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Abstract

In this dissertation, I argue that drawing in the early-modern period engaged with modes of perception beyond the visual. I focus on a printed drawing book, the *Artis Apellae liber* (1650-56), designed by the Utrecht artist Abraham Bloemaert (1566-1651) and engraved by his son Frederik. This work teaches a student to draw by copying, leading the practitioner from sensory organs to bodily fragments (hands, legs, torsos), culminating in studies of the nude and historical compositions. I contextualize the *Artis Apellae liber* within the confessional debates of the seventeenth century, arguing that as the Catholic, Calvinist and Lutheran churches established official doctrines, questions about the body and its relationship to the divine and matter were re-examined. In turn, developments in early-modern natural philosophy challenged previously held beliefs about the body and its capacity for movement and rest. I situate the drawing of the body in the seventeenth century within these theological and philosophical revolutions, maintaining that the body as a corporeal instrument (beyond the field of vision) was integral to seventeenth-century artistic practice.

The first chapter, *Books and Matter*, grounds the process of learning to draw from a book in early-modern discourses on reading. This chapter examines the intersecting practices of reading as devotion and reading as a means to retire from the world to foster qualities of imagination and judgment. For both practices, the book acts as a metaphor for the body. The second chapter, *Bodies (Universal and Particular)*, examines drawing the male nude in seventeenth-century practice and pedagogy. Through an investigation of the
artistic vocabulary surrounding the study of the model in the studio—nae t’leven (from life), wel-dragen (to bear, endure) and wel-stand (well-being)—I suggest that Bloemaert’s drawings of the male figure engage with a new sense “space,” in which bodies stand and move in relationship to each other. The third chapter, Senses and Knowledge, looks at early-modern discourses on vision and the senses. While scholars have focused on perspective as a metaphor for seeing in early-modern artistic practice, there has been little attention to a divergent pedagogy grounded in the senses. I connect the roles of seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting and touching in artistic practice to a wider seventeenth-century Neo-Aristotelianism and its critics, who sought how, or if, all knowledge is founded in the senses. The fourth chapter, Faces and Passions, examines the role of drawing the face in artistic pedagogy, arguing for love (Caritas-divine love) as a mode of perception. Beginning with Alberti, many artist theorists discussed how the senses first perceive objects in the heart. I connect these dialogues on the heart and the senses with wider theological discourses, arguing that Bloemaert’s lessons for drawing the face engage with the heart’s ability to perceive the “other.”

From books, hands, eyes, faces, skin and bodies, this dissertation examines the surfaces of seventeenth-century artistic processes and pedagogy, arguing that surfaces in the seventeenth-century were as much about the invisible as the visible. The Artis Apellae liber taught students not only to draw but also to understand their bodies as perceptive tools capable of shaping their worlds, represented and real.
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Introduction

On the 13th of January 1651, Abraham Bloemaert’s son Frederik made a payment to the Utrecht Domkappitel to toll the cathedral bells in mourning for his father.1 The tradition of ringing the cathedral or parish church bells to pray for the deceased was a remnant of Catholic practice in the seventeenth-century Calvinist Dutch Republic.2 Although the Dutch Reformed Church initially resisted this rite, the sound of remembrance and mourning had become woven into urban life as part of the amorphous space between civic and religious observance. On the day of Bloemaert’s funeral, the cathedral bells clanged across the city to mark the death of one of Utrecht’s foremost artists, first at noon and then for an hour as the procession bearing the body of the deceased wound its way through the city’s narrow streets from the home to the grave. The continuance of this tradition—crossing the confessional divide between the Old Roman Catholic Church and the new Reformed Church—appropriately symbolizes the career of Abraham Bloemaert (1566-1651) and his final artistic work, the Artis Apellae liber (1650-1656), a pedagogical drawing manual published after his death by his son Frederik.

This dissertation studies this book—designed by Bloemaert and engraved by his son Frederik—to explore the interrelationships between devotional and artistic practice.3 The Artis Apellae liber has no text, aside from a title page in Latin (fig. 1). Despite its

1 Rijksarchief in de provincie Utrecht, Domkapittel, 702.
constitution in images rather than words, the book has suffered the same fate as many
textual works, changing in form and content as it has inspired and been reinterpreted by
editors, publishers and translators, fellow artists and engravers over the last three and a
half centuries.

Bloemaert’s original drawings for the Artis Apellae liber are in the Fitzwilliam
Museum in Cambridge; these drawings provided the designs for Frederik’s engravings.
The first edition of the Artis Apellae liber published by Frederick between 1650 and 1656
contains six parts, each consisting of twenty plates. There is no overt organizing
principle, as the book moves from fragmented studies of the sensory organs (eyes, ears,
mouths and noses) to compositions for history painting. In between, the book contains
exercises in drafting hands, feet, faces, genre figures (beeldjes), allegorical figures,
religious figures, putti, and nudes. In addition to these engraved lessons, the Tekenboek
(another name for the Artis Apellae liber) also includes chiaroscuro woodcuts that depict
religious and allegorical subjects. The book contains no explicit instruction, either verbal
or visual. Instead Bloemaert creates strange juxtapositions on the page: knees, hands and
heads (fig. 2); a hand pouring the contents of a pitcher, the sole of a foot, profiles and hair
(fig. 3); flexing, stepping and standing feet surrounding a downward-gazing Madonna-
like figure (fig. 4); breasts, hair, hands and cloth (fig. 5).

4 Only three versions of this edition survive in the collections of the British Museum, the Los Angeles
County Museum of Art and the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. I have, however, been unable to track
down the edition in Paris. The call number under which it is filed attaches to a microfilm that is a later
dition of the Artis Apellae liber. Between 1679-1702 Nicolaes Visscher (based in Amsterdam) published
another addition of the Tekenboek including sixty more plates engraved by Frederick after his father’s
designs. Louis Renard and Bernard Picart published a third edition in Amsterdam, entitled Artis Apellae
thesaurus (1723). The fourth edition published in 1740, known as the ‘Bloemaert ed. Picart,’ is the most-
well known. François Boucher also published his own reinterpretation of Bloemaert’s Tekenboek, entitled
Livre d’Etude d’après les Dessins originaux de Blomart (1735). Boucher’s drawing book primarily
contains Bloemaert’s beeldjes and genre figures from the Tekenboek and other sources. For a brief
overview, see: Bolten, Method and Practice, 66-67 and Ingeborg Leijzapf, Het Tekenboek ‘Artis Apellae
An appendix to this dissertation presents the lessons and their order in the 1650-56 edition in the collection of the British Museum. While Bloemaert designed the lessons and Frederik engraved them, the person who demarcated the number on the right-hand corner of the metal plate—to order the lessons—remains unknown. From the construction of the individual lessons and the visual rhymes among hair, hands, bodies and cloth, the apparent “lack” of a structure for the *Tekenboek* parallels the poetic order within the lessons themselves, founded upon analogies and visual plays. On the one hand, the absence of text makes this a difficult work to “read.” On the other hand, the absence of text provides the art historian the opportunity to explore methodologically how art history grounds itself in a reading of images over words.

The art-historical discipline demands articulation in a non-verbal language. It is the art historian’s role to translate silent pictures into words. The construction of the *Artis Apellae liber*, as a book composed of images and not language, draws attention to this conundrum of art historical practice: *How to talk about a book of images, when there is no text to guide the reading?* While the absence of text in Bloemaert’s work may speak to a lack of interest on his part in the theoretical, I will argue that the lessons themselves, nevertheless, engage with philosophical and theological problems that dominated the seventeenth century.

In many ways, this dissertation is an extended reading of the singular opening lesson—*Lesson 2*—composed of a lapidary profile, its lifelessness contrasting with the shifting gaze of various eyes, none attached to a body; an upturned mouth and nose; barely smiling lips; a moustache; a lock of hair; an ear (fig. 6). This lesson partakes in a
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5 While one might think that the opening lesson would be numbered 1, it is numbered two, suggesting that the opening title page is a lesson within itself.
drawing-book tradition that introduces the student to draftsmanship through the sensory. A similar drawing book that grounds drawing pedagogy in the sensory includes, Giacaomo Franco (1550-1620) and the opening lesson to his *De excellentia* (1611), which brings together on a single page disconnected ears, eyes mouths and noses (fig. 7). Unlike the harmonious play within Bloemaert’s lesson, however, Franco attempts to instill a modicum of order, presenting the ears in a row, the eyes in a row, smiling lips in a row and noses and mouths lining the bottom of the page. The intermingling of Bloemaert’s lesson, refusing a hierarchy of the senses, becomes slightly more ordered in Franco’s lesson. Yet both present a synesthetic mingling of sensory organs on a single page.

In his own studies for a printed drawing book, Jusepe Ribera (1591-1652) devotes a lesson to the interrelationship between the mouth and the nose, the proportions among palates, lips, nose cartilage and bone (fig. 8). Ribera uses a wide-open mouth to structure the lesson, revealing the ridges of the mouth’s bridge and the indentations of its molars. Gaping open in neither a scream nor a laugh, this lesson introduces the grotesque and the exaggerated, embodied by the attention to the mouth’s cavernous interior.

While each of these three artists approaches the pedagogy differently, Bloemaert, Franco and Ribera construct books that belong to a tradition of printed drawing book that introduces drawing practice and pedagogy by pictorializing sensory organs. Bloemaert’s lessons, however, radically depart from this tradition of drawing book in his attention to the particular, to the local, to daily scenes of life of seventeenth-century rural Utrecht. The *Artis Apellae liber* documents not only a spectrum of life in rural Utrecht but also the seasons of life itself, a study of bodies from their infant forms (fig. 9) to their sagging
beards and faces (fig. 10). Teaching the pupil with an amalgamation of sensory organs, Bloemaert’s lessons proceed to reveal his particular world as artist and draftsman in seventeenth-century Utrecht. The studies of hair bands and braids in lesson 11 speak to a quick drafting of a local young woman, her kerchiefed hair contrasting with the loose locks of an Apollian youth (fig. 11). Her youth precedes the three consecutive studies in lesson 14 of an aged woman, a face whose countenance will reappear in the chapter *Faces and Passions* (fig. 12). This lesson speaks not only to a type of face—an aging peasant woman—but also to Bloemaert’s consideration of a particular face from various angles.

Besides the expected lessons of hands, arms, legs and feet, as seen in this tradition of printed drawing book, (figs. 13, 14, 15, 16), Bloemaert also grounds his work within movements of devotion, as may be seen in lesson 31. Here, Bloemaert presents hands breaking the Eucharistic bread, framed by variations of hands in prayer, in gesturing, and in cradling a candleholder (fig. 17). These studies of limbs and organs lead to beggars, peasants, soldiers and wanderers, figures whom one imagines Bloemaert encountered while walking in rural Utrecht (figs. 18, 19, 20). Scenes of domesticity, as seen in lesson 52 (fig. 21), contrast with Allegories of fall and the harvest (fig. 22); studies of peasant women roaming the countryside (fig. 23) are juxtaposed with bare-breasted women, standing Aphrodite-like in waves of cresting drapery (fig. 24).

The *Tekenboek* belongs to a pan-European tradition of printed drawing book, and yet it is rooted in rural Utrecht. Bloemaert presents an encyclopedia of his world, imagined and observed. It is this dialectic between the imagined and the observed, the particular and the universal, that makes the *Artis Apellae liber* unlike any other early-
modern printed drawing book. In any consideration of the *Artis Apellae liber*, it becomes clear that there are many ways to approach this book, for it raises questions about allegory, classicism, mythology, gender and labor (to name a few). By no means do I consider my work the definitive reading of this visual text; I select interludes, passages, and scenes that speak to wider questions. My guiding interest in this work is the role of practice. I consider the disciplined actions of the student, the artist and the devotee and how these various repetitive movements overlap in studying the world and its bodies.

**The Literature**

Art historical interpretation of the *Artis Apellae liber* has largely focused on the heavily-edited 1740 edition by exiled Huguenot artist/engraver/publisher Bernard Picart (1673-1733), which contains the most complete set of images (160 prints divided into eight “chapters”). This work is more a collector’s item for the cabinet than a book for the workshop. Scholars have yet to consider Picart’s significant reinterpretations of Bloemaert’s pedagogic project and drawing practice, a revision I address in my conclusion. First, however, I will return to the 1650-56 edition printed by Bloemaert’s son Frederik and the accompanying drawings in the Fitzwilliam Museum in Cambridge.

Two recent dissertations consider Bloemaert’s work within the context of Catholicism and Utrecht. Indeed, the question of “confessionalism” and Bloemaert’s own confessional status as a Catholic guide the most recent scholarship on his work. Soo Yeon Park’s *Use of Devotional Images in the Seventeenth-Century Northern Netherlands: A Case Study of Prints by Abraham Bloemaert (1566-1651)* examines Bloemaert’s religious prints in the context of early-modern spirituality, the reform of the
Catholic church and the Jesuitical movements. In Abraham Bloemaert (1566-1651), the Netherlandish Academy and Artistic Collaboration in Seventeenth-Century Utrecht, Elizabeth Novgrady attempts to piece together Bloemaert’s workshop practice, stressing the importance of artistic collaboration in the face of religious upheaval in the Netherlands during Bloemaert’s lifetime. Both dissertations contribute to reassessing seventeenth-century Dutch painting separate from the dominant paradigms of “Calvinism” and Hegelian realism; both look at Bloemaert’s work beyond the stylistic debates of Mannerism versus Classicism. Nevertheless, in these considerations the lens of confessionalism constricts Bloemaert’s practice.

Born the same year as the iconoclastic riots, Bloemaert’s work coincided with a period of intense religious conflict in the Netherlands, a struggle that resulted over the course of his lifetime in the establishment of core divisionary doctrines. These doctrines, or “confessions,” established the Catholic, Calvinist, Lutheran and Anglican churches as separate institutions, and also helped to define a new relationship between religion and state. Confessionalism is crucial in determining Bloemaert’s understanding of the body, materiality, finitude and the ability to grasp the divine in the quotidian. Although Bloemaert is known to have been Catholic, reading his practice solely through Catholic
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religious beliefs limits our understanding of his oeuvre. While I take confessionalism to have been instrumental for Bloemaert, I ultimately move beyond this context to demonstrate the orientation of Bloemaert’s practice around epistemological questions about the relationship between cognition and sensory perception, problems that also engaged Bloemaert’s preeminent contemporaries, Catholic and Protestant alike. The role of the sensory apparatus in how we perceive and come to know the world engaged seventeenth-century artists, theologians and thinkers in ways that cut across demarcations of religious belief.

This dissertation pivots around several key concepts: confession, pietas, the Academy, and religion. Throughout the remainder of this introduction, I will introduce the importance of these themes for grasping Bloemaert’s work and place my own understanding of these terms and their relevance to seventeenth-century drawing and pedagogy.

Confessio

From the Latin word confessio, confession is the official doctrine that churches developed in the wake of the Reformation to define their beliefs. The Helvetic Confessions (1536, 1566), the Zurich Consensus (1549) and the canons of Dordrecht (1619) establish the Reformed (Calvinist) church of the United Netherlands. The Council of Trent and the “Tridentine Profession of Faith” (1564) set down the written accords for the Catholic Church. The confessions served to clarify the positions of each respective church on such central questions as the Eucharist, Baptism, death, resurrection, and the means by which the individual comes to know God: the Word, the body, the image.
Among many articles of faith, the Tridentine Profession asserts the seven sacraments (Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Anointing of the Sick, Holy Orders, Marriage). The Reformed Church acknowledges these practices but argues that Christ ordained only Baptism and the Eucharist, in the *Sacraments of the Gospel*.

The Tridentine Profession of Faith maintains that the Eucharist is a *conversionem totius substantiae*—the priest’s blessing fundamentally changes wine and bread into the blood and body of Christ. In contrast, the States-General (the legislative body of the Dutch government) decreed: “In order to represent the spiritual and heavenly bread to us, Christ decreed an earthly and sensory bread, which is a Sacrament of his body.”

The Reformed Church in the Netherlands likened the Eucharist to an image or a holy drawing (*heylige teecken*), but the sacrament was not the thing itself. For the Catholic Church, the Eucharist transforms into Christ’s body. For the Reformed Church, the Eucharist is a “drawing” that stands before the eyes, a sensory manifestation that *represents* but is not the body of Christ. While the Council of Trent upheld the importance of (literal) images in the practice of worship as means to access knowledge of God, however, the Canons of Dordrecht stressed that God may be known only through the Word and the Book of Creation (Nature). Such differences aside, the taste, the smell, and the touch of the Eucharistic wafer and wine were fundamental to both Catholics and Calvinists. For the Catholics, the sensory qualities testified to the miracle of the conversion, whereas for the Calvinists, these were perceived to be an “earthly” sign of Christ’s body.

---

7 "Om ons dit geestelick ende Hemelsch broodt af te beelden, heeft Christus verordent een aertsche ende sienelick broodt, ‘t welck een Sacrament is van sijn lichaem." *Groot placaet-boeck*, 414.

8 "Soo werckt hy dan in ons, al wat hy door dese heylige teeckenens ons voor ogen stelt, hoe wel de wijze ons verstant te boven gaat, ende ons onbegrijpelick is, ghelijck de werckinge des H. Geestes, verborgen onbegrijpelick is." *Groot placaet-boeck*, vervattende de placaten, ordonnantien ende edicten van de ... Staten Generael der Vereenighde Nederlanden, ende van de ... Staten van Hollandt en West-Vrieslandt, mitsgaders vande ... Staten van Zeelandt*, vol. 3, ed. Simon van Leeuwen (‘s-Gravenhage: J. Scheltus, 1683) 414.
The role of confessionalism has guided recent histories of the Dutch Republic. In the 1950’s, historians began to examine how the emergence of the Calvinist, Catholic, Lutheran and Anglican churches laid the groundwork for modern society.\(^9\) Confessionalization played a decisive role in establishing an ideology of the state’s authority, locating social needs (welfare, for example) under the control of state legislation, a “cultural identity” that united a nation’s otherwise disparate population, and negotiating relationships among a system of states.\(^10\) Artistic institutions began to define themselves at the same time. The first drawing Academies were founded during the “reform” of the major churches. The *Artis Apellae liber* emerged in a trans-European dialogue among artists about what it meant to draw—to see the world and directly re-picture it with pen and paper—following the official reformation of the major Western Churches and the reconsideration of images’ role in accessing knowledge of the divine.

The historian Pieter Geyl first used the term “protestantization” to describe the development of a Dutch identity as inherently “Protestant” and separate from the “Flemish” Catholic South. Geyl’s work demonstrates that the division between a


“Protestant” North and a “Catholic” South is not the result of essential indigenous qualities to the Northern Low Countries versus the Southern Low Countries.¹¹

L.J. Rogier, another major twentieth-century historian of the seventeenth-century Netherlands and confessionalism, examined the operations of the Roman Catholic Church in the Calvinist Netherlands. Through studying the archives of the Holland Mission (a series of Vicar Apostolics appointed by Rome to carry on the “parish” work of the Catholic church despite the outlawing of Roman Catholic practices and gatherings). Rogier makes clear that the Holland Mission allowed for the continual development of Catholicism in the Calvinist state. The zealous Delft native Sasbout Vosmeer (1548-1614)—who often is cited in connection with his procurement of the head of William I’s assassin, Balthasar Gérard, after his quartering, disemboweling and beheading—was the first apostolic vicar for the Holland Mission. (Vosmeer kept the assassin’s head as a relic). Philippus Rovenius (1573-1651) followed Vosmeer in the line of apostolic vicars appointed by Rome, leading his “parish” and openly publishing treatises and discourses on the Holy Roman Catholic Church, seeking to maintain the reformed principles of the Council of Trent while ministering to his pastoral, urban flock. The prolific writings of Rovenius will be woven into this dissertation, contextualizing the religious discourses to which Bloemaert would have been exposed as a Catholic in Utrecht; for example, the importance of Christian Piety in Rovenius’s 1,100 page-tome Institutionum Christianae

pietatis (1635), which covers a range of subjects central to Bloemaert’s practice, from the passions to the examination of conscience and virtue.

**Pietas**

In his biography of Abraham Bloemaert, the Florentine biographer, artist and theorist Filippo Baldinucci (1624-1697) stresses that Bloemaert was not only a good Catholic but also a pious Christian man (*non solamente buon cattolico, ma uomo di si cristiana pietà*). In a biography that for the most part quotes in Italian verbatim Karel van Mander’s life of Bloemaert from *Het Schilderboek* (1604), Baldinucci’s few words describing Bloemaert as both a Catholic and a Christian come as an authorial aside. As a testament to Bloemaert’s faith, Baldinucci recounts that the Jesuits celebrated the Mass (administering the Eucharist) daily in the Bloemaert home until the authorities banged down the door, interrupting Mass. For this offense, the city magistrates charged a fine and Bloemaert was harassed to the point that an anonymous person penned a “defamatory book” about him.\(^\text{12}\)

Baldinucci’s biography of Bloemaert points to one important factor for contextualizing Bloemaert’s artistic practice in seventeenth-century Utrecht: Bloemaert was not only Catholic but also pious. Although Bloemaert’s rigorous faith places him on the margins of society, his activity as a painter situates him at the nexus of seventeenth-century culture, interacting with the most important humanists, politicians and thinkers in the seventeenth-century Dutch Republic and beyond. As Baldinucci’s biography attests, pietas unites these divergent factions. In the Netherlands, scholars have argued that despite the division of different faiths into specific confessions that defined themselves

\(^{12}\) Filippo Baldinucci, “Notizie di Abraam Bloemaert,” *Notizie dei Professori des Disegno*, ed. Paola Barocchi, et. al. vol. 3 (Firenze: Euro Grafica, 1974-75) 626. The defamatory book has not been found, if there is one.
against one another in written creeds, there was a continuing adherence to the preservation of the civic body at the expense of one’s own personal faith.\textsuperscript{13}

Baldinucci’s summation of Bloemaert—\textit{a good Catholic and a man of piety}—illustrates that both Catholicism and \textit{pietas} grounded Bloemaert’s role in society. He was a member of both the “body” of the Catholic Church and the community of Saint Luke’s Guild. Bloemaert collaborated with both the Jesuits and the Holland Mission (despite the fact that both these institutions frequently fought). Bloemaert’s work for these institutions provided the crucial visual material for instructing and disseminating tenets about the role of saints, the Eucharist, and the history (and legitimating) of the Catholic Church in the Netherlands.\textsuperscript{14} Yet in the \textit{Artis Apellae liber} (the final testament to his pedagogy and practice) Bloemaert presents a theory of images and their making that moves beyond confessional divides. The printed drawing book, as a kind of artistic \textit{civitas}, teaches the student to draw the body. In instructing the student to represent the body, the book also examines how the body is an affective-instrument, capable of seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting, touching.

\textbf{Religion}

For an understanding of the role of religious practice in the \textit{Artis Apellae liber}, the definition of religion must be reexamined. In an article published in 1966 entitled “Religion as a Cultural System,” Clifford Geertz presented a definition that continues to

\textsuperscript{13} In her study of the Utrecht humanist Arnoldus Buchelius (1565-1641) and his changing confessions throughout his life (from a Catholic to a Counter-Remonstrant), Judith Pollmann demonstrates that through \textit{piety} Buchelius maintained active friendships and conversations with other Utrecht citizens whose confessions were antithetical to his own. Judith Pollmann, “The Bond of Christian Piety,” \textit{Calvinism and Religious Toleration in the Dutch Golden Age} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002) 58-69.

\textsuperscript{14} For an overview of Jesuit publication in the Northern Netherlands and Jesuit relationships with Amsterdam publishers, see: Paul Begheyn, “Uitgaven van jezuïeten in de Noordelijke Nederlanden 1601-1650,” \textit{De zeventiende eeuw} 13 (1997): 293-308.
be used. Geertz defined religion as “a system of symbols” that ground “powerful, pervasive and long-lasting moods and motivations in men,” so that men also formulate “conceptions of a general order of existence.”¹⁵ In an important critique, Talal Asad discusses how Geertz’s definition of religion is formed by a specific, cognitive, Christian viewpoint. Asad argues that when Geertz associates religion with “symbols,” religion becomes “isolated from social practices and discourses and regarded primarily in terms of consciousness.” As Asad makes clear, Geertz’s definition does not take into account “how ‘knowledge’ and ‘attitudes’ are related to material conditions and social activities, and to what extent they are formed by them.”¹⁶ Religion becomes a cognitive state of mind instead of “materialities that form religious subjects.”¹⁷

Looking towards revisionist definitions of religion, this dissertation explores the intersections between embodied religious and artistic practice in the Artis Apellae liber. Following the sixteenth-century Reformation, artists in the seventeenth century seriously engaged with the problems of religious practice as ritual. I will argue that the matter involved in religious practice and daily life informed the matter involved in making art. The Reformation and its aftermath in the seventeenth century led to a reconsideration of the body as an image and as a means to know and perceive the world. These questions move beyond belief. I am not trying to assert the importance of Catholicism to the seventeenth-century Dutch Republic and its artistic production. Instead I am considering how religion and its practices (still entrenched in seventeenth-century daily life, regardless of personal beliefs) informed and came to bear on artistic practice.

