropriated the device over the ensuing century.\textsuperscript{140} Georg Pencz’s \textit{Fall of Phaeton} ceiling in the so-called \textit{Hirsvogelsaal} in Nuremberg’s Tucher Castle, executed around 1534, counts among the region’s earliest instances of \textit{sotto in su} painting [Fig. 27].\textsuperscript{141}

The horizontal perspective employed in \textit{sotto in su} images is technically distinct from normative linear perspective only insofar as the position of the vanishing point above the


\textsuperscript{139} The earliest examples of this formula developed in the context of the Mantuan court of Ludovico Gonzaga. Andrea Mantegna’s 1465-1474 \textit{Camera degli Sposi} culminates in a fictive oculus, in which a company of foreshortened \textit{putti} assemble around a painted balustrade that marks the transition between apparently “solid” architecture and the “open” sky above. Mezzolo da Forlì’s frescoes in the Bessarione chapel of the Basilica dei Santi Apostoli in Rome, featuring the \textit{sotto in su Ascension of Christ}, were painted soon after Mantegna’s in 1480. Giulio Romano’s frescoes for the Palazzo del Te and Antonio da Correggio’s work in San Giovanni Evangelista and the Duomo in Parma continued this tradition. See Sjöström, \textit{Quadratura}, 26-36.


\textsuperscript{141} While the design of the ceiling can be attributed to Pencz, it is unclear if he executed it as well. On the question of the authorship of the \textit{Fall of Phaeton} and its place in Pencz’s oeuvre, see Johannes Hallinger, “Georg Pencz und der Hirsvogelsaal zu Nürnberg,” in \textit{Der Hirsvogelsaal in Nürnberg. Geschichte und Wiederherstellung}, ed. Susanne Böning-Weis, Nadja Bennewitz, et al. Arbeitshefte des bayerischen Landesamtes für Denkmalpflege 113 (Munich: Karl M. Lipp Verlag, 2004), 91-103.
viewer requires dramatic foreshortening, and that this occurs primarily along the vertical lines of the design.\textsuperscript{142} Still, early modern artists treated \textit{sotto in su} composition as a special case of perspectival construction.\textsuperscript{143} In a context in which artful demonstrations of perspective were hailed as hallmarks of artistic talent, the extreme forms of foreshortening involved in \textit{sotto in su} composition signaled a extraordinary technical mastery.\textsuperscript{144} Serlio’s \textit{Quarto libro}, relayed to northern audiences via the translations of Coecke van Aelst, contends that the artist should strive after the utmost illusionism in his choice of color, subject, and execution of foreshortened perspective, but offers scant practical instruction in realizing \textit{sotto in su} paintings.\textsuperscript{145} Writings on perspective published by Dürer and followers such as Hieronymus Rodler offered northern artists limited guidelines for formulating illusionistic ceiling paintings.\textsuperscript{146} Dürer’s treatise on measurement, the \textit{Underweysung der messung}, culminates in an account of the perspectival techniques whereby the artist might foreshorten irregular bodies such as the female nude portrayed in the final image of the text’s posthumous, 1538 edition.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{142} See Sjöström, \textit{Quadratura}, 28.
\item \textsuperscript{143} This is the case in Serlio’s \textit{Secondo libro}; Giovanni Paolo Lomazzo, \textit{Trattato dell’arte della pittura, scultura et architettura} (Milan: 1584-1585; 1590); and Hans Vredeman de Vries, \textit{Perspective, id est celeberrima ars…} (The Hague: 1604). On the treatment of \textit{sotto in su} composition in period treatises, see Sjöström, \textit{Quadratura}, 36-47.
\item \textsuperscript{144} On regard for foreshortening and \textit{sotto in su} composition as a performance of artistic ingegnum, see Nicola Suthor, \textit{Braurua. Virtuosität und Mutwilligkeit in der Malerei der frühen Neuzeit} (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 2010), 46-59.
\item \textsuperscript{145} Sebastiano Serlio, \textit{Gemaynen reglen}, fols. 67-68.
\end{itemize}
Nevertheless, his lessons failed to explain other key principles of *sotto in su* composition, such as how to represent foreshortened architecture and open sky.\(^{147}\)

Dürer’s guide to perspective demonstrates his expertise in reporting the world’s appearances, and his masterful translation of theory to artistic practice. By re-enacting Dürer’s triumph over the vagaries of perspective and the irregularities of the human form, the foreshortened bodies in Pencz’s *Fall of Phaeton* ceiling express the artistic ideals of the Nuremberg master’s paradigmatic text. Dietterlin treated the illusions of the perspective pictorial interior with greater ambivalence. His lost *Truth Triumphant* ceiling design, known from an etching by his grandson Bartholomäus, allegorizes the veracity of Reformation doctrine [Fig. 29].\(^{148}\) Truth casts personifications of Islam, Judaism, and Catholicism earthward with her foreshortened foot, aligning Dietterlin’s perspectival mastery with the defeat of false religions. Yet optical illusion assumes a more pernicious form in the face of votive-bearing Catholicism, which is grotesquely magnified behind a glass *globus cruciger*. The object simultaneously represents earthly rulers’ false claims to divine authority and the artistic hubris of treacherous images. Within Dietterlin’s allegory of the victory of the Evangelical gospel lurks anxiety about the power of the perspective pictorial interior’s visual deceptions.\(^{149}\)


\(^{149}\) On early modern attitudes toward the paradoxical use of perspective’s optical illusions to compose a seemingly truthful visual report, see Ernest B. Gilman, *The Curious Perspective: Literary and Pictorial Wit in the Seventeenth Century* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1978), 31-33; and Stuart Clark, *Vanities of the Eye: Vision in Early Modern European*
As Georg Pencz’s ceiling design demonstrates, painted architecture was among the most potent agents of the perspective pictorial interior’s impressive illusions. Two of its figures occupy a temple built from a stepped platform and two Corinthian columns. The posts share Apollo’s tilted orientation, tapering as they lean toward the vanishing point at the center of the composition. The construction is an early northern example of ceiling quadratura, or a perspectival image that describes fictive architecture.\textsuperscript{150} Like other types of architectural perspective, quadratura ceiling compositions represent a point of intersection between architectural and painterly knowledge. As illusionistic constructions embedded in actual buildings, they also embody the visual and material conjunction of painting and architecture.\textsuperscript{151} Quadratura in ceiling paintings typically extends from the margins of the composition, rooted in the built walls surrounding the picture plane. It thus functions as a framing device, a borderland between the immaterial world of painting and the concrete reality of brick-and-mortar architecture.\textsuperscript{152} Although it was technically possible to use


\textsuperscript{150} Nina C. Wiesner, \textit{Das Deckengemälde von Georg Pencz im Hischvogelsaal zu Nürnberg. Studien zur Kunstgeschichte 154} (Hildesheim, Zurich, and New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 2004), 81. The rise of illusionistic ceiling painting and quadratura in northern and Central Europe during the sixteenth century accompanied the reception of Italian Renaissance architectural forms in that region. The right angles of the post-and-lintel construction in Pencz’s classical temple were far easier to represent in horizontal perspective than the pointed arches and irregular forms of the region’s Gothic manner. On this phenomenon, see Martin Mádl, Michaela Šeferisová Loudová, and Zora Wörgötter, eds., \textit{Baroque Ceiling Painting in Central Europe / Barocke Deckenmalerei in Mitteleuropa. Proceedings of the International Conference, Brno, Prague, 27th of September-1st of October, 2005} (Prague: Artefactum, 2007), 8.


*quadratura* to create the illusion of a seamless transition between architecture and painting, artists in sixteenth-century northern Europe did not at first employ the technique in that way. The base of Pencz’s temple, for instance, extends from the scalloped molding between the Hirs vogelsaal’s lateral walls to the ceiling, but since the molding severs the temple columns, the painted construction appears misaligned with the structure of the room.

Northern authors regarded *quadratura* as contiguous with other types of architectural perspective. *Eyn schön nützlich Büchlin*, published by Hieronymus Rodler in 1531, contends that “*Quadratur* is that which divides itself into four corners in the manner of a house, a pavement, or a stage, with two side walls, and a facing or observed wall.”153 Yet neither he nor any other writer of the earlier sixteenth century offered extensive advice for creating *quadratura* in horizontal perspective, nor illustrated how to use the device to meld painting with architecture. Vasari had in fact treated the entire genre of illusionistic ceiling painting as a subject beyond explanation, contending that “the artist’s judgment, not the rules, should provide the yardstick” in such projects. Attempting to describe “a manner for painting ceiling vaults in perspective” in his 1583, posthumous edition of Giacomo Barozzi da Vignola’s *Le due regole della prospettiva practica*, editor Egnazio Danti complained that

This is absolutely the most difficult of operations that Perspective can present, partially because there is no single rule to address the variety and irregularity of vaults, and also because no one, as far as I know, has heretofore written anything about it154

---


154 “Questa è assolutamente la piu difficile operazione, che possa fare il Prospettuo, non la potendo conseguire interamenta con la regola, per la varietà & irregolarità delle volte, né fin qui da nessuno (che io sappia) n’è stato scritto poco nè assai” Giacomo Barozzi da Vignola and Egnazio Danti, *LE DVE REGOLE DELLA PROSPETTIVA PRATICA DI M. IACOMO BAROZZI DA VIGNOLA, con i commentari del R.P. M. Egnazio Danti dell’ordine de Predicatori Matematico dello Studio di Bologna.* [hereafter, “Le due regole”] (Rome: Francesco
Danti resolved to clarify quadratura’s more ineffable principles with illustrations, promising that, “where words have been inadequate, Vignola’s work supplements with figures, so that these most lovely rules are easy to comprehend.” The treatise contained an unprecedented variety of copperplate engravings useful for sotto in su composition. It also inspired a long tradition of publications that address quadratura by adopting Le due regole’s visual orientation.

Authors north of the Alps already favored images for addressing the art of quadratura. Some months before Vignola’s influential text appeared, Georg Hass released his Künstlicher, und Zierlicher Neuer vor nie gesehener, Funffzig Perspectifischer, stuck..., or, Fifty new, never before seen, artful and decorative perspective pieces…. Intarsia furnishings created by woodworkers like Hass were ubiquitous vehicles for perspectival imagery during the sixteenth century. In fact, the previous decades had yielded a spate of model books and print series authored by and for makers of perspectival marquetry. Hass’s Funffzig Perspectifischer, Zanetti, 1583), Princeton, NJ, Marquand Library of Art and Archaeology, Princeton University, NA2710.V69q, 89.

155 “Dove ha mancato con le parole, ha talmente supplito con le figure, che assai bene fa intendere queste sue belissime regole…” Danti, Le due regole, 66.


157 These include Giovanni Paolo Lomazzo’s 1584 Trattato dell’arte della pittura, scoltura, et Archittetura…, Hans Vredeman de Vries’s 1604-1605 Perspective, id est celeberrima ars…, and Pietro Accolti’s 1625 Lo inganno de gl’occhi…


159 These include Lorenz Stör’s Geometria et Perspectiva of 1567, Hans Lengker’s 1571 Perspectiva…, and Wenzel Jamnitzer’s 1568 Perspectiva. Corporum regularium. On the tradition of
stuck… contains fifty etchings featuring the type of configuration that Rodler called “Quadratur” [Fig. 30]. Ideal for amusing the print collector with their optical tricks, the images also functioned as patterns “for inlay or painting on ceilings, in the interiors of all manner of pleasure palaces, chambers, and many other places.” Plate V shows a ceiling panel with a sotto in su image of the ascent of Elijah, surrounded by geometric openwork that partially obscures a fictive, clouded sky. Like many images in Hass’s book, the print could represent a perspective pictorial interior with four walls and a ceiling, or a ceiling that itself seems to portray such a space. And as in the era’s other model books for multi-media ornament, artists could realize these capricious structures in paint, inlay, or a combination of those media. The formal conceits of Plate V relate in compelling ways to the themes of its Ascent of Elijah narrative. The work’s optical and material ambiguities resonate with the mystery of Elijah’s deathless apotheosis. As a technique supposedly beyond verbal exegesis, quadratura furnishes a suitable frame for the prophet’s similarly inexplicable flight to the hereafter. Through the apparent convergence of painting and architecture, Hass enlivens Elijah’s union with God.

Dietterlin probably had at least Vignola’s text on hand while working on the Great Hall, but the Architectura etchings suggest that the painter likewise knew of Hass’s prints.
Plate 14 of Dietterlin’s Annder Buch depicts a Doric portal leading to a shack with a carpenter resting atop his axes and a plank [Fig. 31].\textsuperscript{163} While not projected in horizontal perspective, the construction nevertheless employs the visual idioms of Hass’s \textit{sotto in su} designs. Its receding wood architecture refers not only to the commonplace that the ornaments of the Doric Order originated in timber construction, but also gives a nod to the materials and subjects of the sixteenth-century intarsia artist.\textsuperscript{164} The foreshortened body of the carpenter—perhaps a reference to Hass—reads as a form viewed \textit{sotto in su}. The hut’s ceiling beams plunge from the doorway to its central post to fuse threshold and interior, an engagement of frame and space that suggests the disparate levels of built and painted reality articulated in the \textit{quadratura} adornments of the perspective pictorial interior.\textsuperscript{165}

Some sixty years earlier, Strasbourg artist Hans Baldung had also devised a printed image of a foreshortened man lying in a wood shack [Fig. 32]. Facing a horse’s exposed rear end and enchanted by a cackling witch, the protagonist of Baldung’s \textit{Bewitched Groom} inhabits a dystopia in which the artistic ideals of Dürer’s perspective lessons are mocked as mere superstitions, and the principles of perspective spurned as calculations that are, at best,
The orthogonal lines of the stable’s roof beams conflict with the perspectival scheme established by the diminishing body of its inhabitant. Read as the vision of the enchanted groom, the interior’s odd spatiality becomes an artfully constructed apparition. Dietterlin’s image adapts the structural ambiguities and hallucinatory tone of the *Bewitched Groom*. Plate 14’s oddly tapering ladder and misaligned walls reprise Baldung’s skeptical take on the objectivity of normative perspective. But the contradictory angles of its stacked roof planks, which appear projected in horizontal perspective and seem to combine the work’s architectonic frame with its illusionistic space, also convey the peculiarities of *sotto in su* construction and the melding of painting and architecture. Regarded as the dream of its supine carpenter, the scheme in Plate 14 refers to the deceptive nature of perspective as well as the fantastic character of designs that meld the artistic media. By infusing a normative perspective with the forms of a *sotto in su* design, Dietterlin reimagines Baldung’s meditation on the vagaries of perspective as a study on the complexities of the perspective pictorial interior. Plate 14 argues that just as normative perspective defies definition by hard-and-fast rules, syntheses of the arts staged in the perspective pictorial interior transcend the conventional logic of pictorial representation.

Draped in a loincloth and grasping tools arranged in the form of a cross, Plate 14’s protagonist assumes the guise of a less mundane carpenter—Christ. Dietterlin often

---


167 On the status of dreams as treacherous visions in the early modern period, see Stuart Clark, *Vanities of the Eye*, 300-328.

168 Since the figure of the ascended Christ was a common fixture of *sotto in su* painting, this imagery strengthens the design’s associations with that form.
aligned imagery related to the body of Christ with the structures of the perspective pictorial interior. A design for a wall painting exemplifies this phenomenon. The drawing portrays the Last Supper in a perspective pictorial interior, itself rendered in linear perspective as long, diminishing hall [Fig. 33]. The structure’s walls meld with a ceiling showing the Mystic Lamb, whose sacrificial blood spills into an earthly fountain beyond its cusped partitions. The image’s confluences of architecture, painting, and sculpture bind the various celestial and terrestrial manifestations of Christ’s body and the institution of Communion, structuring the allegory and enhancing its conceptual unity. While this amalgamation of the arts advances the drawing’s formal and rhetorical mechanisms, it also features as a prime subject of the work. For Dietterlin, convergences of the media—the co-incidence of supposedly disparate materials and techniques—embody a strange and baffling materiality, one that parallels the paradoxical corporeality of the human Son of God.

The Architectura develops the idea that the merging of media might aptly figure more mysterious physical states. Plate 146 of the 1598 installment of the treatise shows a facade with the Ascension in a cruciform cartouche [Fig. 34]. Spectators in the painting’s foreground occupy a space composed in normative perspective, but figures perched atop the scene’s cloud-enveloped cliffs seem to loom above the line of sight. They gesture toward the ascending Christ’s foreshortened figure, which appears as if viewed from below. The scene resembles a sotto in su image on a curving plane, a pictorial formula similar to the one that

---

169 Pfeiffer identifies the drawing as a design for a wall painting in a space with Gothic architecture. See Pfeiffer, “Zu einer Deckenvisierung des Wendel Dietterlin,” 63.


171 On the long history of this paradoxical form of materiality in the religious culture of Western Europe, see Caroline Walker Bynum, Christian Materiality: An Essay on Religion in Late Medieval Europe (New York: Zone Books, 2011).
Dietterlin used to unite the holy histories on the apex of the Great Hall’s vaulted ceiling with the hunting scenes below. In Plate 146, the device amplifies Christ’s otherworldly appearance and distinguishes the divine realm of the Ascension from the mundane realities of its observers and the façade. Like The Ascent of Elijah and Dietterlin’s designs for the Great Hall, the image allegorizes transcendence over the material world. The recurring presence of this theme in the artist’s representations of works that fuse the arts was no coincidence. In integrating the media, artists overcame the physical constraints of their working materials and surpassed the technical limits of their crafts. Syntheses of the arts and images of transcendence thus forged a symbiotic relationship, wherein forms that eclipse material norms augmented the rhetorical thrust of supernormal imagery, and the imagery of apotheosis dramatized the boundary-breaking operations of plurimedial forms.

Because works that meld the arts evinced an almost supernatural aura, it comes as no surprise that artists employed such compositions to demonstrate surpassing artistic genius. The inscription “OPIFEX INGENIOSVS,” or, “Ingenious craftsman” adorns the self-portrait that prefaces Hass’s Funfftzig Perspectifischer, stuck. Dietterlin imbued his media-merging works with similar rhetoric. Sporting modern dress and clutching a heavy tome, one bystander in his Ascension façade evidently represents a self-portrait of the artist with his Architectura. As in the Raising of Lazarus, Dietterlin’s likeness witnesses a miraculous transformation, expressed in part through the image of metamorphosing media. But whereas the Lazarus panel asserts the supremacy of painting over sculpture, the etching celebrates the artist’s aptitude for intermingling the arts in the curvilinear vault of the Great Hall and the Architectura designs, and even implies a link between those projects. The imagery of the Ascension façade suggests that Dietterlin’s Architectura was partly inspired by his triumph in

172 Hass, Funfftzig Perspectifischer, stuck, frontispiece.
synthesizing architecture, sculpture, and painting in an all-encompassing, perspective pictorial space.

While often regarded as antagonistic exchanges, the *paragone* also sparked collaborations and intersections of the artistic media, producing works that ingeniously probe the mechanisms of their own making and materials.\(^{173}\) The printed illustrations of Dietterlin’s *Architectura* and peer texts attest that the *paragone* theme, especially the notion of the rapport between the arts, suffused northern art literature in the decades around 1600. Dietterlin compared the visual media by illustrating projects that integrate the visual arts to a degree rarely before witnessed in such publications. The Strasbourg artist’s *Erst Buch* depicts objects that lack a specific medium, the *Annder Buch* portrays plurimedial works, and the final *Architectura* shows a crescendo of altarpieces, facades, and the ingredients for interiors that synthesize the arts. By showing how decorative motifs can merge materials in manifold ways, his designs for epitaphs, altarpieces, facades, and other plurimedial works advance a compelling visual argument for the *Architectura*’s theory of the architectural Orders as manners of ornament that can transcend formal distinctions between the arts. Authors who responded to Dietterlin’s *Architectura*—especially woodworkers and painters—competed to realize printed models for brilliant syntheses of the visual media, bringing the *paragone* discourse to the realm of printed, illustrated literature and leading it in a new direction. Dietterlin’s media-merging works turned the *paragone* into a pretense for dissolving boundaries between the visual arts.

The syntheses of painting, sculpture, and architecture figured in Dietterlin’s oeuvre did not receive a name during the artist’s lifetime. Praising the art of Gian Lorenzo Bernini in his 1682 biography of the multitalented artist, Filippo Baldinucci later contended that,

\(^{173}\) See van Gastel, Hadjinicolaou, and Rath, “*Paragone as Comradeship,*” 32-47.
…Bernini was the first to attempt to unite architecture with sculpture and painting in such a way as to make of them all a beautiful whole [un bel composto] and that he achieved this by occasionally departing from the rules, without actually violating them.\(^{174}\)

Here Bernini’s biographer theorizes a pursuit perfected by the creator of the Cornaro Chapel, but in fact—as the work of Dietterlin and his northern colleagues suggest—practiced by many before him.\(^ {175}\) Dietterlin and Bernini tackled a number of similar projects. Besides their mutual pursuit of what Irving Lavin called the “Unity of the Visual Arts”, both artists reimagined the elephant obelisk of the _Hypnerotomachia Poliphili_ (1499) in their own monuments, and explored the theatrical dimensions of art in designs for “Four Rivers” fountains.\(^ {176}\) With the synthetic microcosm of the Great Hall of the New Lusthaus in Stuttgart, Dietterlin completed what is now called a _Gesamtkunstwerk_, “total work of art,” and with the _Architectura_, he gave artists a blueprint for realizing such projects. Bernini may well have known Dietterlin’s text, and applied its ideas to his own _Gesamtkunstwerke_.\(^ {177}\) Both artists moreover shared a penchant for the kind of artistic impropriety, or “licentiousness”, that Baldinucci describes as Bernini’s prime instrument for enmeshing the arts. Dietterlin’s experiments with merging the media bent the rules of his era’s professional institutions and


\(^{175}\) Lavin, _Bernini and the Unity of the Visual Arts_, 1:6-7.

\(^{176}\) An obelisk-bearing elephant similar to Bernin’s _Obelisco de Minerva_ is pictured in Plate 18 of Dietterlin’s 1598 _Architectura_. A “Four Rivers” fountain is shown in Plate 123 of the editions from that year.

\(^{177}\) On the _Gesamtkunstwerk_ in the early modern period and a starting-point for the broad-ranging bibliography on this topic, see the essays in Luís de Moura Sobral and David W. Booth, eds., _Struggle for Synthesis: A Obra de Arte Total nos séculos XVII e XVIII_, acts of the international symposium, Museu Nogueira da Silva e Mosteiro de Sao Martinho de Tibaes, Braga, June 11-14, 1996 (Lisbon: Instituto Português do Património Arquitectónico e Arqueológico, 1999).
subtly challenged the protocols of architectural decorum. Well before the notion of the bel composto gained a foothold in European art through work of Bernini and became an expression of art theoretical writing, numerous publications from northern Europe had already imagined the device, in one way or another, as an art of restrained transgression.

Restraint and transgression, balance and dynamism—such binaries could well belong to the list of dichotomies whereby Heinrich Wölfflin forged a paragone between the art of the sixteenth and that of the seventeenth centuries exactly one hundred years ago. Diagnosing the essential distinction between Renaissance and Baroque style, Wölfflin wrote that, for sixteenth-century art, “…unity is realized by a harmony of free parts, and [for seventeenth-century art], by a pulling together of those parts into one theme, or by the subordination of all other elements to one unconditioned, leading part.178 Those similarly committed to the idea of distinct periods for art have described Dietterlin as a Renaissance figure who anticipates the Baroque, both for the nature of his compelling ornamental style and his innovative experiments with fusing the artistic media.179

Caught between these two models of synthesis, Dietterlin’s work occupies itself with precisely the conflict Wölfflin describes. On the one hand, the painter’s experiments with merging the media arise from a conservative interest in joining Vasari’s three sister arts. On

---


the other, the *Architectura*’s universal theory of architectural ornament pursues the radical agenda of ordering all decorative form under the banner of a single medium. The artist’s obsession with quoting and reworking the art of a waning sixteenth century in the *Architectura* etchings qualifies his *magnum opus* as a retrospective treatise, yet his interest in subordinating the various figural media to a unified rubric of architectural ornament sets the work’s theoretical rhetoric in the future tense. Ultimately, the *paragone* developed in Dietterlin’s *Architectura* resurrects and renovates a far more timeless theory—the Vitruvian image of architecture as the art that encompasses all other fields of human knowledge.
Conclusion

The preamble to the Erst Buch concludes with a provocative prognostication. In a jumble of Latin and German, Dietterlin asserts that, “…the new proceeds always out of the old. And from the new, the antiquated becomes worthless… and so what has become old and indeed base, shall no more be held as high as what is new, and strange, and unique…”¹

The pursuit of newness for its own sake had, by the closing years of the sixteenth century, gained widespread purchase in European artistic discourse.² Shades of this idea had emerged in Albrecht Dürer’s Underweysung, where the author justifies innovations in architectural ornament with the observation that “…all those who build wish to have a new fashion.”³

Sebastiano Serlio, too, had explained that he devised the architecturally licentious designs of his Extraordinario libro because, “…most men crave, every once in a while, something new.”⁴ Yet in contending that novel forms of art are inherently superior to those that came before them, Dietterlin assumes a more radical position. It is this philosophy that condones his Architecurā’s wild departures from the conventions of classical ornament, as well as the

¹ “…Semper enim ex antiquis nova prodeunt. Et ex novis antiqua vilescunt… Und also was Alt und gar gemein worden, nie mehr so hoch, als das jenig so new und frembt, und selbsam ist, gehlten wirt.” Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, ARCHITECTVRA und Aüsstheilung der V. Seüln. Das Erst Buch (Stuttgart: s.n., 1593), Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Res/2 A.civ. 58-1/2, under, “Ein kurtzer bericht, an den Leser”.
⁴ “…che la maggior pate degli huomini appetiscono il piu delle volte cose nuove…” Sebastiano Serlio, Extraordinario libro di architettura di sebastiano serlio, architetto del re christianissimo, nel quale si dimostrano trenta porte di opera rustica mista con diversi ordini: Et venti di opera dilicata di diverse specie con la scrittura davantu, che narra il tutto. (Lyon: Giovan di Tournes, 1551), Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Res/2 Arch. 134 i, under, “A GLI LETTORI”.
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book’s radical rethinking of the canonical architectural Orders and of architectural expertise. The principle of reinvention promoted in the Architectura’s sparse text and abundance of fantastic etchings would define the treatise’s fluctuating fortunes for centuries to come.

Dietterlin died in 1599. The artist’s personal emblem, which anchors the title page of each installment of the Architectura series, long foreshadowed this event [Fig. 1]. His insignia shows a bloom sprouting from an hourglass, both symbols that sixteenth-century viewers associated with the maxim “memento mori”—“remember death”. These objects are interwoven with a snake encircling the artist’s WD monogram. The wending snake, known in German as a “windende Schlange”, puns Wendel’s chosen name and its associations with the winding line. The endlessly repeating, reptilian form of this uroboros also symbolizes the cyclical nature of time. Its form brings to mind the modes of invention and reinvention explored in Dietterlin’s text, and raises the possibility of the artist’s triumph over death. The motto in the cartouche that accompanies Dietterlin’s emblem, “Profert, commutat, concludit, et omnia tempus”—“Discover, transform, and compose for the times in all regards”—meanwhile promotes the pursuit of novelty and the fantastic mode of invention, reinforcing the uroboros’s associations with unceasing renewal and immortality.

Dietterlin’s device additionally advances a philosophy of artistic expertise. The influential compendium of emblems that Andrea Alciato first released in 1534 under the title Emblematum Libellus had combined the image of the uroboros with the motto “Ex literarum

---


studii immortalitatem acquiri’: “Out of the study of literature, one acquires immortality.”

Regarded in light of Alciato’s emblem, Dietterlin’s own uroborus design suggests that the profound knowledge of art and architectural literature evidenced in the Architectura will preserve its author’s fame for all time, and that the knowledge that artist readers might derive from studying Dietterlin’s treatise will bring them immortality as well. The emblem promises that the forms of architectural and artistic expertise explored in the Architectura will long outlive the mortal bodies of author and readers alike.

Geographies of Ornament: The Architectura in the World

And in fact, demand for Dietterlin’s Architectura endured well into the next centuries.

The work’s afterlife in the European book market shows that Dietterlin’s engaging illustrations quickly became emblematic of the German tradition of architectural theory.

Antwerp publisher Peeter Verbiest incorporated designs from Dietterlin’s Architectura in a bilingual, French and Dutch translation of Hans Blum’s influential Von den fünff Sülhen in 1619. Amsterdam publisher Claes Jansz. Visscher produced a competing version of the tract

---


in 1623 [Fig. 2]. The books’ extended titles each boast that their pages contain designs by the “renowned Wendel Dietterling,” a hook that still remained a key selling point for the engraved edition of the work that Verbiest released in 1640. The Architectura itself inspired unflagging interest as well. Nuremberg publisher Paulus Fürst, heir to the 1598 Architectura


publisher Balthasar Caymox, printed a second German edition of the *Architectura* in 1655.\(^\text{11}\) Johann Christoph Weigel (1661-1726) later published a third edition of the treatise.\(^\text{12}\)

Dietterlin’s efforts to court a broad spectrum of learned architecture enthusiasts, collectors of architecture prints, patrons, architects, and figural artists fostered the project’s broad success. All manner of readers found uses for the book. Inscriptions in one copy of the 1598 *Architectura* indicate that the work passed from a sculptor to a woodworker to a wall painter in the period between 1611 and 1622 alone.\(^\text{13}\) Countless readers filled copies of the book with marginalia and sketches. Some even physically transformed copies of the work,

---


reordering the prints and thereby casting the treatise’s ideas in a new light. An iteration of
the 1598 *Architectura* in the former library of avid architectural patron Duke Heinrich Julius
of Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel (1564-1613) has been reassembled into six separate “books”
of basic architectural ornaments, doors and heraldic designs, windows, fireplaces, fountains
and grottoes, and tombs and epitaphs.\(^\text{14}\) A copy of the 1598 *Architectura* in the Avery Library
has also been reorganized to include “books” of epitaphs and fountains. Each of these
“books” are introduced with one of the Order-themed title pages from the original text,
relabeled in a seventeenth-century hand to indicate the new subject of those sections.\(^\text{15}\) By
organizing the images of the *Architectura* such that the books showed the same type of
subject in five different Orders, readers made Dietterlin’s picture of the stylistic differences
between each decorative mode more tangible.

The ubiquity of Dietterlin’s text in early modern workshops and libraries was
matched only by its designs’ enduring presence in the art of the seventeenth and eighteenth
centuries. As the excursus of this dissertation demonstrates, the artists of the Baroque period
took up Dietterlin’s models for auricular ornament in all manner of media, from print to

---

\(^\text{14}\) Dietterlin, *ARCHITECTVRA von Auðtheilung, Symm=etria und Proportion der Fünff Seulen und
daller daraus volgender Kunst Arbeit, von Fenstern, Caminen, Thürgerichten, Portalen, Bronnen und
Epita=phien. Wie dieselbige aüß jedweder Art der Fünff Seulen, grundt auffzureissen, zuzurichten, und ins
Werck zu zubringen seyen; Al=ten solcher Kunst Liebhabenden, zu einem bestendigen und ring ergreifenden
derricht erfunden, in zweyhundert Stück gebracht, Geetz, und an tag gegeben Durch Wendel Dietterlin
Maler zu Straßburg. Cum gratia & Privilegio Cas. Maiest. ad Decenium Getruckt zu Nürnberg, in
verlegung Hubrecht und Balthasar Caymox 1598 Profert, commutat, conclubit et omnia tempus
(Nuremberg: Hubrecht and Balthasar Caymox, 1598), Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, A: 10.4.1 Geom. 2”.

\(^\text{15}\) Wendel Dietterlin, *ARCHITECTVRA von Außtheilung, Symm=etria und Proportion der Fünff
Seulen, und aller daraus volgender Kunst Arbeit, von Fenstern, Caminen, Thürgerichten, Portalen, Bronnen und
Epita=phien. Wie dieselbige aüß jedweder Art der Fünff Seulen, grundt auffzureissen, zuzurichten, und ins
Werck zu zubringen seyen Al=ten solcher Kunst Liebhabenden, zu einem bestendigen und ring
ergreifenden undricht erfunden, in zweyhundert Stück gebracht, Geetz, und an tag gegeben Durch Wendel
Dietterlin, Maler zu Straßburg. Cum Gratia & Privilegio Cas. Maiest. Getruckt zu Nürnberg, in
verlegung Balthasar Caymox 1598, WD Profert, commutat, conclubit et omnia tempus. (Nuremberg:
Balthasar Caymox, 1598), New York, Avery Fine Arts and Architectural Library, Columbia
University, AA 557 D56.
metalwork to stucco. The cases discussed in Chapter V meanwhile attest to the *Architectura*’s broad impact on the *Kleinarchitektur* of the period—from woodwork altarpieces to stonework epitaphs—as well as its effects on seventeenth-century façade painting.

Dietterlin’s *Architectura* additionally made waves in period architecture. The book enjoyed an immediate and enthusiastic reception the building culture of the German-speaking lands, from Paul Francke’s Marienkirche in Wolfenbüttel (1608) to the early seventeenth-century “God’s Gate” of Bückeburg Castle. Soon the *Architectura*’s effects could also be observed across Europe. Dietterlin’s treatise played a formative role, for instance, in the architectural culture of early seventeenth-century England. Decorative schemes from the *Architectura* are discernable in works such as Charlton House (1607-12) and Northumberland House (1608). Experts in England indeed regarded the *Architectura* as a canonical work of modern architectural literature. For example, Henry Percy, Earl of Northumberland, lent Sir John Holles books by “Vitruvius…Vignola, Jacques Androuet, Lorenzo Sirigatt, Jacques Perret, [and] Philibert de L’Orme…” in order to supplement his friend’s more basic collection of treatises by Serlio, Alberti, Palladio, and “Wendelino Dietterlin.”

Dietterlin’s bizarre retooling of classical architecture even shaped England’s emerging tradition of art literature. Describing ways to devise “idle toyes” and “fantastical”

---


compositions in the antique mode, Henry Peacham’s *The Art of Drawing* (1606) recommends that artists employ tritons, dolphins, eagles, apes, and even the idiosyncratic device of “dogs yoacket [yolked],” a constellation of motifs evidently drawn from Dietterlin’s *Architectura*.

The architecture of the Spanish baroque offered fertile ground for the decorative idiom described in the *Architectura* as well. Ornamental motifs derived from its etchings proliferated widely in the architecture of Seville between the second third of the seventeenth century and the second half of the eighteenth century. Perhaps as a result of Dietterlin’s elevated artistic stature in Spain, it was not long before his *Architectura* also came to shape the art of the New World. After a wave of destructive earthquakes in the middle of the seventeenth century, numerous Peruvian churches and their furnishings were decorated with ornamental schemes from the *Architectura*. The facades, portals, and retables of Cusco’s cathedral (1654) and church of La Compañía (1651-68), as well as San Francisco in Lima (1657-74) [Fig. 4] variously display elongated scrolls, auricular ornament, and other motifs adapted from the pages of Dietterlin’s treatise. The church of San Francisco was remodeled according to plans by a Portuguese architect, Constantino de Vasconcelos. While it has been argued that Vasconcelos’s design was inspired in part by the recent work on Cusco’s Cathedral and La Compañía, the Portuguese architect’s use of Dietterlin’s models also

---

suggests that the *Architectura* was highly esteemed in Portugal during this period. A century later, architect Lorenzo Rodríguez used abstract terms first published in the *Erst Buch* as inspiration for the *estipites* of the Sagrario Metropolitano (1768) in Mexico City, one of many instances of Dietterlin’s impact on eighteenth-century architecture in Mexico [Fig. 4].

The very features that made the *Architectura* accessible to all manner of figural artists and architects ensured that the treatise also spoke to audiences across vast geographical and chronological distances. Dietterlin devised most of the *Architectura* prints to convey his paradigm of ornamental reinvention without the aid of the accompanying text. This meant that the book’s copious images, originally designed to address post-Reformation Germany’s many unlearned craftsmen, transcended language barriers and outlasted fleeting trends in architectural discourse. It also meant that Dietterlin’s ideas could proliferate via individual pages of text or as fugitive etchings—objects that could change hands and travel far more readily than whole copies of his treatise could. The author’s interest in describing the limits of architectural decorum furthermore gave artists operating under disparate cultural conditions relatively free reign in adapting his designs. Following a pattern often observed in early modern decorative art, artists and architects rarely copied the *Architectura*’s ornamental schemes outright. They instead took cues from the book’s cut-and-paste compositional aesthetic, lifting signature Dietterlin motifs, such as scalloped auricular volutes and lantern-formed pinnacles, and recombining them in new arrangements. Peacham’s comments


confirm that period artists valued Dietterlin’s ornamental images precisely because the designs lent themselves to repetition and proliferation in further fantastical schemes. But in conceiving the images of the *Architectura* as inherently flexible matrices of ornamental invention, Dietterlin did not only ensure that the treatise could bridge sweeping cultural divides. He also guaranteed that the *Architectura* would remain relevant even as new paradigms of ornament arose, thereby exempting his work from the prophecy that the new will inevitably outstrip the old.

Although Dietterlin’s treatise remained on the radar of art experts for centuries, it did not assume the position in the history of architectural literature that he might have anticipated. Later critics ignored the *Architectura*’s heterogeneous sources and its cross-cultural impact in the service of subordinating Dietterlin’s work to more straightforward narratives of architectural history, which were often based on the idea of regional styles. Eighteenth-century drawing collector and connoisseur Pierre-Jean Mariette wrote that “Dietterlin (Vendelin), who died in 1597 at the age of 49, was from Strasbourg and therefore German and not Flemish,” linking the artist’s cultural identity to that of the city in which he practiced. An early edition of the first modern history of German architecture, Wilhelm Lübke’s *Geschichte der Renaissance in Deutschland* (first published in 1872) identified the *Architectura* as a paradigmatic text of a specifically German Renaissance. This orientation typifies the interpretations of those who composed the first modern surveys of architectural history, who were often intent on constructing and defining architectural styles and

---


literatures that would accord with the increasingly definite boundaries of Europe’s nascent nation-states.27 The national identity of the artists who composed early modern ornament treatises became a key criterion for judging those works. A spate of turn-of-the-century articles—primarily published in journals dedicated to Alsatian art—subsequently portrayed Dietterlin as fundamentally *German* figure, and indeed as a hero of Strasbourg’s *German Renaissance*.28 Nevertheless, Dietterlin’s connections to a city that had often changed hands between French and German-speaking powers complicated efforts to pigeonhole the *Architectura* as a quintessentially German work. Reprints of the *Architectura* in German and French appeared in quick succession in 1860 and 1862, followed by new editions of the German reprint in 1884 and 1886.29 It is tempting to discern in this volley of publications as the product of a scramble to assimilate Dietterlin to the emerging myths of French and German Renaissance architecture.

The aftermath of debates about national styles of architecture lives on in the modern scholarship. That Dietterlin’s *Architectura* ultimately came to be known as the flagship work

---

27 In fact, it was during this period that critics from Lübke to Heinich Wölfflin rejected Goethe’s idea of the Gothic as the quintessentially German idiom and instead presented the Renaissance style as the characteristic German manner. On this phenomenon, see Hans Belting, *Die Deutschen und ihre Kunst. Ein schwieriges Erbe.* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1992), 21.


of a German Renaissance architectural literature is only one repercussion of nineteenth-century art history’s early struggles with the categories of nation and architectural style. With important exceptions, researchers now tend to describe the geography of sixteenth-century architectural theory through the lens of language regions that are distinct from, but related to, the political boundaries once used to map architectural trends. Despite the manifold connections between the architectural literatures of the German-speaking lands, France, the Netherlands, and England during this period, they are often treated solely as distinct traditions. When scholarship on early modern architectural literature plots trans-regional vectors of exchange, it is typically along the familiar North-South axis between these individual language regions and Italy. A smaller body of literature concentrates on North-North axes of exchange, but mostly to describe the Netherlands’ effect on Germany. The impact of German literature on Netherlandish treatises, such as Visscher and Verbiest’s

30 The trend is evident in the separation of chapters in survey texts such as Kruft (which nevertheless pairs the Netherlands and Germany in the sixteenth century) and in Taschen’s introduction to architectural treatises, as well as monographic studies on German architectural theory. See Hanno-Walter Kruft, *A History of Architectural Theory from Vitruvius to the Present*, trans. Ronald Taylor, Elsie Callander, and Antony Wood (London: Zwemmer; and New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1994), 166-171. Some studies use “German” as a geographical designation, while others treat it as a linguistic designation. On architecture books in sixteenth-century “Germany”, see Bernd Evers and Christoph Thoenes, eds., *Architectural Theory: From the Renaissance to the Present: 89 Essays on 117 Treatises* (Cologne and Los Angeles: Taschen, 2003), 470-529; on German-language architecture books in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, see Hubertus Günther, ed., *Deutsche Architekturtheorie zwischen Gotik und Renaissance* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1988).

31 The scholarship that documents the influence of Italian treatises on individual French, Netherlandish, and English literatures is too vast to cite in full here. The structure of the important overview of early modern architectural treatise culture, *Paper Palaces*, nevertheless exemplifies the literature’s tendency to view the history of period architectural publications through the lens of Italy’s impact on other regions. Only three of the book’s fourteen preliminary essays on the reception of Vitruvius deal with non-Italian subjects, while four of the five chapters in the subsequent sections, “The Treatise in Context,” and “Beyond the Renaissance Treatise,” address non-Italian works. See Vaughn Hart with Peter Hicks, eds., *Paper Palaces: The Rise of the Renaissance Architectural Treatise* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1998).
versions of texts by Blum and Dietterlin, has received little attention. Indeed, modern research tends to present the architectural treatise tradition of the German-speaking realm, which was among the last regions of Western Europe to produce a Vitruvian text in the vernacular, as an importer of early modern architectural culture alone. The architecture of the early modern German-speaking lands is likewise regarded as the kitchen sink of Europe’s building idioms, rather than a crucible in which various strands of ornamental inquiry distilled into a brew that would intoxicate seventeenth-century audiences from London to Lima.

Yet as the studies in this dissertation demonstrate, ample evidence challenges the idea that Dietterlin’s oeuvre embodies a specifically German architectural Renaissance.

Chapter I has revealed how Dietterlin’s late-Renaissance Strasbourg wrestled with the

---


33 Among the twentieth-century studies of German architectural literature, Forssman, Irmscher, and Kruft all emphasize the tradition’s dependence on Italian writings, and, to a lesser extent, its reliance on Netherlandish tracts. Only Forssman attends to the exchanges between French and German architectural literatures. Almost none of the existing scholarship focuses on the interplay between German and English architectural literatures, or the influence of German tracts on architectural writings in France, the Netherlands, or England—with the exception of Yves Pauwels, who has scrutinized the impact of Hans Blum’s treatises in France. On the influence of Italian literature in German architectural theory, see Kruft, A History of Architectural Theory, 166-171; and Günter Irmscher, Kölner Architektur- und Säulenbücher um 1600. Sigurd Greven-Studien 2 (Bonn: Bouvier, 1999), 11-17; 26-37. For an extensive overview of the proliferation of Vitruvianism in the North through Italian as well as French and Netherlandish publications, see Erik Forssman, Säule und Ornament. Studien zum Problem des Manierismus in den nordischen Säulenbüchern und Vorlageblättern des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts. Acta Universitatis Stockholmensis. Stockholm Studies in History of Art 1 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiskell, 1956), 39-95. For the interplay between French and German architectural literatures, see Forssmann, Säule und Ornament. On the influence of Hans Blum in France, see Yves Pauwels, “Les éditions françaises du traité de Hans Blum...”, 123-134; and Pauwels, “Hans Blum et les Français, 1550-1650,” Scholion. Mitteilungsblatt der Stiftung Bibliothek Werner Oechslin 6 (2010): 77-88.
cultural identity of its architecture in its confrontation with Vasari’s *Vite* and his account of
the *maniera tedesca*. Dietterlin’s response to Vasari in the hall of the Strasbourg masons’ lodge
shows that if a German ornamental manner existed in the imaginations of those who
supposedly perpetuated it, it was a style defined by its knack for amalgamating foreign and
ancient idioms with local and modern mores. Dietterlin’s *Architectura* also contradicts the
image of a monolithic German ornamental manner or treatise tradition. As Chapters II, II,
IV, V, and the Excursus have proven, author created the treatise and its designs by
borrowing from ornament prints and art and architectural literature produced in the
German-speaking lands, as well as the Netherlands, France, Italy, and England. Dietterlin’s
geographically omnivorous use of sources demonstrated mastery and expertise by
highlighting his broad knowledge of European artistic culture. It additionally allowed the
*Architectura* to present a panorama of the ornamental idioms of sixteenth-century Europe, a
feature that appealed to the continent’s burgeoning contingent of architectural book and
print collectors.

Dietterlin’s strategy of publishing the *Architectura* in German as well as bilingual,
Latin/French editions also refutes the notion that the treatise represents an essentially
German contribution to the history of art, signaling instead that the author wished his work
to circulate among an international public of Latinate and non-Latinate readers. The
treatise’s multilingual publication scheme is itself derived from Netherlandish and Italian or
French models of architectural treatise production. Perhaps stimulated by the tradition of
Vitruvius translation that took root north of the Alps in the middle decades of the sixteenth
century, the practice of preparing multiple or bilingual translations of architectural treatises
thrived in sixteenth-century northern Europe. While Coecke van Aelst released Dutch, German and French editions of Serlio’s *Quarto libro* (1539, 1542 and 1542, respectively) and Vredeman de Vries published German and French and then Dutch versions of his own *Architectura* project in quick succession (1577 and 1581), Serlio had Books I and II and the *Extraordinario libro* of his *Regole generali* printed as bilingual, Italian/French works. In engaging a cornucopia of non-German sources and a model of multilingual publication already widely used in the Netherlands and France, Dietterlin fortified and even multiplied the proliferating networks of exchange linking the various centers and regions of the European culture of ornament.

It also appears that Dietterlin did not merely angle to reach a European audience. One etching first published in the 1598 *Architectura* features a fountain with corners anchored by personifications of Egypt and a number of lands rarely before mentioned in European architectural literature: Brazil, the Andes, Hispaniola, Peru, and Ethiopia [Fig. 5].

---

34 For a useful overview of the phenomenon of Vitruvius translation in northern Europe during the middle of the sixteenth century, see Hubertus Günther, “Vitruv in der Renaissance,” in *Deutsche Architekturtheorie zwischen Gotik und Renaissance*, 72-73.

author’s apparent interest in the world beyond Europe suggests his awareness that the images of the *Architectura* could very well convey his ideas to these far-flung places. With its multiple languages and abundance of fantastic designs that were easily adaptable to various cultural and climatological contexts, his treatise innovatively addresses the increasingly global audience of early modern architecture.

This dissertation’s reevaluation of the place of Dietterlin’s work in the geography of early modern art bears a number of broad implications. The project’s account of the trans-regional artistic dialogues in which Dietterlin’s *Architectura* partook refutes the lingering image of the German-speaking realm as a backwater of early modern architectural culture. It also discards the idea that the theoretical discourses on architectural ornament that transpired in this realm were ultimately relevant only to German Renaissance architectural culture, and indicates that European architectural literature was far more integrated across linguistic and geographical boundaries in the years around 1600 than is presently appreciated. The dissertation’s assessment of the *Architectura*’s impact on global architectural culture furthermore suggests that the trans-regional influence of German-language architectural treatises in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries deserves additional attention. Far from promoting the German treatise tradition in the way that nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century authors celebrated it, such research would enhance our shifting understanding of the early modern world’s architectural culture as a complex, multipolar web of influences. In exploring how the visual components of treatises fostered artistic dialogue across cultures and over vast distances, the dissertation indicates the flaws in the prevailing, language-based geography of early modern architectural theory, and elaborates an alternative to this paradigm of inquiry.
The Interplay Between Architecture and the Figural Arts

With its symbols of Labor and Utility accompanying the tools of painting and sculpture before an ornately decorated monument, the title page of Dietterlin’s 1593 Erst Buch had allegorized the role of architectural ornament in the practice of the figural arts. The etched title page of Dietterlin’s 1594 Annder Buch, which the author reused as a title page for the Doric and Corinthian books of the 1598 Architectura, meanwhile allegorized the very nature of artistic and architectural knowledge [Fig. 6]. Also organized around an embellished architectonic structure, the composition depicts a woman with the armor and plumed helmet of Athena. Facing a picture panel propped against the gable with Dietterlin’s emblem and motto, she bears the palette, brush, and Mahlstick of painting in one hand, and the compass of design and geometry in the other. Athena is joined by a man with the winged helmet of Hermes, who chisels the plaque inscribed with the author’s name and thus symbolizes the art of sculpture. At the base of the plaque lie the ruler, T-square, and column capital of architecture.

The conjunction of Hermes or Mercury and Athena or Minerva, known as “Hermathena”, often appeared in art around 1600 as a pair or an entity that joined attributes of the god of eloquence and invention and the goddess of wisdom and craft. An emblem

36 In the 1598 Architectura, the title page of the Doric Order occurs as Plate 44, and the title page of the Corinthian Order occurs as Plate 134.
invented by Joris Hoefnagel, delineated by Hans von Aachen, and engraved around 1590 by Aegidius II. Sadeler shows Hermathena striding forward beneath a cartouche that reads “CVRSVS,” or, “walk quickly” [Fig. 7]. The motto recalls the ancient adage festina lente, that is, “make haste slowly”, and thus promotes the virtue of equilibrium. Because early modern viewers associated Hermathena with the quality of equilibrium as well as art and craft, the composite figure could symbolize manifold artistic ideals—for instance, the coordination of form and content, the balance between architectural invention and decorum, or the combination of art and science. As a composite figuration of the disparate acuities involved in ars and techné, Hermathena could also embody the conjunction of industry and learning, or the harmonious rapport between artistic theory and practice. By picturing Hermathena in the title page of his Annder Buch, Dietterlin—who may well have known Hoefnagel’s design—affiliated his own project with these various ideals.


40 On Hermathena as the embodiment of the coordination of form and content, see Müller and Kaschek, “Diese Gottheiten sind den Gelehrten Heilig,” 27. On Hermathena as a symbol of the unity of art and science, see Wilberg-Schuurman, Die Emblematische Elemente, 1:198.

41 For Hermathena as an emblem of industry and learning, see Kaufmann, “The Eloquent Artist,” 44.
As the combined image of the god of eloquence and the goddess of wisdom, Hermathena was additionally associated with excellence in learned rhetoric. Cicero once called a statue of Hermathena an appropriate ornament for his orator’s academy, for, he wrote, while silver-tongued Hermes symbolized all such gymnasia, the wisdom of Athena distinguished his own. During the early modern period, Hermathena also symbolized compelling *artistic* rhetoric. Dietterlin’s *Hermathena* title page signals to readers that the *Architectura*’s introduction to the art of architectural ornament avails itself of rhetorical principles. Ancient and modern rhetorical literature widely presented oratory as a matter of embellishing the elements of speech. In artfully combining and elaborating the individual architectural motifs presented in the 1593 *Erst Buch*, the *Annder Buch*’s portals and heraldic designs figure the dichotomy between the fundamental parts of Dietterlin’s decorative language and its rhetorical ornaments. The structure of the artist’s final, 1598 *Architectura* meanwhile embodies the three topics of rhetoric as portrayed in Cicero’s *De inventione*. In presenting the basic elements of the Orders, the first etchings of the book’s five sections lay out the topics of architectural ornament, realizing the initial rhetorical procedure of invention (*inventio*). The regular sequence in which the book’s designs occur—proceeding from a synoptic image of the Order to representations of its windows, fireplaces, portals, fountains, heraldic designs, and epitaphs—manifests the subsequent rhetorical procedure of

---

42 “est ornamentum Academiae proprium meae, qoud et Herme commune est omnium et Minerva singulare est insigne eius gymnasi…” Cicero, *Epistulae ad Atticum*, I.4.3.
44 On the links between Dietterlin’s concept of invention and the Ciceronian tradition of invention theories from Vitruvius to the Renaissance, see Günter Irmscher, *Kölner Architektur- und Säulenbücher*, 63-64.
45 Cicero, *De inventione*, passim.
the logical arrangement of parts (dispositio). The embellishments depicted in the Architectura’s model projects meanwhile embody the rhetorical element of style, a feature of expression developed only once the Ciceronian rhetorician fixes the topics and structure of expression.

Dietterlin’s engagement with Ciceronian rhetorical principles complemented his efforts to expand the expressive capacities architecture through new conceptions of figural architectural ornament. By manifesting the topics of rhetoric as described in De inventione, the Architectura’s system of ornamental invention gained theoretical underpinnings with an esteemed, ancient pedigree.

Yet another dimension of the Hermathena trope informs the allegory of art presented in Dietterlin’s title page as well. Hoefnagel’s design presents Hermathena as the champion of the Muses, celebrating harmony among the arts and letters as the basis for an ideal unity of the various fields of human learning. Early modern artists similarly depicted Hermathena as an emblem for the unity of the various visual arts—a central precept of the academic ideals of art in the later sixteenth century. Dietterlin applies these concepts to the Architectura’s representation of the relationships between architecture and the figural arts. Bearing the attributes of the figural media, the Hermathena in the Annder Buch title page portrays painting and sculpture as complementary aspects of comprehensive artistic expertise.

Architecture, structuring the composition and embodied in the ruler, T-square,

46 See Cicero, De inventione, 1.7; and Cicero, De oratione, 1.31.143. Vitruvius applies the category of dispositio to architectural composition as well. See Vitruvius, De architectura, II.1.1-2.
47 See Cicero, De inventione, 1.7.9.
48 On Dietterlin’s interest in the rhetoric of figural architectural ornament, see Chapter IV.
49 On Hoefnagel’s Hermathena as protector of the Muses, see Müller and Kashek, “Diese Gottheiten sind den Gelehrten Heilig?,” 31-32.
50 Kaufmann, “The Eloquent Artist” (1982), 128-130.
51 An owl and a rooster, the respective avian attributes of Athena and Hermes, make subtle appearances in the Erst Buch title page, imparting that image with the visual rhetoric of the Hermathena motif as well.
and column capital, meanwhile assumes an autonomous presence, and indeed acts as the
design’s organizing entity. This configuration promotes the Vasarian principle that
architecture provides a context for the arts of painting and sculpture as well as the Vitruvian
notion of architecture as the discipline that encompasses the knowledge of all other arts. Yet
it can also convey the more Dietterlinian idea that all the figural arts draw upon architecture.
In portraying architectural knowledge as the source of balanced expression and learned
rhetoric in ornamental composition in the figural arts, the Hermathena title page aptly
summarizes the Architectura’s theory of architectural expertise.

It is notable that Dietterlin’s pictorial introduction to the Annder Buch shares the
iconography of many of the numerous printed allegories of artistic knowledge that painters
such as Hendrick Goltzius, Frans Floris, Bartholomaeus Spranger, and Hans von Aachen
designed in the decades around 1600. The fashion for pictorially allegorizing the visual arts
had first emerged in the work of Giorgio Vasari and other artists in the earlier and middle
decades of the sixteenth century. Many such images, including Hans von Aachen’s Athena
Introducing Painting to the Liberal Arts (1600) [Fig. 8], frame painting and other visual media as
members of the long-esteemed company of liberal arts. Hoefnagel’s design employs the
combination of Hermes and Athena as a personification of the links between the visual arts
and other areas of knowledge, particularly the liberal arts, by aligning Hermathena with the
image of the Muses. The introduction of the visual arts to such representations of the liberal

52 For Floris and Goltzius’s designs, see Catharine King, “Artes Liberales and the Mural
Decoration on the House of Frans Floris in Antwerp, c. 1565,” Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte 52,
no. 2 (1989): 239-256; for Spranger and von Aachen’s designs see Kaufmann, “The Eloquent
Artist” (1982), 126-127 and 127-28, respectively.
53 King, Representing Renaissance Art, 26-46.
54 Larry Silver, “Step-sister of the Muses: Painting as a Liberal Art and a Sister Art,” in
Articulate Images: The Sister Arts from Hogarth to Tennyson, ed. Richard Wendorf (Minneapolis:
sculpture and architecture as lowlier, mechanical crafts—a change that signaled waxing esteem for the intellectual dignity of the visual arts.55

The Hermathena title page and indeed the Architectura project participate in this phenomenon, but ennoble the visual arts to another end. Dietterlin's allegory incorporates few references to the liberal arts. Hermes figures the art of oratory, and the ruler and compass, which can also read as manifestations of disegno or design, vaguely suggest geometry. Otherwise, references to fields of human learning beyond the visual arts do not appear. Rather than proving the intellectual merits of painting, sculpture, and architecture vis-à-vis their place among a pantheon of liberal arts alone, Dietterlin's allegory of the visual arts in the hands of learned Hermathena additionally celebrates the autonomous nobility of artistic knowledge. His Architectura's inquiry into the links between architecture and the figural arts actualizes this vision of painting, sculpture, and architecture as an independent scheme of interconnected disciplines. In describing an Order-based system of visual arts akin to the epistemological framework that organized liberal arts, Dietterlin gives the unity of painting, sculpture, and architecture new theoretical underpinnings. The Annder Buch title page's Vitruvian portrayal of architecture as the art that encompasses the other arts is likewise borne out in the remainder of the Architectura project. By engaging Vitruvius's theory of architecture as the art that involves all the other arts, Dietterlin asserts that architectural expertise synthesizes knowledge of the visual and the liberal arts in a unified epistemological scheme. He turns the heterogeneous and diffuse nature of architectural knowledge in

sixteenth-century northern Europe into a form of expertise that gives structure to artistic
knowledge as a whole.

Dietterlin’s vision of architectural theory as the basis for a system of ornamental
invention pertinent to all the visual arts did not endure beyond its enthusiastic reception
among the artisanal literature and ornament pamphlets of early seventeenth-century
northern Europe. The encyclopedic architectural tracts published in the German-speaking
lands during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries afforded the other visual arts little
attention. In the outline of architectural knowledge released under the title of Synopsis
Architectonica in 1626 [Fig. 9], Henning Hasemann classifies painters, sculptors, stonemasons,
carpenters, and other artisans as figures subject to the authority of the architect and
characterizes their works as subsidiary aspects of an architectural project, but designates the
Orders as a topic that concerns the architect alone. By the time Joachim von Sandrart
released the first German-language art treatise that aspired to offer a universal overview of
artistic knowledge, his Tentsche Academie (Academia Todesca) of 1675-1679, architecture had
assumed a position subordinate to painting. The treatise begins with a discussion of
architectural theory, but the greater part of the work addresses the subject of history

56 On this literature, see Ulrich Schütte, Ordnung und Verzierung. Untersuchungen zur
deutschsprachigen Architekturtheorie des 18. Jahrhunderts (Braunschweig and Wiesbaden: Vieweg,
1986).
57 Henning Hasemann, SYNOPSIS ARCHITECTONICAE Oder: Summarischer Begriff der
Bau-Kunst nach ihrem füglichen Methodo mit angelegenem Fleiße zusammentragen... (Frankfurt am
Main: Gedr. bey Caspar Rötel; in Verlegung Eberhard Kiesers, 1626), Darmstadt, Digitale
Sammlungen Darmstadt, Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Darmstadt,
58 Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann offers a useful overview of the historiography of the Tentsche
Akademie as an encyclopedia of artistic knowledge, and argues that the work encompasses a
systematic investigation of the arts. See Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, “Antiquarianism, the
History of Objects, and the History of Art Before Winckelmann,” Journal of the History of Ideas
62, no. 3 (July 2001): 526-529.
painting, which architecture and sculpture are said to equip with formulae for invention, as well as models for symmetry and proportion and ethos and pathos. 59

Controversy over the value of Dietterlin’s Architectura as a paradigm for architectural knowledge defined the book’s reception after the early modern period. Modern audiences with a general interest in ornament regarded the treatise as an excellent model for decorative composition. The extended title of William Bell Scott’s 1845 The Ornamentist or, Artisan’s Manual in the Various Branches of Ornamental Art listed Dietterlin’s works first among the book’s program of historical models for ornamental composition. 60 The full title of the Architectura’s nineteenth-century French reprint indicates that the work is for the “use and instruction of friends of art.” 61 Even Dietterlin’s preparatory drawings for the Architectura lingered from the later nineteenth century until 1962 in the Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden, having served there as didactic tools for artists-in-training. 62

But other parties—those interested primarily in architectural design—abhorred the model of architectural ornament composition advanced in the Architectura’s fantastic images. Some disagreed with the treatise’s expansive vision of the canonical Orders of architecture.

When Mariette described Dietterlin’s work, the connoisseur complained that critics give

61 Wendel Dietterlin, Le livre de l'architecture: recueil de planches donnant la division, symétrie et proportion des 5 ordres appliqués à tous les travaux d'arts, qui en dépendent, tels que fenêtres, cheminées, chambranles, portails, fontaines et tombeaux... Inventé et publié en 200 planches pour l'usage et l'instruction des amis de l'art (Liège: Claesen, 1862).
62 Communication with Natalia Kardinar, Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden, September 28, 2012. On the nineteenth-century afterlife of Dietterlin’s Architectura drawings, see the introductory essay for Appendix IV.
Dietterlin “…too freely the title of famous architect, as he does not deserve it,” insisting that, “…he disfigured architecture by overstepping the Orders with barbarous taste.”