Beyond Catholicism or Calvinism, seventeenth-century theology and philosophy explored a fundamental question still relevant today: can we grasp universal knowledge of the world through our individual perceptions? This question plays out in artists’ working methods as they consider how to represent their own impressions of the world. The *Artis Apellae liber* presents pedagogy that instantiates itself in sensorial perception, in order to move to the universal. In this dissertation, I explore how representations of eyes, ears, noses, hands and mouths informed drawing pedagogy in the seventeenth century. In turn, these questions about images engaged with the body, laying the groundwork for seeing bodies in relationship to one another as they move through space and time, rather than in relationship to God and the eternal divine. While this might seem like a lot to place on a printed drawing book by an artist who might be described as minor, the *Artis Apellae liber*’s presentation of gazing eyes, grasping hands, torqued cloth, crouched bodies, reading bodies and praying bodies asks for an examination of artistic practice in relationship to seventeenth-century discourses on the corporeal, faith and the role of the artist in mediating between his own eye, his hand and the greater world.

*Accademia*

The *Artis Apellae liber* comes out of a tradition of drawing books begun in North Italy by the followers of the Carracci during the height of the “Counter-Reformation.” While the Carracci themselves never designed printed drawing books, a series of engravers and etchers (Odoardo Fialetti, Giacomo Franco, Luca Ciamberlano) produced printed drawing books that have been connected to the pedagogic program of the Carracci
Accademia, first the Accademia dei Desiderosi, later the Accademia degli Incamminati.\textsuperscript{18} Two brothers, Annibale (1560-1609) and Agostino (1557-1602), and their cousin Ludovico (1555-1619) form the Bolognese triumvirate known as the Carracci.\textsuperscript{19} The three artists began a drawing academy where artists sketched from the male nude, “reforming” Mannerist painting in Bologna contemporaneously with the “reform” of the Catholic Church following the Council of Trent.\textsuperscript{20} The Carracci are famous for “drawing from life,” whereas the tradition of printed drawing book that emerged with their names attached places drawing within the reified copying of repetitive, printed drawing lessons. This is a tension that the Artis Apellae liber addresses: \textit{how to teach drawing from life with a printed drawing book?}

By studying not only nature but also the works of other artists, the Carracci created a “reformed” style based upon an observation or study of the natural world that was tempered. In her work on the Carracci and their pedagogy, Gail Feigenbaum

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{18} Rosand, “The Crisis of the Venetian Tradition,” 5-55.
  \item \textsuperscript{19} The Carracci Accademia is an important pedagogic model for the seventeenth-century Teekenschool (drawing schools) that developed in Haarlem and Utrecht. Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann also has noted the affinity between the Carracci and the Haarlem academy, see: “The Eloquent Artist: Towards and Understanding fo the Stylistics of Painting at the Court of Rudolf II,” \textit{The Eloquent Artist: Essays on Art, Art Theory and Architecture, Sixteenth to Nineteenth Century} (London: Pindar Press, 2004) 62-70.
\end{itemize}
maintains that the Carracci’s “reform” occurred through “collective” rather than “individual” identity.\textsuperscript{21} The Carracci realized a “collective” style in a form of drawing that sought to balance an individual’s perceptions and universal knowledge. In draftsmanship, the Carracci meld observation and idealization, realizing the subjectivities of their own vision, while seeking ascension towards a “universal” way of seeing.

The seventeenth-century Italian scholar and biographer Carlo Cesare Malvasia (1616–1693) records many anecdotes about the importance of drawing in the economy of the Carracci workshop.\textsuperscript{22} Of particular importance to the consideration of Bloemaert is Malvasia’s discussion of the “great ear of Agostino.” From this larger-than-life fragment of the ear (a sculptural cast), Agostino could “gain a better grasp of its structure and how it appears from every angle, for the ear is considered, and rightly so, to be one of the most difficult parts of the human body to draw.”\textsuperscript{23} The attention the Carracci lavished on bodily segments contextualizes the fragments composing the lessons of the \textit{Artis Apellae liber}. Agostino worked from sculptural casts of bodily parts, studying the relief, light, and projection of the part from many different angles. Through the rapid movement of his pen and changing viewpoints, Agostino attempts to grasp the body by examining the changes of light and shade on the corporeal surface, shifting his own body around the stillness of the sculptural fragment. Like Bloemaert’s lessons in the \textit{Artis Apellae liber}, Agostino’s study sheets (\textit{recto} and \textit{verso}) realize this drawing methodology in crowded and seemingly unsystematic compositions of legs, feet, ankles, nudes, angels, faces, eyes and ears (figs. 25, 26, 27). The examination of the body’s surfaces through drafting

\textsuperscript{21} Feigenbaum, “The Carracci Academy,” 155.
bodily fragments (ears, eyes, noses, hands, legs, torsos) from a variety of angles became the foundation for a system of drawing pedagogy “canonized” in the printed drawing books that emerged from artists’ printed books that became connected to the Carracci Accademia.

This study of the body through fragments and surfaces guides the lessons of the Artis Apellae liber. Like Agostino, Bloemaert does not present the body to the student through its underlying structure, its skeletal or muscular composition. The lessons in the Tekenboek produce printed versions of Agostino’s great ear, fragments of the body seen from a variety of angles. The body parts come into relief through light’s reflection on skin’s surface. In lesson 3, a composition of ears, downturned gazes and an eye (fig 28), Bloemaert displays an ear and its lobe from different perspectives. Against these auditory protuberances, Bloemaert places a single eye staring at the viewer.

The juxtaposition of bodily fragments on a single page may be seen not only as a study of a single organ from multiple viewpoints but also as study of the minute difference between different bodies. In a drawing at Princeton University, Jusepe Ribera considers, in red chalk, the varying landscapes of two ears belonging to two separate heads (fig. 29). The intensity of a deeply gathered brow, its forward gazing eye and the insinuation of a hooked nose bridges the two ears. Rising from this brow, with light chalk diamond hatching, Ribera considers an ear and its attenuation to the head, its framing by soft, short, subtly ringletted hair. The roundness of this ear contrasts with the one that Ribera pictures below. The artist draws the extension of the jaw and the mouth, a lengthening complimented by the longer lines of red chalk and soft blurring of chalk pigment. This ear and its shadowed indents of cartilage are jagged and uneven as
compared to the nearly perfect rounded curve of the upper ear. This single page demonstrates in red chalk the working methods that the *Artis Apellae liber* simulates in print: the detailed and attentive study of various parts, considering the differences among viewpoints and bodies.

Beginning with Odoardo Fialetti’s *Il vero modo et ordine per disegnar tutte le parti et membra del corpo humano* (Venice, 1608)[figs. 30, 31] and followed by Giacomo Franco’s *De excellentia et nobilitate delineationis libri duo* (Venice, 1611)[figs. 32, 33] and Luca Ciamberlano’s *Le livre de dessein* (figs. 34, 35, 36, 37) engravers began to disseminate in print fragmented studies of sensory organs and limbs. These printed drawing books posthumously became associated with the pedagogy of the Carracci Accademia. Although Ciamberlano, Fialetti and Franco did not invent the idea of a printed drawing book, their attention to the sensory fragment—great ears—separates their work from earlier traditions, which originate in the medieval model book.24 A valuable

---

object in the workshop, the medieval model-book provided drawn studies of figures, costumes, animals and natural flora and fauna for the workshop to copy and integrate into compositions, working directly from the *exemplum* or *simile*. Like the medieval model-book and its patterns, the printed drawing book disseminates ways to contour the world instead of confronting the world itself. Such books also disperse the specific *maniera* (working method) of artists. The printed drawing book confronts the dichotomy between standardization and individualization, the anonymous workshop versus the artist’s signature, the collective versus the individual.

The printed drawing book introduces to the student drawing, teaching the student to see the three-dimensional world and translate it onto the two-dimensional page. From Leonardo da Vinci (1452-1519) to Denis Diderot (1713-1784), the prescriptions for the young draftsman’s trajectory of study remain the same. First, the young draftsman copies drawings or prints. Once he masters this stage, then the student studies relief and sculpture. After mastering drawing after the lapidary, the student draws after life (*nae t’leven*). The studies culminate when the draftsman has the ability to draw with no model, *uyt den gheest*, from the intellect.

The drawing books of the Carracci school made their way North to the Netherlands and Utrecht through the printed compilations of various publishers, such as

---

Claes Jansz. Visscher (1587-1652), whose 1640 *Fundamentales regulae artis pictoriae et sculpt* and his 1651 *Fondamenten der Teyckenenkonst* were both published in Amsterdam. Another Amsterdam publisher, Johannes Janssonius (1588-1664), edited and printed compilations of the Italian printed drawing books under the title *Diagraphia, sive ars delineatoria* (1616).\(^{28}\) The *Artis Apellae liber* belongs to this tradition. The majority of artists who designed lessons for drawing manuals in the tradition of the Carracci—such as Jusepe Ribera, il Guercino (1591-1666) and Jacopo Palma il Giovane (1544-1628)—devoted their work to ascetics, saints, ecclesiology, devotional prints and altarpieces. In other words, artists who produced printed drawing books (or lessons for printed drawing books, such as Ribera)[figs. 38, 39] within the model of copying sensory fragments actively engaged in shaping the production of images for the reform of the Catholic Church. I am not, however, trying to say that this is a “Catholic” drawing book. The process of religious reform within the Catholic Church, nevertheless, forced artists to reconsider not only images but also drawing pedagogy and the practice of making images. All these books establish the process of drawing within the replication of sensory organs. Usually, these drawing manuals are seen against the other models of drawing instruction, which base their pedagogy on Euclidean geometry and textual didactic instruction.

A comparison between the *Artis Apellae liber* and the printed drawing lessons of Bloemaert’s contemporary and fellow Utrechter Crispijn van de Passe (1594-1670), in his

---

\(^{28}\) The connection of this type of drawing book with the Carracci academy was made explicit by publishers later in the seventeenth century, as printed drawing books reprinting images from these earlier compilations came out under the name of the Carracci, such as the 1660 *Livre de portraiture d’Anib Carrache* printed in Paris or the 1690 *Scuola perfetta per imparare a bene designare tutto il corpo humano parte per parte / cavata dalla disegni di Carracci* published in Rome.
Light der teken en schilderkonst (1643-44), shows the differences between two different pedagogical structures, one based in geometry the other based in the senses. First, van de Passe dedicates his work the city magistrates of Utrecht. Van de Passe, who was born in Cologne, lived in Paris and settled in Amsterdam, presents his work to the city of Utrecht, likening the offices and ministries to lights and beacons. In his introduction, Van de Passe describes drawing as the mother of many sciences/arts (scienza, sciences, kunst, Künste), for there is no mechanical (mechanica, mechaniques, kunst, handwerken) work that does not need its aid. As his opening lesson clarifies, in order to begin the art of drawing, one must be introduced to the science (science, wetenschap, wissenschaft) of the straight line and the curved line, the triangle, the square, the circle and the oval (fig. 40). Despite this attention to Euclidean geometry—the science of drawing—these rules break down in lessons dedicated to eyes, ears, noses and mouths. Van de Passe states that drawing the sensory organs cannot be described by mathematical rules, for they are understood in the spirit (spirito, geest, l’esprit, geist). The only rule for drawing these fragments is practice, according to van de Passe.

Different from van de Passe’s Light der teken en schilderkonst, the Artis Apellae liber engages in dialogue with van de Passe’s work. Indeed, van de Passe’s attention to the necessity of spirit and practice for drawing the sensory organs illuminates Bloemaert’s own pedagogy. Moreover, van de Passe includes Bloemaert’s portrait in the title page: the great draftsman of Utrecht. Furthermore, within the Light van de Passe uses drawings and designs from Bloemaert’s œuvre. Despite a presence in van de Passe’s

---


30 Van de Passe, Light, A3.
drawing manual, however, Bloemaert’s work remains separate. The *Artis Apellae liber* is not dedicated to the city of Utrecht but to the young drawing student. The book contains no explanatory text and no mapping of bodily parts and organs onto Euclidean geometry, “science” or mathematics. Bloemaert dedicates the opening lessons to that which van de Passe describes as the realm of the *gheest* and the product of practice.

The reemergence of Euclidean geometry as a “science” has been associated with a search for “certainty” in the face of the uncertainty that the religious wars and the process of confessionalism activated in the seventeenth century. In his study of Descartes’ use of Euclid to derive a “certain methodology,” Stephen Toulmin grounds Descartes’ search for “certainty” within the religious turmoil of the confessional seventeenth century, the Thirty Years War and the crises around religion, faith and politics. As Toulmin argues, “Writing as he did, at the low point in the Thirty Years’ War, Descartes had good reason to understand the damage that the intellectual divisions in Christianity had done to humanity, and he dreamed of an ideal *method*, giving a knowledge that could transcend these divisions.”

31 Descartes “hoped that a rational method would provide a certainty that circumvented religious oppositions.”

32 Like Descartes’ “ideal method,” with his use of four different languages (Italian, German, French and Dutch) and a legible presentation of lessons through grids and text, van de Passe presents a pedagogical method to transcend divisions. His opening title page celebrates the draftsmen of Utrecht, united in their pursuit of art regardless of confession. As in Descartes’ search for a “certain method” (and use of Euclidean geometry to attain this method), van de Passe attempts to outline a methodology for drawing, establishing the art of draftsmanship as a science

---

The Artis Apellae liber makes no professions of the “science” of drawing and the importance of Euclid or geometry. In contrast, the work shows the breaking of the Eucharistic bread (fig. 41), hands in prayer (fig. 42), bodies in prayer (Fig. 43, 44), and Holy Families (fig. 45). Bloemaert’s opening lesson (fig. 46) displays the organs that van de Passe himself says can be understood only through practice, experience and gheest. Van de Passe grounds drawing in geometry. Bloemaert founds drawing in daily practice, the individual artist rooted in seeing, hearing, smelling and touching the world.

Nevertheless, the methodologies of Descartes and Bloemaert share a common foundation. Before his “geometric turn,” Descartes was schooled by the Jesuits at La Flèche and, as many scholars have argued, remained indebted to this education for the structure of his Meditations (1641). This discourse about the role of eyes to see, ears to hear, noses to smell, tongues to taste, skin to feel and hands to grasp, fundamental to Bloemaert’s final artistic project the Artis Apellae liber, belongs to a seventeenth-century tradition that explored the role of the senses and knowledge. This sensory discourse guided many seventeenth-century projects, from the meditations of Ignatius of Loyola (1491-1556) and his Spiritual Exercises (1522-1524) to René Descartes (1596-1650) and his Meditations (1641). The seventeenth century in Europe has been described as a time

---

offering varieties of “spiritual exercises” for “reforming one’s self and one’s knowledge.”  

Both Descartes and Ignatius explored the sensory as a tool for meditation and for mental exercises to acquire habits and knowledge. For Ignatius, his spiritual exercises establish themselves within the sensorial experience of the world. In an exercise on the Nativity, the exercant is asked to use the “five senses of the imagination.” The contemplator sees Joseph, Mary and the Christ Child; hears the words uttered; smells and tastes “the infinite fragrance and sweetness of the Divinity, of the soul, and of its virtues, and of all, according to the person who is being contemplated.” Finally, the devotee is asked to touch, “to embrace and kiss the places where such persons put their feet and sit.” The devotee visualizes Joseph, Mary and the Christ Child at the manger, hears the words passed between Joseph and Mary (perhaps the cries of the Christ Child), smells and tastes the odors and fragrances emanating from the Child in the manger, and touches the feet and hands of the newborn, as though the contemplator was present at the Nativity as a shepherd. In Ignatius’s system, the meditator ascends towards Christ through the

---


35 Jones argues that Descartes finally turns to geometry as a “spiritual exercise” to cultivate himself. Jones, “Geometry as Spiritual Exercise,” *The Good Life*, 15-54. The dialectic between the sensory and the geometric as embodied in the work of Descartes parallels the two “types” of drawing books, one founded in geometry the other in the sensory. While these are two different methods, they nevertheless come from the same place of seeking a method to know and represent the world.

senses and through imaginatively reconstructing the material world. It is possible to read the progression of lessons within the *Artis Apellae liber* as one indebted to this Ignatian tradition. In *Lesson 2*, Bloemaert introduces the student to visual representations of the sensory organs, so that upon reaching the final compositions, such as the *Nativity* lesson (fig. 47), the pupil engages not only with his visual imagination of the manger event but also with the gaze and touch of an observer of that scene.

Similarly, Descartes opens his *Meditations* by considering the various qualities of a piece of wax—its appearances, taste, sound, smell, touch.37 He tells the reader, “Take, for example, this piece of wax; it is quite fresh, having been but recently taken from the beehive; it has not yet lost the sweetness of the honey it contained; it still retains somewhat the odor of the flowers from which it was gathered; its color, figure, size, are apparent (to the sight); it is hard, cold, easily handled; and sounds when struck upon with the finger.”38 Like Ignatius’s imaginative sensorial reconstruction, Descartes asks the reader to imagine a piece of wax, evoking its sweet flavor, its smell of flowers, its cold and hard touch, and even its sound when lightly struck. He uses this sensorial opening, however, to turn away from the sensorial body and embrace a “geometric extended body.”39 Nevertheless, Descartes begins his *Meditations* in the world of the sensory. It has been argued that Descartes’ *Meditations* in form and practice were influenced by his Jesuit education and share many similarities with Ignatius’s *Spiritual Exercises*. As

---

Catherine Wilson discusses, Descartes’ *Meditations* reversed the tradition of “religious meditatio” set by theologians. “In the upside-down Cartesian version of a meditative exercise, the Meditator withdraws from practical affairs in order to get to know himself better, and assumes a posture of suspicion with respect to his senses.” Still, Descartes’ project of “personal reform” remains grounded “among the Catholic Reformation traditions of transforming oneself through potent imaginative exercises.” It is precisely to this “Catholic Reformation” tradition of “transforming oneself” through habitual, repeated exercises that I wish to frame the *Tekenen boek*.

I am not suggesting that Bloemaert read either Ignatius’s *Exercises* or Descartes’ *Meditations*, although his knowledge of both is probable; some of Bloemaert’s most important patrons were influential Jesuit theologians and Bloemaert’s hometown Utrecht was one of the first sites in the United Netherlands to publically debate Descartes’ work. The *Artis Apellae liber* aligns with neither an Ignatian nor a Cartesian tradition,

---

41 Jones, 71.
42 Despite the fact that Bloemaert’s hometown Utrecht (with Leiden) was one of the first places to seriously debate Descartes’s philosophy in the United Netherlands, Bloemaert’s work never has been explored in relationship to Descartes’s philosophy. The point of contention in Descartes’s philosophy was his theory of matter, which refused Thomas Aquinas’s understanding of the Eucharist. Descartes defined matter as size, shape, motion and extension, which led theologians to ask how Christ is in the Eucharist by size, shape and motion? Although Descartes formulated a response within his metaphysics for the presence of Christ in the Eucharist, it was due to this definition of matter, which threatened Christ’s presence within the Eucharist, that Descartes’ *Meditations* was placed on the Index of forbidden books in 1663. On Descartes and Utrecht, see: Martin Schoock, *La querelle d’Utrecht*, ed. Theo Verbeek (Paris: Les impressions nouvelles, 1988); Theo Verbeek, *Descartes and the Dutch: Early Reactions to Cartesian Philosophy*, 1637-1650 (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1992); Theo Verbeek, “Le contexte néerlandais de la politique cartésienne,” *Archives de la philosophie* 53 (1990) 357-370; Theo Verbeek, “The invention of nature: Descartes and Regius,” *Descartes’ Natural Philosophy*, ed. Stephen Gaukroger, John Schuster, John Sutton (London and New York: Routledge, 2000) 149-167; Catherine Wilson, “Descartes and the corporeal mind: some implications of the Regius affair,” *Descartes’ Natural Philosophy*, 659-679; J.A. van Ruler, *The Crisis of Causality: Voetius and Descartes on God, Nature and Change* (Leiden: Brill, 1995). Within his lifetime Descartes attempted to have his philosophy accepted by the Jesuits. Finally, however, it would the Jesuit Honoré Fabri, who would first place Descartes’s work on the Index, see: William B. Ashworth, Jr. “Catholicism and Early Modern Science,” *God and Nature: Historical Essays on the Encounter between Christianity and Science*, ed. David C. Lindberg and Ronald L. Numbers (Berkeley, Los Angeles and
precisely. Nevertheless, the practice of learning to draw and the printed drawing book in
the seventeenth century belong to the tradition of printed manuals and treatises that
sought through “exercises” to cultivate, know and reform the “self.” Did Bloemaert
understand the role of the senses and meditation as means to draw away from the world
and find God, or to draw away from the world and find one’s self? This ambivalence
made the Tekenboek successful for generations of artists regardless of religious
confession. The introduction to the drawing student of the representation of the sensory
organs before lessons devoted to bodies, drapery and barely intimated landscapes may be
contextualized within the seventeenth discourses on meditation and sensory exploration,
both dependent upon the mastery of the senses and practice.

The control of the senses appears not only in meditative literature but also in
seventeenth-century art theory. In his didactic poem on artistic practice, Den Grondt
(1604), Karel van Mander alludes to the necessity of mastering the senses to stimulate the
intellect: “The senses disperse themselves like the hunting hounds who devoured the
flesh of their master for food . . . So is many a good spirit seduced in youth by this blind
god of desire and consumed in flames.”43 Here van Mander refers to the hunter who
becomes the hunted in the famous myth of Actaeon, a hunter whom Artemis turned into a

London: University of California Press, 1986) 136-166. For the discussion of Descartes’s writings on
matter and the Eucharist, see: Steven M. Nadler, “Arnauld, Descartes and Transubstantiation: Reconciling
Cartesian Metaphysics and Real Presence,” Journal of the History of Ideas 49.2 (1988): 229-246; Vlad
Roger Ariew, “Condemnations of Cartesianism: The Extension and Unity of the Universe,” Descartes and
the Last Scholastics (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1990) 155-171; Roger Ariew,
“Descartes and the Jesuits of La Flèche: The Eucharist,” Descartes and the Last Scholastics, 140-154; J.R.
Armogathe, Theologia cartesiana: L’explication physique de l’Eucharistie chez Descartes et dom
Desgabets (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1977); Julian Bourg, “The Rhetoric of Modal Equivocacy in
43 “De Sinnen als Honden ter lacht verstroyen, / Die haer Meesters vleys voor spijse verslinden…” Karel
van Mander, Der Grondt, 1:62. This is also why drawing became a popular activity for the cultivated
gentleman, from Castiglione to Goethe drawing was considered necessary for le bon sens, see: Kemp,
Zeichen und Zeichenunterricht.
Stag. Unable to recognize their master’s metamorphosis, Actaeon’s own hounds devour him. In using the myth, van Mander suggests that unless the student learns to control the senses, he will be consumed by their perceptions. Through learning to draw, the student masters his senses and acquires a reasoned imagination.

Interwoven throughout van Mander’s didactic poem on painting are not only artistic instructions but also instructions for how to lead a good life. Perhaps under the influence of the revival of Stoicism, as seen in the works of Justus Lipsius and dialogues such as Lipsius’s *On Constancy* (1584), van Mander instructs the youth “to do good” in order to “combat sorrow.” Like one of the speakers in Lipsius’s *On Constancy*, van Mander was forced to flee his home in the Spanish Low Countries. Van Mander’s exhortation to the student to “do good” in order to “combat sorrow” has echoes beyond a moral platitude, when seen in the context of the seventeenth century and the struggles of many intellectuals, thinkers, theologians (and artists) to mediate the sorrow wrought on the European continent by the religious wars.

The connection between Descartes, Ignatius and Bloemaert is an approach to study that is dependent upon self-examination, active participation, and the intertwining faculties of memory and intellect. But the philosophy of meditative literature in the

---

44 Van Mander, *Der Grondt*, 1:64. “Om weldoen cannet niet te vroech aenvatten, / Noch om qualijck doen niet te langh ghetoeven, / Alst wel gheluckt, sonder ditten oft datten, / Soo is teen dinghen boven alle schatten, / Den rustelijcksten staet teghen t’bedroeven.”

seventeenth century has another side that has not been explored in relationship to artistic pedagogy. The other side of meditation is a necessary auto-didacticism. As one scholar describes the foundation of Descartes’ method, it is not a “class-room subject of instruction” but an action that “nobody can really begin to understand it except by being induced to indulge in the actual exercise of it, by grappling with the problems under the guidance and help of a more experienced thinker, but, nevertheless, in the last resort, thinking the problems out for himself.” While this may seem obvious as an approach to philosophical thinking, it has not been considered evident as a way to approach the pedagogy of drawing.

In his presentation of the drawing book without didactic texts and line-by-line instruction, Bloemaert suggests that one can learn drawing only by struggling with it. As the master behind the designs, Bloemaert guides the student, but the process leaves the student alone. The premise of retreat and solitude is a necessary starting point for Descartes, Ignatius and Bloemaert, whether it is the imposed exile of Descartes in Holland, the necessary removal from the worldly world by the exorcant in Ignatius’s


Exercises, or the solitary space of the artist’s studio. The Artis Apellae liber aligns the process of drawing with the process of meditation.⁴⁷

The Tekenboek, in its status as a work within the workshop, engages with the necessity of concentrated, repetitive copying, guided by Abraham’s and Frederick’s designs, but ultimately propelled by the student. The Tekenboek also introduces the other tenets of meditative practice, examining sensory perception in order to control the senses, not to be consumed by them. The Bloemaert’s Tekenboek examines the possibilities of drawing as a means of analysis and self-revelation, presenting exercises for the pupil to analyze and to master the progression and reception of sensory knowledge.

⁴⁷Margaret Deutsch Carroll has drawn analogies between Rembrandt’s process of printmaking and Protestant devotional seventeenth-century poetry, specifically John Donne: Margaret Deutsch Carroll, “Rembrandt as Meditational Printmaker,” The Art Bulletin 63.4 (1981): 585-610. Walter Melion also has considered the process of Hendrick Goltzius’s printmaking in relationship to devotional meditation, see: Walter S. Melion, “The Meditative Function of Hendrick Goltzius’s Life of the Virgin of 1593-94,” Image and Imagination of the Religious Self in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe, ed. Reindert L. Falkenberg, Walter S. Melion and Todd M. Richardson. (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2003): 397-426; “Self-Imaging and the Engraver’s Virtù: Hendrick Goltzius’s Pietà of 1598.” Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek 46 (1995): 104-43; “Cordis circumcisio in spiritu: Imitation and the Wounded Christ in Hendrick Goltzius’s Circumcision of 1594,” Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek 52 (2001): 31-77. Based upon an understanding of meditation “as the soul’s action of image-making,” Melion particularly understands Goltzius’s process as one of protean imitation. Just as Goltzius attempts to pictorialize the Life of the Virgin through the manieras of different artists (Dürer, Bassano, etc.), it pushes upon the viewer to engrave or pictorialize (imitate) their own soul in the image of God. Although Melion focuses upon Goltzius’s own work and process within the rubric of meditation, he still understands Goltzius’s work as a final object of vision to be meditated upon. In contrast, the Bloemaert’s Tekenboek is a guide to a process of drawing rather than an object solely to be viewed.
The *Artis Apellae liber* is a book. It is folio size (large), measuring 183 x 152 mm. It contains between 100-160 engraved drawing lessons, one lesson a page. A bound collection of images, the work is at once a practical item for the workshop and a valuable object for the collector. The exact number of lessons and their organization varies according to the edition, changing its form and content at the hands of different editors and publishers. After the opening title page of a young draftsman drawing in the studio (fig. 1), the lessons unfold. First, the artist Abraham Bloemaert displays sensory organs (eyes, ears, noses), then limbs, faces, nudes and finally, mythological and religious compositions.

The printed drawing book originates in the pen and ink drawings by Bloemaert and the copper plates engraved by his son Frederick. The larger context of ink, paper, copper, leather and binding cannot be overlooked when considering the *Artis Apellae liber* as a work. Bloemaert’s drawings for the *Artis Apellae liber* are in the collection of the Fitzwilliam Museum of Cambridge, while the copper plates engraved by Frederik have been lost. Subsequent editions of the *Artis Apellae liber*, throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, depended upon the survival of the copper plates engraved by Frederik. Although today images proliferate across backlit screens, digitally reproduced seemingly ad infinitum, the physical, material constitution of the *Artis Apellae liber* would have been inherent to its preciousness both to the people involved in making it and to the individuals who utilized it.
Not only Abraham and Frederik were involved in the construction of the *Artis Apellae liber*. Also necessary to the creation of a printed book were the publishers, artisans of the printing house, craftsmen, apothecaries, booksellers and other anonymous tradesmen. The early-modern book may be seen as a “circulation of matter, a circulation that involved an extraordinary diversity of labors.” The paper came from the laborious collection of cloth rags and linen, which were macerated to form a pulp; the color of the paper taking on the shade of the cloth and water that went into its making. The recipe for ink contained linseed oil, onion, distilled turpentine (rosin), oxidized lead (litharge) and other culinary and naturally toxic materials. Before the utilization of lye was widespread, artisans used urine to clean the leather inking balls (the implement for the application of ink to the type). Although today its afterlives extend into microform, catalogue raisonés, and image databases, integral to the *Artis Apellae liber* is its madeness as a physical object, taking up space in the workshop, library, and collector’s cabinet. Moreover, the printed book must be understood as a collaborative project, the partnership between draftsman and engraver, engraver and publisher, publisher and artisans of the printing house.

The printed drawing book as a “collaborative matrix” points to the complexities of early-modern authorship. While the *Tekenboek*, as the *Artis Apellae liber* is also called, may present Bloemaert’s *maniera*—the traces of Bloemaert’s drawing habits and

51 Here, I draw from de Grazia and Stallybrass, who discuss the necessity of rethinking Shakespeare “in relation to our new knowledge of collaborative writing, collaborative printing, and the historical contingencies of textual production.” De Grazia and Stallybrass, “Materiality,” 279.
practice—it bears the remains of countless other efforts that went into its creation. The first edition of the *Artis Apellae liber* most likely appeared after Bloemaert’s death in 1651, published by Frederik. As a testament to Bloemaert’s workshop, draftsmanship and pedagogy, the drawing book extended Bloemaert’s influence as a draftsman and pedagogue beyond his own life. Nevertheless, as will be seen, the *Artis Apellae liber* (as a material book) also takes part in a discourse that explores the relationship between the materiality of the book as a metaphor for the body’s own finite form.

**The Title Page**

Surrounded by both famous and anonymous faces, limbs, and torsos, a young draftsman, with stylus and sketchbook in hand, gazes up at a reclining nude figure (fig. 1). Raking light—the heavily raised white page of the chiaroscuro print—brings the draftsman and the sculptural figure of his attention into relief. This space (the studio) and this medium (chiaroscuro) are the means by which Abraham and Frederick Bloemaert introduce their drawing book. Against the table on which the reclining male nude rests, leans a muscular torso with its back to the viewer. Its truncated form echoes the famous Belvedere Torso, the Antique fragment found in Rome in the fifteenth century that became a source of inspiration for artists such as Michelangelo (1475-1564) and Hendrick Goltzius (1558-1617). In the shadows of the foreground, the head of a woman with empty eye sockets faces the viewer. A woman’s torso, a muscular leg, a curled hand with protruding veins, a foot and an animal’s skull all hang from the studio’s wall, ready to be taken down and studied or inserted into a composition.
The central reclining nude figure recalls the antique Marforio and Michelangelo’s allegorical sculptures from the Medici chapel at San Lorenzo, casts of which Bloemaert had in his workshop. Although the drawing book’s title page cites casts of famous works like the Belvedere Torso and Michelangelo’s San Lorenzo nudes, Bloemaert filled the studio for *A Young Draftsman* with the engraved torsos, heads and limbs that also proliferated in early-modern prints and printed drawing books. This composition introduces the figures and parts that will be pictured in drawing lessons throughout the rest of the book. No longer hanging on the wall or posed on the floor, the following plates in the *Artis Apellae liber* are composed of fragmented limbs, expressive faces and nude bodies, harmoniously placed on the page. Like a primary-school text on Grammar, the lessons are structured around building faces and bodies from parts, just as a student learns to construct sentences by first memorizing the alphabet. The lessons begin with the eyes, ears, mouths, noses, arms and hands, legs and feet and work towards facial and bodily expression.

As discussed in the introduction, this model of printed drawing book developed out of the drawing books made by Northern Italian engravers. In the wake of the reformation of the Catholic Church, artists such as the Carracci sought to redefine the role of painting in religion and daily life, following the critique of images in the liturgy and ritual of the Catholic Church. The *Artis Apellae liber*’s engravings reproduce a cast of characters, physiognomies and silhouettes that cite types coming from the “Carracci”

---

52 In the North, the reclining statue was a popular mode of representation associated with Michelangelo’s work in Rome, particularly the reclining nudes for the grave monument in San Lorenzo (1520-1534). The reclining figures also echo the famous reclining Roman statuary such as the Marforio, drawn by Maarten van Heemskerk (1498-1574) and Hendrick Goltzius (1558-1617) during their Roman sojourns. Another Netherlander, Cornelis Cort (1533-1578) completed widely-distributed engravings of Michelangelo’s monument in San Lorenzo. Although Bloemaert never went to Italy, the Utrecht humanist Arnoldus Buchelius reports that Bloemaert kept in his studio casts made by Hendrik Goltzius of the San Lorenzo sculptures. Roethlisberger, *Abraham Bloemaert*, 44-45.
drawing books, similar faces and heads appearing in books from Venice to Utrecht.\textsuperscript{53} 

With an absence of text or didactic instruction, these books present the maniera of a specific artist, thereby making the stock figures of a workshop available to a wider public, while disseminating a master’s style.

For beginning apprentices or novice draftsmen, printed drawing books on the Carracci model provided types for the student to copy. In drawing from these printed books, apprentices followed the early-modern pedagogical model: first draw from prints and other artists’ drawings, then from sculpture, then after life, and finally, from the imagination. As printed drawing books travelled throughout Europe, from printing house to artist’s workshop, publishers and engravers recompiled and republished these popular figures, pirating “Carracci” lessons for new drawing book compilations. The Diagraphia (fig. 48) printed in Amsterdam by Jan Janssonius (1588-1664) in 1616, made widely available stock characters and lessons from the Italian books: profiles, bearded men, hands lifting cloth, fingers holding styluses, swinging feet, children’s faces, studies of women crowned either with rings of braided hair or cloth, and the iconic fragment—the Belvedere Torso.

Claes Jan Visscher (1587-1652) republished Luca Ciamberlano (an engraver of printed drawing books in the tradition of the Carracci) and his work in Fundamentales regulae artis pictoriae et sculpt in 1640 (fig. 49) Fondamenten der teyckenkonst in 1651

(fig. 50) and *Lucidissimum speculum* (n.d.).⁵⁴ Again, variations on the same lessons and figures from the body parts to the facial types are assembled. Visscher’s 1640 edition of the *Fundamentales* makes clear the relationship between Bloemaert and the Carracci tradition of the printed drawing book, for Visscher includes a lesson designed by Bloemaert in this compendia dedicated to Carracci studies. The inclusion of Bloemaert’s draftsmanship (fig. 51) within a drawing book named after the Carracci also points to the collaborative structure of the early-modern printed drawing book. Emerging from the workshop and the early drawing academies, the early-modern printed drawing book takes part in a pan-European dialogue among artists about *how* to teach drawing in print.

This lesson—designed by Bloemaert and printed by Visscher in a compilation devoted to the Carracci—composes two studies of a female head with a spiraled braid, a young man looking down, a bare breast, hands cupping a staff and fingers fingering and grasping cloth. (This lesson also appears in the *Artis Apellae liber*). Arranging the disparate parts, Bloemaert provides suggestions of narrative. He takes the common models of the printed drawing book (heads, hands and cloth) and re-imagines them into an almost-composition. From his play among hair and hands, gazing and caressing, Bloemaert provides the parts for an Arcadian love story, the desires of shepherds and shepherdesses. Visscher’s inclusion of this lesson within his *Fundamentales* indicates Bloemaert’s engagement with the tradition of the printed drawing book that emerged from Italy in the beginning of the seventeenth century and also underscores the importance of looking at printed drawing books as collaborative projects, whose contents depended upon dialogues among artists, printing houses and publishers; Visscher’s

---

⁵⁴ Those engraved by Luca Ciamberlano are often under the title of *Scuola Perfetta per imparare a Disegnare tutto il corpo Humano* (published throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth century). See Bartsch XVII.
Fundamentales originated in engravings by Luca Ciamberlano, inspired by the workshop drawings of Agostino Carracci. When Visscher reprinted Ciamberlano’s studies in the Dutch Republic, he also included the lesson of a “local” drawing master—Bloemaert—bringing together in a single compilation the workshop studies of several masters, engravers and draftsmen.

From Fialetti’s Il vero modo to Visscher’s Fundamentales to the Bloemaerts’ Artis Apellae liber, the same models of dismembered and remembered bodies and parts are pictured. The Artis Apellae liber, however, is unusual in its playful presentation and juxtapositions among faces, hands, drapery, breasts, cloth, skin, youth and age, hair and gazes. On the one hand, the construction of bodies from parts has been interpreted as an attempt to build a common artistic language. Just as a student’s grammar primer begins with letters, so the printed drawing book begins with lines and fragments from which the student builds compositions or “sentences.” While these books offer lessons based upon a pedagogy of copying, the Artis Apellae liber through its unexpected compositions complicates the pupil’s process of rote, repetitive mimicry.

The Artis Apellae liber, again in the opening chiaroscuro A Young Draftsman, states its debt not only to the canonical Belvedere and Marforio casts that were part of the artist’s studio but also to the tradition of printed drawing books such as Il vero modo, De excellentia, Diagraphia and the later Fundamentales (and all the editions in between). Figures such as the Belvedere torso proliferated in artists’ workshops not only through sculptural casts but also through these printed drawing books. The leg, the foot and the hand suspended from the studio’s wall echo the fragments in Northern drawing book compilations. Presenting an artist’s studio constructed imaginatively from both the two-
dimensional medium of print and the sculptural casts that dominated the workshop, *A Young Draftsman* suggests that the space of the studio is not only a physical location. The artist’s studio may also be found in the Bloemaerts’ *Tekenboek* and the relationship between the student and the book.

Most representations of the early-modern artist’s workspace capture the community of the workshop and the enterprise of many artisans collaborating under one roof. From Fialetti’s depiction of a workshop in *Il vero modo* (fig. 52) to Pier Francesco Alberti’s *Academia d’Pitori* (fig. 53), these etchings show the multiple activities in the workshop. Pier Francesco Alberti’s engraving contains an encyclopedia of pedagogical methods: geometry, architecture, sketching from sculpture, learning from anatomy and dissection. In the corner of the workshop, a young boy displays to his master a rudimentary drawing of eyes. The apprentice would have made this drawing by copying from books such as *Il vero modo*.

Bloemaert, however, represents a different artist’s workspace than the collaborative environment of Pier Francesco Alberti’s and Fialetti’s representations of the workshop. The chiaroscuro introducing the *Artis Apellae liber* pictures not the workshop but the artist’s studio. The studio, different from the *bottega* or workshop, was a separate and solitary area in which the artist worked alone.\(^5\) Carlo Ridolfi (1594-1658), writing about Tintoretto (1518-1594), designates the studio as a place of solitary retirement for intensive study from sculpture:

Most of the time when he [Tintoretto] was painting, he would retire to his studio, located in the most remote part of the house, where he undertook tasks that required keeping the light burning at all times, in order for them to be clearly

visible. By this I mean he spent the hours destined for rest amid infinity of reliefs, composing, through the working of models, the inventions he was to carry out in his works.  

Engaging with the solitary space of the studio as described by Ridolfi, *A Young Draftsman* shifts the conception of the studio from a place that was not only a physical site but also an imaginary place constructed through print and the lapidary-like figures that were passed around in prints, drawings and printed drawing books. Just as Tintoretto retired to the studio to “rest amid an infinity of reliefs,” so the young draftsman sits alone. Amid an “infinity of reliefs,” the student works alone. The solitude of the studio becomes mirrored in the relationship between the student and the printed drawing book. Like Tintoretto or the young draftsman resting amid the sculptural fragments, the user of the manual engages in a solitary practice, apart from the workshop. Unlike the illustration of a *bottegha* in Fialletti’s printed drawing book, the Bloemaerts’ studio takes on the question of the solitary enterprise grounded upon the engagement between reader and print, draftsman and drawing book.

**The Body of the Text**

The study of chiaroscuro constituted artists’ earliest training. Chiaroscuro—from the words *chiaro* for light and *scuro* for darkness—analyzes representation through the movement of lights and shadows on surfaces, thereby bringing the world into relief. The sparse writings on Northern artistic practice show that looking at objects and bodies in terms of light and shadow guided the beginning stages of pedagogy. In his chapter on

---

draftsmanship (Teyckenkonst), the theorist and painter Karel van Mander devotes attention to the importance of copying chiaroscuro prints from an early stage. As opposed to the linear outlines of black-and-white engraving, chiaroscuro prints capture the world’s surfaces through variations of tonal values, teaching students to see in light and shadow. According to van Mander, Parmigianino (1503-1540) was an exemplar to copy:

Good prints with ground tints and effective highlights have opened the eyes of many a mind; so for those of the renowned Parmigianino and others. Thus, in order to be fruitful in art, graft your spirit to such lots. Or work after something good in a plaster cast, and note well how you bring up the lights; because the highlights truly converse with their little words.57

Van Mander continues to emphasize the importance of chiaroscuro to the early stages of artistic pedagogy. In the biography of Bartholomeus Spranger (1546-1611), one of the formative figures in Northern Mannerism, van Mander relates how Spranger learned to draw from the chiaroscuro prints of Frans Floris (1517-1570) and Parmigianino: “[Spranger] used only charcoal and chalk copying the prints of Parmigianino and Floris on blue paper for the sake of liveliness, furthermore he tried, with highlights and shadows.”58 As van Mander stresses, the examination of light and shadow—often by applying charcoal or chalk on blue paper—organized the early stages of drawing pedagogy. In order to draw in the dramatically lit studio (amid an infinity of reliefs), students needed to ground the beginning of their practice in the study of lights and shadows, seeing the world through tonal contrasts.

57 “Fraey printe n met gronden, en hooghsels cluchtich / Hebben menigh gheest zijn ooghen ontsloten, / Gheleijck daer zijn die van Parmens gheruchtich, / En ander, dus om zijn Consten vruchtich, / Begrefftijt uwen gheest met sulcke loten, / Of doet nae yet fraeys van plaister ghegoten, / En merckt op de daghen wel in het legghen: / Want de hooghsels vry al mede wat segghen.” Van Mander, Der Grondt, 2:12.

The combination of lights and darks and an outline form the basis for the chiaroscuro print made by Frederik for *A Young Draftsman*. First Frederik laid down the outline of the image with a metal plate for the contour. Then Frederik applied several wooden blocks (each with a slightly different shade) in order to bring the image into relief. Indeed this was the same chiaroscuro method used by Parmigianino. The chiaroscuro technique applies multiple blocks to a single image in order to build up different gradations of tonal value. There is one block that gives the contours to the image (for *A Young Draftsman* a metal engraved plate gives the first definition of line), and then a series of other wooden blocks, printed on top of the original contour line, enhance form through a series of tonal fluctuations. Often the paper itself plays an important role as the background emerges into sculptural relief from the pressure of the woodblock.59

Using the chiaroscuro print, which van Mander describes as crucial to the early-stages of drawing pedagogy, Frederik embeds within the material process of the opening title page the “type” of pedagogic print a young apprentice should study. The title page, therefore, formally introduces the student to the studio and announces how a draftsman should view the world—through the movement of light and shadow on exterior surfaces. Chiaroscuro prints capture the tension between the two-dimensional work on paper and the three-dimensional sculptural form. They realize the study of light and shadow through

the physical force of the woodblock that stamps minor but significant relief into two-dimensional forms. Abraham and Frederik employ chiaroscuro to imagine the threshold space of the studio. Their choices suggest that the study of both sculptural bodies and drawn bodies in the “paper studio” of the printed drawing book guide studio practice.

Abraham and Frederik’s book contains six other chiaroscuro prints, including: *A Saint in Prayer* (fig. 54) *Caritas* (fig. 55) *Mother and Child* (fig. 56), *Variations on the Three Graces* (fig. 57), *Holy Family* (fig. 58) and an *Angel Smiting the People* (fig. 59). Although the Bloemaerts use chiaroscuro to commence their drawing lessons—to realize the three-dimensional space of the artist’s studio in two-dimensional print—the rest of their chiaroscuros are devoted to religious or allegorical subjects. With *A Young Draftsman*, Bloemaert and son introduce the necessity of studying the world through examining tonal gradations—the relief—of bodies and sculpture, a pedagogy stressed by van Mander in *Den Grondt*. Yet the closing chiaroscuro to the *Prima Pars* of the *Artis Apellae liber* suggests that light in drawing practice aids not only in observation of the world but also in grasping the metaphysical. Like bookends, the two chiaroscuros framing the first section of the *Artis Apellae liber* hold two different understandings of light and shadow in artistic practice: one physical and the other metaphysical. Bloemaert and Frederik begin their *Tekenboek* with a draftsman in the studio and conclude the first twenty lessons (the *Prima Pars*) with a chiaroscuro of a saint genuflecting in prayer (fig. 34). The kneeling figure gazes away from the book on his lectern to light falling from an outside source. Both the young draftsman and the saint are isolated, excluding themselves from the world to study—either sculpture or scripture. The young draftsman uses the studio to consider shifting light on surfaces of bodies and things. The saint, on the other
hand, does not manipulate light but waits for light to be bestowed on him as grace. Although both the student of the drawing book and the saint initiate their studies in solitude through the book, both will finally put down the book. The drawing student—once he has become a master—can draw from the intellect (uyt den gheest). In turn, the saint looks away from his book, once grace as light touches his body.

The chiaroscuro prints in the Bloemaerts’ *Tekenboek* put into play two different types of light (one metaphysical, one material). The use of chiaroscuro to suggest a metaphysical light and to draw analogies between artistic and devotional practice may be seen not only in the Bloemaerts’ drawing book but also in the work of their contemporary Crispijn van de Passe and his *Light der teken en schilderkonst* (1643). Like the Bloemaerts, van de Passe also includes chiaroscuro woodcuts of figures in prayer, (figs. 60, 61, 62, 63). Although the *Tekenboek* diverges from the pedagogy and presentation of van de Passe’s book (as discussed in the introduction), both include chiaroscuro woodcuts of figures in prayer. While van de Passe states his debt to Vignola, grounding drawing in Euclidean geometry and textual instruction, Bloemaert omits lines, points, circles, triangles and text. Nevertheless, both include chiaroscuros of saints in prayer. In one of van de Passe’s chiaroscuros, a saint opens his arms in ecstasy, receiving a light from the sky (fig. 62). In another image, a female saint turns away from the book in her lap to look towards the light emanating from clouds (fig. 63). As in the *Artis Apellae liber*, van de Passe includes images of saints in ecstasy, saints turning away from the book to look upon the metaphysical light outside of the printed text.

Although he includes the devotional woodcuts within his drawing book, van de Passe never discusses them in his accompanying text. In his instructions on how to sketch...
highlights and shadows for drapery, van de Passe writes: “If someone wants to dress an image with cloth, it is extremely important that he first on gray or light-blue paper, or something similar, makes an outline.” The use of light-blue or gray paper (the same on which van de Passe prints his chiaroscuros) provides the ground for the study of light and shadow. Van de Passe’s instructions repeat van Mander’s advice to the young draftsman to study from chiaroscuros and use paper with a tonal background. Van de Passe goes on to tell his students that it is “necessary to have a room with a window that receives a Northern light.” Nevertheless, all the windows pictured in van de Passe’s manual remain closed. Stressing the manipulation of light to illuminate objects, van de Passe includes an illustration of drawing a male nude in the workshop. In his illustration, the draftsmen sit around a Jupiter-like figure within a darkened and enclosed space (fig. 64). The windows are shut, no natural light may enter; a star-shaped lantern hanging from the ceiling allows the students to study the male figure. Although this is the workshop, (as opposed to the solitary space of the studio), the drawing students gather in an isolated space—closed off from the world—to study the surfaces of the model through the manipulation of light.