Another contingent complained that Dietterlin and many of the artists whose work he took as a source of inspiration collectively represent the very antithesis of good architectural composition. Renowned English architect Reginald Blomfield published a long and colorful opprobrium of Dietterlin and other northern architectural theorists of the later sixteenth century in his *Architectural Drawing and Draughtsmen* of 1912. It is worth quoting nearly in full:

Here is a plate from De Vries engraved in 1563, and one from the book that Dietterlin dedicated ‘nobili et ornatisimo viro Conrad Schlosberger’ in 1593. I only show these plates in order that the student may know what to avoid. Either of these plates or any one of Sambin’s ‘Termes’ is an epitome of all that is vile and abominable in design. Yet Dietterlin believed it to be serious architecture. He dedicated his work to amateurs, and “the ruder mechanics,” as he calls the unfortunate workmen who were to carry out his designs, and believed he was doing service to the Art…The havoc that such men wrought in German and Flemish and in our own Elizabethan and Jacobean art is well known to students. When architectural draughtsmen launched out into such stuff as this, there was no reason why they should ever stop. Men of the type of De Vries and Dietterlin, and even Du Cerceau, considered as ornamentalists, are the parasites of architecture, whom students should entirely eschew. The aim of the student should be first-hand knowledge acquired by study and observation; knowledge of the ends to be aimed at in art; knowledge of the methods and materials through which those ends are to be realized. The draughtsman’s line should be the expression of this knowledge, its means of conveyance to other minds and other hands; and unless there is this knowledge behind the drawing, inspiring and controlling it, the results will be disastrous. To architects most of all, draughtsmanship, essential as it is, must play the part of a servant, not of a master; it is not there for the display of virtuosity, but for the serious and considered statement of knowledge and thought. And it is this that to some extent differentiates the purpose of architectural draughtsmanship from the drawing of the free artist.

Blomfield charges Dietterlin and his compatriots with numerous crimes against architecture.

In quoting the schemes of prior treatise authors and architects, and in promoting a fantastic, recombinatory paradigm of architectural design, Dietterlin and company essentially practiced plagiarism. The *Architectura* and similar texts likewise display a total ignorance of how to

---


generate new works from esteemed architectural models. Dietterlin’s undisciplined and bombastically virtuosic inventions belong to the world of the figural artist, not that of the architect. The expertise that the *Architectura* peddles could not, in the estimation of Blomfield and other modern readers, qualify as valid architectural knowledge.

Integral to Blomfield’s assessment is the assumption that architectural design differs on a fundamental level from ornamental design in the other visual arts. During the second half of the nineteenth century, Jacob Burckhardt, Heinrich von Geymüller, Wilhelm Lübke and other authors of the first surveys of early modern architecture had attended earnestly to the links between building and the decorative arts. The generation of Heinrich Wölfflin, Aloïs Riegl, and August Schmarsow, and Aby Warburg also studied objects that straddled the line between architecture and the figural arts. Yet by the first decades of the twentieth century, when Blomfield wrote, architects and their critics increasingly advanced the case that architecture stands apart from figural arts. The shift also manifested in the structures of art history writing. Even Julius von Schlosser, a keen historian of the object and the minor arts, organized his influential *Kunstliteratur* of 1924 into distinct histories of art literature and architectural literature. Such habits crystallized in the eventual separation of the disciplines of art and architectural history, a development that occurred in institutional entities such as journals, departments and schools, and museums, as well as in the scholarly discourse itself.

A modernist commitment to the autonomy of architecture from the other visual media has

---

65 On art and architectural historians’ interest in the relationships between architecture and objects during the decades around 1900, see Alina A. Payne, *From Ornament to Object: Genealogies of Modernism* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2012), 112-156.
subsequently blinded many historians to that medium’s intimate relationship with the figural arts during the Renaissance.

The findings of this dissertation suggest that the interplay between architecture and the other visual arts in the early modern period deserves renewed consideration. In drawing attention to Dietterlin and his Strasbourg colleagues’ passionate reactions to Vasari’s writings, Chapter I uncovers fertile ground for further inquiry into the roles of the Vite in the North during the later sixteenth century and indeed the early modern period at large. It also exposes the Vite as a previously obscure actor in sixteenth-century northern Europe’s preoccupation with the category of ornamental style, as well as its interest in the relationships between the arts. If Dietterlin’s theory of the Orders as five manners of ornament for all the visual media and his investigations of the interplay between the arts are in part motivated by Vasari’s notions of maniera and his theory of the sister arts, it will be critical to ask how other northern architectural theorists were affected by the Vite as well. Finally, in indicating the various ways in which artists employed certain decorative manners to manifest the artistic knowledge and aptitudes of the northern architect, the study clarifies why the early modern discourse on ornament also became a stage for exploring the nature of architectural expertise.

This project’s account of Dietterlin’s strategies for drafting and etching the illustrations of the Architectura augments our understanding of the formation of printed, illustrated architectural treatises in the early modern period. Both Chapter II and the Appendix of Dietterlin’s circa two hundred known drawings indicate the great extent to which sixteenth-century architectural draftsmen could depend on drawing techniques traditionally employed to devise designs for ornament in the other arts. Dietterlin’s use of the Architectura drawings to explore how the rules of architectural decorum relate to
decorative design in painting and sculpture attests to the rigor with which figural artists of sixteenth-century northern Europe studied architectural theory, despite its variable and tenuous authority over their work. The universal theory of ornament that Dietterlin developed in the *Architectura* preparatory drawings and spread through his printed treatise demonstrates how an early modern artist could conceive of ornament, like the categories of geometry and design, as a link between the disparate visual arts. In examining Dietterlin’s portrayal of the five Orders of architecture as a framework for the invention of ornament in any medium, Chapter II sheds light on the emergence of an early theory of artistic style. Since Dietterlin’s theory of style demonstrated that knowledge of the canonical Orders of architecture was eminently relevant to the other visual arts, Chapter II additionally reveals how architectural *expertise* was thought to pertain to figural artists.

The evaluation of Dietterlin’s experiments with the medium of etching developed in Chapter III shows that sixteenth-century northern Europe’s critical engagement with the relationships between architectural ornament and the figural arts reverberated well beyond the sphere of decorative design. In probing ways to figure the mercurial materiality of ornament in the *Architectura* prints, Dietterlin deftly used etching to imitate other graphic media. His images thus positioned the once-marginal technique as printmaking’s most protean medium and an arena for displaying masterful manipulation of artistic materials. Chapter III calls attention to the *Architectura* as one of the early modern period’s most stunning performances of printmaking virtuosity, but also reveals Dietterlin’s project as a key impetus for the rising esteem for etching at the dawn of the seventeenth century. The artist’s example ushered in an unprecedented generation of author-etchers—including woodcarvers, metalworkers, and façade painters—whose various books on architectural ornament
significantly diversified the field of figural artists engaged in published architectural discourse.

The dialogue between architecture and the other visual arts in Dietterlin’s age was a two-way conversation. If the previous two chapters reveal the impact of architectural theory on the figural arts, the dissertation’s remaining case studies demonstrate how the architectural literature of sixteenth-century northern Europe incorporated themes from painting, sculpture, and other fields of human knowledge—a trend that shaped architecture as well as art. The *Architectura*’s contribution to the advent of anthropomorphic forms of the Orders, the subject of Chapter IV, shows how architectural theorists’ interest in addressing painters and sculptors and their experiments with pictorial rhetoric made figural ornament a central topic of architectural literature in Dietterlin’s world. By expanding the possibilities for staging complex allegories, self-portraits, and even narratives in built form, authors brought the rhetoric of the figural arts to the medium of architecture. Stimulating painters’ and sculptors’ curiosity about the theories of architectural ornament, they also extended the expressive apparatus of architecture to the realm of the figural arts. Chapter IV thus suggests how the increased role of figuration in sixteenth-century architectural publications made expertise in matters such as allegory and iconography more important to the education of the architect, and architectural expertise more compelling to the figural artist.

Dietterlin’s instrumental role in the rise of the nebulous and often flesh-like motif known as “auricular ornament”, addressed in the Excursus, equipped artists with a new way to subvert the typically solid materiality of architecture. In employing forms like those pictured in period anatomical texts, architects could challenge the medium’s structural conventions and the anatomical analogies that shaped canonical understandings of architectural figuration. The *Architectura*’s influential interpretation of the auricular motif also
suggested ways to meld the forms of architecture with painting and sculpture, and inspired non-architects to explore the boundaries of architectonic form. These phenomena indicate how areas of human inquiry beyond the arts, such as the study of anatomy, also shaped early modern discourse about architectural expertise and the interplay between the arts.

Dietterlin’s fascination with the relationships between architecture and the other arts accords with contemporary artists’ broad interest in comparing the visual arts and the modes of artistic expertise they entailed. Motivated by shifting guild structures and professional institutions as well as conflicts over who could perform certain types of artistic labor, northern art publications engaged in a lively but heretofore unrecognized *paragone* discourse. Perhaps taking cues from Vasari’s remarks on the arts’ universal use of *disegno* and *maniera*, Dietterlin and other artists of his milieu advanced competing claims for the excellence of their own trades, but also illustrated ornament books with projects that seemed to fuse the visual media. The *Architectura*’s contributions to these *paragone* debates reveals vital origins of Europe’s emerging, Baroque-era fascination with synthesizing the three sister arts in plurimedial projects. It also demonstrates how melding architecture and the figural media came to be regarded as an expression of comprehensive artistic knowledge.

Once, architecture was conceived as the field of knowledge that encompassed all other arts. Dietterlin’s *Architectura* promotes this profoundly Vitruvian idea, but also inverts it, asserting that architectural expertise is likewise integral to mastering all the other visual arts. In scrutinizing the flexible boundaries of early modern architectural knowledge through Dietterlin’s work, the present dissertation has looked beyond existing scholarship’s focus on the hybrid careers of artist-architects and the abstract debates of art literature to assess the theoretical and formal dimensions of inter-media exchange. By evaluating the ways in which the design practices of architecture and the figural arts intersected, it develops a more
comprehensive model for assessing how interactions between architecture and the other visual media shaped notions of architectural and artistic expertise. By challenging the prevailing view that architectural expertise held sway in the design of buildings alone, the project provides a point of departure for reevaluating the links between early modern architectural culture and the other visual arts.

Epilogue: Chaos and Cosmos

Near the end of his life, Dietterlin devised a painted triptych for the Magistrat of Strasbourg. The composition of this lost Salvation of Mankind ensemble is recorded in a three-sheet etching delineated by Wendel’s grandson Bartholomäus and printed by Wendel’s son Hilarius [Fig. 10]. With its diverse terrain and plethora of narrative vignettes, the work represents the entire spatial and chronological scope of Creation. Its leftmost portion depics a lightning-laced cloud with a distant God the Father holding the tablets of the Ten Commandments, which hovers above a fallen Adam relieved by Aaron, Moses, and the institution of the Law. The rightmost sheet shows the conjunction of man’s earthly condition and the divine through the miracle of the Transfiguration. Christ’s triumph over death, announced by John the Baptist, unfolds in the center portion of the work. Structured by the elaborate columns of a fantastic ruin, the triptych embodies the synthesis of existential order and ornament known to the ancients as “Κόσμος.”

---

Κόσμος is the universe, regarded as a harmonious system. As Angus Fletcher and others have noted, it is also the West’s oldest term for ornamental expression. The ancient Greeks used Κόσμος to denote both “ornament” and “duly-ordered,” and also to imply “world” in a more figurative sense. Aristotle included it among the eight types of poetic language, asserting that, “every word is either a standard term, loan word [foreign], metaphor, ornament [Κόσμος], neologism, or lengthening, or contraction, or modification.” Plato, meanwhile, employed the term to describe the harmonious disposition of creation. He observed that “they call the whole of this world by the name of order [Κόσμος]” because the gods and men are bound together by orderliness. It was the Platonic metaphor of the world as order that ultimately supplied Κόσμος’s dominant meaning: the term came to signify “universe” in the first place, and “adornment” only in the second. The notion that adornment reflects the existential order reinforced the hierarchy between the universal sense of Κόσμος, and its humbler connotations of ornament. Yet as the terminology of adornment developed, it retained vestigial links to notions of the universe. Κόσμος gave to rise to words for “cosmetic,” “costume,” and “custom;” translated as the Latin decoratio and ornatus, it also begat “decorum” and “ornament.” Each term could describe indicators of rank or position

74 Fletcher, Allegory, 109
76 Ibid; and Fletcher, Allegory, 109.
in the universal hierarchy. Embedded in the language of embellishment, the cosmic theme assumed a subtle but ubiquitous role in Western ideas of adornment.

Many early modern thinkers also defined the universe in terms of ornament. In the 1579 emblem book Μικρόκοσμος, PARVVS MVNDVS, humanist Laurentius van Goidsehoven (née Haechtanus) maintains that the cosmos is comprised of laws, human spirit, and “potentii decoratam.” The work’s title page depicts ornament as an organizing principle of creation, with a strapwork border encompassing fauna that symbolize the four humors, as well as the sacred sphere of man in the form of a globus cruciger [Fig. 11]. Other authors were more inclined to discern a metaphorical likeness between the cosmic and the cosmetic. The Dutch humanist Franciscus Junius, for instance, reminded readers of his treatise on the painting of the ancients that “the Good and great maker of this universe created the world after so glorious and beautifull a manner that the Greekes, together with the Romans…have called the universe by the name of an Ornament [Κόσμος].” Following Plutarch, who first observed that Κόσμος might refer to macrocosmos, the large-scale order of the universe, or to microcosmos, a representation of that order on a smaller scale, early modern

audiences also regarded ornament as a symbol of the cosmic order. Wenzel Jamnitzer’s 1568 *Perspectiva* pictures models for ornamental motifs based on the Platonic solids then believed to define the cosmic fabric. The famed Strasbourg astronomical clock, newly refurbished when Dietterlin first arrived in the city, adorned the cathedral with a moving model of the cosmos and its various chronological dimensions. In these and many other ornaments in which the part implied the whole, the whole implied the part, and the whole and part completed each other to fulfill the ancient prerequisites for the microcosmic image.

A far more concrete constellation of issues—guild rights, the availability of commissions, and regional traditions, for instance—motivated Dietterlin to use ornament to explore the nature of architectural expertise. Nevertheless, his theories of universal artistic knowledge also betray a keen interest in representing the order of the cosmos. The artist questioned the nature of architectural expertise in part because he endeavored to describe the structures of the world. The concept that ornament expresses the order of the universe undergirds much of Dietterlin’s work. The artist’s entablature designs for the Great Hall of the Stuttgart Lusthaus melded the interior’s painting, sculpture, and architecture and transformed the space into a seamless embodiment of Duke Ludwig of Württemberg’s realm and its place within the cosmic scheme. Dietterlin’s *Salvation of Mankind* triptych contrasts the disparate existential conditions of the old and new dispensations through divergent forms of ornament: while the ruins of its Old Testament scenes are comprised of cracked arches,

---

79 Fletcher, *Allegory*, 110.
82 Fletcher, *Allegory*, 110.
mottled columns, and cornices arranged in a physically impossible network of intersecting beams, the architecture of the world under Christ is harmoniously composed.

But among all the works in Dietterlin’s oeuvre, the *Architectura* mounts the deepest inquiry into the ways in which ornament figures the cosmic scheme. The project’s images of anthropomorphic and auricular ornaments give the human body—often regarded as the microcosmic image of the macrocosmic order—a new role in the art of architecture. The final, 1598 treatise’s etched ornamental designs collectively present an innovative fusion of classical, mythological, and Christian imagery. The manner in which Dietterlin ordered the books’ religious symbolism across the different installments of the *Architectura* project successively enhanced the work’s microcosmic ambitions. Among the opening pages of the *Annder Buch*, readers find a portal featuring the post-lapsarian Adam and Eve alongside the creatures that accompanied them in Paradise. The *Annder Buch*’s closing etching shows a triumphal arch design mounted by the skeletal personification of death, and beyond the open portal, the image of Christ’s vacant tomb—a design one viewer inscribed with a poem that condemns sinners to everlasting death and promises the pious eternal life [Fig. 12].

---


84 Irmscher, *Kölner Architektur- und Säulenbücher*, 60.

85 This image first appeared as Plate 3 in the *Annder Buch*, and was republished as Plate 24 in the 1598 installments of the *Architectura*.

86 Recto lower center [black ink]: “vrome menschen fullen / na het sterben: groote koninck / rich, in wegh be erpen. / maer von menschen kleyn en groot / sterben den […] en euwegen
new, expanded sequence of numbered plates included in the final, 1598 *Architectura*,

Dietterlin scattered between these two images numerous depictions of Old and New Testament episodes. The finished treatise thus narrates the history of humankind from creation and the fall of man to the arrival of the Redeemer, his resurrection, and the promise of the life of the world to come. Regarded against this narrative arc, Dietterlin’s seemingly contradictory efforts to degrade the Orders through licentious designs yet reform contemporary architecture through a system of decorous composition acquire new meaning. His account of the deterioration and ultimate restoration of the architectural Orders mirrors the very fate of humanity in the Christian historical scheme. The *Architectura*’s paradigm for unlocking the universe of designs possible within the formal and iconographical parameters of the five Orders in turn suggests the generative potential inherent to the structures of creation. The philosophical and even mystical dimensions of the treatise’s system of ornamental invention moves Dietterlin’s inquiry into the nature of architectural knowledge from the domain of architectural expertise to the more profound realm of architectural wisdom.

Other artists of Dietterlin’s era likewise explored how architectural ornament might reflect the cosmic order. In picturing allegories based on the anthropomorphic iconography of the Orders, Dietterlin drew much inspiration from Hans Vredeman de Vries’s 1577 *Theatrum Vita Humana*. This print series’ six engraved scenes connected the Composite Order with childhood, the Corinthian with youth, the Ionic with womanhood, the Doric with manhood, the Tuscan with old age, and the absence of any architectural Order with toot.” Cologne, Wallraf-Richartz-Museum, Kupferstichkabinett, Inv.-Nr. 31707. Although the design first appeared as Plate 58 of the *Annder Buch*, this particular iteration of the print comes from Plate 209 of the 1598 installment of the *Architectura*.

Ruin, or “RIYNE” [Fig. 13]. Whereas previous works had conceived of the Orders through a typology of human bodies, the *Theatrum Vitae Humanae* presented them as embodiments of biological and indeed spiritual states. And while Vredeman treated of the system of Orders as a metaphor for the stages of human life, Dietterlin employed images of the Orders to allegorize the whole course of human history. Vredeman’s idea that the canonical modes of architecture can each express abstract social, psychological, or religious themes undergirds the expansive figural symbolism that Dietterlin’s *Architectura* develops for the five Orders. Yet Dietterlin’s treatise departs from Vredeman’s model by assigning the Orders manifold other meanings, and by picturing the ways in which actual architectural ornaments might embody the Orders’ abstract personalities. The result is a universe of architectural symbolism that, through the sheer richness of its forms and symbolism, projects a veritable world image. In the prospectus of the *Architectura* project that Dietterlin included along with his 1592 application for an imperial printing privilege, the author had promised that the treatise’s final installment would contain an annotated cosmology in the form of a so-called *Tabula Cebetis*. Although this grand finale never materialized in the way Dietterlin projected, the finished *Architectura* ultimately embodied an impressive cosmology in and of itself. For Dietterlin’s age, the production of a cosmology was considered a formidable display of

---


89 “Darzu soll auch khommen, die Alt gedreisinwurdi Tabula Cebetis, mit Ihrem darzu gehörigem Schrifften, unnd erklärungen,” Wendel Dietterlin, Application for an Imperial Printing Privilege, May 11, 1592, Vienna, Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, AT-OeStA/HHStA RHR Impressoria 13-52 (Impressoria Fz. 13), fol. 362v. For more on Dietterlin’s proposal to include a *Tabula Cebetis* in the *Architectura*, see Appendix II. For a transcription of the application, see Appendix III.
learning at once wide-ranging and profound.\textsuperscript{90} Insofar as the \textit{Architettura} describes the cosmos through a universe of ornament, it, too, fulfills this ideal of human knowledge.

Dietterlin also was not alone among period architectural theorists in seeking to embody this ideal. In what is often regarded as the last architectural treatise of the Italian Renaissance tradition, the 1615 \textit{Idea dell’architettura universale}, Vincenzo Scamozzi develops a comprehensive account of the theory and practice of architecture that is deeply concerned with how ornament reflects the cosmic scheme.\textsuperscript{91} Scamozzi argues that “since there is no higher or mightier reason than God’s, and no greater or nobler results than those produced by Nature, it can be claimed that there is both order and ornament in all things.”\textsuperscript{92} This extends to the order among the forms of ornament in the disparate arts. Scamozzi

---


\textsuperscript{91} Drawing on contemporary discourse on the memory theater, Scamozzi likens his treatise to a theater of the imagination—a function certainly echoed in the \textit{Architettura}’s ordered exploration of ornamental invention. On Scamozzi’s use of the memory theater theme, see Marco Frascari, “The Mirror Theater of Vincenzo Scamozzi,” in \textit{Paper Palaces}, 247-260.

distinguishes the forms proper to architecture from those belonging to the figural arts. “And as for painters and sculptors and many other worthy artists, well versed in disegno” he writes,

…it is easy to find many and various forms: because they almost always imitate either nature or art, and so have before their eyes forms as if prepared: so, by contrast, the architect investigates forms differently from the others, in as much as he cannot use either the natural or the artificial [forms]; but keeps on seeking with his intellect, and finding, a third type of form, between these and those; which can serve perpetuità, uso, and are accompanied by much grace and beauty.93

Scamozzi, who traveled in the North and may well have known Dietterlin’s Architectura, contends that architectural motifs arise through a more conceptual form of composition and thus differ fundamentally from the natural and synthetic motifs of the visual arts.94 Neither entirely natural nor entirely synthetic, architectural forms instead qualify as a kind of quintessence that synthesizes the various structures of the universe in a single body.

Dietterlin’s universal theory of ornamental invention contradicts Scamozzi’s notion that the motifs of the architect and the ornaments of the figural artist are distinct entities within the universe of forms. The Strasbourg artist’s philosophy of artistic knowledge and his cosmological interests meet in a drawing for the title page of the Architectura’s final installment [Fig. 14]. A cavity in the center of the composition, set to receive the title page text, assumes the shape of a shield—an object that audiences intimately associated with representations of the universe. The Homeric description of the shield of Achilles, which


served as the model for the classical tradition of artistic ekphrasis and many subsequent accounts of shields, had emphasized the object’s dual role as ornament and mirror of the universe. In both the ancient and the early modern eras, the worlds often depicted on shields operated as descriptions of the cosmic order. Dietterlin’s drawing shows the implements of painting and sculpture flanking the empty shield at the base of an architectonic structure. The configuration portrays the figural arts as entities linked to each other, and to the art of architecture, through the forms of architectural ornament, which in turn serve as a framework for the cosmic shield. The image allegorizes the Architectura’s inquiry into how knowledge of architectural ornament binds the disparate visual arts as a potent mirror of the universal order.

Referring to the sculpted, architectonic boxes of the kind that Dietterlin claimed first inspired his Architectura project, Julius von Schlosser once observed that the architectural literature of sixteenth-century northern Europe had an excellent reason for “repeat[ing] the German Kunstbüchlein’s dedications to all those disciplines related to the arts.” Namely, because

…the industrious Augsburg and Nuremberg woodworkers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries sought in their...‘art cabinets’ to embody an ideal of their times—a ‘temple’ in two senses, not only encyclopedic in terms of its content, which attempted to encompass omnes res scibiles...but also in terms of its form.96

Here von Schlosser implies that sixteenth-century northern architectural theorists’ obsession with engaging all the arts reflects the cosmological impulses of the disparate artists who used their books. Just as the woodworker created “temples” that could encompass the manifold forms and matter of the universe, works like Dietterlin’s *Architectura* engaged the full spectrum of the arts to create a microcosm of artistic knowledge. There is no reason to limit this observation to the architectural literature of the North. Scamozzi and the many other European authors who devised cosmologies of architectural ornament likewise used their treatises to describe the nature of the cosmos itself.

Perhaps inadvertently, von Schlosser’s analysis evokes the close relationship between representing the cosmos and describing the knowledge it contains. His reference to the encyclopedic in particular captures the epistemological dimensions of early modern architectural literature’s cosmological ambitions. Dietterlin’s *Architectura* exhibits this encyclopedic impulse. Its meditations on the many guises of architectural expertise confront, through a discipline thought to combine virtually every area of human knowledge, the era’s shifting ways of knowing. The treatise’s models for devising emblematic architecture can produce potentially unlimited chains of associative meaning, creating a world known through metaphor. But at the same time, Dietterlin’s paradigm of ornamental composition operates on the basis of a concrete typology of measurable forms. The *Architectura’s* cosmology of ornament, of architecture, and the arts—and its image of a universe governed by both chaos and rules—arise from a mind caught between the age’s intersecting epistemes of emblematic elaboration and rationalist order.
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**Figure 2.**
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**Figure 5.**
Martin Schongauer, *Censer*, Fifteenth century, Engraving, New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, 26.41
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**Figure 6.**
Wendel Dieterlin, Etched illustration to Dieterlin’s *ARCHITECTVRA und Aüsstheilung der V. Seüln. Das Erst Buch.* (Stuttgart: s.n., 1593), Stuttgart, Staatsgalerie Stuttgart, Graphische Sammlung, Kasten 206/7, Pl. 34
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Figure 8.
Attributed to Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, *The Crucifixion*, Oil on canvas, 86.4 x 67.3 cm, East Lansing, MI, Kresge Art Museum, Michigan State University purchase, funded by the Friends of Kresge Art Museum, 91.1
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Figure 9.
Dietterlin Monograms [from Le Blanc II, p. 131]
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Figure 10.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, *Putto after Raphael’s “Isaiab”*, 1577 or later, Quill with brown and dark brown ink on heavy, dark cream laid paper, 25.3 cm x 11.0 cm, Strasbourg, Musées de la Ville de Strasbourg, Cabinet des Estampes et des Dessins, CdEedD 77.985.0.867, (rép: 77 R. 2011.0103)
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Figure 11.
Karel van Mander after Raphael, *Putto after Raphael’s “Isaiab”*, c. 1574-1577, Black chalk, 27.0 x 19.5 cm, Leiden, Rijksuniversiteit, Prentenkabinet, Inv no. PK 1933-T-2
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Figure 12.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, *Sapientia*, 1594, Quill with black ink and brush with grey-black wash on off-white laid paper, 15.1 x 10.8 cm, Karlsruhe, Staatliche Kunsthalle Karlsruhe, Kupferstichkabinett, Brentel Album F (Inv. NR. 1965-10), fol. 33’
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Figures 1a. & 1b.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Etched illustration to Dietterlin’s ARCHITECTVR von Portalen vnd Thürgerichten mancherley arten. Das Annder Büch (Strasbourg: Bernhard Jobin’s heirs, 1594), Stuttgart, Staatsgalerie Stuttgart, Graphische Sammlung, Kasten 206/7, Pls. 55 & 56 (superimposed)
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Figure 2.
Heinrich Vogtherr the Elder, Woodcut illustration to Vogtherr’s Ein Fremds und wunderbars kunsbüchlin allen Malern, Bildschnitzern, Goldschmiden, Steinmetzen, Schreinern, Plättern, Waffen un Messerschmiden hochnützlich zu gebrauchen (Strasbourg: Christian Müller, 1572) [copy of the first edition of 1538, a complete version of which was inaccessible to the author], Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Rar. 693, p. 55
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Figure 3.
Albrecht Dürer, Fraktur, Woodcut illustration to Dürer’s Underwysung der messung… (Nuremberg: 1525), Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Rar. 610, fol. Mii‘
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Figure 4.
Hanns Schmuttermayer, Engraved illustration to Schmuttermayer’s Fialenbüchlein (Nuremberg: Georg Stuchs, circa 1486), Nuremberg, Germanisches Nationalmuseum, Inv.- Nr. 36045
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Figure 5.
Giovanni Antonio da Brescia, Base, capital, and mask, circa 1515, Engraving, 14.1 x 10.8 cm, Chicago, The Art Institute of Chicago, Gift of Mr. Potter Palmer, 1937.74
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Figure 6.
Lucas van Leyden, Grotesque, 1528, Engraving, London, Victoria & Albert Museum, 28611A
Figure 7.

Figure 8.
Heinrich Vogtherr the Elder, Woodcut illustration to Vogtherr’s *Ein Fremds und wunderbar kunstbучlin llen Molern, Bildschnitzern, Goldschniden, Steinmetzen, Schreinern, Platnern, Waffen un Messerschmiden hochnutzh zu gebrauchen* (Strasbourg: 1538), Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibliothek – Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Dresden, Art.plast.2241,misc.2., fol. iii’.

Figure 9.
Musée de l'Œuvre Notre-Dame (former Frauenhaus), East Wing [left], c. 1347; West Wing [right], Hans Thoman Uhlberger, 1579-1582, Strasbourg [photo from Braat p. 20]

Figure 10.
Jan and Lucas van Doetechum (etchers) after Hans Vredeman de Vries (inventor), Etched illustration to Vredeman’s *ARCHITECTVRA, Oder Bawng der Antiquen...* (Antwerp: Gerard de Jode, 1577), Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Res 2/A.civ.251, fol. 22

Figure 11.
Hans Thoman Uhlberger, Hall of the Strasbourg masons, 1579-1582; Attributed to Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, *Grotesque wall and ceiling paintings*, 1582 or later, Musée de l’Œuvre Notre-Dame (former Frauenhaus), Strasbourg [photo by the author]

Figure 12.
Hans Thoman Uhlberger, South portal, Hall of the Strasbourg masons, 1579-1582; Attributed to Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, *Grotesque wall paintings*, 1582 or later, Hall of the Strasbourg masons, Musée de l’Œuvre Notre-Dame (former Frauenhaus), Strasbourg [photo by the author]
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Figure 13.
Hans Thoman Uhlberger, Vault, 1579-1582; Attributed to Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Grotesque ceiling painting, 1582 or later, Hall of the Strasbourg masons, Musée de l'Œuvre Notre-Dame (former Frauenhaus), Strasbourg [photo by the author]
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Figure 14.
Erhard and Ulrich Heydenreich, Broken Astwerk tracery, circa 1520, Münster zur Schönen Unserer Lieben Frau, Ingolstadt [photo by the author]
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Figure 15.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Grotesque Head, After 1570, Quill with light brown ink on cream laid paper, 17.7 x 13.2 cm, Strasbourg, Musées de la Ville de Strasbourg, Cabinet des Estampes et des Dessins, CE L1, 22, 77.985.0.868
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Figure 16.
Heinrich Aldegrever, Panel with Grotesque Candelabrum Containing a Mask, a Couple of Tritons and Two Children, 1549, Engraving, New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, 22.41.2
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Figure 17.
Attributed to Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Grotesque wall painting, 1582 or later, Hall of the Strasbourg masons, Musée de l'Œuvre Notre-Dame (former Frauenhaus), Strasbourg [photo by the author]
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Figure 18.
Attributed to Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Canephore candelabra, 1582 or later, Hall of the Strasbourg masons, Musée de l'Œuvre Notre-Dame (former Frauenhaus), Strasbourg [photo by the author]
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Figure 19.
M. Borde, Design after a wall painting for the hall of the Strasbourg masons attributed to Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, circa 1890, Musée de l'Œuvre Notre-Dame, Inv. N° 3453_mb
Figure 20.
Hans Thoman Uhlberger, Superimposed capitals and pier, 1579-1582, Hall of the Strasbourg masons, Musée de l'Œuvre Notre-Dame, Strasbourg [photo by the author]
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Figure 1.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Etched illustration to Dietterlin’s ARCHITECKTVRA und Aussenbeilung der V. SeuIh. Das Erst Buch. (Stuttgart: s.n., 1593), Stuttgart, Staatsgalerie Stuttgart, Graphische Sammlung, Kasten 206/7, Pl. 2.
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Figure 2.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Etched illustration to Dietterlin’s ARCHITECKTVRA und Aussenbeilung der V. SeuIh. Das Erst Buch. (Stuttgart: s.n., 1593), Stuttgart, Staatsgalerie Stuttgart, Graphische Sammlung, Kasten 206/7, Pl. 3.
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Figure 3.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Design for a Façade Painting with an Allegory of Commerce, 1580s or later, Quill with black ink and brush with gold, yellow, maroon, red, green, blue, purple and grey wash with white heightening on cream laid paper, 26.7 x 29.2 cm, Paris, Musée du Louvre, Collection Rothschild, Inv. 3399 DR.
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Figure 4.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Etched illustration to Dietterlin’s ARCHITECKTVRA und Aussenbeilung der V. SeuIh. Das Erst Buch. (Stuttgart: s.n., 1593), Stuttgart, Staatsgalerie Stuttgart, Graphische Sammlung, Kasten 206/7, Pl. 38.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 5.
Unknown artist after Hans Holbein the Younger, Drawing of lateral façade of Haus zum Tanz, circa 1520-1538, Pen and ink with watercolor on laid paper, Basel, Kunstmuseum Basel, Inv.-Nr. 1955. 144.2
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Figure 6.
Albrecht Dürer, Woodcut illustration to Dürer’s Underweysung der messung… (Nuremberg: s.n., 1525), Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Rar. 611, fol. Gvi
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Figure 13.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Etched illustration to Dietterlin’s *ARCHITECTVR A und Aüsstheilung der V. Seüln. Das Erst Buch.* (Stuttgart: s.n., 1593), Stuttgart, Staatsgalerie Stuttgart, Graphische Sammlung, Kasten 206/7, Pl. 25.

Figure 14.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Etched illustration to Dietterlin’s *ARCHITECTVR A und Aüsstheilung der V. Seüln. Das Erst Buch.* (Stuttgart: s.n., 1593), Stuttgart, Staatsgalerie Stuttgart, Graphische Sammlung, Kasten 206/7, Pl. 14.

Figure 15.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Design for *Erst Buch Plate 14*, 1593 or earlier, Quill with black-brown ink and brush with grey, dark grey, light brown and light green wash and white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper, 25.35 x 17.71 cm, Dresden, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 74.

Figure 16.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Etched illustration to Dietterlin’s *ARCHITECTVR von Portalen vnnd Thürgerichten mancherley arten. Das Annder Büch* (Strasbourg: Bernhard Jobin’s heirs, 1594), Einsiedeln, Bibliothek Werner Oechslin, A 18a, Pl. 15.

Figure 17.

Figure 18.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Design for *Erst Buch Plate 13[III. IONICA].*, 1593 or earlier, Quill with black-brown ink and brush with brown, dark brown, grey, and dark grey wash on heavy, dark brown, laid paper, mounted on cream paper, 25.60 x 12.2 cm, Dresden, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 73.
Figure 19.

Figure 20.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, *Design for Erst Buch Plate 19, [III CORINTHIA],* 1593 or earlier, Quill with black ink and brush with brown, dark brown, and grey-blue wash on heavy, dark brown, laid paper, mounted on heavy cream paper, 25.60 x 12.21 cm, Dresden, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 110

Figure 21.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, *III CORINTHIA*, Etched illustration to Dietterlin’ *ARCHITECTVRA und Aüsstheilung der V. Seüln. Das Erst Buch.* (Stuttgart: s.n., 1593), Stuttgart, Staatsgalerie Stuttgart, Graphische Sammlung, Kasten 206/7, Pl. 19

Figure 22.
After Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, *Modified Copy after Erst Buch Pl. 19,* 1593 or later, Graphite and quill with brown ink on laid paper, 30.5 x 20.5 cm, Lemgo, Weserrenaissance-Museum Schloß Brake, Inv. Nr. S 56/87

Figure 23.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, *Design for Annder Buch Plate 21, Version I,* 1594 or earlier, Graphite and black chalk and quill with black ink and brush with grey-blue, dark grey, and light green wash on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper, 26.10 x 18.10 cm, Dresden, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 51

Figure 24.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, *Design for Annder Buch Plate 21, Version II,* 1594 or earlier, Black chalk and quill with black and brown ink and brush with grey, dark grey, and light green wash and white heightening on off-white, laid paper, mounted on heavy cream paper, 26.10 x 18.10 cm, Dresden, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 50
Figure 25.
Jacques I. Androuet Du Cerceau, Etched illustration to Du Cerceau’s  *SECOND LIVRE D’ARCHITECTURE* (Paris: André Wechel, 1561), Paris, École nationale supérieure des beaux-arts Les 1598, Pl. 56

Figure 26.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Etched illustration to Dietterlin’s  *ARCHITECTVRA von Außtheilung, Symmetria und Proportion der Fünff Seulen*… (Nuremberg: Hubrecht and Balthasar Caymox, 1598), Zurich, Zentralbibliothek, Alte Drucke, Rx 12: c,2 | F, Pl. 171

Figure 27.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Etched illustration to Dietterlin’s  *ARCHITECTVRA von Außtheilung, Symm=etria und Proportion der Fünff Seulen*… (Nuremberg: Hubrecht and Balthasar Caymox, 1598), Zurich, Zentralbibliothek Zürich, Alte Drucke, Rx 12: c,2 | F, Pl. 147

Figure 28.
Gabriel Krammer,  *CORINTIA*, Etched illustration to  *SCHWEIFF BVechlein*… (Prague: Gabriel Krammer, 1602), fol. 18, New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, 28.44.18

Figure 29.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Etched illustration to Dietterlin’s  *ARCHITECTVRA von Außtheilung, Symm=etria und Proportion der Fünff Seulen*… (Nuremberg: Hubrecht and Balthasar Caymox, 1598), Zurich, Zentralbibliothek Zürich, Alte Drucke, Rx 12: c,2 | F, Pl. 79

Figure 30.

Figure 31.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder,  *Design for 1598 Architectura Plates 204 and 205*, 1598 or earlier, Quill with black ink and brush with grey-black wash on off-white, laid paper, 54.7 x 36.0 cm, Berlin, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Kunstbibliothek, HdZ 769
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Figures 32a & 32b.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Etched illustration to Dietterlin’s ARCHITEKTURA von
Außtheilung, Symmetria und Proportion der Fünff Seulen… (Nuremberg: Hubrecht and Balthasar
Caymox, 1598), Heidelberg, Universitätsbibliothek Heidelberg, 83 B 945 RES, Pls. 204 &
205 (superimposed)
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Figure 33.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Etched illustration to Dietterlin’s ARCHITEKTURA von
Außtheilung, Symmetria und Proportion der Fünff Seulen… (Nuremberg: Hubrecht and Balthasar
Caymox, 1598), Zurich, Zentralbibliothek Zürich, Alte Drucke, Rx 12: c,2 | F, Pl. 105
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Figure 1.
Jost Amman (etcher) after Wenzel Jamnitzer (inventor), Title Page, Etched illustration to Jamnitzer’s PER\textsc{spect}iv\textsc{a} \textsc{corporum regularium}..., Dresden, S\ä{c}chsische Landesbibliothek – Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Dresden, Optica.21
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Figure 2.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Title Page, Etched illustration to Dietterlin’s ARCHITECTV\textsc{RA} \textsc{von Außtheilung, Symm}etr\textsc{i}a und Propor\textsc{tion der Fünff Seulen…} (S.l.: s.n., 1598), Nuremberg, Germanisches Nationalmuseum, K 481
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Figure 3.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Etched illustration to Dietterlin’s ARCHITECTV\textsc{RA} \textsc{und Aüsstheilung der V. Seüln. Das Erst Buch} (Stuttgart: s.n., 1593), Stuttgart, Staatsgalerie Stuttgart, Graphische Sammlung, Kasten 206/7, Pl. 18 [detail]
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Figure 4.
Albrecht Dürer, \textit{Melencolia I}, 1514, Engraving, New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, 43.106.1 [detail]
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Figure 5.
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Figure 6.
Matthäus Greuter (engraver) after Wendel Dietterlin the Elder (inventor), \textit{The Ascent of Elijah} (second state), after 1589, Engraving, Frankfurt am Main, Städel Museum, Graphische Sammlung, N. 15004

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 7.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, \textit{The Fall of Man} (first state), 1590, Etching, London, British Museum, 1884,0412.4
This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 8.
Hanns Lautensack, *The Good Samaritan*, 1566, Etching, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, Inv.-Nr. 73C431

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 9.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 10.
Albrecht Dürer, *Melencolia I.*, 1514, Engraving, New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, 43.106.1

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 11.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, *The Story of Abraham*, circa 1590-1592, middle field: Quill with black and green ink and brush with grey and red wash with white heightening and gold highlights on laid paper prepared with a grey wash; outer fields: Quill with black-brown and green ink and brush with grey-blue wash, with white heightening and gold highlights on laid paper prepared with a blue wash; frames: [partially attached]: Quill with dark brown ink on laid paper prepared with a red wash; 42.8 x 32.1 cm, Basel, Kunstmuseum Basel, Kupferstichkabinett, Inv.-Nr. 1904.37

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 12.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, *The Story of Jacob and Joseph in Egypt*, circa 1590-1592, middle field: Quill with black ink, brush with black, grey-blue, brown, red-brown, and yellow wash with white and gold leaf heightening on yellow, prepared, laid paper; outer fields: Quill with black ink, reed with dark green ink, brush with blue and grey, blue-grey, and red wash with white and gold leaf heightening on blue, prepared, laid paper, 43.2 x 32.9 cm, Basel, Kunstmuseum Basel, Kupferstichkabinett, Inv.-Nr. 1904.38

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 13.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, *The Last Judgment*, 1590, Quill with black and dark brown ink with grey and black wash, with white heightening and gold leaf on brown, laid paper, expanded with black-painted framing edges, 46.8 x 34.4 cm, Stuttgart, Staatsgalerie Stuttgart, Graphische Sammlung, Inv.-Nr. C 1967/GVL 200
Figure 14.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, *The Story of Abraham*, circa 1590-1592, Etching with black and red ink on three sheets of off-white, laid paper, Karlsruhe, Staatliche Kunsthalle Karlsruhe, Kupferstichkabinett, Inv.-Nr.: 1965-42

These images have been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figures 15a & 15b.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, framing strips for *The Story of Abraham*, 1592, Etching with black ink, Berlin, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Kupferstichkabinett, Inv.-Nrs. 533-82 and 534-82

These images have been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 16.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, *Family Tree of Duke Ludwig of Württemberg*, circa 1596, four-plate etching, 68.2 x 90.6 cm, Vienna, Albertina Museum, Graphische Sammlung, DIII, 1 fols. 3 and 4

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 17.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 18.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 19.
Albrecht Dürer, *Adam and Eve*, 1504, Engraving (fourth state), New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, 19.73.1

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 20.

421
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Figures 21a & 21b.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Recto: Design for an Elaborate Fountain Surmounted by a Statue of St. Christopher; Verso: Studies of Architectural Details; Verso: Sketch of a Tabernacle (?) with Studies of Architectural Details, circa 1594-1598, Recto: Pen and black ink, brush and grey wash on cream laid paper; Verso: Black chalk and pen and black ink on cream laid paper, 24.5 x 17.9 cm, New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2006.89

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 22.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Design for Erst Buch Plate 18, Version I, 1593 or earlier, Quill with brown-black ink and brush with grey, dark grey, and grey-brown wash and white heightening over graphite and black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper, 25.10 x 17.10 cm, Dresden, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 78

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 23.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Design for Erst Buch Plate 18, Version II, 1593 or earlier, Graphite and quill with black-brown ink and brush with brown and gray wash and white heightening on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper, 25.71 x 17.90 cm, Dresden, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 79

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 24.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Etched illustration to Dietterlin’ ARCHITECTVRA und Aüsstbeilung der V. Seüln. Das Erst Buch. (Stuttgart: s.n., 1593), Stuttgart, Staatsgalerie Stuttgart, Graphische Sammlung, Kasten 206/7, Pl. 18

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 25.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Etched illustration to Dietterlin’s ARCHITECTVRA und Aüsstbeilung der V. Seüln. Das Erst Buch. (Stuttgart: s.n., 1593), Stuttgart, Staatsgalerie Stuttgart, Graphische Sammlung, Kasten 206/7, Pl. 25.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 26.
Jan van Doetechum the Elder (etcher) after Hans Vredeman de Vries (inventor), Plate from Vredeman’s Scenographiae..., 1560, Etching, New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2012.136.569.1
Figure 27.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Etched illustration to Dietterlin’s *ARCHITECTVRA und Aüsstheilung der V. Seüln. Das Erst Buch.* (Stuttgart: s.n., 1593), Stuttgart, Staatsgalerie Stuttgart, Graphische Sammlung, Kasten 206/7, Pl. 25 [detail]

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 28.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Etched illustration to Dietterlin’s *ARCHITECTVR von Portalen vnnnd Thürgerichten mancherley arten. Das Annder Büch* (Strasbourg: Bernhard Jobin’s heirs, 1594), Einsiedeln, Bibliothek Werner Oechslin, A 18a, Pl. 30.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 29.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, *Design for Annder Buch Plate 30*, 1594 or earlier, Quill with black-brown ink and brush with gray wash over graphite and black chalk on laid paper, mounted on laid paper, 25.80 x 18.40 cm, Dresden, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 88

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 30.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Etched illustration to Dietterlin’s *ARCHITECTVRA von Aüßtheilung, Symm=etria und Proportion der Fünff Seülen…* (Nuremberg: Hubrecht and Balthasar Caymox, 1598), Zurich, Zentralbibliothek Zürich, Alte Drucke, Rx 12: c,2 |F, Pl. 80

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 31.
Daniel II. Meyer after Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Etched illustration to Meyer’s *Architectura von Aüßtheilung der funff Seülen…* (Frankfurt am Main: Johann and Theodor de Bry, 1612), Nuremberg, Germanisches Nationalmuseum, K484 f 4°, p. 67
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Figure 1.
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Figure 2.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Etched illustration to Dietterlin’s ARCHITECTVR von Portalen vnnd Tbürgerichten maucherley arten. Das Annder Bűch (Strasbourg: Bernhard Jobin’s heirs, 1594), Stuttgart, Staatsgalerie Stuttgart, Graphische Sammlung, Kasten 206/7, Pl. 23

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 3.
Jan van Doetechum the Elder and Lucas van Doetechum (etchers) after Hans Vredeman de Vries (inventor), Ornamental figures, Etching from CARYATIDVM (VVLGVS TERMAS VOCAT) … (Antwerp: Gerard de Jode, circa 1565), Sheet: 15.9 x 23.2 cm, Plate: 15.6 x 22.9 cm., Munich, Staatliche Graphische Sammlung München, Inv. 60678 D, Pl. 10.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 4.
Hans Schroer the Elder of Lüttich, Termen grotesques, 1562, Sgraffito, West wing courtyard, Neuburg Castle, Neuburg an der Donau [photo by the author]

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 5.
Attributed to Virgil Solis, Woodcut illustration to Walther Hermann Ryff’s Vitruvius Teutsch… (Nuremberg: Johannes Petreius, 1548), Princeton, NJ, Marquand Library of Art and Archaeology, Princeton University, NA310 .V86q, fol. XV
Figure 6. Attributed to Hermann Wulff, residence of Hermann Kruwel (so-called “Hexenbürgermeisterhaus”), 1568-1571, Lemgo [photo by the author]

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 7. Sebastiano Serlio, *Synoptic Table of the Orders*, Woodcut illustration to Serlio’s *REGOLE GENERALI DI ARCHITETTURA SOPRA LE CINQUE MANIERE DE GLIEDIFICI, CIOE, THOSCANO, DORICO, IONICO, CORINTHIO, ET COMPOSITO, CON GLIESEMPI DELL’ANTICITÀ, CHE, PER LA MAGIOR PARTE CONCORDANO CON LA DOTTRINA DI VITRUVIO* (Venice: Francesco Marcolini Da Forli, 1537), Princeton, NJ, Marquand Library of Art and Archaeology, Princeton University, NA 2510 .S51q, fol. VI'

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 8. Hans Blum, *Ionica I.*, Woodcut illustration to Blum’s *Von den fünf Sülén...* (Zurich: Christoph Froschauer, 1550), Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Res/2 A.civ. 24 d, fol. 22'
Figure 9.
Jan van Doetechum the Elder and Lucas van Doetechum (etchers) after Hans Vredeman de Vries (inventor), *Termen and canephore*, Etching from *CARYATIDVM (VVLGV'S TERMAS VOCAT) ...* (Antwerp: Gerard de Jode, circa 1565), Sheet: 15.9 x 23.2 cm, Plate: 15.6 x 22.9 cm, Munich, Staatliche Graphische Sammlung München, Inv. 60678 D, Pl. 1

Figure 10.
Jan van Doetechum the Elder and Lucas van Doetechum (etchers) after Hans Vredeman de Vries (inventor), *Termen and canephore*, Etching from *CARYATIDVM (VVLGV'S TERMAS VOCAT) ...* (Antwerp: Gerard de Jode, c. 1565), Sheet: 15.9 x 23.2 cm, Plate: 15.6 x 22.9 cm, Munich, Staatliche Graphische Sammlung München, Inv. 60678 D, Pl. 14

Figure 11.
Paul Francke, South portal, Schola Julia, 1577-1578, Helmstedt [photo by the author]

Figure 12.
Jan van Doetechum the Elder and Lucas van Doetechum (etchers) after Hans Vredeman de Vries (inventor), *COMPOSITA*, Etched illustration to Vredeman's *ARCHITECTVRA, Oder Bauung der Antiquen aus dem Vitruvius ...* (Antwerp: Gerard de Jode, 1577), Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Res/2 A.civ. 251, fol. 23
This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 13.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, III IONICA, Etched illustration to Dietterlin’s ARCHITECTVRA und Aüßtheilung der V. Seüln. Das Erst Buch. (Stuttgart: s.n., 1593), Stuttgart, Staatsgalerie Stuttgart, Graphische Sammlung, Kasten 206/7, Pl. 13

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 14.
John Shute, IONICA, Etched illustration to Shute’s The First and Chief Groundes of Architecture… (London: Thomas Marshe 1563), Cambridge, Cambridge University Library, Syn3.56.1, facing fol. viii

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 15.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, I. TV3CANA, Etched illustration to Dietterlin’s ARCHITECTVRA und Aüßtheilung der V. Seüln. Das Erst Buch. (Stuttgart: s.n., 1593), Stuttgart, Staatsgalerie Stuttgart, Graphische Sammlung, Kasten 206/7, Pl. 1

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 16.
Giuseppe Arcimboldo, Emperor Rudolf II of Habsburg as Vertumnus, 1590, Oil on panel, Skokloster, Skokloster Castle, Inv. no. 11615

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 17.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Etched illustration to Dietterlin’s ARCHITECTVRA und Aüßtheilung der V. Seüln. Das Annder Buch. (Strasbourg: Bernhard Jobin’s heirs, 1594), Stuttgart, Staatsgalerie Stuttgart, Graphische Sammlung, Kasten 206/7, Pl. 57

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 18.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Etched illustration to Dietterlin’s ARCHITECTVR von Portalen vnnd Thürgerichten mancherley arten. Das Annder Bäćh (Strasbourg: Bernhard Jobin’s heirs, 1594), Stuttgart, Staatsgalerie Stuttgart, Graphische Sammlung, Kasten 206/7, Pl. 57
Figure 19.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Etched illustration to Dietterlin’s *ARCHITECTVR von Portalen vnnnd Thürgerichten mancherley arten. Das Annder Büch* (Strasbourg: Bernhard Jobin’s heirs, 1594), Stuttgart, Staatsgalerie Stuttgart, Graphische Sammlung, Kasten 206/7, Pl. 9

Figure 20a.
Unknown architect, Christoph Jelin (sculpture), Lower Castle Portal, Schloss Hohentübingen, circa 1604-1608, Tübingen [photo by the author]

Figure 20b.
Christoph Jelin, *Gunman*, circa 1604-1608, Lower Castle Portal, Schloss Hohentübingen, Tübingen [photo by the author]
Figure 21.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Etched illustration to Dietterlin’s ARCHITECTVR von Portalen vnnd Thürgerichen mancherley arten. Das Annder Büch (Strasbourg: Bernhard Jobin’s heirs, 1594), Einsiedeln, Bibliothek Werner Oechslin, A 18a, Pl. 21

Figure 22.
Gabriel Krammer, IONICA IIII, 1599, Etched illustration to Krammer’s ARCHITECTVR A VON DEN FVNF SEVLEN … (Prague: s.n., 1600), Princeton, NJ, Marquand Library of Art and Archaeology, Princeton University, NA2810 .K86q, p. 23

Figure 23.
Giovanni Maria Filippi, Town Hall [detail: window on west façade], 1617-1619, Small Side, Prague [photo by the author]

Figure 24.
Daniel II. Meyer, Etched illustration to Meyer’s ARCHITECTVR A… (Frankfurt am Main: Johann Theodor de Bry and Johann Israel de Bry, 1609), Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Res/2 A.civ. 120, fol. 48r
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Figure 1.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Etched illustration to Dietterlin’s ARCHITECTVR A und Aussenbeilung der V. Säulen. Das Erst Buch. (Stuttgart: s.n., 1593), Stuttgart, Staatsgalerie Stuttgart, Graphische Sammlung, Kasten 206/7, Pl. 35

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 2.
Christoph Jamnitzer, Der Fadeschisch Radesco Baum..., Etched illustration to Jamnitzer’s Neuw Grottefsken Buch... (Nuremberg: Christoph Jamnitzer, 1610), Braunschweig, Herzog Anton-Ulrich Museum, Inv. Nr. 8108

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 3.
Jan van Doetechum the Elder and Lucas van Doetecum (etchers) after Cornelis II. Floris (inventor), Auricular Cartouche with Figures within a Strapwork Frame from Veederey Veranderinge van grotissen ende Comptimenten. Libro Primo; Etching, New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, Purchase, Anne and Carl Stern Gift, 1959, 59.642.32

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 4.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Etched illustration to Dietterlin’s ARCHITECTVR A von Aussenbeilung. Symmetry and Proportion of the Five Columns... (Nuremberg; Hubrecht and Balthasar Caymox, 1598), Zurich, Zentralbibliothek Zürich, Alte Drucke, Rx 12: c,2 | F, Pl. 108

These images have been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figures 5a & 5b.
Heinrich Vogtherr the Elder, Anathomia oder abconterfettung einer Weibs leib/ wie er inwendig gestaltet ist [left]; Anathomia oder abconterfettung eines Mans leib / wie er inwendig gestaltet ist [right]; (Strasbourg: Jacob Fröhlich, 1544) [first edition Strasbourg, 1538-39], Woodcuts printed from 24 blocks, cut and constructed, with hand-coloring and letterpress, Boston, Boston Medical Library in the Francis A. Countway Library of Medicine, ff QM33.A16.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 6.
Attributed to Jan Stephan Kalkar, OCTAVA MVSCI VLOVM TABVLA, Woodcut illustration to Andreas Vesalius’s De humani corporis fabrica (Basel: Johannes Oporini, 1543), Augsburg, Staats- und Stadtbibliothek 2 Med 193, p. 192.
Figure 7.
After Leonhard Fuchs, Woodcut illustration to Walther Hermann Ryff’s *Vitruvius Tentsch*… (Nuremberg: Johannes Petreius, 1548), Heidelberg, Universitätsbibliothek Heidelberg, T 2017 RES, fol. CXXXVv

Figure 8.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Etched illustration to Dietterlin’s *ARCHITECTVR von Portalen vnd Thürgerichten mancherley arten. Das Annder Büch* (Strasbourg: Bernhard Jobin’s heirs, 1594), Stuttgart, Staatsgalerie Stuttgart, Graphische Sammlung, Kasten 206/7, Pl. 37

Figure 9.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Etched illustration to Dietterlin’s *ARCHITECTVRA von Anßtheilung, Symm= etria und Proportion der Finff Seulen*, (Nuremberg: Hubrecht and Balthasar Caymox, 1598), Zurich, Zentralbibliothek Zürich, Alte Drucke, Rx 12: c,2 |F, Pl. 90

Figures 10a. & 10b.
Anonymous sculptor, *Epitaph for Albrecht von Haspergen*, 1625, Sankt Petri, Bremen [photo by the author]

Figure 11.
Rutger Kasemann, Etched illustration to Kasemann’s *ARCHITECTVR…* (Cologne: Hermann Esser, 1630), Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Cod. icon. 187 c, Pl. 21 [BSB album p. 50]

Figure 12.
Adam van Vianen (I), *Lidded ewer for the Amsterdam Goldsmith’s Guild*, 1614, h 25.0 cm × w 14.0 cm × d 9.0 cm × w 910.0 gr, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, BK-1976-75, [image: https://www.rijksmuseum.nl/en/collection/BK-1976-75]

Figure 13.
Wendel Dietterlin the Younger, *Grotesque*, Etching, Strasbourg, Musées de la Ville de Strasbourg, Cabinet des Estampes et des Dessins, Inv. Nr. 77.009.0.222, Pl. 12
Figure 14.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Etched illustration to Dietterlin’s ARCHITECTVRA von Außtheilung, Symm=etria und Proportion der Fünff Seulen… (Nuremberg: Hubrecht and Balthasar Caymox, 1598), Zurich, Zentralbibliothek Zürich, Alte Drucke, Rx 12: c,2 | F, Pl. 199

Figure 15.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Etched illustration to Dietterlin’s ARCHITECTVRA von Außtheilung, Symm=etria und Proportion der Fünff Seulen… (Nuremberg: Hubrecht and Balthasar Caymox, 1598), Zurich, Zentralbibliothek Zürich, Alte Drucke, Rx 12: c,2 | F, Pl. 127
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Figure 1a.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, The Raising of Lazarus, 1582, Oil on fir wood panel, 105 x 83.8 cm, Karlsruhe, Staatliche Kunsthalle Karlsruhe, Inv.-Nr. 2181

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 1b.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, The Raising of Lazarus, 1582, Oil on fir wood panel, Karlsruhe, Staatliche Kunsthalle Karlsruhe, Inv.-Nr. 2181 [detail]

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 2.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Design for a Façade Painting with Nemesis or Fortune, Quill with black ink and brush with gold, maroon, green, blue, and grey wash with white heightening on cream laid paper, 1580s or later, 26.5 x 27.5 cm, Paris, Musée du Louvre, Collection Rothschild, Inv. 3398 DR

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 3.
Albrecht Dürer, Nemesis (The Great Fortune), 1502, Engraving, second state of two, New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, 19.73.89

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 4.
South German, Cabinet with polychrome inlay [closed state], circa 1600, wood and marquetry, Cologne, Museum für Angewandte Kunst, Inv. Nr. A 822 [image: www.bildindex.de]

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 5.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Etched illustration to Dietterlin’s ARCHITECVR von Portalen vund Thürgerichten mancherley arten. Das Annder Bűch (Strasbourg: Bernhard Jobin’s heirs, 1594), Einsiedeln, Bibliothek Werner Oechslin, A 18a, Pl. 49

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 6.
Jacob Guckeisen (etcher) after Veit Eck (inventor), Title Page, Etched illustration to Eck and Guckeisen’s Kunstbüchlein, Darin etliche Architecthischer Portalen, Epitaphien, Caminen, Schweiffen vnd außzügen… (Strasbourg: Jost Martin, 1596), Einsiedeln, Werner Oechslin, EBI01-6123474
This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 7.
Jacob Guckeisen (etcher) after Veit Eck (inventor), Etched illustration to Eck and Guckeisen’s *Kunstbüchlein, Darin etliche Architectischer Portalen, Epitaphien, Caminen, Schweifffen vnd auszuggen...* (Strasbourg: Jost Martin, 1596), Einsiedeln, Bibliothek Werner Oechslin, EBl01-6123474, Pl. 13

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 8.
Bartli Hetzer, *Portal for the Basel Zunft zu Spinnwettern* [detail], 1593, Basel, Historical Museum [Photo from Lévy-Coblentz, p. 184]

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 9.
Jacob Guckeisen (etcher) after Veit Eck (inventor), Etched illustration to Eck and Guckeisen’s *Etliche Architectischer Portalen, Epitapien, Caminen, vnd Schweyffen...* (Cologne: Johann Bussemacher, 1596), Zurich, Zentralbibliothek Zürich, Alte Drucke, Rx 12: c | F, Pl. 18

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 10.
Jacques I. Androuet Du Cerceau, Etched illustration to Du Cerceau’s *Second livre d’architecture...* (Paris: André Wechel, 1561), Paris, École nationale supérieure des beaux-arts, Les 1598, second plate

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figures 11a & 11b.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Etched illustration to Dietterlin’s *ARCHITECVRA von Ausbtheilung, Symm= etria und Proportion der Finff Seulen...* (Nuremberg: Hubrecht and Balthasar Caymox, 1598), Braunschweig, Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum, WDietterlin d.Ä AB 2.190 (ZL 87/6029), Pls. 202 & 203 (superimposed)

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 12.
Daniel Hopfer, *Large Altar Tabernacle with the Holy Kinship, the Crucifixion, and the Resurrection,* circa 1518, Etching on two sheets of paper, Munich, Staatliche Graphische Sammlung München, Inv. Nr. 15873D
Figure 13.
Jörg Zürn, High Altar, 1613-1616, Limewood, Münster, Überlingen [photo from von Manteuffel, p. 191]

Figure 14.
Tobias Stimmer, façade of Haus zum Ritter, 1568-1570, Schaffhausen [photo by author]

Figure 15.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Etched illustration to Dietterlin’s ARCHITECTVRA von Auftheilung, Symm= etria und Proportion der Fünff Seulen… (Nuremberg: Hubrecht and Balthasar Caymox, 1598), Zurich, Zentralbibliothek Zürich, Alte Drucke, Rx 12: c,2 | F, Pl. 145
Figure 16.
Hans Schoch (architect) and Sebastian Götz (sculptor), *Freidrichsbau* north façade [detail], 1601-1607, Heidelberg Castle, Heidelberg [photo by author]

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

Figure 17.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Etched illustration to Dietterlin’s *ARCHITECTVRÄ von Auftheilung, Symm= etria und Proportion der Fünff Seulen…* (Nuremberg: Hubrecht and Balthasar Caymox, 1598), Zurich, Zentralbibliothek Zürich, Alte Drucke, Rx 12: c.2 | F, Pl. 104
Figure 18.
Tobias Schmid, façade of *Haus zum weissen Adler*, 1522/23, Stein am Rhein [photo by author]

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

Figure 19.