Although van de Passe emphasizes light from a “Northern window” for workshop practice, his actual illustrations of drawing practice point to the use of artificial illumination. In his engraving of sketching from the male model, the windows are closed and candlelight illuminates the body. It is in his studies of saints in prayer, who turn

---

towards the “light of grace,” that van de Passe pictorializes the “light from a Northern window.” The most famous example of this metaphysical “Northern light” is Jan van Eyck (1395-1441) and his Berlin Madonna (1425), in which the light streams through the Northern window, illumining the Virgin’s body (fig. 65). As Panofsky argues, van Eyck paints the light through the North window because that is the “superessential light that illumines the City of God, the Light Divine disguised as the light of day.” Van de Passe discusses “light from a Northern window” as necessary to drawing practice, and yet his illustrations of the workshop and studio show artificial illumination. Nevertheless, both Bloemaert and van de Passe introduce a “superessential light” in their chiaroscuros. Although both Bloemaert and van de Passe ground drawing practice in the study of light and dark (chiaroscuro), formed by the artificial illumination of the studio and the workshop, both intimate another brilliance.

The Illuminated Image

Beyond the Artis Apellae liber, Bloemaert’s engagement with the relationship between the book and the reader as a site for devotion and seclusion exhibits itself in his only known portrait (fig. 66), of the early-modern theologian Thomas à Kempis (1380-1471). One of the founders of the Devotio moderna tradition, Kempis wrote a foundational text for early-modern devotional practice, De imitatione Christi (1418). This work leads the reader from the outer world into the interior worlds of contemplation. As Kempis instructs his reader: “Strive, therefore, to turn away thy heart from the love of the

---

things that are seen, and to set it upon the things that are not seen.” The *Devotio moderna* movement and Kempis bridge the confessional divides of later centuries. Kempis’s writings influenced both the theologians of the Calvinist Church and the reform of the Catholic Church, as may seen in the work of Philippus Rovenius, the Vicar Apostolic (the Roman Catholic Church representative) of Utrecht during Bloemaert’s lifetime.\(^6^2\)

The continuing influence of Kempis for both Catholics and Protestants demonstrates that the inward movement to a personal piety based upon an individual’s relationship to Christ crossed confessional divides. As Kempis’s writing stresses, one does not need the mediation of the church or the priest to find divine knowledge. In the face of the crisis of the Catholic Church and its ministry in the Netherlands, popular Catholic devotional prayer books proliferated. This particular form of devotion is grounded in the “interior life,” an interiorization complemented by the act of reading. Kempis writes: “Christ’s beauty and glory are interiorly experienced and it is within you that he delights to be. He frequently visits the man who loves the interior life.”\(^6^4\) Reading is a necessary means to the “interior life.” Just as Kempis instructs his reader on how to pray, Kempis tells his reader how to read: “Therefore we ought to read books which are devotional and simple, as well as those which are deep and difficult.”\(^6^5\) For Kempis, one should not utilize books to know but to wonder: “Our own curiosity often hindereth us in the reading of holy writings, which we seek to understand and discuss, where we should pass simple on. If thou wouldst profit by thy reading, read humbly, simple, honestly, and

---

not desiring to win a character for learning.”

The importance of printed books as means to retire from the world and seek the “interior life” becomes the framing structure for Bloemaert’s portrait of Kempis, a portrait grounded in the relationship between reading and devotion.

In his portrait, Bloemaert imagines “the man who loves the interior life.” He places Kempis alone, in a tightly enclosed space, surrounded by books. The theologian holds an open book; behind him sits a pile of books. A book stands upright on the floor, propped open with an inscription, part in Latin and part in Dutch: “Above and in all, my soul always rests in the Lord, found it nowhere save ‘in a nook with a book’” (in een hoecxken met een boecxken). Next to Kempis, a scroll unfurls with the words: “Nowhere is there secure peace aside from the cell, the codex, the convent.” The Kempis portrait contextualizes more than just interior and personal devotion. It depicts the integral relationship between the individual and the book for the Kempian tradition. Kempis instructs his reader on the practice of reading, as it is an integral part of the “interior life.”

Bloemaert explores the theme of retiring to a nook with a book within his own *Tekenboek*, presenting the book as a tool in his representation of the *Young Draftsman* and in the *Saint in Prayer*. Bloemaert also designed lessons that display *the book in a nook*. In the *Artis Apellae liber*, Bloemaert includes two lessons imagining women engaged in the interior practice of reading. In one lesson (fig. 67), a Mary-like figure sits alone. Crowned by a halo of light, her eyes look down at the book in hands. In the other lesson (fig. 68), a woman sits on a hillock with her dog, cradling a book in her hands.

Although separate in the *Artis Apellae liber*, these two engravings act as pendants. While one lesson overtly stresses the devotional nature of reading, the other speaks to the role of

---

reading in daily life. Both explore the role of the book as a means to solitude. The *book in a nook* extends beyond the devotional act of reading to the moment of quiet that the woman finds in the countryside with her canine companion.

The phrase *in a nook with a book* also appears in a collection of Kempis’s writings, published by the Amsterdam Catholic publishing house of Pieter Jacobsz. Paets (1587-c.1657). In Paets’s edition of Kempis’s *The Dialogue of the Soul with God* (*Die alleen-spraecke der zielen met Godt*), the title page shows a Mary and Christ Child enthroned and before them Kempis kneels in prayer (fig. 69). Bridging the City of God (Mary and the Christ Child) and the City of Man (Kempis), a book lies open on the ground, its pages revealing the words *in een hoecken met een boecken*. Engraved by Christoffel van Sichem II (1581-1658) for the printing house of Paets, popular works such as this Kempian treatise show the typical mediation of the devotional book in prayer (*in a nook with a book*). Indeed, the Paets printing house printed not only Kempis’s works but also Bloemaert’s.

The Paets family ran one of the largest Catholic printing houses in Amsterdam, republishing devotional works that had been first published in Antwerp, Cologne and other important Catholic centers. Working with the woodcutter Christoffel van Sichem II, a member of the Reformed Church, the Paets printing house recycled popular devotional works into new compilations, including one of Bloemaert’s devotional print series, the *Sacra Eremus* (1612/1619), engraved by Boëtius Bolswert (1585-1633). Bloemaert’s designs of fifty-two hermits and hermitesses—the *Sacra Eremus Ascetarum*

---

67 Lienke Paulina Leuven, *De Boekhandel te Amsterdam door katholieke gedreven tijdens de Republiek* (Epe: Hooiberg, 1951) 12.
and *Sacra Eremus Ascertarium* (fig. 70)—illustrated the book *‘t Bosch der eremyten ende eremittinnen, van Aegypten ende Palestinen* (fig. 71) with texts citing events from the lives of the desert saints written by the Jesuit Heribert Rosweyde (1569-1629). ^69_

Although the first two editions of the *Sacra Eremus* were printed in Antwerp in 1612 and 1619, two later editions came out in Amsterdam in 1644 and 1645 published by Paets. The 1644 and 1645 *Sacra Eremus* was one devotional tract among many that the Paets family printed in Amsterdam in the middle of the seventeenth century. Other devotional works include: *De Passio onses Heeren Iesu Christi* (*The Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ*, 1629) with images engraved by Maarten van Heemskerck (fig. 72); *Bibels Tresoor* (*Bible’s Treasure*, 1646) [fig. 73]; *‘t Schat der zielen* (*Treasure of the Soul*, 1648) [fig. 74]; *Goddelycke Wenschen* (*Godly Wishes*, 1629/1645). Many of these treatises draw on the religious emblem book *Pia Desideria* (1624), a collection of words and images to guide prayer and meditation, written by the Jesuit Herman Hugo (1588-1629) and engraved by Boëtius Bolswert. ^70_

The Paets house compiled works such as *Bibels Tresoor* and *‘t Schat der zielen* using fragmentary quotes from the Bible, aphorisms, proverbs, theological texts by early-Church fathers and collections of images.

---

^69_ Bloemaert’s images accompany a text, which provides information regarding the ascetic’s life, feast day and recommendations for further reading. See: Roethlisberger, *Abraham Bloemaert*, 171-175. There are two “original” editions of the *Sacra Eremus*. Confusingly, the first edition (what Roethlisberger call the “original form of the whole”) was not printed until 1619. The modified second version, however, is dated to 1612. Roethlisberger, *Abraham Bloemaert*, 173, 175. Although Roethlisberger cites two editions, as may be seen from the pirating and reprinting of the early-modern printing world, the *Sacra Eremus* circulated in many different editions and compilations beyond the 1612 and 1619 editions published in Antwerp, such as the 1644 and 1645 editions published by Paets in Amsterdam and at least one edition in French, *La forest des hermites et hermitesses d’egypte et de la Palestine* (Antwerp, 1619).

taken from other sources, such as Bloemaert’s renderings of the hermits in *Sacra Eremus* and Bolswert’s engravings for the *Pia Desideria.*

Editors, engravers and publishers took on an “authorial” role, as they re-assembled, re-contextualized and reframed popular images and texts for the devotional works. In *Bibels Tresoor,* van Sichem incorporates figures from Bloemaert’s work into this new compilation, including the angel that Bloemaert designed for the title page of *Sacra Eremus.* Remaking this Bloemaertean angel for the *Bibels Tresoor,* van Sichem places below the cutout of Bloemaert’s angel a cartouche with the letters ABC and a book engraved with *Verbum Dei (the Word of God)* on its clasp (fig. 75). “What was in the beginning shall endure to the end (*Wat. Int. Beginne. Was. Sal. Tot. Het. Eynde Dueren*)” encircle the image. Beneath this small emblem is an explication: “For all the arts commotion, must finally disappear / But God and God’s Word, shall eternally exist.” The *Word,* unlike the material book, shall endure. This emblem juxtaposes an image of the book to the immaterial Word of God. The materialization of the ABC letters play against the knowledge of the *Word* that is infinite. Unlike the arts of the book, God’s Word was in the beginning and shall endure to the end; the material image contrasts with the infinite creative source of God’s Word.

As the opening text accompanying Bloemaert’s images for the *Sacra Eremus* makes clear, the corporeal form itself is a finite image of the infinite God, just as the material book is an image of the immaterial Word. Bloemaert’s engraving shows Christ tempted by the devil. The text explains the relationship between Adam and Christ,

---

71 For a list of the varying content within the Christoffel van Sichem II compilations, see: Hollstein XXVII, 45-51.
72 “Op u, en in u woort, O Godt: state my betrouwen / Ick vrage nergens na, mach ick u slechs behouwen / Want alle aerts ghewoel, moet eyndelijck vergaen / Maer Godt, en Godes Woort, sal eeuwichlick bestaen.”
temptation and the body (fig. 76). Adam, who accepted temptation, brought death. Christ, who refused temptation, brings the possibility of eternal life. The relationship between Adam’s mortality and Christ’s immortality is stressed in the form of the image that their body takes. “Adam is made from the earth . . . made towards the image of God, Christ is God’s image himself.”73 The following figures in the Sacra Eremus provide examples (both visual and textual) about saints who lived in order to bring themselves closer to God, who attempted to shape their corporeal image towards (naer) God. Through prayer, meditation, reading devotional texts, refusal of food and sex, these ascetics attempted to bring their bodies—made from the earth—closer to the Christ, who is not like God’s image but is God’s image.

Goddelycke wenschen draws further attention to the question of matter, stuff and human genesis from the earth. In one parable, Goddelycke Wenschen asks: “Remember, I beseech thee, that thou hast made me as the clay; and wilt thou bring me into dust (stof) again? (Job: 10)” (Gedenckt doch eens dat ghy my als lÿck ghemaect heeft, ended at ghy my in stof sult wederom verkeeren). In order to explore the question of dust-to-dust, the necessary decomposition of the human body, the author cites Jeremiah: 18 and the parable of the potter clay:

The word which came to Jeremiah from the LORD, saying: ‘Arise and go down to the potter’s house, and there I will cause you to hear My words.’ Then I went down to the potter’s house, and there he was, making something at the wheel. And the vessel that he made of clay was marred in the hand of the potter; so he made it again into another vessel, as it seemed good to the potter to make. Then the word of the Lord came to me saying: ‘O house of Israel, can I not do with you

73 "Adam wort geschape uyt der aerden, welleke maget was ende onbebout. Christus wort gebooren van eender maget. Adam is geschapen naer het beelt Godts, Christus is Godts beelt selfs. Adam is gestelt over alle onredelijcke dieren; Christus over al dat leven ontfange heeft. Door eene maget alle wijsheyt. De doot door den boom, het leven door het cruyce." Heribert Rosweyde, ‘t Bosch der eremyten ende eremitinnen (Antwerp, 1619).
as this potter?" says the LORD. ‘Look, as the clay is in the potter’s hand, so are you in My hand, O house of Israel!”

Accompanying this text is a crude image of an angel shaping a bust out of clay at a potter’s wheel in a workshop (fig. 77). Idol-like busts of partially formed figures line the shelves of the workshop. At the wheel, the angel’s hands shape the clay. The text and the illustration in tandem point towards not only a context for understanding the body-like vessels formed at the potter’s wheel but also for grasping the use of images (Beelden) in the book.

Despite their attention to images, these devotional books maintain an ambivalent attitude towards their illustrations because the image itself is a metaphor for the corporeal body. The body, as an image of God, is finite. Devotional books, as mere images of the Word, are finite. These devotional books bridge the finite and the infinite, the ephemeral and the eternal, the body and the soul. The ABC title page of Bibels Tresoor makes this clear in its emblem, which professes that all arts will disappear and only the Word of God shall remain. While the clay of the potter’s wheel may be remade into new forms, shapes and bodies, it nevertheless consists of the same matter. Artists, like the potter, use the same matter to reshape and reform. The devotional book presents itself as a metaphor for the body. Like the corporeal figure, the bound collection of aphorisms, texts and images will not endure. This is built into the structure of the popular devotional manual. The components of these books, their illustrations, aphorisms, and Biblical texts are like the

74 “Staet op ende gaet nederwaerts in het potbackers huys, ende daer sult ghy hooren mijne woorden. Ende ginck neder in des Pot-backers huys, ende siet, hy maeckte een wreck op een wiel, ende het vat brack dat hy maeckte van der aerden met sijn handen, ende omgekeert sijnde heeft hy daer … en ander vat ghemaeckt also het hem ghenoeghde in sijn oogen dat hy ‘t maecken soude: Ende des Heeren woort is tot my gheschier segghende, en sal ick u-lieden niet konnen ghedoen ghelijck desen Pot-backer. Siet ghelijck de Pot-aerde in des Pot-backers hant is, also zy dy in mijn hant ghys huys van Israël.” Herman Hugo, Goddeleycke wenschen (Amsterdam: Pieter Paets, 1645).
clay on the potter’s wheel. Matter will be recompiled, reformed, remade into a new bound object, a new body of work.

Van Sichem reused Bloemaert’s angel for the title page of Bibels Tresoor, a compilation of images and text founded upon the making of new books from old material. Similar to van Sichem’s appropriation of Bloemaert’s angel, the student of the Artis Apellae liber will take the images of eyes, ears, hands, legs, torsos and bodies presented by Bloemaert and remake them into his own creations. Like the angel at the potter’s wheel, the user of the Artis Apellae liber takes the “clay” of the printed drawing book to form his own figures.

Matter is the clay of the potter’s wheel; it is what remains through the building and breaking down of forms. The question of “matter” plagued early-modern philosophers. Their arguments revolved around bodies, which occupy space and are divisible (or indivisible) and present in daily life. New understandings of matter developed with the rise of Epicureanism and the printed Latin editions and vernacular translations of Lucretius’s De rerum natura, which began to appear in the 1470s.75 For Aristotelians, one could study form, matter and the soul all within the “science of

---

nature.” Aristotelian theories of matter fell short of addressing the changes in matter “known to artisans—potters, dyers, jewelers, metalworkers, druggists, and alchemists.” The changes that these artisans observed as they plied their trades fell short of an Aristotelian framework, rejected in the course of the seventeenth century in favor of a widespread commitment to the homogeneity of matter, and to the production of qualities and effects by the motion of subvisible particles.” The canonical theory of Aristotelian matter and form in the seventeenth century began to be replaced by a theory of atomists (found in the revival of Lucretius and *De rerum natura*).

I would not argue that the *Artis Apellae liber* reveals an understanding of matter that is strictly “Aristotelian” (in whatever seventeenth-century form that might mean) or atomist. What the seventeenth-century debates about matter and the rediscovery of Lucretius and *De rerum natura* reveal, however, is that artisans and artists engaged with

---

76 Wilson, *Epicureanism*, 7, 106.
79 Wilson, 49.
matter and its sensible qualities in ways that would lead to scientific revolutions. John Evelyn, famous in early-modern studies of print culture for *Sculptura: or The history, and art of chalcography and engraving in copper* (1662), was one of the first to translate Lucretius into English. In his translation of Lucretius *De rerum natura*, Evelyn writes:

“Had bodies no eternal permanence, / They would dissolve with the least violence: / But since the bands of various causes are / (Though matter permanent) dissimilar / Bodies of things are safe ’till they receive / A force with may their proper thread unweave, / Nought then return to nought, but parted fals / To Bodies of their prime Originals.”

In translating this Ancient poet of Epicurean philosophy, Evelyn raises the same questions as the devotional manuals: what is the relationship between the body and matter? For the devotional tradition, creation came from God, the first utterance of the divine Word. Here nothing comes from nothing.

Understanding Bloemaert’s printed drawing book in relationship to the other devotional treatises and other early-modern discussions of matter reveals an artist who understood matter not only as a means to making but also as a means to understand the processes of the material body itself. Artisans like Evelyn and Bloemaert worked in the physical material world—paper, ink, paint—and, in turn, meditated whether in word or image upon the relationship between matter and body. In grounding the *Artis Apellae liber* within the matter of paper and rags, ink and linseed oil, bodies bounded by earth and clay, I seek to demonstrate how insistently materially it is as a book, as well as, its inseparability from the body’s own materiality, finitude and eventual decay. As the devotional manuals assert, in the end all that remains is the Word. I would argue that this

---

focus on decay, clay and the potter’s wheel reveals an insecurity and uncertainty about the body’s own materiality, its capability of resurrection and its relationship to an infinite divine. The making of the Artis Apellae liber during a period that questioned what constituted the material world contextualizes the stakes in learning to draw the body—studying whether to apprehend form and matter impressed by divine will on the potter’s wheel or a world “where bodies freely run their course, without design, or Fate, or Force.”

The Printed Book
In his work on engraving, Evelyn defends the making of pictures, describing them as a “universal language” fundamental for a child’s education. He states that children benefit from “a kind of Encyclopedia of all intelligible, and memorable things that either are, or have ever been in rerum natura.” For Evelyn the engraver, pictures provide “the most pleasing descriptions of sensual objects, which naturally slide in their [children’s] fluid, and tender apprehensions, speedily possessing their memories, and with infinite delight, preparing them for the more profound and solid studies.” Pictures, just like texts and words, act as didactic tools. In presenting a work absent of language, Bloemaert’s Tekenboek speaks in a “universal language,” a draftsman’s Encyclopedia of organs, limbs, bodies and drapery. The foundation for education through the printed book, however, originates in a devotional tradition. For artists working with printed drawing books, aspects important to studio practice also guided the practice of asceticism:

---
82 Evelyn, Sculptura: the The history, and art of chalcography and engraving in copper. (London: Beedle and Collins, 1662) 141.
83 Evelyn, Sculptura, 142.
solitude; repetition; retiring from the world into a secluded space; drawing into one’s self; exploring the finite limits of one’s body. Both religious and artistic practices are driven by a mastery of the body and the senses that is developed through a series of repetitive motions, either drawings or devotions. These are both methods that the medium of print complements, for it, too, engages with solitude, repetition and singularity, the “interior life” found with the reader and his/her book.

The roots of the practice of reading in the devotional tradition continue to echo in Gerard de Lairesse (1640-1711) and his *Grondlegginge der teekenkonst* (1701). In this text on drawing, de Lairesse describes reading:

> …a splendid occupation of the mind/heart (*gemoeds*). It enriches the memory. It makes our thoughts exist and our speech/reason pleasant. It gives to genius (*vernuft*) a great splendor and lessens the infirmity or lack of ingenuity: it makes this endurable and the former astonishing. In short, the best things exist in reading and judgment. One is the father and the other is the mother of the noblest thoughts. 

In the attention to the printed book as a source of consolation and strength, de Lairesse defends the necessary relationship between draftsmanship (this is his treatise on drawing) and reading. The reader strengthens memory, ingenuity and judgment—the same skills necessary to the prolific draftsman—in retiring to a quiet place with a book.

Nevertheless, de Lairesse imagines a more secular relationship to the “book in a nook.” Rather than bringing the reader closer to God, the book brings the reader closer to his immaterial and intellectual self.

---

Like de Lairesse’s construction of a relationship between reading and
draftsmanship, the Bloemaerts’ *Tekenboek* also points towards an integrality between the
act of reading and the act of drawing. Although the *Artis Apellae liber* contains no text, it
nevertheless belongs to this tradition of reading. From its opening title page of the
draftsman in the studio to its lessons that engage with the role of reading in devotion and
secluding one’s self from the outer world, the *Artis Apellae liber* presents itself as a book
that students will use to find comfort and solitude and to strengthen their mind and
judgment with pictures that sensually slide into “tender apprehensions.”
Paradoxically for a naked body, the *Artis Apellae liber*’s three male nudes obscure more than they reveal.\(^8^5\) In the first drawing, a man crouches on his hands and knees. Delineated in quick pen strokes, a man’s torso and head look down, observing the struggle of the hands-and-knees figure (fig. 78). In the second drawing, two lifeless men extend horizontally on the ground (fig. 79). In the third drawing, a youthful male strides forward, effortlessly carrying a basket on his shoulders (fig. 80).\(^8^6\) Two of these models,

\(^8^5\) These drawings are in the *Cambridge Album*, the collection of drawings for the *Artis Apellae liber*. This album also contains three female nudes. I will not discuss these female figures because the male and female nude cannot be equated, and the role of the female nude in seventeenth-century drawing practice mandates its own study, as may be seen in: Eric Jan Sluijter, *Rembrandt and the Female Nude* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006). Only one of these drawings (fig. 58) was published in the 1650-56 edition. The other two drawings were not published until the 1740 Picart edition.

\(^8^6\) From Dürer’s *Vier Bücher von Menschlicher Proportion* (1528) to Charles-Antoine Jombert’s publication of Rubens’s notes under *Théorie de la figure humaine: considérée dans ses principes, soit en repos ou en mouvement* (1773), the study of the human body and its pedagogies has been a consideration of how to understand, and in turn, represent the movement of the body. Dürer’s focus on proportion (three chapters dedicated to the ratios of various bodies and a final fourth chapter exploring movement) becomes inverted in the seventeenth century as artists grapple with movement over proportion, an inversion reflected in Jombert’s title of Rubens’s writings, *A Theory of the Human Body, considered in its principles of rest and repose or in movement*. Nevertheless, Dürer’s *Vier Bücher von Menschlicher Proportion* (1528), translated into Dutch *Beschryvvinge van Albrecht Durer, van de menschelijke proportie* (1622), was the canonical work on human proportion. From Karel van Mander to Willem Goeree, Dürer’s tome is greeted with respect and wariness. Van Mander warns his readers that too much attention to anatomy and proportion will become an end in itself. Van Mander, *Der Grondt*, 3: 1-15. Goeree states outright that many artists have found Dürer’s studies boring: “De Lesing die wy van Durers Boeken in onse Taal hebben in geheel Slegt, Langwilig, en Duyster, alhoewel de Beelden tamelijk in haar Teykenkundigen omtrek bepaald zijn.” Goeree, *Natuurlyk en schilderkonstig ontwerp der Menschkunde*, 88-89. Most seventeenth-century art theorists viewed Dürer’s *Vier Bücher* as the summation of proportion, and utilized the canonical proportional systems established by previous workshop traditions (as described in Cenino Cenini’s fourteenth-century *Il libro dell’arte*), or Vitruvian systems, (discussed by Lomazzo, Alberti, Leonardo and later van Mander and Goeree). By shifting the central considerations from proportion to movement, theorists and artists inadvertently moved the objective from considering the harmonious interrelationship between the macrocosm and the microcosm to focusing on the interrelationship between the immaterial consciousness and the material body as manifested in movement. In his canonical essay on proportion and style, Erwin Panofsky argues that Dürer’s treatise on proportion was the climax in the Renaissance studies on proportion. While Panofsky too readily dismisses the continuing importance and relevance of this science dedicated to ratio within seventeenth century artistic practice and pedagogy (as large portions of printed drawing books are devoted to explicating the canons of proportion), his generalizations—space and matter, will and movement—allight on concepts that are integral to the changes in representations of the human figure. First published as, “Die Entwicklung der Proportionlehre als Abbild der Stilentwicklung,” *Monatshefte für Kunstwissenschaft* XIV (1921): 188-219. Later published as, “The History of the Theory of
the standing young male and the man on his hands and knees, are repetitions from the
drawing *Moses Striking the Rock* (1605-1610) that Bloemaert executed earlier in his
career (fig. 81). Culled from his memory and practice, these nudes—once anonymous
actors within large historical renderings—are presented within the *Artis Apellae liber*
isolated from their compositional context. While these drawings evoke working *nae
t’leven* (from or towards life), representing the body in the world, stressed to stand,
playing corpse in the studio, striding forward in the recognized weight-bearing
*contrapposto* pose, they are nevertheless repetitions from Bloemaert’s workshop and
were drafted *uyl den gheest* (from the intellect).

Bloemaert and his contemporaries Hendrick Goltzius (1588-1617), Cornelis
Cornelisz. van Haarlem (1562-1638), Karel van Mander (1548-1606), Jan Harmensz.
Muller (1571-1628) and Joachim Wtewael (1566-1638) established the standards of the
male nude in the seventeenth-century Netherlands. Famous as “Northern Mannerists,”
artists such as Goltzius, van Haarlem and Bloemaert delineated, engraved and painted in
pen, ink and oil paint phantastical bodies. These knotted muscular figures extend their
physiques in godly banquet scenes, such as the variations on the *Wedding of Peleus and
Thetis* (fig. 82), and suffer extreme physical duress, as may be seen in the falling bodies
of the *Four Disgracers* co-created by van Haarlem (in paint) and Goltzius (in
engraving)[figs. 83, 84, 85, 86]. Yet Northern Mannerists also are renowned for

---

inventing the practice of drawing nae t’leven, exemplified in Goltzius’s study of a sleeping female, a study of the female body from the lips of her labia to her closed eyelids (fig. 87).

Karel van Mander, Hendrick Goltzius and Cornelis Cornelisz. van Haarlem formed the first drawing academy, in which they drew the male body nae t’leven. In Bloemaert’s city Utrecht, his contemporary Crispijn van de Passe attended a Teekenschool overseen by the foremost drawing masters. In his Light der teken en schilderkonst, Van de Passe names Bloemaert as one of the great draftsman of his day, suggesting that Bloemaert was involved in the Utrecht Teekenschool. Nevertheless, despite nae t’leven investigations of the naked body, Mannerist nudes retain an “idealized” form, whether it is the muscular knollenstil of Goltzius’s engraved disgracers or the lithe muscular frame of Bloemaert’s youth (fig. 80). While some of these figures may be exaggerated in their proportions or musculature, they do not commit the crimes of Rembrandt, who often was accused of recording bodies in their awkward particularities.


For an overview of Rembrandt’s critics, see: Eric Jan Sluijter, Rembrandt and the Female Nude, 15-18; 195-196. For Arnold Houbraken (1660-1719), Rembrandt was a paradigm of artists who incorrectly work
Censured for having an “undisciplined” practice of working from life, Rembrandt sketched a series of young male nudes (most likely for his own printed drawing book), in which thick pen strokes outline ungainly adolescent frames (fig. 88). Rembrandt recorded the male body in its idiosyncrasies, capturing the singular physique and mien of an adolescent. In contrast, Bloemaert did not trace the singular qualities of a male model. While Rembrandt focused on the “particularities,” Bloemaert abstracted his figures into anonymous males with non-descript muscular forms. From struggling to stand, wrestling, or striding forward, Bloemaert’s three nudes address the question of representing the body-in-movement. Bloemaert’s figures struggle with capturing the force that instills the human form with movement. The crux of Netherlandish artistic praxis—between leven and gheest—was built around this very tension between the corporeal and the incorporeal, the visible body and the invisible force that moves, breathes and separates a body from a corpse.

Drawing the body engaged with one of the fundamental beliefs in the confessional literature of the Reformed period: man is an image (Beeld) made by God. As the opening to the Statenvertaling (States-General Bible) tells the reader, after God made the heavens, earth and the sea, so he finally made the Man in his image. That God made man in his image often provides the opening for much of the seventeenth-century confessional literature in the Dutch Republic, such as the Mennonite Jacques Outerman’s (1547-1639) A clear proof of God’s Word (1612), which begins with the First Article: “That God in

naer ’t leven, see: Arnold Houbraken, De groote schouburige der nederlantsche konstchilders en schilderessen (’s Gravenhage, 1753) 262-268.

the beginning made all men after his image.” As the Catholic Vicar Apostolic Rovenius stresses in the dedicatory epistle to his popular work on devotional exercises, *The Golden Censer* (1620), “we men are made by God, in order to work, love and also at the end, to come back to him.” The importance of understanding man as an image of God in the confessional literature of the late-sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and the development of drawing the naked figure in the workshop are two inseparable grasps on the world and the body, which accounts both for the increase of attention to the figure ca. 1600 and its polemic, the juxtaposition between *leven* and *gheest*.

**Struggling to Stand**

According to Karel van Mander’s biographer, he and his fellow artists Goltzius and van Haarlem founded a drawing academy in Haarlem in which they worked *nae t’leven,* which suggests that they drew live male nude models. In an analysis of the Haarlem

---

91 “Hoe Godt in den beginne alle Mensche na zyên beelde gheschapen heeft / en als zy alle door de zon de doot waren / dat hy haer al te samen door Christum wederom dan de verdoemenisse ghemaect heeft / het welcke me te bewyys van veel heerlycke namen is … / die Godt alle te samen nae der waerheit te komen / ende tot bewyys dienen dat Godt de auteur is van het geode / ended at de Duyvel is auteur van het quade.” Jacques Outerman, *Een claer bewijs  uyt Gods woordt* (Gouda, 1612) Fol. 2.

92 “Aenghesien dat wy menschen geschapen zyn van Godt, om hem te dienen, ende lief to hebben, om alsoo tot hem, die ons leste eynde is, te komen.” Philppus Rovenius, *Het gulden wierockvadt, eenen ieghelycken nut ende oorbaer om syn ghebeden…* (Antwerp: Ian Cnobbarta, 1636).

Academy and its roots, Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann looks to Rudolfine Prague and Bartholomeus Spranger’s influence on the Haarlem Mannerists. As Kaufmann demonstrates, Goltzius breaks with the courtly “mannered” style of Spranger (a mode defined by pure *gheest*) and bases the Academic “ideal” of the Haarlem academy with a tempering of *gheest* through studying *nae t’leven*. While Spranger’s courtly stylistics (and *gheest*) were integral to the development of the Academic tradition in Haarlem, the foundation of a drawing Academy also must be considered in relationship to the early Academic tradition in France. Both the poetic movement of the Pléiade and the Academy of the Court under Henry III (*Académie de Poésie et de Musique*) should be looked at when considering the institution of the Haarlem drawing Academy. Karel van Mander (the artist whose name is explicitly linked to the foundation of the Haarlem drawing Academy) was not only a painter but also a poet. In fact, he was one of the leading *rederijkers* (poets/rhetoricians) in Haarlem and an important contributor to the *Nederduytschen Helicon* (1610), a collection of poetry dedicated to celebrating a Dutch Republic formed by peace rather than war.

Not only a contributor to the *Nederduytschen Helicon*, van Mander also took part in the *Witte Angieren*, a Haarlem rhetoricians group formed by Flemish refugees in the

---


95 On the *Nederduytschen Helicon* and van Mander, see: Boukje Thijs, *De hoefslag van Pegasus: een cultuurhistorisch onderzoek naar Den Nederduytschen Helicon (1610)* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2004). As Hessel Miedema notes, this collection of poetry is influenced by the poetic tradition of the Pléiade in France. Hessel Miedema, “Karel Van Mander’s Grondt Der Edel Vry Schilder-Const: (Foundations of the Noble and Free Art of Painting”), *Journal of the History of Ideas* 34.4 (1973) 656.
North. In this way, the French Academies of the sixteenth century may have resonated with van Mander not only for stylistic reasons but also for religious concerns. In her study of the French Academies, Frances Yates demonstrates that the Palace Academy (Académie de Poésie et de Musique) had both Catholics and Huguenots as its members, suggesting that Henry III may have initiated the Academy as a means for pacifying the tense relationships between Huguenots and Catholics in sixteenth-century France.\textsuperscript{96} In order to find a place for dialogue during the religious wars, the French Academies brought together Huguenots and Catholics to “recover, below the hideous passions of the present, the ancient music of a just and peaceably ordered society.”\textsuperscript{97} In this way, Yates’s work on the pre-Richelieu academies in France provides an important parallel to consider the development of drawing academies in Haarlem and Utrecht, both cities that struggled with confessionalism and both formed by large Catholic populations adjusting to the state religion of the Reformed Church.

Understanding the academy as a site for dialogue among members of different confessions, under the aegis of Athena and Mercury, may be seen in a print designed by van Mander and engraved by Jacob Matham for the Witte Angieren, or Flemish Chamber of Rhetoric in Haarlem (fig. 89). In a central cartouche, Christ and the personification of the church Ecclesia join hands, a banner above the two figures proclaiming \textit{In liefde ghietrouw} (faithful in love). Mercury and Athena frame the image of Christian harmony; Mercury blows his trumpet, and Athena stands, shield resting at her feet. This print speaks to a unified idea of a church defined by Christ and liefde, regardless of confession. Mercury and Athena are at ease (not at war), fostering the growth of wisdom, rhetoric.

\textsuperscript{97} Yates, 127.
and art. Designed for the Chamber of Rhetoric, this print argues for the purpose of unity (as opposed to religious disharmony) when pursuing wisdom and art. Considering van Mander’s involvement with the rhetoricians’ societies as sites for exploring the interrelationships between moral philosophy, rhetoric and pacification in Holland, his formation of another Academy dedicated to studying *nae t’leven* should be seen in the context of these other academic endeavors.

Van Mander uses the term *nae t’leven* throughout his *Schilderboek* for the practice of drawing many different things, not just the nude body. When he refers to the male nude, he uses the term *naekten* in conjunction with *nae t’leven*. Yet primarily *nae t’leven* describes the interaction between the artist and the literal presence of another three-dimensional thing or body. Importantly, van Mander does not characterize working from prints or drawings as *nae t’leven*; the object of the draftsman’s attention must have a three-dimensional presence, although it can be as varied as a medallion or a city. Raphael (1483-1520) made the portraits of Theologians and Poets for the *Stanza della Segnatura* (1508-1510) *nae t’leven* from his studies of medallions and Antique statues. Dürer’s inclusion of a self-portrait within *The Martyrdom of Achatius and the ten thousand martyrs of Armenia* (1508) was *nae t’leven*. The works of various itinerant artists, sketching cityscapes from their travels and reincorporating them into compositions—
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98 For example, in his life of Francesco Salviati (fol. 156-159), he mentions the Florentine Academy, in which artists studied “naeckten nae t’leven.” In the life of Cornelis Cornelisz van Haarlem, he describes van Haarlem’s pupil Geerit Pietersz. as a student who daily worked *nae t’leven*, so that he was outstanding in understanding the nude: “Doe Geerit hier in een laer oft twee seer in de Const was ghevordert, bleef noch dry oft vier laer te Haerlem op zijn selven werckende, en daeghelijcx practiserende nae t’leven, soo dat hy uytnemende verstandigh in naeckten is geworden.” Miedema, *Lives*, 433. Van Mander, *Schilderboeck*, fol. 293v.


from Jan Vermeyen (1559-1606) and his tapestries inspired by Tunis to Jan van Scorel (1495-1562) and his landscapes, views and castles along his way to Jerusalem—are categorized as nae t’leven.\textsuperscript{101} Van Mander utilizes nae t’leven to describe Cornelis Cornelisz. van Haarlem’s drawing from antique statuary (most likely plaster casts of Antique statuary, such as those done by Goltzius of Michelangelo’s allegorical figures in the San Lorenzo chapel).\textsuperscript{102} In the same biography, van Mander particularizes a van Haarlem still life as nae t’leven.\textsuperscript{103} For van Mander, nae t’leven encompasses the one-to-one interaction between the artist and the physical presence of another thing, whether it is a medallion, a pot of flowers, a plaster cast, a male model in the studio, or a city.\textsuperscript{104}

For van Mander, nae t’leven encompasses a broad range, from the still life to the panorama. Later art theorists began to use the term exclusively for drawing the naked model. Nevertheless, artists and theorists remain ambivalent about the material of the model: wood or flesh. Van de Passe tells his readers that the Italian masters invented a method to study movement from wooden dolls (mannequins) because models tired of


\textsuperscript{104}Alpers argues that \textit{nae t’leven} refers to “everything visible.” Alpers, \textit{Art of Describing}, 40. Nevertheless, I would specify that it is everything visible that is extended (occupies space) in the world, i.e. it is not two-dimensional images or visions. Moreover, the concept of \textit{nae t’leven} cannot be understood separate from emerging ideas about the interrelationship among bodies.
holding a pose. Despite the replacement of the living model with the inanimate doll, van de Passe still considers this method nae t’leven. The fluidity of model, mannequin and flesh continues in de Lairesse’s pedagogic writings at the end of the seventeenth century, particularly his Grondlegginge der teekenkonst (1701). In a dialogue between drawing master and student, the student asks if it is best to learn “life drawing” by sketching the naked model at night and the clothed mannequin during the day, both the naked living model and the clothed mannequin—nae t’leven. Throughout the seventeenth century from van Mander to de Lairesse, nae t’leven refers not only to drawing the male nude in the studio but also the draped mannequin and the statue or its plaster cast.

Working nae t’leven has been considered primarily in relationship to the academic nude, as well as to the burgeoning empiricism in early-modern natural philosophy in the work of Francis Bacon (1561-1626), Galileo Galilei (1564-1642), Johannes Kepler (1671-1630) and René Descartes (1596-1650) and the emerging field of optics with a focus on the visible world. All these modes of inquiry pertain to nae t’leven, but they overlook the strangeness of terminology vis-à-vis the Teekenschool and van Mander’s use of the term. In early-modern natural philosophy, nae t’leven signifies

106 “…dat ik eerst de Beelden naar het leeven behoorden te Teekenen, wert e verstaen alles nat Naakt moet zyn, en de Kleeren altyd naar de Leeman: daar men hier gemeenlyk in de Kollegien, naar ’t naakte Leeven Teekent by Avond met een Lamp, en meest naar de Leeman by Dag. Kan dan het Dag en Lamplicht, zodanig t’zaamen gevoegt worden, dat men ’t in een stuk zou kunnen vereenigen, zonder dat het mistaat?” De Lairesse, Grondleggings̩e, 82-83.
that the specimen—flora, fauna, beast—existed in front of the draftsman. As Claudia Swan argues, working *nae t’leven* is a one-to-one relationship between the illustration and the object, between the representation and the thing.\(^{108}\) The relationship between working *nae t’leven* in drawing practice and emerging epistemological modes that explored the tension between knowledge and vision (Bacon, Galileo, Kepler and Descartes) remain relevant and necessary to an understanding of *nae t’leven*. Nevertheless, the *Teekenschool* complicates the one-to-one juxtaposition between the representation and the thing. *Nae t’leven* refers to drawing the human body, but the study of drapery on the mannequin also is considered *nae t’leven*, blurring the indexical relationship between the movement of the body and the agitation of cloth. For the *Teekenschool*, working *nae t’leven* signifies the existential presence of an extended thing—flesh, marble, plaster or wood. What must also be considered, however, is the interrelationship between *nae t’leven* and *uyt den gheest* in artistic practice and theory. The ambiguity of Bloemaert’s life-like but ultimately repetitious images of nudes attest to this.\(^{109}\)

**Nudes before 1600**

Before 1600, nudes in Netherlandish drawing practice were interwoven with studies of ornament, limbs, *grotteschi*, costume and drapery. Geographically far from the great discoveries of Antique statuary, Northern artists who did not travel to Italy studied the

\(^{108}\) In her discussion of the term *nae t’leven* and its linguistic cognates in early-modern natural history illustration, Claudia Swan argues that “images done *al vivo* stand in for actual specimens by virtue of their iconic correspondence with the real.” Swan, 370.

\(^{109}\) Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, *The School of Prague: Painting at the Court of Rudolf II* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1985) 112-114. Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann cogently has pointed out that the tension in Mannerist practice between the *gheest* and the *leven* (previously two styles dependent upon genre, as seen in the Prague School) begins to change in the work of Goltzius, who uses a study of a model *nae t’leven* for a mythological work.
male nude through prints, drawings and paintings of famous Antique works such as *il Spinario* or the *Laocoön*. Bloemaert never travelled to Italy, yet as has been seen, he was familiar with Antique sculpture through sculptural casts, printed drawing books and other artists’ drawings. While the question of the-body-in-movement was important for the generation of artists preceding Bloemaert, they primarily represented a body’s movement through agitations in cloth and hair, using the drapery’s folds to depict the form’s dynamism. An example of this may be seen in Frans Floris’s sketchbook from his travels in Italy, in which he drafted Michelangelo’s nudes, linear analyses of costume (such as a sandaled foot) and repetitive lines of Antique drapery (figs. 90, 91, 92). Floris’s sketchbook displays at once his indebtedness to the male-nude tradition of Michelangelo, while demonstrating that the study of movement and bodies was still relegated to the outer material of cloth for many artists, despite Michelangelo’s own repetitive work on the body itself.

Like Floris’s studies of apparel and drapery, many early-modern model books present the body as an object no different from hats and sandals. In Heinrich Vogtherr’s *Kunstbüchlein* (1540), the body supports (frames) its accessories, an expressive mannequin on which to drape variations of ribbons, silk, gauze and cloth that formed the most à la mode headwear (fig. 93). The fringe, plumes and pomp of Vogtherr’s architectonic hats reflect the ostentatious exaggeration of expression within the figures, seen in the variations of caricatured noses—hooked, pointed, bulbous—jowls, mouth and beards. Assembled from previously disconnected fragments of hats and hands, there is no ontological difference between the body and its adornments. Equating the body with its
decorative extensions—the body as ornamental frame, structure and column—becomes mirrored within the sixteenth-century artists’ sketchbooks and drawings.

A play between body and ornament drives sixteenth-century studies of the naked male form. In an anonymous sixteenth-century drawing in the Hermitage, the artist places side-by-side two columnar studies. The artist presents a columnar-like leg, immobile with its rigid flexion of muscle. The leg extends from down the length of the page to the arch of the foot’s sole. A serpentine body with a woman’s breasted torso chased by a putto and an actual column crowned by a satry frame this study of the leg (fig. 94). This drawing places side-by-side mythological and human anatomy. In the study of the quadriceps, the artist pays careful attention to the tension at the knee joint, the hip flexor and the rippling of the quadriceps across the skin’s surface, while softening this rigid study of muscularity through the suggested curl of pubic hair at the pelvis. This slight attention contrasts with the columnar Satyr, whose own genitalia have been replaced by a metal ring revealing the functionality of the columnar post.

In these representations of the body, the artists do not distinguish between the body and the ornament, the costume as frame for the body and the body as frame for costume. Both Floris’s studies of Michelangelo and drapery and the Hermitage drawing’s tongue-in-cheek play realize flux within the body’s detachable parts, accessories and frames, not within the body itself. Even in the Hermitage drawing—a study of muscle—the leg remains inert, like a column. The representation of bodily progression and change through the outer cresting and furling of cloth and serpentine bodies suggests that the body moves from the force of an outside pressure.
These sixteenth-century renditions of the body as static—set into action by accessories and ornamental play—imply that the body inclined towards rest and would only move when impelled to do so by an outside force. Rest was the body’s natural state, only a “violent force” put bodies in motion. This Aristotelian conception of movement, which guided the ways that artists wrote about and represented motion, is most clearly elaborated in the writings of Leonardo da Vinci (1452-1519), who describes force as “a non-material (spirituale) power, an invisible potency which is imported by accidental violence from without to all bodies out of their natural inclination.”110 For Leonardo, bodies incline towards rest or a “natural state;” only a “non-material power” sets them into movement.

But studies of movement in seventeenth-century natural philosophy began to suggest new possibilities for a body’s displacement and change. In turn, questions of bodies and movement are inseparable from emerging concepts of space. Descartes argued that rest and movement are equal “states” of being. Bodies move in relationship to other moving bodies. A body requires force to continue in a state, whether rest or movement.111

---

110 Gombrich considers “movement” and “force” in Leonardo’s water studies, arguing that Leonardo’s studies are driven by the “physics of Aristotle” in which “all force in this sublunar world is ultimately due to ‘accidental’ dislocation. Without ‘violence’ applied from outside the elements would all be at rest in their proper place and it is their desire to achieve this natural state which accounts for all observed movement.” see: E.H. Gombrich, “The Form of Movement in Water and Air,” The Heritage of Apelles: Studies in the Art of the Renaissance (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1976) 51-52. “Forza non è altro che una vitrù spirituale, una potenza invisibile, (infusa) la quale è create e infusa, per accidental violenza, da corpi sensibili nelli insensibili, dando a essi corpi similitudine di vita; la qual vita è di maravigliosa operazione, constringendo e stramutando di sito e di forma tutte le create cose, corre con furia a sua disfazione, e vassi diversificando mediante la cagioni.” Jean Paul Richter, ed, The Literary Works of Leonardo da Vinci, vol. 2 (London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1939) 219, 1113B.

111 “La premiere [loy] est que chaque chose en particular…continué d’estre en mesme estat autant qu’il se peut, & que jamais elle ne le change que par la rencontre des autres…De façon que, si un corps a commencé une fois de se mouvoir, nous devons conclure qu’il continué par après de se mouvoir, & que jamais il ne s’arreste de soy-mesme.” René Descartes, “Principes,” Oeuvres de Descartes, ed. Charles Adam and Paul Tannery, vol. IX-2:37 (Paris: Librairie Philosophique, 1964) 84. For the question of force in Descartes’s writings, see: Daniel Garber, Descartes’ Metaphysical Physics (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992) 293-299; Alan Gabbey, “Force and Inertia in the Seventeenth Century: Descartes and Newton,” Descartes: Philosophy, Mathematics and Physics, ed. Stephen Gaukroger (Sussex: Harvester
From the relational movement of bodies, space emerges. As Descartes writes, “The terms ‘place’ and ‘space,’ then do not signify anything different from the body which is said to be in a place; they merely refer to its size, shape and position relative to other bodies.”

Needless to say, the question of space in the seventeenth century was still contested and under debate. *(Is space extended matter or a vacumn?)* Nevertheless, in the lessons of the *Artis Apellae liber* an awareness of the relationship among different bodily forms helping to define the space of the page and the contours of the lessons emerges. This is not to suggest that Bloemaert and the Haarlem and Utrecht Mannerists were reading Galilean and Cartesian studies of movement and falling bodies. Nevertheless, it indicates an important shift in both philosophic and artistic circles, in which the body came to be considered more in relationship to other bodies than as a solid form that inclines towards rest.

In contrast to sketchbooks such as Floris’s, Bloemaert reflected on the artistic problem of conveying movement within the body—not through cloth and drapery—but within the naked form of the body itself. While studies of hair and cloth remain integral, as the *Artis Apellae liber* testifies, the three male nude drawings that began this chapter reflect on the body-in-movement apart from its detachable accessories of cloth. In the seventeenth century, inspired by Michelangelo and new workshop practices, artists in the North turned to the body. Without drapery’s lines and undulations, the male nude in the

---

Press, 1980) 230-320; Martin Gueroult, “The Metaphysics and Physics of Force in Descartes,” *Descartes: Philosophy, Mathematics, Physics*, 196-229; Gary Hatfield, “Force (God) in Descartes’ Physics,” *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science* 10 (1979): 113-140; Michael Della Rocca, “If a Body Meets a Body’: Descartes on Body-Body Causation,” *New Essays on the Rationalists*, ed. Rocco Gennaro and Charles Huenemann (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999) 48-81. The actual role of “force” and “movement” in Descartes’s writings is still a matter of debate around the question of whether Descartes was an “occasionalist” and thought that only God could cause movement, or if God endowed bodies with the ability to move “on their own.”

workshop initiates a direct confrontation between the artist and his ability to represent the displayed force of the naked body itself.