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

Figure 20.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Etched illustration to Dietterlin’s *ARCHITECTVRA von Aufftheilung, Symmetry et Proportion der Fünff Seulen…* (Nuremberg: Hubrecht and Balthasar Caymox, 1598), Zurich, Zentralbibliothek Zürich, Alte Drucke, Rx 12: c.2 | F, Pl. 147

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

Figure 21.
Daniel II. Meyer, Etched illustration to Meyer’s *ARCHITECTVRA…* (Frankfurt am Main: Johann Theodor de Bry and Johann Israel de Bry, 1609), Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Res/2 A.civ. 120, Pl. 7
Figure 22.
Daniel II. Meyer, Etched illustration to Meyer’s *ARCHITECHTVRA*… (Frankfurt am Main: Johann Theodor de Bry and Johann Israel de Bry, 1609), Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Res/2 A.civ. 120, Pl. 2

Figure 23.
Daniel II. Meyer after Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Etched illustration to Meyer’s *Architectura von Außtheylung der fünff Seülen…* (Frankfurt am Main: Johann and Theodor de Bry, 1612), Los Angeles, Getty Research Institute Library, NA2841.M49 1612, Pl. 13

Figure 24.
Attributed to Paul Juvenal the Elder, *Design for Meierisches Haus, Hauptmarkt 26, Nuremberg*, 1614 or later, Quill with brown ink and wash, 48.2 x 82 cm, Nuremberg, Germanisches Nationalmuseum, Inv.-Nr. HZ 3398

Figure 25.
Friedrich Brentel, *True counterfeit image of the room in the princely pleasure palace in Stuttgart*, Engraving, 1619, Stuttgart, Staatsgalerie Stuttgart, Graphische Sammlung, Inv.-Nr. A 31982

Figure 26.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, *The Last Judgment*, 1590, Quill with black and dark brown ink with grey and black wash, with white heightening and gold leaf on brown laid paper expanded with black-painted framing edges, 46.8 cm x 34.4 cm, Stuttgart, Staatsgalerie Stuttgart, Graphische Sammlung, Inv.-Nr. C 1967 / GVL 200

Figure 27.
Attributed to Georg Pencz, *Apollo and Phaeton* from *The Fall of Phaeton*, Hirsvogelsaal, circa 1534, Tucherschloss, Nuremberg [photo by author]

Figure 28.
Albrecht Dürer, *Artist Sketching a Reclining Nude Woman*, circa 1525, Woodcut illustration to Dürer’s *Underweysung der messung mit dem Zirckel und Richtscheydt*, 2nd ed. (Nuremberg, Hieronymus Andreae, 1538), Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek Bamberg, 22/JH.Ma.f.4, final plate
Figure 29.
Bartholomäus Dietterlin (etcher) after Hilarius Dietterlin (draftsman) and Wendel Dietterlin the Elder (inventor), *The Truth Triumphant*, Etching, Berlin, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Kupferstichkabinett, Inv.-Nr. 620-113

Figure 30.

Figure 31.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Etched illustration to Dietterlin’s *ARCHITECTVRA von Portalen vnn Thürgerichten mancherley arten. Das Annder Büch* (Strasbourg: Bernhard Jobin’s heirs, 1594), Einsiedeln, Bibliothek Werner Oechslin, A 18a, Pl. 14

Figure 32.
Hans Baldung (called Grien), *Bewitched Groom*, circa 1544, Woodcut, New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, Rogers Fund, 1917, 17.42.25

Figure 33.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Design for a Wall Painting with the Adoration of the Lamb, 1590s, Quill with black ink and brush with dark grey and grey wash with white heightening over black chalk on heavy, cream laid paper mounted on heavy cream paper, 20.35 x 30.87 cm, Dresden, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 166

Figure 34.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Etched illustration to Dietterlin’s *ARCHITECTVRA von Aufftheilung, Symmetry und Proportion der Fünff Seulen…* (Nuremberg: Hubrecht and Balthasar Caymox, 1598), Zurich, Zentralbibliothek Zürich, Alte Drucke, Rx 12: c.2 | F, Pl. 146
Conclusion Figures
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Figure 1.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Title Page [detail], Etched illustration to Dietterlin’s ARCHITECTVR A von Auftheilung, Symmm= etria und Proportion der Fünff Seulen… (S.l.: s.n, 1598), Nuremberg, Germanisches Nationalmuseum, K 481

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 2.
After Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Engraved illustration to Hans Blum, Description des cinq ordres de colonnes… / Beschryvinghe van de vijf columnen van architecture… (Amsterdam: Claes Jansz. Visscher, 1623), Oxford, Bodleian Library, Antiq.c.N.4 (4), under “TVSCANA I.”

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 3.
Constantino de Vasconcelos and Manuel de Escobar, portal, San Francisco, 1657-74, Lima [photo from Dorta, lamina 3]

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 4.
Lorenzo Rodríguez, West façade, Sagrario Metropolitano, 1768, Mexico City [photo from Donahue-Wallace, p. 168]

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 5.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Etched illustration to Dietterlin’s ARCHITECTVR A von Auftheilung, Symmm= etria und Proportion der Fünff Seulen… (Nuremberg: Balthasar Caymox, 1598), Zurich, Zentralbibliothek Zürich, Alte Drucke, Rx 12: c,2 | F, Pl. 200

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 6.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Title Page, Etched illustration to Dietterlin’s ARCHITECTVR von Portalen vnd Thürgerichten mancherley arten. Das Annder Bűch (Strasbourg: Bernhard Jobin’s heirs, 1594), Stuttgart, Staatsgalerie Stuttgart, Graphische Sammlung, Kasten 206/7
This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 7.
Aegidius Sadeler II. (engraver) after a lost drawing by Hans van Aachen based on a scheme by Joris Hoefnagel, CVRSVIS/Hermathena, Engraving and etching, circa 1590, Sheet and Plate: 36.2 x 27.2 cm, Munich, Staatliche Graphische Sammlung München, Inv. 65245 D

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 8.
Aegidius Sadeler II. (engraver) after Hans von Aachen (inventor), Athena Introducing Painting to the Liberal Arts, Cologne, Wallraf-Richartz-Museum/Fondation Corboud, Graphische Sammlung

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 9.
Henning Hasemann, SYNOPSIS ARCHITECTONICAE Oder: Summarischer Begriff der Baw=Kunst nach ihrem füglichen Methodo mit angelegenem Fleiße zusammengetragen... (Frankfurt am Main: Caspar Rötel, 1626), Den Haag, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, KW 582 C 70

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 10.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder (inventor), Bartholomäus Dietterlin (etcher), and Hilarius Dietterlin (printer), The Salvation of Mankind, Karlsruhe, Staatliche Kunsthalle Karlsruhe, Kupferstichkabinett, Inv.-Nr. I/58.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 11.
Gerard de Jode, Title Page, Etched illustration to Laurentius van Goidtsenhoven’s Μικροκόσμος. PARVVS MVNDVS (Antwerp: Gerard de Jode, 1579), Mannheim, Universitätsbibliothek, SH 052/047

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 12.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Etched illustration to Dietterlin’s ARCHITECTVRA von Auftheilung, Symm=etria und Proportion der Fünff Seulen… (Nuremberg: Hubrecht and Balthasar Caymox, 1598), Cologne, Wallraf-Richartz-Museum, Kupferstichkabinett, Inv.-Nr. 31707
Figure 13.
Hans Vredeman de Vries, RVYNE, Engraving from Theatrum Vitæ Humanae, 1577, London, British Museum, 1948,0410.4.166

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 14.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Design for Title Page, 1598 Architectura, 1598 or earlier, Quill with dark brown and black ink and brush with brown and yellow-brown wash and traces of white heightening over graphite on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream laid paper, sheet: 28.9 x 22.2 cm, drawing: 27.4 x 18.9 cm, Bonn, Bibliothek des Kunsthistorischen Instituts Bonn, no number, bound in JA 138/2 R
Appendix I:
Master List of Versions of the *Architectura*

1593

A


Place of Publication: Stuttgart

Year: 1593

Publisher: Wendel Dietterlin?

Dedication: Conrad Schloßberger

Pages: This version includes an etched title page, two-page dedication, list of terms, address to the reader, drafting the shaft and *entasis*, arrangement of the shaft, history of the Tuscan order, description of the Tuscan Order, history of the Doric Order, description of the Doric Order, history of the Ionic Order, description of the Ionic Order, history of the Corinthian Order, description of the Corinthian Order, history of the Composite Order, description of the Composite Order, a colophon, and thirty-eight etched plates.

Books: One

Ink: Black

Colophon: Ende des Ersten Buches. / Getruckt in der Fürstlichen Statt / Stuttgart, im Jar nach Christi Geburt, als man zalt / M.D. LXXXIII.

Language: German

Examples: Stuttgart, Staatsgalerie Stuttgart, Graphische Sammlung [no inv. number—stored in Kasten 206/7]; Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Res/2 A.civ. 58-1/2 [with *ex libris* from Bibliotheca Palatina]; Munich, Universitätsbibliothek, Technische Universität München, 4° 1436 RB 154/1; New York, Avery Architectural and Fine Arts Library, Columbia University, AA 557 D56 [bound with other copies of Dietterlin’s *Architectura* texts]


Notes: The Stuttgart copy lacks plates numbered 36 and 37. The Bayerische Staatsbibliothek (BSB) copy has two instances of the *Tuscan* plate and lacks plates numbered 35-37. The Technische Universität München (TU) copy lacks Plates 36 and 37. The numbers on Plates 7 and 14 of the TU and BSB copies are printed backwards. Pages in the BSB and TU examples also lack numbers. In other copies, these images are labeled 3, 4, and 35. Perhaps this is evidence of confusion about planned order of the plates during the early stages of production.

B

Title: *ARCHITECTVRA / De quinque Columnarum / Simmetrica distributione / et variis eorumdem orn/ / namentis / Liber I. / Per Vuindelinum / Dieterlin pictorem / Argentinensem. / MD XCIII. / Cum gratia & prini = / legio Cas: Maiestatis / ad decennium. / [Monogram]: WD / Profert, commutat, concludit / et omnia tempus.
Place of Publication: Strasbourg
Year: June 1593
Publisher: Bernhard Jobin’s heirs
Dedication: Conrad Schloßberger
Books: One
Ink: Red and Black
Colophon: FINIS LIBRI PRIMI. / EXCVDEBATVR / AGENTINAE / APVD
HAEREDES BERN- / HARDI JOBINI
Language: Latin and French
Examples: Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, 13 Geom. 2° [bound with Liber II.; New York, Avery Architectural and Fine Arts Library, Columbia University, AA 557 D56 [without colophon, bound with other copies of the Architectura]; and AA 557 D56 v. 1.

1594

A

Place of Publication: Strasbourg
Year: 1594
Publisher: Bernhard Jobin’s heirs
Dedication: Margrave Ernst Friedrich of Baden-Durlach
Pages: This version includes an etched title page, dedication, address to the reader, fifty-eight etched plates (including a one-page lesson on drafting the elevation of a portal, with printed text and an etching), and a colophon.
Books: One
Ink: Red and black
Language: German
Examples: Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Res/2 A.civ. 58-1/2; Einsiedeln, Bibliothek Werner Oechslin, A18a, 1116
Bibliography: von Heinecken IV (1790), 671; Le Blanc II (1856), 131; von Zahn (1863), 99-100 [as Ib]; Andresen (1865), 2:277; Schmitz (1939), 257, under no. 1941; Pirr (1940), 21; Hollstein VI (1959), 214, no. 17 [as edition 2]; Großmann (1997) 164; Irmscher (1999), 51.
Notes: Bayerische Staatsbibliothek example is missing the colophon, and its plates have been placed in a slightly different order and are re-numbered.

Place of Publication: Strasbourg

Year: 1594

Publisher: Bernhard Jobin’s heirs

Dedication: Margrave Ernst Friedrich of Baden-Durlach

Pages: This version includes an etched title page, dedication, address to the reader, fifty-eight etched plates (including a one-page lesson on drafting the elevation of a portal, with printed text and an etching), and a colophon.

Books: One

Ink: Black

Colophon: Gedruckt zu Straßburg, / bey Bernhardt Jobins Erben. / ANNO. / M.D. XCIIII.

Language: German

Examples: Stuttgart, Staatsgalerie Stuttgart, Graphische Sammlung [no inv. number—stored in Kasten 206/7]; Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, 13 Geom. 2° [bound with Liber I.]

Bibliography: von Heinecken IV (1790), 671; Le Blanc II (1856), 131; von Zahn (1863), 99-100 [as Ib]; Andresen (1865) 2:277; Schmitz (1939), 257, under no. 1941; Pirr (1940), 21; Hollstein VI (1959), 214, no. 17 [as edition 2]; Großmann (1997), 164; Irmscher (1999), 51.

---

Title: ARCHITECTVR / de / Postium seu / Portalium ornatu uario / LIBER II. / Authore / Vnendelino Diet= / terlin ciue e Pi= / ctore Argentensi. / M.D.XCIIII . / Cum gratia et Privilegio / Cæsareo ad decennium. / [Monogram]: WD / Prőfert, communat, concludit / et omnia tempus.

Place of Publication: Strasbourg

Year: 1594

Publisher: Likely Bernhard Jobin’s heirs

Dedication: Margrave Ernst Friedrich of Baden-Durlach

Pages: This version encompasses an etched title page, dedication, address to the reader, a two-page lesson on drafting the elevation of a portal that includes a page with printed text and an etching, and fifty-seven additional etched plates.

Books: One

Ink: Red and black

Colophon: No Colophon

Language: Latin and French

Examples: Nuremberg, Germanisches Nationalmuseum, LGA Gew Mus. 3391

Title: ARCHITECTVRA / de / Postium seu Portalium / ornatu vario. / LIBER II. / Authore / Vwendungo Diet= / terlin ciue e Pr= / ctore Argentensi. / M.D.X.CIII . / Cum gratia et Privilegio / Casareo ad deconnium. / [Monogram]: WD / Profert, commutat, concludit / et omnia tempus.

Place of Publication: Strasbourg

Year: 1595

Publisher: Bernhard Jobin's heirs

Dedication: Margrave Ernst Friedrich of Baden-Durlach

Pages: This version contains an etched title page, dedication, address to the reader, a two-page lesson on drafting the elevation of a portal that includes a page with printed text and an etching, fifty-seven additional etched plates, and a colophon.

Books: One

Ink: Black

Colophon: EXECVDEBATVR, / ARGENTINAE, APVD HERE- / DES BERNHARDI IOBINI. / ANNO, / M.D. XCV.

Language: Latin and French

Examples: New York, Avery Architectural and Fine Arts Library, Columbia University, AA 557 D56 [bound with other Architecturas]; and AA 557 D56 v. 2 [has a page full of inscriptions on back of the colophon, bound with Latin text on the Composite Order from the Liber I., and does not include dedication or a page with instructions on devising doors]; Zurich, ETH-Bibliothek, Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule, Rar 1226q; Munich, Universitätsbibliothek, Technische Universität München, 4° 1436 0075/RB 54-2


Place of Publication: Unspecified

Year: 1598

Publisher: Unspecified

Dedication: Daniel Sore

Pages: This version encompasses an etched portrait of Wendel Dietterlin, and 210 pages including a main title page, two-page dedication, address to the reader, list of terms, five
etched section title pages for individual sections printed in black or red and black ink with three instances in which a plate design is repeated, a one-page lesson on drafting the elevation of a portal with printed text and an etching as well as one instance in which Tuscana is repeated. These are interspersed with two pages of instructions on drafting the shaft, a history of Tuscan order, description of the Tuscan Order, history of the Doric Order, a two-page lesson on drafting the shaft, a description of the Doric Order, description of the Ionic Order, history of the Ionic Order, history of the Corinthian Order, description of the Corinthian Order, history of the Composite Order, and a description of the Composite Order.

Books: Five
1. Tuscana
2. Das andrer Buch von der DORICA sampt Ibrn zugehörigen stuckhen.
3. Von der Ionica sambt ibrn zugehörigen stuckhen
4. Von der Corinthia sambt ibrn zugegebnen stuckhen.
5. Von der Composita mit Ibrn zugegebnen stuckhen.
Ink: Red and black
Colophon: No colophon
Language: German
Examples: Nuremberg, Germanisches Nationalmuseum, K 481
Bibliography: Großmann (1997), 164; Irmscher (1999), 51
Notes: This issue contains the van Wyn portrait. Großmann argues that this is a test copy. In some instances the plate numbers from past releases have not yet been erased.

B

Place of Publication: Nuremberg
Year: 1598
Publisher: Hubrecht and Balthasar Caymox
Dedication: Daniel Soreau
Pages: This version contains a portrait of Wendel Dietterlin [only in Germanisches Nationalmuseum example], and 209 pages including a main etched title page, two-page dedication, address to the reader, list of terms, four etched section title pages for individual sections with two instances in which a plate design is repeated, a one-page lesson on drafting the elevation of a portal with printed text and an etching as well as one instance in which Tuscana is repeated. These are interspersed with a description of the Tuscan Order, history of Tuscan order, two pages of instructions on drafting the shaft, a description of the Doric Order, history of the Doric Order, history of the Ionic Order, description of the Ionic Order, description of the Corinthian Order, history of the Corinthian Order, a description of the Composite Order, and a history of the Composite Order.
Books: Five
1. Tuscan
2. Das annder Buch von der Dorica samt ihrn zugehörigen stuckhen
3. Von der Ionica samt ihrn zugehörigen stuckhen
4. Von der Corinthia samt ihrn zugehörigen stuckhen.
5. Von der Composita mit Ihrn zugegebenen stuckhen.

Ink: Red and black

Colophon: Gedruckt zu Nürnberg / In verlegung / Balthasar / Caymox / Anno. M.D.X.C.

Language: German

Examples: Heidelberg, Universitätsbibliothek Heidelberg, 83 B 945 RES [with colophon], Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibliothek — Staats - und Universitätsbibliothek Dresden, Archit.136; Zurich, Zentralbibliothek Zürich, Alte Drucke, Rx 12: c.2 [F [no colophon], Nuremberg, Germanisches Nationalmuseum, N966 (S.548) [no colophon]; Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Res/2 A.civ. 58 m [Bound with Hendrick Goltzius's 1596 Visus and Auditus]; Frankfurt, Städel Museum, Graphische Sammlung, 1696 76/2 4°, Princeton, NJ, Marquand Library of Art and Archaeology, Princeton University, NA2835.D572q [a mixed copy containing the main title page of this issue, but also subsidiary title pages from other Architectura texts]

Bibliography: von Heinecken IV (1790), 671; Le Blanc II (1856), 131; Andresen (1865), 2:277; von Zahn (1863) 100-101 [as II]; Schestag (1871), 192 ff.; Schmitz (1939), 257, no. 1942; Pirr (1940), 21; Forssman (1956), 240, no. 21; Großmann (1997), 164; Irmscher (1999), 51-52

Notes: Except for the Germanisches Nationalmuseum example, copies that include the van Wyn portrait are rare. The title pages of this version often display evidence that the words “Maler zu Straßburg” and “Hubrecht und Balthasar Caymox” were at first printed in red ink. In the Heidelberg and Frankfurt copies, Hubert’s name has been erased or crossed out. There are at least three variations of this issue of the Architectura (Irmscher 1999 51-52).
Arrangement of text lines, Latin script sometimes printed in cursive, sometimes in block text, variations in ornament on text pages, subsidiary title pages sometimes printed in red and black and otherwise just in black, and pagination varies. Copies of the 1598 Architectura assembled from parts of different “master” versions of the text often mix components of these variations, as in Princeton NA2835.D572q. Based on the survey of Architecturas undertaken in the course of researching the present dissertation, this version of the text appears to exist in the greatest numbers.

C

Title: ARCHITECTVRA / DE / CONSTITVTIONE, / Symmetria, ac proportione / quinq[ue]; Columnarum: / AC OMNIS, INDE PROMA- / nantis structuræ artificiosæ: vtpote Fenestrarum, Caminorum, Postium seu Portalium, Pontium, / atq[ue]; Epitaphiorum. / QVA RATIONE, SCILICET, EX ME- / tria ratione quin[g]; Columnarum, ist hac rectè deli- / neari, connuenerient constituti, atq, artificialia / absolui queant. / IN GRATIAM STVDIOSORVM AC AMAN- / tuum buius artis, recta faciliq[ue]; via ac methodo addiscendae / inuenta: ac ducentis figuris artifi / ciosis delineata, atq[ue] con- / structa ā / Wendelino Dietterlin . / Pictore Argentinensi. / Cum gratia & Privilegio Cas. Maiest. ad Decennium / Norinbergæ sumptibus Huberti &. / Balthasari Caymox / 1598. / Pröffert, commutat, conclu= / bit et omnia tempus.
Place of Publication: Nuremberg
Year: 1598
Publisher: Huberti & Balthasari Caymox
Dedication: No dedication
Pages: This version contains a portrait of Wendel Dietterlin and 210 pages including a main etched title page, address to the reader, four etched section title pages for individual sections with two instances in which a plate design is repeated, a two-page lesson on drafting the elevation of a portal with printed text and an etching, as well as one instance in which Tusca is repeated. These are interspersed with a list of architectural terms, a history of Tuscan order, description of the Tuscan Order, a two-page lesson on drafting the shaft, history of the Doric Order, description of the Doric Order, history of the Ionic Order, description of the Ionic Order, history of the Corinthian Order, description of the Corinthian Order, history of the Composite Order, and a description of the Composite Order.
Ink: Red and black
Books: Five
1. Tusca
2. Das annder Buch von der Dorica samß ihrn zugehörigen stuckben
3. Von der Ionica samß ihrn zugehörigen stuckben
4. Von der Corinthia samß ihrn zugegebenen stuckben.
5. Von der Composita mit Ihrn zugegebenen stuckben.
Colophon: No colophon
Language: Latin and French
Examples: New York, Avery Fine Arts and Architectural Library, Columbia University, AA 557 D56 [bound with other Architecturas]; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Oxford University, H 3.3(1) Art (Hubert crossed out in title page); Cambridge, MA, Houghton Library, Harvard University, Typ. 520.98.325
Notes: The text is the Latin/French material from previous bilingual editions. This version includes the van Wyn portrait.

D

Place of Publication: Nuremberg
Year: 1598?
Publisher: Balthasar Caymox
Dedication: No dedication
Pages: Portrait of Wendel Dietterlin and 209 pages including a main etched title page, two-
page dedication, address to the reader, list of terms, four etched section title pages for individual sections with two instances in which a plate design is repeated, and a one-page lesson on drafting the elevation of a portal with printed text and an etching. These are interspersed with a description of the Tuscan Order, history of Tuscan order, two pages of instructions on drafting the shaft, a description of the Doric Order, history of the Doric Order, description of the Ionic Order, history of the Ionic Order, description of the Corinthian Order, history of the Corinthian Order, description of the Composite Order, and a history of the Composite Order.

**Books:** Five
1. Tuscan
2. ARCHITECTVRA. Das Annder Buch / von der DORICA sambt iibrn / zugehörigen stuchben
3. Von der Ionica samst iibrn zugehörigen stuchben
4. Von der Corinthia samst iibrn zugegebenen stuchben.
5. Von der Composita mit iibrn zugegebenen stuchben.

**Ink:** Black

**Colophon:** Gedruckt zu Nürnberg / in verlegung, Balthasar / Caymox / Anno. / M.D.XCVIII.

**Language:** German

**Examples:** New York, Avery Architectural and Fine Arts Library, Columbia University, AA557 D5601 F [no portrait, no colophon, no Tuscan, etching numbers have been crossed and changed in pen, and the contents partly re-ordered to reflect the themes of the last two sections as re-designated by a former owner—fountains and epitaphs]; Zurich, Zentralbibliothek Zürich, Graphische Sammlung, Rar 61 T | F; Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibliothek—Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Dresden, Archit 137

**Bibliography:**

**Notes:** Irmscher contends that this version of the text includes the van Wyn portrait, but the author of this dissertation has not located an example that does. Irmscher also hypothesizes that it represents the final 1598 edition because the title page lacks the “ad decennium” printing privilege. Fowler argued that this version does not contain plates executed by Dietterlin, but comparison between the plates of this edition and the other editions of the 1598 Architectura refute this claim. Paulus Fürst used the plates of the “introduction to the reader” in this version in his own 1655 editions. This suggests that he may have used old plates to print that edition before releasing his own version with some re-etched plates.

**1655**

Place of Publication: Nuremberg
Year: 1655
Publisher: Paulus Fürst
Dedication: No dedication
Pages: Portrait of Wendel Dietterlin and 208 pages including a main etched title page, one two-page dedication and one one-page dedication [from the 1593 and 1594 installments of the text], two one-page addresses to the reader [from the 1593 and 1594 installments of the text], a list of terms, four etched title pages for individual sections with two instances in which a plate design is repeated, and a one-page lesson on drafting the elevation of a portal with printed text and an etching. These are interspersed with a history of Tuscan order, description of the Tuscan Order, two pages of instructions on drafting the shaft, a history of the Doric Order, description of the Doric Order, history of the Ionic Order, description of the Ionic Order, history of the Corinthian Order, description of the Corinthian Order, history of the Composite Order, and a description of the Composite Order.

Books: Five
1. Tuscana
2. Das annder Buch von der Dorica samt ibhrn zugehörigen stickhen
3. Von der Ionica samfß ibhrn zugehörigen stickhen
4. Von der Corintheia samßt ibhrn zugengebenen stickhen.
5. Von der Composita mit Ibhrn zugengebenen stickhen.

Ink: Black
Colophon: No colophon
Language: German
Examples: Munich, Staatliche Graphische Sammlung München, 1958, 152 B

Notes: The SGS copy is re-bound with components of earlier editions of the Architecturas

Corinthian Order, history of the Composite Order, and a description of the Composite Order.

Books: Five
1. Tuscan
2. Das ander Buch von der Dorica samst ihrn zugehörigen stuckhen
3. Von der Ionica samst ihrn zugehörigen stuckhen
4. Von der Corinthia samst ihrn zugegebenen stickhen.
5. Von der Composita mit Ihrn zugegebenen stickhen.

Ink: Black
Colophon: No colophon
Language: German
Examples: Cambridge, MA, Houghton Library, Harvard University, Typ. 620.55.325 A and F; Princeton, NJ, Marquand Library of Art and Archaeology, Princeton University, NA2835 D56q; Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Xb 4° 123

Bibliography: von Heinecken (1790), 671; von Zahn (1863), 104-105 [as III]; Andresen (1865), 2: 278; Ohnesorge (1893), 29; Pirr (1940), 21; Hollstein VI (1959), 214, no. 17 [as edition 4]; Irmscher (1999), 50.

No year

A


Place of Publication: Nuremberg
Year: c. 1661-1726
Publisher: Johann Christoph Weigel
Dedication: No dedication
Pages: Portrait of Wendel Dietterlin and 208 pages including a main etched title page, address to the reader, list of terms, four etched section title pages for individual sections with two instances in which a plate design is repeated, and a one-page lesson on drafting the elevation of a portal with printed text and an etching. These are interspersed with a history of Tuscan order, description of the Tuscan Order, two pages of instructions on drafting the shaft, a history of the Doric Order, description of the Doric Order, history of the Ionic Order, description of the Ionic Order, history of the Corinthian Order, description of the Corinthian Order, history of the Composite Order, and a description of the Composite Order.

Books: Five
1. Tuscan
2. Das ander Buch von der Dorica samst ihrn zugehörigen stuckhen
3. Von der Ionica samst ihrn zugehörigen stuckhen
4. Von der Corinthia samst ihrn zugegebenen stuckhen.
5. Von der Composita mit Ihrn zugegebenen stuckhen.

Iink: Black
Colophon: No colophon
Language: German
Examples: Zurich, ETH-Bibliothek, Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule, Rar 214 GF
Bibliography: Unpublished. I am grateful to Werner Oechslin and to the staff of the ETH Bibliothek for bringing this example to my attention.
Appendix II:
The Publication History of the *Architectura*

To understand the course of Dietterlin’s research into the art of devising architectural ornament, it is necessary to establish a chronology for the drawings, etchings, and books that comprised his *Architectura* project. The treatise’s complex publication history provides the most concrete framework for re-constructing the evolution of Dietterlin’s *Architectura*, for the order in which various editions of the treatise were printed establishes the only firm *terminus ante quem* for the drawings and the prints.¹

The dedications of the 1593 *Erst Buch* and *Liber I.*—both addressed to Conrad Schloßberger, Protector of Esslingen—describe the *Architectura* project’s origins. Dietterlin tells how he commenced the *Architectura* near Stuttgart when “wintery weather” impeded his return journey to Strasbourg upon completing work on Duke Ludwig of Württemberg’s new *Lusthaus*.² The artist had resided in Stuttgart since 1590 in order to execute three

---

¹ Prior to the account offered here, the most complete history of the various editions of the *Architectura* was G. Ulrich Großmann, “Die verschiedenen Ausgaben der ‘Architectura’,” *Anzeiger des Germanischen Nationalmuseums* (1997): 157-173.

² “Dem Edlen uñ Ehrnvesten, Conrad Schloßbergern, Fürstlichen Württembergischen Pflegern, des Denckendorischen Hoffs zu Eßlingen, meinem günstigen lieben Herrn. Insonders Günstiger Herr, Ich bin gleichwoł in vorhaben gestanden, auff vollendung der jenigen Arbeit, So dem Durchleuchtigen Hochgebornen Fürsten uñ Herrn, Herrn Ludwigen Herßogen zu Würtemberg, und zu Teck, Grauen zu Mümpelgart, rc Meinen gnädigen Fürsten und Herrn, in ihrer Fürstlichen Gnaden alhie zu Stuttgart new erbawtē Fürstlichem uñ nun mehr weitberümtem Lusthauß, diese nechtsvershine 2. Jahr durch mich neben andern underthenig verfertigt wordem. mich also bald widerumb gehn Straßburg, also mein Burgerlich heimwesen, mit meiner haushaltung zu begeben, So hat mich doch die ungelegenheit deß beschwerlichen Winterlichē Wetters unwegs, auch andere vnuversehen vorgefallene verhindernüssen, mehrertheils unnd fûrnmlich aber, die Anmütige Freund und Kundtschafft, darein ich die zeit meiner alhiegen wohnung, gegē Ewer Ehrnvest und etlichen andern (als besondern Liebhabern und Forderern der Malerey unnd anderer guten Künsten) kommen bin, biß dahero von solcher meiner vorgehabten wider reiß, immer zurück vnnd vff gehalten, damit ich aber solche zeit meines längern verharrens allie, nicht vergebensvnd ohne nuß zu zubrückte, auch meinen lieben Herrn unnd Freunden, die mich die zeit meiner alhiegen bey wonung mit sonderer Freundschaft uñ gutten willē, gemeint, ein Memorial, dabey nach meinem Abschied sich meiner zu erinnern haben, hinderlassen
monumental ceiling canvases for the *Lusthaus’s* Great Hall.³ Archival records confirm that he stayed around Stuttgart for about one year after finishing the *Lusthaus* paintings in 1592, a period in which he was presumably free pursue other projects and commence a treatise.⁴ The artist’s application for a ten-year Imperial printing privilege is dated to May 11, 1592, and mentions that he has already distributed the treatise’s “printed architectural sketches” (*durch denn Trüeb mitbetailten Innwarp*) into seven books.⁵ This implies that Dietterlin had many

³ Dietterlin’s request to obtain his Strasbourg citizenship while away in Stuttgart is recorded in the Protocols of Strasbourg’s Council of XXI: “Wendel Dietterlin, der maler…hab dem hertzog von Würtemberg etlich gemäld gefertigt und sey aber noch mehr zu fertigen, inhalt bey mein hrn gelesenem furstlichem schribens, das dan der selb sic huff zwey jar verweilen möcht. Bitt er, ime solche zeit sein burgerrecht vorzubehalten; erbeut er sich die arbeit, so er m. hern zu fertigen, auch zu befurdern. Erkandt, is time willfart, und dweil er m. hern noch arbeit zu fertien, hab man die bürgschaft in handen, dz man, wo er etwas schuldig bleibt, sovil am lidlon inbehalten kan.” Strasbourg, Archives de la Ville et de la Communauté Urbaine de Strasbourg, Protocols of the Council of XXI for 1590, September 7, fol. 490. Quoted from Hans Rott, *Quellen und Forschungen zur Südwestdeutschen und Schweizerischen Kunstgeschichte im XV und XVI. Jahrhundert. III. Der Oberrhein. Quellen I* (Baden, Pfalz, Elsass) [hereafter, “Oberrhein Quellen I”] (Stuttgart: Strecker und Schröder Verlag, 1933), 233-234.

⁴ Stuttgart’s municipal receipt book for 1593/4 relates that Dietterlin also used this time to paint an allegory of Justice and the Republic for the city: “Als mr…Wendel Dietterlin, der maler von Straßburg, nach verfertiger arbeit in dem furstl. Lusthaus im theirgardten noch ein jar lang alhie mit seiner haushaltung sitzen bliben, hat er zur dancksagung gegen gemeiner statt derselben ein kunstreiche tafel der Justitien und Republic verehrt…” Stuttgart, Stadtarchiv Stuttgart, Stadtrechnungen for 1593/94. See also Rott, *Oberrhein Quellen I*, 234.

⁵ “…durch denn Trüeb mitbetailten Innwarp hab ich min werkh Im Siben Bücher ringelet…” Wendel Dietterlin, Application for an Imperial Printing Privilege, May 11, 1592, Vienna, Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, AT-OeStA/HHStA RHR Impressoria 13-52 (Impressoria Fz. 13), fol. 362′.
drafts for *Architectura* designs and perhaps many prints in hand by that time. However, early modern artists often exaggerated the swiftness with which they could work in order to cultivate an image of surpassing technical prowess.\(^6\) Dietterlin’s suggestion that the *Architectura* was already nearly complete by the spring of 1592 must therefore be taken with a grain of salt—particularly because he probably first learned to etch only around 1590.\(^7\) Since hiring an engraver to print nearly two hundred designs would have entailed staggering costs, Dietterlin likely did not plan his serial treatise before learning to create his own prints. Given the date of Dietterlin’s introduction to the art of etching as well as the timing of his other artistic commitments, it is likely that the artist commenced the *Architectura* project some time between 1590 and May 1592, and probable that the work was far from finished at the time he applied for a copyright.\(^8\)

Dietterlin’s application for an imperial printing privilege reveals much about the artist’s early ambitions for the *Architectura* project. The document claims that he began working on the treatise “many years ago” (*vil Jahr hero*) and asserts that the work’s “printed architectural sketches” will ultimately total two hundred and eighty engravings (*Kupfferstuckh*).\(^9\) Although etchings were commonly described with some variation of the word “*Kupferstich*” during the sixteenth century, Dietterlin’s use of the term “*Kupfferstuckh*” in reference to his etchings nonetheless deserves consideration. The author’s diction frames the *Architectura* prints as instances of a medium that arguably enjoyed higher regard than etching

---


\(^7\) On Dietterlin’s first etchings, see Chapter III.


\(^9\) Dietterlin, Application for an Imperial Printing Privilege, fol. 362’.
in 1590s Central Europe. Dietterlin’s reference to the treatise’s “Kupfferstuckb” may also relate to the artist’s fascination with imitating the technique of engraving through etching.\textsuperscript{10} The above statement additionally indicates that Dietterlin at first intended to create a much larger work than the one he actually produced. The final and summative 1598 installment of the \textit{Architectura} includes one hundred and ninety-eight distinct etched designs divided into five “books” of around forty-five pages each, about eighty prints short of his projected total.

The copyright application furthermore relates that the finished \textit{Architectura} will be comprised of seven “books”—a plan never before noted in the scholarly literature. In conceiving his project as a seven-part series, Dietterlin aligned himself with Sebastiano Serlio, who had intended that his \textit{Regole generali} would also encompass seven texts.\textsuperscript{11} Nevertheless, the content of Dietterlin’s \textit{Architectura} was to differ dramatically from that of Serlio’s series. Dietterlin writes that the first book of the \textit{Architectura} will contain a thorough introduction to the “distribution of the five columns.” It was to appear “…in a form that is easier, shorter, and more comprehensible to youth” than any prior book, for the artist had “…drafted [illustrations of] columns, terms, beautiful pedestals, architraves, entablatures, and all manner of other ornaments in the most assiduous way.”\textsuperscript{12} The second book would portray portals, doors, and shields; the third, windows and sections of gables; the fourth, all

\textsuperscript{10} For more on the status of engraving and etching in Dietterlin’s world and on the artist’s interest in imitating engraving through etching, see Chapter III.


\textsuperscript{12} “Das Erst Buoch wiirt begriffen, ein gründtliche aüßteiling Inn fünff Sailen, Auff einem leichterem, Ringerem, unnd den Jügenndt begreifflicherem Form, insonder bißher dann anderen dargethan worden, Dann ich hab die selbigen Sailen, Colonen, oder Terminos, mit schonen Possamenten, Archadrab, Simbßen, Haupt=Simbßen, unnd allerläí Zierden, Æuff das fleissigst, beschrieben, unnd für Augen gerißen.” Dietterlin, Application for an Imperial Printing Privilege, fol. 362r.
sorts of stoves and fireplaces; the fifth, fountains; and the sixth, epitaphs. All of this content eventually appeared in the final, 1598 installment of the *Architectura*, but was instead scattered across the treatise’s five “books” and organized in terms of *Orders* rather than type of object. This shift suggests a change in Dietterlin’s concept for the project, for the structure that the finished treatise assumed defined the theory of architecture that it conveyed. Dietterlin probably at first intended to organize the ornaments pictured in the *Architectura* series’ individual releases according to the conventional succession of Orders from Tuscan to Composite. Yet by ultimately organizing the treatise’s diverse subjects within five different, Order-based sections, the author more clearly presented the Orders as manners of ornament that might give rise to decorative designs in any medium.

The seventh and final book in Dietterlin’s original scheme for the *Architectura* series was to present “the twelve months with their respective signs”—presumably, the zodiac. Eight Dietterlin drawings in London and Karlsruhe portray allegories of the months. The

---


14 “In das sibenndt und letzt hab ich gestellt, die Zwoelff Monat mit ihrem Zaichen, auff allerläß dingen, unnd sonderlichen Arten.” Dietterlin, Application for an Imperial Printing Privilege, fol. 362v.

15 See Appendix IV KA.1-6 and LO.1-2.
artist may have intended to incorporate those designs into this seventh installment of his *Architectura* treatise series. Dietterlin also relates that the *Architectura*’s seventh book will include a so-called *Tabula Cebetis*, “with all of its attendant writings, and a commentary.”16 Believed during early modern times to have been authored by Socrates’ student, Cebes of Thebes, the *Tabula Cebetis* is now thought to have been composed in the first or second century. The text, written as a dialogue between an old man and a group of pilgrims, interprets an allegorical image of a tablet in the Temple of Saturn that depicts the entirety of human existence split into walled zones that represent the various stages of True Education, showing how individuals might move up or down the path to this ideal.17 The popularity of the *Tabula Cebetis* in the early modern period may relate to the contemporary fashion for emblems, for the *Tabula* was often interpreted as a memory aid for those seeking the way to virtue.18 The *Tabula*’s emblematic elements would certainly have complemented the enigmatic architectural allegories pictured in Dietterlin’s treatise. So, too, would the ancient text’s parable of education, as Dietterlin considered the *Architectura*’s instructive efficacy to be the trait that set the work apart from extant treatises on architectural ornament. Finally, the *Tabula Cebetis*’s cosmic imagery would have complemented Dietterlin’s ambition to portray a cosmology of architectural ornament through a system of Orders that encompasses all the visual media and illustrates both mythological and Christian themes.19 The copyright

---

16 “Darzu soll auch khommen, die Alt gedrehtsinwurdig Tabula Cebetis, mit Ihrem darzu gehörigem Schrifften, unnd erklärungen…” Dietterlin, Application for an Imperial Printing Privilege, fol. 362v.
19 On the cosmological dimensions of the *Architectura*, see the dissertation Conclusion.
application also emphasizes the universal qualities of the planned *Architectura* by noting that
the work will be useful and instructional to all “…Baumeistern, stoneworkers, sculptors,
painters, and woodworkers, and especially young students of art, and all others who love the arts.”
Since Dietterlin did not ultimately realize the *Architectura* as a seven-part series, we
must assume that the author composed his application for a ten-year privilege before
completing the designs he said he would include in this *magnum opus*, and that this expansive
project proved too ambitious to realize as he originally planned.

Dietterlin’s *Erst Buch* was printed in Stuttgart without a named publisher in 1593. In
the address to the reader, the author explains that, “…In publishing (*Publicieren*) this work, it
is my foremost intent and meaning to communicate a lesson…to young and yet unpracticed
artists about the embellishment and ornament of Architecture.”

In an era when printing privileges were jealously guarded, Dietterlin’s use of the verb “*Publicieren*” likely wasn’t a
usual reference to his indirect involvement in the printing of the book. This language
suggests that the artist himself released the first iteration of the tract, perhaps because he had
not yet found an investor to finance the venture. The *Erst Buch* encompasses an etched title
page, sixteen pages of text, a colophon, and a series of full-page etchings numbered from
two to forty but known to this author to encompass a maximum of thirty-eight plates total.

---

20 “…zum nütz unnd Unnderwaßung, Allen Baumaistern werckläuten in Stain, unnd
Bildhauen, Malern unnd Schrainern, Insonderhait den angehenden Jugent, auch allen unnd
andern den Khunsten liebhaben.” Dietterlin, Application for an Imperial Printing Privilege, fol. 362.
21 “Jedoch in Publicieren dieses meines Wercks, dis mein fürnemmest Intent und Meinung ist,
den Jungen unnd noch nicht wolgeübten Künstlern, von der Verzierung unnd Ornament der
Architectur …ein underricht unnd fürgemäld zu Comunicieren, und sie dadurch
bericht an den Leser”.
22 On the competition for printing privileges in sixteenth-century Europe, see Lisa Pon,
*Raphael, Dürer, and Marcantonio Raimondi: Copying and the Italian Renaissance Print* (New Haven
An identical sequence of images appear in the *Liber I.*, a translation of the *Erst Buch* with an etched Latin title page, dedication, address to the reader, bilingual, Latin/French body text, and a colophon. Dietterlin signed the *Liber I.*’s dedication at Stuttgart in June of 1593. The colophon nevertheless attests that the heirs of publisher Bernhard Jobin printed the book in Strasbourg during the same year. Because Dietterlin moved from Stuttgart to Strasbourg in 1593 (evidently with his etching plates), it appears that the release of the *Liber I.* postdates the appearance of the *Erst Buch.*

The 1593 editions of the *Architectura* project portray the very assortment of columns, pedestals, terms, entablatures, pedestals, and architraves that Dietterlin had promised the *Erst Buch* would encompass. However, it is evident that the author had already reconsidered his initial plans to publish a seven-part series by time this first installment of the *Architectura* was released. In the introductions to both 1593 texts, Dietterlin vows only to produce another four books. These, he relates, are to individually feature a quartet of subjects: portals, windows, fountains, and epitaphs. As of 1593, Dietterlin had abandoned the idea of concluding the *Architectura* with a summary of the zodiac and a *Tabula Cebetis.*

---


24 “FINIS LIBRI PRIMI / EXCVDEBATVR / AGENTINAE / APVD HAEREDES BERN- / HARDI JOBINI” Ibid., colophon.
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Jobin’s heirs soon released the *Architectura*’s second installment—the *Annder Buch*—with a dedication to Margrave Ernst Friedrich of Baden-Durlach signed at Strasbourg on September 1, 1594. Dietterlin distributed another fifty-three previously unpublished etchings among the book’s quintet of Order-themed sections, introducing each part with one of the five visual synopses of the Orders that had also served as the initial plates of the 1593 treatises’ five sections. Two versions of the *Annder Buch* were produced: one with a title page with red and black lettering, and another with a title page printed only in black. The *Liber II.*, a Latin/French translation of the *Annder Buch* with the same series of images and a dedication to Ernst Friedrich signed at Strasbourg some time in September 1594, was released without a named publisher simultaneously with, or just after, the *Annder Buch.* This version only received a red and black ink title page—presumably because Dietterlin assumed that the *Liber II.*’s generally wealthy Latinate readers preferred this more expensive format. Jobin’s heirs subsequently printed a nearly identical edition of this text with black text and a

---


27 Examples of the red and black version of the *Annder Buch* are Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Res/2 A.civ. 58-1/2; and Einsiedeln, Bibliothek Werner Oechslin 1116. An example of the black version of the *Annder Buch* is Stuttgart, Staatsgalerie Stuttgart, Graphische Sammlung (no inv. number; stored in Kasten 206/7).
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colophon dated to 1595. Since the typeface of the 1594 Liber II. is identical to that of the Liber I. and the 1595 Liber II., it is likely that Jobin’s heirs also printed the 1594 Liber II.

The last phase of the Architectura project was the most complex. An apparent test copy of the ARCHITECTVRA von Außtheilung, Symmetria und Proportion der Fünff Seulen… now held in the Germanisches Nationalmuseum was printed without a named publisher or place of publication in 1598. It contains a dedication to the aristocratic painter Daniel Sorea signed in Strasbourg and dated to February 15, 1598. As with many 1598 copies of the Architectura, a portrait of Dietterlin with an inscription noting the author’s death date in 1599 is bound with the work, after the title page. The inclusion of this posthumous portrait is only the most common way in which copies of the Architectura treatises were altered after printing. Another version of the ARCHITECTVRA von Außtheilung was released in 1598 with the same dedication to Sorea and a title page bearing the names and location of the

29 “EXECVDEBA TVR, / ARGENTINAE, APVD HERE- / DES BERNHARDI IOBINI. / ANNO, / M.D. XCV.” Dietterlin, ARCHITECTVRA de Postium seu Portalium ornatu vario. LIBER II. [hereafter, “Liber II. (1595)”] (Strasbourg: Bernhard Jobin’s heirs, 1595), Zurich, ETH-Bibliothek, Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule, Rar 1226q, colophon.


32 In the decades around 1600, books were sold unbound. It is therefore possible that the Caymox press began selling copies of the Architectura printed in 1598 with the circa 1599 portrait soon after initially printing the texts. For a list of copies of the text with portraits, see Appendix I. On the Dietterlin portrait, see the Introduction to this dissertation.
publishers: Hubrecht and Balthasar Caymox of Nuremberg. A colophon sometimes included in this edition nevertheless lists only Balthasar as publisher. Hubrecht’s name is often crossed out in the title pages of this edition as well. Meanwhile, a 1598 French/Latin translation of the text, the ARCHITECTVRA DE CONSTITVTIONE, Symmetria, ac proportione quinq[ue]; Columnarum appeared with a title page naming both Hubrecht and Balthasar as publishers. Balthasar is the sole publisher mentioned in the title page of a further edition of the ARCHITECTVRA von Außtheilung, which also indicates the place and date of printing as Nuremberg, 1598. Copies of this edition occasionally include the


35 Dietterlin, ARCHITECTVRA von Außtheilung, Heidelberg, Universitätsbibliothek Heidelberg 83 B 945 RES; and Frankfurt am Main, Städel Museum, 1696 76/2 4", title page.

36 Wendel Dietterlin, ARCHITECTVRA DE CONSTITVTIONE, Symmetria, ac proportione quinq[ue]; Columnarum: AC OMNIS, INDE PROMA-nantis structure artificiosa: utpote Fenestrarum, Caminarum, Postium seu Portalium, Pontium, atq[ue]; Epitaphiorum. QVA RATIONE, SCILICET; EX MEtrica ratione quinq; Columnarum, ist bac rectè deli-neari, convenienter constitui, atq; artificiosè absolui queant. IN GRATIAM STVDIOSORVM AC AMANtium huius artis, recta faciliq[ue]; via ac metodo addiscendae inuenta: ac ducentis figuris artificiosis delineata, atq[ue]; con-structa à Wendelino Dietterlin. Pictore Argentinensi. Cum gratia & Privilegio Cas. Maiest. ad Decennim Norinbergæ sumptibus Huberti &. Baltasari Caymox 1598. Pröfert, commutat, conclu=bit et omnia tempus. (Nuremberg: Hubrecht and Balthasar Caymox, 1598), New York, Avery Architectural and Fine Arts Library, Columbia University, AA 557 D56, title page.

37 Wendel Dietterlin, ARCHITECTVRA von Außtheilung, Symm=etria und Proportion der Fünff Seulen, und aller darauf volgender Kunst Arbeit, von Fenstern, Caminen, Thürgarichten, Portalen, Bronnen und Epita=phien. Wie dieselbige auf jedweder Art der Fünff Seulen, grundt auffzureissen, zuzurichten, und ins Werck zu zubringen seyen Al=ten solcher Kunst Liebbabenden, zu einem bestendigen und ring ergreiffenden underricht erfunden, in zweyhundert Stick gebracht, Geetzet, und an tag gegeben Durch Wendel
Balthasar Caymox colophon.\(^{38}\) The erasure of Hubrecht’s name from what appear to be successive editions of the final *Architectura* suggest that Balthasar assumed sole control of the work’s publication at some point in 1598. Notably, the title page of the aforementioned edition also lacks the “*ad decennium*” inscription that designates the expiration date for Dietterlin’s printing privilege. The absence of this notation suggests that this is the last edition of the *Architectura* to appear with the date 1598.\(^{39}\) If the disappearance of the privilege notice in the present edition can be taken as evidence that Dietterlin’s copyright had expired when this work was printed, this would corroborate the theory that versions of the 1598 text that lack Hubrecht’s name postdate those that include him. All normative copies of the *Architectura* with a 1598 title page contain a virtually identical sequence of plates, but for variations in the typescript of their different title pages.

With this final installment of the *Architectura* project to appear during Dietterlin’s lifetime, the artist abandoned his plan to create a five-part series.\(^{40}\) He instead combined the

---

\(^{38}\) “Gedruckt zu Nürnberg / in verlegung, Balthasar / Caymox / Anno. / M.D.XCVA.”

\(^{39}\) Irmscher notes that this version may even have first been published ten years after the initial 1598 releases. See Günter Irmscher, *Kölner Architektur- und Säulenbücher um 1600*. Sigurd Greven-Studien 2 (Bonn: Bouvier Verlag, 1999), 52.

\(^{40}\) Dietterlin evidently knew he would end the *Architectura* series as a three-part work already with the publication of the second, *Annder Buch*, for its introduction asks “…the good reader…to wait until [the author] finish[es] and publish[es] the remaining part about
body text and every print from both the Erst- and the Annder Buch with a new introduction just over one hundred previously unreleased etchings. These he distributed over five sections, or “books”, respectively dedicated to the Tuscan, Doric, Ionic, Corinthian, and Composite Orders. But for the variable presence of the Dietterlin portrait, all normative versions of the 1598 editions encompass virtually the same sequence of images. The Tuscan book contains the most window designs; the Doric the most doors and fireplaces; the Ionic the most fountains, the Corinthian the most façade designs, and the Composite the most epitaphs, sarcophagi, and altarpieces. If Dietterlin originally meant each of the Architectura’s five projected installments to contain about forty-five new etchings, as the Erst- and Annder Buch both did, then the one hundred and ninety-eight etchings that he ultimately produced for the Architectura fell short of that goal by almost a volume’s worth of prints. The five “books” of the 1598 releases nevertheless represent all the types of works that Dietterlin’s first pledged that the finished quintet of Architectura publications would cover, in roughly the order promised. The structure of the 1598 releases thus masks the artist’s failure to realize the full quintet of treatises. This dissimulation evidently worked, for no modern study of the Architectura has noted the shift in Dietterlin’s publication plans.

windows, fountains, and epitaphs” / “…den günstigen Leser freundlich bittende, er derselbigen sich zu seinem nuß freud oder kurßweil gebrauchen wölle, erwartend, biß wir die vbrige theyl von Fenstern, Brunnen, vnd Epitaphiis auch verfertigt, vnnnd an Tag gebracht werden haben…” Dietterlin, Annder Buch, under, “Vorrede an den Günstigen Leser”.

41 The title page designs that introduced the five “books” repeated the title page compositions for the Erst and Annder Buch, while the whole work received a new title page.
43 The different versions of the 1598 text generally encompass one hundred and ninety-eight distinct etched designs, three cases in which one of the title page designs is repeated, and eight numbered pages of text, resulting in the final plate bearing the number “209”.
Etching plates are not known for their hardiness. It is therefore unsurprising that some etchings printed in the 1598 versions of the *Architectura* show signs that plates Dietterlin first employed for the 1593 and 1594 texts were reworked after several years in commission. An outstanding example of this is the entirely new *Tuscan* plate that appears in all versions of the 1598 *Architectura* [Fig. 1], except for the Nuremberg test copy. While the two *Tuscan* prints are virtually indistinguishable, minor differences do occur. The anthropomorphic post in the new print possesses a smaller, more closed mouth. The handle of the spoon in his hat does not reach his forehead, as in the other design. Unlike the previous *Tuscan* etching, the full band of the barrel covering the term’s legs is visible below the pig’s feet tied to his waist. Finally, the inscription in the new design includes a backwards “N” and a line over the “A”. The strong resemblance between the two *Tuscan* plates suggests that Dietterlin himself etched the newer design, possibly in order to replace a now-defunct original *Tuscan* plate. Others would continue this practice. The *Architectura* was also re-printed several times after Dietterlin’s death, often with a number of re-etched plates.

To sum up: the *Architectura* project began as a serial treatise and ended as a greatly expanded amalgamation of the planned series’ first two components. Novel texts and images appeared only in what can be regarded as the leading installments of 1593, 1594, and 1598.

---

44 For instance, numerous etchings in a copy of the 1598 *Architectura* at Princeton University display this phenomenon. This is Dietterlin, *ARCHITECTURA von Auftheilung* (Nuremberg: Hubrecht and Balthasar Caymox, 1598), Princeton, NJ, Marquand Library of Art and Archaeology, Princeton University, NA2835.D56q.

45 Großmann, “Die verschiedenen Ausgaben der ‘Architectura’,” 168. The old *Tuscan* print occurs in Nuremberg, Germanisches Nationalmuseum, K 481 [Appendix I, Type 1598 A]. The new *Tuscan* print occurs in Heidelberg, Universitätsbibliothek Heidelberg, 83 B 945 RES [Appendix I, Type 1598 B]; Cambridge, MA, Houghton Library, Harvard University, Typ. 520.98.325 [Appendix I, Type 1598 C]; and Zurich, Zentralbibliothek Zürich, Graphische Sammlung, Rar 61 T | F [Appendix I, Type 1598 D].

46 On editions of the *Architectura* published after Dietterlin’s lifetime, see the Conclusion of this dissertation.
In at least one instance, a new installment of the treatise was first released in German and a Latin/French translation soon ensued. This appears to be the case with the other installments of the *Architectura* as well.

Given this publication chronology and the stylistic trends visible in the *Architectura* drawings, which are discussed at length in Chapter II and Appendix IV, it is possible to reconstruct a general timeline for the creation of the *Architectura* prints. The time lapse between the publication dates of treatise’s different installments suggests that the artist developed the *Architectura* in at least two (and perhaps three) rounds of drawing and etching. If this is the case, Dietterlin at first published his etchings whenever he had enough designs for a new volume of approximately fifty prints. After 1594, he hoarded the equivalent of two volumes’ worth of prints before ending the *Architectura* project with a final release. Given the project’s origins between circa 1590 and 1592, it is possible to date the two main periods of etching to circa 1590/2-1593, and 1593-1598, with the latter period potentially encompassing two sub-phases of 1593-1594 and 1594-1598.

**Figure**

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

Figure 1.
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, *IVSCANA (Version II)*, Etched illustration to Dietterlin’s *ARCHITECTVRA von Außtheilung, Symmetria und Proportion der Fünff Suelen…* (Nuremberg: Hubrecht and Balthasar Caymox, 1598), Zurich, Zentralbibliothek Zürich, Alte Drucke, Rx 12: c,2 | F, Pl. 6
Appendix III:
Transcription of Dietterlin’s Application for an Imperial Printing Privilege for the
Architectura

Wendel Dietterlin, Application for an Imperial Printing Privilege, May 11, 1592, Vienna,
Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, AT-OeStA/HHStA RHR Impressoria 13-52 (Impressoria Fz. 13), fol. 362'-363'

fol. 362'

Aller Durchleüchtigster, Großmechtigster Römischer
Käyser, Eure Rö: Kaÿ Stat: sind mein Aller
Vnnd nothwendiste, willigsten dinnst zum schüldiger
insonstern züvor
Aller gundigsten Herrn, Ich hab mich vil Jahr hero,
Zum meiner unaunten Khnst vleissig geübt,
und dahin gearbaitet, damit ich diesalb nit nur
für mich, unnd mir selb behielten, daunnter auch
andern darmit diente, unnd allen In Architectür,
Unnd Inn Khnst Liebhabern, durch denn Trückh
mithetaiten Innwarf hab ich min weckh
Im Siben Bűucher ringetait, die inganzem in sich
halten, Zwaÿ Hundert unnd achzig Kupfferstuckh,
Das Erst Buoeh wiirt begriffen, ein gründliche
außtheilung Inn fünff Sailen, Auff einem leicherem,
Ringerem, unnd den Jügenndt begreiflicherem Form,
insonder bißher dann anderen dargethan worden,
Dann ich hab die selbigen Sailen, Colonen, oder Terminos,
mit schonen Possamenten, Archadrab, Simbßen, Haupt=
Simbßen, unnd allerlaÿ Zierden, Auff das fleissigst,
beschrieben, unnd für Augen gerißen. Zum das
Annder Buoeh soll khommen allerhandt Portal,
Thürrn undd Wappen, auch mit Ihrem Zierden.
Inn das dritt Buoeh, werden gebracht Mancher=
laÿ Fenster, unnd Außzuge des Gübeln.
Das virrt Buoeh, wirrt in sich haten allerlaÿ
Ofen, Camin, und Ofenthür. Das fünfft
Buoeh wirrt in sich halten Springende, auch

fol. 362'

Schönstbrünnnen, unnd Birstfäßen. Inn das
seacht Buoeh hab ich gedordert allerhandt
Epitaphia, unnd was zu Innselbigem Zirden
gehorig. In das sibenndt und
letzt hab ich gestellt, die Zweolff Monat mit ihrem
Zaichen, auff allerlaÿ dingen, unnd sonderlichen
Arten. Darzu soll auch khommen, die Alt
gedreitsinwurdig Tabula Ceretis, mit Ihrem darzu
gehörigem Schrißten, unnd erklärungen, zum
nüzt unnd Unnderwaßung, Allen Baumaistern
werckhläuten in Stain, unnd Bildhaueren, Malern
unnd Schrainern, Insonderhait den angehenden
Jugent, auch allen unnd andern den Khunsten
liebhaben.

Dieweil ich dann auff diß Nutzbars werckh, so ich
dürch denn offnen Trückh an tag zugeben vor=
habens, wirtt allain main Arbait sonder auch
ainem ausehenlichen Kosten genandt, So
gelangt an E:Ro:Kaß:Mt main aller unnder=
thenigsten Fürsten, diesleb wollen, mir aüß Kaßser=
lichen Mutigkeit, ain privilegium, das mir das
selb nit nachgemacht, unnd getruckht werden, allen
gundigst miththailen. Darmit ich mainem groß
muche arbeit, unnd Lasteres ettliche maßen möge
ergoldt werden, Das will umb E:Ro:
Kaß:Mt: ich nach mainem gleichsall geringem

fol. 363°

Aber darf nussersstren vnmmögeen, aller willigst
unnd unnderthenigst unnd diener, zu Ihmem Kässer=
lichen Mütigsten Gnade, mit allem gehorsamist
grundhendt

E Ro:Kaß:Mt:

Aller unnderthenigsten
unnd Gehorsamer

Wendel Diietterlin, von Straß=
burg, Ietzunden Fürstichsten
Württembergischen gestalten
Maler zu Stüttgartten

Fol. 363°

Diietterlin Wendel.
Mallern zu Stüttgardten
Pro Impreßoria mit
[..]

Fiar aŭf 10 Jar

I Ro:Kaŷ:Mt

S. Epelanger

Eii Maŷ
A° 1592
Appendix IV: 
Catalogue Raisonné of Drawings by Wendel Dietterlin the Elder

Wendel Dietterlin the Elder produced a remarkable number and variety of drawings. He employed different drafting manners, materials, and techniques depending on the subject and purpose of the drawing at hand, and also adopted different drawing styles over the course of his career. Yet despite its great size and importance, Dietterlin’s drawing oeuvre lacks a complete catalogue.¹ His drafting manner has also never received a comprehensive analysis.² The present catalogue raisonné describes all of the drawings currently associated with the artist in the published literature and brings to light thirteen unpublished examples of his drafted work. A companion catalogue documents all drawings erroneously attributed to the artist in the current literature, providing an alternative attribution where possible. In analyzing the one hundred and eighty-nine known Dietterlin the Elder drawings, the catalogue sheds new light on one of the major draftsmen of the northern Renaissance.³ The large volume of drawings documented here provides sufficient basis to form a typology and chronology of the artist’s various drafting styles. The catalogue’s assessment of the development of Dietterlin’s Architectura meanwhile offers novel insights into the formation of printed, illustrated architectural treatises in sixteenth-century northern Europe.

¹ Albert von Zahn compiled the first substantial list of Dietterlin’s drawings in 1863, which was nevertheless limited to the designs for the artist’s Architectura etchings. The most recent list, by G. Ulrich Großmann, does not name all of the artist’s known drawings and contains errors of attribution, which are identified in Appendix V. See Albert von Zahn, “Wendel Dietterlin’s ‘Säulenbuch,’” Archiv für die zeichnenden Künste mit besonderer Beziehung auf Kupferstecher- und Holzschneidekunst und ihre Geschichte 9 (1863): 97-108; and G. Ulrich Großmann, “Wendel Dietterlin der Ältere,” in Allgemeines Künstler-Lexicon. Die Bildenden Künstler aller Zeiten und Völker, Vol. 27 (Dewailly-Dismorzi), general editor Günter Meißner (Munich and Leipzig: K.G. Sauer, 2000), 317.

² Gustav Pauli’s brief 1899 analysis of the Architectura drawings remains the most thorough account of Dietterlin’s drafting manner to date. See Gustav Pauli, “Die Originalzeichnungen Wendel Dietterlins,” Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst, n.s., 10 (1899): 281-4.

³ Two of the “drawings” counted in this number are in fact groups of five related, fragmentary sheets, documented as DR.23 and DR.164 in the present catalogue.
The drawings in Dietterlin’s oeuvre can be divided into three main groups: study drawings, drawings for paintings, and drawings for etchings. Only a few Dietterlin drawings that are not obviously preparatory for other projects have survived. Two such works—both previously unpublished—are held in Strasbourg’s Cabinet des Estampes et des Dessins. The *Grotesque Head* appears to be drawn after a mix of contemporary ornament prints. The monogrammed *Putto After Raphael’s “Isaiah”* reproduces part of Raphael’s composition, which Dietterlin likely knew through print or the drawing of another artist. Each Strasbourg drawing is executed in quill and ink contours with exuberant, crosshatched modeling. Since the drawings appear to show a beginner emulating motifs from other works, and since Dietterlin rarely employed crosshatching in his later drawings, the works likely originate from the early years of his career in Strasbourg.

In the drawing of sixteenth-century Strasbourg, Swiss draftsmen such as Tobias Stimmer (1539-1584), Daniel Lindtmayer the Younger (1552-1607), and Hans Jakob Plepp (1557/60-1597/98) exercised a strong influence. Stimmer, who, like Dietterlin, practiced as a façade painter and arrived in Strasbourg in 1570, worked in close quarters with Dietterlin and likely competed with him for commissions. Nevertheless, it is evident that he and Dietterlin also cultivated a mutual interest in each other’s art. A drawing after Dietterlin’s lost 1575 wall painting of the *Dream of Jacob* for the Strasbourg Bruderhof is executed in Stimmer’s hand [Fig. 1]. Dietterlin’s early drawing in turn shows Stimmer’s influence. The forms of Dietterlin’s *Putto*, like Stimmer’s circa 1570 *Orpheus and the Animals* [Fig. 2], are

---

4 See Appendix IV SB.1.
5 See Appendix IV SB.2.
defined with a hard outline and modeled with expressive, curvilinear, crosshatched lines with hooked ends. Stimmer’s drawings for glass painting, or Scheibenrisse, also appear to have been sources for Dietterlin’s similarly symmetrical, heraldic designs for the Architectura. Still, the two artists’ individual manners remain distinct. Stimmer’s drawings generally display a more linear, graphic quality than the shadowy, sculptural forms of Dietterlin’s drafted works.

Designs for paintings comprise a much larger share of Dietterlin’s known drawings. Most were likely executed between the artist’s arrival in Strasbourg in 1570 and the point at which he commenced the Architectura project in the early 1590s, and thus provide an idea of Dietterlin’s mid-career drafting style. The group includes working drawings for paintings as well as more finished designs that were likely intended as contract or presentation drawings. Approximately a dozen working drawings for different types of paintings can be associated with Dietterlin. Heinrich Geissler identified two such works, now held in the British Museum, as Dietterlin’s studies for allegorical representations of April and March. These sheets form the basis for the present catalogue’s new attribution of a half-dozen unpublished allegories of months from a group of drawings in Karlsruhe to Dietterlin as well. Since the London and Karlsruhe sheets are marked with the names of colors, it is likely that they represent drafts for a painting cycle that was to depict the twelve months of the year. The

---

8 Some examples of Dietterlin’s Scheibenrisse-like works are analyzed in Appendix IV DR.53, 55, 58, and 59. Pirr hypothesizes that the young Dietterlin received training in Stimmer’s Strasbourg workshop. See Margot Pirr, Die Architectura des Wendel Dietterlin 1598. Ph.D. Dissertation, Berlin, 1940 (Gräfenheinichen: C. Schulze & Co., 1940), 22.


10 Karlsruhe, Staatliche Kunsthalle Karlsruhe, Kupferstichkabinett, Friedrich Brentel Album F (Inv.-Nr. 1965-10).
drawings are executed with pen and ink applied in short, vigorous strokes, and modeled in brush with light, diaphanous washes.

The style of Dietterlin’s month group resembles the manner of the mid-career drawings of the Swiss glass painter Christoph Murer (1558-1614), who resided in Strasbourg between 1583 and 1586. Murer’s pen-and-ink Landschaft mit Falkenjagd und anderen Jagddarstellungen (1590) [Fig. 3] shows comparable subject matter and a similarly loose style. Both Dietterlin and Murer shared an affinity for expressing lightness and weight by placing varying pressure on the quill, as well as a penchant for creating forms with clear, dark outlines and sheer, nebulous layers of wash. Murer’s figures are, however, somewhat stiffer, and their limbs more elongated. As with Stimmer’s Scheibenrisse, the designs of this prolific glass painter likely influenced Dietterlin’s own forays into composing schemes that could act as models for glass painting.¹¹ The heraldic designs first published in Dietterlin’s 1594 Annder Buch—works like Design for Annder Buch Plate 37—resemble Murer’s works in this genre.¹²

Dietterlin’s London and the Karlsruhe sheets show pastoral scenes, a genre favored among the draftsmen of the upper and lower Rhineland and present-day Baden-Württemberg during the later sixteenth century. Such imagery was particularly popular among artists who, like Dietterlin, were active at the court of Württemberg.¹³ It was there that Dietterlin resided between 1590 and 1593 to partake in the decoration of the Great Hall of the New Stuttgart Lusthaus—an interior that featured an extensive program of pastoral hunting scenes.¹⁴ This stay occasioned lively artistic exchanges between Dietterlin and his

---

¹¹ Pirr, Die Architectura, 22.
¹² Design for Annder Buch Plate 37 is catalogued in Appendix IV DR.55.
¹⁴ On Dietterlin’s involvement in the decoration of the Great Hall of the Lusthaus, see Chapter V.
Württemberg peers. The work that Stuttgart artists produced following Dietterlin’s time in the city indicates that the artist played a leading role in introducing a new, mannerist style to the draftsmen at court.\textsuperscript{15} The London and Karlsruhe drawings in turn suggest that the Strasbourg painter absorbed aspects of the drafting style practiced by the artists who also served Duke Ludwig during Dietterlin’s short stay. As in Stuttgart court artist Hans Steiner’s (c. 1550-1610) \textit{Bärenjagd bei Hengstetten} (1585) [Fig. 4], Dietterlin composes the tree trunks in his \textit{Allegory of April} with a spiraling column of lines. He nevertheless rejects Steiner’s stark, dramatic use of wash in favor of delicate outlines and pale washes. The minimal pen strokes and clusters of hunching peasants and animals in Dietterlin’s \textit{Allegory of March} recall the groups of figures and fauna in the 1588 \textit{Dachsjagd im Stuttgarter Lustgarten} by Jacob Züberlin (1556-1607) [Fig. 5], who also worked alongside Dietterlin in the Great Hall.\textsuperscript{16} However, compared to the naturalistic anatomy of the staffage in Züberlin’s drawing, figures such as the sheep-shearer in Dietterlin’s \textit{Allegory of the Month of June} and the fishermen in his \textit{Allegory of the Month of April} appear more abstract and improvised, constructed from a few arching gestures of the quill.

A double-sided drawing in Stuttgart shows another type of Dietterlin’s drafts for painting.\textsuperscript{17} The recto side depicts \textit{Christ Before the Palace of Pontius Pilate}, and the verso shows \textit{Christ Before Caiaphas}. With their elongated limbs, exaggerated \textit{contrapposto} stances, and impassioned gestures, their figures assume a more mannered appearance than the characters in the Karlsruhe and London drafts. Executed in black chalk, brush with reddish-brown

\textsuperscript{15} Geissler, “Zeichner am württembergischen Hof,” 103.
\textsuperscript{17} This sheet is assessed in Appendix IV SG.2.
wash, and white heightening, the Stuttgart drawings also exhibit a much thicker accretion of media than the restrained quill-work and nearly transparent washes of the Karlsruhe and London sheets. South German artists such as Hans Mielich employed a similar array of media to create theatrical, chiaroscuro lighting effects when drafting religious narratives in the 1570s and 1580s, as in the artist’s circa 1570 Circumcision [Fig. 6]. The liberal use of dark ink and white bodycolor visible in Dietterlin’s double-sided Stuttgart sheet and in Mielich’s drawing relates to an established tradition of drafting images with dramatically contrasting light and dark tones on prepared, colored paper. Tobias Stimmer’s 1562 Crucifixion at the Pierpont Morgan Library in New York, for instance, displays similar effects [Fig. 7].

Dietterlin composed his presentation and contract drawings with vigorous contours, dynamic shading, and diverse, substantial layers of drawing media. This cohort of drafted works includes well-developed designs for paintings to be executed in a number of different techniques. Two highly finished and previously unpublished drawings in the Collection Rothschild of the Louvre, Design for a Façade Painting with Nemesis or Fortune, and Design for a Façade Painting with an Allegory of Commerce, are drafted with crisp, confident ink contours, a

---

18 On this drawing, see Stijn Alsteens and Freyda Spira, Dürer and Beyond: Central European Drawings in the Metropolitan Museum of Art. Published in conjunction with the exhibition of the same name, New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, April 3-September 3, 2012 (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art; New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2012), 89-91.


20 It is likely this habit that lead print scholar Heinrich von Heinecken to identify two unknown drawings formerly in the Church of St. Nicholas in Strasbourg as works of Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, and to assert on the basis of those sheets that the artist had invented the art of pastel. See Karl Heinrich von Heinecken, Dictionaire des artistes, dont nous avons des estampes, avec une notice detaillee de leurs ouvrages gravés. Vol 4. (Cec-Diz). (Leipzig: Breitkopf, 1790), 672.
colorful spectrum of washes, and white heightening.\textsuperscript{21} The torsion-filled, muscular anatomy of their male figures, as well as the delicate oval faces, round bellies, and graceful limbs of their female bodies recall the signal traits of the figures in the work of Prague court painter Bartholomäus Spranger, which Dietterlin likely knew through the engravings of Aegidius II. Sadeler, or the prints of Hendrick Goltzius.\textsuperscript{22}

The dramatic \textit{Last Judgment} in Stuttgart likely served as a model for the ceiling painting that Dietterlin executed for the Great Hall of the New \textit{Lusthaus} in Stuttgart between 1590 and 1592.\textsuperscript{23} It, too, contains thick layers of wash set off with liberally applied white heightening, as well as golden highlights. Dietterlin’s use of gold leaf in the drawing—an element not recorded in descriptions of the ceiling painting—demonstrates that the work was not only valued as a plan for another project, but as an autonomous work of art.

Two pendant drawings in Basel, \textit{The Story of Abraham} and \textit{The Story of Jacob and Joseph in Egypt}, share the \textit{Last Judgment}'s approximate dimensions and its dark, dramatic style.\textsuperscript{24} Like the Stuttgart drawing, they also bear numerous layers of wash thickened with bodycolor and highlighted with flecks of gold leaf. Both Basel drawings are constructed from three sheets: a central, rounded sheet with lateral tabs and two arching strips that frame the upper and lower portions of each work. \textit{The Story of Abraham}'s unusual depiction of Abraham sacrificing Isaac with his left hand indicates that the work is preparatory for a project that will reverse

\textsuperscript{21} The Paris drawings are assessed in Appendix IV PA.1 and 2.
\textsuperscript{22} Geissler, “Zeichner am württembergischen Hof,” 102. Dietterlin’s \textit{Last Judgment} drawing is analyzed in Appendix IV SG.1.
\textsuperscript{24} The Basel compositions are addressed in Appendix IV BA.1 and 2.
the orientation of the composition. This trait, as well as Dietterlin’s use of gold highlights, suggests that the drawing and its pendant are plans for reverse glass paintings. Though no reverse glass painting based on Dietterlin’s *Story of Abraham* is known, the work did serve as the model for a multi-panel etching ensemble executed in black and red ink. The pair of framing strips from *The Story of Joseph and Jacob in Egypt* became models for etchings as well.

Because they probably served as plans for reverse glass paintings, the Basel drawings do not represent Dietterlin’s typical approach to drafting prints. The numerous drawings for the etchings published in Dietterlin’s *Architectura* treatise series provide far greater insight into the artist’s conventional procedure for planning etchings. The *Architectura* drawings also present a rare opportunity to analyze the formation of a printed, illustrated architectural treatise of the sixteenth century. Comparable primary sources all present certain limitations for historians who seek to analyze the manner in which printed, illustrated architecture books of the period developed. The manuscript for Sebastiano Serlio’s Book VII was heavily edited by its publisher Jacopo Strada, and therefore cannot offer a clear picture of how the author planned to execute the treatise. The New York and Munich manuscripts for Serlio’s Book VI divulge fascinating insights into how the author prepared different versions of the treatise, but their highly finished compositions yield few clues about how Serlio formed the

---


26 An example of this is Karlsruhe, Staatliche Kunsthalle Karlsruhe, Kupferstichkabinett, Inv.-Nr.: 1965-42.

27 These are among the *Scenes from the Old Testament* documented in Andresen II.11-15 and Hollstein VI.5-9.

28 The preparatory version of the manuscript is Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Cod. Ser. Nov. 2649. On the formation of Serlio’s Book VII, see Myra Nan Rosenfeld, “Sebastiano Serlio’s Drawings in the Nationalbibliothek in Vienna for his Seventh Book on Architecture,” *The Art Bulletin* 56, no. 3 (September 1974): 400-409.
designs.\textsuperscript{29} Strasbourg architect Daniel Specklin’s relatively complete plans for the illustrations of his various architectural publications likewise betray little about the artist’s drawing strategies.\textsuperscript{30} The same is true of the many polished drawings related to Jacques I. Androuet Du Cerceau’s architectural publications.\textsuperscript{31} Dietterlin’s drafts for the \textit{Architectura} images, in contrast, show the artist’s inventive processes in ample detail. All stages of the drafting process are represented in this group, which contains many sets of multiple drafts for a single design. Given their outstanding potential to shed light on how printed, illustrated architecture treatises of the sixteenth century were drafted, it surprising that this outstanding corpus of drawings has received scant attention since the sheets were briefly documented and described in the late nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{32}

Since only one page of the \textit{Architectura} combines an etching and text printed with a press, the preparatory materials for the treatise are better characterized as a collection of drawings than a book manuscript.\textsuperscript{33} The corpus of surviving \textit{Architectura} drawings is quite large: alongside a handful of unused \textit{Architectura} sketches, one hundred and sixty-five sheets

\textsuperscript{29} The two manuscripts—New York, Avery Architectural and Fine Arts Library, Columbia University, AA520 SE 694 F; and Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Cod. iconogr. 189—are compared in William Bell Dinsmoor, “The Literary Remains of Sebastiano Serlio,” \textit{The Art Bulletin} 24, no. 2 (June 1942): 115-154.

\textsuperscript{30} On the architectural drawings of Daniel Specklin, see Albert Fischer, \textit{Daniel Specklin aus Straßburg (1539-1589). Festungsbaumeister, Ingenieur, und Kartograph} (Sigmaringen: Jan Thornbecke Verlag, 1996), 93-100; 117-143.


\textsuperscript{32} Von Zahn first published a list of the drawings correlated with the etchings of the 1598 versions of the \textit{Architectura} in an article principally dedicated to documenting the treatise and its various editions. Gustav Pauli described the \textit{Architectura} drawings as a window onto Dietterlin’s drawing practice. See von Zahn, “Wendel Dietterlins ‘Säulenbuch,’” 97-108; and Pauli, “Die Originalzeichnungen Wendel Dietterlins,” 281-284.

\textsuperscript{33} The image is Plate 2 in the 1594 installment of the treatise and Plate 23 in the 1598 installment.
or groups of related drawing fragments represent drafts for over two thirds of the treatise’s one hundred and ninety-eight distinct etchings. They also far outnumber any other group of Dietterlin drawings, and thus make up the greater part of the present catalogue. Three individual *Architectura* drawings exist in New York, Berlin, and Bonn. Two albums in the Dresden Kupferstich-Kabinett contain the remaining *Architectura* drawings.\(^{34}\) One of the albums holds an additional five Dietterlin drawings not used for the *Architectura*, as well as five designs attributed to followers of the artist.\(^{35}\) Before they came to the Kupferstich-Kabinett in 1962, the albums were kept in the library of the Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden, formerly the Akademie der Bildenden Künste.\(^{36}\) As with the drawings in New York and Berlin, the provenance of the Dresden sheets prior to the mid-nineteenth century is


unknown. The Dresden drawings were once bound on numbered mounting sheets in a single volume, but were re-mounted between 1863 and 1899, and later distributed between the two present volumes.\textsuperscript{37} The material contained therein raises a number of questions: Was Dietterlin the sole author of the \textit{Architectura} designs? What strategies did the artist employ to tackle the monumental project of drafting nearly two hundred etchings? What were his methods for transposing his inventions to print? In what order, if any, did he create the drawings? And where do the \textit{Architectura} drawings fit within the artistic culture of the sixteenth-century Rhineland, and early modern architectural culture at large?

In the title page of the 1598 installment of the \textit{Architectura}, Dietterlin claims to have “…invented, yielded, etched, and produced [the] two hundred images”\textsuperscript{38} that illustrate the

\textsuperscript{37} When von Zahn first described the Dresden group in 1863, the drawings were assembled in a volume with leather-covered wood binding. The front cover was initialed “IHM,” and its rear cover bore a gilded stamp with the inscription “VENDEL DIETERLEINS ORIGINALIA”. The endpaper was inscribed “Originalia, von Wendel Dietterlein, Mahler zu Straßburg, zu seinen Säulenbuch, 1598”. Von Zahn hypothesized that Dietterlin bound the volume himself. In 1899, Pauli argued that the disparities between the artists’ initials and those recorded on the front cover, as well as the unique spelling of the artist’s name on the back cover, spoke against von Zahn’s theory. Pauli’s article still refers to a single volume. The two albums in which the Dresden drawings now exist must therefore have been made after 1899. Discrepancies between von Zahn and Pauli’s descriptions of the mounting sheets furthermore indicate that the Dresden sheets were re-mounted between 1863 and 1899. Von Zahn encountered the drawings affixed to 171 sheets numbered 1-168, with 56, 60, and 64 repeated. Pauli, meanwhile, refers to mounting sheets numbered 1 to 171. The current mounting sheets also bear the same numbering, in pen, and without any sign of alteration. Inscriptions designate the plate in the 1598 \textit{Architectura} that relates to the drawing at hand. The sheets are presently organized in the albums to reflect the order in which Dietterlin’s designs appear in the summative, 1598 edition of \textit{Architectura}. See von Zahn, “Wendel Dietterlins ‘Säulenbuch’,” 105, 108; and Pauli, “Die Originalzeichnungen Wendel Dietterlins,” 284.

work. However, the variety of techniques and manners portrayed in the *Architectura* drawings raises the question of whether Dietterlin is indeed the sole author of the designs. Because early modern artists often relied on assistants to realize large-scale projects like the *Architectura*, it is important to be inclusive about who might have been involved in producing the treatise’s illustrations. Dietterlin’s sons Hilarius and Wendel Dietterlin the Younger were likely present in the artist’s workshop during the years in which he created the text. None of the *Architectura* drawings suggest the presence of multiple drafting hands, but members of the Dietterlin atelier may well have made minor contributions to some of the designs. Since no extant study addresses the draftsmen in the circle of Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, it is impossible to determine with absolute certainty whether the members of his workshop contributed to the designs, not to mention who might have made which contributions. Still, the corpus of *Architectura* drawings shows a remarkable degree of formal coherence, suggesting that Dietterlin had a heavy hand in executing all the designs.

The technical practices and the order of operations that Dietterlin employed to create the *Architectura* drawings remained relatively consistent throughout the project. Chalk

---

or graphite and ink sketches, working drawings in chalk or graphite and ink, and more
finished etching designs with ink and complex layers of wash can all be found within the
corpus of *Architectura* drawings. The Dresden albums contain seventeen sets of sheets that
depict different phases in the evolution of a corresponding number of compositions. This
attests that the artist devised the *Architectura* prints in multiple stages, and across multiple
sheets of paper. Most of the *Architectura* drawings depict a well-developed design for a single
print, roughly the size of the anticipated etching. Few of the artist’s early *Architectura* sketches
survive, but many may be hidden on the verso of the Dresden albums’ mounted sheets. A
rare glimpse of the earliest phase of Dietterlin’s drawing process is visible on the verso side
of a *Design for an Elaborate Fountain*, one of the only un-mounted *Architectura* drawings.\(^{40}\) The
sketch is executed in black chalk, and appears to depict a tabernacle.\(^{41}\)

As likewise explained in Chapter III, a design for Plate 18 of the 1593 treatise shows
Dietterlin’s typical procedure for drafting the *Architectura* project’s working drawings.\(^{42}\) The
artist first established the outlines design in a chalk or graphite sketch, here visible in the
blank areas with the term farthest to the left. Sometimes the artist also plotted the design in
black chalk, a phenomenon discernible in the blank space to the right of the term. While
Dietterlin occasionally employed a straight edge to establish the major axes of his forms, he
tended to draw with a free hand.\(^{43}\) Once the preliminary graphite or chalk scheme was
complete, the artist confirmed its forms with the quill and black-brown ink, using deeper

\(^{40}\) The composition depicted on the recto is a design for Plate 82 of the 1598 *Architectura*.
This drawing is described in Appendix IV NY.1.
\(^{41}\) If the artist tended to repurpose his more finished sheets as vehicles for testing such
concepts (or vice versa), it is possible that sketches for *Architectura* etchings are hidden on the
verso sides of many sheets mounted in the Dresden albums.
\(^{42}\) This work is analyzed further in Appendix IV DR.13
tones and thicker lines to create the impression of weight and depth. Dietterlin sometimes used even darker ink to make corrections, as in the wings attached to the uppermost part of the pilaster second from the right. The artist also occasionally modeled the forms of his working drawings with wash, as in this sheet’s two leftmost pilasters.

Dietterlin polished his designs on a third or fourth sheet. He created the more finished drawing for Plate 18 with the same procedures and materials as the earlier draft, but applied a greater volume of wash. He devised its shadows by layering passages of grey, blue-grey, and brown ink, and employed wide, parallel brushstrokes to describe the work’s textures. Many printmakers of Dietterlin’s period used wash rather than tedious line-work in order to model the forms of their drawings. Still, the sophisticated brushwork of the more developed Architectura drawings, particularly those designs first published in 1593, cannot have been easy to execute. The rich chromatic effects cultivated in the later draft for Plate 18 and many other Architectura drawings had little outlet for expression in the etchings.

---

46 Design for Erst Buch Plate 18, Version II is assessed in greater detail in Appendix IV DR.14.
47 Ibid.
48 As noted in Chapter III, this raises the possibility that Dietterlin added the wash only after the drawings outlived their usefulness as plans for the prints, perhaps to amplify the drafts’ visual appeal. Some drawings bear inscriptions in the artist’s hand that specify changes to be made to the shading at the printing stage. For instance, the following inscriptions appear in the design for Plate 25 of the 1593 installments of the Architectura: recto upper left [quill and black-brown ink]: l [with indicator lines pointing to negative space between the figure and the architecture]; recto upper left [quill and black-brown ink]: d [with an indicator line pointing to the figure’s face]. In the final etching, the areas labeled “l” (perhaps signifying light, or “Licht”) have been made lighter, while the areas labeled “d” (perhaps signifying dark, or “dunkel”) have been made darker. Such notes confirm that the wash was applied before he executed the etching.
Dietterlin’s efforts to enhance the drawings’ visual appeal indicate that he viewed the works as drafts for etchings and as autonomous artistic achievements.

Many of the *Architectura* drawings exhibit traces of editing. Some, as in *Design for Annder Buch Plate 18*, display corrections added after the artist modeled the forms of the designs with wash. These edits are typically executed in a color of ink distinct from the tone employed to draft the initial composition: here, the artist used a reddish purple tone. Dietterlin sometimes employed a series of parallel or crosshatched marks to “erase” a problematic passage without rendering an alternative scheme. The vases in the upper right quadrant of *Design for Annder Buch Plate 32, Version II* are rejected in this way. In most cases, the artist simply drew the desired form over the undesirable design. More extensive passages of editing show Dietterlin obscuring an unsatisfactory aspect of the design with white heightening, and drawing over the whitened passage with quill and brush. This technique is visible beneath the vases that crown the portal in *Design for Annder Buch Plate 53*. In the most extreme cases, Dietterlin cut the problematic motif from the page and replaced it with a scrap of paper showing a more pleasing design, as in *Design for Erst Buch Plate 14*. The artist also occasionally used annotations that describe problems or prescribe changes to be made in a subsequent stage of work. In the *Design for Annder Buch Plate 31*, ribbing is “nit Groß genug”, not big enough, and a corbel should become “wenig”, or less prominent. Often these inscriptions occur in the most finished of the surviving drawings for a given print, and the changes noted in the drawing are indeed carried out in the

---

50 *Design for Annder Buch Plate 32, Version II* is catalogued in Appendix IV DR.50.
51 *Design for Annder Buch Plate 53* is documented in Appendix IV DR.86.
52 The entry in Appendix IV DR.9 assesses *Design for Erst Buch Plate 14*.
53 *Design for Annder Buch Plate 31* is catalogued in Appendix IV DR.48.
This indicates that the artist occasionally improvised alterations to the design with the etching stylus in the plate drawing. Dietterlin's various tactics for revising the *Architectura* drawings indicate that the artist valued his ability to develop the designs without drafting them anew. His drawing practice was an exercise in efficient creativity.

Although his order of operations for drafting the *Architectura* designs rarely changed, Dietterlin did employ a variety of compositional methods to plan the etchings. The artist created many of the designs first published in the 1593 treatise by employing the decorous mode of architectural drafting that he described in that text. The carefully measured *Tuscana* etching first published without a plate number in the 1593 *Erst Buch* shows this technique. Dietterlin formulated other *Erst Buch* compositions, as well as a few designs published in the later *Architectura* treatises, with a cut-and-paste method. As the *Design for Erst Buch Plate 14* demonstrates, the artist also employed the technique to edit his works. Nearly all of the bilaterally symmetrical designs first published in the 1594 and 1598 installments of the *Architectura* exhibit traces of a fold-based counterproof method commonly employed in the early modern period to devise symmetrical ornamental schemes. The first version of the Dietterlin’s design for Plate 21 of the *Annder Buch* shows how the artist drew half a Doric triumphal arch in graphite on one side of the sheet, then folded the paper vertically to transfer the graphite in a counterproof reflection of the original design. He next added alternate schemes in chalk, ink, and wash to each side, elaborating the right half of the composition farther. Sometimes Dietterlin folded his sheets to double a half-elevation in wet

---

55 See Appendix IV DR.1
57 Pauli contends that Dietterlin likely used a press in this process. See Pauli, “Die Originalzeichnungen Wendel Dietterlins,” 282. *Design for Annder Buch Plate 21, Version I* is presented in Appendix IV DR.37.
ink to produce a folded offset, a technique observable in Design for Annder Buch Plate 4.\textsuperscript{58}

What the cut-and-paste and folding techniques hold in common are their aptitude for minimizing the labor of ornamental drafting. Like the evidence of Dietterlin’s editing procedures, the traces of these compositional methods show that the artist created the \textit{Architectura} through highly streamlined methods of production.

It would seem that these different modes of composition could be used to date the \textit{Architectura} drawings. By such logic, the designs derived from folded counterproofs and folded offsets, which appear first in the 1594 installment of the treatise, would postdate the 1593 treatise, which contains no images derived from such drawings. Period artists such as Lorenz Stör are known to have composed the illustrations for ornament publications in similar drawing campaigns.\textsuperscript{59} However, Dietterlin’s choice of compositional technique was often based on whether or not he was representing a roughly symmetrical subject. He may well have drafted bilaterally symmetrical, counterproof designs for the 1594 and 1598 treatise before composing the cut-and-paste designs first published in 1593, only to save the counterproof drawings for the later release. In fact, the consistent style of the treatise’s prints prompted Margot Pirr to contend that Dietterlin had made designs for the \textit{Architectura}’s final installment, such as the images of portals, already at the time the \textit{Erst Buch} appeared.\textsuperscript{60}

Besides differences in compositional technique, the \textit{Architectura} drawings also exhibit two distinct styles. Compositions for designs that first appeared in the \textit{Erst Buch} typically...
show a crisp drafting manner, characterized by careful, measured strokes of the quill and even passages of wash that do not transgress the outlines articulated by those contours. The artist’s design for the Tuscania etching first published without a plate number in the 1593 Erst Buch exemplifies this phenomenon.61 With its straight yet searching lines and exactingly applied lines of wash, the drawing almost evokes the hesitant look of a copy. Designs for prints which first appeared in the 1594 and 1598 treatises meanwhile display a more dynamic treatment of line and wash. Drawings such as Design for Annder Buch Plate 4 show the artist plotting his schemes with quickly executed ink contours of varying thickness and washes comprised of broad, fluid strokes of the brush.62 While the subject determined which compositional technique Dietterlin would employ, this did not affect what drafting manner the artist applied. Disparities between the style of the drawings for the different installments of the Architectura are a more significant indicator of the drawings’ likely dates.

The difference between the style of the drawings preparatory for the etchings first published in Dietterlin’s 1593 and 1594 books and the manner of the drawings for the prints that he first published in 1598 has been interpreted as a sign that the artist completed the designs for the two earlier releases before those included in the project’s final installment.63 However, the disparity between the drawings for the 1593 treatise and those for the 1594 and 1598 releases is even greater. The relatively tight manner of the drawings preparatory for Dietterlin’s Erst Buch and the fluid style of the drafts for the prints first published in the 1594 and the 1598 installments of the Architectura suggest that Dietterlin completed most of the

61 This drawing is documented in Appendix IV DR.1.
62 Design for Annder Buch Plate 4 is catalogued in Appendix IV DR.27.
63 The Architectura prints’ overall stylistic consistency also prompted Pirr to contend that Dietterlin nevertheless had early sketches for designs to be included in the final installment already at the time the Erst Buch appeared. Since few first sketches for the project survive, the theory is impossible to prove. See Pirr, Die Architectura, 20-21.
designs for the 1593 *Erst Buch* before devising the images for the other releases of the
*Architectura*, perhaps wishing to test the market for his work before he continued the
project.\textsuperscript{64} The long pause between the publication of the 1594 and 1598 treatises likewise
suggests that the artist developed the later installments of the *Architectura* in at least two
rounds of drawing. If Dietterlin commenced the *Architectura* project between circa 1590 and
1592, it is possible to date the two main periods of drawing to circa 1590/2-1593, and 1593-
1598. The latter period potentially encompassed two sub-phases of drawing, the first lasting
from 1593 to 1594, and the second occurring between 1594 and 1598.

Dietterlin’s strategies for transposing his drafted *Architectura* designs to the etching
plates reveal other dimensions of his drawing practice. The *Architectura* drawings almost all
share the dimensions of their corresponding prints. Indentations appear along the major
contours of many *Architectura* drafts. These phenomena indicate that the artist sometimes
traced the drafted designs into the etching plate coating.\textsuperscript{65} However, since none of the prints
perfectly mirror the related drawings, it is apparent that Dietterlin made numerous
alterations to the designs while executing the plate drawing.\textsuperscript{66} The *Architectura* etchings’
remarkably consistent style makes it quite difficult to date the prints with any greater
specificity than the *terminus ante quem* marked by their earliest publication dates. Dietterlin
may have produced some of the prints released in the later treatises before 1593.

Placed in the context of Rhenish architectural draftsmanship during the late sixteenth
century, the *Architectura* designs reveal origins of Dietterlin’s architectural drawing practice
and the artistic priorities he brought to devising the treatise’s images. One of the more

\textsuperscript{64} Pirr discerns the same general shift from a tighter to a looser style, but identifies the
turning point in this development as the period between the 1594 and 1598 treatises. See
Pirr, *Die Architectura*, 20.

\textsuperscript{65} Pauli, “Die Originalzeichnungen Wendel Dietterlins,” 284.

\textsuperscript{66} Ibid.
prolific architectural draftsmen with whom Dietterlin likely had contact was the Strasbourg architect and cartographer Daniel Specklin (1536-1589). Specklin resided in Dietterlin’s adopted city between 1564 and his death. Specklin left behind many manuscripts for engineering and fortification treatises, such as the *Architectur* of 1583, the 1589 *Architectura von Vestungen*, and the *Peter-Buch*. An aquarelle drawing of Schloss Pfirt from the artist’s 1583 *Architectur* manuscript shows a network of stylized castle buildings perched on the various levels of a hill [Fig. 8].

With its disciplined, straight lines and exactlying applied washes, Specklin’s drawing prioritizes absolute clarity of form. This is not to say that his architectural drawings serve a merely documentary role. The image of Schloss Pfirt and many of Specklin’s other architectural representations present an ideal view of their subjects, imparting the drawing with the elevated rhetoric of a commemorative image. Yet while Specklin shared Dietterlin’s interest in what might be called fantasy architecture, his drawings exhibit a much drier, precise style than Dietterlin’s *Architectura* drafts. It appears unlikely that the painter learned the art of architectural draftsmanship from the Strasbourg engineer.

---


69 On the architectural drawings of Daniel Specklin, see Fischer, *Daniel Specklin aus Straßburg (1539-1589)*, 93-100; 117-143.

Another accomplished draftsman, the Stuttgart architect Heinrich Schickhardt (1558-1635), cultivated a lively friendship with Dietterlin. Many of the surviving Schickhardt drawings depict building plans and representations of monuments executed during the architect’s extensive travels, including a journey in Italy undertaken between 1598 and 1600. Some Schickhardt drawings, such as his depiction of Hubert Gerhard’s Augustusbrunnen [Fig. 9], are constructed from short, looping lines or hard contours executed with a straight edge. The gestural strokes of Schickhardt’s pen recall the expressive contours of Dietterlin’s quill, but they lack the presence and dynamism introduced by the varying thickness of the painter’s drafted lines. The more reserved character of the Augustusbrunnen drawing of course has to do with its function as a copy after an existing monument. Since Dietterlin’s Architectura drawings are preparatory works, they evoke an air of anticipation absent from Schickhardt’s documentary travel drawings.

Other Schickhardt designs bear a greater resemblance to Dietterlin’s drawings. A 1598 study of Genoa’s Palazzo Doria-Tursi in the artist’s Raiß in Italia sketchbook depicts


72 Schickhardt’s drawings are catalogued in Wilhelm Heyd, ed., Handschriften und Handzeichnungen des Herzoglich württembergischen Baumeisters Heinrich Schickhardt (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1901). For an analysis of the drawings Schickhardt created during his Italian journey, see Dirk Jonkanski, “Die Italienresien Heinrich Schickhards,” in Neue Forschungen zu Heinrich Schickhardt, 79-110.
the grand residence with great precision [Fig. 10].\textsuperscript{73} Like many of Dietterlin’s \textit{Erst Buch} drawings, its forms are outlined in dark brown ink and modeled with grey wash applied in many instances in short, horizontal strokes. By the time Dietterlin lived alongside Schickhardt between 1590 and 1593, the painter already had significant experience in devising architectural ornament for painted facades. Nevertheless, the fact that Dietterlin’s drawings for the \textit{Erst Buch} (and only this first treatise) resemble Schickhardt’s work indicates that the Stuttgart architect played a role in the Strasbourg painter’s formation as an architectural draftsman. The increasingly exuberant style of Dietterlin’s \textit{Architectura} drawings probably indicates his waning dependence on Schickhardt’s formal models.

The differences between Dietterlin’s drawings and those of his contemporaries arise from disparities between the works’ projected functions. The drawings of Specklin and Schickhardt represent specific, built works, plans for particular built projects, or idealized images of architecture. Almost all of Dietterlin’s drawings could meanwhile serve as adjustable models for architectural ornaments, and therefore assume a more improvised manner. Dietterlin moreover devised his \textit{Architectura} designs as plans for \textit{ornament etchings}—or more accurately, as schemes for decorative prints that might inspire further inventions.

While the pictorial conventions of Schickhardt and Specklin’s architectural drawings suited scientific and technical illustration or the representation of ideal architecture, they were inappropriate for Dietterlin’s artistic goals.

Given its outstanding size, the Dresden group probably represents the remnants of Dietterlin’s own drawing collection. Early modern artists often kept drafts of their designs to

\textsuperscript{73} Heinrich Schickhardt, \textit{Raiß in Italia} (1598), Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek Stuttgart, Cod. Hist.qt.148a-d. [http://digital.wlb-stuttgart.de/sammlungen/sammlungsliste/werksansicht/?no_cache=1&tx_dlf%5Bid%5D=387&tx_dlf%5Bpage%5D=1],
use as models for future works or as didactic devices. Dietterlin could draw from the extensive catalogue of forms depicted in the *Architectura* designs in formulating new interior or façade paintings, or in composing painted representations of architecture. The *Architectura* drawings could also serve as tools for training apprentices in the art of ornament and print design. Members of the Dietterlin atelier could compare different drafts of the *Architectura* drawings and contrast them with the corresponding etchings. This would allow students to trace the trajectory of the artist’s invention from idea to execution. The *Architectura* drawings could serve as a *scholion* to the printed treatise, a visual commentary that divulges compositional secrets not betrayed in the text. In an era in which not all drafts for printed, illustrated ornament treatises eventually found a publisher, the *Architectura* drawings’ potential functions as models for ornamental works and teaching tools made the gamble of investing copious time and materials to devise a treatise with numerous images worthwhile.

As noted in Chapter II, several drawings indicate that Dietterlin made creative use of various copying techniques to enhance the didactic power of his drawing collection. It is apparent that the surviving drawings for the *Ionica* and the *Corinthia* prints gave rise to counterproof drawings that the artist evidently edited and then used to form the *Ionica* and *Corinthia* plates. By using counterproofs to form the *Ionica* and *Corinthia* etchings, Dietterlin saved his original designs from the potentially damaging process of tracing the composition to the etching plate. He also produced etched compositions that share oriented like the original drawings. The artist’s students could thus compare the drafts with their related

---

74 On the roles of drawing collections in the early modern workshop, see Meder, *The Mastery of Drawing*, 152. For an analysis of drawing collections specific to the Central European context in the sixteenth century, see Kaufmann, *Drawings From the Holy Roman Empire*, 16-17.

75 Christopher S. Wood describes how a manuscript for a perspective treatise by Lorenz Stör failed to attract a patron. See Wood, “The Perspective Treatise in Ruins,” 246.

76 For these drawings, see Appendix IV DR. 8 and DR.15.
etchings to evaluate the designs’ evolution, unencumbered by the mirror effect that usually
distinguishes the *Architectura* prints from their related drawings. For copyists in Dietterlin's
circle, the *Ionica* and *Corinthia* designs could also demonstrate the distinctions between
drawing after a drawing and drawing after a print. A copy after Plate 146 of the 1598
*Architectura* now held in the Brentel album in Karlsruhe is executed in Dietterlin's hand.\(^77\) It is
possible that the artist produced this drawing to demonstrate strategies for drafting copies of
prints, and subsequently traded or gave the work to his Strasbourg colleague. Dietterlin’s
models for practicing his methods of ornamental composition evidently inspired further
ornamental inventions. A drawing in Lemgo shows how one of the artist’s followers
modified *Corinthia* by eliminating its personification and adding a spiral column.\(^78\)

Copies after Dietterlin’s *Architectura* prints are the most numerous type of drawing
among the drafted works formerly attributed to the artist. An addendum to the present
catalogue documents all the drawings that were erroneously identified in print as works by
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder at the time this dissertation was composed. Each entry justifies
why the related drawing cannot be attributed to the artist, and, wherever possible, offers an
alternative attribution.

\(^77\) See Appendix IV KA.9.
\(^78\) This drawing is addressed in Appendix V, under “Lemgo Drawing”.
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Appendix IV Figures

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 1.
Tobias Stimmer after Wendel Dietterlin the Elder?, *The Dream of Jacob*, circa 1575, Pen drawing, Berlin, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Kupferstichkabinett, KdZ 12 274h

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 2.
Tobias Stimmer, *Orpheus and the Animals*, circa 1570, Pen and black ink on laid paper, 19.2 x 15.1 cm, London, British Museum, 1899,0120.34

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 3.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 4.
Hans Steiner, *Bärenjagd bei Hengstetten (recto)*, 1585, Quill and brown ink with grey wash on laid paper, Mainz, Mittelrheinisches Landesmuseum, Inv.-Nr. 03/157

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 5.
Jacob Züberlin, *Dachsjagd im Stuttgarter Lustgarten*, 1588, Quill with brown ink and brush with grey wash on laid paper, 42.0 x 23.5 cm, Cologne, Wallraf-Richartz-Museum, Inv.-Nr. Z 428

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 6.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Figure 7.
Tobias Stimmer, *The Crucifixion*, 1562, Pen and black ink extensively highlighted with white gouache, on reddish brown prepared paper, varnished, 42.9 x 31.1 cm, New York, The Pierpont Morgan Library, 1971.1
Figure 8.
Daniel Specklin, *Schloss Pfirt*, 1583 or earlier, Aquarelle drawing, Strasbourg, Musées de la Ville de Strasbourg, Cabinet des Estampes et des Dessins, CESt Architectur, fol. 60

Figure 9.

Figure 10.
Checklist of Drawings by Wendel Dietterlin the Elder

* Indicates that the work has not been published in print

**Basel**


BA.2- *The Story of Jacob and Joseph in Egypt*, Kunstmuseum Basel, Kupferstichkabinett, Inv.-Nr. 1904.38

**Berlin**

BE.1- *Design for 1598 Architectura Plates 204 and 205*, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Kunstabibliothek, HdZ 769

**Bonn**

The Bonn drawing does not have an individual inventory number. It is identified here by the inventory number of the book in which it is bound, and by page.


**Dresden**

The Dresden drawings do not have individual inventory numbers. They are identified here by album number and folio page.

DR.1- *Design for Erst Buch [I TV/SCANA]*, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 1

DR.2- *Design for Erst Buch Plate 6*, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 2

DR.3- *Design for Erst Buch Plate 8*, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 31

DR.4- *Design for Erst Buch Plate 9*, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 32

DR.5- *Design for Erst Buch Plate 10*, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 33

DR.6- *Design for Erst Buch Plate 11*, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 34

DR.7- *Design for Erst Buch Plate 12, with preliminary studies*, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 35

DR.8- *Design for Erst Buch Plate 13 [III. IONICA]*, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 73

DR.9- *Design for Erst Buch Plate 14*, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 74

DR.10- *Design for Erst Buch Plate 15*, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 75
DR.11- Design for Erst Buch Plate 16, Versions I and II, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 76
DR.12- Design for Erst Buch Plate 17, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 77
DR.13- Design for Erst Buch Plate 18, Version I, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 78
DR.14- Design for Erst Buch Plate 18, Version II, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 79
DR.15- Design for Erst Buch Plate 19 [III CORINTHIA], Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 110
DR.16- Design for Erst Buch Plates 20 and 21, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 112
DR.17- Design for Erst Buch Plate 23, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 113
DR.18- Design for Erst Buch Plate 24, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 114
DR.19- Design for Erst Buch Plates 25 and 33, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 115
DR.20- Design for Erst Buch Plate 28, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 141
DR.21- Design for Erst Buch Plates 21 and 28, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 140
DR.22- Design for Erst Buch Plate 31, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 142
DR.23- Design for Erst Buch Plates 20, 27, and 32, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 111
DR.24- Design for Erst Buch Plate 33, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 143
DR.25- Design for Erst Buch Plates 39 and 40, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 144
DR.26- Design for Annder Buch Plate 3, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 13
DR.27- Design for Annder Buch Plate 4, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 14
DR.28- Design for Annder Buch Plate 5, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 15
DR.29- Design for Annder Buch Plate 6, Version I, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 16
DR.30- Design for Annder Buch Plate 6, Version II, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 17
DR.31- Design for Annder Beuch Plate 8, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 18
DR.32- Design for Annder Buch Plate 9, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 19
DR.33- Design for Annder Buch Plate 10, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 20
DR.34- Design for Annder Buch Plate 11, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 26
DR.35- Design for Annder Buch Plate 14, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 47
DR.36- Design for Annder Buch Plate 18, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 48
DR.37- Design for Annder Buch Plate 21, Version I, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 51
DR.38- Design for Annder Buch Plate 21, Version II, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 50
DR.39- Design for Annder Buch Plate 21, Version III, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 52
DR.40- Design for Annder Buch Plate 22, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 53
DR.41- Design for Annder Buch Plate 23, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 54
DR.42- Design for Annder Buch Plate 24, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 55
DR.43- Design for Annder Buch Plate 25, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 56
DR.44- Design for Annder Buch Plate 26, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 65
DR.45- Design for Annder Buch Plate 27, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 66
DR.46- Design for Annder Buch Plate 29, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 87
DR.47- Design for Annder Buch Plate 30, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 88
DR.48- Design for Annder Buch Plate 31, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 89
DR.49- Design for Annder Buch Plate 32, Version I, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 90
DR.50- Design for Annder Buch Plate, Version II, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 91
DR.51- Design for Annder Buch Plate 33, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 92
DR.52- Design for Annder Buch Plate 35, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 93
DR.53- Design for Annder Buch Plate 36, Version I, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 101
DR.54- Design for Annder Buch Plate 36, Version II, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 100
DR.55- Design for Annder Buch Plate 37, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 102
DR.56- Design for Annder Buch Plate 41, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 125
DR.57- Design for Annder Buch Plate 42, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 126
DR.58- Design for Annder Buch Plate 48, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 133
DR.83- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 41, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 28

DR.84- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 42, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 29

DR.85- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 43, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 30

DR.86- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 53, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 36

DR.87- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 54, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 37

DR.88- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 55, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 38

DR.89- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 56, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 39

DR.90- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 57, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 40

DR.91- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 58, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 41

DR.92- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 60, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 42

DR.93- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 61, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 43

DR.94- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 64, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 44

DR.95- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 65, Version I, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 45

DR.96- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 65, Version II, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 46

DR.97- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 72, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 49

DR.98- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 78, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 57


DR.100- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 79, Version II, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 59

DR.101- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 80, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 60

DR.102- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 83, Version I, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 61

DR.103- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 83, Version II, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 62

DR.104- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 84, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 63

DR.105- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 85, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 64

DR.106- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 88, Version I, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 67
DR.107- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate, Version II, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 68
DR.108- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 89, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 69
DR.109- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 90, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 70
DR.110- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 91, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 71
DR.111- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 92, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 72
DR.112- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 101, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 80
DR.113- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 102, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 81
DR.114- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 103, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 82
DR.115- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 106, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 83
DR.116- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 107, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 84
DR.117- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 108, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 85
DR.118- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 109, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 86
DR.119- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 117, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 94
DR.120- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 118, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 95
DR.121- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 120, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 96
DR.122- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 122, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 97
DR.123- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 123, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 98
DR.124- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 124, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 99
DR.125- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 127, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 103
DR.126- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 129, Version I, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 164
DR.127- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 129, Version II, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 104
DR.128- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 130, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 105
DR.129- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 131, Version I, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 106
DR.130- Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 131, Version II, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 107
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DR. 131- *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 132*, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 108

DR. 132- *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 133*, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 109

DR. 133- *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 143*, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 116

DR. 134- *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 145*, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 117

DR. 135- *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 146*, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 118

DR. 136- *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 147*, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 119

DR. 137- *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 148*, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 120

DR. 138- *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 149*, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 121

DR. 139- *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 150*, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 122

DR. 140- *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 151*, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 123

DR. 141- *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 152*, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 124

DR. 142- *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 160*, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 127

DR. 143- *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 162*, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 128

DR. 144- *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 163, Version I*, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 129


DR. 146- *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 164*, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 131

DR. 147- *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 166*, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 132

DR. 148- *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 169*, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 135

DR. 149- *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 170*, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 136

DR. 150- *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 171*, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 137

DR. 151- *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 172*, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 138

DR. 152- *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 173*, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 139

DR. 153- *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 189*, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 145

DR. 154- *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 190*, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 146
DR.155- *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 191*, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 147

DR.156- *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 198*, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 153


DR.159- *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 200*, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 157

DR.160- *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 201*, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 156

DR.161- *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 204, Version II*, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 158

DR.162- *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 206*, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 159

DR.163- *Design for a Wall Painting with the Adoration of the Lamb*, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 166

DR.164- *Five Fragments of Column Capitals*, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 167

DR.165- *Unused Design for the Architectura with Orpheus and Fauna*, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 165

DR.166- *Unused Design for the Architectura with a Two-story Gable with Windows*, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 162

DR.167- *Unused Design for the Architectura with a Tomb*, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 163

**Karlsruhe**

The Karlsruhe drawings do not have individual inventory numbers. They are identified here by album number and folio page.

**KA.1- Allegory of an Unknown Month with Plans for a Calendar Cycle**, Staatliche Kunsthalle Karlsruhe, Kupferstichkabinett, Brentel Album F (Inv.-Nr. 1965-10), fol. 19v

**KA.2- Allegory of an Unknown Month (summer or fall)**, Staatliche Kunsthalle Karlsruhe, Kupferstichkabinett, Brentel Album F (Inv.-Nr. 1965-10), fol. 19v

**KA.3- Allegory of the Month of December**, Staatliche Kunsthalle Karlsruhe, Kupferstichkabinett, Brentel Album F (Inv.-Nr. 1965-10), fol. 19v

**KA.4- Allegory of the Month of June**, Staatliche Kunsthalle Karlsruhe, Kupferstichkabinett, Brentel Album F (Inv.-Nr. 1965-10), fol. 19v

**KA.5- Allegory of the Month of October**, Staatliche Kunsthalle Karlsruhe, Kupferstichkabinett, Brentel Album F (Inv.-Nr. 1965-10), fol. 19v

**KA.6- Allegory of the Month of September**, Staatliche Kunsthalle Karlsruhe, Kupferstichkabinett, Brentel Album F (Inv.-Nr. 1965-10), fol. 19v

**KA.7- Clemettia**, Staatliche Kunsthalle Karlsruhe, Kupferstichkabinett, Album F (Inv.-Nr. 1965-10), fol. 55v

**KA.8- Sapientia**, Staatliche Kunsthalle Karlsruhe, Kupferstichkabinett, Brentel Album F (Inv.-Nr. 1965-10), fol. 55v
* KA.9- Design after 1598 Architectura Plate 146 [Apotheosis of Christ], Staatliche Kunsthalle Karlsruhe, Kupferstichkabinett, Brentel Album F (Inv.-Nr. 1965-10), fol. 2r

**London**

LO.1- Allegory of the Month of March, British Museum, 1997,0712.99
LO.2- Allegory of the Month of April, British Museum, 1997,0712.100

**New York**

NY.1- Recto: Design for an Elaborate Fountain Surmounted by a Statue of St. Christopher; Verso: Sketch of a Tabernacle (?) with Studies of Architectural Details, Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2006.89

**Paris**

*PA.1- Design for a Façade Painting with an Allegory of Commerce, Musée du Louvre, Collection Rothschild, Inv. 3399 DR
*PA.2- Design for a Façade Painting with Nemesis or Fortune, Musée du Louvre, Collection Rothschild, Inv. 3398 DR

**Strasbourg**

*SB.1- Grotesque Head, Musées de la Ville de Strasbourg, Cabinet des Estampes et des Dessins, CdEedD 77.985.0.868, réc: 77.R.2011.0104 (formerly “attributed to Wendel Dietterlin”)
*SB.2- Putto after Raphael’s “Isaiah”, Musées de la Ville de Strasbourg, Cabinet des Estampes et des Dessins, Strasbourg, CdEedD 77.985.0.867, réc: 77 R. 2011.0103

**Stuttgart**

SG.1- The Last Judgment, Staatsgalerie Stuttgart, Graphische Sammlung, Inv.-Nr. C 1967 / GVL 200
SG.2- Recto: Christ Before the Palace of Pontius Pilate; Verso: Christ Before Caiaphas; Staatsgalerie Stuttgart, Graphische Sammlung, Inv.-Nr. C 1974/2367 (formerly “Wendel Dietterlin the Elder. Follower?”)
Basel Drawings

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

BA.1
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder

The Story of Abraham

Circa 1590-1592

Middle field: Quill with black and green ink and brush with grey and red wash with white heightening and gold highlights on laid paper prepared with a grey wash

Outer fields: Quill with black-brown and green ink and brush with grey-blue wash, with white heightening and gold highlights on laid paper prepared with a blue wash

Frame strips [partially attached]: Quill with dark brown ink on laid paper prepared with a red wash

Sheet [at greatest points]: 42.8 x 32.1 cm

Kunstmuseum Basel, Kupferstichkabinett, Inv.-Nr. 1904.37

PROVENANCE: Donjeu La Reyniere, Marquis de Chevigné 1773?; Peter Visscher-Passavant (1751-1823), Basel, Lugt 2116; Purchased 1904 from a Geneva art dealer


This colorful drawing is comprised of three separate panels of paper and a series of thin framing strips mounted together on a single sheet. The three principal elements include a large, central sheet and two crescent-shaped pieces that frame the top and bottom of the central sheet. The other Dietterlin drawing in Basel, The Story of Jacob and Joseph in Egypt, shares the approximate dimensions, materials, style, and Old Testament subject matter as the present work, as well as its tripartite construction.\(^79\) This suggests that the two compositions were conceived as related components of a multi-part series.\(^80\) Like the Last Judgment drawing in Stuttgart, made as a model for the ceiling painting that Dietterlin executed for the Great Hall of the new Stuttgart Lusthaus between 1590 and 1592, the Basel drawings display thick

\(^79\) See the following entry in this catalogue, Appendix IV BA.2.

deposits of colored pigment and white heightening. The similarities between the Basel
sheets and the Stuttgart drawing indicate that the artist conceived of the present work and its
pendant as finished presentation drawings. As Chapter III relates, Dietterlin likely devised
this gilded work and the other Basel sheet as designs for gold-flecked glass paintings. In
both Basel drawings, the outer panels are executed in bluish tones, and the middle panels are
rendered in yellow tones. These colors evoke the contrast between silver and gold, and raise
the possibility that the works were also devised to be able to serve as models for metalwork
design.

The Story of Abraham drawing gave rise to several etchings. One ensemble features a
winged central panel printed in black ink, and two flanking panels printed in red ink. The
second state of the central panel appears without wings, and is only known as a black ink
design. Dietterlin additionally produced black ink versions of the framing panels of the
Story of Abraham ensemble. These joined a number of other etchings in the same form as
these framing strips that likewise show scenes from Genesis, including black ink etchings

---

81 See Appendix IV SG.1.
82 Perhaps because Dietterlin tended to employ drawing media for his presentation drawings
in this way, eighteenth-century historians later described him, erroneously, as the inventor of
pastel. See Karl Heinrich von Heinecken, Dictionaire des artistes, dont nous avons des estampes, avec
une notice detallée de leurs ouvrages gravés. Vol. 4. (Cec-Diz) (Leipzig: Breitkopf, 1790), 672.
83 Christian Müller, ed., Von Dürer bis Gober: 101 Meisterzeichnungen aus dem Kupferstichkabinett
des Kunstmuseums Basel. Catalogue of the exhibition of the same name, Basel, Kunstmuseum
Basel, October 3, 2009-January 24, 2010 (Munich: Hirmer Verlag, 2009), under no. 41.
84 The central component of the Story of Abraham etching ensemble is documented in
Andresen II.9 and Hollstein VI.3. The red and black ensemble is known in at least one
example: Karlsruhe, Staatliche Kunsthalle Karlsruhe, Kupferstichkabinett, Inv.-Nr. 1965-42.
85 Berlin, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Kupferstichkabinett, Inv.-
Nr. 35-1963; and Munich, Staatliche Graphische Sammlung München, Inv.-Nr. 1859:178.
86 Andresen and Hollstein do not mention the different red and black ink versions of The
Story of Abraham’s framing elements. The first and second states of the central panel are only
mentioned in Andresen II.9.
made after the framing strips of *The Story of Jacob and Joseph in Egypt* drawing. One of the prints from this series, the bottom strip from *The Story of Abraham* ensemble, is labeled “W. Dietterlin Inventor Anno 1592”. It is therefore likely that the Basel drawings also originate from the early 1590s, when Dietterlin resided at the court of Württemberg.

*The Story of Abraham* etchings are labeled with the names of biblical verses that help identify the scenes represented in the drafted composition. The upper band of the drawing shows, from right to left, Abimelech returning Sarah to Abraham (Genesis 20), an angel revealing water to the wandering Hagar and Ishmael (Genesis 21:19), Esau selling Jacob his birthright (Genesis 25:33), Jacob returning to Bethel (Genesis 35), Jacob meeting Esau (Genesis 33), and the defiling of Dinah (Genesis 34). The lower band shows, from right to left, the Tower of Babel (Genesis 11), the calling of Abram (Genesis 12) and Abram and Lot parting ways (Genesis 13), Lot and his Daughters (Genesis 19:34-36), the death and burial of Sarah (Genesis 23), and Isaac’s covenant with Abimelech (Genesis 26:26-34). The tab on the left side of the middle panel depicts the birth of Isaac (Genesis 21:1-5), and the tab on the right portrays the Lord addressing Abraham (Genesis 12, 15, and 17). A number of the scenes in the drawing’s central panel are labeled with the numbers of the chapters in Genesis that they portray. With reference to the inscriptions in the corresponding print, it is possible to identify the scenes (proceeding clockwise from the right side of the sheet) as the Covenant of Circumcision (17:10), Jacob in the house of Laban (Genesis 28), Sarah expelling Hagar (Genesis 16:6), the King of Sodom blessing Abraham (Genesis 14: 20), the meeting of Rebecca and Isaac (Genesis 24: 15), and Abraham preparing to sacrifice Isaac (Genesis 22:1-19). The composition’s impressive variety of biblical narratives is not organized according to

---

87 These prints are documented in Andresen II.11-15 and Hollstein VI.5-9. The etching dated to 1592 is from this series.
their chronology in the Scripture. Intimate, everyday scenes stand next to momentous events in biblical history, and mundane episodes are aligned with encounters with the divine. Each vignette appears to naturally transition to the next. While the sheer range of narratives captured in this tripartite drawing and the other Basel ensemble attest to Dietterlin’s versatility as a storyteller, the works’ pictorial cohesion speaks to his mastery of compositional arrangement.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

**BA.2**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*The Story of Jacob and Joseph in Egypt*
Circa 1590-1592
Middle field: Quill and reed with black ink, brush with black, grey-blue, brown, red-brown, and yellow wash with white and gold leaf heightening on yellow prepared laid paper
Outer fields: Quill with black ink, reed with dark green ink, brush with blue and grey, blue-grey, and red wash with white and gold leaf heightening on blue prepared paper
Sheet [at greatest points]: 43.2 x 32.9 cm
Kunstmuseum Basel, Kupferstichkabinett, Inv.-Nr. 1904.38

PROVENANCE: Donjeu La Reyniere, Marquis de Chevigné 1773?; Peter Visscher-Passavant (1751-1823), Basel, Lugt 2116; Purchased 1904 from a Geneva art dealer

This drawing and *The Story of Abraham* were once attributed to glass-painter Christoph Murer. Dieter Koepplin first identified the drawings as works of Wendel Dietterlin. Like the other Basel drawing, the present work depicts a variety of Old Testament narratives. *The Story of Jacob and Joseph in Egypt* gave rise to etchings that represent the top and bottom elements of the composite ensemble, which are labeled with scriptural

---

references that identify the stories shown in the drawing. The lower panel of the drawing depicts, from right to left, the prosperity of Jacob (Genesis 30:37-43), Joseph lowered into the pit by his brothers (Genesis 37:24), Judah and Tamar (Genesis 38), Joseph and Potiphar's wife and Joseph falsely imprisoned (Genesis 39), and Joseph interpreting the dreams of Pharaoh (Genesis 41). The upper panel portrays, from right to left, Joseph recounting his dreams (Genesis 37:1-11), Joseph’s brothers sent to Egypt (Genesis 42:1-5), Joseph’s hospitality to his brothers (Genesis 43), Benjamin and the silver cup (Genesis 44:1-17), the Israelites in Egypt (Exodus I), and the discovery of Moses in the basket (Exodus 2:4-6). The central portion of the drawing shows, among other scenes, Jacob’s ladder (Genesis 28:12), Jacob wrestling with the Angel (Genesis 32:35), and the blessing of Jacob and Esau (Genesis 27).

The dramatic coloring and lighting in this drawing recalls the expressionistic effects achieved by the painters of the so-called Danube school, which had flourished in the earlier part of the sixteenth century. Otherwise the work’s style is thoroughly avant-garde. As in The Story of Abraham, Dietterlin has organized the abundance of narratives in this drawing such that each vignette appears to flow seamlessly into the other stories portrayed around it. The episodes depicted in The Story of Jacob and Joseph in Egypt, like those shown in the other Basel drawing, do not proceed according to the order in which they occur in the Scripture. The fluid transitions between the vignettes, then, are a formal conceit alone. The impressive cohesion of the drawings’ disparate elements bears much in common with the compositional

---

89 These prints are documented in Andresen II.11-15 and Hollstein VI.5-9.
experiments of Baroque-era drawing, and indeed represents a precocious foray into that style.⁹₀

Above all, it is architecture that mediates the fluid transitions between the distinct scenes in Dietterlin’s Basel compositions. Columns separate the central zones of the drawings’ middle panels from the scenes portrayed in their lateral tabs. Walls, portals, archways, palace colonnades, prison bars, ruins, and even the boughs of a primitive hut distinguish interior from exterior and subtly separate the disparate narrative vignettes within these spaces. Dietterlin’s deft use of built forms in the Basel compositions indicates that the artist considered the depiction of architecture an invaluable facet of painterly composition. The author’s grasp of architecture as an excellent tool for organizing compositions likely motivated him to address his *Architectura* to painters and other figural artists.