The male nude drawings for the *Artis Apellae liber* confront the problem of representing movement through the body’s surface. Bloemaert engages this problem with his two prone figures. One figure pushes his hand into the ground, struggling to stand. With one arm extended and lifeless, the other palm presses into the ground of the paper. The juxtaposition between the lifeless limb and the active arm, enabling the body to stand, introduces within one body the play between inertia—an unwillingness to move—and the necessary force that the figure summons to rise from the ground. The other naked form extends across the page with one leg bent back towards the viewer, wrists intertwined, hands limp. From the motionless body a cloth unfolds, its lively landscape of lights and shadows contrasts with the corpse-like body. These two studies of nearly immobile bodies confront the difficulty of conveying force and movement in an immobile figure.

As the little-known painter/etcher Jacob van der Gracht (1593-1652) discusses in his treatise on anatomy, there are two kinds of draftsmen. First, there are those who draw from Antique statues and grasp the harmonies of proportion. Then there are those who concentrate on *wel dragen*, how a body bears itself, by working *nae t’leven*.113 Van der Gracht, who printed *Anatomy book of the outer body parts for Painters, Engravers, and Surgeons* (1634), understood that movement for artists arises from a study of how bodies

---

occupy and traverse in space (bear themselves) more than proportion. Indeed, Sluijter defines *wel-draken* in van der Gracht’s treatise as the “convincing suggestion of space.” As van der Gracht clarifies, working *nae t’leven* teaches the draftsman how to place a figure correctly from the foreground to the background.

His discussion of the two “types” of artists (one dedicated to proportion the other to *nae t’leven*) elucidates Bloemaert’s practice, which pays little attention to harmony, proportion or even muscular structure. Instead, Bloemaert’s nudes concern themselves with the process of *wel dragen*—the disposition of bodies from the foreground to the background of the paper. From their arranged limbs, bent in variations of near-and-far from the viewer, the two prostrate bodies provide the student of the *Artis Apellae liber* with a masterful display of draping a single figure across the plane of a surface so that it extends from the foreground to the background.

---

114 Sluijter, 211.
115 “Ten lesten, andere onder de Schilders meynen genoech te wesen, indien sy alleen nae ‘t leven schildere, so alst haer voorstaet; daer op alleenlick lettende, dat sy sich wel dragen, dat is dat het voorste wel voorkomt, en d’achterste wel schiet. Dit en kan oock voor geen goede maxime der Schilder-konst gehouden worden, somen de voldat is, sonder arbeyt ofte moeyt eene sekere stant oft beweglicheyt des lichaes hout, werken alle de musculen op haren tijt. Maer dit en kan niet lang dueren. Want soo haest hy vermoeyt begint te worde, en met moeyt de selve stat moet houde, so zijnder nae-bueren oft mede-hulpsters, die haer mede-maeten te hulp komen oft ontlasten, ende de principale en doen voortaen haer werckinge niet meer, soo ‘t behoort. Dit moet nootwendigh een groote qualick-stande geven in alle figueren, en en kan nochants niet waer genomen worden van de gheen, die d’Anatomie, ofte wreeking der nature niet en verstaet. Wederom die ‘t naeckt wilt ghebruycchen, sonder kennis der schelick lichaem, ‘t weelck ‘t vel is. Dit vel verandert ooc, door ‘t verscheydwy roeren der muscule, gelijck het kleet verandert ofte verscheyde vouwen ontfangt door ‘t roeren des lichaems. So dat hier in oock nootwendig de welstant der konste te kort moet geschiede, door de geen die de anatomie ofte beroerlickheyt niet grondelick en verstaet.” Jacob van der Gracht, *Anatomie der uiterlicke deelen van het menschelick lichaem*, (‘s Gravenhage: 1634) 2-3.
116 In his treatise on painting—a *wetenschap* (science) of the visible world—van Hoogstraten also describes drawing (*Teykinge*) as the pure recognition of forms in space: “The determination of things exists in length and width, height and depth, hollows and humps, lines and curves, inclined and oblique, and in so many different manners as can be drawn with lines and points.” Samuel van Hoogstraten, *Inleyding tot de hooge schoole der schilderkonst* (Rotterdam: Fransoois van Hoogstraten, 1678) 33. Van Hoogstraten’s understanding of things as determined alone by their extension in space, their length, breadth, height and depth, betrays a certain Cartesianism, separating the body from its animating forces of breath, spirit and *gheest*, and reducing it to extended forms in space. Celeste Brusati, *Artifice of Illusion: The Art and Writing of Samuel van Hoogstraten*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995) 136.
Nevertheless, van der Gracht’s use of the phrase *wel-dragen* is unexpected. Major Dutch seventeenth-century art theorists—van Mander, Philips Angel, Samuel van Hoogstraten—do not use the term *wel-dragen*. Primarily, it is used in Biblical translations, referring to the ability to endure or bear. In the *Statenvertaling* of the Bible, the Prophet Jeremiah states (Jeremiah 10:19), “there is always a sickness, that I shall bear (*wel-dragen)*.” In the Lutheran Bible, the prophet Joël describes a lush earth in which the fig trees and the vines shall bear (*wel-dragen*) their bounty (Joël 2:22). In 1663, the Dutch poet Jan Zoet, uses *wel-dragen* to describe bearing one’s cross: “Teach me to bear (*wel dragen*) my cross and worries.” According to van der Gracht, artist’s who study *nae t’leven* consider the ability of a body to bear itself. In order to convey a weight-bearing body with the strength to move itself, van der Gracht stresses the importance of foreshortening and the extension of the body from the foreground to the background of the page, using the phrase *wel-dragen*, which stresses weight and endurance. Bloemaert’s nude drawings for his *Tekenboek*—an artist who studied *nae t’leven*—concentrate on representing a body’s mobility. From the hands-and-knees figure to the prostrate bodies, Bloemaert stresses the endurance and strength necessary for a body to *wel-dragen*, bear itself.

---

117 Jeremiah 10:19. “Dit is immers eene kranckheyt, die ick wel dragen sal.” *Biblia, dat is: De gantsche H. Schrifture, vervattende alle de canonlijcke Boecken des Ouden en des Nieuwen Testaments (Statenvertaling 1637).*


According to his biography in *Het Schilderboeck* (1606), Bloemaert was not to be bettered in the act of drawing *nae t’leven* the Utrecht countryside, its farmhouses and farm implements, trees and domestic animals. And yet his biographer acknowledges that Bloemaert often adds to these scenes his own little touches—lilies and vegetation—stating that Bloemaert gives no place to drawing *nae t’leven* in order not to hinder his *gheest*. On the one hand, Bloemaert became famous for his landscapes done *nae t’leven* (figs. 95, 96). On the other hand, Bloemaert’s biography remains ambivalent about working *nae t’leven* and its obstruction of the intellect or *gheest*. As Bloemaert’s nudes for the *Artis Apellae liber* demonstrate, Bloemaert sought to abstract the particular qualities of a body. The tension between *leven* and *gheest* in Bloemaert’s artistic practice may be understood as the driving dialectic of the Mannerist tradition, to which he is a part. Indeed, the division that opens up between *leven* and *gheest* (or nature and mind) in the sixteenth century forms the crux of one of the most important discussions of Mannerist artistic practice, Panofsky’s reading of Zuccari (1540-1609) and his *L’Idea de’pittori, scultori ed architetti* (1607).

---

120 This series of landscape drawings is known as the *Berlin Album*, which consists of 35 sheets with 48 drawings, held primarily in Berlin, but there are also loose sheets scattered throughout various other collections. Bolten argues that the *Berlin Album* is the first attempt of the young Bloemaert to master drawing the outside world. Bolten dates these drawings between roughly 1585-1591, writing that the album “was in fact one of the first, fruitful attempts in the Northern Netherlands at rendering landscape as it was, without stylistic conventions or embellishments, certainly preceding the realism that in the second decennium of the 17th century found its heyday in Haarlem.” Bolten, *Abraham Bloemaert: The Drawings*, vol. 1, 406.


122 Paul Taylor has argued for a close attention to van Mander’s sources for the *Schilderboek*, possibly from the artists themselves. Considering this, it is possible that the information for Bloemaert’s biography was gathered from correspondence with Bloemaert or his close associates. For this reason, I hesitate to consider van Mander an author of Bloemaert’s biography and refer to a biographer-at-large, conveying the complexities of artist’s presentation within these biographic works, see: Paul Taylor, “Review “Karel van Mander The Lives of the Illustrious….”” Edited by Hessel Miedema. *Oud Holland* 115 (2001-2002): 131-154.
As Panofsky maintains, in the latter-half of the sixteenth century, the rift between the subject and the object emerged as “that which in the past had seemed unquestionable was thoroughly problematical: the relationship of the mind to reality as perceived by the senses.”\textsuperscript{123} In this study of early-modern aesthetics, Panofsky argues that Zuccari in \textit{L’Idea} closes the conceptual gap between the “subject” and the “object” by means of a metaphysical concept of the “Idea” going back to Thomas Aquinas and High-Scholastic Aristotelianism. The artist forms a \textit{disegno interno} in his mind, which he then realizes in the material world as a \textit{disegno esterno}.

Panofsky’s attention to the “crisis” in artistic practice between the individual’s corporeal organs of perception and the demand on artists to create a “universalizing” image resonates with the drawings of the Haarlem and Utrecht drawing Academies. Considering van Mander’s time in Rome, it is possible that he carried some of Zuccari’s ideas North. Nevertheless, van Mander left Italy in 1577 and Zuccari’s \textit{L’Idea} was not published until 1607 (one year after van Mander’s death).\textsuperscript{125} Moreover, the juxtaposition in Northern art theory between \textit{nae t’leven} and \textit{uyt den gheest} does not map onto Zuccari’s \textit{disegno interno} and \textit{esterno}. Working \textit{nae t’leven} engages with what is present before the draftsman; it is evident knowledge (\textit{scientia}). The term \textit{uyt den gheest} points towards something else, the manifestation of the draftsman’s \textit{gheest} (intellect, character, \textit{l’esprit}). \textit{Nae t’leven} and \textit{uyt den gheest} demonstrate two different forms of knowledge and draftsmanship. Indeed, this dialectic in Netherlandish draftsmanship ca. 1600 parallels the late-Scholastic exploration of “evident intuitions,” a tradition that continued

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{124} Panofsky, 86.
\end{footnotesize}
into the sixteenth century in Jesuit schooling and became transformed in the work of Descartes.

The late-Scholastic tradition of “intuition” and “abstraction,” like Zuccari’s *L’Idea*, sought to mitigate the divide between “sensory experience” and “knowledge,” or nature and mind. In order to grasp the significance circa 1600 of working at the intersection between *leven* and *gheest*, *nae t’leven* must be contextualized in not only an emerging early-modern discourse on observation and the natural world but also older epistemological discourses. Intuition and abstraction (as opposed to Panofsky’s *Idea*) are two terms from the late Scholastic period that wrestle with—like *nae t’leven* and *uyt den gheest*—what can and cannot be directly perceived. *Nae t’leven*, like intuitive knowledge, describes the interaction of two bodies in the presence of one another.

In the words of one of the early theorizers of intuition: “Intuitive cognition of a thing is cognition that enables us to know whether the thing exists or does not exist.” “Abstractive cognition, on the other hand . . . in opposition to intuitive cognition, it does not enable us to know the existence of what does exist or the non-existence of what does not exist.”

Intuition allowed the ability to discern between two different forms of knowledge: “certain philosophical knowledge (*scientia*) and faith…. Faith involved certainty without evidence. Faith was meritorious because it was not casually determined, unlike the evident knowledge of the natural world.”

*Nae t’leven* assures the viewer of a correspondence between the image and its counterpart in the world, working with the “evident knowledge of the natural world.”

---


127 Jones, 81. Jones points out that this outline of knowledge and its varying qualities continued into the seventeenth century and works such as the Jesuit *Ratio studiorum*. Jones, 81-84.
Raphael’s working from Antique medallions, Vermeyen’s and Scorel’s renderings of Tunis and Jerusalem, and Bloemaert’s watercolors of rural Utrecht are grounded within the verified existence of the things pictured. Intuitive cognition and nae t’leven are the ways of knowing and affirming through art the existence of things in the world. Whereas uyt den gheest, does not verify the existence or non-existence of the things pictured. Both drawing nae t’leven and intuitive cognition affirm a direct grasp through the senses of the knowledge of a thing’s presence. In contrast, abstractive cognition derives from habitual knowledge. A person may know a thing that is not technically present before him because he has regularly experienced its presence. Abstractive cognition mirrors the process of drawing uyt den gheest, which an artist develops through constant practice and studying life models.

While intuition is a late-Scholastic concept indebted to Duns Scotus and William of Ockham, Descartes transformed intuition in the seventeenth century, arguing that one established the ability to intuit (clearly and distinctly grasp evident knowledge) only through exercise and the cultivation of this habit. For Descartes, practice was “necessary

---

to reach the state where one can consider things clearly and distinctly [with intuition].”

While these questions of intuition might seem like a philosophical abstraction apart from the artist’s workshop, the importance of late-Scholastic intuition penetrated into sixteenth and seventeenth-century concepts of knowledge and evidence. As the scholar Stephen Gaukroger argues, the construction of knowledge in the early seventeenth century was indebted to a “Scotist” model (Duns Scotus, an early theorizer of intuition), based in grasping concrete particulars and proceeding to abstract universals. The practice of working *nae t’leven* and *uyt den gheest* parallels this construction of knowledge, even the turn that it takes with Descartes, in which intuition must be cultivated through habit.

*Intuitive and abstractive* cognition contextualize what was at stake in working *nae t’leven* versus *uyt den gheest* in early-modern artistic practice. Many of the nudes in Northern printed drawing books derive from a study of prints. Indeed, Bloemaert’s own nudes pay tribute to the Italian tradition established in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. In the 1590s, Bloemaert completed a series of figures dedicated to copying Michelangelo’s figure of *Haman* from the Sistine ceiling (fig. 97). The three drawn versions of this Michelangelesque figure display a naked form catapulting out of the page towards the viewer. With little attention to anatomy or genitalia, this drawing uses the naked body to study the progression and regression of limbs across the surface of the paper. Looking at the bodies from prints reduces the corporeal to a two-dimensional form. Moreover, the printed body effaced the wriggling of appendages, the shifting weight of chests, bellies, legs, genitalia, extending arms and hands into frozen images.

---

129 Jones, 83. Jones distinguishes between late-Scholastic intuition and Cartesian intuition. Whereas Descartes’s intuition depended upon “training,” for the late Scholastics: “Evidence in the scholastic sense demands no real training or exercise of the intellect whatsoever; the evident impels necessarily and without practice.” Jones, 83.

The nude in the workshop, therefore, gave artists the opportunity to consider what the medium of print could not convey—a body’s ability to occupy and traverse the breadth of a certain interval. Working *nae t’leven* allowed the ability to know, perceive intuitively, and cultivate the habit of perceiving the presence of another body in a shared space.

As van der Gracht’s and van Mander’s texts make clear, *nae t’leven* examines how bodies bore weight, and positioned themselves in relationship to other bodies, the artist and the viewer. Working with the model in the workshop sets the study of the nude within the immediate comprehension of a body’s extension (width, breadth, length and height).\(^{131}\) The process of working *nae t’leven* concerned itself not with the particularities of the nude body but with what could not be conveyed by the study of prints—a body’s ability to occupy and traverse space. Drawing *nae t’leven* and *uyt den gheest*—a tension between intuition and abstraction—illustrates that *nae t’leven* records the particular evidence perceived by the individual, whereas *uyt den gheest* exhibits the knowledge-made-universal received from this experience. Drawing *uyt den gheest*, like faith, depended upon the draftsman’s certain hand without the presence of the object or body. *Uyt den gheest* demanded “certainty without evidence.” Appearing to be *nae t’leven*, quick sketches from the *Teekenschool*, Bloemaert’s nudes bear no details of a certain body’s marks, scars, torsions and affects. Through his own experience and observation within the studio and the workshop, Bloemaert reduces the study of the male nude to an abstraction of the nude—to the rendering of his *gheest*, the manifestation of his practice.

---

\(^{131}\) It has been pointed out that the Carracci positioned models in the workshop based upon famous poses seen in paintings, prints and drawings, see: Gail Feigenbaum, “Practice in the Carracci Academy,” *The Artist’s Workshop*, ed. Peter M. Lukehart (Hanover and London: University Press of New England, 1993) 67-68.
Striding Forward

Carrying a basket on his shoulders, Bloemaert’s youth strides forward (fig. 80). The weight of his load effortlessly balanced, Bloemaert’s young male is the epitome of van Mander’s seventeenth-century nude. In Den Grondt and his chapter Actitude, Welstandt, ende Weldoen eens Beelds (Attitude, ‘wellbeing’ and well-doing of an image), van Mander describes a figure carrying something on his shoulders, his legs seemingly arbitrarily placed. For van Mander, this type exemplifies the Antique ability to make a standing figure as though it were walking. Antique statues are remarkable because they welstandig houden—have the appearance of moving. Welstandigheid, or the ability to simulate three-dimensional extension with a two-dimensional figure, captures the ineffable presence of a body. 132 For van Mander, welstandt refers not only to the bodies but also to the simulated movement of bodies. In his chapter on landscape, van Mander discusses the necessary attention to the passage from the foreground to the background in order to promote welstandigheid. 133 Like van der Gracht’s wel dragen, van Mander draws attention to the imagined figure that will progress from the background to the foreground (or vice versa) in a landscape. The land’s curvatures, valleys and peaks, therefore, must have welstandt as they progress across the picture’s plane, just as Bloemaert’s prone figures display welstandt in their inert body’s progression from the foreground to the background.


In his work on Dutch art theory, Paul Taylor translates *Welstandt* as the “appearance of plausible three-dimensional construction.” A seventeenth-century English-Dutch dictionary, however, translates *welstandt* as “becoming.” In his *Lof der Schilderkonst* (1641), Philips Angel (b. 1591) analyzes the proper deployment of light and shadow to create *welstandt*, or the appearance of life and actuality: “for shadow being combined in its proper place, gives such enchanting force (*tooverachteige kracht*), and so wonderful an appearance of solidity (*wonderbaerlijcke welstandt*), that many things, which can hardly be depicted in colours with a Brush, appear quite actual.” What makes these bodies “actual” is their “seeming solidity,” or the appearance that these bodies occupy a territory in which no other body can be.

The importance of *welstandt* to Academic practice may also be seen in Joachim von Sandrart’s (1606-1688) *Teutsche Academie* (1675-1680). Sandrart studied at the Utrecht academy with Jan Gerritsz. van Bronchorst, and in his printed *Academie* he stresses the importance of *Welstandt*, or *Wolstand*. As in Angel’s analysis, Sandrart describes *welstandt* as the use of lights and shadows to give a body force. The mastery of representing a body with *welstandt* may be seen in virtuosic performances of

---

136 “Het wel schicken van dagen en schaduwem by een, is een van de principaelste hoofd-banden daer een goet Schilder mede verçiert dient te zijn, om de wel-standigheydt die de selve onse Konst aen brenght: want de schaduwe by een gevoeght zijn op haer behoorlijke plaets, gheven sulcken tooverarchteighe kracht, en wonderbaerlijcke welstandt; dat veel dinghen, die nauwelijcx door gheen *Penceelen met verwen zijn na te bootsen, seer eyghentlijck doen schijnen; want de kracht die de levende en wesentijcke dingen hebben, schoon haer schaduwen ghestroyt zijnde, onder een haspelen, ende evenwel noch een welstandt hebben; soo konnen wy om de onvolmaecktheydt die in ons noch overigh is, het selve in onse wercken gheen welstandt gheven, noch soodanighen kracht als sy ons voor komen; dan als wy het selve wel te wege konnen brengen, wanneer wy de schaduwe, en het licht, ghesamentlijck met geode ordenen by een gheschickt hebben.” Philippus Angel, *Lof der schilder-konst* (Leiden: Willems Christiaens, 1642) 39. The translation is from Taylor, “Houding.” 219.
foreshortening, such as those by Michelangelo. In describing how to copy from
Michelangelesque figures, Sandrart stresses the practice of foreshortening (*Verkurzung*),
noting that the draftsman must pay careful attention when working from the model
(stone, wax, cast) and set the figure in proper height and distance in relationship to the
draftsman’s own perspective and horizon.\(^{138}\) *Verkurzung* creates the effect of viewing a
body first by the fragment and then understanding the whole through the foreshortened
limb that moves toward the viewer’s space.\(^{139}\) Bloemaert’s *Study of a Male Nude* (fig. 77)
is a Sandrartian paradigm. Michelangelo’s Sistine Haman provides an exercise in
foreshortening and *welstandt*. More than a study of the body itself, Bloemaert’s *Standing
Male Nude* (after Michelangelo’s *Haman*) investigates foreshortening and *welstandt*,
through an understanding of the necessary relationship between the representation and
the viewer to set a figure in movement.

The concept of *welstandt*, however, goes beyond questions of experienced space,
or the foreshortened body, as becomes clear in Franciscus Junius’s writings. The art
theorist and antiquarian Franciscus Junius (1589-1677), who resided primarily in England
(although he spent time in the Netherlands as well), wrote about a “certain grace” that

\(^{138}\) “Unsere Vorfahren / haben allezeit ein wachen des Aug gehabt / auf die Verkurzung des Figuren :
dadurch sie / dem Gesicht nach / einen mehrern Schein / als sie an sich selbst haben / in die Lange unde
hohe bekommen; welches die Dicte der Umriß Schatten und Liechtes also scheinen machet. In dieser Kunst
/zumal in einfachen Bildern / hat über andere excelliret / oft gedachter Michaël Angelo : der dann hierzy /
den nachfolgern zur Lehre / aus Erde / Lam / Gyps oder Wachs / solchen Modellen gemacht / welche viel
standhafter sind / als die bewegliche lebhaft Bilder. Wann man nun ein verlangtes Model also zu werk
gebracht / feßet man dasselbige / in gebührlicher Höhe und Distanz, über den Horizont: warnach dann /
destro sicherer / die Bilder gemacht werden. Die Unwissenheit dieses handgriffs / verurfachet viel Müh und
Arbeit : welche ihrer viel nicht gern auf sich nehmen / die etwan auch nicht soviel Verstands haben / dieses
Meisterstuck auszusinnen. Es haben aber die Liehhabere dieser Kunst immer mehrers sich beslissen / mit
aushebung aller Difficulteten / den bästen Weg zu finden / wie dei Proportion verkürzbar zu machen / und
der rechte Schatten zu erhalten / sey damit der verlangte effect erfolge.” Sandrart, *Teutsche Academie*, 76.
\(^{139}\) Wann nun das Menschliche Auge gegen einem solchen Bild / so gemeinlich auf etwas empor stehet / sich
wendet / da zeigen sich ihme erstlich die Fußolen / Kniehe oder Schenkel / und dann erst die übrigen
Theile des Leibes: daher die Kunst billig diesen Namen bekommen.” Sandrart, 76.
cannot be outlined by language or rules. After listing the five “principal” points of painting for the Ancients (invention, design, color, the representation of motion and the economy by which the entire scene is portrayed) Junius writes that “a certain grace” gives life. “The case standeth even thus with picture: unlesse there bee in the worke that same ayre and comely Grace (welstandigheyd), which is made up by the concord and agreement of severall accomplished parts, it cannot please the beholder.” Junius translates the English grace into the Dutch welstandigheyd.

Turning to Pliny, Junius mentions the painter Apelles (the Antique painter, also the inspiration for the Tekenboek’s title the Artis Apellae liber), whose art was attributed to Grace. As Junius imagines the Ancient painter:

“Where the peerelesse artificer [Apelles] understandeth by this Grace, nothing else but a peculiar perfection of the Invention, Proportion, Colour, Motion, Disposition, so diffused through the whole work, that the picture we doth not so much ravish our senses with the Invention, Proportion, Colour, Motion, Disposition, as they are peculiar perfections and perfect in themselves, but rather as they bring all their peculiar perfections together, to achieve the highest perfection of an universall Grace indifferently, shewing it selfe in the whole worke, and in every part of it.”