**Berlin Drawing**

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

**BE.1**

Wendel Dietterlin the Elder

*Design for 1598 Architectura Plates 204 and 205*

1598 or earlier

Quill with black ink and brush with grey-black wash on off-white, laid paper

54.7 x 36.0 cm

Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Kunstbibliothek, HdZ 769

INSCRIPTIONS: recto lower right [graphite]: Inv. N: 1732. / P Contito

Heinrich Geissler first suggested Dietterlin as the author of this drawing, which was once attributed to contemporary Munich court artist Peter Candid.91 While Geissler hypothesized that the work represents a plan for an actual altarpiece, the drawing’s strong resemblance to the composition in Plates 204 and 205 of the 1598 installment of the Architectura indicate it undoubtedly served as a design for Dietterlin’s treatise.92 In fact, the drawing’s style suggests that this was the work’s primary purpose. Northern sculptors’ drawings such as the designs contained in the Spencer Album in the New York Public Library (made circa 1573) generally lack wash modeling, but also tend to show concrete, completed forms.93 This drawing, on the other hand, features dramatic shading that would have helped Dietterlin determine how to concentrate his stylus marks in the etching plate.

Geissler identified the woman with the crozier, book, and dove standing beside St. Paul as Saint Odilia, an Abbess of the Benedictine Order, who, during the later sixteenth century, was venerated only in Alsace. St. John the Evangelist and Mary Magdalene stand closer to the crucified Christ. On the next level of the altarpiece, St. Ambrosius with his beehive joins St. Barbara with her chalice and tower. St. Martin, rending his garment, crowns the ensemble’s uppermost tier, where the sheet has been cut down. The feet of the Immaculata, resting atop her customary crescent moon, are still discernable in the niche at St. Martin’s side, just beneath the trimmed top edge of the sheet. This imagery, along with the variety of saints depicted in the design and the work’s emphasis on the blood of Christ,
indicates that the altarpiece was likely intended to address a Catholic audience. The church for which it might have been intended is unknown.

Dietterlin adjusted the design’s religious rhetoric in the final etchings. St. Odilia disappears, eliminating a reference to the cult of a local saint. The artist substituted the bloody Crucifixion at the base of the retable with an Adoration of the Magi, and replaced the vessel containing the Sacred Heart with an image of Veronica’s veil. The putto bearing a chalice at the feet of the Virgin assumes a baser attitude in the etched design, casting the veneration of the Immaculata in a dubious light. Instead of crowning the altarpiece with the Immaculata, Dietterlin placed an image of the Archangel Gabriel triumphing over two devils at the apex of the design. This addition is visible in a more developed design for the upper portion of the altarpiece, now held in Dresden (Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 204, Version II). The alteration suggests that Dietterlin himself may have trimmed the top edge of the Berlin sheet in order to project how the design would appear with another crowning element. All these changes shift the focus of the original, Berlin design from objects that inspired veneration of the body of Christ or the Virgin to more abstract forms of worship that were better suited to a Reformed aesthetic. For other examples of Dietterlin’s Reform-minded drawing edits, see Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 88, Version I, and Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 88, Version II.

---

95 Dresden, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, CA2002-2, fol. 158; in this catalogue, Appendix IV DR. 161.
96 These are discussed in Appendix IV DR.106 and DR.107.
Bonn Drawing

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

BO.1
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
Design for Title Page, 1598 Architectura
1598 or earlier
Quill with dark brown and black ink and brush with brown and yellow-brown wash and traces of white heightening over graphite on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream laid paper
Sheet: 28.9 x 22.2 cm
Drawing: 27.4 x 18.9
Bibliothek des Kunsthistorischen Instituts Bonn, no inventory number, bound in JA 138/2 R

PROVENANCE of JA 138/2 R: Barons of Putz und Adelsturn until 1718; gift of family Putz und Adelsturn to Bibliothek of the Monastery of St. Jacob (Schottenkloster), Regensburg; Baron Leopold de Hohenhausen, circa 1770; Paris to Bibliothek des Bonner Kunsthistorischen Instituts on November 17, 1942, through exchange and 8500 Francs


The drawing, identified by Georg Satzinger in 2004, is a highly developed design for the title page of the 1598 installment of the Architectura. It does not display indentations or other signs that Dietterlin may have traced the sheet directly to the plate. Blank space in the middle of the shield at the center of the composition provides room for the title’s typeset lettering. The sheet is mounted on the page opposite the title page of a copy of the 1598 Architectura with the inventory number JA 138/2 R. It is unclear when the drawing joined the book. Few drawings preparatory for the Architectura etchings outside of those held in the Dresden albums are known. There is a strong likelihood that the drawings that do not now belong to the core Dresden group left that set before the former Dresden Akademie der Bildenden Künste, now the Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden, acquired the albums.

---

Dresden Drawings

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

DR.1
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
Design for Erst Buch [I TV‘SCANA]
1593 or earlier
Quill with brown ink and brush with dark grey, blue-grey, and grey wash and white heightening over graphite on cream, laid paper
25.50 x 18.20 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 1 [this drawing, like all of the other Dresden drawings, lacks its own inventory number]

INSCRIPTIONS: recto lower right [quill with dark ink]: I / AÅCSVVT
PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284

This drawing presents a visual synopsis of the Tuscan Order. It portrays the fundamental forms of the Order, as well as an anthropomorphic herm that figures Dietterlin’s description of the Tuscan mode as an Order that resembles a simple farmer. The work exemplifies the style that Dietterlin employed in executing the designs first published in the 1593 installment of the Architectura project. It also represents a rare case in which the artist used graphite instead of black chalk or a combination of graphite and black chalk to plot the composition. The graphite contours, visible in the columns’ axes of symmetry, between the two rightmost columns, and in many other locations throughout the sheet, have mostly been applied using a ruler or other straight edge. Dietterlin evidently took care to measure the composition’s architectural forms so that they would reflect the results of the instructions for architectural composition given in his 1593 text. The artist went over his graphite lines with the quill and dark brown ink. He applied the lines in relatively short strokes of the quill, varying the pressure on the drawing instrument to create lines of slightly varying thickness. This lent the drawing a hesitant manner. The cautious mood continues in Dietterlin’s treatment of the wash. While the artist applied wash with expressive abandon in
the drawings for *Architectura* designs published at a later date, here he wields the brush with careful, horizontal and vertical strokes. In modeling the forms of the design with these networks of parallel lines, the artist could better anticipate how the linear shading marks of the etching would transform the appearance of his initial composition. The precise, almost tense character of the *Tuscan* drawing shows an artist yet unpracticed in the art of drafting etchings with efficiency and speed.

The print that resulted from this drawing is unnumbered in the 1593 releases, and appears as Plate 2 in the *Annder Buch*. It is Plate 6 in the 1598 *Architecturas*.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

**DR.2**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*Design for Erst Buch Plate 6*
1593 or earlier
Quill with brown-black and grey ink and brush with grey wash and white heightening on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper
25.10 x 17.60 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 2

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284

The present Tuscan Order design depicts three abstract terms and an anthropomorphic term with the head and hooves of Silenus, symbolism discussed in greater detail in Chapter IV. Stylistically, the composition typifies Dietterlin’s concept of the Tuscan manner as a spare, rugged mode of ornament. Except for Silenus's laurel wreath, its ornaments are primarily geometric, showing none of the florid vegetation that characterizes the designs of the more delicate Corinthian and Composite Orders depicted in the
Small dots added to a number of the terms’ raised bands impart the objects with a rough texture, likewise reflecting the Tuscan Order’s coarse nature.

The composition also appears as Plate 11 in the 1598 *Architecturas*.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

**DR.3**

Wendel Dietterlin the Elder

*Design for Erst Buch Plate 8*

1593 or earlier

Quill with black and brown ink and brush with grey, dark grey, and grey-brown wash and white heightening on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper

25.26 x 17.81 cm

Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 31

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden

LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284

The image of column capitals set atop corresponding bases was ubiquitous in the architectural prints of the sixteenth century. Dietterlin appears to have drawn inspiration for the objects in this image of Doric Order ornaments from the engraved, single-leaf architectural designs of Sebastiano Serlio, the Master PS, Peter Flötner, or, most likely, Sebald Beham, whose 1543 and 1545 engravings of Doric capitals and bases the present motifs most resemble.98 Compared to the style of the ornaments pictured in the previous, Tuscan Order drawing (*Design for Erst Buch Plate 6*), the objects in this Doric design exhibit a

more flamboyant manner. Wave motifs, egg-and-dart patterns, and palmettes describe natural forms that are generally absent in Dietterlin’s Tuscan Order images.

This design also corresponds to the composition in Plate 47 of the 1598 Architecturas.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

**DR.4**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*Design for Erst Buch Plate 9*
1593 or earlier
Quill with black-brown ink and brush with grey, dark grey, and grey-brown wash and white heightening on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper
25.67 x 18.50 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 32

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284

Heinrich Vogtherr, the Elder’s Kunstbüchlin, discussed in detail in Chapter I, contains a rich variety of candelabra-formed columns that may have served as models for the decorative bands on these Doric columns. To formulate the partially bare columns in this design, Dietterlin also looked to the trophy-adorned posts of Hans Vredeman de Vries’s c. 1565 *Eersten Boeck* as models. Yet whereas Vredeman’s trophy designs and candelabras are

---

99 *Design for Erst Buch Plate 6* is catalogued in Appendix IV DR.2.
100 Pirr, *Die Architectura*, 76.
represented in low relief and cover only a small section of his columns, Dietterlin’s trophies
are shown in high relief, and cover the majority of each post. By emphasizing the
sculptural quality of their decorations, Dietterlin made the columns more interesting models
for his sculptor readers.

This design also corresponds to the composition in Plate 48 in the 1598 Architecturas.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

DR.5
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
Design for Erst Buch Plate 10
1593 or earlier
Quill with black-brown ink and brush with grey, dark grey, and grey-brown wash and white
heightening on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper
25.42 x 17.98 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 33

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284

This design for Doric entablatures corresponds to the composition in Plate 49 of the
1598 Architecturas. The artist likely drew inspiration for this image and the Architectura
project’s other representations of entablatures from engravings designed by Sebastiano
Serlio, the Master PS, and Jacques I. Androuet Du Cerceau. Nevertheless, Dietterlin’s
interpretation of the Doric entablature is rather unorthodox. While the entablature at the
top of the page shows the triglyphs characteristic of the Doric Order, the ensemble below it
shows panels with geometric ornaments that only approximate the Doric triglyph’s fluting.

102 See Pirr, Die Architectura, 77.
103 See, for instance, the later plates of Jacques I. Androuet Du Cerceau’s PETIT TRAITTE
DES CINQ ORDRES DE COLOMNES (Paris: s.n., 1583).
104 Pirr, Die Architectura, 41.
In the entablature at the very bottom of the page, consoles have replaced the Doric triglyphs entirely. The metopes, which are of somewhat normal length in the highest entablature, stretch ever longer in the middle and lower entablatures. They contain trophies, a warlike symbol appropriate to the image that generally Dietterlin cultivates for the Doric Order. Still, the dentilation visible in the lowest entablature belongs to the Ionic Order, not the Doric.\textsuperscript{105} The artist apparently prioritized the decorous application of symbolism in architecture over the correct use of the Orders’ conventional ornaments.

\textit{This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.}

\textbf{DR.6}
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
\textit{Design for Erst Buch Plate 11}
1593 or earlier
Quill with black-brown ink and brush with grey, dark grey, and grey-brown wash and white heightening on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper
25.1 x 18.25 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 34

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284

This design corresponds to the lower part of the representation of Doric entablatures in Plate 11 of the 1593 installment of the \textit{Architectura}. Dietterlin must have planned the entablature ultimately represented in the upper part of the etching on a separate sheet, combining the different elements in the final design. Here the artist continues the unusual interpretation of the Doric entablature developed in the \textit{Design for Erst Buch Plate 10}.\textsuperscript{106} As in the other image, the lower entablature shows Dietterlin replacing the Order’s

\textsuperscript{105} Ohnesorge, \textit{Wendel Dietterlin}, 39.
\textsuperscript{106} Pirr, \textit{Die Architectura}, 41. \textit{Design for Erst Buch Plate 10} is covered in Appendix IV DR.5.
standard triglyphs with consoles, stretching the metope to an unusual width, and adding a trophy in its place. The upper entablature dispenses with these forms entirely.

The print associated with this drawing also appeared as Plate 50 in the 1598 *Architecturas*.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

**DR.7**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder

*Design for Erst Buch Plate 12, with preliminary studies*

1593 or earlier

Quill with black-brown and brown ink and brush with grey and dark grey wash and white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper

25.31 x 17.81 cm

Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 35

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden

LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284; Satzinger (2004), 75

This drawing features three abstract terms and two anthropomorphic terms of the Doric Order. Numerous passages of ink *pentimenti* show Dietterlin experimenting with various forms that the ornaments in this composition might assume. The artist evidently tested two different orientations for the design’s rightmost anthropomorphic term. A version of the figure facing left appears near the lower right corner of the sheet, and a more developed variation, also facing left, appears in the larger façade. With his armor, ram’s head ornaments, and warlike demeanor, the anthropomorphic term on the left side of the design likely represents Ares, the god of war. This bellicose imagery continues in the battle-axe and spiked morning star in the trophy on the abstract term to the right.

The design corresponds roughly to the composition in Plate 51 in the 1598 *Architecturas*. 
This Ionic design, composed across multiple sheets that have been cut and re-assembled on the present mounting paper and subsequently gone over with the quill, typifies the cut-and-paste compositional method that Dietterlin often used to devise the first *Architectura* images. The drawing was likely used to make a now-lost offset that Dietterlin employed to create the etching plate drawing, a phenomenon discussed in greater depth in Chapter II. The work represents the only instance among the *Architectura* preparatory drawings in which the artist used heavy, brown paper. This thicker support would have better tolerated contact with water, an aspect of the offsetting process that Dietterlin probably used to create the lost counterproof drawing.

A more developed version of the present composition reappears in Plate 18 of the 1594 treatise, and in Plate 95 of the 1598 *Architectura*. 

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

**DR.8**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*Design for Erst Buch Plate 13 [III. IONICA]*
1593 or earlier
Quill with black-brown ink and brush with brown, dark brown, grey, and dark grey wash on heavy, dark brown, laid paper, mounted on cream paper
25.60 x 12.2 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 73

INSCRIPTIONS: recto lower left [quill with brown ink]: III. / IONICA
PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284
A section from the top of this sheet has been cut away. Dietterlin added another scrap of paper to that section and drafted the images of two Ionic column capitals and shafts over the area, connecting the two sheets with further marks of his pen. While the cuts in Design for Erst Buch Plate 13 [III. IONICA] show the artist using the cut-and-paste method to organize an entire composition, the interventions made to this drawing demonstrate how the artist also used the technique make minor edits to his work. This drafting method physically reflected Dietterlin’s affinity for drawing the elements of disparate ornament publications and prints together to form chimerical new compositions. The present drawing is in fact inspired by a number of other graphic sources. The capitals with female heads set beneath curling Ionic volutes resemble the head of an Ionic term in Jacques I. Androuet Du Cerceau’s unnumbered series of twelve ornament prints, the Termes et cariatides of circa 1550. They also reflect Dietterlin’s account of the Ionic Order capital as an object that resembles the head of a woman with buns on either side of her head, a motif he drew from Hans Blum’s 1550 Von den fünff Sülén.

107 Design for Erst Buch Plate 13, [III. IONICA] is addressed in Appendix IV DR.8.
109 Hans Blum, Von den fünff Sülén, Grundtlicher bericht vnnd deren eigentliche contrafeyung, nach Symmetrischer vßteilung der Architectur. Durch den erfaren, vnnd der fünff Sülén wolberichten, M. Hans Blümen von Lor am Mayn, fyßsig uß den antiquitetten gezogen, und erüwlich, als vor nie beschrieben, inn Truck abgefertigt. Allen kunstryc hern Bauherren, Werckmeisteren, Steinmetzen, Maleren, Bildhouweren, Goldschmiden, Schreyneren, och allen die sich des circkels uñ richtschyts gebruchend, zü grossem nüß und
Just as Dietterlin’s Doric Order designs display a greater degree of detail and refinement than his Tuscan Order inventions, the compositions of the Ionic Order exhibit a more delicate manner than those of the Doric. Here the egg-and-dart motifs and palmettes already used in the Doric Order are joined by spiraling rollwork and grotesque masks, as well as twining, rope-like forms and dainty tassels.

The present composition additionally appears in Plate 96 of the 1598 *Architectura*.  

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

**DR.10**  
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder  
*Design for Erst Buch Plate 15*  
1593 or earlier  
Quill with black ink and brush with grey and dark grey wash and white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper  
25.21 x 17.71 cm  
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 75  

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden  
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284  

This drawing shows four columns of the Ionic Order. The female head with palmettes adorning the column farthest to the left derives from the Composite column represented in Plate 18 of Vredeman de Vries’s 1565 *Ander Buch*, a compilation of ornaments from the Corinthian and Composite Orders.\(^\text{110}\) Dietterlin eliminated the acanthus

\(^{10}\) See Hans Vredeman de Vries, *Das ander Buch, Gemacht auff die zway Colonnen, Corinthia vnd Composita, sampt iren podien, basen, cornicen, capitellen, architraben, phrisen vnd coronamenten, Iede inn vier manieren gezieret vnd gtailet, zu mehrer zierd vnd schoene, Gozogen auß den berumpten Architecten Vitruvio, Sampt noch anderen zierder dar zu dienlich, den Malern, Bildhawern, Stainmetzen, Schreinern, Glasern, vnd sunst allen Liebhabern zu gutem* [hereafter, “*Ander Buch*”] (Antwerp: Hieronymus Cock, 1565), Pl. 18.
leaves depicted in Vredeman’s design. Acanthus was a signal feature of the Strasbourg artist’s Corinthian and Composite Order inventions, but not his Ionic works. Dietterlin kept the model’s other vegetal ornaments and looping forms, both of which he associated with the Ionic Order. That Dietterlin employed what Vredeman saw as a Composite pattern for an Ionic Order design indicates that the author of the 1593 *Architectura* texts allowed himself a great degree of freedom in selecting what Order would be associated with certain forms.

This design corresponds to the composition in Plate 97 in the 1598 *Architecturas*.

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

**DR.11**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*Design for Erst Buch Plate 16, Versions I and II*
1593 or earlier
Quill with black-brown ink and brush with grey and dark grey wash and white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper
Sheet I: 12.71 x 17.75 cm
Sheet II: 12.53 x 17.78 cm
Total, on mounting sheet: 24.81 x 17.83 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 76

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284

This sheet has been cut and re-assembled on an early modern mounting sheet. What is now the upper section in the re-assembled drawing corresponds to the design in the lower section of Plate 16 in the 1593 *Architectura* texts (Plate 98 in the 1598 editions). The lower section of the re-assembled sheet appears to be an earlier version of the lower Ionic entablature of that print. The present drawings show that Dietterlin developed the design in part by punctuating the rosette band with a blank plaque, and by applying varying passages of so-called *Schweffwerk* to part of the architrave. In adding these motifs, the artist increased the number of ornamental configurations that the etching could model.
Dietterlin also adjusted the design by enlarging the entablature’s tiny, volute-adorned dentils and interspersing them with female busts. The changes reflect the artist’s habit of amplifying the figural elements and general plasticity of his architectural drawings. The disappearance of the quadrilateral form to the right of the more developed entablature in the upper part of this ensemble in the final etching meanwhile reflects Dietterlin’s tendency to subtract background elements from his _Architectura_ drawings and prints. This enhanced the treatise’s efficacy as a clear, easy-to-use book of model ornaments. By amplifying the sculptural, figural qualities of his designs and by eliminating details that would subtract from their utility as visual models for the production of new ornamental inventions, Dietterlin broadened the audience of artists that the _Architectura_ could potentially attract.

The entablatures portrayed in this design display a level of decorative intricacy unusual for a building element typically placed quite high in the construction, where viewers cannot examine it carefully. This suggests that the entablatures were conceived as ornaments for smaller-scale architectonic forms, such as the tops of wooden furnishings or small, metalwork objects.

The etching related to this drawing reappears as Plate 98 in the 1598 _Architecturas_.

_This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations._

**DR.12**

Wendel Dietterlin the Elder

_Design for Erst Buch Plate 17_

1593 or earlier

Quill with brown and black ink and brush with grey, dark grey, and grey-brown wash and white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on heavy cream paper 13.6 x 18.00 cm

Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 77

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
This design anticipates the lower Ionic entablature in Plate 17 of the 1593 texts. That print also appears as Plate 99 in the 1598 *Architectura*. The sheet therefore attests that Dietterlin conceived and drafted the representations of entablatures published in the first installment of the *Architectura* series as separate entities. In terms of both composition and style, the design recalls the representations of Ionic entablatures published in Vredeman’s 1565 *Eersten Boeck.*

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

**DR.13**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*Design for Erst Buch Plate 18, Version I* 1593 or earlier
Quill with brown-black ink and brush with grey, dark grey, and grey-brown wash and white heightening over graphite and black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper 25.10 x 17.10 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 78

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284

Dietterlin’s graphite and black chalk underdrawing for this series of Ionic terms, much of which is still visible in the lower registers of the sheet, indicates that the artist used a straight edge to plot the axis of symmetry for each figure, and subsequently elaborated them with a free hand. He then went over the sketches with the quill, and modeled the leftmost term and the upper half of the term next to it with wash. Finally, the artist developed the

---

111 Vredeman de Vries, *Eersten Boeck*, esp. Pl. Q.
design farther in Design for Erst Buch Plate 18, Version II. The present design corresponds to the composition in Plate 100 in the 1598 versions of the Architectura.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

**DR.14**

Wendel Dietterlin the Elder  
*Design for Erst Buch Plate 18, Version II*

1593 or earlier  
Quill with brown-black ink and brush with grey, dark grey, and light brown wash and white heightening on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper  
Total assembled sheet: 25.71 x 17.90 cm  
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 79

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden  
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284

This design represents a more finished version of Design for Erst Buch Plate 18, Version I. Here Dietterlin has maintained the placement of the four Ionic terms plotted in the earlier drawing, but added the architectonic background eventually adopted in the print. The rightmost term is elongated and receives upstretched arms. Dietterlin’s enthusiastic use of polychrome wash in this design—a detail that had no bearing on the final appearance of his black-and-white etching—suggests that the artist regarded the Architectura drawings as more than just plans for the prints. By coloring the drawing in this manner, he imparted the work with autonomous aesthetic appeal. This enhanced the drawing’s value for potential collectors, but also allowed Dietterlin to project how his invention might appear as a painted façade or wall design.

---

112 That drawing is catalogued in Appendix IV DR.14.  
113 The drawing is catalogued in Appendix IV DR.13.
Notably, the sheet has been cut in several places and re-assembled. Since the artist had already worked out the placement of the design’s individual figures in the previous draft, the cuts and repairs in this sheet may represent efforts to conserve the drawing after it experienced damage in the course of Dietterlin’s etching plate-tracing process.

This design corresponds to Plate 100 in the 1598 *Architecturae*.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

**DR.15**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*Design for Erst Buch Plate 19 [III CORINTHIA]*
1593 or earlier
Quill with black ink and brush with brown, dark brown, and grey-blue wash over graphite on heavy dark brown laid paper, mounted on heavy cream paper
25.60 x 12.21 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 110

INSCRIPTIONS: recto lower center [quill with brown ink]: IIII. / CORINTH / IA
PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 107; Pauli (1899), 284

Curiously, the composition of the only surviving drawing for Dietterlin’s visual synopsis of the Corinthian Order faces the same direction as the related etching. While the most obvious explanation for this phenomenon is that the drawing is a copy after the print, this does not seem to be the case. The unfinished crenellation that mounts the entablature above the drawing’s rightmost column and the carefully-measured graphite plot lines visible beneath the drawing’s ink contours indicate that, despite its highly finished appearance, the work is preparatory for the etching. Dietterlin must have created a reverse copy of the present design, which he then used to render the composition in his etching plate coating. This evidently produced *Corinthia* prints that face the same way as the present composition.
Water spots on the drawing suggest that the artist made the counterproof by using the offset technique.

In the text that accompanies this image, Dietterlin explains that the artist Callimachus was inspired to invent the ornaments of the Corinthian Order when he happened upon the tomb of a young virgin, which was decorated with a vessel overflowing with curling acanthus leaves. The proportions of the column that Callimachus invented for the Order reflect the physique of a maiden, and the capital recalls the ornament placed upon her tomb. Therefore, Dietterlin writes, the Corinthian Order possesses a more delicate and purer appearance than the other Vitruvian Orders, and indeed resembles an ornamented virgin.\footnote{Dietterlin likely adapted his account of the Corinthian Order from Blum’s 1550 \textit{Von den fünff Sülern}, which in turn depends on Vitruvius’s story of the Corinthian Order’s origins.} The Strasbourg artist’s synoptic image of the Corinthian Order nevertheless visualizes this story far more vividly than Blum’s spare, linear image of the Corinthian column. The female caryatid pictured in Dietterlin’s \textit{Corinthia} design possesses the delicate body of a youthful virgin and balances an urn overflowing with the Order’s acanthus leaves upon her head. While the maiden’s body stands in the position of the column, the urn replaces the capital that typically crowns the shaft. In illustrating the Corinthian Order as a


\footnote{Blum, \textit{Von den fünff Sülern}, fol. 20*. Vitruvius’s Callimachus story occurs in Vitruvius, \textit{De architetur}, IV.1.10.}
manifestation of the figure and objects that first modeled its forms, Dietterlin suggests that the Vitruvian narratives that inspired the Orders' conventional, abstract architectural forms might also give rise to a highly pictorial mode of architecture. It is this principle that made his *Architectura* so appealing to figural artists.

This design also appears in Plate 38 of the 1594 *Architecturas*, and in Plate 136 of the 1598 *Architecturas*.

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

**DR.16**
*Design for Erst Buch Plates 20 and 21*

1593 or earlier

Elements from *Erst Buch* Pl. 20 [base sheet]: Quill with brown and black ink and brush with dark grey and grey-blue wash with white heightening over graphite on sheets of off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream laid paper

Elements from *Erst Buch* Pl. 21: Quill with brown and black ink and brush with dark grey and grey-blue wash with white heightening on sheets of off-white laid paper, mounted on cream paper. Verso of left column sheet: quill with brown ink.

Sheet with design for *Erst Buch* Pl. 20: 25.31 x 18.10 cm

Left column sheet: 23.50 x 4.10 cm

Center column sheet: 21.50 x 4.50 cm

Right column sheet: 24.50 x 4.20 cm

Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 112

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden

LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 107; Pauli (1899), 284

This construction features a series of Corinthian columns appended to a sheet that shows column bases from the Corinthian chapter of Dietterlin’s first treatise. In the work’s closed state, an early ink sketch for the column second from the left in Plate 21 is visible on the verso side of the rightmost column flap. The recto sides of the column flaps, visible in the ensemble's open state, represent the designs of the other three columns pictured in Plate 21. The bases represent designs from *Erst Buch* Plate 20. The leftmost column in this
composition is the second column from the right in Plate 2. The center column in the composition is the rightmost column in Plate 21. The rightmost column in the composition is the leftmost column in Plate 21.

It is unclear if Dietterlin created this construction, or if a member of his workshop or even a subsequent owner of the drawings is responsible for assembling the work as it now appears. Certainly the intervention occurred after the drawings had outlived their purposes as models for the Architectura etchings, for in this state they would have been too difficult to trace to the plate. If the artist or an associate reconfigured the drawings, it would attest that the drafts for the Architectura etchings enjoyed an active afterlife in the workshop. Whether or not the author of the present construction belonged to Dietterlin’s circle, the work speaks to the Architectura designs’ aptitude for inspiring new configurations of ornamental form.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

DR.17
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
Design for Erst Buch Plate 23
1593 or earlier
Quill with brown-black ink and brush with grey, dark grey, and grey-brown wash over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper
26.41 x 18.30 cm [at greatest points]
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 113

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 107; Pauli (1899), 284

The present drawing represents a series of Corinthian entablatures. Dietterlin’s ink compass marks are still visible in the center of the composition, as are the lines of his ruler. These contours indicate that the artist did not always draft the Architectura with a free hand. Rather, he depended on the drawing implements of a contemporary architect. This sped the
drafting process, and allowed the artist to compose designs with more accurate proportions.

Drawings for the 1593 installment of the Architectura treatise drafted in this fashion produced etchings that architects or artists could directly copy and re-scale to equally decorous designs.

This design appears in Plate 140 in the 1598 Architecturæs. A tall, thin section from the lower left portion of the sheet is missing, perhaps damaged when Dietterlin traced the design to the plate, or removed for or use in another design.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

DR.18
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
Design for Erst Buch Plate 24
1593 or earlier
Black chalk and quill with brown-black ink and brush with grey and grey-brown wash on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream laid paper
25.9 x 17.69 cm [at greatest points]
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 114

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 107; Pauli (1899), 284

This design for a Corinthian Order entablature with an obelisk pinnacle represents the lower portion of the design in Plate 24 of the 1593 installment of the Architectura. The composition reappears as Plate 141 in the 1598 Architecturæs. The upper right corner of the sheet is missing.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

DR.19
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
Design for Erst Buch Plates 25 and 33
1593 or earlier
This drawing depicts one anthropomorphic term with five abstract terms of the Corinthian Order. It is comprised of three panels of paper, brought together and drawn over with the artist’s quill. The left and center components together represent the composition in Plate 25 of the Erst Buch, while the sheet with the rightmost term in this arrangement provides the model for the Corinthian term on the right side of Plate 33 of the treatise. A tall, rectangular section is missing from the left sheet. Perhaps it was cut away when Dietterlin applied pressure to the drawing to trace the design on to the etching plate. It is also possible that the artist removed that section of the composition in order to use it as a model for another Architectura design. The inscriptions at the top left of the sheet indicate alterations to the design to be made in the final plate. The “l” likely designates “leer” (empty), for Dietterlin’s etching empties the indicated spaces of all marks. The “d” likely indicates “dunkel” (dark), for the etched figure’s face becomes darker to contrast with the lighter space that Dietterlin wished to create next to her countenance in the etching. The artist often added such inscriptions to his drawings. They could either indicate changes to be incorporated in a subsequent draft of the design, or alterations to be improvised in the plate drawing itself.
The term in the center of the composition sports the hooves and head of a stag, and is crowned by a basket with acanthus leaves. In Vitruvius’s story of the origins of the Corinthian Order, the sculptor Callimachus is inspired to create a column capital that resembles a basket with acanthus leaves set atop the grave of a maiden of Corinth. Dietterlin repeats the story in his own text, and reinforces the acanthus basket theme through this image. The stag, meanwhile, refers to the animal familiar of the huntress goddess Diana. One might expect the symbols of Diana to appear in the designs of the Ionic Order rather than those of the Corinthian, for according to ancient lore, it was to that goddess that the original Ionic temple was dedicated. Dietterlin’s decision to depict the animal familiar of Diana in a Corinthian design can be justified by the fact that Diana is a virginal deity who shares the maidenly nature of the girl whose funerary monument gave rise to the Corinthian Order. Dietterlin likely took inspiration for this ornament from the stag terms pictured in Joseph Boillot’s 1592 *Nouveaux pourtraitz et figures de termes...*, which pictures a veritable menagerie of animals in architectural form.¹¹⁶

This design reappears in Plate 142 in the 1598 *Architectura*.

This design shows four columns of the Composite Order. The leftmost column of the design is rendered on a separate sheet. Two sections are apparently missing from the center elements of the two leftmost columns in the present ensemble. These portions of the columns have been re-drawn in Dietterlin’s hand on small scraps of paper and attached to the present composition. It is possible that these additions represent an edit to the design, or a repair made to the sheet following damage resulting from the etching transfer process. The column now positioned farthest to the left must have stood farthest to the right at the time Dietterlin crafted the etching plate, for that is the arrangement reflected in reverse in the final etching. Dietterlin avoided unnecessary drafting in this work by verbally noting minor changes that should be made to the composition when the designs were actually etched into the plate. For instance, the tapering fluting marked “nit” (nicht) at the top of the column with the young satyrs is replaced by even fluting in the etching. The design corresponds to Plate 178 in the 1598 Architecturae.
This pair of drawings for a Composite column and two Corinthian columns demonstrates Dietterlin’s penchant for physically and notionally separating his drawings into individual ornaments, which he then integrated into full Architectura compositions. The column farthest to the left on the left sheet appears in a significantly altered form as the column second from the right in Plate 28 of the Erst Buch. The rightmost column on the left sheet appears in altered form as the column farthest to the right in Plate 21 of the 1593 treatise. The individual column in the sheet to the right corresponds to the column second from the left in Plate number 21 of the same text. Thus, the two rightmost columns exist on separate sheets but ended up in the same design, and the leftmost column occupies the same sheet as the middle column but ended up in a different design. This shows that Dietterlin did not always physically cut individual ornaments from their original sheets when applying his motifs to a new Architectura composition. Sometimes he would draft an individual element anew. The artist apparently conceived of his compositions as networks of ornamental units that could be parsed and re-organized into new arrangements.

It is also significant that the leftmost column ended up among the columns of the Composite Order in Plate 28 of the Erst Buch while the column next to it on the same sheet was ultimately included among the columns of the Corinthian Order in Plate 21 of the Erst Buch. This suggests that Dietterlin did not draft his ornaments with an entirely fixed notion of what Order they would represent, and that he used the drawing process to determine which motifs and forms to associate with which individual Orders.
The design for Plate 28 of the Erst Buch reappears in Plate 138 of the 1598 Architecturas. The designs for Plate 21 of the Erst Buch reappear in the 1598 Architecturas in Plate 178.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

**DR.22**

Wendel Dietterlin the Elder

*Design for Erst Buch Plate 31*

1593 or earlier

Quill with black-brown ink and brush with grey-brown, dark grey, and grey wash with white heightening over black chalk on cream laid paper, mounted on cream paper

25.40 x 18.40 cm

Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 142

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden

LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 107; Pauli (1899), 284

Here Dietterlin portrays a suite of entablatures for the Composite Order. Of all the Orders represented in the Architectura project, the Composite features the most florid ornaments. The style of the adornments portrayed in this drawing—swirling egg-and-dart patterns, elaborate garlands and arabesque flourishes, as well as opulent masks—is representative of Dietterlin’s typical treatment of the Composite Order.

The author likely expected that architect and artist readers would only employ one of the three examples of entablatures pictured here for a single composition. Nevertheless, his drawing combines the trio of figures into a strange convergence of architectonic forms. The strategy of cramming numerous designs into a single composition allowed Dietterlin to show a greater amount of ornament in more extensive detail within a single plate, but also amplified the image’s pictorial drama. The staggered gestalt of this design’s three primary
horizontal elements imparts the viewer with the sense that the work’s architectural bodies are about to collide.

This design reappears in Plate 181 in the 1598 *Architecturae*.

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

**DR.23**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*Design for Erst Buch Plates 20, 27, and 32*
1593 or earlier
Quill with black-brown ink and brush with dark grey and grey wash with white heightening on five sheets of off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream laid paper
Upper left sheet: 6.80 x 4.21 cm [at greatest points]
Upper right sheet: 6.21 x 4.21 cm [at greatest points]
Center sheet: 12.10 x 6.00 cm [at greatest points]
Lower left sheet: 5.80 x 3.82 cm [at greatest points]
Lower right sheet: 5.60 x 4.60 cm [at greatest points]
Total mounting sheet: 26.81 x 17.10 cm [at greatest points]
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 111

INSCRIPTIONS: recto center left [graphite; in modern hand]: zu pergament. I mit fol. 137;
recto lower right [graphite; in modern hand]: mitt in der Arch. / 111.
PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 107; Pauli (1899), 284

Dietterlin evidently determined a suitable use for each of the fugitive ornaments mounted to this Dresden album page, for he applied modified versions of the pedestals in two of the 1593 prints. The pedestal in the upper left corner corresponds to the Corinthian pedestal in the lower right corner of Plate 20 of the *Erst Buch*. The pedestal in the lower right corner corresponds to the pedestal in the lower left corner of Plate 20 of the same treatise.
The pedestal in the lower left corner matches the Composite pedestal at the right in Plate 27 of the *Erst Buch*. The Composite console in the center resembles the object in the center of Plate 32 of the 1593 treatise. The pedestal at the upper right corresponds to the Corinthian
pedestal in the center of Plate 20 for the Erst Buch. The relationships between these fugitive sheets and the prints suggest that Dietterlin disassembled many sketches to stock a grab bag of ornaments to apply in his Architectura compositions. Perhaps the components evidently missing from many Architectura sheets served this purpose.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

**DR.24**

Wendel Dietterlin the Elder

*Design for Erst Buch Plate 33*

1593 or earlier

Quill with brown ink over graphite on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper

25.90 x 9.10 cm

Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 143

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden

LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 107; Pauli (1899), 284

Dietterlin ultimately combined the Composite terms pictured in this sketch with the rightmost term in *Design for Erst Buch Plates 25 and 33* to form the design for Plate 33.  

Despite the remarkably accurate symmetry of the present drawing, differences in the ink patterns on each side of the sheet indicate that Dietterlin did not replicate the design using the folded counterproof technique that he often employed in drawings for the 1594 and 1598 texts (see Chapter II). The fact that Dietterlin did not use the folding counterproof technique to form this bilaterally symmetrical Erst Buch drawing suggests that the artist indeed formulated the Architectura designs in at least two distinct drafting campaigns, one ending in 1593 with the publication of the Erst Buch designs, and the other beginning with the appearance of that work. Perhaps the artist hesitated to devise the images for subsequent

---

117 *Design for Erst Buch Plates 25 and 33* is documented in Appendix IV DR.19.
installments of the planned *Architectura* treatise until he could use the first publication to
determine whether his project would attract readers willing to purchase copies of the books.

This design corresponds to the composition in Plate 183 in the 1598 *Architectura*.

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

**DR.25**

*Design for Erst Buch Plates 39 and 40*

1593 or earlier

Recto all sheets: Quill with brown and black ink and light brown, dark grey, and grey wash with white heightening over black chalk

Verso upper sheets: black chalk; stamp [in purple ink]: stamp of Akademie der Bildenden Künste Dresden.

On four sheets of heavy off-white laid paper, mounted on heavy cream laid paper

Upper left sheet: 28.1 x 11.4

Upper right sheet: 28.3 x 5.9

Lower left sheet: 27.8 x 16.9

Lower right sheet: 24.8 x 5.8

Total Ensemble: 55.9 x 17.4

Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 144

INSCRIPTIONS: upper right sheet, recto upper right [quill with brown ink]: 195.

MARKS: upper left sheet, verso center [stamp in purple ink]: AKADEMIE / DER / BILD. KÜNSTE/ DRESDEN

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden

LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 107; Pauli (1899), 284

This drawing is likely among the first multiple-plate *Architectura* designs that

Dietterlin drafted. A highly developed work with few traces of experimentation, the drawing
probably represents the end product of a design process that unfolded over several drafts.

The left portion of the top sheet has been trimmed and replaced with another strip of paper, which depicts a caryatid porch with an obelisk-formed pinnacle. Dietterlin evidently applied
the strip to replace an unsatisfactory aspect of the composition. This demonstrates how the artist could use the cut-and-paste technique to edit a relatively minor aspect of the design, circumventing the need to draft a relatively finished but slightly problematic composition
anew. It is interesting to note that the artist composed the two-plate design relatively to scale, even if there is no evidence that he traced the drawing to the plate. Whether or not Dietterlin used the drawings as templates for his work with the etching stylus, he valued them as tools for projecting, as closely as possible, the ultimate appearance of the *Architectura* etchings.

In the 1593 installment of the *Architectura*, the present image serves as the pictorial finale of the treatise and belongs to no particular Order. Yet the work also corresponds to the composition depicted across Plates 187 and 188 in the 1598 installment of the *Architectura*, where it occurs amidst the images of the Composite Order. Since the present design combines the images of the columns of all five Orders, and thus reflects the Composite Order’s status as a manner derived from the other canonical modes of architecture, this was an appropriate way for Dietterlin to reclassify the drawing in the context of the later treatise.

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

**DR.26**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*Design for Annder Buch Plate 3*
1594 or earlier
Quill with black and brown ink and brush with dark grey and grey wash with white heightening over black chalk on off-white laid paper, mounted on cream paper
24.92 x 18.17 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 13

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284

The present drawing shows a Tuscan portal built from stone, the crudest construction material and the substance most appropriate to what Dietterlin calls the
“rough” (grob) Tuscan Order. The designs of Serlio’s 1551 Extraordinario libro, which begins with a series of similar, rusticated portals, probably served as inspiration for the door. The primeval nature of the portal’s architecture echoes in the brutish appearance of its ornamental figures. The clothed bodies of post-lapsarian Adam and Eve recline on either side of the portal’s slanted, broken pediment, representing the ignoble origins of humanity’s earthly troubles. Between the pair slithers a snake bearing the fruit of knowledge that caused their downfall. Animals skirmish all around them, acting out the discord that followed Adam and Eve’s expulsion from the Garden of Paradise. Dietterlin probably drew the idea for the columns with squabbling fauna from Boillot’s Nouveaux pourtraitz et figures de termes..., which shows terms adorned with unicorns and deer fighting other animals. Behind Dietterlin’s image of the first parents appears the framework of a hut with a crossbeam roof. Like the carved, cave-like form of the arch itself, the hut recalls the structures that Vitruvius described as mankind’s earliest dwellings. Antediluvian man and the most primitive forms of architecture combine here to form an architectural emblem that allegorizes the parallels between the origins of man and the origins of building. This emblem serves as the prelude to the larger Christian narrative developed across the subsequent Architectura designs, acting as a point of departure for the treatise’s expansive cosmology of ornament.

This design also appears as Plate 24 of the 1598 Architectura.

---

118 Sebastiano Serlio, Extraordinario libro di architettura di Sebastiano Serlio, Architetteto del re Christianissimo, nel quale si dimostrano trenta porte di opera Rustica mista con diversi ordini: Et venti di opera dilicata di diuerse specie con la scrittura daumentu, che narra il tutto (Lyon: Giovan di Tournes, 1551), Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Res/2 Arch 134 i.
119 Boillot, Nouveaux pourtraitz, fols. Cii r, Ciii r, Eiii r, and E iv r
120 Vitruvius, De architectura, II.1.2
DR.27
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
Design for Annder Buch Plate 4
1594 or earlier
Quill with black and brown ink and brush with grey-blue and grey-brown wash and white heightening on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper
25.21 x 17.81 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 14

INSCRIPTIONS: recto lower right [quill with black ink]: 4 [overwritten with “6”]
PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284

Dietterlin appears to have rendered the right half of the elevation of this Tuscan portal with quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the drafted design. He subsequently embellished the design with quill and ink and brush with wash. This offset technique is observable in nearly every bilaterally symmetrical Architectura composition published in 1594 or later. The style of this drawing also typifies the drafting manner that Dietterlin would employ for the designs first published in the second installment of his treatise project. Its contours are composed with confidence and vigor, particularly the editing marks, which appear as black lines applied over various aspects of the composition. The wash is applied with broad, expressive strokes. Multiple coats of wash create thick deposits of pigment, resulting in deep, bluish shadows. Dietterlin does not accurately depict the play of light and shadow across the design’s architectonic forms, apparently preferring to work out this element of the design in the linear shading of the etching plate drawing. This composition reappears as Plate 25 in the 1598 Architectura.
This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

DR.28
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
Design for Annder Buch Plate 5
1594 or earlier
Quill with black and brown ink and brush with grey-blue and grey wash on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper
25.41 x 17.80 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 15

INSCRIPTIONS: recto upper right [quill with brown ink]: x / 4 ½; recto upper right [quill with brown ink]: A
PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284

Compared to the loose, serene manner of the previous drawing, the present design for a Tuscan portal from the second installment of Dietterlin’s Architectura exhibits a more dynamic, or even frenetic, style. Its lines are applied with a drier quill, in shorter, more anxious strokes. Unsatisfactory marks are crossed out with a scribble. The dark contours that Dietterlin often used to edit his drawings are here composed in quick, aggressive motions.

While Dietterlin evidently created Design for Annder Buch Plate 4 with a straight edge and without rush, this drawing was executed with a free hand, and in apparent haste. The stylistic differences between the two works may well result from a lapse in time between their respective executions. Whereas the Design for Annder Buch Plate 4 betrays a greater affinity with the carefully composed manner of the drawings for designs first published in 1593, the Design for Annder Buch Plate 5 reflects more closely the style of the compositions first published in 1598. Dietterlin likely drafted the former drawing relatively early in his work on the middle installment of the Architectura, and the present design somewhat later. The fact that drawings for compositions published as consecutive prints in the 1594 treatise display

122 Design for Annder Buch Plate 4 is discussed in the previous catalogue entry, Appendix IV DR.27.
this apparent development in style indicates that the artist did not draft his *Architectura*
designs in the order they appeared in the books. It likewise suggests that the project’s second
installment took a considerable time to execute.

The volute figure in the upper right corner of this design also appears in *Design for Annder Buch Plate 6, Version I*.\textsuperscript{121} The present composition also appears as Plate 26 of the 1598 *Architectura*.

\textit{This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.}

\textbf{DR.29}

\textit{Design for Annder Buch Plate 6, Version I}

1594 or earlier
Quill with grey, black, and brown ink and brush with grey and dark grey wash with white heightening on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper
25.10 x 17.97 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 16

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284

A variation of this design for a Tuscan portal appears in Plate 6 of the 1594 installment of the *Architectura*, and in Plate 27 in the 1598 installment of the *Architectura*. The volute form floating above the portal represents a side view of the pinnacle of the door. Dietterlin developed the present composition in *Design for Annder Buch Plate 6, Version II*, where he eliminated the floating form.\textsuperscript{124} The form reappears in a more rudimentary form in *Design for Annder Buch Plate 5*, and in Plate 5 itself.\textsuperscript{125} There it is labeled “A”. The pinnacle of the portal pictured in Plate 6 of the 1594 *Architectura* is marked with a corresponding “A”.

\textsuperscript{123} This drawing is covered in Appendix IV DR.29.
\textsuperscript{124} *Design for Annder Buch Plate 6, Version II* is discussed in Appendix IV DR.30.
\textsuperscript{125} *Design for Annder Buch Plate 5* is addressed in Appendix IV DR.28.
This indicates to viewers that the form in Plate 6 shows a side view of the pinnacle in Plate 5. Dietterlin’s tactic of shifting forms between different drawings indicates that the artist planned some *Architectura* images simultaneously, conceiving the treatise as a whole with coordinating parts.

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

**DR.30**  
*Design for Annder Buch Plate 6, Version II*  
1594 or earlier  
Quill with black and brown ink and brush with dark grey and grey wash with white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper  
25.52 x 18.10 cm  
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 17  
PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden  
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284

The present drawing of a Tuscan portal represents a more mature version of the design begun in *Design for Annder Buch Plate 6, Version I*. While the first version shows a similar portal in perspective, with part of its left side visible, this design depicts a frontal view of the arch. Dietterlin drafted the image by forming the right half of the architectural elevation with quill and ink, as well as brush and wash, and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double aspects of the drafted design. He then embellished the composition with quill and ink and brush with wash. Corrections and additions are made with quill and black ink and brush with grey wash with white heightening. This design reappears as Plate 27 of the 1598 editions of the *Architectura*.

---

126 *Design for Annder Buch Plate 6, Version I* is described in Appendix IV DR.29.
This design for a Tuscan portal shows a *putto* in the guise of Bacchus, holding two gourds and accompanied by a pair of other *putti*. Flanking them are ram figures, an unusual motif particularly associated with Dietterlin’s architectural designs. Bacchus, rams, and *putti* all reinforce the Dionysian, pastoral symbolism found throughout the Tuscan Order images.

To form this image, Dietterlin appears to have rendered the right half of the architectural elevation and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the drafted design. He subsequently developed the composition with quill and ink and brush with wash. Corrections are made with quill and black ink. This composition reappears as Plate 29 of the 1598 *Architecturae*.

---

The present design for a Tuscan portal, the iconography of which is discussed at length in Chapter IV, features fauns and satyrs as well as a cyclops and a mysterious figure with a flask and jug—all characters that resonate with what Dietterlin imagines as the Tuscan Order’s Dionysian character. It also depicts the faint image of an ornate arch rendered in brown ink somewhere beyond the doorway in the foreground. A similar phenomenon occurs in Design for Annder Buch Plate 21, Version II.\textsuperscript{128} Neither of the etchings related to these drawings include the forms of these sketched portals. Had Dietterlin pictured the distant arches in the prints, the compositions would have resembled sweeping architectural perspectives in the manner of Hans Vredeman de Vries’s 1560 print series, the \textit{Scenographie, sive perspectivae}.\textsuperscript{129} Deep perspectives do appear beyond the doors in Plates 3, 29, 39, 51, and 58 of Dietterlin’s \textit{Annder Buch}. Those designs are repeated in the 1598 \textit{Architectura}, where they are joined by further perspectival images, such as the designs in Plates 104 and 147.

The present drawing shows that the artist deliberated over whether to incorporate the illusion of expansive space into the images of his \textit{Architectura}. The other designs attest that he ultimately decided, with increasing frequency, to do just that. The phenomenon suggests that Dietterlin cultivated an ever stronger interest in addressing figural artists potentially looking to render such perspectives in paint, relief, or intarsia. It may also indicate that the artist amplified his efforts to attract non-artist readers who merely found such perspectival images amusing.

\textsuperscript{128} The drawing is examined in Appendix IV DR.38.
\textsuperscript{129} Hollstein XLVII.30-50.
Dietterlin made corrections to this design with the quill and brown ink. The composition reappears as Plate 30 in the 1598 *Architectura*.

---

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

**DR.33**

Wendel Dietterlin the Elder  
*Design for Annder Buch Plate 10*  
1594 or earlier  
Quill with grey, black, and brown ink; brush with grey and dark grey wash over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on heavy cream paper  
25.46 x 17.89 cm  
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 20

INSCRIPTIONS: recto lower right [quill with black and brown ink (bistre?)]: 6; recto upper left [charcoal]: zu groß / + / Bischn / auf …; recto upper right [charcoal]: zu ding [?]

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden  
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284

The present drawing for a Tuscan portal shows Dietterlin experimenting with a range of different styles and techniques. The artist continues to employ the reserved style that characterized his drawings for the 1593 text, as well as the brown quill lines and bluish-grey wash found in many of those sheets. Here, however, he renders the architectural elements of the portal with brown ink and executes the grillwork over the doorway in blue-grey, evoking the chromatic contrast between brick or stone and metal. This versatile design could in fact be executed in diverse media, from wood to stucco, stone, metal, paint, or some combination of those materials.

As in the drawings for designs first published in 1593, the wash is applied with great precision, rarely transgressing the outlines. A hint of the more dynamic manner characteristic of the later *Architectura* drawings appears in the metal grill adorning the portal. Dietterlin appears to have rendered half of the grill in quill and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the drafted design. He then embellished the grill with brush and wash.
Because the present work assembles a range of the styles and techniques present in the
*Architectura* drawings on a single sheet, it offers compelling evidence for the argument that
Dietterlin is the primary (and likely *sole*) author of the designs.

This composition reappears as Plate 31 of the 1598 *Architecturam*.

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

**DR.34**
*Design for Annder Buch Plate 11*
1594 or earlier
Quill with black and brown ink and brush with grey, blue-grey, and dark grey wash and white
heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper
24.51 x 17.91 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 26

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284

Like the other heraldic compositions first published in the 1594 *Architectura*, the
present Tuscan Order design could serve as a model for a sculpted epitaph, a panel painting,
a textile, or many other forms of decoration. The heraldic content and symmetrical structure
of the works particularly recalls the forms of contemporary glass painting, a thriving trade in
Dietterlin’s late sixteenth-century Rhineland milieu. The material ambiguities of these
designs made them useful to the widest possible range of artisan consumers.

This drawing shows a wild man and his female consort, engaging a theme popular in
German print culture of the earlier sixteenth century. Artists such as Albrecht Altdorfer and
Hans Schäufelein often incorporated the image of the wild man into their representations of

552
the primeval German forest. The wild man’s untamed nature suits the stereotypically uncouth character of the Tuscan Order. His connections with the German past are likewise appropriate to this particular mode of architecture. Dietterlin writes that the Tuscan Order is named for the giant Tuscano, father of the German people. As a symbol for the early Teutonic people, Dietterlin’s wild man could well represent a “child” of the mythical Tuscan.

Dietterlin made some additions and corrections to the drawing with white heightening, quill and light brown ink, and brush with blue-grey wash. This composition also appears as Plate 38 of the 1598 *Architecturas*.

---

**DR.35**

Wendel Dietterlin the Elder  
*Design for Annder Buch Plate 14*  
1594 or earlier  
Quill with black and brown ink and brush with grey, grey-blue, and light brown wash over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on heavy cream paper  
25.23 x 18.10 cm  
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 47

INSCRIPTIONS: recto lower center [quill with black ink]: NuI[?]r / 14  
PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden  
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284

The design in Plate 14 of the *Annder Buch*, discussed at length in Chapter V, serves as the leading portal for the book’s Doric Order section. The structure is comprised of wood, a material long associated with the Doric Order because its temples had originated as wooden

---

structures.\(^{131}\) The substance’s prominent role in this design signals the treatise’s potential appeal for carpenters, a contingent of artisans that indeed made liberal use of Dietterlin’s models. The sleeping figure, who clutches the axe and chisel of a woodworker, reinforces this idea. His foreshortened body is likely inspired by the slumbering man in Hans Baldung’s *The Bewitched Groom* woodcut of circa 1544, an image that also features a modest interior comprised of a strange arrangement of wooden planks and beams.\(^{132}\) With its plunging, perspectival view, the present design could serve variously as a model for a building or an architectonic sculpture, or even a painting or intarsia piece.

This portal combines ornamental motifs associated with a variety of architectural idioms. With its Doric columns and modest, post-and-lintel construction, it generally embodies a classical manner of building. The banded, arboreal column pictured to the right of the doorway meanwhile resembles the innovative model for the French Order in Philibert De l’Orme’s 1567 *Premier Tome de l’Architecture*, which otherwise promotes a fairly rigorous and conservative classical manner.\(^{133}\) The broken entablature and spiral column—the only post of its kind in Dietterlin’s entire oeuvre—in turn evoke the more subversive motifs of the mannerist architectural style. Dietterlin’s Doric portal also incorporates the vine-like forms of *Astwerk*, an ornament associated with late Gothic design.

Throughout the *Architectura* project, Dietterlin associates the individual Orders with particular moods and characteristics. The Doric Order, for instance, captures the heroic demeanor of a brave soldier. The diversity of manners included in this design nevertheless indicates that Dietterlin does not affiliate the individual architectural Orders with the

\(^{132}\) Hollstein II.237.
architectural style of any particular time or place. Just as the composition’s combination of architecture and perspective made the image useful for all manner of architect and artisan readers, the design’s stylistic heterogeneity made it applicable to a wide variety of architectural contexts.

To create this drawing, Dietterlin rendered the left half of the architectural elevation in ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the drafted design. The artist subsequently embellished the design with quill and black ink and brush with grey-blue wash, and made corrections in brown ink. This design also appears as Plate 66 of the 1598 installment of the Architectura.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

DR.36
Design for Annder Buch Plate 18
1594 or earlier
Quill with maroon ink and brush with grey, dark grey, and green wash on heavy cream laid paper, mounted on heavy cream paper
24.81 x 17.55 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 48

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284

The shadow in both this drawing for a Doric portal and in the related print appears on the right side of the doorway. This raises the possibility that the artist made a counterproof of the present drawing and developed the design on the subsequent sheet, or that he improvised the marks that comprise the etched shadow when drawing into the plate coating. This composition also appears as Plate 70 of the 1598 Architectura.
This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

**DR.37**

*Wendel Dietterlin the Elder*

*Design for Annder Buch Plate 21, Version I*

1594 or earlier

Black chalk and quill with black ink and brush with grey-blue, dark grey, and light green wash on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper

26.10 x 18.10 cm

Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 51

**PROVENANCE:** Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden

**LITERATURE:** von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284

This drawing is the first and least-developed of a trio of designs for the Doric triumphal arch first portrayed in Plate 21 of the *Architectura*’s 1594 installment. With the exception of the figures standing atop the right side of the image’s triumphal arch, the underdawing of this design displays nearly perfect symmetry along its central axis. Dietterlin evidently drew half the elevation on one side of the composition and folded the sheet, allowing the chalk dust to transfer a mirror image of the design to the blank side before adding the figures and other details not shown in the reflection. The artist then used the quill to further develop alternative schemes on each half. Gone over in ink, the graphite figure at the pinnacle assumed an animal-skin headdress and a contrapposto stance, the leftmost columns received helmet-formed capitals, and the rightmost columns became cannon. Only this half displays shading in wash, which the artist probably added last.

Already at this early stage, Dietterlin considered how to marry the robust forms of his Doric design with imagery that would aptly reflect the Order’s heroic personality. Cannon, armor-formed trophies, bows and a crossbow, and a quiver of arrows depicted in the lower registers of the composition impart the arch with a warlike tone. The hero Hercules, recognizable by the outline of a garment comprised of the skin of the Nemean

---

134 The other two drafts are covered in Appendix IV DR. 38 and DR.39.
lion, crowns the ensemble. Perhaps because Hercules did not represent the ideal personification of the theme of war, Dietterlin removed him from the design in the next phase of drafting. Yet figures eliminated in one stage of the artist’s drawing process were rarely lost altogether. The Hercules figure at the top of this sheet reappears, in modified form, in Plate 148 of the 1598 text.

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

**DR.38**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder  
*Design for Annder Buch Plate 21, Version II*  
1594 or earlier  
Quill with black and brown ink and brush with grey, dark grey, and light green wash and white heightening on off-white, laid paper, mounted on heavy cream paper  
26.10 x 18.10 cm  
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 50

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden  
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284

The subsequent design for Plate 21 shows a folded counterproof chalk underdrawing partially gone over and elaborated with the quill. Dietterlin appears to have made a first round of additions in black ink, and a second in brown. He developed each side of the doubled counterproof composition in alternative ways. One side of the arch received a shield and batons, while the other side was adorned with an armored breastplate. A chalk cannon above the breastplate on the left side of the design finds reflection in an ink version on the right side of the arch. Dietterlin additionally adorned each half of the arch with cannon-formed columns oriented in opposite directions. In place of the Hercules figure that once stood at the pinnacle of the composition, the artist rendered the outline of an armored,
helmeted figure, who places his hand on the hilt of a sword and sits behind a pile of war booty.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

**DR.39**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*Design for Annder Buch Plate 21, Version III*
1594 or earlier
Quill with black and brown ink and brush with grey and dark grey wash and white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper
25.50 x 18.07 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 52

INSCRIPTIONS: recto upper center [quill with grey ink]: zü groß; recto upper right [quill with brown ink]: nit; recto center right [quill with brown ink]: zü groß; recto lower center [quill with black ink]: 2Φ.

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284

The drawing closest in form to the design in Plate 21 of the *Annder Buch* shows traces of Dietterlin’s folded counterproof drafting method in chalk as well as in ink, indicating that the artist folded the sheet to double his drafting marks at least two times. Layers of grey ink contours, grey wash, and editing marks in brown and black added over the counterproof framework elaborate a different set of ornaments on each side of the composition. For the most part, Dietterlin confirmed the arrangement of ornaments depicted in the previous phase of drafting, refining the quiver and bow shown in the arch’s right niche. The artist distributed cannon forms to both sides of the arch’s upper tier, and decided to orient all the cannon columns in an upright position. He also developed the image of the warrior at the top of the ensemble in greater detail.
Dietterlin additionally incorporated some new elements into the scheme. To the niche on the left side of the arch he added a trophy ensemble featuring a suit of armor, and rendered a spear-bearing figure leaning against the wall on the right side of the doorway. The artist must have been satisfied with the results of his labors, for Plate 21 reproduces the scheme portrayed in the present design quite closely. Although the trio of drawings related to this etching represents the only instance in which three different designs for a single *Architectura* print survive, it is not improbable that Dietterlin generally drafted the prints on at least three sheets of paper before settling on a given composition’s final appearance.

The number 20 inscribed at the bottom of the sheet indicates the place of the design within the sequence of plates that comprised the 1594 installment of the *Architectura*, and was likely added so that the artist could plan the order of the images within the treatises. Similar numbers, which probably served the same purpose, also appear at the bottom of the subsequent three sheets. This design also appears as Plate 73 of the 1598 installment of the *Architectura*.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

**DR.40**  
*Design for Annder Buch Plate 22*  
1594 or earlier  
Quill with black and brown ink; brush with grey, dark grey, and light brown wash and white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper  
22.43 x 18.00 cm  
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 53

INSCRIPTIONS: recto center [quill with brown ink]: gerirß nit; recto lower center [quill with black ink, partially cut along with sheet]: 22.  
PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden  
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284
To create this drawing for a Doric portal, Dietterlin rendered the left half of the architectural elevation in quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the drafted scheme. Corrections and additions are made with quill and brown and black ink and brush with light brown and grey wash, which may contain white heightening. The sheet is cut in half and re-mounted on another sheet of heavy cream paper.

A large, triangular portion from the central, upper section of the sheet is missing, perhaps damaged when Dietterlin transposed the design to the plate, or cut for use elsewhere. The corresponding passage in the related etching depicts the virgin huntress Diana, bearing a bow and a quiver of arrows as well as a large spear, and sporting a headpiece with the crescent moon. Her prominent presence in a construction of the stereotypically masculine Doric Order indicates that Dietterlin did not, like many of his predecessors, conceive of the Orders as strictly gendered entities. The artist instead regarded the various manners of architecture as constellations of abstract qualities, or manifestations of a certain mood. For instance, the bravery of the divine huntress shown in the etching that resulted from this design is consistent with the Doric Order’s heroic, intrepid nature.

In her proper right hand, the etched Diana holds the leashes of the four dogs still visible in the present drawing. This motif was rarely seen in architectural books of Dietterlin’s era, or indeed among sixteenth-century ornament prints writ large. The heads of various wild game—a boar, a bear, and a gams—adorn the portal, as does the head of a dead stag. While the goddess of the hunt is often pictured with such quarry, the combination of the leashed dogs and the stag brings to mind the tale of Diana and Actaeon, related in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*. Ovid tells how the hunter Actaeon happens upon the bathing Diana, who,

---

infuriated at this indignity, splashes the intruder with water and thereby transforms him into a stag. Failing to recognize their master, Actaeon’s dogs promptly kill the unfortunate man.

The narrative to which this drawing alludes resonates with several aspects of the theory of architectural design presented in Dietterlin’s *Architectura*. The protagonist’s transformation suggests the volatile, mercurial nature of forms and materials, a notion vital to Dietterlin’s picture of physical fusions of architecture and the figural arts. The dichotomy between rules and transgression, indulgence and restraint—a virtue referenced in the leashes holding Diana’s dogs at bay—is also evoked in this design. These ideas reflect the *Architectura*’s complex case for the right of the experienced artist to indulge in a degree of architectural license.

This design also appears as Plate 74 in the 1598 *Architecturas*.

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

**DR.41**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*Design for Annder Buch Plate 23*
1594 or earlier
Quill with black and brown ink; brush with dark grey and grey-blue wash and white heightening on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper
25.60 x 17.48 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 54

INSCRIPTIONS: recto center right [quill with brown ink]: zü groß; recto center [quill with brown ink]: z klein
PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284

The present sheet is cut in several places and re-mounted on another page of heavy cream paper. Its damaged design for a Doric portal includes a “floating” window with a curling, broken cornice, as well as an overabundance of figural ornaments. It also features a
cook-formed term bearing an oversize spoon, bundles of fowl, and a knife. With his partially unbuttoned shirt and protruding belly, the louche term matches the irreverent nature of his architectural context. Decked with boar’s heads and other culinary delights, the structure indeed appears to have sprung from the cook’s crackpot imagination. To his right is an oven filled with pastry forms and covered dishes, topped with a broken pediment. In a niche above the window stand a vat, two vessels and a dowel decked with three sausages. Beneath this ensemble lie a slayed stag and rabbits, and beside it lounges an allegorical figure bearing a cornucopia and bundle of wheat, together symbolizing the wild abundance of ingredients at the cook’s disposal. The cook’s kitchen, like the Architectura itself, serves as a locus of invention.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

**DR.42**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder  
*Design for Annder Buch Plate 24*  
1594 or earlier  
Quill with black and brown ink and brush with grey, grey-blue, dark grey, and light brown wash over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper  
25.00 x 17.79 cm  
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 55  

_INSCRIPTIONS:_ recto lower center [quill with brown ink, partially cut along with sheet]: 24  
_PROVENANCE:_ Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden  
_LITERATURE:_ von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284

Dietterlin formulated this design for a Doric portal by rendering the right half of the architectural elevation in ink and folding the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the drafted design. The artist subsequently developed the composition with quill and ink and brush with various shades of wash. He made corrections to the work in quill with brown and black ink.
The anthropomorphic terms flanking the doorway hold their hands up to their ears, a gesture associated with the blocking of noise, or the sense of hearing. The motif cleverly re-imagines Jacques I. Androuet Du Cerceau and Hans Vredeman de Vries’s images of terms who uphold capitals with raised arms.\textsuperscript{136} If the present design represents the sense of hearing, it is possible that the previous plate in the \textit{Annder Buch}, which shows a cook before a hearth laden with game, represents the sense of taste or smell. The five senses were a widespread theme of medieval and early modern art.\textsuperscript{137} In sixteenth-century northern Europe, artists such as Georg Pencz and Frans Floris I made the theme a common subject of print series.\textsuperscript{138} The 1499 \textit{Hypnerotomachia Poliphili} meanwhile contains a scene in which the protagonist, Polifilo, encounters personifications of the five senses in a pleasure garden.\textsuperscript{139} By visualizing the senses in the context of an architectural treatise, Dietterlin augmented both traditions.

The source of the sound that drives the terms in the present image to cover their ears appears to be the bust in the niche above the portal, which sports a laurel crown and


\textsuperscript{138} For Georg Pencz’s \textit{The Five Senses}, see Hollstein XXXI.103-107. For \textit{The Five Senses} (1561), engraved by Cornelis Cort after Frans Floris I, see New Hollstein, Cornelis Cort, Part III.204-208.

tasseled sleeves. By rendering the figure with a wide-open mouth, Dietterlin suggests that the bust represents a speaking statue. Images of speaking statues abounded in ancient and early modern art, but appeared more rarely in the illustrated architectural literature of the sixteenth century.\footnote{On the speaking statue in early modern art, see Kathleen Wren Christian, “Poetry and ‘spirited’ ancient sculpture in Renaissance Rome,” in \textit{Aeolian Winds and the Spirit in Renaissance Architecture}, ed. Barbara Kena (London and New York: Routledge, 2006), 103-124.} Dietterlin’s Vertumnus-formed term in the synoptic image of the Tuscan Order also can be related to the device, as can the speaking self portrait as a Tuscan term that Gabriel Krammer included in his own 1600 \textit{Architectura}.\footnote{Both cases are discussed in further detail in Chapter IV.} The image of a speaking bust in classical garb evokes the idea of the ancient rhetorician—possibly a reference to the issues of style explored in Dietterlin’s treatise. Notably, the bust in the etched version of the present design possesses a closed mouth. Perhaps the artist found that the image of terms blocking their ears so as not to hear an unskilled orator was too comical even for the outlandish \textit{Architectura}.

This design also appears as Plate 76 of the 1598 installment of the \textit{Architectura}.

\textit{This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.}

\begin{tabular}{l}
\textbf{DR.43} \\
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder \\
\textit{Design for Annder Buch Plate 25} \\
1594 or earlier \\
Quill with black and brown ink and brush with grey, grey-blue, dark grey, and light brown wash and white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper \\
25.30 x 17.90 cm \\
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 56
\end{tabular}

INSCRIPTIONS: recto lower right [quill with light grey ink]: zü groß
This two-story Doric façade explores the intersections between the Order’s heroic, brave demeanor and the imagery of rule. It shows Zeus, king of the gods, straddling his eagle and clutching lightning bolts. A female ruler figure bearing a baton of sovereignty and clutching a crown sported by the lion at her feet appears at the god’s side. The tapestry hung over the doorway in the lower register of the composition shows a figure seated on a throne beneath a baldachin. Although this is the only definitive depiction of fabric among the Architectura designs, its presence cues viewers to the possibility that the images could also serve as models for tapestry—a costly and ostentatious medium that itself embodied power and authority during the Renaissance.

To formulate this design, Dietterlin rendered half an elevation and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the drafted design. Corrections and additions are made with quill and brown and black ink and brush with light brown and grey-blue wash, which may contain white heightening. This design also appears as Plate 77 of the 1598 Architecturas.

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*
This Doric coat of arms features an eagle and conquered Turks, symbols that perhaps refer to the failed siege of Vienna in 1528 and the delivery of the Hapsburg’s Holy Roman Empire from that calamity. Corrections and additions are made with quill with black and brown ink and brush with grey-blue wash, which may contain white heightening. This design also appears as Plate 86 of the 1598 *Architecturae*.

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

**DR.45**

Wendel Dietterlin the Elder

*Design for Annder Buch Plate 27*

1594 or earlier

Quill with black and brown ink; brush with grey-blue, dark grey, and light brown wash and white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper

25.47 x 17.95 cm

Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 66

INSCRIPTIONS: recto upper right [quill with black ink; second word illegible because sheet has been trimmed]: das…; recto lower right [quill with brown ink]: glas

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden

LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284

This Doric coat of arms features rampant lions and plumed helmets, each common devices in early modern heraldry. Both here and in the final etching, Dietterlin left the shield at the center of the composition blank. Artists could easily individualize the rather generic imagery of this scheme by adding a unique collection of personal emblems to the empty shield.

Dietterlin created the image by drafting half an elevation and folding the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the design. Corrections and additions are made with quill with black and brown ink and brush with grey-blue wash. This design also appears as Plate 87 in the 1598 installment of the *Architecturae*. 
This design in this drawing serves as the first portal image of the Ionic Order section of Dietterlin’s *Annder Buch*. It portrays a three-story triumphal arch with a triton-clasping Neptune, god of the sea, atop the central portal. This aquatic theme continues with the water nymphs set atop the columns of the story below, in the posts’ fish-formed spiral fluting, and in the squid decorating the keystone on the central arch. Although there existed no obvious symbolic connection between the Ionic Order and the creatures of the sea, the curling volutes characteristic of the Ionic manner do resemble the forms of waves or spiral shells. The present composition attests that Dietterlin sometimes conceived of the link between a particular *Architectura* design and its Order in terms of form alone.

This design also appears as Plate 110 of the 1598 *Architecturas*.
The techniques that Dietterlin used to formulate the present drawing of an Ionic portal depart from the artist’s typical approach to drafting the *Architectura* designs. Instead of modeling the portal’s forms with wash—the artist’s usual procedure for creating the illusion of volume—he employed finely hatched and crosshatched marks. The *Design for Annder Buch Plate 41* and *Design for Annder Buch Plate 42* likewise display this phenomenon. The crosshatching in the present drawing occurs mostly on the right side of the composition. While the short, sketchy stokes used to devise this work are rarely observed in the *Architectura* drawings, comparative examples do exist in other drafts for the treatises designs. Dietterlin articulated the rough texture of the rusticated stones in *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 14* and *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 19* by using such strokes. The crosshatching visible in this drawing, also unusual for the *Architectura* drawings, likewise is not unknown to Dietterlin’s oeuvre. The artist also employs it to model the epitaph depicted in *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 90* and a child’s face in *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 145*, as well as the *Grotesque Head* and *Putto After Raphael’s “Isaiah”* in Strasbourg. Dietterlin’s different approach to drawing the present design resulted in a different sort of *Architectura* print. The crosshatched *Design for Annder Buch Plate 30*, *Design for Annder Buch Plate 41*, and *Design for Annder Buch Plate 42* all gave rise to etchings that appear sketchier

---

142 See Appendix IV DR.83 and DR.84.
143 *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 14* is covered in Appendix IV DR.67. *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 19* is addressed in Appendix IV DR.74.
144 *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 90* is catalogued in Appendix IV DR.109; *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 145* in DR.134; *Grotesque Head* in SB.1 and *Putto After Raphael’s “Isaiah”* in SB.2.
and rougher than the other *Architectura* prints. The great difference between Plate 30 and the treatise’s other etchings is too jarring for the image to merely represent an inferior workshop design poorly amalgamated to the project’s other, more finely executed prints. It appears that Dietterlin included the sketchy Plate 30 to demonstrate his stylistic breadth as an etcher.\(^{145}\)

As discussed in greater detail in Chapter III, the idea of style also comes to the fore in the pictorial content of the Plate 30 design. Dietterlin’s unexpected use of rustication—an ornament generally associated with the Tuscan Order—in the context of an Ionic arch would have struck knowledgeable readers as a clash of architectural manners.\(^{146}\) Sebastiano Serlio’s 1551 *Extraordinario libro* had also presented arches and portals of the more refined Orders adorned with such uncouth rustication, providing Dietterlin with a model for this conceit. The laurel-crowned classical busts featured in Dietterlin’s design meanwhile bring to mind the image of ancient orators such as Cicero, whose accounts of high, middle, and low rhetorical style proved widely influential to early modern theories of architectural ornament.\(^{147}\) This design also appears as Plate 111 in the 1598 *Architectura*.

---

\(^{145}\) For more on this conceit, see Chapter III.


\(^{147}\) On the influence of ancient theories of rhetoric and style in Renaissance art and architecture in general, see Caroline van Eck, *Classical Rhetoric and the Arts in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
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The present drawing of an ornate Ionic portal with *putti* and shields displays a dry, careful drafting style typical of Dietterlin’s earlier *Architectura* designs. It is likely that Dietterlin researched the drawing techniques of other artists in his region who represented architectural materials while the *Architectura* project was still young. The reserved style of this drawing and the manner of its architectural ornaments recall the form and content of Swiss artist Christoph Murer’s glass painting designs, many of which feature flamboyant architectonic frames.148 The composition also appears in Plate 112 of the 1598 *Architecturas*.
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**DR.49**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*Design for Annder Buch Plate 32, Version I*
1594 or earlier
Quill with black-brown ink and brush with grey-blue, dark grey, and light brown wash over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream laid paper
25.31 x 18.20 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 90

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284

---

To create this drawing of an Ionic portal, Dietterlin rendered the left half of the architectural elevation with quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double aspects of the drafted design. He then embellished the composition with quill and ink and brush with wash. Corrections and additions are made with quill and black ink and brush with grey wash.

A large section corresponding to the opening of the portal and the lower right corner are both missing from this sheet. It is possible that the artist removed an unsatisfactory door design from the sheet, or that he found a more appropriate context for the door design in another Architectura composition. If the area of loss represents a compositional intervention (rather than damage resulting from Dietterlin’s penchant for tracing the drawings directly into the plate), then the present drawing would demonstrate that the artist used the cut-and-paste technique he employed to formulate many Erst Buch compositions to devise designs published after that work’s 1593 release as well. Dietterlin continued to develop the present design in Design for Annder Buch Plate 32, Version II.\footnote{Design for Annder Buch Plate 32, Version II is covered in Appendix IV DR.50.}

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

\textbf{DR.50}
\textit{Design for Annder Buch Plate 32, Version II}
1594 or earlier
Quill with black and brown ink and brush with grey-blue, dark grey, and light brown wash and white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream laid paper,
25.20 x 17.71 cm [at greatest points]
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 91

INSCRIPTIONS: recto lower left [quill with brown ink]: 32
PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
The present design represents a more developed version of Design for Annder Buch Plate 32, Version I, as the artist has added the entablature that ultimately appeared in the etching. He also included two seated figures holding mirrors, iconography that engages the themes of vanity and the passage of time. To form this image, Dietterlin rendered the left half of the architectural elevation with quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double aspects of the drafted design. He then embellished the composition with quill and ink and brush with wash. The entire lower right quadrant of this sheet is missing. It is unclear if Dietterlin also finalized the scheme for the door in the present version of the composition, as that element is missing in the other, earlier sheet. This design also appears in Plate 113 in the 1598 Architecturae.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

DR.51
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
Design for Annder Buch Plate 33
1594 or earlier
Quill with black ink and brush with grey-blue and dark grey wash over black chalk on off-white laid paper, mounted on cream laid paper
25.31 x 17.8 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 92
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150 Design for Annder Buch Plate 32, Version I is catalogued in Appendix IV DR.49.
The present design for an Ionic portal with voluptuous caryatids features a door with a cage motif reminiscent of the trellis-like forms that organize the compositions of many of Cornelis II. Floris’s grotesque prints. To form the drawing, Dietterlin rendered the left half of the elevation and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the drafted design. Corrections and additions are made with quill and black ink and brush with grey-blue wash and white heightening. This design is also appears in Plate 114 of the 1598 *Architectura*.

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

**DR.52**  
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder  
*Design for Annder Buch Plate 35*  
1594 or earlier  
Quill with black ink and brush with grey-blue, dark grey, and white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream laid paper  
25.62 x 18.20 cm  
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 93

INSCRIPTIONS: recto lower left [quill with black ink]: 35  
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This design for an Ionic portal bears the images of four deities. Hercules, toting his club and sporting the skin of the Nemean lion, stands in the niche at the lower left. Armored Mars, clutching the faint figure of an axe, poses in the niche on the right. Luna, holding a torch in her proper left hand and wearing a crescent moon crown akin to the headpiece worn by Diana in Plate 22 of the *Annder Buch*, leans on the left side of the arch’s high gable. Fortuna, with her unusual mural crown, acts as Luna’s pendant on the other side of the composition.

The meaning that Dietterlin intended to communicate with this iconography is not entirely clear. The valor of Hercules and Mars can be related to Hans Blum’s remark that the
Ionic Order is “like a brave woman.”\textsuperscript{151} Luna and Hercules have a common connection to the Nemean lion: Hercules famously slayed the lion as the first of his twelve labors, and Aelian writes that the creature fell from the moon.\textsuperscript{152} Set below Luna in Dietterlin’s composition, Hercules occupies the ideal position for “receiving” the falling beast. The occurrence of such obscure mythological references in this image indicates that the artist either boasted a formidable knowledge of the classical sources, or worked with a learned advisor. Perhaps Georg Gadner, who invented the iconographical program for the Great Hall of the Stuttgart Lusthaus with the advice of theologian Lucas Osiander, and who was present at the court of Württemberg at the time Dietterlin carried out the interior’s ceiling designs, counseled Dietterlin on such matters\textsuperscript{153}

To create this image, Dietterlin rendered half an elevation and folded the sheet to transfer the pigment, to double the drafted design. Corrections and additions are made with quill and black ink and brush with grey-blue wash and white heightening. A large section corresponding with the opening of the portal is missing from the original sheet. This design also appears as Plate 116 in the 1598 Architecturae.

\textit{This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.}

\textbf{DR.53}
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
\textit{Design for Annder Buch Plate 36, Version I}
1594 or earlier

\textsuperscript{151} “Die dritte Colum wirt gezogen auff den weiblichen cörper einer dapfferen frawen,” Blum, \textit{Von den fünf Sülen}, fol. 25, under, “Ionica I.”.
\textsuperscript{152} Aelian, \textit{ΠΕΡΙ ΖΩΝ ΙΙΟΘΤΟΣ}, 12.7
Quill with black and brown ink and brush with blue-grey and grey-blue wash with white heightening over black chalk on heavy, off-white laid paper, mounted on heavy cream laid paper
25.25 x 18.11 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 101
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The present drawing for an Ionic coat of arms, like many other designs first published in the 1594 treatise, features the heraldic subject matter, symmetrical compositional scheme, and spare, linear quality of period glass painting drawings, or Scheibenrisse. This suggests that Dietterlin was intimately familiar with the work of Rhenish Scheibenrisse designers such as Tobias Stimmer and Christoph Murer. Dietterlin continued to develop this composition in Design for Annder Buch Plate 36, Version II. A more evolved version of this design also appears in Plate 125 of the 1598 Architecturas.

DR.54
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
Design for Annder Buch Plate 36, Version II
1594 or earlier
Quill with black and brown ink and brush with grey-blue and dark grey wash over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream laid paper
25.41 x 18.32 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 100

INSCRIPTIONS: recto center right [quill with brown ink]: zu...[cut off with sheet]; recto lower center [quill with brown ink]: ...kr [first part cut off with sheet]

154 For a useful overview of Scheibenrisse drawing during the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, see Alsteens and Spira, Dürer and Beyond, 94-110. A more complete analysis can be found in Ariane Mensger, Die Scheibenrisse der Staatlichen Kunsthalle Karlsruhe. 2 vols. (Cologne: Böhlau, 2012).
155 See Appendix IV DR.54.
The present drawing represents a more developed version of the Ionic heraldic design depicted in *Design for Annder Buch Plate 36, Version I*. After establishing the content of the design in the previous drawing, the artist used the present drawing to plan how the modeling effects of the print would appear. To create this work, Dietterlin rendered the left half of the architectural elevation with quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double aspects of the drafted design. He then embellished the composition with quill and ink and brush with wash. Additions are made with quill and black ink and brush with grey wash. The artist’s washes impart the forms of the drawing with the effect of volume, and also lend its figures a voluptuous sensuality. With their exaggerated, mannered poses and abundance of naked flesh, the women recall the female bodies of contemporary Prague court painters such as Bartholomaeus Spranger and Joseph Heintz. Dietterlin could have known such compositions through the engravings of the prolific Rudolfine printmaker Aegidius II. Sadeler.

After adding layers of wash, Dietterlin made corrections to this drawing with quill and brown ink. For instance, it appears that Dietterlin considered removing the vases that he confidently included in the previous drawing, for they were not included in the folded counterproof sketch that he employed to establish the architectonic structure of the composition in the present sheet. However, the vases do emerge as corrections that

---

156 See Appendix IV DR.53.
Dietterlin made to this sheet, and appear in the etched composition. This design also appears in Plate 125 in the 1598 *Architecturae*.

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

**DR.55**

Wendel Dietterlin the Elder

1594 or earlier

Quill with black and brown ink and brush with blue-grey and dark grey wash with white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream laid paper

25.25 x 18.11 cm

Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 102
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**PROVENANCE:** Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden

**LITERATURE:** von Zahn (1863), 107; Pauli (1899), 284

The helmets with the goose head and female torso shown in this Ionic design reappear in Dietterlin’s *Coat of Arms of the Dukes of Württemberg* etching of the later 1590s.\(^{158}\)

Archival records show that Dietterlin designed a number of heraldic and genealogical images on commission after the publication of the 1594 treatises in which this design first appeared. Between 1596 and 1597, the artist was paid for depicting the ancestors and offspring of the House of Württemberg.\(^{159}\) The House of Württemberg also paid Dietterlin for a print of the

---

\(^{158}\) Hollstein VI.14.

\(^{159}\) A record in Stuttgart credits “Wendel Dieterlin [sic.], painter of Strasbourg” for printing the family tree of Württemberg in copper: “Wendel Dieterlin, Maler zu Straßburg (württembergischer Stammbaum, in Kupfer gestochen)” Stuttgart, Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart, Landschreiberei, receipts for 1596/7, A256 Bd. 83, fol. 358'.
Württemberg family tree in 1598 or 1599. These records likely relate to the etching *Family Tree of Duke Friedrich of Württemberg*, and its pendant, the *Family Tree of Herzog Ludwig of Württemberg*. Ohnesorge hypothesized that the latter print was made in emulation of a panel painting that Jakob Züberlin created for Duke Ludwig in 1585. Another etching, the aforementioned *Coat of Arms of the Dukes of Württemberg*, shares the compositional formula of the heraldic designs pictured in the *Annder Buch*, and likely dates from the same period as the *Family Tree* designs. This indicates that the more generic genealogical and heraldic designs printed in the 1594 installment of the *Architectura* inspired Dietterlin’s old patrons from the House of Württemberg to commission similar works, tailored to the symbolism of their dynasty.

This design also appears in Plate 126 in the 1598 *Architectura*.

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

**DR.56**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*Design for Annder Buch Plate 41*
1594 or earlier
Quill with brown and black ink and brush with light brown wash over charcoal on off-white laid paper, mounted on cream paper
25.71 x 17.93 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 125

INSCRIPTIONS: recto upper right [quill with brown ink]: D; recto lower left [quill with brown ink]: 41.

161 Andreasen II.247.6; Hollstein VI.15.
162 Although the image depicts the family tree of Duke Ludwig, Hollstein erroneously lists this work as the “Second Genealogical Tree of Duke Friedrich of Württemberg”. See Hollstein VI.16.
In order to draft this Corinthian portal, Dietterlin rendered the right half of the elevation and folded the sheet in half while the ink was still wet to double the design. He subsequently went over a number of the blotted lines with the quill and brush with wash. Like the Design for Annder Buch Plate 30 and Design for Annder Buch Plate 42, the present drawing is modeled with carefully applied hatching and crosshatching instead of the wash that Dietterlin typically employed to represent volume. This design also appears in Plate 154 of the 1598 Architecturas.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

**DR.57**

*Design for Annder Buch Plate 42*

1594 or earlier

Quill with black and brown ink over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper

25.60 x 18.21 cm

Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 126

Inscriptions: recto upper right [quill with brown ink]: E.

Provenance: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden

Literature: von Zahn (1863), 107; Pauli (1899), 284

This design for a Corinthian portal also appears in Plate 155 in the 1598 Architecturas.

Like the Design for Annder Buch Plate 41 and Design for Annder Buch Plate 30, the present drawing is modeled with carefully applied hatching and crosshatching in place of Dietterlin’s typical wash.\(^{164}\) The artist’s more customary drafting manner is visible in the grill adorning

---

\(^{164}\) Design for Annder Buch Plate 41 is described in Appendix IV DR.57 and Design for Annder Buch Plate 30 is discussed in DR.47.
the doorway, evidently added after the arch, with a thicker quill. The lunette component of
the grill has been doubled in the manner of Dietterlin’s typical folded counterproofs. The
lower component of the door is executed in Dietterlin’s usual, free manner, but also
incorporates hatching. Both these details affirm that the artist had a hand in creating this
work.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

**DR.58**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*Design for Annder Buch Plate 48*
1594 or earlier
Quill with black ink and brush with dark grey, light brown, and grey wash and white
heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper
25.21 × 17.60 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 133
INSCRIPTIONS: recto lower left [quill with black ink]: 48.
PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 107; Pauli (1899), 284

To create this drawing for a Corinthian heraldic design, Dietterlin rendered the right
half of the elevation with the quill and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to leave a
complete design. He subsequently went over a number of the blotted lines with the quill and
brush with wash. Corrections and additions are made with quill and black ink and brush with
grey wash and white heightening.

The drawing shows Saints Peter and Paul flanking a blank escutcheon crowned with
a Bishop’s miter. Dietterlin evidently added the attributes that identify these figures—Paul’s
sword and book, and Peter’s keys—with white heightening and quill and ink late in the
drawing process. Paul, as the author of the letters to the Corinthians recorded in the New
Testament, figures as a suitable accessory for a Corinthian Order design. However, it appears
that Dietterlin did not originally conceive the figure as St. Paul. A pair of small protrusions on the top of Paul’s head, rendered in black ink, appear to originate from an earlier phase of drafting, and do not occur in the final etching. The protrusions resemble small horns, attributes traditionally associated with images of Moses. Dietterlin must have begun the drawing with the intention of portraying the Old Testament patriarch in this design. In 1505, Michelangelo had devised a statue of Moses for the tomb of Pope Julius II. Like the horned figure in Dietterlin’s drawing, Michelangelo’s Moses sports horns and a flowing beard while clutching his garment and turning his head. Vasari praised Michelangelo’s sculpture in his Vite, and Antonio Salamanca published an image of the statue in a 1554 engraving of the tomb. As a design that could serve as a model for an epitaph, the present image apparently struck Dietterlin as an appropriate place to quote Michelangelo’s renowned tomb sculpture.

Though Moses did not ultimately appear in the etching, his likeness does occur in the final plate of Dietterlin’s 1594 and 1598 treatises, an image for which no preparatory drawing survives. There the figure is seated, and, except for his outstretched proper right hand, adopts roughly the same attitude as Michelangelo’s Moses. He occupies the lower register of a triumphal arch adorned with a skeleton and other symbols of death, a far grander funerary ensemble than the present epitaph design. Moses’s position in a niche at the base of Dietterlin’s arch even corresponds to the eventual location of Michelangelo’s Moses on one side of the base of Julius II’s tomb. The Strasbourg artist’s homage to Michelangelo continues in other aspects of the etched portal design. The door is flanked by hunched

---


166 The same plate also serves as the final image of the 1598 treatise, Plate 209.
figures that recall the position of the bodies of Night and Day and Dawn and Dusk in Michelangelo’s Medici Chapel. The composition thus synthesizes different aspects of Michelangelo funerary monuments into a unified whole. If Dietterlin planned from the beginning to incorporate a pictorial reference to Michelangelo’s Moses into his Architectura project, the triumphal arch that concludes the 1594 and 1598 installments of the treatise offered a more impressive framework for that act of artistic emulation than the present design. Dietterlin’s apparent decision to strike the Moses figure from this drawing allowed him to formulate a more multi-dimensional pictorial ode to Michelangelo in the grand finale of his project.

The present design also corresponds to the composition of Plate 167 of the 1598 Architectura.

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

**DR.59**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder  
*Design for Annder Buch Plate 49*  
1594 or earlier  
Quill with black ink and brush with dark grey, light brown, and grey wash and white heightening on heavy, off-white, laid paper, mounted on heavy cream laid paper  
24.8 x 17.70 cm  
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 134

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden  
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 107; Pauli (1899), 284

During the early modern period, unicorns were said to be attracted to virgins. The mythical animals portrayed in this Corinthian Order design thus aptly refer to the maiden whose tomb decoration supposedly inspired the forms of the Corinthian Order. To

construct this drawing, Dietterlin followed his typical folded offset procedure. The artist rendered elements of the left half of the elevation and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the design. He subsequently went over a number of the blotted lines with the quill and brush with wash. Corrections and additions are made with quill and black ink and brush with grey wash and white heightening. This design also appears as Plate 168 of the 1598 *Architecturae*.

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

**Dr. 60**

*Design for Annder Buch Plate 51*

1594 or earlier
Quill with black and brown ink and brush with dark grey and grey wash with white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper
25.81 x 17.82 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 148

INSCRIPTIONS: recto lower left [quill with brown ink]: zü lang / diis / therm; recto lower right [quill with brown ink]: Bey [?]; recto lower right [quill with black ink]: 51
PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 107; Pauli (1899), 284

Dietterlin’s design for a Composite pavilion flanked by statues of armored men features the kind of angled architectural perspective often associated with his contemporary Vredeman de Vries. Encrusted with ornament, the monument depicted here displays the *horror vacui* typical of Dietterlin’s Composite compositions. The hard, precise style of this drawing suggests that the artist drafted it earlier than many of the other, looser designs for the *Annder Buch*, which often display the confident and dynamic manner of drawings for prints that Dietterlin first published in the 1598 treatise. Some corrections are made with quill and brown ink. This design also appears as Plate 192 of the 1598 *Architecturae*. 

583
The present design for a Composite portal typifies the linear compositions that Dietterlin used to plot the basic forms of his *Architectura* designs prior to strategizing how to portray the volumes and textures of the work in a subsequent sheet. The artist crafted this drawing by rendering the left half the elevation and folding the sheet in half while the ink was still wet to leave a symmetrical scheme. He subsequently went over a number of the blotted lines with the quill. Corrections and additions are made with quill and black ink and brush with grey wash and white heightening. This design also appears in Plate 193 of the 1598 *Architectura*. 

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.
Dietterlin characterizes the Composite Order as a “work brought together from the other Orders.” This design for a Composite portal, strangely, contains no columns, pilasters, or terms. It indicates that the mingling of the Orders in the Composite mode can result in the disappearance of the very weight-bearing elements that, according to Dietterlin’s theoretical system, give each architectural manner its standard proportions. The artist evidently regarded the Composite as the Order in which the formal parameters of architecture can dissolve into pure decorative form. The strange results that such Composite mixtures produce is embodied in the figure of the chimerical beast at the pinnacle of the ensemble. In the etched version of the design, it becomes clear that the figure is comprised of the head of a woman, the body of a horse, and the tail of a fish—the very creature that Horace describes in his diatribe against grotesque painting.

To create this drawing, Dietterlin rendered elements of the right half of the elevation in ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to leave a complete design. He then went over a number of the blotted lines with the quill and brush with wash. Corrections and additions are made with quill and black ink and brush with grey wash and white heightening. This design also appears as Plate 194 of the 1598 installment of the *Architectura*.

---

168 “…die wel es ein zusamen getragen Werck, auß den andern Seulen ist…” Dietterlin, *Erst Buch*, under, “COMPOSITA”.

This drawing shows an early draft for the lower element of the two-plate etching that served as one of the concluding images of the 1594 installment of Dietterlin’s *Architectura*. The network of *Astwerk* covering the portal on the right side of this design for a Composite façade derives from the arboreal ornament above the portal in Albrecht Dürer’s *Circumcision* woodcut (c. 1502-1505). This reference indicates that Dietterlin mined all manner of prints for his architectural motifs—not just those sources that took architecture as a primary subject.

This early draft for Plate 55 shows Dietterlin plotting the design in chalk, developing half the elevation in quill, and folding the sheet along the door’s axis of symmetry to transfer a portion of the wet ink scheme as reflection adjacent to the original design. Here the artist encounters the formal limits of the mechanical drafting tactics that he so frequently employed to devise the *Architectura*’s bilaterally symmetrical designs. While the folded counterproof aptly reproduces linear schemes, it is a problematic tool for copying the marks of modeling. Even a representation of a monument with symmetrical forms must display

---

170 Pirr, Die *Architectura*, 98. The print is catalogued in Bartsch X.86(132), Hollstein VII.198, Meder 198, and Anna Scherbaum, “*Die Beschneidung Christi*,” in Schoch II, pp. 251-253, no. 176.
modified symmetry if it is to register the play of light across its volumes in a consistent manner. But a folded counterproof will inevitably reverse the pictorial descriptions of volume in the original design, creating a contradictory lighting scheme in the resulting image. To depict a uniformly lit, symmetrical object, was necessary for Dietterlin to create an asymmetrical drawing. The artist thus articulated the volumes of the façade’s forms with wash added after he had created the linear framework of the design through the folded offset technique. He continued to plan the composition and explore ways to mechanically draft asymmetrical compositions in Design for Annder Buch Plate 55, Version II, and Plate 56.¹⁷¹

A more developed iteration of this design also appears in Plate 197 of the 1598 Architectora.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

₁⁷¹ See Design for Annder Buch Plate 55, Version II, and Plate 56 in Appendix IV DR.64.
In the earlier drawing for Plate 55 of the *Annder Buch*, Dietterlin drafted the work’s smaller symmetrical doorway in a free hand, and did not double its image in the folded offset.\(^{172}\) In this drawing, Dietterlin continues to experiment with ways to mechanically draft asymmetrical compositions, combining the cut-and-paste procedure he used to formulate many *Erst Buch* designs with the counterproof method of the later *Architectura* drawing campaigns. He parses the design into bilaterally symmetrical ornamental schemes, then uses the folded offset technique to render each unit of ornament on a separate sheet. He next combines the sheets to create an oversize portal with symmetrical and asymmetrical modules of ornament, ultimately producing the design for an impressive, two-plate etching. This composition also appears in Plates 196 and 197 of the 1598 *Architectura*—appropriately, within the context of the treatise’s Composite Order book.

As the only two-part etched composition of the 1594 installment of the *Architectura* and as one of the treatise’s concluding images, the print that the artist derived from this drawing bears much in common with the two-part etching that concludes the 1593 installment of the *Architectura* (shown in *Design for Erst Buch Plates 39 and 40*).\(^{173}\) That work portrays one portico with the columns of the Vitruvian system of Orders, and another with the posts of the Serlian system—a visual summary of the ancient and Renaissance schemes of classical architectural ornament.\(^{174}\) The present design, in contrast, shows a monumental façade composed with florid, Gothic-style ornaments. Conceived as a pendant to the bipartite image that concludes the 1593 treatises, Dietterlin’s Gothic façade embodies a stylistic

---

\(^{172}\) *Design for Annder Buch Plate 55* is discussed in Appendix IV DR.63.

\(^{173}\) *Design for Erst Buch Plates 39 and 40* is documented in DR.25.

\(^{174}\) The meaning of this design is discussed in Chapter II.
alternative to the Vitruvian and Serlian paradigms of architectural composition—a manner of ornament then regarded as quintessentially northern, and also fundamentally modern.\footnote{For more on the dichotomy between classicizing and “Gothic” architectural ornament, see Chapter I.}

\textit{This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.}

\textbf{DR.65}
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
\textit{Design for Annder Buch Plate 57}
1594 or earlier
Quill with black ink and brush with dark grey and grey wash with white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper
24.30 x 18.60 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstick-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 160

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 107; Pauli (1899), 284

This Composite Order heraldic design was likely inspired by Dürer’s \textit{Allegory with the Standards of the Empire and of Nuremberg} (1521), which likewise features a pyramid of shields flanked by angels.\footnote{Pirr, \textit{Die} Architectura, 116. The print is documented in Bartsch X.162; Dodgson 144; and Meder 285.} The present composition also appears as Plate 208 of the 1598 \textit{Architectura}. In order to draft this work, Dietterlin rendered elements of half the elevation and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the design. Corrections and additions are made with brush with grey wash and white heightening and quill with black ink.
DR.66
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
Unused Window design for 1598 Architectura
1598 or earlier
Quill with black ink and grey and black wash over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper
17.70 x 251 cm [at greatest points]
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 161

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 107; Pauli (1899), 284

No window design in this form appears anywhere in the printed Architectura. Still, the many formal similarities between this window and those that Dietterlin ultimately included in the 1598 treatise suggest that it is an unused design for that book. In order to execute this drawing, Dietterlin rendered components of the left half of the elevation and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet and doubled the design. A large section from the upper left corner of the sheet is missing.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

DR.67
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 14
1598 or earlier
Quill with black ink and brush with dark grey and grey wash with white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper
25.40 x 17.20 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 3

PROVENANCE: Akademie der Bildende Künste, Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284

To create this drawing of a Tuscan Order window, Dietterlin rendered portions of the left half of the elevation and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the drafted design. He subsequently made additions to the right half of the drawing in quill and
black ink. The drawing shows Dietterlin taking a particular interest in the window’s rustication, a prominent feature of the Architectura’s Tuscan designs. The draftsman describes the rough texture of the stones with short, scratchy quill strokes. Unusually dry and sketchy compared to Dietterlin’s typical quill work, the marks more closely resemble the short contours and hatching used to draft Design for Annder Buch Plate 30, Design for Annder Buch Plate 41, and Design for Annder Buch Plate 42.177

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

**DR.68**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 15, Version I*
1598 or earlier
Quill with black ink and brush with grey and dark grey wash over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper
25.15 x 17.16 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 4

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284

In order to draft the present Tuscan window design, Dietterlin rendered the left half of the elevation in ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the drafted scheme. He subsequently went over both sides with the quill and brush with grey wash. The artist developed the composition further in *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 15, Version II*.178

---

177 These drawings are respectively addressed in Appendix IV DR.47, DR.56, and DR.57.
178 The drawing is catalogued in Appendix IV DR.69.
The present work represents a more developed version of the design depicted in *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 15, Version I*. Dietterlin created this drawing by rendering the left half of the elevation in ink and folding the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the drafted design. He then embellished the design with the quill and brush with wash, working out the composition of the windowpane ultimately shown in the etching.

---

170 *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 15, Version I* is documented in Appendix IV DR.68.
In order to create this work, Dietterlin rendered the left half of the elevation in quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the drafted design. He then went over both sides of the design with quill and brush with wash.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

**DR.71**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder  
*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 17, Version I*  
1598 or earlier  
Quill with black ink and brush with dark grey and grey wash over black chalk on off-white laid paper, mounted on cream paper  
25.21 x 17.81 cm  
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 7

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden  
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284

To draft this work, Dietterlin rendered the left half of the elevation with quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the drafted design. He then embellished both sides with quill and ink and brush with grey wash. The artist subsequently developed the composition further in *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 17, Version II.*

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

**DR.72**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder  
*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 17, Version II*  
1598 or earlier  
Quill with black ink over black chalk on off-white laid paper, mounted on cream paper  
25.10 x 17.50 cm  
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 8

---

180 The drawing is described in Appendix IV DR.71.
Despite its sketchier appearance and the absence of wash, the present drawing represents a more developed version of the design shown in Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 17, Version I.\textsuperscript{181} To create this work, Dietterlin rendered the left half of the elevation in ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the drafted design. He then embellished both sides with the quill. With these marks, Dietterlin refines the precise form of the window to be depicted in the etching. He adds scrolling to either side of the window, as well as the base of a panel with garlands. This is visible atop the window’s pointed pediment, which is supported by two consoles that survive from the first iteration of the design. The console-supported pediment pictured in this design likely derives from a portal in Chapter 9 of Philibert De l’Orme’s 1567 Premier Tome de l’Architecture.\textsuperscript{182} This suggests that Dietterlin altered his developing compositions to incorporate a greater number of pictorial quotations from canonical architectural literature.

Regarded as a sequence, the series of Tuscan window designs that Dietterlin created for the 1598 Architectura display an increasing degree of embellishment and complexity.\textsuperscript{183} The Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 14, the earliest Tuscan window in the book, shows the simplest of window pane schemes and a minimal degree of rusticated decoration. The Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 15, Version I and Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 15, Version II feature a sumptuous, shell-formed niche in its half-round gable and a window that combines a more ornate network of straight and curving panes. The Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 16 includes made entirely of curving bands as well as banded S and C-formed strapwork  

\textsuperscript{181} Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 17, Version I is analyzed in Appendix IV DR.71.  
\textsuperscript{182} Pirr, Die Architectura, 91.  
\textsuperscript{183} These designs are covered in Appendix IV DR.67-72.
ornaments with elegantly attenuated ends. The *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 17, Version II* incorporates the most complicated tracery, a radial design distributed across the window’s three principal openings.

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

**DR.73**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 18*
1598 or earlier
Quill with black ink and brush with dark grey and grey wash with white heightening on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper
25.0 x 17.89 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 9

INSCRIPTIONS: recto upper left [quill with black ink]: diß iß zü kürz; recto upper right [quill with black ink]: zü groß;
PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284

Karl Ohnesorge contended that the elephant at the center of the composition represents a Tuscan oven, a hypothesis corroborated by the creature’s proximity to a fireplace. Whatever its projected purpose, the design demonstrates Dietterlin’s masterful ability to amalgamate imagery from diverse sources into clever, new inventions. The seemingly absurd idea of picturing an elephant in an architectural treatise likely arose from the *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili* (1499), which depicts an elephant-formed monument. The forms of the present design derive from other sources. Dietterlin’s *Architectura* elephant bears a howdah occupied by Saracens, just like the elephant shown in a 1485 engraving by Martin

184 Ohnesorge, *Wendel Dietterlin*, 43
Schongauer. The *Architectura* creature’s strange anatomy, with its backward-bending legs and thick-toed feet, meanwhile resembles the physique of the rhinoceros in Dürer’s famed 1515 woodcut. Dietterlin’s drafted elephant faces the same direction as the creature in Dürer’s woodcut. This suggests that the author of the *Architectura* used the Nuremberg master’s original print as a model, rather than one of the many reversed copies of the rhinoceros design printed by sixteenth-century followers of Dürer.

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

**DR.74**

Wendel Dietterlin the Elder

*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 19*

1598 or earlier

Quill with black ink and brush with dark grey, brown-grey, and grey wash on off-white laid paper, mounted on cream paper

24.60 x 17.71 cm

Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstick-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 10

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden

LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284

To devise the first Tuscan fireplace pictured in the *Architectura*, Dietterlin rendered the left half of the elevation and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the drafted design. He then went over both sides of the sheet with quill and ink and brush with wash. As in the first Tuscan window design for the treatise, *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 14*, Dietterlin employed short, dry quill strokes to depict the rough texture of the work’s rustication. This indicates that Dietterlin drafted the present work relatively early in the

---

186 Schongauer’s engraving is documented in Hollstein XLIX.94, Lehrs 94, and Bartsch VIII.92 (158).
187 Dürer’s print is documented in Bartsch X.136 (147); Dodgson I.125; Meder 273; and Yasmin Doorey, *“Rhinocerus (Das Rhinoceros),”* in Schoch II, pp. 420-424, no. 241.
188 *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 14* is covered in Appendix IV DR.67.
course of developing the 1598 Architectura. As with Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 14, the marks in the present drawing corroborate the theory that the unusual, crosshatched Design for Annder Buch Plate 30, Design for Annder Buch Plate 41, and Design for Annder Buch Plate 42 all in fact originate from the hand of Wendel Dietterlin the Elder.\footnote{These drawings are respectively catalogued in Appendix IV DR.47, DR.56, and DR.57.}

\textit{This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.}

**DR.75**  
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder  
\textit{Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 20}  
1598 or earlier  
Quill with black ink and brush with grey and dark grey wash over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper  
25.40 x 17.70 cm  
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 11  

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden  
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284

Dietterlin drafted this design for a Tuscan fireplace by rendering the left half of the elevation and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the drafted design. He subsequently went over both sides of the design in quill and ink and brush and wash.

\textit{This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.}

**DR.76**  
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder  
\textit{Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 21}  
1598 or earlier  
Quill with black ink and brush with dark grey and grey wash with white heightening on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper  
21.00 x 18.00 cm  
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 12
To create this drawing of a Tuscan fireplace, the artist drafted the right half of the elevation in quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the scheme. He then made corrections with white heightening and brush with grey wash. With its three banded lozenges and term-formed supports, the composition recalls the fireplace design in Plate 9 of Du Cerceau’s 1561 *Seconde Livre d’Architecture*. Dietterlin adapted Du Cerceau’s model with a witty touch. The rack inside the fireplace is hung with a series of sausages—an instance of base humor that perhaps refers to the Tuscan Order’s stereotypically crude manner. A similar rack of sausages nevertheless occurs in the upper right corner of the Doric façade in Plate 23 of the *Annder Buch* (Plate 75 in the 1598 *Architectura*), which portrays a cook-formed term and the accessories of his bustling kitchen. The sausage motif, then, was not exclusive to the Tuscan Order.

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

**DR.77**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder  
*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 33*  
1598 or earlier  
Quill with black ink and brush with grey and black and grey-brown wash and white heightening on off-white laid paper, mounted on cream paper  
25.22 x 18.10 cm  
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 21

INSCRIPTIONS: recto lower left [quill with black bistre]: MA. 2  
PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden  
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284

---

190 Pirr, *Die Architectura*, 78; 82.
This pair of Tuscan wells, like the well in Plate 79 of the 1598 *Architectura*, displays a pulley system similar to those pictured in the renowned engineering drawings of Dietterlin’s friend, the architect Heinrich Schickhardt.\(^1\) Perhaps Shickhardt advised Dietterlin on strategies for representing such machines, or showed the painter drawings that might aid his work. The artist may also have drawn inspiration for the *Architectura*’s well designs from Vredeman de Vries’s series of twenty-four well etchings, published by the van Doetechums around 1574.\(^2\)

---


\(^2\) See Hollstein XLVIII.384-407.
brush and wash, and developed the composition further in *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 34, Version II*.\(^{193}\)

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

**DR.79**

Wendel Dietterlin the Elder  
*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 34, Version II*  
1598 or earlier  
Quill with black ink and brush with grey, dark grey, and light green wash and white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper  
25.22 x 17.45 cm  
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 23

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden  
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284

The present drawing depicts a more evolved version of the Tuscan fountain composition shown in *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 34, Version I*.\(^{194}\) Here Dietterlin eliminated the foliate appendage visible on the left side of the monument in the previous drawing, replacing it with a simpler fixture in this design. He also added staffage, a ground plan of the well, and a background of architectural ruins. The order in which Dietterlin devised the different elements of the print suggests that the artist conceptualized his *Architectura* etchings around structures rather than details such as figures and backgrounds.

\(^{193}\) *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 34, Version II* is documented in Appendix IV DR.79.  
\(^{194}\) *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 34, Version I* is catalogued in Appendix IV DR.78.
The present drawing depicts an interior fountain of the Tuscan Order with a quadrilateral plan and a central column adorned with the image of a hunter slaying a bear with the help of his dogs. As with the animals in Design for Annder Buch Plate 3, Dietterlin likely drew the motif of skirmishing fauna from Boillot’s *Nouveaux pourtraitz et figures de termes...* Boillot had refused to include the image of humans in his printed collection of terms, as was the usual practice of the day, explaining that to depict humans as servile supports for architecture was to debase man’s free and noble nature. The animal terms in his tract thus serve to replace conventional, human posts. Dietterlin’s fountain column includes a human, but not in a weight-bearing role. By exempting the figure from this duty, Dietterlin heeds Boillot’s criticism, but also blurs the line between architectural sculpture and free sculpture as such. The animals’ gravity-defying positions within the tussle only amplify the impression that the architecture is dissolving into pure sculpture. The etched version of

---

195 Design for Annder Buch Plate 3 is analyzed in Appendix IV DR.26.
196 “Et que la force aussi ne nous est donnée telle, qu’au reste des animaux robustes et valides, auxquels est plus séant et convenable d’imposer charges et pesanteurs, que non pas à l’homme qui est propre et duisant à chose de prix et excellence, m’assurant sur ces raisons, j’ai fondé une opinion contraire à la première, que vous offrant au hasard cette nouveauté, me donneriez quelque lieu pour être reçu avec mes termes brutaux” Boillot, *Nouveaux pourtraitz*, fol. 5'.
this design, with its ornate railing formed from tangled masses of pine branches, takes this
conceit even further.

Dietterlin also employs other devices to probe the boundaries between architecture
and the figural arts in this design. A pine branch twines around the column and leads the eye
to the image of a squirrel attempting to escape the fracas. In the foreground, a dog maims a
rabbit. Dietterlin renders the spout of water issuing from these figures as if it were a spray of
blood. Such touches lend the image the quality of a narrative with different subplots. In
devising the Architectura, Dietterlin acted as much as a storyteller as a theorist of architecture.
The narrative qualities of the Architectura designs speak to the artist’s background as a
painter. They also attest to his interest in addressing an audience of figural artists and readers
with a taste for amusing architectural prints.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

DR.81
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 37
1598 or earlier
Quill with black ink and brush with grey, light brown, and dark grey wash and white
heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper
24.95 x 17.65 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 25

INSCRIPTIONS: recto upper right [quill with grey ink]: 11 / 11o
PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284

To create this model for a Tuscan Order double lavabo, Dietterlin rendered the left
half of the elevation in ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the
drafted design. He then embellished the design with the quill and with brush and grey wash.
Corrections are made with white heightening and quill with black ink and light brown wash.
The present drawing shows the lower element of an epitaph of the Tuscan Order. Dietterlin rendered the left half of the elevation in quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the drafted design. He then went over both sides of the drawing with quill and ink and brush and wash.

To devise this design for a Tuscan epitaph ensemble, Dietterlin rendered the left half of the elevation with quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the drafted design. He then made additions and corrections with quill with black ink, and brush with grey and black wash, and white heightening.
The present design depicts a Tuscan Order epitaph with an image of the Crucifixion flanked by donor figures. The Crucifixion was a pictorial subject that conformed to both Protestant and Catholic strictures on the use of religious images. As such, Dietterlin's epitaph could appeal to both types of patrons, making it an attractive model for artists across the Protestant and Catholic German-speaking lands. To create the drawing, Dietterlin rendered aspects of the right half of the elevation with quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the drafted design. He then made additions to both sides of the drawing with the quill and with brush and wash.
This design features the epitaph of a bishop, recognizable by its supine effigy’s spiraled crozier and the miter set atop the escutcheon above the recumbent figure. It is not necessarily the case that the design evokes pro-Catholic sympathies. At the time Dietterlin composed this work, Strasbourg was embroiled in the so-called Kapiteltreit. Upon the death of Johann IV von Mandersheid-Blankenheim in 1583, Protestant members of the Cathedral Chapter moved to elect Johann Georg von Brandenburg as the new Bishop. When the Catholic majority instead elected Karl von Lothringen, the dispute mushroomed into a violent exchange that only dissipated with the intervention of Emperor Rudolf II on behalf of the Catholics in 1599. Dietterlin’s bishop epitaph may well refer to the death that sparked this conflict.

In order to produce this design for a Doric window, Dietterlin rendered aspects of the left half of the elevation with quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the drafted design. He then made embellishments to the design with quill with

---

black ink and brush with dark grey and grey-brown wash. Corrections and additions are made with white heightening.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

**DR.87**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 54*
1598 or earlier
Quill with black ink and brush with grey, dark grey, and grey-brown wash and white heightening on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper
24.68 x 16.81 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 37

INSCRIPTIONS: recto upper right [quill with black ink]: für 4; recto center [quill with black ink]: fiß pfasn Gr…; recto right center [quill with black ink]: das / nit
PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284

The present design depicts a Doric Order window with an entablature supported by triglyph-formed consoles that echo the triglyphs typically incorporated into the frieze of this Order. To create the design, Dietterlin rendered the left half of the elevation in quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the drafted design. Corrections and additions are made with white heightening, quill with black ink, and brush with grey and grey-brown wash. At this stage, the artist experimented with the form of the tripartite pediment crowning the design. The folded offset design featured the small pediment visible in the leftmost third of the drawing. Dietterlin tested how enlarging this form would affect the image by augmenting the pediment on the right side of the scheme. *Penimenti* related to this experiment are visible in the lower right corner of the sheet. The etching that arose from this design shows that the artist ultimately decided to execute the lateral pediments in a smaller size.
To draft this Doric Order window, Dietterlin rendered the left half of the elevation in quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the drafted design. He then embellished the drawing with brush and wash.

The tracery in this Doric Order window design shows Dietterlin employing a three-arch scheme typical of the architecture of the Romanesque period. This feature combines strangely with the pediment, which is broken in four places in a gesture of indecorous subversion characteristic of mannerist architecture. Such stylistic clashes abound in the more
purely architectonic designs of the *Architectura* project, which Dietterlin evidently employed as a context for formal experimentation.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

**DR.90**
*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 57*
1598 or earlier
Quill with black ink and brush with grey, dark grey, and light brown wash and white heightening on heavy, off-white, laid paper, mounted on heavy cream paper
25.43 x 17.20 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 40

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284

Dietterlin rendered the left half of this Doric window elevation with quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the drafted design. He subsequently went over the left half of the design with brush and wash. Corrections and additions are made with brush with white heightening and grey and grey-brown wash and quill with black ink.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

**DR.91**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 58*
1598 or earlier
Quill with black ink and brush with grey and dark grey wash over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper
25.48 x 18.00 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 41

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
Dietterlin rendered the left half of this elevation of a Doric window with quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the drafted design. He then made additions to both sides of the design with quill and ink and brush and wash. Corrections are made with brush with white heightening. In the etching, Dietterlin eliminated the garland from the base of one of the columns, allowing the print to model at least two alternative versions of the design.

The present design represents the first fireplace of the Doric Order. As in the Doric windows, Dietterlin adorns the design with the Order’s characteristic triglyphs. The artist likely derived the idea of formulating a fireplace crowned with a lunette window from the fireplaces of Du Cerceau’s *Second Livre*, many of which feature the same motif.  

---

198 Pirr, *Die Architectura*, 83.
In order to formulate this design, Dietterlin rendered the left half of the elevation and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the design. He then embellished the drawing with quill and ink and brush and wash. Corrections are made with brush with white heightening.

As the author of a book in part intended to serve as a compendium of model heraldic ornaments, Dietterlin faced the strange task of rendering objects conventionally defined by their idiosyncratic imagery in a generic form that artists could easily adjust to suit
different patrons. The present fireplace features a pair of women bearing the helmets that often served figured in such heraldic designs. Dietterlin folded the sheet to double the image of the crescent-topped helmet, but he removed the crescent on one side of the image in the final etching. The hooded falcon next to the figure bearing that helmet was also doubled on the opposite side of the composition as a result of Dietterlin’s folding. The artist subsequently went over the offset falcon with the quill and ink, changing it into a bird with a branch in its beak. In making such edits, the artist transforms unusual imagery into more common forms, achieving a balance between the general and the specific.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

**DR.95**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder  
*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 65, Version I*  
1598 or earlier  
Quill with black ink and brush with grey and dark grey wash and white heightening on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper  
25.00 x 17.80 cm  
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 45

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden  
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284

As with numerous other fireplace designs of the final *Architectura*, Dietterlin drafted this Doric scheme by drawing the left half of the elevation with quill and ink and folding the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the drafted design. He subsequently embellished both sides of the drawing with quill and ink and brush and wash, and continued to develop the composition in *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 65, Version II*.\(^\text{199}\)

---

\(^{199}\) *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 65, Version II* is catalogued in Appendix IV DR.96.
This drawing is a more developed version of the composition shown in *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 65, Version I.* The artist has added the *putto* that ultimately appeared on the right side of the fireplace in the print, using white heightening to erase the offset version of the figure that appeared when he folded the drawing to create a complete elevation. By including the *putto* on only one side of the final composition, Dietterlin indicated two possible ways to execute the design.

In the earlier drawing, a triumphal arch is visible beyond the opening in the monument in the foreground. Viewed against this distant construction, the fireplace in the foreground can also read as a portal or triumphal arch. In the present work, Dietterlin replaced the distant arch with the lateral elements of a fire screen, effectively transforming the monument from a portal into a fireplace. The changing function of the design indicates that Dietterlin devised some of the *Architectura*’s inventions by conceiving an architectonic form and then working out what purpose that form might serve. Function, in other words, followed form.

---

200 *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 65, Version I* is addressed in Appendix IV DR.96.
This drawing shows the lower portion of the Doric portal depicted in Plate 72 of the 1598 *Architectura*. The sheet is cut in several places, including along the major outlines of the portal. It has been re-assembled and mounted on another sheet of paper.

In this design for a Doric fountain, Dietterlin depicts an angel revealing water to Abraham’s banished second wife Hagar and their thirsting son Ismael at the moment of the mother’s greatest despair.\(^{201}\) The receding walls of the fountain impart the scene with striking

\(^{201}\) Genesis 21:17
depth, enhancing the viewer’s awareness that the design could be realized as a constructed fountain or as a painting of a fountain. Vessels, a plate, a piece of fruit, and a draped cloth adorn the parts of the monument extending farthest into the foreground. The composition thus functions simultaneously as a model for a holy history and a still life. While many designs of the *Architectura* could be reproduced in a number of media, few of the treatise’s models for painting also bridge genres of image. By combining multiple genres of pictorial expression within a single image, Dietterlin meet the needs of artisan readers who sought inspiration for many types of paintings.

---

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

**DR.99**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 79, Version I*
1598 or earlier
Quill with black ink and brush with grey and dark grey wash and white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper
25.46 17.71 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 58

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284

The drawing represents a less developed iteration of the design also pictured in *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 79, Version II.*\(^{202}\) In both drawings, the figure of Christ appears in the upper left corner of the sheet. The related etching depicts this figure with a ♀ symbol at his feet and at the pinnacle of the well, indicating that the reader might cut Christ from the etched page and append him to the well as its crowning element. There is no evidence that Dietterlin ever drafted the well as a completed entity, with Christ on top. The

\(^{202}\) *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 79, Version II* is discussed in Appendix IV DR.100.
detached position of Christ in this relatively early drawing indicates that Dietterlin conceived
the *Architectura* designs as pictorial compositions, and not as constructions *per se*.

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

**DR.100**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 79, Version II*
1598 or earlier
Quill with black ink and brush with grey and dark grey wash on off-white, laid paper,
mounted on cream paper
25.40 x 17.81 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 59

INSCRIPTIONS: recto upper right [quill with black ink (bistre?)]: diyßm seul / sol gr...m;
recto center right [quill with black ink]: Rürsr [?]; recto lower right [quill with black ink;
sideways]: Seul kan brünnen / mal dn f... gm [?] nicht

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284

The present drawing depicts a more developed version of the design represented in
*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 79, Version I.*\(^{203}\) Here Dietterlin eliminates the ornaments
that adorned the well basin in the previous drawing. With diagonal marks, the artist indicates
that the rollwork flourish on the offset side of the design should not appear in the print. The
well in the etching accordingly features one plain column as well as a column with spiral
fluting, a garland, an ornate capital, and rollwork ornament, thus illustrating two alternative
ways to execute the design. The inscriptions in this drawing evidently refer to this planned
alteration. The plan of the well pictured in the left side of the sheet did not appear in the
etching.

\(^{203}\) *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 79, Version I* is covered in Appendix IV DR.99.
This design shows a Doric fountain with a celestial globe straddled by a figure with a hammer and chisel—perhaps God as architect of the universe. Notes to the right of the base indicate that the size of the mask and the grotesque figures should be diminished. A ground plan of the fountain is shown to the left of the elevation, but, as in many Architectura designs, it disappears in the final etching. The trend indicates that Dietterlin decided to erode the practical value of his Architectura for architects in favor of producing a compendium of attractive, clean compositions focused on architectural ornament.
This drawing shows a Doric fountain mounted by the figure of Venus, accompanied by Amor and clutching a quiver with her companion’s arrows as well as a heart that appears to bleed spurts of water. To create this work, Dietterlin rendered the left half of the elevation with quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the drafted design. He subsequently elaborated the drawing with quill and ink and brush and wash. *Pentimenti* in various sections of the sheet show Dietterlin subsequently conceptualizing exactly how different forms in the design might appear in the final etching. An arabesque-like shape shows a possible way to develop the grotesque flourish just below Venus and Amor. A shell beside the base of the fountain, which features three *putti* in niches, depicts a ridged form similar to the one that Dietterlin eventually included at the feet of the central *putto* in the etching. The sketchy form below the floating shell records the artist working out the design of the short pilasters that flank the base figures. That Dietterlin sketched rudimentary ideas for ways to elaborate upon forms he had already arranged and modeled shows that the artist first concerned himself with composition, then with the articulation of volume and space, and finally with details like texture and the specifics of the ornamental scheme. Dietterlin continued to develop the present composition in *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 83, Version II*.204

---

204 *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 83, Version II* is described in Appendix IV DR.103.
Quill with black ink and brush with grey and dark grey wash and white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper
26.10 x 18.22 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 62

INSCRIPTIONS: recto lower right [quill with black ink]: 3
PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284

The present drawing shows a more developed version of the design depicted in
Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 83, Version I.205 To create it, Dietterlin drafted the left half of the elevation and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the drafted design. He then embellished the scheme with quill and ink and brush and wash. Corrections and additions are made with white heightening. Drawing over the white heightening that he used to erase unsatisfactory details of his designs during the final stages of composition, Dietterlin added the garland crowns to the putti at the base of the fountain. Cupid’s quiver has moved to its final position, and Dietterlin has confirmed the trajectory of the waterspouts that will appear in the final etching.

205 This drawing is analyzed in Appendix IV DR.102.
The Doric fountain bases depicted in this drawing are supposed to correspond with the fountain designs shown in the previous drawings. The pool with the cruciform plan, labeled A in the print after this design, corresponds to the design for the St. Christopher fountain shown Plate 82 of the 1598 *Architectura*. It displays a footprint that matches the darkened spaces in the plan, as well as a letter A to cue the reader to the relationship between the two images. A drawing for the St. Christopher fountain etching, *Design for an Elaborate Fountain*, is held in the Metropolitan Museum of Art.\(^{206}\) The pool with the star-formed plan in the lower half of the present drawing is meanwhile meant to serve as the base for the Venus and Amor fountain in Plate 83, as the footprint of that ensemble matches the darkened space in the base design, and as both forms are labeled with the letter B in the final etchings.