---

141 “De opinste volmaecktheyd der Schilderyen is voornaemlik daer in gheleghen, dat dese vijf hoofd-stucken malckander in’t werck soo vriendelick ontmoeten en soo wel met malckander over een draeghen, dat es door haeren onderlinghen eendraght een sekere soorte van aengenaemheyd ofte welstandtigheyd (die ghmenlick de Graatiedo Bevalligheydt der Schildereyen gheenaemt wordt) ’t sementlick uytsorten. Soo en is oock dese Graatie in haeren eyghen aerd anders niet, dan een soete en gantsch vriendelick over een stemmig van allerley volmaecktheden in een stuck wrecks op een gehoppt.” Franciscus Junius, De schilderkonst der Oude, Begrepen in drie Boeken (Middelburgh, 1641) 3:6:1.
Grace unites a work. Ineffable, grace bestows a “peculiar perfection.” Through grace, Apelles reconciles the disparity among many different elements within a composition. Grace cannot be described because it is the quality that pulls all the disparate parts of a picture together into a single body.

For Francis Bacon, beauty is expressed in motion. It is not the effortless grace of perfect proportion but may contain “some strangeness” and is formed “not by rule.” Bacon derides the famous studies of Dürer and the oft-quoted Renaissance maxim that beauty is formed from a pastiche of the loveliest parts:

In beauty, that of favor, is more than that of color; and that of decent and gracious motion, more than that of favor. That is the best part of beauty, which a picture cannot express; no, nor the first sight of the life. There is no excellent beauty, that hath not some strangeness in the proportion. A man cannot tell whether Apelles, or Albert Duré, were the more trifler; whereof the one, would make a personage by geometrical proportions; the other, by taking the best parts out of divers faces, to make one excellent. Such personages, I think, would please nobody, but the painter that made them. Not but I think a painter may make a better face than ever was; but he must do it by a kind of felicity (as a musician that maketh an excellent air in music), and not by rule.

In different ways, both Bacon and Junius struggle with the “Apelles” tradition, in which “the most beautiful parts” make a body. For Junius, Apelles united the disjointed limbs into a single figure through grace. For Bacon, a picture need not be made from a selection of the most beautiful parts; it is constructed through a “certain felicity.”

---

144 Samuel van Hoogstraten cites Bacon’s essay, suggesting that grace (Gratie) “lends a helping hand” to the painter to form beauty. “Franciskus Bacon, van de schoonheit spreekende, brengt de konst in verkleyning. Dat is het beste deel van schoonheyt, zegt hy, ’t welk geen Schilder kan uitleggen; noch door geen eerste aenziende kan bemerkt worden. En daer is geen zoo uitnudente, die geen wanstal onderworpen is. Men kan niet weten of Apelles, of Albert Duré, grooter gek was, van welke de eende, een beeld van Geometricale proportien wilde maken, en d’ander de beste deelen van verscheyde schoonheden gemeng, eene daer uit bestont te formeeren. Maer zulk een afbeeldinge (dunkt hem) kon niemant behaegen, dan den Schilder zelfs. Niet te min (dunkt hem voorts) zoo zouw een Shilder wel een beeter beelt kunnen maken, dan’er oit geweest is, maer dat zoude door geluk, of by geval, geschieden; gelijk ’t gebeuren kan, dat een
While the concepts of grace or a certain felicity resonate with the role of judgment in early-modern artistic practice, they nevertheless remain separate. As David Summers demonstrates, judgment connects to the eye; it is the giudizio dell’occhio (judgment of the eye). The question of judgment is bound to optics, vision and the eye’s ability to perceive. In contrast, these discussions of grace and welstandt engage with the entire body of the artist. Welstandt suggests the sensation of a body’s presence beyond the optical illusion. Despite their slight differences in interpreting the Apelles tradition and its relationship to grace, both Junius and Bacon agree that grace unites a single body within a picture’s plane. Here in Bacon’s and Junius’s discourses on “grace,” can be found the intersections between grace and the printed drawing book.

The pedagogy of the printed drawing book is based upon learning to build bodies from the assemblage of parts. Grace points towards what the printed drawing book cannot teach: the ability to unite limbs and organs through a “kind of felicity.” Bloemaert’s three nude studies for the Artis Apellae liber show his mastery in uniting bodily fragments into a single figure, through a kind of felicity, through grace. Bloemaert’s nudes reveal that drawing the body-in-movement is founded not upon proportion or anatomy (there are no illustrations of either within the Artis Apellae liber) but upon “grace” and welstandigheyd—the mastery of a body’s three-dimensional presence.

As a body moves, the relationships among knees, calves, palms, fingers, arms and shoulders, neck and head shift in relationship to a viewer. Instead of emphasizing

musikant in sijn speelen een zoet geluit maekt’ zonder eenigen regel. Maer hier op moet een konstenaer uitroepen, o Bakon! Uw hooge wijsheyt doet u doolen, en dit is vermetelheyt buiten uw leest. Zeker ‘t geene G. Vosius zegt, dat hoe groot ook een schoonheyt is, zy wort van verscheide beelden overwonnen, geschiet niet by geval, schoon ‘er somtijts wel eenige toeval van Gratie da hulpende handt toe verleent heeft.” Samuel van Hoogstraten, Inleyding tot de hooge schoole der Schilderkonst, 279-280.

proportion or anatomy, artists such as Bloemaert (and writers such as Junius and Bacon) instantiate that movement and its representation may be attained by “grace.” While the skill to convey a mobile body embodying force establishes itself within certain pedagogical practices, such as studying Michelangelo’s prints and working nae t’leven in the studio, there nevertheless remains something that cannot be taught.

In his Essay on Criticism (1711), Alexander Pope states there are “nameless graces which no methods teach, / And which master-hand alone can reach.” Pope understands grace “beyond the reach of art, / Which, without passing through judgment, gains the heart, and all its end at once attains.” For Pope, a “nameless grace” grabs the “heart.” This sentiment echoes certain devotional narratives—such as those of Thomas à Kempis—that are built upon an individual’s immediate relationship to God through the heart. Indeed, welstandt has deeper resonances than the ability to “foreshorten” figures.

The Body: A Made Image

The Staten Generael use the term wel-standt in their introduction to the Statenvertaling to declare that they have done everything to ensure the welstandt and propagation of the Reformed Church. Not only artists utilized the term welstandt to discuss the appearance of three-dimensionality but also the States General deployed the term to express the hope that the Reformed Church would allow a welstandt between the state religion of the Reformed Church and the Dutch Republic. Wel-standt expresses the

147 “Saluyt, Doen te weten: dat wy van den aen-beginne der Reformatie af in dese Landen ter herten ghenomen, ende met alle vlijt ende sorghvuldigheydt ghetrache hebben te besorgen alles wat tot goeden welstant ende voort-plantinge van de Oprechte, Ware, Christelicke Gereformeerede Religie, ende den suyveren Godts-dienst heeft moghen stricken ende noodigh was.” Anonymous, Biblia (Statenvertaling) fol. 2r.
“well-being” between a part and whole, whether between an institution and a country, or between an individual and God. In his history of the Netherlands (Nederlandsche Historien), P.C. Hooft (1581-1647) continually uses the term welstandt der Landen in order to express the well being and protection of the Dutch Republic under the Sovereignty of the Princes and Christ and against the Spanish.148 The term welstandt, other than the uses of Karel van Mander and Philips Angel, primarily refers to the well-being of the United Netherlands and their unified body. The term welstandt comes to refer to an individual’s body in Frederik Ruysch (1638-1731) and his Alle de ontleed-genees-en heelkundige werken, when he refers to the “well-being” of his body, despite his increasing age (89 years).149 Nevertheless, before Ruysch, term welstandt appears in relationship to the wellbeing between separate entities, individual and state, individual and God, picture and viewer.

The term welstandt also appears in a fundamental seventeenth-century philosophical tract, Benedict Spinoza’s God, Man and Welstandt (1662), an expression of welstandt as a means to discuss relationship between man and God. The connection between Spinoza and art theory is by no means farfetched.150 Willem Goeree, one of the

149 “Hier op dient tot antwoordt, als ik overwege, en my binnen bring, hoe na ik, door de zeer hooge jaren, en ouderdom de Eeuwigheidt genadert ben, zoude ik wel chier de penne by my nederleggen, en laten rusten: maar aan de andere zyde, overwegende de geode welstandt mynes lichaams, en krachten, die ik door de onverdiende genade van den alles vermogenden Heere tot noch toe, zynde nu getreden in myn 89 Jaar, geniete.” Frederik Ruysch, Alle de ontleed-genees-en heelkundige werken (Amsterdam: Janssoons van Wasberge, 1744) 1112.
150 Jonathan Israel defines the European seventeenth century as a “crisis of the mind,” battling between a fading Aristotelianism and an emerging Cartesianism. He argues that from the 1660s onwards, Spinozism provided a site of cohesion for the disparate movements and thinkers, providing the basis for the “Radical Enlightenment” and “atheism.” Jonathan Israel, Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the Making of Modernity, 1650-1750 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001). My use of Spinoza here is not to suggest that he influenced Bloemaert (impossible), but that Spinoza deploys a use of the word welstandt (vital for art theory) in a way that brings together its various meanings, pointing to a relationship between a part and whole, which indicates a larger relationship between the individual and divine. Spinoza is always a bit of a
Classicist art theorists *par excellence*, specifically discusses Spinoza in his treatise on representing the human body, *Natuurlyk en schilderkonstig ontwerp der menschkunde* (1683). Goeree poses the Cartesian (and Spinozan) question: what is the relationship between the body and the soul? Considering Descartes’ claim that the body and the soul are separate entities, Goeree asserts that it is vital to understand the material (*stoffelijk*) body with respect to the non-bodily thinking *Geest* (mind), and how these two act together in the world. Goeree turns to Spinoza for an answer to his question: “Benedict Spinoza, who stated that God is everything, imagined that the soul does not determine the body through movement and stillness, but that the body and the soul are one and the same thing.”\(^{151}\)

In his passage on *welstandt*, Spinoza connects man’s well being (*welstandt*) to his ability to gain direct knowledge of an object (intuition):

> Since, then, Reason has no power to lead us to the attainment of our well-being (*welstandt*), it remains for us to inquire whether we can attain it through the fourth, and last, kind of knowledge. Now we have said that this knowledge does not result from something else, but from a direct revelation of the object itself to the understanding. And if that object is glorious and good, then the soul becomes necessarily united with it, as we have also remarked in reference to our body.\(^{152}\)

\(^{151}\) “Benedictus de Spinosa, die na alle waarschijnlijkheyd steld dat het Heel-al God is, steld voor cast dat het Lichaam de Ziel niet tot denken, noch de Ziel het Lichaam tot beweging noch tot ruste kan bepalen; maar dat het Lichaam en de Ziel, een en ’t selve ding is, dat nu onder de toe-eygening van beweging, end an onder toe-eygening van denken bevat werd.” Willem Goeree, *Natuurlyk en schilderkonstig ontwerp der menschkunde* (Amsterdam: Wilhelmus Goeree, 1682) 359.

\(^{152}\) Benedictus de Spinoza, *Spinoza’s Short Treatise on God, Man & his Wellbeing*, trans. A. Wolf (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1910) 133. “Aangezien dan de reeden geen magt heeft om ons tot onze welstandt te brengen, zo blyft dan overig dat wij onderzoeken, of wij door de vierde en leste manier van kennisse daar toe kunnen geraaken? Wij hebben dan gezeid dat deze manier van kennisse niet en is uyt gevolg van iets anders, maar door een onmiddellijke vertooninge aan het verstand van het voorwerp zelve: En zo dat voorwerp dan heerlyk is en goet, zo werd de ziele noodzaakelyk daar mede vereenigt, zo wij ook van ons lichaam gezeid hebben. Hier uyt dan volgt onwiderspreekelyk; dat de kennisse die is, welke de liefde veroorzaakt.” Benedict de Spinoza, *Korte verhandeling van God, de Mensch en deszelfs welstandt*, XXII.
Spinoza confronts whether or not direct and immediate knowledge of the object is possible. According to Spinoza, a person may attain *well being* through “a direct revelation of the object itself.” Goeree’s discussion of Spinoza illuminates the grounding of the term *welstandt* within a relational philosophy of subjects and objects. As Spinoza asserts, through corporeal things “the direct revelation of the object,” the study of the “incorporeal,” is possible. Indeed, this resonates with Panofsky’s discussion of a crisis between “subjects” and “objects” in the latter half of the sixteenth century. I would argue that a large part of this crisis stemmed from confessionalism. The relationship between the individual and the body of the Church (Christ’s body) was thrown into confrontation as different religions established their *one true faith* against other religions. In their movement towards the “universal,” from the study of the particular, artists of the Haarlem and Utrecht Academies grounded their practices within a “universalized” representation of the body. Frances Yates has drawn attention to the way in which the French Academies before 1635 were places for a peaceful dialogue and mutual exchange between Protestants and Catholics in the early Academies. Drawing the “religious image” *par excellence*, the naked male form (*the image made by God*), allowed the possibility of a universal, idealized image.

Drafting bodies and things *nae t’leven* presumes a spatial relationship between the artist and the figure. Nevertheless, even when drawing *uyl den gheest*, artists are left with the continuing presence of their own bodies. It is not sketching the rural landscapes of

---

153 Spinoza, *Short Treatise*, 134-135; “en wanneer wij dan deze uitwerkingen gewaar worden, alsdan konnen wij met waarheid zeggen weder geboren te zijn. Want onse eerste geboorte was doen als wij vereenigide met het lichaam door welke sondanige uijtwerkingen en lopinge van geesten zyn ontstaan: maar deze onse andere of tweede geboorte zal dan zijn, zo wanneer wij geheel andere uytwerkingen van liefde, gestelt na de kennisse van dit onlichamelijk voorwerp, in ons gewaar worden.” Spinoza, XXII.
Utrecht, which were then absent when Bloemaert returned to his workshop to paint. The body can never be entirely absent. Like the late Scholastic tension between the “intuitive” and the “abstractive,” Netherlandish artistic practice worked in the juxtaposition between leven and gheest, or the intuitive and the corporeal versus the abstractive and the incorporeal. Drawing the male nude was fundamental to the development of nae t’leven because it exercised not only the artist’s relationship to other objects in the world but also the artist’s relationship to his own body and the communal body of the guild, the workshop, the Church (as a concept personified by Ecclesia).

As pedagogical examples, Bloemaert’s nudes display neither a mastery of anatomy nor proportion. But in their attention to foreshortening, the “appearance of moving,” and the practice of welstandt, Bloemaert’s nudes speak to the “certain felicity” that is able to bring together the disparate limbs of a body into a united moving whole. This mastery cannot be explained in words—although writers such as Junius and Bacon attempted, through grace. Bloemaert’s nudes demonstrate that the ability to draw the body-in-movement comes out of an embrace of gheest, intellect, and the incorporeal. The act of drawing the particular nude body in the studio, and then abstracting and universalizing it, was a means to explore the rift between subjects and objects, mind and nature. The attempt to universalize the particular contextualizes the foundation of Academies dedicated to bringing together artists around God’s made image—the body.
Abraham Bloemaert was a master without a master. Under the guidance of his father Cornelis, Bloemaert began his artistic education copying prints and drawings. After leaving his father’s house, Bloemaert joined the workshop of Joos de Beer (a fellow Utrecht artist). While working as a young apprentice in de Beer’s workshop, Bloemaert “counterfeited” (gheconterfeyt) a painting so well that his father Cornelis, who “could not come to an agreement with de Beer (who had little interest in such things), took his son back home because he felt that he had enough clever pieces of his own for copying.”

This vignette illustrates both the importance of learning from other artists’ prints, drawings (and paintings) in the early stages of Bloemaert’s training. Bloemaert’s father was a sculptor/engineer/architect, who would have been familiar with the technical draftsmanship necessary for an artisan. Nevertheless, Bloemaert’s own artistic pedagogy bears little influence of this technical instruction and instead, as instantiated by his biography, is founded upon the successful copy. Bloemaert’s training as a painter outside of his father’s house continued in a series of uninspired apprenticeships from Utrecht to France. During his final “apprenticeship” in a “Master Herry’s” workshop in France, Bloemaert remained un-tutored and unchallenged in the precepts of perspective, proportion and color. Nevertheless, the young draftsman practiced drawing from his intellect (alles uyt den gheest)—the highest skill of an artist.

The history of Bloemaert’s apprenticeships and his self-modeled position as an artist auto-didact remains important for understanding the project to which he dedicated

---

154 Van Mander, Lives, 446; Van Mander, Schilderboeck, fol. 297.
himself at the end of his life, the *Artis Apellae liber*. In a practice grounded within repetitive, rote drawing after other artist’s work, without guidance from a master, Bloemaert learned to draw *uyt den gheest*. Just as his father took Bloemaert back into his house because he had enough “clever” pieces for his son to copy, so the *Artis Apellae liber* provides for the willing student a printed collection of works to copy. Nevertheless, as I will argue, the *Artis Apellae liber* presents not only a series of lessons for a student to dutifully mimic but also a work that engages with the role of senses in artistic practice. In engaging with the sensory in practice, the *Artis Apellae liber* moves the student beyond repetitive copying.

**Sensory Organs and their Objects**

Disconnected eyes, noses, mouths, heads and hands introduce the drawing lessons for the *Artis Apellae liber*, and so suggest an integral relationship between learning to draw and the senses (fig. 98). Bloemaert introduces the eye in conjunction with the mouth, the nose and the ear. The four organs work separately yet in concert. This introductory lesson demonstrates a drawing pedagogy rooted within the corporeal perception of the world. As young drawing students began their practice with working from prints and drawings, the printed drawing book provided a set of models for beginning apprentices.

Most drawing books in the tradition of the Carracci *Academia* begin with variations on studies of the sensory organs, from Fialetti’s arched lines building step-by-step the socket and curve of the eye (fig. 30) to Franco’s play among eyes, mouths, lips, moustaches, ears and hair (fig. 32). These are the precursors to the eyes, ears, noses and faces of the Bloemaerts’ opening composition. The drawing manual also suggests the role
of images in mediating between the perceiver and the outside world. One can see one’s own eyes, ear, nose, and mouth only through reflection. Eyes (the organ of sight) only can be seen indirectly, through the intercession of another surface—a mirror, a painting, and a printed drawing book.

Bloemaert’s students do not begin their studies with objects such as a shoe, table or vase; they are introduced to the process of design through drawing the organs that make the act of perceiving the outside world possible. This choice establishes drawing instruction in the Aristotelian cognitive tradition that all knowledge comes through the senses. In *De Anima*, Aristotle delineates a sensory map that continues to influence popular understandings of sensory perception today. Defining five senses (sight, hearing, smell, taste and touch), Aristotle describes not only the object of attention and its qualities but also the psychical function of each sense. “The sense and its organs are the same in fact, but their essence is not the same.” The sensory organ is a “spatial magnitude,” whereas “the power to perceive” is not necessarily a magnitude that occupies space.\textsuperscript{155} Sight is what we perceive with our eyes and discerns colors. Through the medium of air the ear receives sound. The object of the nose is odor, classified into five categories: sweet, sharp, bitter, pungent and oily. Taste is a form of touch, and falls into six classifications: sweet, bitter, fatty, salty, pungent and burning hot. The organ of touch, for Aristotle, is not the flesh or skin (the medium of touch but not the organ); the organ of touch is “situated further inward.”\textsuperscript{156} While today philosophers and scientists


might count as many as seventeen (or more) senses, taking into account animal modes of
perception through magnetic fields, electric fields, infrared and echolocation, the
Aristotelian demarcation of five senses attached to organs which “occupied spatial
magnitudes” and corresponded to outer “objects” continued as the basic understanding of
the senses into the seventeenth century.\(^\text{157}\)

Printed drawing books, like the *Artis Apellae liber*, ground their pedagogy in the
pictorialization of the sensory organs, making the means of perception an object in itself.
One might argue that by reducing the “five senses” to visual representations the multiple
senses become a single object of sight. Bloemaert, however, in his juxtapositions among
eyes, ears, noses, mouth, tongues and hands evokes the synesthetic intermingling of all
five sensory processes in perceiving the world, thereby pictorializing the “spatial
magnitudes” of the sensory organs. The student following the *Artis Apellae liber* turns the
page to the third lesson, which presents a plethora of various ears, framed by profiles by
hair and by a single eye (fig. 99). The heads form a triangular composition, a young girl
gazing down bordered by the profiles of two bearded men. The faces break apart into
separate studies: the cartilage of an ear viewed from different angles and lights; a study of
an unruly lock of hair contained behind an ear. Amid these “auditory” fragments, a single
eye—barely connected to an emergent face circumscribed by wisps of hair, looks out
from the page. A face, an eye, an ear, the suggestions of gazes, turns and thoughts, this
lesson teaches a student to draw an ear or a face neither with line-by-line instruction nor
with principles of geometry or perspective. The attention to ears makes the sensory act of

---

\(^{157}\) For an overview of current research on the senses, see: Fiona Macpherson, “Individuating the Senses,”
*The Senses: Classical and Contemporary Philosophical Perspectives* (Oxford: Oxford University Press,
2011) 3-43.
hearing visual. The disembodied and turning ear lobes play against the single eye.

Removing the mediators of textual and visual instruction, this drawing exercise suggests that just as the ear receives noise and the outer world impresses itself on the eye, like these sensory modes of reception, this lesson too will impress itself into the cognitive mind of the draftsman.

Seeing: The Lens of the Eye

Medieval optics and cognition was a strange wedding between geometrical optics (diagrams of triangles tracing light rays from objects to eye lenses) and “species” (separate bodies that transported images of the object to the inner senses, impressing themselves within the internal processes of cognition). The legacy of medieval geometrical optics, founded in the work of the polymath Alhazen (965-1040), came to fruition in the writings of Johannes Kepler (1571-1603). For Alhazen (965-1040), and later for Roger Bacon (1214-1294), John Pecham (1230-1292), and Witelo (b.1230) among others, light and color are embedded within the object. Every detail of the object sends its form to the eye’s lens. The means of transportation between the object and the lens are species, which infinitely multiply and carry the image from the object to the lens through the optical channels of cognition.\textsuperscript{158} The confusion of the mosaic impressions of light and color require \textit{intuitio}, which discriminates, compares and finally “combines them into a definite perceptible representation.”\textsuperscript{159}

The optical theory in the medieval period placed the apex of a triangle in the retina of the eye. In 1604, Kepler inverted this schema so that the apex is on the object

\textsuperscript{158} A. Mark Smith, “Getting the Big Picture in Perspectivist Optics,” \textit{Isis} 72.4 (1981) 582.
\textsuperscript{159} Smith, “Getting the Big Picture,” 584.
instead of the eye. Light rays then “paint” on the eye, while the eye’s lens focuses the picture. From Kepler onwards this mode of mathematical and optical vision dominates seventeenth-century discourses on vision and “ picturing.”

Certainly, Kepler was revolutionary in discerning that the image on the retina was inverted, but as David Lindberg asserts in his study on optics, Kepler’s idea of “pictures painted on the retina” is rooted in a medieval tradition. From Alahazen to Kepler, a one-to-one correspondence between points on the object and points on the eye define theories of vision. As Lindberg states, “Kepler presented a new solution (but not a new kind of solution) to a medieval problem, defined some six hundred years earlier by Alhazen.”

The field of optics studies the difference between the spatial attributes of an object in the world and how the object stimulates the eye and creates a representation. Drawing books that approach the world through geometry use the rules of Vitruvius, Platonic solids, and diagrams to explain and master the discrepancy between how the world exists and how it is viewed. This tradition of drawing book initiated by Albrecht Dürer developed in tandem with a strong textual tradition, necessary to explain the complicated processes of perspective and proportion.