With the present drawing, Dietterlin solved a problem he had often faced when composing the *Architectura* fountain and well designs. Many of the *Architectura* fountain and well drawings depict a footprint of the featured structure, but few of the related etchings ultimately show that plan. Dietterlin evidently harbored a greater interest in showing his designs’ pictorially engaging elevations than their relatively boring footprints. But by eliminating this element of the fountain plans, the artist presented works that were harder to realize as built projects. Dietterlin resolves the issue in this drawing by presenting the fountains’ footprints, embodied by the base pools, in raking perspective. The image does not depict the dimensions of the fountain bases with as much accuracy as a conventional plan would, but it does inject the forms with a degree of visual interest absent from Dietterlin’s previous depictions of architectural plans. This tactic also allowed the artist to show the

\(^{206}\) New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, Inv. no. 2006.89. The drawing is described in Appendix IV NY.1.
fountains’ figural elements alone on the page, doing away with the pictorial awkwardness that results from combining an elevation and a plan in a single image.

Because it pictures the bases for both works, the drawing for Plate 84 also indicates that Dietterlin conceived the St. Christopher and Venus fountains as a dichotomous pair. Both include an adult accompanied by a child, but while one design features a male protagonist and represents a holy history, the other centers on a female protagonist drawn from mythology. Besides conforming to Dietterlin’s general love for the interplay between parallel and opposite forms, the duo attests to the artist’s affinity for manifesting a single architectural Order through both Christian and mythological imagery.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

**DR.105**  
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder  
*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 85*  
1598 or earlier  
Quill with black ink and brush with grey, dark grey and light brown wash and white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper  
15.30 x 17.70 cm [at greatest points]  
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 64  

INSCRIPTIONS: recto lower right [quill with black ink; sideways]: day[?] das kann [?] / mord [?] ; recto lower right [quill with black ink]: dīßes  
PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden  
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284  

In order to devise the image of a Doric lavabo—the top half of which is shown in the present fragment—Dietterlin rendered the left half of the elevation and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the drafted design. He then went over both sides of the design with quill and ink, and modeled the left half of the composition with brush and wash. The wash may contain white heightening. Crosshatching, which Dietterlin used only rarely to
shade designs, appears to the right of the portal’s entablature. The sheet has been trimmed beneath the grotesque mask.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

**DR.106**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 88, Version I*
1598 or earlier
Quill with black ink and brush with grey and dark grey wash and white heightening on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper
24.3 x 18.10 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 67

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284

The present drawing shows an early version of Dietterlin’s design for a Doric epitaph featuring Christ and the Apostles in the garden of Gethsemane, attended by a pair of male and female donor figures. Because the episode conveys Christ’s bravery in the face of his impending suffering and death, depicting the scene in this image was an ideal way to manifest the quality of valor that Dietterlin also associated with the Doric Order. The artist continued to develop the design in *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 88, Version II*.207

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

**DR.107**
*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate. 88, Version II*
1598 or earlier
Quill with black ink and brush with grey and dark grey wash and white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper

---

207 This drawing is documented in Appendix IV DR.107.
The present drawing represents a more developed version of the composition depicted in *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 88, Version I*. Here Dietterlin has worked out the arrangement of the shield-adorned arches that will ultimately appear in the print. The artist has also adjusted the work’s confessional tone. Both designs depict Christ praying in the garden of Gethsemane as his apostles sleep below. In the earlier drawing, the female patron figure’s hands were clasped in prayer. In the present drawing, she now reads a book—presumably, the Bible. In the previous drawing, the male patron figure holds one hand to his chest and extends the other toward Christ in a gesture of supplication. Now he holds both hands in an attitude of wonder. By increasing the design’s apparent emphasis on the power of the Word and by diminishing the theme of divine intercession, Dietterlin aligned the work more closely with the principles of the Reformation.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

**DR.108**

*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 89*

1598 or earlier
Quill with black ink and brush with grey, dark grey, and light brown wash and white heightening over graphite and black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper
25.45 x 18.00 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 69

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden

---

208 *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 88, Version I* is analyzed in Appendix IV DR.106.

209 The episode is recounted in Mark 14:32-37 and Matthew 26:37-44.
In order to devise this Doric epitaph, Dietterlin rendered the left half of the elevation in quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the drafted design. He then embellished both sides of the design with quill and ink and brush and wash, making corrections with white heightening mixed with blue-grey ink.
hand. Corrections are made with quill and black ink and white heightening mixed with grey wash.

Dietterlin apparently considered three different ways to portray the Virgin. In the first and most developed attempt, the artist showed the mother of Christ embracing the body of her son and leaning over to regard his broken body. A subsequent network of lines shows Dietterlin imagining how the design would appear if the Virgin were to lean over farther, and place her face against Christ’s body in an even more tender embrace. Another collection of contours shows the figure seated upright, adopting an attitude that conveys a greater emotional distance. This is the position that Dietterlin ultimately favored for the etching. As in the designs for Plate 88, the changes that the artist made to this drawing betray a considered approach to the theological implications of the *Architectura* designs. Had Dietterlin shown the Virgin with her face touching the body of Christ, the design may well have acquired an emotional charge too dramatic for the tastes of Reformed audiences.

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

**DR.110**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 91*
1598 or earlier
Quill with black ink and brush with grey, dark grey, and light brown wash and white heightening on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper
25.42 x 17.89 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 71

INSCRIPTIONS: recto lower center [quill with grey-black ink]: 4
PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284

---

210 The designs for Plate 88 of the 1598 *Architectura* are described in Appendix IV DR.106 and 107.
This design for a Doric cenotaph shows St. Gregory kneeling before the Crucifix. According to legend, Pope Gregory the Great was saying Mass one day when a disbeliever expressed doubt about the real presence of Christ in the transubstantiated bread of Communion. A vision of the Man of Sorrows showing his wounds and accompanied by the instruments of the Passion subsequently appeared to St. Gregory, confirming the presence of Christ in the Host. Representations of the so-called Mass of Saint Gregory experienced a surge in popularity during the late medieval period, particularly north of the Alps.211 They became a widespread form of Andachtsbild, or private devotional image, as well as the subject of altarpieces.212 Printed depictions of the Mass of Saint Gregory were frequently sold as indulgences, granting those who purchased the objects a deduction from the number of years they were otherwise condemned to spend in purgatory.213

Dietterlin’s version of the Mass of Saint Gregory shows the Pope kneeling before the Man of Sorrows on the cross. The apparition of Christ is flanked by putti bearing the Arma Christi, as well as St. Paul with his sword and St. Peter with his keys. Dietterlin incorporates the entire ensemble into an ornate Doric sarcophagus. The episode particularly suits Dietterlin’s Doric Order because it features a noble, masculine subject resonant with the heroic character that the author attributed to the Doric manner. Dietterlin’s design also

212 Miri Rubin, Corpus Christi: The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 120–122, 308–310. For the dissemination of the Mass of Saint Gregory image type in the German-speaking lands during the late Middle Ages and a useful bibliography on this large topic, see Mitchell Merback, “Fount of Mercy, City of Blood: Cultic Anti-Judaism and the Pulkau Passion Altarpiece,” Art Bulletin 87, no. 1 (December 2005): 606-608, and note 111.
accords with the *Architectura*’s multifaceted exploration of the intersections between architecture and the figural arts. By fusing an image typically represented in painting or print with a small monument, the artist combines the narrative functions of the figural arts with the forms of architecture.

The subject of this design was doctrinally charged. The story of the Mass of Saint Gregory confirmed the special status of the Pope as the Vicar of Christ and affirmed the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and thus reinforced two Catholic teachings that attracted the criticism of Reformers. As a model for a small, printed portrayal of the Mass of Saint Gregory, Dietterlin’s design anticipates an object that can function as a devotional aid and thus encourage behaviors that ran counter to the roles that Reformers prescribed for religious images. The etching could be compared to the printed images of the Mass of Saint Gregory sold as indulgences. And since the etching was to occur within a book, it could also recall the images of the Mass of Saint Gregory often included in Catholic books of hours.\(^{214}\)

Viewers familiar with Dietterlin’s efforts to temper any overly Catholic messages in the *Architectura* designs may expect that the image is intended to act as satire, but the composition contains no obvious criticism of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, the authority of the Pope, or the functions of the *Andachtsbild*. While Dietterlin’s *Architectura* often presented religious material in a way that fell on the side of the Reformation, it generally handled sacred imagery in a manner that could appeal to all confessions. The present image runs counter to both trends, suggesting that the author also sought to form a more ecumenical text by including an image with Catholic leanings among the *Architectura* prints.

Although somewhat generic in appearance, the armored ruler featured in this design for a Doric epitaph may be meant to recall Emperor Rudolf II in his guise as King of Bohemia, accompanied by the lion that symbolized that land. If the image shows the unmarried ruler, the woman to his left likely represents his mother, Maria of Austria. To create this drawing, Dietterlin drafted the left half of the elevation and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the drafted design. He then embellished both sides of the design with quill and ink and brush and wash. Corrections are made with white heightening mixed with grey wash. The lower left corner of the sheet is cut away along the contours of a column base.
In order to draft the present design for an Ionic window, Dietterlin rendered the left half of the elevation with quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the drafted design. He then developed the drawing with quill and ink and brush and wash, rendering a cornucopia-formed arabesque in place of the putto that he originally depicted on the left side of the design. The arabesque form visible in the right side of the window shows a variation on the cornucopia, scaled down and reversed. It indicates that despite Dietterlin’s frequent use of mechanical drafting techniques to reproduce or reverse the ornamental forms of his Architextura designs, the artist still boasted a talent for inverting and copying the forms freehand.

To produce this design for an Ionic window, Dietterlin rendered the left half of the elevation in quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the drafted design. He then embellished both sides of the composition with quill and ink and brush and wash. Corrections are made with grey wash and white heightening.
In formulating the present design for an Ionic window façade, the iconography of which is discussed in Chapter II, Dietterlin experimented at length with ways to formulate the legs and feet of the figure of standing on the plinth that reads “LIBERTAS.” The artist made corrections to the personification of liberty with white heightening mixed with blue-grey wash. The final form that her freely moving body assumed aptly evokes the unruly character of her architectural context. With its precariously stacked arrangements of architectonic form, the façade displays a significant degree of architectural license. Its seemingly gravity-defying gestalt suggests that the design models a façade painting, and not an actual structure.

At least one painter, Bartholomaeus Spranger, did draw inspiration from the etching that Dietterlin made from this drawing in order to devise a painting. The Prague artist’s Cupid Fleeing Psyche, now held in the Landesmuseum für Kunst und Kulturgeschichte Oldenburg, portrays a similarly manneristic façade with a window and a sculptural figure striding from a niche to the right of the design (the position of the niche in Dietterlin’s

---

215 I am grateful to Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann for making me aware of this connection.
printed composition). Yet whereas Dietterlin had likely envisioned his composition as an actual façade painting, Spranger’s work is an architectural trompe l’oeil executed in oil on copper. This was not the only sense in which the Prague painter departed from Dietterlin’s model. Spranger also made significant alterations to the figural imagery of the Architectura design. The window in his copper plate painting opens onto the image of Psyche, who has just betrayed Cupid by looking upon his sleeping form, attempting to restrain her fleeing lover. Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann has connected the sculptures portrayed in Spranger’s design to the work of Rudolfine sculptor Adriaen de Vries, whose figures, through the mediation of engravings, may also have inspired Dietterlin’s bodies. In the catalogue of the recent Spranger exhibition, Sally Metzler tentatively dated the painting to circa 1599, and speculated about whether the copper plate had been cut. The apparent relationship between Dietterlin’s print and Spranger’s work indicates that the Oldenburg composition indeed dates from 1598 or afterward, and that it probably always boasted the same strangely cropped compositional formula as the Architectura etching.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

**DR.115**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 106*
1598 or earlier

---

216 Oldenburg, Landesmuseum für Kunst und Kulturgeschichte Oldenburg, Inv.–Nr. 15.579.
Dietterlin appears to have rendered one side of this Ionic fireplace elevation in black chalk and folded the sheet to transfer the pigment and double the drafted design. He then embellished both sides of the composition with quill and ink and brush and wash. Corrections are made with grey wash and white heightening. The artist developed the volutes with grotesque faces in a quill sketch in the upper left corner of the sheet. Another passage of *pentimenti* shows Dietterlin testing out how a shield might appear in the uppermost element of the chimney, a detail that he eventually eliminated in the print.

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

**DR.116**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 107*
1598 or earlier
Quill with black ink and brush with grey and dark grey wash and white heightening over black chalk or graphite on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper
25.21 x 17.21 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 84

INSCRIPTIONS: recto lower right [quill with black ink]: 19
PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284

The present design for an Ionic fireplace features Selene (the Greek version of the Roman Luna) with her crescent moon-adorned headpiece. She is seated beside the Nemean
lion, a creature said to have “fallen from the moon”. A reference to this rather obscure element of classical mythology also occurs in Design for Annder Buch Plate 35, which shows an Ionic portal with the image of Selene and Hercules wearing the skin of the Nemean lion. In the present design, a *putto* to the left of the lion holds an arrow, referring to the beast’s imperviousness to human weapons. The related etching also shows Selene holding a spear. A *putto* on the other side of the design holds a dog. These various accoutrements of the hunt probably belong to Selene’s mortal lover Endymion, who is often described as a hunter. By developing the Selene/Luna theme referenced in Design for Annder Buch Plate 35 with this evocative iconography, Dietterlin further enriched the *Architectura*’s image of the symbolism potential to the Ionic Order.

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

**DR.117**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder  
*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 108*  
1598 or earlier  
Quill with black ink and brush with grey and dark grey wash and white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper  
25.51 x 17.89 cm  
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 85  

Inscriptions: recto lower center [quill with black ink]: 21  
Provenance: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden  
Literature: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284

---

219 Aelian, *ΠΕΡΙ ΖΩΝ ΙΔΙΟΤΗΤΟΣ*, 12.7  
220 *Design for Annder Buch Plate 35* is addressed in Appendix IV DR.52.  
This drawing depicts an Ionic fireplace with an auricular lozenge, mounted by a phoenix rising from his own ashes and flanked by Adam and Eve. This iconography is discussed at greater length in the dissertation’s Excursus. To devise the design, Dietterlin rendered the left half of the elevation and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the drafted design. He then elaborated both sides of the composition with quill and ink and brush and wash. Corrections are made with white heightening mixed with grey wash.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

DR.118
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 109*
1598 or earlier
Quill with black ink and brush with grey and dark grey wash and white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper
25.61 x 17.80 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-1, fol. 86

INSCRIPTIONS: recto lower center [quill with black ink]: 20
PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 106; Pauli (1899), 284

The present drawing depicts an Ionic fireplace with a chimney niche in which Vulcan, hammer held high, toils away at his anvil. The god is accompanied by his wife Venus, as well as Amor. In depicting the goddess of love with her consort in the midst of his fiery work, Dietterlin engages the early modern notion that the processes of artistic creation resemble the operations of sexual generation.\(^{222}\) Involved as it is with fire, the element Vulcan employs to accomplish his labors, Dietterlin’s fireplace strikes the viewer as the metaphorical product of the gods’ generative pursuits. Because the Ionic Order is associated

\(^{222}\) For further discussion of this theme in early modern artistic culture, see Ulrich Pfisterer, *Kunst-Geburten. Kreativität, Erotik, Körper* (Berlin: Wagenbach, 2014).
with the character of a mature woman, such allusions to productivity and fertility were particularly appropriate for an Ionic image.

To create this drawing, Dietterlin rendered the left half of the elevation in quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the drafted design. He subsequently embellished the design with quill and ink and brush and wash. Corrections are made with white heightening mixed with grey wash. Dietterlin likely derived the idea of crowning a fireplace with a niche from the fireplace designs of Du Cerceau’s Second Livre.223

According to John 4:4-26, Jesus encountered a Samaritan woman at a well and asked her to give him a drink of water. The woman expressed surprise at this request, and hesitated to fulfill it. Jesus told her the he would have given her the Water of Life, which, unlike the well water, can quench thirst for eternity. He subsequently identified himself as the Messiah. Like many of the Architectura’s other designs, this visual parable of the revelation of truth underscores the deceptive nature of appearances. It is an ethos suits a book in which

223 Pirr, Die Architectura, 84.
licentious configurations of architectural ornament are treated as a mask for the true ratios of Vitruvius, which only readers who have virtuously internalized the lessons of correct architectural composition can recover.

The present design can be understood as a formal and thematic pendant to Plate 78 of the 1598 *Architectura*, which shows the Angel of God quenching the thirst of Hagar and Ismael at the head of another fountain with a quadrilateral pool.224 Dietterlin’s image of Christ and the Samaritan woman visualizes a New Testament narrative alongside a monument that recalls the construction in his previous representation of a similar, Old Testament story. With these two designs, Dietterlin reimagines a longstanding visual tradition of biblical typology—that is, the parallel representation of Old and New Testament vignettes—as a conceit for the pages of architectural literature. The device enhances the *Architectura*’s narrative pretensions and indeed positions the treatise as a Bible of architecture. As with the New Testament realization of Old Testament prognostications, the ornamental configurations prophesized earlier in Dietterlin’s book reach their ultimate fulfillment in its later sections.

---

224 This design is described in Appendix IV DR.98.
This drawing of an Ionic fountain features a figure that resembles the statue of Augustus atop the so-called “Augustusbrunnen”, which sculptor Hubert Gerhard completed in Augsburg between 1588 and 1594. Dietterlin rendered the design by drafting the right half of the elevation with quill and ink and folding the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the drafted design. He then elaborated both sides of the composition with quill and ink, and modeled the forms of the right half of the design with brush and wash.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

**DR.121**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 120*
1598 or earlier
Quill with black ink and brush with grey and dark grey wash over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream laid paper
25.62 x 17.30 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 96

This design for two Ionic fountain bases relates to the fountain ornaments depicted in the two plates that precede this figure in the 1598 installment of the *Architectura*. The round base shown at the top of the sheet relates to the archer fountain depicted in *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 118*, and the trefoil base at the bottom of the sheet relates to the
fountain portrayed in Plate 119. To form the drawing, Dietterlin rendered the left half of the elevation in quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the drafted design. The artist subsequently embellished the design with quill and ink and brush and wash.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

**DR.122**

Wendel Dietterlin the Elder  
*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 122*

1598 or earlier  
Quill with black ink and brush with grey, dark grey, and light grey-brown wash with white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream laid paper  
25.2 x 16.99 cm  
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 97

**INSCRIPTIONS:** recto upper right [quill with black ink]: groß; recto lower center [quill with black ink]: 28  
**PROVENANCE:** Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden  
**LITERATURE:** von Zahn (1863), 107; Pauli (1899), 284

The present drawing shows an Ionic fountain decked with sea monsters, dolphins, shell basins, and even a crab. The figural group perched on a wall beyond the monument includes Zeus, with his bundle of lightning bolts, embracing a voluptuous, nude woman. Given the design’s nautical imagery, the woman likely represents the sea nymph Thetis, whose coupling with Zeus produced the hero Achilles. The style of the figures recall the dynamic, manneristic verve of the bronze sculptures of Adriaen de Vries, as well as the almost gravity-defying lightness of the bronzes of Hubert Gerhard.

---

225 *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 118* is assessed in Appendix IV DR.120.
This drawing depicts a model for an Ionic fountain featuring four rivers. The aged male in the foreground, labeled “RHENVVS” backwards, must represent the Rhine. He and the other three figures are based on the four rivers at the base of Hubert Gerhard's Augustusbrunnen in Augsburg.  

---

To produce this drawing of an Ionic lavabo, Dietterlin rendered the left half of the elevation with quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the drafted design. He then embellished the design with quill and ink and brush with wash.

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

**DR.125**  
*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 127*  
1598 or earlier  
Quill with black ink and brush with grey and dark grey wash and white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream laid paper  
25.32 x 17.71 cm  
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 103  

INSCRIPTIONS: recto lower right [quill with black ink]: 31  
PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden  
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 107; Pauli (1899), 284

This design for an Ionic epitaph features the crucified Christ, with a veiled Virgin to the right of the cross and St. John the Evangelist to the left. The image of a woman embracing the Crucifix is conventionally associated with Empress Helena. The mother of Emperor Constantine the Great, Empress Helena was said to have found the True Cross during the course of a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. As a virtuous, brave matron, she is an ideal embodiment of the Ionic Order.

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

**DR.126**  
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder  
*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 129, Version I*  
1598 or earlier  
Quill with black ink and brush with dark grey and grey wash with white heightening over graphite and black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper  
25.50 x 17.50 cm
The present drawing shows a less developed version of the design pictured in *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 129, Version II*. To create this work, Dietterlin rendered the right half of the elevation and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the design. He subsequently embellished the composition with quill and ink and brush with wash. Corrections and additions are made with brush with grey wash and white heightening and quill with black ink. *Pentimenti* crowd the center of the frame, showing Dietterlin experimenting with the various forms that the design’s lateral niches might take. Because they fit perfectly within the borders of the frame, it appears likely that the artist rendered these sketches after he had plotted the work’s general structure.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

**DR.127**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 129, Version II*
1598 or earlier
Quill with black ink and brush with grey and dark grey wash over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream laid paper
25.21 x 18.29 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 104

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 107; Pauli (1899), 284

---

227 *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 129, Version II* is catalogued in Appendix IV DR.127.
The present drawing depicts a more developed version of the composition pictured in *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 129, Version I*.\(^{228}\) In order to formulate the drawing, Dietterlin rendered half the elevation on the right side of the sheet with quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the drafted design. He then elaborated the design with quill and ink and brush with grey wash. Here the artist eliminated the figures from the lateral niches, and replaced the grotesque mask that crowned the center of the larger frame in the previous drawing with the face of a woman flanked by garlands—the motif that also appears in the final etching. The outline of a shield not ultimately included in the print appears at the base of the central compartment.

---

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

**DR.128**  
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder  
*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 130*  
1598 or earlier  
Quill with black ink and brush with grey and dark grey wash and white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper  
25.30 x 17.80 cm  
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 105

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden  
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 107; Pauli (1899), 284

To devise this design for an Ionic epitaph, Dietterlin rendered the left half of the elevation with quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double aspects of the drafted design. He then embellished the composition with quill and ink and brush with wash.

\(^{228}\) *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 129, Version I Appendix IV DR.126.*
This drawing shows an Ionic cenotaph with the effigy of an armed figure accompanied by a kneeling woman, who bears the palm and laurel crown of victory. The man assumes a rather generic appearance, a feature that would have assisted artisan readers in adjusting the figure to resemble a particular honoree.

Stylistically, the present work typifies Dietterlin’s usual working drawings for the images of the 1598 installment of the Architectura. The outlines of figures are formulated with an impressive economy of quill strokes, and wash is applied with expressive abandon. Dietterlin noted changes to be made to the design in the sheet’s two inscriptions: the shield is “too big” and the base needs another elements. Corrections and additions to the drawing are made with quill and black ink and brush with grey wash and white heightening. A more developed iteration of this design is visible in Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 131, Version II.  

---

Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 131, Version II is documented in Appendix IV DR.130.
The present drawing represents a more developed iteration of the Ionic cenotaph
scheme shown in *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 131, Version I*. Unlike the earlier design,
this sheet shows Dietterlin employing his folded counterproof method to swiftly draft the
forms already planned in the previous image. The artist rendered the left half of the elevation
with quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double the drafted
design. He then embellished the design with quill and ink and brush with wash. Corrections
and additions are made with quill and black ink and brush with grey wash and white
heightening.

In the earlier drawing, Dietterlin inscribed the shield held by the lion with the remark
that “this is too big,” adding a smaller shield beside the unsatisfactory motif. Here, the artist
has replaced the feather and helmet-adorned shield borne by the lion in the former drawing
with the more subdued version sketched in the previous sheet. The change indicates that
Dietterlin’s working process did not always involve embellishment. Just as often, the artist
developed his *Architectura* designs by eliminating extraneous details.

---

230 *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 131, Version I* is described in Appendix IV DR.129.
This design for a princely tomb in the Ionic Order features an armored man on horseback accompanied by a dog, a standard-bearer personification of victory in battle and a crown and jewel-bearing personification of the spoils of that victory. Dietterlin drafted the architectural forms of the monument in chalk, but chose not to develop that element of the design farther in this drawing. His primary interest lay in forming the figures.
the more earthly passion that binds the couple. To create this design, Dietterlin rendered the left half of the architectural elevation with quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double aspects of the drafted design. He then embellished the composition with quill and ink and brush with wash. Corrections and additions are made with quill and black ink and brush with grey wash with white heightening.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

**DR.133**

Wendel Dietterlin the Elder

*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 143*

Quill with black ink and brush with dark grey and grey wash with white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper

25.10 x 18.20 cm

Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 116

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden

LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 107; Pauli (1899), 284

This design for a Corinthian façade shows David bearing the head of Goliath as well as his slain enemy's sword. Although David was a young boy and not a maiden like the young girl associated with the Corinthian Order, the biblical hero's youth and legendary virtue still qualifies him as an appropriate representative of that manner. Dietterlin’s decision employ a boy to embody the Corinthian Order attests that the artist conceived of the Orders more as constellations of abstract qualities than as manners of ornament necessarily identified with a specific human type, as many architectural theorists before him had assumed.

---

231 The story of David and Goliath is told in 1 Samuel 17.
To create this drawing, Dietterlin rendered the left half of the architectural elevation with quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double aspects of the drafted design. He then embellished the composition with quill and ink and brush with wash. Corrections and additions are made with quill and black ink and brush with grey wash with white heightening.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

**DR.134**

Wendel Dietterlin the Elder

*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 145*

1598 or earlier

Quill with black ink and brush with dark grey and grey wash with white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper

25.50 x 17.81 cm

Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 117

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden

LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 107; Pauli (1899), 284

This design for a Corinthian façade depicts Day in the guise of a laborer with two axes and accompanied by a lark and dog, as well as Night holding an unlit torch, compass, and tankard, and accompanied by an owl and a cat. A *putto* perched between the pair carries one shield marked with an image of the sun and another inscribed with an image of the moon, each of which he holds so as to face the corresponding personification. The connection between this allegory of the times of day and the Corinthian Order remains obscure. So, too, does the exact purpose of the design, which could model an ornately sculpted façade, a façade with painted decorations, or a scheme featuring some combination of painting, sculpture, and architecture. The vagaries of print allowed Dietterlin to impart to the image an ambiguous materiality.
In order to draft this drawing, Dietterlin rendered the right half of the architectural elevation with quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double aspects of the drafted design. He then embellished the composition with quill and ink and brush with wash. Corrections and additions are made with quill and black ink and brush with grey wash with white heightening. The crosshatched child’s face in the field encompassed by the left window frame resembles the face of the putto in Dietterlin’s *Putto After Raphael’s “Isaiah”*.232

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

**DR.135**

Wendel Dietterlin the Elder

*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 146*

1598 or earlier
Quill with black ink and brush with dark grey and grey wash with white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper
25.40 x 17.52 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 118

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden

LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 107; Pauli (1899), 284

This drawing for a Corinthian façade features a painting of the Ascension with a kneeling figure holding a book—likely a self-portrait of Dietterlin with the *Architectura*. A figure holding the model of an octagonal-plan building similar to period representations of the Holy Sepulcher is seated above the painted cartouche, representing the site of Christ’s death and Resurrection. The related print, which shows few changes to the drafted design, is discussed further in Chapter V.

232 *Putto After Raphael’s “Isaiah”* is analyzed in Appendix IV SB.2.
This design for a Corinthian façade, also discussed at length in Chapter V, shows King David rending his garments at the news of the deaths of Saul and Jonathan. By preceding the present image with a Corinthian façade design featuring the young David as slayer of Goliath in Plate 143, Dietterlin suggests the passage of time and reinforces the Architectura’s narrative-like qualities.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

**DR.137**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 148*
1598 or earlier
Quill with black ink and brush with dark grey and grey wash with white heightening on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream laid paper
25.61 x 17.90 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 120

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 107; Pauli (1899), 284

The story is related in 2 Samuel 1.1-16.

The design for Plate 193 is addressed in Appendix IV DR.133.
Dietterlin’s model of a Corinthian fireplace with Hercules sporting the skin of the Nemean lion also shows the image of a woman holding a cup. In the etched version of this design, the woman also holds a cross, and thus assumes the guise of Ecclesia. The sketchy figure to the right of Hercules in the drawing also holds a cup. The final print shows the woman wearing a ridiculous, feathered headdress, an attribute associated with vanity and folly. Together, these allegorical figures evoke dichotomy between virtue and vice. It is an appropriate device for a fireplace dedicated to Hercules, who was known for redeeming himself from worldly iniquities. To create this drawing, Dietterlin rendered the left half of the architectural elevation with quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double aspects of the drafted design. He then embellished the composition with quill and ink and brush with wash. Corrections and additions are made with quill and black ink and brush with grey wash with white heightening.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

**DR.138**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder  
*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 149*  
1598 or earlier  
Quill with black ink and brush with dark grey and grey wash with white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream laid paper  
27.20 x 16.61 cm  
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 121  

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden  
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 107; Pauli (1899), 284

The present design for a Corinthian fireplace shows the crowned Zeus with an eagle at his side, joined with Hera. Cupid with a quiver of arrows looks on. The fireplace is supported on one side by the figure of Mercury, with his winged helmet. The many-eyed giant Argus Panoptes holds up the other side of the ensemble. According to ancient myth,
Hera charged Argus with guarding the heifer-nymph Io, with whom Zeus wished to conduct an affair. Zeus sent Mercury to kill Argus, so that he might couple with Io. Dietterlin’s fireplace thus portrays the physical union of Zeus and Hera while simultaneously alluding to a controversy between the couple and its bloody consequences. In embodying the contrast between love and the violence or concord and discord, the design captures the play of opposites often described as a hallmark characteristic of mannerist art.

It is possible to discern a loose formal and stylistic relationship between Dietterlin’s prints and major sculptural programs of the period, such as the decorations of the Golden Room in Bückeburg Palace that Jonas Wolf and Ebert Wolf the Younger executed around 1604.235 Appearing much like Mercury and Argus Panopotes in the present design, the twisting bodies of Mars and Venus hold up the so-called “Gods’ Gate” in the Palace’s Golden Room. The Gate is crowned with the body of Mercury, which, like the likeness of Hera in Dietterlin’s Corinthian fireplace, seems to spring forward from the ensemble, toward the viewer.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

DR.139
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 150
1598 or earlier
Quill with black ink and brush with dark grey, reddish-brown, and grey wash with white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream laid paper
24.80 x 17.73 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 122

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden

235 On the Gods’ Gate, see Heiner Borggrefe, Schloss Bückeburg. Höfischer Glanz, fürstliche Repräsentation (Hannover: Schlütersche, 2010), 16.
This design for a Corinthian fireplace supported by figures of Apollo with his Lyre and Pan with his pipes also features the image of a seated, bare-breasted woman wearing a crown and holding a book. In the etching related to this design, Dietterlin also represented a snake entwining itself around her arm. The addition of the snake allows the viewer to more easily identify the figure as Cleopatra, who, according to tradition, committed suicide with the bite of an asp to her breast.

To form this drawing, Dietterlin rendered the left half of the architectural elevation with quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double aspects of the drafted design. He then embellished the composition with quill and ink and brush with wash. Corrections and additions are made with quill and black ink and brush with grey wash with white heightening. The lower left corner has been torn away and the original sheet has been re-assembled on a mounting sheet.

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

**DR.140**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 151*
1598 or earlier
Quill with black ink and brush with dark grey, reddish-brown, green, and grey wash with white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream laid paper
27.71 x 16.80 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 123

INSCRIPTIONS: recto upper right [quill with black ink]: 119.
PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 107; Pauli (1899), 284

Dietterlin intensely deliberated how to compose the figure in the niche above this Corinthian fireplace. The drawing shows an armored man with a downcast head, standing
behind a shield. Dramatic editing marks in black ink obscure much of this figure from view, and appear to describe a taller figure, standing in front of the shield. In the etching related to this design, Dietterlin did ultimately portray a standing figure. The etched man moreover sports an impressive suit of classicizing armor and tramples a slain enemy beneath his feet. Such alterations made gave the fireplace a more dynamic character, and made it more suitable for the patron who wished to aggrandize his accomplishments on the battlefield through the image of a triumphing soldier.

To create this design, Dietterlin rendered the left half of the architectural elevation with quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double aspects of the drafted design. He then embellished the composition with quill and ink and brush with wash. Corrections and additions are made with quill and black ink and brush with grey wash with white heightening. Reddish-brown and green paint appears to have been accidentally applied to the sheet.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

**DR.141**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 152*
1598 or earlier
Quill with black and brown ink and brush with grey, dark grey, and blue-grey wash with white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream laid paper
25.42 x 18.00 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 124

INSCRIPTIONS: recto upper left [reed pen with brown ink]: kleiner.; recto lower left [quill with black ink]: 39
PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 107; Pauli (1899), 284
This design for a Corinthian garden gate, shown as an architectural perspective in the manner of Vredeman de Vries, features a suite of terms composed from various fruits. Giuseppe Arcimboldo had shown Emperor Rudolf II as a figure comprised of a similar confabulation of fruits in a painting executed around 1590. Gregorio Comanini’s 1591 *Il Figino* celebrated the portrait as a depiction of the Emperor in the guise of Vertumnus, the Etruscan and Roman god of metamorphosis.\(^{236}\)

Dietterlin adds the image of Vertumnus to his design as well, showing the deity as an enlivened statue seated in the niche of a gate situated at the intersection of two paths. In picturing the god in this fashion, he visualizes the description of the Roman idol to Vertumnus in an elegy by Propertius.\(^{237}\) Vertumnus imagery also appears in the *Architectura’s* pictorial synopsis of the Tuscan Order, a phenomenon treated at length in Chapter IV.\(^{238}\) But while the Vertumnus in Dietterlin’s allegory of the Tuscan Order is represented alone, here he is joined by a female companion with a crown of twigs. The woman likely represents Pomona, the beloved of Vertumnus whose story is related in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*.\(^{239}\) Dietterlin shows the God entreating Pomona to become his lover, just as the deity attempts to do in the ancient text. With the addition of the female element to the Vertumnus motif, Dietterlin’s depiction of the god becomes more appropriate for the conventionally feminine Corinthian Order.


\(^{237}\) Propertius, *Elegiae*, IV.2.

\(^{238}\) The design for Dietterlin’s synoptic image of the Tuscan Order is discussed in Appendix IV DR.1.

This design for two-thirds of a Corinthian triumphal arch is adorned with five of the nine Muses playing instruments. A full version of the arch would presumably depict all nine figures. To the right of the muses sits a figure with a plumed helmet and a shield. In the etched version of this design, Dietterlin transformed this figure into a recognizable likeness of Athena, clad in armor and bearing a shield with the image of Medusa. The sketched outline of Pegasus rears his winged body in an outlined section in the upper right corner of the sheet. According to myth, Pegasus was born from the blood that issued from the head of Medusa when the hero Perseus decapitated her.²⁴⁰ The creature is said to have opened a spring on Mount Helicon, where the Muses made their home, by striking his hoof to the ground.²⁴¹ Athena, who, like Pegasus, was also born from the head of her parent, helped the Greek hero Bellerophon to tame the beast.²⁴² The goddess of the arts was also the sister of the Muses. By including these variously interrelated figures in his arch design, Dietterlin displayed an extensive knowledge of ancient lore.

²⁴⁰ Hesiod, ΘΕΟΓΟΝΙΑ, 281; Apollodorus, ΒΙΒΑΙΟΘΗΚΗ, 2.42.
²⁴¹ Aratus, ΦΑΙΝΟΜΕΝΑ, 215-224.
²⁴² Pindar, Ολυμπιαν Οδες, 13
DR.143
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 162*
1598 or earlier
Quill with black ink and brush with grey and dark grey wash and white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper
25.40 x 17.70 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 128

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 107; Pauli (1899), 284

This Corinthian design is the first of a suite of five related images numbered consecutively from 162 to 166 in the 1598 *Architectura*. It shows a man mounting a dragon set atop a broken cornice and flanked by the three-headed hellhound Cerberus and a loaded cannon. These attributes identify the figure as the personification of fire. In the bottom section of the sheet, Dietterlin rendered the left half of the architectural elevation with quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double aspects of the drafted design. He then repeated the procedure in the top portion of the composition, drafting the design on the right side of the sheet. The artist subsequently embellished the composition with quill and ink and brush with wash.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

DR.144
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 163, Version I*
1598 or earlier
Quill with black ink and brush with grey, dark grey, and light brown wash and white heightening over black chalk and graphite on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream laid paper
25.1 x 17.90 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 129

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 107; Pauli (1899), 284
The present design, which is related to the aforementioned suite of five Corinthian fountain etchings, shows a female figure with wings on either side of her head, sitting atop an architectural base with a globe. A peacock, an eagle, a falcon, and several smaller, exotic birds accompany her. Beneath the eagle’s talons lie bellows, and draped over the woman’s proper right arm is a bagpipe-like instrument. A chameleon perches on her outstretched hand. According to early modern lore, such creatures consumed only air. The fowl and the instruments that surround the woman can also be associated with the winds. Together, these attributes identify the figure as the personification of air. Her function as a fountain ornament is apparent from the sprightly lines that issue from the mouth of the bird at the base of the design, which resemble streams of spraying water.

This drawing represents a less developed iteration of the ensemble depicted in Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 163, Version II. It shows a rare instance in which Dietterlin used an early drawing to plot the figural group of an Architectura design in greater detail than its architectural context. Dietterlin composed the architectonic form in the background of this drawing by drafting the left half of the elevation in black chalk and folding the sheet to transfer the pigment and double the design. The artist subsequently rendered the right half of the sculpture base with quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to likewise double aspects of the ink scheme. He then embellished the composition with quill and ink and brush with wash. While Dietterlin left the architectural frame in its preliminary, chalk outline form, he fully modeled Air with the quill and brush. Here, Dietterlin was primary interested in describing sculptural form.

243 For instance, when Claudius asks how Hamlet fares, he answers, “Excellent, i’faith, of the chameleon’s dish. I eat the air, promise-crammed.” See Shakespeare, Hamlet, III.2.87-87.
244 Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 163, Version II is covered in Appendix IV DR.146.
This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

**DR.145**

Wendel Dietterlin the Elder  
*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 163, Version II*  
1598 or earlier

Quill with black ink and brush with grey, dark grey, and light brown wash and white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper  
25.00 x 17.31 cm

Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 130

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden  
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 107; Pauli (1899), 284

The present drawing shows a more developed version of the composition depicted in *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 163, Version I.* In this work, Dietterlin concentrates on establishing the final form of Air’s architectonic frame. The artist elongates the broken cornice over the niche, and adds lateral niches with storks. He also renders a band of zodiac symbols on the globe at the figure’s feet. The stars that comprise the signs of the zodiac reside in the sky, which is also the domain of air. By associating Air with the zodiac, Dietterlin expands the cosmological rhetoric of the *Architectura’s* allegorical representations of the Elements. He also augments the designs’ possible associations with the arcane arts: while the Elements relate to the theory of alchemy, the zodiac pertains to astrology.

To create this drawing, Dietterlin rendered the left half of the architectural elevation with quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double aspects of the drafted design. He then embellished the composition with quill and ink and brush with wash. Corrections and additions are made with quill and black ink and brush with grey wash with white heightening. Many elements of the sheet have been cut and reassembled on a backing sheet. The cuts probably arose when Dietterlin traced the design into the etching plate coating.

---

245 *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 163, Version I* is covered in Appendix IV DR.144.
This drawing of a Corinthian fountain likewise belongs to the suite of designs related to Plates 162 to 166 of the 1598 *Architectura*. The aged male figure at the center of the ensemble mounts a beast with the head and forelegs of a horse and the tail of a fish. It is joined by a tern, a crane, a lobster, a crab, and a *putto* who grabs the chimera’s ear. With his long beard and headpiece comprised of the detritus of some aquatic environment, the male figure displays the attributes of a river god. This is the personification of the Element of water.

In order to draft this drawing, Dietterlin rendered the left half of the architectural elevation with quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double aspects of the drafted design. He then embellished the composition with quill and ink and brush with wash. Corrections and additions are made with quill and black ink and brush with grey wash with white heightening. Elements of the sheet have been cut—probably when Dietterlin made the etching plate—and reassembled on the mounting paper.
This is the final drawing associated with the series of designs related to Plates 162 to 166 of the 1598 *Architectura*. To draft this work, Dietterlin rendered elements of half the elevation in black chalk and folded the sheet in half to transfer the pigment and leave asymmetrical design. He subsequently went over a number of the lines with the quill and ink. Corrections and additions are made with quill and black ink. Because the figures in the present work remain in outline form, it is likely that Dietterlin developed the design further on subsequent sheets.

Dietterlin’s design depicts a majestic, multi-story Corinthian grotto adorned with the fountain figures shown in the previous drawings. The bottom tier includes, from left to right, the personifications of air and water, as well as a personification of earth, for which no drawing is known. The top tier of the scheme features the personification of fire. The image’s combination of fountain designs demonstrates the results of Dietterlin’s fantastic paradigm of ornamental invention. With this image, Dietterlin applied the *Architectura’s* lessons in fluidly mixing architecture with the figural media to a model for inventing a space that seamlessly integrates sculpture with the built environment. The artist’s strategy of concluding the ensemble of Elements fountains with a dramatic, cumulative image also enhanced the treatise’s narrative qualities and supported his efforts to portray architecture as a vehicle for storytelling.

The suite of grotto designs likewise provided a context for Dietterlin to experiment with ways to represent architecture. While the artist had shown the individual personifications of the Elements in elevation, the culminating design of the series features a
perspectival view. The shift adds visual interest to the series, and, in manifesting the same perspectival mode of projection that Vitruvius had recommended for theater design, portrays the invention of a space as a matter of staging forms. The conceit evidently appealed to period viewers. Salomon de Caus’s 1620 Hortus Palatinus, a book of engravings that portrayed the new Palatine Garden at Heidelberg castle, likewise contains plates that show different views of the same fountain and grotto figures.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

DR.148
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 169
1598 or earlier
Quill with black ink and brush with grey and dark grey wash and white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper mounted on cream laid paper
25.71 x 17.60 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 135

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 107; Pauli (1899), 284

In order to create this design for a Corinthian frame or epitaph, Dietterlin rendered the left half of the architectural elevation with quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double aspects of the drafted design. He then embellished the composition with quill and ink and brush with wash. Corrections and additions are made with quill and black ink and brush with grey wash with white heightening. Five cartouches

---

246 The scenography of the theater is described in Vitruvius, De architectura V.6.8
247 Salomon De Caus, HORTVS PALATINVS A FRIDERICO REGE BOEMLÆ ELECTORE PALATINO HEIDELBERGÆ EXSTRVCTVS (Mannheim: Churfürstl. Hof- und Akademie-Buchdruckerei, 1795) [re-print of original edition, Frankfurt am Main: Johann Theodor de Bry, 1620], Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Germ.sp. 85 m, [http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/resolve/display/bsb10018756.html], Plates 26 and 27.
are intentionally left blank, so as to remain available to for the artisan reader to fill with his own inventions. Dietterlin’s frequent source of inspiration, Hans Vredeman de Vries, had published many such designs for empty frames.248 Nevertheless, the older models of Fontainebleau artists such as Antonio Fantuzzi and Jacques I. Androuet Du Cerceau, with their greater abundance of figural and vegetal ornaments and their more architectonic structures, appear to be the main referents here.249
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DR.149
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 170
1598 or earlier
Quill with black ink and brush with grey and dark grey wash and white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper
25.51 x 17.72 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 136

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 107; Pauli (1899), 284

To produce this design for a Corinthian frame, Dietterlin rendered the left half of the architectural elevation with quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double aspects of the drafted design. He then embellished the composition with quill and ink and brush with wash. Corrections and additions are made with quill and black ink and brush with grey wash with white heightening. A passage of pentimenti is visible in the middle of the frame.

248 See, for instance, Hollstein XLVII.101-120.
249 On the ornament etchings of the so-called Fontainebleau school, see Henri Zerner, Etching and Engraving at the School of Fontainebleau (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1969).
The position of this image within the 1598 Architectura's sequence of designs would imply that it represents a Corinthian sarcophagus or cenotaph. The drawing portrays a ship commanded by an armored figure bearing a spyglass and attended by a winged victory. The captain’s location on the vessel does recall the placement of effigies on the sarcophagi portrayed in Dietterlin’s other prints. Nevertheless, the ship form and finely rendered ornaments such as the wispy leaves of the winged victory’s palm frond were both foreign to stonework funerary monuments of the Strasbourg artist’s milieu. It thus appears that the drawing in fact figures a metal nef, or saltcellar, that merely masquerades as a sarcophagus or cenotaph. As related in Chapter II, the design demonstrates that Dietterlin’s theory of the Orders as a system for devising ornament in any medium could also apply to the invention of small decorative objects.
The present design for a Corinthian epitaph features the image of a portly figure sporting a contemporary costume that includes sumptuous, fur mantle and layers of golden chains. Presumably he represents a modern-day lord. The figure is flanked by the horned likeness of Moses, clutching the tablets on which he received the Commandments, as well as a woman bearing a book. The pair corresponds to a common sixteenth-century convention for figuring “Law and Gospel,” that is, the order of the world before the coming of Christ, and the order that followed the revelation of his teachings. Sixteenth-century Evangelicals employed the Law and Gospel image type to promulgate the Reformation philosophy that salvation was more a matter of faith and grace than good works or adherence to divinely given rules. Though Protestant in tone, Dietterlin’s design nevertheless portrays the prince caught between the two regimes, lifting his hand in perplexed hesitation. With the signing of the Peace of Augsburg in 1555, the principle of “cuius regio, eius religio” went into effect across the Holy Roman Empire, imposing the imperative that princes determine whether their territories would become Catholic or Lutheran. The image of a ruler deliberating between loyalty to Law or Gospel could well refer to this development. The prince’s choice affects

not only the fate of his own soul, but also the salvation of all those he governs—hence his anxious attitude.

To execute this drawing, Dietterlin rendered the left half of the architectural elevation with quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double aspects of the drafted design. He then embellished the composition with quill and ink and brush with wash. Corrections and additions are made with quill and black ink and brush with grey wash with white heightening.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

**DR.152**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder  
*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 173*  
Before 1598  
Quill with black ink and brush with dark grey and grey wash with white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper mounted on cream paper  
25.40 x 18.21 cm  
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 139

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden  
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 107; Pauli (1899), 284

This Corinthian tomb design shows a prince with ermine mantle studying from a book. Before him sit a pair of *putti*, bearing a crown that rests upon a pillow. In contrast to this passive character, the female figures on either side of the man clutch the sword and arrows of battle. This combination of personalities brings to mind the contrast between the *vita contemplativa* and the *vita activa*—dichotomous modes of human life that were nevertheless regarded as equally crucial to the pursuit of good government. Together, the prince and his attendants figure the balance of active and passive pursuits required for effective rule.
To create this drawing, Dietterlin rendered the left half of this Corinthian architectural elevation with quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double aspects of the drafted design. He then embellished the composition with quill and ink and brush with wash. Corrections and additions are made with quill and black ink and brush with grey wash with white heightening.
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**DR.153**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 189*
1598 or earlier
Quill with black ink and brush with grey and dark grey wash and white heightening over black chalk on heavy, off-white, laid paper mounted on heavy cream laid paper
25.4 x 18.20 cm [at greatest points]
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 145

INSCRIPTIONS: recto lower center [quill with black ink]: 30
PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 107; Pauli (1899), 284

The present work features a Composite gable design. Dietterlin may have acquired the idea to depict gable designs in his treatise from the models of gables that Vredeman de Vries first published in his 1565 and 1578 engravings of the ornaments of the architectural Orders, which are stylistically similar to those of Dietterlin’s *Architectura*. However, whereas Vredeman had shown only portions of individual gable designs combined on the page as half elevations, Dietterlin portrays the entire gable. And while Vredeman’s partial gables reflected in the visual conventions of the crammed architectural model book,

---

Dietterlin’s whole designs are better characterized as images from an architectural viewpoint. Such subtleties of presentation and elevated visual rhetoric made Dietterlin’s Architectura more appealing to collectors of fine architectural prints.

In order to compose this drawing, Dietterlin rendered the left half of the architectural elevation with quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double aspects of the drafted design. He then embellished the composition with quill and ink and brush with wash. Corrections and additions are made with quill and black ink and brush with grey wash with white heightening. In the final etching, the artist eliminated the garland-adorned panels shown in the lower window. The upper right corner, a section 7.5 x 9.7 cm large, has been removed and re-attached. The total composition has been re-assembled on the mounting sheet.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

DR.154
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 190
1598 or earlier
Quill with black ink and brush with dark grey and grey wash and white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper mounted on cream paper
25.01 x 18.03 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 146

INSCRIPTIONS: recto upper right [quill with black ink]: darnb
PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 107; Pauli (1899), 284

To devise this Composite Order gable, Dietterlin rendered the left half of the architectural elevation with quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double aspects of the drafted design. He then embellished the composition with quill and ink and brush with wash. Corrections and additions are made with quill and black ink and brush
with grey wash with white heightening. A design for an alternative to the top tier of the gable is visible in the upper right corner of the sheet. In the etching related to this composition, Dietterlin developed the motif into a fully modeled architectural ornament.
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**DR.155**  
*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 191*  
1598 or earlier  
Quill with black ink and brush with dark grey and grey wash and white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper mounted on cream paper  
25.81 x 17.82 cm  
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 147

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden  
LITERATURE: Zahn (1863), 107 Pauli (1899), 284

The delicate strapwork that adorns this figure and the *Architectura*’s other Composite gable designs would have been much easier to execute in wood than in stone. Wood had long been valued in northern architectural tradition, yet was unpopular in the contemporary exterior architecture of the Italian peninsula.²⁵² Dietterlin’s reference to this “northern” building material particularly suits the present architectural subject. The gable, like wood architecture, was regarded as a quintessentially northern motif, associated with the high, pitched roofs that protected the buildings of this region from its harsher weather.

To draft this work, Dietterlin rendered the right half of the architectural elevation with quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double aspects of the drafted design. He then embellished the composition with quill and ink and brush with

---

wash. Corrections and additions are made with quill and black ink and brush with grey wash with white heightening.
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**DR.156**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 198*
1598 or earlier
Quill with black ink and brush with dark grey, light brown, and grey wash with white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper
25.41 x 17.63 cm

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 107; Pauli (1899), 284

This Composite fountain design features a niche occupied by Summer with the figures of Cancer and Leo, the signs of the zodiac that correspond to that season. *Putti* carrying a crescent moon and a mask—symbols that perhaps refer to the transience and fickleness of time—accompany the figure. Time himself appears to the right of the fountain, identified by his hourglass and bearing, atlas-like, a monumental clock face. A nearly identical representation of Time appears at the pinnacle of the fountain. This indicates that the viewer could remove the clock-bearing figure from the sheet and join him with the rest of the ensemble to create a taller, more impressive composition. In the etching related to this design, the figures below Summer receive the labels “AVTVMNVS” and “VER,” multiplying the number of seasons depicted.

To draft this work, Dietterlin rendered the left half of the architectural elevation with quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double aspects of the drafted design. He then embellished the composition with quill and ink and brush with wash.
Corrections and additions are made with quill and black ink and brush with grey wash with white heightening.
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**DR.157**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 199, Version I*
1598 or earlier
Quill with black ink and brush with grey wash with white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper mounted on cream paper
25.61 x 17.70 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 154

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 107; Pauli (1899), 284

With its numerous chalk and ink *pentimenti*, the present drawing depicts a less developed version of the Composite fountain design shown in *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 199, Version II*.
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**DR.158**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 199, Version II*
1598 or earlier
Quill with black ink over black chalk on off-white, laid paper mounted on cream paper
25.60 x 18.00 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 155

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 107 Pauli (1899), 284

---

253 For an analysis of *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 199, Version II*, see Appendix IV DR.158.
The present drawing represents a more developed version of the Composite fountain design pictured in Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 199, Version I. To create this drawing, Dietterlin rendered the left half of the architectural elevation with quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double aspects of the drafted design. He then embellished the composition with quill and ink. In this second draft of the design, Dietterlin finalized the position of the putto with the bow and arrow at the right edge of the fountain basin and eliminated the putto with the vessel, seated on the edge of the fountain basin in the earlier design. He also added a cat-toting putto at Christ’s feet. The form of the child with a curving object slung over his shoulder appears to be inspired by the putto with the vessel in the earlier draft. The horn-bearing putto at the left edge of the fountain basin was ultimately eliminated in the print.

It is interesting to note that while Dietterlin embellished the earlier composition with wash, he left the present design in outline form. The artist’s drafting process did not always unfold in a straightforward progression from chalk sketch to ink drawing to modeled design. Even a relatively finished composition, if unsatisfactory, could be reconceived in a less developed drawing.

An extra strip of paper is attached to the main sheet, with an inscription [graphite, in a modern hand]: 155 (zü fol. 199…).

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

DR.159
Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 200
1598 or earlier
Quill with black ink and brush with dark grey, light brown, and grey wash with white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper mounted on cream paper

254 Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 199, Version I, is catalogued in Appendix IV DR.157.
The present drawing shows a Composite fountain with a cruciform plan. Three archers occupy the visible arms of the construction, training their bows at an invisible target, evidently situated above the figures. Given the fact that an arrow-pierced St. Sebastian is portrayed in drawing for the previous plate in the *Architectura*, Plate 199, it is apparent that this design represents the base of that composition. According to the text passage in which Dietterlin introduces this Order, the Composite manner was comprised of the ornaments of all the other Orders.255 By filling his Composite etchings with the elements of constructions that readers had to combine in order to “complete”, Dietterlin encouraged his audience to enact the synthesis of forms that defined the Composite Order.

---

255 “Weil sie eine zu fetzung, Fügung, oder vermischung ist, der dreyen obgemelten, als Dorischen Ionischen vnd Corinthischen Seulen, von den Architectis, also Proportioniert, wie deren ar vnd eigenschafft hernach auch kürßlichen angezeigt werden solle.” Dietterlin, *Erst Buch*, under, “COMPOSITA”.

---
Dietterlin’s design for a Composite fountain features personifications of Ethiopia, Egypt, Hispaniola, Peru, Brazil, and the Andes. None of the figures in the drawing bear attributes that might associate them definitively with any one of these locales. Only in the etching did Ethiopia and Egypt receive discernible turbans that might identify them with the lands under the influence of Islam, and the personifications of the South American regions the feather attire supposedly worn in that part of the world. The faint image of the assembled St. Sebastian fountain, the parts of which were to be shown in the two etchings preceding this design in the 1598 _Architectura_, is visible in the background on the right side of the sheet.
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**DR.161**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
_Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 204, Version II_
1598 or earlier
Quill with black ink and brush with dark grey and grey wash with white heightening on two sheets of off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper
Upper sheet: 20.81 x 17.60 cm [at greatest points]
Lower sheet: 2.00 x 14.90 cm [at greatest points]
Total ensemble: 22.70 x 17.10 cm [at greatest points]
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 158

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 107; Pauli (1899), 284

In order to create this drawing of the upper part of a Composite Order altarpiece, Dietterlin rendered the left half of the architectural elevation with quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double aspects of the drafted design. He then
embellished the composition with quill and ink and brush with wash. Corrections and additions are made with quill and black ink and brush with grey wash with white heightening. The lower right corner of the composition is missing.

The present work represents a more developed version of a design for the altarpiece pictured in Plates 204 and 205 of the 1598 installment of the Architectura, which is held in the Kunstbibliothek in Berlin. While the Berlin drawing shows the lower section of a standing Immaculata in the top portion of the composition, the present sheet portrays the seated figure ultimately depicted in the etching. And whereas the Berlin drawing features a narrow frame, the arch of the frame in the present work has been flattened into the wider form that Dietterlin eventually adopted for the print.

The sheet on which the Berlin drawing is composed is about twice as large as the present sheet and the other sheets that Dietterlin typically used to draft the Architectura designs. The present drawing and the Berlin sheet indicate that Dietterlin sometimes planned the treatise’s oversize, two-plate compositions by plotting the entire work on a large sheet, and subsequently honed the details of the design on the smaller sheet. These would then be re-incorporated in to a final drawing representing the contents of both etching plate compositions.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

**DR.162**

*Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 206*

1598 or earlier

Quill with black ink and brush with dark grey and grey wash with white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper

---

256 Berlin, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Kunstbibliothek, HdZ 769. The drawing is described in Appendix IV BE.1.
This drawing depicts another design for a Composite altarpiece. An image of the Last Supper is faintly visible in the *predella* at the base of the ensemble. St. Benedict, holding the cup with which rebellious monks attempted to poison him, assumes the form of a term on the outer edge of the altar. St. Bartholomew, holding the knife that his tormenters used to flay him alive, is shown next to St. Benedict. In order to devise this work, Dietterlin rendered the right half of the architectural elevation with quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double aspects of the drafted design. He then embellished the composition with quill and ink and brush with wash. Corrections and additions are made with quill and black ink and brush with grey wash with white heightening.

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

**DR.163**

Wendel Dietterlin the Elder  
*Design for a Wall Painting with the Adoration of the Lamb*  
1590s  
Quill with black ink and brush with dark grey and grey wash with white heightening over black chalk on heavy, cream laid paper, mounted on heavy cream paper  
20.35 x 30.87 cm  
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 166  

LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 107; Pauli (1899), 284; Pfeiffer (1958), 61-63.

The present composition was not included in the *Architectura*. It assumes the form of the top of a pointed arch, and likely represents a design for a wall painted devised to fit within an architectural niche of that shape. This drawing’s iconographical program, discussed in greater detail in Chapter V, includes a representation of the Last Supper beneath an
architectural perspective, a vision of the Mystic Lamb, and the image of humanity clamoring to drink from the Fountain of Life.

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

**DR.164**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*Five Fragments of Column Capitals*
1593 or earlier
Quill with black and brown ink over black chalk on heavy, off-white laid paper, mounted on heavy cream laid paper
Upper left sheet: 5.03 x 8.51 cm
Upper right sheet: 5.72 x 5.71 cm
Center sheet: 6.79 x 9.18 cm
Lower left sheet: 4.93 x 7.90 cm
Lower right sheet: 3.91 x 4.80 cm
Mounting sheet: 21.80 x 16.62 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 167

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 107; Pauli (1899), 284

An inscription on the mounting paper, composed in a modern hand, argues that these drawings are “nicht Dietterlin.” Nevertheless, the five fragmentary sheets each portray column capitals drafted a loose, dynamic had that match the artist’s typical manner for executing preliminary ink sketches. Many of the figures also appear in more evolved form in the prints of the *Architectura*. The capital farthest to the right on the sheet appended to the mounting sheet’s upper left corner anticipates the uppermost, rightmost Corinthian Order capital that first appeared in Plate 25 of the 1593 installments of the *Architectura* (Plate 139 of the 1598 *Architecturas*). The capital farthest to the right in the center sheet meanwhile anticipates the Corinthian capital with the trefoil in the center of the right edge of the same print. The capital pictured on the fragment appended to the upper right corner of the mounting sheet re-emerges in more evolved form as the Composite capital at the bottom.
center of Plate 29 in the 1593 treatises (Plate 178 of the 1598 *Architecturae*). The correspondence between the designs confirms that Dietterlin is indeed the author of these drawings.
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**DR.165**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*Unused Design for the Architectura with Orpheus and Fauna*
1598 or earlier
Quill with black ink and brush with dark grey and grey wash with white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper
24.05 x 17.60 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 165

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863), 107; Pauli (1899), 284

This drawing, which was never used for the *Architectura*, features a boxy form topped by Orpheus charming a menagerie of animals with his lyre. The work recalls compositions like the fountain design in Plate 36 of the 1598 treatise. Both feature a columnar element, a single human figure, and groups of animals. Nevertheless, the form at the base of the composition more strongly recalls the structure of a sarcophagus. Since the 1598 *Architecturae* is the only installment of the treatise that features sarcophagi, it is likely that Dietterlin originally intended to include the design in that text.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

**DR.166**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*Unused Design for the Architectura with a Two-story Gable with Windows*
1598 or earlier
This design was probably created for the 1598 *Architectura*, which is the only installment of the treatise that features windows or gables. The ensemble’s two-story format departs from the other, single-story gable designs in the treatise. This suggests that Dietterlin considered creating a two-plate etching from this composition. To create the drawing, the artist rendered the left half of the architectural elevation with quill and ink and folded the sheet while the ink was still wet to double aspects of the drafted design. He then embellished the composition with quill and ink and brush with wash. Corrections and additions are made with quill and black ink and brush with brown wash.

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

**DR.167**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
_Undesigned Design for the Architectura with a Tomb_
1598 or earlier
Quill with black ink and dark grey and grey wash with white heightening over black chalk on off-white, laid paper, mounted on cream paper
27.00 x 18.32 cm
Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, Inv.-Nr. CA2002-2, fol. 163

PROVENANCE: Hochschule für Bildende Künste Dresden
LITERATURE: von Zahn (1863) 107; Pauli (1899), 284

The present drawing shows a foreshortened sarcophagus, viewed through a baldachin with Composite Order columns. An angel kneels upon the coffin beneath the canopy, attended by three robed figures surrounded by a company of sleeping soldiers. Here
Dietterlin portrays the three female followers of Christ when they discover their Savior’s poorly guarded, empty tomb and are informed by the Angel of the Lord that the deceased has risen from the dead. An image of the resurrected Christ, holding the banner of Salvation and standing upon a globe that crushes the serpent of Death, appears to the left of this ensemble. Dietterlin depicts the serpent beneath the globe once more at the pinnacle of the ensemble. This indicates that the artist planned to produce an etching that could be cut and re-assembled so that the image of the resurrected Christ appears, triumphantly, atop that baldachin that covers his tomb. Two richly dressed donor figures appear on either side of the globe, expressing awe at this miraculous apparition.

This Composite Order scheme was likely intended for the 1598 *Architectura*, the only text of the series that contains tomb designs. And yet Dietterlin never employed the image in the final version of the text, where, given the author’s preference for picturing tomb designs last of all the different genres of object included in each Order, it would have appeared toward the end of the last, Composite book. The absence of this design from the *Architectura* likely had something to do with the artists’ desire to preserve the stunning conclusion of the 1598 treatise’s grand narrative arc. The final image of that text (Plate 209) shows a skull-filled ossuary beneath a triumphal arch with ornaments that construct an allegory of death. Beyond the arch, the viewer spies an aperture that opens on to the image of a cross before a sepulcher that brings to mind the simple tomb of Christ. It is unclear if the tomb is open or closed, and therefore uncertain if we are still awaiting the Resurrection of Christ, or already preparing for his victorious return and the ultimate judgment of the living and the dead. The *Architectura*’s ambiguous narrative resolution thus extends beyond the book’s pictorial conclusion. The treatise triumphs over its own visual end, just as Christ and the souls of the saved conquer the finality of death. Had Dietterlin supplemented this composition with the
explicit image of the Resurrection of Christ shown in the present drawing, it would have
undone the mystery of the Architectura’s pictorial finale and weakened the power of its
ingenious narrative conceit.

**Karlsruhe Drawings**

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

**KA.1**

Wendel Dietterlin the Elder  
*Allegory of an Unknown Month with Plans for a Calendar Cycle*  
1590s

Pen with black-brown ink with brush and brown-grey wash and white heightening on laid paper

Staatliche Kunsthalle Karlsruhe, Kupferstichkabinett, Friedrich Brentel Album F (Inv.-Nr. 1965-10), fol. 19v [drawing does not have its own inventory number]


**LITERATURE:** Unpublished

The present drawing of a boar hunt comes from an album of sixteenth- and early
seventeenth-century drawings assembled by Strasbourg painter Friedrich Brentel and now
held in the Karlsruhe Kupferstichkabinett. The Karlsruhe album abounds with drawings
by artists active in and around Strasbourg in the decades around 1600. All of the Karlsruhe
drawings attributed to Wendel Dietterlin in this catalogue are affixed to pages of this album.
This particular drawing bears inscriptions detailing the number of days and nights in various
months, indicating that the work represents one component of a twelve-part calendar cycle.

---

257 Brentel Album F, Karlsruhe, Staatliche Kunsthalle Karlsruhe, Kupferstichkabinett, Inv.-
Nr. 1965-10. Communication with Dr. Astrid Reuter, Staatliche Kunsthalle Karlsruhe,
Six sheets appended to fols. 19v and 20r of the Brentel Album and two sheets in the British Museum are rendered with similar materials in the same hand, and are also individually labeled with the names of different months. These drawings likely represent other parts of a related suite of images. The sheets in the British Museum are firmly attributed to Wendel Dietterlin, suggesting that the six allegories of the months held in the Brentel album also originate from Dietterlin’s hand. In fact, all the works are vigorously composed with his characteristic, spare lines. Most describe torsion and weight in a manner typical of Dietterlin’s early-stage designs. The drawings’ anatomical forms reflect the figural style of the artist’s early 1590s work, and several feature the blue-grey wash that he particularly favored in drawings for the 1594 installment of the *Architectura*.

The *Allegory of the Month of June* in the Brentel Album group is inscribed “Kircheim.”

Kircheim am Teck lies in the former territory of Conrad Schloßberger (1558-1638), the Protector of Esslingen with whom Dietterlin wintered on his journey from Stuttgart to Strasbourg, and to whom the artist dedicated the 1593 installment of the *Architectura*.

---

258 These works are documented in Appendix IV KA.1-6 and LO.1-2. The inventory numbers of the British Museum drawings are 1997,0712.99 and 1997,0172.100.

259 *Allegory of the Month of June* is documented in Appendix IV KA.4.

260 “…mich als bald widerumb gehn Straßburg, als mein Burgerlich heimwesen, mit meiner haufhaltung zu begeben, So hat mich doch die ungelegenheit deß beschwerlichen Winterliche Wetters uñwegs, auch andere unverschen vorgefallene verhindernüssen, mehrertheils unnd fûnernlich aber, die Anmütige Freund und Kundtschafft, darein ich die zeit meiner alhieigen wohnung, gege Ewer Ehrnvest und etlichen andern (Als besonderm Liebhabern und Forderern der Malerey unnd anderer guten Künsten) kommen bin, biß dahero von solcher meiner vorgehabten wider reiß, immer zuruck uff gehalten, damit aber solche zeit meines längern verharrens alhie, nicht vergebens und ohne nuß zubrächte, auch meinen lieben Herrn unnd Freunden, die mich die zeit meiner alhieigen bey wonung mit sonderer Freundschaft un gutten willê, gemeint, ein Memorial, dabey nach meinem Abschied siich meiner zu erinnern haben hinderlassen möchte, Hab ich uff derselben mich wol meinenden Freundt, uñ anderer mehr Kunstliebenden beschehen, vîlfaltigs bezern uñ anhalten, die in disem gegenwertigen Libell für augen gestalt, mancherley arten und Manier der Ornamenten und zier…” Dietterlin, *Erst Buch*, under, “Dem Edlem uñ Ehrnvesten
this time, the painter had just finished work on the Great Hall of Ludwig of Württemberg’s new Stuttgart Lusthaus, which featured a series of hunting scenes and depictions of localities within the Duke’s domain. The Brentel Album/British Museum group also includes two hunting scenes. All these details reinforce the hypothesis that the drawings were executed some time during the early 1590s.

Many sheets from this group bear notations that designate colors for the different objects and staffage portrayed, suggesting that the drawings represent plans for paintings. Yet it is possible that Dietterlin also intended to employ the designs for another end. In the plans for the Architectura that the author elaborated in his 1592 application for an Imperial printing privilege, he related that the work’s seventh and final book would contain a suite of prints that depict “the twelve months and their signs”—presumably, a calendar cycle and the zodiac. Perhaps Dietterlin meant to use the drawings from this calendar cycle as the models for this never-realized component of the treatise.

__This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.__

**KA.2**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*Allegory of an Unknown Month (summer or fall)*
1590s
Pen with black ink and brush with grey wash
Staatliche Kunsthalle Karlsruhe, Kupferstichkabinett, Friedrich Brentel Album F (Inv.-Nr. 1965-10), fol. 19v [drawing does not have its own inventory number]

Conrad Schloßbergern., Fürstlichen Würtembergischen Pflegern, des Denckendorischen Hoff's zu Eßlingen, meinem günstigen lieben Herrn”.

261 “In das sibenndt und letzt hab ich gestellt, die Zwoelf Monat mit ihrem Zaichen, auff allerlaý dingen, unnd sonderlichen Arten.” Wendel Dietterlin, Application for an Imperial Print Privilege, May 11, 1592, Vienna, Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, AT-OeStA/HHStA RHR Impressoria 13-52 (Impressoria Fz. 13), fol. 362v.
INSCRIPTIONS: recto center left [pen with lack ink]: grün/ grün; recto center [pen with lack ink]: grün; recto center right [pen with lack ink]: braun
LITERATURE: Unpublished

This drawing of a figure on horseback and peasants at harvest time probably belongs the same calendar cycle as the British Museum’s *Allegory of the Month of March* and *Allegory of the Month of April* and the other Dietterlin drawings appended to fols. 19r and 20r of Brentel Album F. It bears inscriptions designating the colors to be used for various objects and staffage.

---

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

**KA.3**

Wendel Dietterlin the Elder

*Allegory of the Month of December*

1590s

Pen with black ink and brush with grey wash

Staatliche Kunsthalle Karlsruhe, Kupferstichkabinett, Friedrich Brentel Album F (Inv.-Nr. 1965-10), fol. 20r [drawing does not have its own inventory number]

INSCRIPTIONS: recto upper center [pen with black ink]: December; recto upper center [pen with green ink]: Listerb…
LITERATURE: Unpublished

This drawing, inscribed “December”, shows activities performed during the final month of the year: the slaughter of a pig, the washing of cloth, and the taming of a bull. It probably belongs to a calendar cycle that includes other Dietterlin drawings pasted to fols. 19r and 20r of Brentel Album F, as well as the British Museum drawings 1997,0712.99 and 1997,0172.100. Many figures in this work are labeled with letters and abbreviations that indicate the colors that Dietterlin probably intended to use when rendering the forms in paint. The two sketches of rams on the right side of the sheet have been executed in a different hand, possibly by a member of Friedrich Brentel’s circle.
KA.4
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*Allegory of the Month of June*
1590s
Pen with black-brown ink with brush and brown-grey and blue wash over black chalk on laid paper
Staatliche Kunsthalle Karlsruhe, Kupferstichkabinett, Friedrich Brentel Album F (Inv.-Nr. 1965-10), fol. 19° [drawing does not have its own inventory number]

INSCRIPTIONS: recto upper left [pen with black ink]: b…[?]; recto center left [pen with black ink]: dieses feld / gelb; recto upper center [pen with black ink]: Junig. ; recto upper right [pen with black ink]: Kirchheim; recto center [pen with black ink]: nur 3 l…gelb; recto center right [pen with black ink]: W / Wasser; recto center right [pen with black ink]: dis n; recto lower left [pen with black ink]: W/ W/ Woll; recto lower center [pen with black ink]: …l…ht [?]
LITERATURE: Unpublished

This drawing of shepherds shearing sheep while peasants wash clothes in a nearby river is identified through the inscription as an allegory of the month of June. The work probably belongs to a calendar cycle with the five other Dietterlin drawings appended to fols. 19° and 20° of Brentel Album F and the British Museum drawings 1997,0712.99 and 1997,0172.100. The inscription “Kircheim” indicates that the composition probably depicts Kirchheim unter Teck in Baden-Württemberg.

KA.5
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*Allegory of the Month of October*
1590s
Pen with black-brown ink with brush with grey-brown wash on laid paper
Staatliche Kunsthalle Karlsruhe, Kupferstichkabinett, Friedrich Brentel Album F (Inv.-Nr. 1965-10), fol. 19° [drawing does not have its own inventory number]

INSCRIPTIONS: recto upper center [pen with black ink]: October; recto center [pen with black ink]: Maur Maur; recto lower right [pen with black ink]: Rost.
LITERATURE: Unpublished
This drawing of the grape harvest, identified by its inscription as an image of the month of October, probably belongs to a calendar cycle with other drawings from fols. 19° and 20° of Brentel Album F and the British Museum drawings 1997,0712.99 and 1997,0172.100. A more developed version of the scene spied through the doorway of the building next to the grape trellis is visible on the right side of the sheet.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

KA.6
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
Allegory of the Month of September
1590s
Pen with black-brown ink and brush with brown-grey wash with white heightening over black chalk on laid paper
Staatliche Kunsthalle Karlsruhe, Kupferstichkabinett, Friedrich Brentel Album F (Inv.-Nr. 1965-10), fol. 19° [drawing does not have its own inventory number]

INSCRIPTIONS: recto upper center [pen with black ink]: September; recto center [pen with black ink]: W
LITERATURE: Unpublished

The inscription on this drawing of the stag hunt designates the image as an allegory of September. It probably belongs to a calendar cycle that also includes the British Museum drawings 1997,0712.99 and 1997,0172.100 and the five other Dietterlin drawings pasted to fols. 19° and 20° of Brentel Album F.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

KA.7
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
Clemettia
1594
Clemettia shows the personification of clemency as an armored woman bearing the fasces of solidarity and a scepter of rule as she muzzles a lion and tramples a bearded foe. The drawing displays the same crisp yet dynamic manner that Dietterlin employed to draft the designs of the 1594 installment of the Architectura. The “1594” inscribed at the base of the composition corroborates this dating. A “6” inscribed in the lower left corner of the sheet in turn suggests that this design is part of a series with at least six components. The drawing is pasted to the same Brentel Album folio page as the Sapientia sheet, which is labeled “5”. The works’ similar size and their stylistic commonalities suggest that Sapientia belonged to the same series as Clemettia. One nineteenth-century source describes a print series that Matthäus Greuter engraved after designs by Dietterlin that showed personified virtues and vices with figures at their feet. Clemettia and Sapientia may well represent the preparatory drawings for those prints.

262 The listing for a photo of this drawing in the online catalogue of the Photothek of the Bibliotheca Hertziana indicates that the work is by Dietterlin. See: Gernsheim Corpus of Drawings, 67258, under http://foto.biblhertz.it/exist/foto/show.xql?c=ART&q=Dietterlin,+Wendel+(der+Ältere) &max=13

263 This drawing is addressed in Appendix IV KA. 8.

264 “Estampes emblématiques, composées de figures allégoriques sous divers emblems. Le trois premier sujets representent les Vèrtus et les Vices, montés sur des chars, conduits par des animaux et des figues symboliques. Le puatrieme et dernier subject présente Dieu le pere, assis sur les nues, son Fils à sa droite et en haut le StaEsprit, prononçant son dernier judgemet. A guache sont ranges les Veritas théologiques, qui intercédent pour un Homme qu’elles presentment à la Divinit. Ces quatre pieces, gravées d’un très-beau burin, sont sans les noms des artistes, don’t le peintre est W. Dietterlein et le Gravuer M. Greuter. 4 pieces in
Besides the strong stylistic resemblance between *Sapientia* and Dietterlin’s *Architectura* drawings from the mid 1590s, the “WD” monogram inscribed between the numerals of the “1594” at the base of this design also attests that the Strasbourg artist authored this sheet. *Sapientia*, like *Clemettia*, invokes the imagery of good rule. Its armored personification of wisdom carries a sword and a scepter, both implements of governance. Clutching the highest tower of the city that she presumably protects, *Sapientia* stands before a rudder that symbolizes her ability to steer the state. Trampling a fool at her feet, she embodies the victory of wise leadership over the forces of ignorance that would lead the polity astray.

Inscriptions in the form of shorthand biblical references cover the design, connecting individual details of the composition to different verses from the Scripture.

265 The listing for a photo of this drawing in the online catalogue of the Photothek of the Bibliotheca Hertziana indicates that the work is by Dietterlin. See: Bibliotheca Hertziana, Gernsheim Corpus of Drawings, 67258, http://foto.biblhertz.it/exist/foto/show.xql?c=ART&q=Dietterlin,+Wendel+(der+Ältere) &max=13.

266 *Clemettia* is described in Appendix IV KA.7.
Proverbs 3, listed next to the dove of the Holy Spirit above Sapientia, lauds the wisdom of trust in the Lord. Sapientia’s robes are labeled with the verse Ecclesiastes 1:2, which decries the vanity of the mundane world. As a sophisticated visual allegory of wisdom that makes learned allusions to biblical writings, Sapientia fittingly demonstrates Dietterlin’s artistic sagacity, as well as his extensive knowledge of the Scripture.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

KA.9
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
Design after 1598 Architectura Plate 146 [Apotheosis of Christ]
1598 or later
Quill with black and brown ink and brush with grey-blue and brown wash on laid paper 19.8 x 14.4 cm
Staatliche Kunsthalle Karlsruhe, Kupferstichkabinett, Brentel Album F, (Inv.-Nr. 1965-10), fol. 2r [drawing does not have its own inventory number]

INSCRIPTIONS: recto lower right [quill with light brown ink, crossed out with quill with black ink]: 446
LITERATURE: Unpublished

This drawing, never before connected to Dietterlin, shows a design for a façade painting featuring the Ascension of Christ, and shares the composition and orientation of Plate 146 of the 1598 installment of the Architectura. Dietterlin’s signature application of line and wash are present, but the marks lack the spontaneity of his original inventions. Many aspects of the model composition are missing, but others, especially the figures, are represented with care. The outlines of the foreground figures appear to have been traced over in ink several times, and thus appear slightly stale. No signs of the counterproof process

---

267 Proverbs 3:1-35.
268 Ecclesiastes 1:2.
are present. With its merely rehearsed-looking contours, the drawing must a represent a freehand copy after the etching executed by Dietterlin.

Drawing copies of drawings and prints was a common practice in sixteenth-century northern Europe. It often served a didactic purpose, for artists in Dietterlin’s world began their training by drawing after other works of art. Yet as the present sheet demonstrates, fully trained masters also drafted copies of completed compositions, even copying their own finished designs.\textsuperscript{269} Artists of Dietterlin’s day who specialized in the depiction of ornament embraced the practice with particular enthusiasm. Designers of glass paintings often made linear versions of their wash-filled working drawings in order to convey ideas to patrons or to better communicate their designs to the painters who realized their inventions.\textsuperscript{270} Jacques I. Androuet Du Cerceau and his circle also drew multiple copies of the master’s architectural and ornament designs, even those that the artist also executed in print.\textsuperscript{271} The present sheet indicates that the practice of drafting copies of ornament designs that already existed in printed form continued at least until the turn of the seventeenth century.

Compared to the process of etching, which allowed for the rapid, consistent reproduction of images, drawing copies of drawings or prints was a laborious pursuit. The practice must have offered Dietterlin something that printmaking did not. This was particularly true when the artist already possessed a plate that he could use to create a printed

\textsuperscript{269} Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann has argued that the frequency with which experienced Central European artists active in the decades around 1600 drafted copies of their own drawings demonstrates the primacy of invention over execution in the artistic culture of that period. See Kaufmann, \textit{Drawings from the Holy Roman Empire}, 141.

\textsuperscript{270} Andrew Morrall, \textit{Jörg Breu the Elder: Art, Culture, and Belief in Reformation Augsburg} (Aldershot, UK, and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2001), 58.

copy of a scheme, as in the case of this drawing. Drafted copies of existing designs reveal aspects of the artist’s design practices that prints cannot. Although made after a design that has already been worked out, many record telling hesitations and changes. Dietterlin’s Design after 1598 Architectura Plate 146, for instance, does not show all the details of the architectural façade depicted in the etching. In exposing false starts, corrections, and omissions, such drafted copies suggest the conflicts and priorities that shaped the previous execution of a design. As visual records of how the artist made an image after the work of invention was already done, drafted copies could also train apprentices to appropriate the draftsman’s style without the distraction of the extraneous marks created in the initial design process.

Brentel may have acquired Dietterlin’s drawing as a model for such exercises. Yet the preponderance of signed sheets and the variety of subjects and hands represented in the Brentel album suggest that Dietterlin’s Karlsruhe drawings and the other drafted works in this cache were also regarded as components of a Stammbuch. The genre of the Stammbuch, or album amicorum, originated as a type of book containing the signatures of prominent people, but by 1600 it could also be a collection of prints and drawings. 272 Dietterlin’s façade design would have been an especially appropriate addition to such an album, for the image contains a “signature” in the form of a Dietterlin self-portrait. The book-bearing figure kneeling in the foreground of the design’s Ascension must represent the painter and his Architectura, for no such character appears in this biblical episode. In creating a drafted copy of his design, Dietterlin produced a work valuable to artists and collectors alike.

272 A useful introduction to the topic of Stammbücher is M.A.E. Nickson, Early Autograph Albums of the British Museum (London: The British Museum, 1970). For examples of the Stammbuch in Dietterlin’s milieu, see Stijn Alsteens and Freyda Spira, Dürer and Beyond, 154-158. A more thorough examination of the topic and further literature can be found in Geissler, Zeichnung in Deutschland, 2:211-222.
London Drawings

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

LO.1
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder

*Allegory of the Month of April*

Circa 1594-8
Pen and brown ink with brown and grey wash on laid paper
8.3 x 13.5 cm
The British Museum, 1997,0712.100

INSCRIPTIONS: recto upper center [pen with brown ink]: Abrilij; recto upper right [pen with brown ink]: IØ

MARKS: former backing [stamp and black ink]: anonymous collector's mark: 'de B.' (not in Lugt).

PROVENANCE: Edmund Schilling

LITERATURE: Schilling (1982), 229, no. 64b; Rowlands (1984), 57, no. 53b

This allegory of April shows the activities of peasants in the springtime: fishing, bringing livestock to pasture, feeding chickens, churning butter, and even engaging in sexual trysts. According to a note on the drawing mounting, Heinrich Geissler confirmed the attribution for this work and the *Allegory of the Month of March* (British Museum 1997,0712.99), which is likely a pendant to the present composition. Six drawings in the so-called Brentel Album F in the Kupferstichkabinett of the Staatliche Kunsthalle Karlsruhe (Inv.-Nr. 1965-10) also share the work’s horizontal format, diminutive dimensions, medium, and style of execution. All likewise depict an allegory of a month. Parallels between the two London drawings and the six allegories of the months in the Brentel Album indicate that Dietterlin is also the author of the Karlsruhe drawings. The short pen strokes and

---

273 There are fragments of a drawing after Christoph Schwarz on the old backing sheets of this work and the drawing of *April* (British Museum 1997,0712.99* and 1997,0712.100*). One is inscribed, “Christophorus Schwarz figuravit. / Aug.. ? pinxit. 1594”.

274 Dietterlin's *Allegory of the Month of March* is analyzed in Appendix IV LO.2.

275 These are appended to fols. 19v and 20r of Friedrich Brentel Album F, Karlsruhe, Staatliche Kunsthalle Karlsruhe, Kupferstichkabinett, Inv.-Nr. 1965-10. The works are described in Appendix IV KA.1-6.
painterly application of wash in both London works and in the Karlsruhe drawings resemble the marks in drawings preparatory for the 1594 and 1598 installments of Dietterlin’s *Architectura*, indicating that the plans for this cycle likely date from the middle to the later years of the 1590s.

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

**LO.2**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*Allegory of the Month of March*
Circa 1594-8
Pen and brown ink with grey wash on laid paper
9.4 x 13.0 cm
The British Museum, 1997,0712.99

INSCRIPTIONS: recto upper center [pen with brown ink]: mertz
MARKS: former backing [stamp and black ink]: Anonymous collector’s mark: ‘de B.’ (not in Lugt).
PROVENANCE: Edmund Schilling
LITERATURE: Schilling (1982), 229, no. 64a; Rowlands (1984), 57, no. 53a

Dietterlin’s *Allegory of the Month of March* portrays the occupations associated with the end of winter and the beginning of spring. Fences are mended, fields are plowed, and beehives are arranged for the production of honey during the warmer months to come. The pastoral imagery of the month cycle shown in the London and Karlsruhe drawings relates to a much older tradition of representations of the seasons in northern art. From the naturalistic images of the months in Jean, Duc de Berry’s *Tres riches heures* to the more recent, peasant-filled allegorical paintings of the months by Pieter Brueghel the Elder, French and
Netherlandish artists had long contributed to this genre. Through artists such as Sebald Beham, printed depictions of peasant life had also become a popular art form in the German-speaking lands by the second third of the sixteenth century.

In and of itself, Dietterlin’s month cycle does not add any obviously new spin on this familiar genre. Yet if the artist indeed planned to incorporate these images into a concluding chapter of the *Architectura* project, as his print privilege application indicates, the designs would have recast the genre in an entirely novel context. No printed architectural treatise composed in northern Europe had ever included a chapter on the seasons of the year. Early modern architects were nevertheless expected to be familiar with this topic, for Vitruvius’s *De architectura* had argued that an understanding of the seasons and of climatology was vital to correctly siting a building and establishing its layout. Had Dietterlin ultimately included these designs in the *Architectura*, the treatise would have more closely imitated the ancient architectural textbook upon which so many modern architectural treatises were based.


278 “Disciplinam vero medicinae novisse oportet propter inclinationem caeli, quae Graeci κλίματα dicunt, et aeris et locorum, qui sunt salubres aut pestilentes, aquarumque usus; sine his enim rationibus nulla salubris habitatio fieri potest.” Vitruvius, *De architectura*, I.1.10.
New York Drawing

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

NY.1
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
Recto: Design for an Elaborate Fountain Surmounted by a Statue of St. Christopher; Verso: Sketch of a Tabernacle (?) with Studies of Architectural Details
c. 1594-1598
Recto: Pen and black ink, brush and grey wash; Verso: black chalk and pen and black ink
24.5 x 17.9 cm
Metropolitan Museum of Art, Inv. no. 2006.89

INSCRIPTIONS: Verso upper left [graphite, 20th-century handwriting]: 51; lower left [pen and black ink in 20th-century handwriting]: 3264 (probably an old museum inventory number, see below); lower left [graphite in 20th-century handwriting]: EK 2621; upper left [graphite, 20th-century handwriting]: 19
MARKS: Verso lower left [stamped in black ink]: MZM in a circle (probably the stamp of the Moravské Zemské Muzeum, Brno, not in Lugt)
WATERMARK: coat of arms, snake on cross above 279
PROVENANCE: Purchase, Edward Pearce Casey Fund, 2006

This design is preparatory for Plate 82 of the 1598 installment of the Architectura. It is one of the only un-mounted designs for the Architectura project, and thus offers a rare glimpse into how Dietterlin used the verso side of his sheets. The verso side of this sheet depicts a black chalk sketch of a tabernacle—an object not pictured in the Architectura. The design was created through the same folded counterproof technique that the artist used to plan many designs ultimately illustrated in the text.

As in many drawings for fountains that first appeared in the last installment of Dietterlin’s treatise, the present design pictures a backdrop of architectural ruins that were not ultimately included in the related etching. The removal of the ruins in the etching transforms the design from the kind of atmospheric and even romanticized representation of ruins often marketed to sixteenth-century print collectors into the sort of no-frills model

279 According to Alsteens and Spira, the watermark resembles one in paper used in Stuttgart in 1594. See Piccard-Online, no. 160491, and Alsteens and Spira, Dürer and Beyond, 136.
ornament print collected by the day's practicing artists. Still, entertaining details such as the
fountain's instrument-bearing nymphs survived to the final etching. These shifts and
continuities show how Dietterlin negotiated the competing demands of the *Architectura's*
diverse audiences, adjusting his invention to the needs of the craftsman reader while
maintaining the appealing fantasy of the initial sketch.

One drawing copied after the print that Dietterlin produced from this design and
formerly attributed to the artist is addressed in the following appendix.\(^{280}\) Another drawing
published as a work made after the present design is held in the Museum der bildenden
Künste Leipzig.\(^{281}\)

**Paris Drawings**

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

**PA.1**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*Design for a Façade Painting with an Allegory of Commerce*
1580s or later
26.7 x 29.2 cm
Quill with black ink and brush with gold, yellow, maroon, red, green, blue, purple and grey
wash with white heightening on cream laid paper
Musée du Louvre, Collection Rothschild, Inv. 3399 DR

INSCRIPTIONS: recto lower left [graphite in modern hand]: Dietterlin 1598; verso lower
left [quill with black ink in modern hand]: 7/6 / No 35 May 2083 454; verso lower center
[graphite in modern hand]: 2011 / 727/2; verso lower right [graphite in modern hand]: 5
MARKS: recto lower left [embossed]: TL; verso lower left [stamped in brown ink]: BRI /
MLI / DES 3; verso lower center [stamped in brown ink]: BR / ML / 3399 DES3

---

London, CT Drawing” in Appendix V.

\(^{281}\) Leipzig, Museum der bildenden Künste Leipzig, Kupferstichkabinett, Inv.-Nr. NI8543.
The drawing is published as “after Wendel Dietterlin” in Herwig Guratzsch, ed., *Salvator
Rosa. Genie der Zeichnung. Studien und Skizzen aus Leipzig und Haarlem*. (Cologne: Wienand,
1999), 56; and in Alsteens and Spira, *Dürer and Beyond*, 136, note 2.
This unpublished drawing shows the elevation of two stories of an exterior architectural façade. An allegory of wise commerce featuring Hermes, a package-bearing merchant, a menagerie of native and exotic animals, and a figure holding the bridle of temperance and the mirror of prudence fills the space between a quartet of windows arranged across a recessed bay. The right edge of a portal is just visible on the left edge of the sheet, indicating that the drawing shows only the rightmost portion of a larger ensemble. The *Design for a Façade Painting with Nemesis or Fortune*, which is also held in the Collection Rothschild and is similar in style, materials, and dimensions, probably depicts another component of the building’s decorative program. With its banded, grotesque-laden columns and elongated volutes, the architecture of the Louvre compositions bears a striking resemblance to the models for façades published in Dietterlin’s 1598 *Architectura*. The drafted figures’ muscular anatomy and mannered poses likewise recall the physical profiles and attitudes of the bodies that fill Dietterlin’s treatise. These parallels indicate that the Louvre designs are examples of the artist’s mature drafting style, that is, the manner he employed from the 1580s onward.

As allegories of trade and fortune, the Paris designs were likely intended for the decorative program of a building with a commercial or civic purpose, such as a mint. Since their architecture does not match that of any surviving building or description of a building in Strasbourg or its environs, it is impossible to pinpoint what edifice the designs were intended to decorate. At any rate, it is highly likely that many of the architectural forms in Dietterlin’s design represent fictive, painted architecture. Rhenish façade painters of the

---

*Design for a Façade Painting with Nemesis or Fortune* is documented in Appendix IV PA.2.
period often organized their compositions around such illusionistic architectural constructions. Along with interior wall decoration, façade painting was among the most important aspects of Dietterlin’s artist practice and a key source of his fame in the German-speaking lands during the early modern period. The total destruction of Dietterlin’s façade paintings before the end of the eighteenth century, along with the apparent absence of surviving preparatory drawing for any of the artist’s projects in this genre, has previously obscured this aspect of his artistic practice. The heretofore-unpublished Louvre drawings thus offer unprecedented insights into Dietterlin’s work in the realm of façade painting.

Façade painters in Dietterlin’s milieu often engaged the *paragone* between painting and architecture by challenging the norms of architectural decorum in their designs. These practices required precisely the kind of expertise in the composition of architectural ornament that Dietterlin’s *Architectura* contained. Many of the *Architectura* designs that could be used for façade painting include architecturally licentious details such as perspective images that seem to pierce the building surface. But if the Paris drawings represent Dietterlin’s plans for a program of fictive, painted architecture, we might conclude that, despite the impression given by the *Architectura*, the artist’s actual façade paintings did not always flout the conventions of architectural decorum. Neither Paris composition includes any architecturally licentious, fictive perspective scenes. Both show the artist attending to architectural norms such as the proper superimposition of an Ionic Order story over a Doric lower level. Dietterlin evidently saved his licentious façade designs for his printed treatise, adopting a more conservative approach to composition when it came to important projects like the one depicted in the Paris drawings.

---

283 For a more thorough discussion of this phenomenon, see the final section of Chapter V.
PA.2
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*Design for a Façade Painting with Nemesis or Fortune*
1580s or later
26.5 x 27.5 cm
Quill with black ink and brush with gold, maroon, green, blue, and grey wash with white heightening on cream laid paper
Musée du Louvre, Collection Rothschild, Inv. 3398 DR

INSCRIPTIONS: Recto lower left [graphite in modern hand]: Dietterlin 1598; recto lower right [graphite in modern hand]: Wendel Dietterlin; verso lower center [graphite in modern hand]: 2011 / 727/2
WATERMARK: Eagle
MARKS: Recto lower left [embossed]: TL; verso lower left [stamped in maroon ink]: ER / ML / 3398 DSSI
PROVENANCE: Vte. Destailleur Danlos (May 1896)
LITERATURE: Unpublished

The present drawing, the iconography of which is treated at length in Chapter V, features the image of a woman who resembles the mysterious female figure in Dürer’s 1502 engraving, *The Great Fortune* or *Nemesis*. Like the *Design for a Façade Painting with an Allegory of Commerce*, Dietterlin’s *Design for a Façade Painting with Nemesis or Fortune* is composed with an array of colorful, thickly layered washes and displays a high level of finish—both hallmark traits of the artist’s presentation or contract drawings.

Strasbourg Drawings

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

SB.1
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder (formerly “attributed to Wendel Dietterlin”)
*Grotesque Head*
After 1570

---

284 The print is documented in Bartsch 10.77(91); Meder 72; and Schoch I.33.
285 *Design for a Façade Painting with an Allegory of Commerce* is analyzed in Appendix IV PA.1.
Built from fine, crosshatched lines, this composition appears somewhat different than most of Dietterlin’s known drawings. Its style of execution resembles the graceful manner of Dietterlin’s signature Strasbourg Putto. The artist evidently drew inspiration for this design from a number of sixteenth-century prints. With its motley confection of features and frontal, isolated position on the page, the monstrous face recalls the grotesque masks pictured in Cornelis II. Floris’s 1555 engraving series, “Pourtraicture ingenieuse de plusieurs facons de Masques”. Its grimacing mouth resembles that of the mask in a 1549 print by Strasbourg artist Heinrich Aldegrever. Its leafy beard meanwhile recalls the facial hair worn by the grotesque masks pictured in Dietterlin’s own Architectura.

The parallels between the present design and the signature drawing of the Putto also held in the Strasbourg Cabinet des Estampes et des Dessins justify confirming the collection’s once-tenuous attribution of this sheet to Dietterlin the Elder. As in the case of the Putto, Dietterlin’s apparent dependence on another graphic model in executing this drawing explains the occurrence of crosshatching, which resembles the marks of an intaglio

---

286 Putto after Raphael’s “Isaiah” is described in Appendix IV SB.2.
287 Hollstein VI.68-85.
289 An inscription on the verso sheet refers to Wendel Dietterlin the Younger, but lists the life dates of Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, indicating some confusion about the attribution of the drawing.
print and is otherwise a rare phenomenon in the artist’s drafted oeuvre. Copying from other
drawings or prints was a common practice among novices. The Strasbourg drawings thus
may well come from the earlier part of Dietterlin’s career. The stylistic differences between
the Strasbourg drawings and the artist’s 1590s designs for the Architectura probably result not
only from the difference between emulation and more inventive forms of composition, but
from the relative immaturity of the artist at the time he created the Strasbourg images.

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

**SB.2**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder after Raphael
*Putto after Raphael’s “Isaiah”*
After 1577
Quill with brown and dark brown ink on heavy, dark cream laid paper
25.3 cm x 11.0 cm
Musées de la Ville de Strasbourg, Cabinet des Estampes et des Dessins, CdEedD
77.985.0.867, (réc: 77 R. 2011.0103)

**INSCRIPTIONS:** lower left [quill with brown bistre]: WD monogram
**LITERATURE:** Unpublished

An intricate WD monogram inscribed in the lower left corner of this drawing
represents a graceful variant of the sign that Dietterlin used in his personal emblem in the
title pages of the *Architectura*. The *Putto’s* oversize, heavy-lidded eyes and the flat nose that
nearly touches his upper lip are characteristic features of the artist’s faces. Many of the *putti*
pictured in the *Architectura*—for example, the figures flanking the fireplace in Plate 108 of the
1598 installment of the treatise—share the present figure’s plump legs and *contrapposto* pose.
A portion of a nearly identical *putto’s* face, rendered in similar, crosshatched marks, also
appears in a drawing for Plate 145 of the final *Architectura*. All these concordances support the case for Dietterlin as the author of this drawing. This would qualify the work as a rare case in which the artist used crosshatching instead of ink wash to model a drafted figure. The presence of crosshatching in Dietterlin’s drawings generally indicates that the design bears some relation to another graphic work.

And in fact, Dietterlin’s *Putto* joins a constellation of printed and drafted copies after Raphael’s 1512 fresco of the prophet Isaiah and *putti* for the funerary ensemble of Apostolic Protonotary Johann Goritz of Luxembourg in Sant’Agostino in Rome. The Accademia di San Luca possesses a fresco fragment (Inv. no 392), which may represent a section removed from the original work during the epitaph’s 1756-60 restoration, or a replica from Raphael’s workshop. In 1592, Hendrick Goltzius created an engraved copy of the entire *Isaia* ensemble. Some sixteenth-century copies were made after the fresco fragment as well. A drawing by Karel van Mander in the Prentenkabinet of the Rijksuniversiteit in Leiden (Inv no. PK 1933-T-2) from the artist’s 1574-77 period in Rome repeats the composition of the

---

290 *Design for 1598 Architectura Plate 145* is documented in Appendix IV DR.134.
291 Dietterlin used crosshatching to render the volumes of a number of drawings for etchings published in the 1594 *Annder Buch*, prints that were in turn intended to express the qualities of Dietterlin’s drafted line. These drawings are described in Appendix IV DR.47, 56, and 57, as well as in Chapter III.
293 Hollstein VII.312.
294 A drawing in the British Museum (Inv. no. 1895-9-15-688) attributed to Annibale Carracci similarly lacks the right hand and pointed foliage. The drawing includes no details from the fresco that are not also recorded in the fragment, suggesting that Annibale after the Accademia San Luca work. See Philip Pouncey and John A. Gere, *Italian Drawings in the Department of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum: Raphael and his Circle* (London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1962), Vol. 1, Appendix III, 176.
Since van Mander traveled through the German lands on his return journey to the Netherlands, it is possible that Dietterlin was able to study that design. Dietterlin’s unusual use of crosshatched lines could thus be a product of his dependence on the engraved lines of Goltzius’s print or the drafted, crosshatched lines of van Mander’s drawing.

Goltzius’s engraving almost certainly circulated more widely than the Leiden sheet. Still, there is reason to believe that Dietterlin made his Putto primarily after van Mander’s drawing. The Strasbourg artist’s composition repeats the formula familiar from the Accademia fragment and copies like van Mander’s work. Dietterlin’s design also includes the original Putto’s proper right hand and the pointed foliage near his head—details present in the full fresco and in van Mander’s drawing, but generally absent from other designs made after the Accademia fragment. If this drawing is copied from van Mander’s sketch, the object attests that the two artist-authors met, and possibly exchanged ideas, at a formative stage in Dietterlin’s career.

Stuttgart Drawings

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

**SG.1**
Wendel Dietterlin the Elder
*The Last Judgment*
1590

---

295 However, the artist additionally included part of the plaque only present in the Sant’Agostino version, suggesting that he also worked from the fresco *in situ*. An inscription in Hendrick Goltzius’s 1592 engraving of the entire Sant’Agostino fresco states that the print was made after a design by Caspar Celio, but its style also suggests that Goltzius was familiar with van Mander’s drawing. See Bartsch III.269(82).
Quill with black and dark brown ink with grey and black wash, heightened with white and gold on brown, laid paper expanded with black-painted framing edges
46.8 cm x 34.4 cm
Staatsgalerie Stuttgart, Graphische Sammlung, Inv.-Nr. C 1967/GVL 200

INSCRIPTION: verso lower center [quill with brown ink]: No 4 Michel angelo Bonnorotti / 55 florin; verso lower center [quill with brown ink, in another hand]: Donum Amicitiae!/…
MARKS: verso lower center [Collector’s Mark, probably 18th century, not in Lught]
PROVENANCE: Collection Sir Robert Mond, London (Lught Suppl. 2813a); Private Collection, Stuttgart.

Dietterlin’s *The Last Judgment* shows Christ in the midst of a dark cloudscape,
admitting ranks of believers to his lofty company and casting sinners down to hell. Angels,
prophets, and patriarchs surround him amidst the spiraling tiers of the heavenly vortex.
Bands of cloud arch across the space. On a pier extending from the lower edge of the
composition stands the Devil, who hurries the flight of the damned to the underworld with
the push of a pole. With its imposing wall of figures, dominated by a wrathful Christ in
majesty, Dietterlin’s design employs the same subject and pictorial formula as Michelangelo’s
*Last Judgment*, a composition he could have known through prints by artists such as Giorgio
Ghisi, Martino Rota, and Johann Wierix.296 The work’s tumbling figures meanwhile emulate
Netherlandish printed models such as the falling bodies of the *Four Disgracers* series that
Hendrick Goltzius engraved after designs by Cornelis Cornelisz. van Haarlem in 1588.297

The composition portrayed in this drawing represents a scene from the trio of
ceiling paintings that Dietterlin executed for the Great Hall of the new *Lusthaus* in Stuttgart

296 Geissler, “*Das Jüngste Gericht*,” 99.
297 Hollstein VIII.306-309; Bartsch 3.258-261.
between 1590 and 1592 for Duke Ludwig of Württemberg. References to contract drawings for all three of Dietterlin’s Great Hall compositions appear in the archival records related to the commission. This work, with its oversize format, high level of finish, and costly gold highlights, was likely one of the trio of presentation drawings mentioned in the Lusthaus correspondence from 1590. Since the Great Hall was destroyed in the eighteenth century, the present drawing represents the only aspect of Dietterlin’s contribution to the project that survives relatively intact. This would suggest that the work offers privileged insights into the former appearance of one of the most renowned sixteenth-century interior decoration campaigns in the German-speaking lands.

Yet the drawing does not show the sort of image we might expect. The three ceiling paintings that Dietterlin executed for the Great Hall were conceived as sotto in su compositions, that is, as works intended to give the impression that their contents were suspended in the space above the viewer. The forms of the The Last Judgment drawing nevertheless display a degree of frontality at odds with the pure sotto in su formula that Georg Gabelkover—a Württemburg, cartographer and one of the parties responsible for planning the ceiling—had advocated for the ceiling program. Dietterlin, renowned in the early modern period for his talents in sotto in su composition, executed the Last Judgment drawing

---

298 The other two works portrayed the Creation and The Apocalyptic Vision of the Twenty-four Elders at the Throne of God. The latter composition is represented in an early drawing after Dietterlin’s design: Hamburg, Hamburger Kunsthalle, Kupferstichkabinett, Inv.-Nr. 1954-95. The work is catalogued in Appendix V of this dissertation, under, “Apocalyptic Vision of the Twenty-four Elders at the Throne of God”.


300 Describing the sotto in su formula that should be used in the ceiling compositions, Gabelkover writes, “...in ain solche Decke fuegen sich schwebende Bilder, Gewülcke und was fliegt, die khnten in ain solche proportion gestellt werden das sie von unden auf in gleicher grosse zu seh.” Letter from Georg Gadner to Duke Ludwig, August 6, 1587. Acta und Hanndlungen des Maalwercks des newen Lussthaus Baws, 1587–1592, Stuttgart, Hauptsächsches Archiv Stuttgart, Hofsachen A20 Bü37a, fol. 147c’.
so that only the upper portion of the design appears to be viewed from below, creating an irrational split between the modes of perspective employed in the composition.\footnote{301} The artist’s reason for introducing this perspectival error likely arose from the status of the \textit{sotto in su} genre as a form then relatively unfamiliar in the German-speaking lands. Gabelkover, Duke Ludwig, and theologian Lucas Osiander (who was also responsible for planning the Great Hall’s pictorial program) only agreed to give the Great Hall ceiling a \textit{sotto in su} composition after much debate.\footnote{302} Dietterlin’s drawings would have likely been the only images available to demonstrate the visual effects of this new perspectival formula. By creating a presentation drawing that combined a normative perspectival scheme in the lower registers of the composition with a \textit{sotto in su} formula in the upper part, Dietterlin visualized the ceiling’s uncanny illusions in a way that his patrons could grasp more easily.

\footnote{301} Geissler, “Das Jüngste Gericht,” 99.
The fantastic architecture of these drawings and the mannered anatomy of the figures are both hallmarks of the drafted oeuvre of Wendel Dietterlin the Elder. A copy after Christ Before the Palace of Pontius Pilate is held in the Moravian Gallery in Brno.\(^3\)\(^{03}\) It is one of a series of six representations of episodes from the life of Christ in that collection.\(^3\)\(^{04}\) Geissler designated the present drawings and the Brno sheets as authored by Dietterlin and/or followers such as Hilarius Dietterlin or Bartholomäus Dietterlin, for the individual components of the series are of uneven quality and are not uniform in style.\(^3\)\(^{05}\) Yet of all the other designs in this group, the present drawings are at once the most artistically sophisticated and the least dependent on printed models. It thus appears that while Wendel Dietterlin the Elder created the designs held in Stuttgart, members of his workshop are responsible for the Brno sheets. If this is the case, it shows that the master collaborated with members of his circle to devise larger cycles of images.

The letters inscribed on the mounting for Christ Before the Palace of Pontius Pilate likely served as a key for the eventual application of colors in a polychrome iteration of the composition on the recto side of the sheet. This indicates that the drawings are designs for paintings.

\(^{303}\) Heinrich Geissler, “Vorderseite: Christus vor dem Palast des Pilatus; Rückseite: Christus vor Kaiphas,” in Deutsche Zeichnungen vom Mittelalter bis zum Barock, 100, no. 151.


\(^{305}\) Geissler, “Vorderseite: Christus vor dem Palast des Pilatus; Rückseite: Christus vor Kaiphas,” 100.
Appendix V: Drawings Formerly Attributed to Wendel Dietterlin the Elder

**Brussels**

-Style of Melchior Lorck, *Emblematic Composition*, Musées Royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique, Inv. no. 4060/1045

**Hamburg**

-Bartholomäus Dietterlin, *Apocalyptic Vision of the Twenty-four Elders at the Throne of God*, Hamburger Kunsthalle, Kupferstichkabinett, Inv.-Nr. 1954-95

**Lemgo**

-Follower of Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, Recto: *Modified Copy after Erst Buch Pl. 19*; Verso: *Design for a Spiral Corinthian Column*, Weserrenaissance-Museum Schloß Brake, Inv.-Nr. S 56/87

**New London, CT**

-After Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, *Design for a Fountain* [after Plates 82 and 78 of the 1598 *Architectura*], Lyman Allyn Museum of Art, 1939.8

**New York**

-German, 16th Century, *Design for a Powder Flask*, Metropolitan Museum of Art, Rogers Fund, 1946, 46.56

**Worcester, MA**

-Wendel Dietterlin the Younger, *Roman Soldiers at the Foot of the Cross*, Worcester Art Museum, 1956.28
Brussels Drawing

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

Style of Melchior Lorck (formerly attributed to Wendel Dietterlin the Elder)

*Emblematic Composition*

Sixteenth century

Quill and brown ink with brush and brown wash on cream laid paper

31.4 x 22.2 cm

Musées royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique / Koninklijke Musea voor Schone Kunsten van België, Inv. no. 4060/1045

**LITERATURE:** Musées Royaux de Peinture et de Sculpture de Belgique, Brüssel (1913), no. 1045

The rigid, frontal stance of this drafted figure and the stylized appearance of his dress resemble nothing in the known drawings of Wendel Dietterlin the Elder. Moreover, there is no evidence that Dietterlin ever made costume studies, the genre to which this work belongs. The Brussels drawing shows two complementary halves of a pair of characters, combined so that they form a single body. One represents a cleric with his bible and rosary beads, and the other represents a courtier with his rich dress and canine companion. The pleated folds of figure’s garments as well as his frontal pose and large, close-set eyes vaguely recall the figures in the costume studies of the Danish-German artist Melchior Lork. Lork prepared at least twelve such works in brown ink. These were likely devised as plans for a woodcut *Trachtenbuch*, or “costume book”, which was to include representations of both contemporary and historical dress. The combination of two designs in the Brussels composition, a commonplace of sixteenth-century ornament drawing, would augment the

---

1 Alsteeens and Spira, *Dürer and Beyond*, 87. Peter Ward-Jackson was the first to publish the drawings. See Peter Ward-Jackson, “Some Rare Drawings by Melchior Lorichs in the Collection of Mr. John Evelyn of Wotton, and Now at Stonor Park, Oxfordshire,” *Connoisseur* 135 (April 1955): 83-93. For more on the drawings of Melchior Lorck, see Erik Fisher, *Melchior Lorck: Drawings from the Evelyn Collection at Stonor Park, England and from the Department of Prints and Drawings, the Royal Museum of Fine Arts, Copenhagen* (Copenhagen: Statens Museum for Kunst Kobenhavn, 1962); and Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, *Drawings From the Holy Roman Empire*, 62-64.
number of models such a book might display in a given number of pages. The artist’s use of wash and the absence of the monogram that Lorck generally added to his costume studies nevertheless suggest that the work does not originate from Lorck’s hand.

Hamburg Drawing

*This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.*

Bartholomäus Dietterlin After Wendel Dietterlin the Elder (formerly “Copy after Wendel Dietterlin the Elder?”)
The *Apocalyptic Vision of the Twenty-four Elders at the Throne of God*
1590 or later
Quill and black ink and brush with grey and black wash on two sheets of thick cream laid paper
55.70 x 39.8 cm
Hamburger Kunsthalle, Kupferstichkabinett, Inv.-Nr. 1954-95

INSCRIPTIONS: verso upper left [graphite]: 1797
PROVENANCE: Collection of Ernst Heinrich Ehlers (1835-1925), Göttingen (Lugt Supplements 860); Auktion C.G. Boerner, Leipzig May 25, 1938, Lot 52 (bid at 150.00 RM); Julius Kähler (1880-1949), Hamburg (not in Lugt); acquired 1954 from Toni Kähler, Aumühle, with support from the Campe’schen Historischen Kuststiftung.
LITERATURE: C.G. Boerner (1937), 35, no. 394, Plate 20 (as Christoph Schwarz); C.G. Boerner (1938), 6, no. 52 (as Christoph Schwarz); Kunstverein Hamburg (1955), 28, no. 305 (as Christoph Schwarz); Stubbe (1958) 194, 203 (as Christoph Schwarz); Pfeiffer (1961), 54-71 (as Dietterlin); Krafft (1964), 23, no. 227; Geissler (1969), 123, note 58 [as drawing after Dietterlin]; Geissler et al. (1984), 19, no. 16; Weber-Karge (1989), 49; Weber-Karge (1990), 115; Großmann (2000), 316 [as Wendel Dietterlin]; Prange (2007), 139-140, no 269 [as likely after Wendel Dietterlin].

This drawing was attributed to late sixteenth-century Munich artist Christoph Schwarz before Wolfgang Pfeiffer connected it to Dietterlin’s work in the Stuttgart *Lusthaus* in 1961. Pfeiffer ascribed the design to Dietterlin based on the drawing’s precise

---

correspondence to descriptions of the central ceiling painting of the Lusthaus’s Great Hall.³ Heinrich Geissler agreed with Pfeiffer’s assertion that the work represents Dietterlin’s Apocalyptic Vision of the Twenty-four Elders painting. However, he contended that the drawing’s lack of stylistic similarity to The Last Judgment drawing in Stuttgart, which is preparatory for another of Dietterlin’s Great Hall ceiling compositions, suggests that the Hamburg sheet is a copy after Dietterlin’s ceiling painting.⁴ Prange added that the present work’s stylistic divergences from Dietterlin’s other drawings indicate the likelihood that it was composed after the ceiling painting, but designated the drawing only as a possible copy after Dietterlin.⁵ 

The fine, careful quality of the lines and delicate washes in this drawing corroborate the theory that the work does not stem from the hand of Wendel Dietterlin, which is generally more dynamic, even when he is producing drafted copies of his own designs. The work’s exacting style, crisp drapery, delicate faces, crooked fingers, and thoughtfully applied washes instead recall the drafting style of Bartholomäus Dietterlin. All these phenomena are visible in the sketches in the sheet in the Kupferstichkabinett of the Staatliche Kunsthalle Karlsruhe, Inv. 1950-25, which is firmly attributed to Bartholomäus. Bartholomäus may have produced the present copy after Wendel Dietterlin the Elder’s Apocalyptic Vision design to maintain in the workshop, a common practice among early modern draftsmen.

---

Lemgo Drawing

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

Follower of Wendel Dietterlin the Elder (formerly “attributed to Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, copy after Plate 19 of the *Erst Buch*”)

Recto: Modified Copy after *Erst Buch* Pl. 19; Verso: Design for a Spiral Corinthian Column

1593 or later

Recto: Graphite and quill with brown ink on laid paper

Verso: Graphite and quill with brown ink on laid paper

Sheet: 30.5 x 20.5 cm

Design: 29 x 21 cm

Weserrenaissance-Museum Schloß Brake, Inv.-Nr. S 56/87

INSCRIPTIONS: Verso upper left [quill and brown ink]: CORiNTHiA /jj

LITERATURE: Großmann (1989), 130, no. 175 [as “attributed to Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, copy after Plate 19 of the *Erst Buch*”]; Großmann (2000), 316 as “attributed to Wendel Dietterlin the Elder”].

G. Ulrich Großmann first connected this drawing with Dietterlin because of the numerous similarities between the design on the recto side of the sheet and Plate 19 of the 1593 *Erst Buch*, Dietterlin’s visual synopsis of the Corinthian Order. One other drawing that resembles Plate 19 is securely attributed to Dietterlin. The author of the present work did not include the personification of the Corinthian Order shown in the etching, and instead of the straight, outlined column depicted in the print, he rendered a spiral column. Großmann contended that the common orientation of the composition on the recto side of the Lemgo sheet and the design in Plate 19 indicate that the drawing is not preparatory for the etching. He additionally asserted that the presence of a spiral column—a motif virtually unknown to

---


7 See Appendix IV DR.15.
Dietterlin’s oeuvre—raises the possibility that the Lemgo designs did not stem from the Strasbourg artist’s hand.\footnote{Ibid. The only design in Dietterlin’s oeuvre that shows a spiral column is Design for Annder Buch Plate 14, documented in Appendix IV DR.35.}

Dietterlin is known to have produced drafted copies of his own designs.\footnote{See Appendix IV KA.9.} The securely attributed design for Plate 19 also shows that the artist made counterproofs of his preparatory drawings that he subsequently used to trace the design to the plate, resulting in a printed composition that likewise faces the same way as the original preparatory drawing.\footnote{For one of Dietterlin’s drafted copies of his own designs, see Design after 1598 Architectura Plate 146 [Apotheosis of Christ], Karlsruhe, Staatliche Kunsthalle Karlsruhe, Kupferstichkabinett, Brentel Album F, (Inv. no. 1965-10), fol. 20\textsuperscript{‌f}, addressed in Appendix IV KA.9. For Dietterlin drawings from which counterproofs were pulled and used to create the corresponding Architectura etchings, resulting in an original drawing that faces the same way as the print, see Design for Erst Buch Plate 14 [III. IONICA.], Dresden, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett CA2002-2, fol. 73, addressed in Appendix IV DR.8; and Design for Erst Buch Plate 19 [III. CORINTHIA], Dresden, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden, Kupferstich-Kabinett, CA2002-2, fol. 110, analyzed in Appendix IV DR.15.} Nevertheless, a number of details indicate that the drawing on the recto side of the Lemgo sheet is likely a modified copy after Plate 19, produced by another artist. The brown ink is more saturated in tone than the ink that Dietterlin tended to employ, and the paper is much darker than the artist’s typical stock. Like the spiral column, the dotted shading visible in its base is almost never observed in Dietterlin’s drawings. Even when Dietterlin was copying his own works, his drafted line maintained a sense of spontaneity absent in this work. While Dietterlin tended to employ mechanical copying techniques to create drafted facsimiles of his designs, the present sheet appears to have been produced by hand. Finally, the Lemgo drawings are significantly larger than the related Architectura etching and its corresponding preparatory drawing. The inscription on the verso side of the Lemgo sheet, “CORiNTHiA
“/Jj” may indicate a second form of the Corinthian Order, i.e. “Corinthia II”, or the artist’s initials, “Jj”.

The Lemgo drawing’s quick, crosshatched strokes also appear in another work formerly attributed to Dietterlin, the Design for a Fountain in New London. That drawing is likewise comprised of ink much darker than Dietterlin typically preferred, and executed on paper heavier than his usual stock. The New London sheet also resembles the Lemgo drawing in that it creatively emulates Dietterlin’s prints, combining elements from fountain designs in Plates 82 and 78 of the 1598 Architectura. This constellation of common features indicates that the drawings share a single author. Yet while the New London drawing merely mixes existing aspects of Dietterlin’s designs, the Lemgo sheet shows the draftsman adding to the Architectura’s repertoire of forms. By injecting the spiral column into Dietterlin’s visual synopsis of the Corinthian Order, the artist of the Lemgo drawings demonstrates that readers used the Architectura images as a platforms for further inventions, just as its author indicated they should do.

New London, CT Drawing

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

After Wendel Dietterlin the Elder (formerly “Wendel Dietterlin the Elder (copy after print after) Dietterlin”)
Design for a Fountain [after Plates 82 and 78 of the 1598 Architectura]
1598 or later
30.48 x 19.685 cm
Quill and brown ink with brown wash on cream laid paper
Lyman Allyn Museum of Art, 1939.8

LITERATURE: Kaufmann (1985), 80.

11 New London, Lyman Allyn Museum of Art, 1939.8. See the following entry in this catalogue.
This sheet features figures of St. Christopher, the Christ Child, and water nymphs that also appear in Plate 82 of the 1598 *Architectura*. It also depicts a quadrilateral fountain with a vase, plate, cloth, and fruit, which all appear in Plate 78 of the same treatise. As mentioned in the previous catalogue entry, Dietterlin is known to have drafted copies of his own designs. However, the contours of the present drawing are too exacting, and the cramped arrangement of the figures on the page—particularly the lower left nymph—too uncharacteristic of Dietterlin’s graceful compositional aesthetic for the work to be considered a work by that artist. The drawing’s stiff execution, the delicate, almost nervous quality of its lines, and the etching-like hatch marks used to model its forms corroborate Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann’s thesis that the work is a copy after the *Architectura* prints, not made by Dietterlin.

As an improvised copy of a print from the *Architectura* composed in brown ink on a heavier cream paper than the stock that Dietterlin usually preferred, the drawing shares much with the Design after Erst Buch Plate 19 in Lemgo. And in fact, its careful, brown ink contours and delicate crosshatching appear to originate from the same hand. The artist’s interest in parsing and recombining motifs from Dietterlin’s book is consistent with the cut-and-paste aesthetic of ornamental invention promoted by the *Architectura*.

---

12 Design after 1598 Architectura Plate 146 (Apotheosis of Christ), Karlsruhe, Staatliche Kunsthalle Karlsruhe, Kupferstickkabinett, Brentel Album F, (Inv. no. 1965-10), fol. 2r. The work is described in Appendix IV KA.9.


14 Lemgo, Weserrenaissance-Museum Schloß Brake, Inv. no. S 56/87. See also the preceding entry in this catalogue.
New York Drawing

This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.

German or Flemish (formerly “Wendel Dietterlin (copy after Dietterlin?)”)

*Design for a Powder Flask*

Second half of the sixteenth century

Pen and brown ink, blue-green and pale brown wash

18.6 x 26.8 cm

Metropolitan Museum of Art, Rogers Fund, 1946, 46.56

INSCRIPTIONS: Verso, bottom left [in graphite]: 46.56; Verso, bottom right [in graphite]: 79062 SH

MARKS: Verso, bottom left: MMA stamp

PROVENANCE: Paul Drey Gallery, New York


In 1985, Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann first indicated the possibility that this drawing was a copy after Wendel Dietterlin the Elder.\(^{15}\) Richardson and Phyrr subsequently suggested that the work might be Flemish.\(^{16}\) The online records of the Metropolitan Museum of Art identify this drawing as “formerly attributed to Wendel Dietterlin the Elder”, but the designation has not yet appeared in print.\(^{17}\)

The strapwork and rollwork ornament pictured in the sheet first emerged in the prints of Netherlandish artists such as Cornelis Bos, Cornelis II. Floris and Hans Vredeman de Vries after the second quarter of the sixteenth century, and soon became popular motifs among South German metalwork designers such as Wenzel Jamnitzer, Virgil Solis, and

---

Matthias Zündt.\textsuperscript{18} Yet although Dietterlin did create designs for works that could be executed in metal, no known Dietterlin composition matches the scheme presented in this drawing. The stylized, hard musculature of the figures moreover does not resemble the dynamic, torsion-filled anatomy of Dietterlin’s typical drafted bodies. The almost brittle drapery likewise diverges from the graceful, flowing representations of cloth visible in the artist’s \textit{Architectura} designs. A powder flask in the Victoria and Albert Museum, thought to be of Flemish origin, from around the 1580s, reproduces the design in reverse.\textsuperscript{19} It is therefore unlikely that the drawing represents a copy after a Dietterlin design, as an earlier attribution suggests.

\textbf{Worcester, MA Drawing}

\textit{This image has been omitted due to copyright considerations.}

Wendel Dietterlin the Younger (formerly “Dietterlin, Wendel the Elder, (copy after?)”)  
\textit{Roman Soldiers at the Foot of the Cross}  
1602  
Brown ink applied with pen, with washes on cream laid paper  
18.00 x 32.1 cm  
Worcester Art Museum, 1956.28  

INSCRIPTIONS: recto lower right [pen with brown ink]: WD[J?] 1602  
LITERATURE: Kaufmann (1985), 81.  

Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann’s 1985 census of German drawings in North American collections designated this drawing as “Dietterlin, Wendel the Elder, (copy after?)”.\textsuperscript{20} The internal records of the Worcester Art Museum identify this drawing as a work by Wendel

\textsuperscript{19} London, Victoria and Albert Museum, Inv. no. 681.1864. See Richardson and Phyrr, “The ‘Master of the Snails and Dragonflies’ Identified,” 364.  
\textsuperscript{20} Kaufmann, “A Census of Drawings from the Holy Roman Empire,” 81.
Dietterlin the Younger, but the new designation has not appeared in print. While the style of the drawing and the WD monogram initially suggested a connection to Wendel Dietterlin the Elder, the inscribed date of 1602, which post-dates Dietterlin the Elder’s death by three years, indicates that the work probably did not originate from his hand. Wendel Dietterlin the Younger, who shared his father’s initials and was still active around 1614, is the most likely author of this design. Close inspection of the monogram in fact reveals a horizontal crossbar above the D, allowing the viewer to read the symbol as a combined form of the letters “WDJ”, possibly shorthand for “Wendel Dietterlin der Jüngere,” or, “Wendel Dietterlin the Younger”. The sheet shows that, of the known artists in Wendel Dietterlin the Elder’s Circle—Bartholomäus Dietterlin, Hilarius Dietterlin, and Wendel Dietterlin the Younger—the drafting style of the last is the closest to Dietterlin père.

There is no record that Dietterlin the Elder planned or executed a Crucifixion with this arrangement of staffage at the base of the cross. The anatomies of the horses are constructed with confidence and indeed dynamism, and the bodies of the human figures display a candid, unrehearsed quality. These details indicate that the drawing is probably Dietterlin the Younger’s preparatory study for a Crucifixion, and not a drawing after a design by Dietterlin the Elder, as the former attribution suggests. Dietterlin the Younger is known to have produced other drawings showing Christ’s Passion and death, perhaps components of the same project as the Worcester design.

---

22 These are catalogued as Gruppen der Frauen zu einer Pietà and Christus mit dem Kreuz nach rechts gehend in Zeichnungen Deutscher Meister im Kupferstichkabinett zu Berlin, ed. Elfried Bock (Berlin: Justus Bard, 1921), 1:153, nos. 389 and 6714.
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