Embedded in the medieval geometrical optical theories of vision (dominated by triangular lines of sight) is the concept of the species, the minute bodies that travel

---

160 It may be noted also that another important theory of visual perception in the early-modern period, grounded in Book IV of Lucretius’s *De rerum natura*, also presumed a materialist basis for perception, in which particles streamed for the objects to the eye of the observer. Fundamentally this theory of perception is different than the geometrical-optical version because it allows more for a “relativity” of perception than the direct copying of species, but similarly, it presumes a physical contact between the perceiver and the object through “emanations.” Under the influence of Lucretius, philosophers such as Robert Boyle and John Locke maintained the “action of subvisible bodies on the sensory organs of observers.” For Epicureanism and perception, see: Margaret Graver, “The Eye of the Beholder: Perceptual Relativity in Lucretius,” *Apeiron: A Journal for Ancient Philosophy and Science* 23.4 (1990): 91-116; Wilson, “Epicureanism in Early Modern Philosophy,” 269.


between the object and the senses to convey a direct impression on the senses. The
species at once guarantee an exact image, while at the same time making it impossible to
“know the thing itself” as the endlessly replicating species mediate between the world
and the perceiver. The viewer never sees the object, only the direct copies of the object
provided by the reproducing, travelling species. As medieval cognition scholar Katherine
Tachau writes about Roger Bacon, the journey of species from the eye to the object is a
self-generating process of replication: “a visible object generates, or ‘multiplies’ species
of light and color in the adjacent, transparent medium.” As Tachau explains, species
“generate further species in the medium contiguous to them, which results in a
continuous multiplication of species along rays proceeding in all unobstructed directions
from all points on the objects surface.” The import of the reproductive generation of
species as a mode of copying has yet to be taken into consideration for considering the
role of copying images in the early-modern period. Albrecht Dürer, obsessed by
perspective, interested in optics, and whose diagrams are thought to have influenced
Kepler’s own experiments, established a tradition of artistic pedagogy within geometry.
The geometrical-optical approach to drawing, seen in Dürer’s Underweysung der
Messung (1525 and 1538), makes complex Euclidean problems and Italian Renaissance
secrets on the art of perspective widely available to Northern artists and artisans. Through
the presentation of geometric lessons and a use of text and illustration, Dürer explains,
systematizes, and theorizes the process of drawing everything from alphabetic letters to

163 With his razor, William of Ockham removed species from the process of cognition, arguing that through
intuition, a person may perceive the existence of the “thing itself.”
164 Katherine H. Tachau, Vision and certitude in the age of Ockham: optics, epistemology and the
the human body. The *Artis Apellae liber* does not ground sensory experience in geometrical optics—as is obvious from the absence of perspectival diagrams and geometry. Instead it presents the images themselves directly to the eye mediated through print. While the medium of print may have been revolutionary, its defining feature of copying images in seemingly endless iterations—images mediating between the things themselves and a perceiver—was grounded within late-medieval Aristotelianism.

Returning to the opening lesson of the *Artis Apellae liber*, Frederik engraves Bloemaert’s drawing with a thin line, keeping the pen-like quality to the engraving (fig. 78). Nevertheless, this is a fixed impression that will be printed in potentially infinite iterations. The mollusk-shaped eyes that stare out from the lesson at the draftsman present not only iconographic types of eyes that circulated within the printed drawing book world but also the action of the eye impressing itself onto the draftsman’s own eye. Through repetitively copying these arched, circular and hatched pupils and irises, eye brows and sockets, lips and noses, the draftsman moves beyond seeing various sensory parts to impressing the forms of the sensory “spatial magnitudes” into the organs themselves through the act of drawing. Like the information of the outer world that vision, smell and taste process, the opening lesson emphasizes the images of the knowledge-receptors themselves. Like the endless replication of species between object and eye, the young draftsman inscribes this image into his memory, impressing the outer world into his inner senses. The *Artis Apellae liber* presents the process of cognition itself as inherently pictorial and bodily, while also confronting the ability to see “the thing itself.” The strange disembodied eyes resting among gaping mouths and barely smiling

---

lips incongruously stare out at the viewer, presenting images as a series of constant replications, from the printed drawing book to the picture of the eye impressed onto the eye.

**Touch: A Movement Inward**

Grounding printed pedagogical projects within the senses may be found not only in seventeenth-century printed drawing books but also in the most influential pedagogical project of the century, the “last Bishop of Bohemia” Johan Comenius (1592-1670) and his *Orbis pictus* (1658), a children’s picture book (fig. 100). In his life’s work as pedagogue and theologian, Comenius sought to unite faith and education in a utopian pan-European method that would bridge confessional divides. Born in Moravia, Comenius was forced into exile in 1621 after the famous Battle of White Castle in 1620, when Emperor Mathias, Ferdinand of Austria sought to reclaim his throne from the Calvinist Frederick of the Palatinate. Following Ferdinand’s victory, there was a rapid “recatholicization” of Bohemia, as the Habsburg Ferdinand sought to assert his legitimacy to power. In the midst of this upheaval, Comenius was forced into exile.

---


167 For an overview of the Counter-Reformation in Bohemia, see: Howard Louthan, *Converting Bohemia: Force and Persuasion in the Catholic Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009); Robert Bireley, “Ferdinand II: Founder of the Habsburg Monarchy,” *Crown, Church, Estates*, ed. R.J.W. Evans (London: Macmillan, 1991) 226-244; R.J.W. Evans, “The Significance of the White Mountain for the Culture of the Czech Lands,” *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 44 (1971): 34-54. In this article, Evans lays out a relationship between religion, history and interpretation that similarly parallels my own, only I would argue that the “religious question” has been a weakness for art history and its adherence to categories of Catholic and Calvinist in the seventeenth century: “The religious question has been something of a weakness of much politically-oriented historical explanation of this period. There is no need
Like many seventeenth-century intellectuals forced into transnational wanderings during the religious upheavals of the Thirty Years War, Comenius settled in Amsterdam. Despite his work as a Theologian (a member of the Unity of Brethren), Comenius’s life as a religious refugee from the Hapsburgs and “Counter-Reformation Catholicism” led to the instantiation of a pedagogical method widely adopted by both Protestants and Catholics (even the Jesuits published Comenius’s textbooks). Described as a “pansophy,” (universal philosophy), Comenius’s search for “universal knowledge” based itself in “an on-going process, beginning with sensory reactions to reality and continuing with rational treatment of the knowledge acquired for the solution of a given problem and of historical pluriform experience.” The groundwork for his pansophy was universal education. In his Great Didactic (1631), Comenius argues for an educational program that will lead not only to “true knowledge” but also “the deepest piety.”

For Comenius, knowledge begins in sensory experience. The introduction to the Orbis pictus discusses the necessity of the senses to discern differences among things:

to enter here the debate about religious motivation: clearly it was the formative impulse, but at the same time it was crystallizing out highly complex emotions and ideas, and involved no separation from ultimately philosophical questions, a fortiori political ones. We must place ourselves squarely in a climate where all the issues of the day were tinged with religion and themselves touched and modified it, not in the sense that men of action were wedded to another world which debased this one, but because it was through religious categories that such men saw the deepest matters…” Evans, “White Mountain,” 37. Evans also gives a measured reading of Comenius in relationship to the reformism of his youth in Bohemia, 47-50.


Comenius’s instantiation of knowledge within the senses, while reasoning with a Neo-Aristotelianism, fundamentally diverges because Comenius’s project in the Orbis Pictus uses words to introduce the student to things, as opposed to more words. Indeed, this may be seen as the Baconian influence on Comenius; Bacon argued against “the pointlessness of all forms of science which base themselves on books, language, or logical method dealing with words, not things.” Brian Vickers, “Francis Bacon and the Progress of Knowledge,” Journal of the History of Ideas 53 (1992): 495-518. As Vickers points out, Bacon departs from Aristotelianism by seeking “the discovery of knowledge” rather than “communication.” Vickers, 514.
“Now there is nothing in the understanding, which was not before in the sense. And therefore to exercise the senses well about the right receiving the differences of things, will be to lay the grounds for all wisdom, and all wise discourse, and all discreet actions in ones course of life.”

Just as Bloemaert instantiates his drawing pedagogy within the representation of the sensory organs, so Comenius initiates his pedagogical project by acknowledging the necessity of the senses to discern “difference.”

In his lesson devoted to the Sensus externi & interni, Comenius displays organs—eye, tongue, ear, hand, and brain—on a cloth background, the two top corners of the cloth pinned (fig. 101). First, Comenius names and describes the functions of the various outer senses. The eyes recognize colors (black and white, green and blue, red and yellow); the ears hear sounds (natural voices and words; artificial tunes); the nose smells odors good and bad; the tongue tastes (sweet, bitter, sharp and sour); the hand determines the quantity and quality of things (hot and cold, humid and dry). Next, Comenius arrives at the inner senses, numbered across the human brain. The number seven designates the common sense, which recognizes the resemblances of things apprehended by the outer senses. Number eight corresponds to the fantasy (imagination), which distinguishes

Similarly, Comenius in the Orbis pictus teaches words in order to explore “things” in the world. See also: Perez-Ramos, Fracis Bacon’s Idea of Science and the Maker’s Knowledge Tradition (Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1988). Comenius also, however, significantly departs from Bacon in his adherence to the importance of both natural philosophy and Biblical revelation, see: Ann Blair, “Mosaic Physics and the Search for a Pious Natural Philosophy in the Late Renaissance,” Isis 1 (2000) 41-42.

(dintingue, juge, entscheidet) and judges among different things. Finally, number nine highlights the memory, which keeps everything and brings it out for use when needed.

While Comenius’s understanding of sensory perception fixes itself in a seventeenth-century theologic-philosophical bouillabaisse of Neo-Aristotelianism, Baconism and mysticism, his framing device demonstrates his commitment to theological questions of reproduction. Comenius presents the sensory organs imprinted on a cloth, referring to Veronica’s Veil, the piece of cloth in which Christ pressed his face while bearing his cross to Calvary. When Christ’s face touched the cloth, he left an image of his face. Comenius’s use of this framing device and pictorial background for the inner and outer senses suggests both images made without hands and the images made on the inner senses by the outer senses impressions.

Comenius connects the process of sensory reception to theological questions of image production. Veronica’s Veil, a subject of popular representation from medieval icons, prints and to seventeenth century painting was “the first universally known individual image of Christ in the West.” Indeed, Veronica’s Veil was a subject in Bloemaert’s work, as may be seen in the 1605 print designed by Bloemaert and engraved by Jacob Matham (fig. 102). The continuing popularity of Veronica’s Veil in the seventeenth century traces back to the thirteenth century and the rise of the Eucharist. As Gerhard Wolf argues, the cult of Veronica was inseparable from developing questions about “mediasation” and the body. The image of the veil asserted its function not as a rare embodiment or singular icon or relic but precisely through the ubiquity of the copy.

This new understanding of the copy through the Veronica Veil and its popularity in the West is interrelated with Eucharistic veneration, another ubiquitous copy.¹⁷⁵

In the thirteenth century, at the same time that the Veil gained popularity, the Eucharist was codified in the doctrine of transubstantiation. According to Aquinas, the moment the priest says, *hoc est corpus meum* (*this is my body*), the bread becomes the body of Christ.¹⁷⁶ As Wolf points out, Veronica’s Veil and the Eucharist are united in their meteoric rise because they both assert the power of the copy to convey the thing itself, whether it is the presence of Christ in an impressed image of his face, or the presence of his body in the wafer and wine of the Eucharist.¹⁷⁷ The Eucharist, therefore, became the most radical copy ever, with the potential for infinite realization of Christ’s body. At this same time, the Veronica Veil took on its new popularity. Both the Eucharist and the Veil gave substance to Christ’s absent body through infinite copies.

These questions of “the copy” in relationship to Christ’s body and the Eucharist persisted into the seventeenth century, and as I argue, continued to impact the work of Bloemaert and his own grasp of the role of copying as practice. Bloemaert was not the
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¹⁷⁵ Wolf, 168.
¹⁷⁷ Veronica’s Veil took on a new popularity as a certain theology of the Eucharist took hold. A common understanding of the Eucharist throughout the medieval period was consubstantiation, in which both the bread and the body of Christ are present. This view was not accepted by everyone but also not considered heretical. It was not until the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215 that the church issued a definition of Transubstantiation in which the substance of the bread changes in the body of Christ. Although, as has been argued, this definition was not considered orthodox until much later. Luther famously argues that there is the Real Presence of Christ within the Eucharist, but similar to the medieval doctrine of consubstantiation, Luther argues for a co-presence of the bread and the body. Luther’s primary quarrel with the doctrine of Transubstantiation was that it became dogma, not through the teachings of the Bible, but through Papal and conciliar authority, as seen in the Fourth Lateran Council. In response to Luther and his followers, the Council of Trent (1547, 1551) issued the statement that the Presence of Christ in the Eucharist is the miraculous changing of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ with only the sensible qualities remaining of the surface. The legacy of the Council of Trent is the complete changing of the bread into the body of Christ and the wine into the blood of Christ. Before this, Christ could be considered present within the Eucharist, while still not insisting on the complete change (minus its accidents) of the bread into the body of Christ. Following the Council of Trent, as priests raised the chalice and murmured the word—*hoc est meum corpus*—the wine and the wafer changed into the body of Christ while maintaining their external accidents of the sensory qualities of wine and wafer (for Catholics).
only seventeenth-century artist that continued to make images of Veronica’s Veil, as may be seen in El Greco’s *Saint Veronica with the Sudarium* (fig. 103) and Francisco de Zurbarán’s different versions of the image (fig. 104).\(^{178}\) Bloemaert’s own interpretation of *Veronica’s Veil* draws attention to the theology of the “hidden God.” An inscription below the presentation of Christ’s face on the veil, reads: “We saw him, and there was neither impressiveness nor beauty in him, and his face was lowered and hidden (Isaiah 53).”\(^{179}\) Bloemaert’s print of *Veronica’s Veil* refers to the *Deus Absconditus* (the hidden God) a fundamental Augustinian precept, which continued to influence Biblical interpretations in seventeenth century, as may be seen in the writings of Blaise Pascal.

God remains hidden, so that only those who search their heart find him.\(^{180}\) As discussed in *Bodies (Universal and Particular)*, there were two types of knowledge or evidence:

\(^{178}\) On Zurbáran the Veronica and the Eucharist, see: Victor Stoichita, “Zurbáran’s Veronika,” *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 54.2 (1991): 190-206. The representation of Veronica’s Veil in the seventeenth century continued in circles dedicated to exploring the importance of the Eucharist as embodying the *real presence* of Christ. The French Catholic theologians Antoine Arnauld and Pierre Nicole explored an early-modern semiotics (theory of the sign) in order to reconcile the post-Tridentine confirmation of the Eucharist as the *real presence* of Christ’s body and blood with Cartesian metaphysics. Louis Marin argues that the logicians Arnauld and Nicole sought to affirm not only the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist but also the real presence of all bodies in representation: “In fact this demonstration is aimed, in one form or another, at the different modes of the ‘real’ presence of bodies in and through signs, as modalities of the efficacy of representation in ‘reality.’” Louis Marin, “The Figurability of the Visual: The Veronica or the Question of the Portrait at Port-Royal,” *New Literary History* 22.2 (1991) 282-283. Arnauld and Nicole maintain the *real presence* of the Eucharist because they seek the *real presence* of the body. In the seventeenth century, the Eucharist and its parallel image of the Veil not only maintained a way to figure Christ in paint but also to continue a rational belief in the possibility of sensory experience; the world’s representation of the body to its self.

observable nature (*scientia*) and faith. The concept of the *hidden God* found in the heart embodies the knowledge of faith.

While Comenius grounded his pedagogy in the things of the world, it was founded within a belief in the knowledge of faith, as well as *scientia*. In his theological treatise, *Labyrinth of the World and the Paradise of the Heart*, Comenius follows the peregrinations of the pilgrim until the seeker finds God in the heart: “While I was speaking, the light about me began to increase and I perceived those pictures, which I had formerly seen faded and broken, became whole, clearly observable and beautiful.” God tells the pilgrim that He dwells not only in heaven but also “in the contrite heart on earth.”

From the beaten and bloody face of Christ in Bloemaert’s rendition of Veronica’s Veil (*there was neither impressiveness nor beauty in Him*) to the “faded and broken pictures” surrounding the pilgrim, pedagogues such as Bloemaert and Comenius struggle to present two forms of knowledge within their works: what may be sensorily experienced in the natural world and what remains hidden, only to reveal itself through faith.

For a tradition of printed drawing manuals that instantiates the practice of drawing (copying the world and its images) within the sensory organs, Bloemaert suggests that knowledge begins with what is seen, tasted, felt. As the student progresses from the senses to prayer, the *Artis Apellae liber* suggests a movement from the sensory to the divine, from the material to the immaterial, from the eye to the heart. Nevertheless, there remains something beyond what may be viewed, heard, smelled, or touched. This presence of excess beyond what is received by the senses comes out in Bloemaert’s

---

unexpected juxtapositions of bodily sensory fragments. The disconnected eyes, mouths, ears and profiles suggest an infinite variation of relationships between the mouth and the eye, the ear and the profile, the smile, the frown, the variations of turning eyeballs. The disparate moments among these fragments pictorializes the process of sensory reception, the instant before the perceiver is able to discern and create a picture from the multitude of impressions. Nevertheless, the ability to synthesize these impressions as a draftsman remains an act of faith, the draftsman makes whole and beautiful what formerly was “faded and broken.”

Perceiving the Printed World

Drawing books such as Dürer’s and van de Passe’s begin with geometric shapes; Bloemaert commences with the organs of perception. Geometry gives the student a foundation upon which to structure the world, a means to transport the seen world to the represented world, a tool to grapple with the disjunctions between how the world is viewed and how it is restricted by representation’s two-dimensional surface. In contradistinction, Bloemaert grounds drawing in the sensory, absenting a rationalism of a clear and distinct drawing pedagogy. The Catholic mathematician and theologian Bernard Lamy (1640-1715) addresses the distinction between a pedagogy based upon Euclidean geometry and a pedagogy founded upon sensory experience in a treatise on geometry, Les élémens de géométrie ou de la mesure de l’étendue. As Lamy writes, “Plato praises geometry because it detaches from the senses.” Geometry, therefore, “turns us towards the intelligible and eternal, of which the knowledge is the end of Philosophy.” The forces
of pain or pleasure are in the sensible, connected to the material world that is constantly changing. Geometry is a means to free one’s self from the senses and turn towards “intellectual things.” Citing the Catholic mathematician Lamy, draws attention to the mutability between faith and methods. Catholicism need not imply a worship of the sensory, and Protestantism need not point towards a Cartesian geometric clarity.

Bloemaert’s adherence to an exploration of the sensory, therefore, belongs to a century that explored the role of the senses in the attainment of knowledge, and need not necessarily be tied to Bloemaert’s own confessional status as Catholic. The opening lessons of the Artis Apellae liber—the sensory fragments—introduce the paradox of seeing the “thing itself,” a world mediated by the endlessly replications of species, prints, drawings, and the impressions replicating between objects and viewers. Drawing pedagogy begins with drawing other artists’ drawings. Students learn to see the world through other eyes. Next, the young draftsman sketches from sculpture, moving from the two-dimensional page to the three-dimensional sculptural form. Finally, after sketching the world through the prints, drawings and sculptures of other artists, the student draws nae t’leven (after or towards life). In the final stage of drawing practice, the student draws uyt den gheest (from the intellect). Before drawing uyt den gheest, however, nae t’leven was a necessary component of seventeenth-century draftsmanship. As van Mander’s

182 “Platon loue la Géometrie, parce qu’elle détache des sens, auxquels nous nous donnons entierement, & qu’elle nous tourne vers ce qui est intelligible & eternal, dont la connoissance est la fin de la Philosophie, comme la vue Claire des Mysteres est la fin de ceux qui s’y font initier. La volupté & douleur sont comme un clou, qui attaché si fortement l’Ame au Corps, qu’elle en devient dépendante: les choses corporelles lui deviennent ainsi plus cliures, parce qu’elle en est plus touchée. Elle ne juge donc point des choses par la lumiere de la raison, mais pare les impressions qu’elle reçoit de son corps. La force de douleur ou des plaisirs, fait qu’elle ne devient sensible qu’a ces perpetuels & divers changements des choses corporelles qui agissent sur elle; ainsi elle s’aveugle, & perd cette lumiere infiniment plus precieuse que les yeux des corps, étant seule capable de nous faire appercevoir la Nature Divine. La Géometrie est comme un mirior poli, où l’on voit des vestiges & des images des choses intellectuelles, ver lesquelles elle tourne l’esprit après l’avoir comme purifié & degagé de la servitude des sens.” Bernard Lamy, Les élémens de géométrie ou de l’étendue (Amsterdam, 1734).
biography of Bloemaert claims, Bloemaert learned to draw by copying the works of previous masters. Nevertheless, the scholar Jaap Bolten has argued that Bloemaert honed his drawing skills during the 1580’s, when he walked around the Utrecht countryside and completed a series of drawings known today as the *Berlin Album*. The Album reveals the young Bloemaert moving outside the studio and the workshop to observe the “sensible material world that is constantly changing,” the world disparaged by Lamy. This moment when Bloemaert stepped outside the workshop to draw the Utrecht countryside *nae t’leven* was central not only to his development as a draftsman but also to his pedagogy. In his *Artis Apellae liber*, Bloemaert includes a series of figures that transition the pupil from directly copying the printed drawing book to stepping outside into the “sensible material world.”

Through his *beeldjes*, or “genre figures,” transient bodies passing through landscapes observing changing meteoric patterns, Bloemaert moves the pupil from the first stage of drawing pedagogy (copying prints and drawings) to drawing *nae t’leven*. The *beeldjes* in the *Artis Apellae liber* embody the movement from the workshop to the outside world, from copying to perceiving. Bloemaert situates his *beeldjes* in subtly suggested landscape, their bodies in cadence to the movement of the outer world around them. In lesson 112, a figure leans his weight forward onto his walking staff (fig. 105). His wide-brimmed hat protects his face from the glare as he gazes out over the valley from his hillock. He does not regard anything in particular. A tree sways in the wind. He leans his weight on his staff, the curve in his body rhyming with the tree’s own figure.

The *beeldje* for lesson 49 gazes over a receding valley barely defined through a low hill rising from the horizon line. Clouds move in across the open ground (fig. 106).

---

The figure for lesson 53 watches a storm advance (fig. 107). Hands clasped behind his back, the figure stares at the heavily engraved lines suggesting the oncoming of rain and wind. A tree bends into a crescent shape, as wind moves across the landscape. These figures watch the transient, ever-changing play of weather and light, clouds and wind, what Lamy calls the perpetually changing movement of matter. As van Mander’s *Den Grondt* asserts, the study of this light and its patterning of colors is what painters should strive to imitate.

In his section on *Reflection, Reverberation, Glittering of “Return-Seeming”* (*Van de Reflecty, Reverberaty, teghen-glans oft weerschijn*), van Mander tells the painter that he must strive to imitate the way that Aurora bestows light upon the landscape. Van Mander describes the “unveiling” of the earth as night moves into dawn and the sun comes through the clouds, causing a “reverberation”:

> So when night must flee and depart the fields, with his black veil of gloomy appearance, and must further unveil the lovely things in all places on the face of the earth, then one can see in the darkness of the clouds a reverberation, or reflection, when the sun comes to gladden us with the day and to overspread the air with many colors.¹⁸⁴

With their variations of light and shadows suggesting wind and clouds as they part and gather, the *Artis Apellae liber’s beeldjes* echo van Mander. This is what Mander describes as not only a visual “reflection” but also a physical and tactile “reverberation.” It is the sun’s appearance—its light—that paints colors on the surfaces of the air and the landscape.

---

Van Mander’s passage continues when the skin of the body itself becomes a surface for reflection. Again, the reader and van Mander “emerge from the dark night” only to arrive “in green meadows, there lying and sitting to enjoy ourselves – so reflection begins to do its work, for me become partakers there of the green, in our faces and bare skin, from the foliage of the trees, grasses and plants.”\textsuperscript{185} The painter becomes folded into the landscape. The skin acts as a surface to reflect the sun and take on the seeming appearance of the greenness of the trees and the grass; the skin becomes the medium for the “inward organ” of touch. Ending this section on reflection, reverberation and return-seeming, van Mander tells the draftsman to go outside to the “globe of nature”: “Finally, eager youths of Gyges, who wander in Pictura’s labyrinths, diligently driven to learn her ways, wherever you wander, for the rousing of pleasure you are recommended to the globe of nature. Send your eyes always carefully to be schooled by her, let the work not discourage you, so perhaps you will enjoy a happy outcome.”\textsuperscript{186}

Within his chapter on \textit{Reflection}, van Mander makes the artist behold the natural wonders of the world and wonder at the sensations of his own body within the world.

Scanning the landscape, their bodies mirroring the movements of the trees, the beeldjes join the landscape in the same way that is recommended by van Mander to the young draftsman. Like the printed figures, the user of the manual stares into the almost empty space of the page and senses the scarcely visible movements of weather, clouds, and birds in the sky and the horizon. The vision is devoted to the natural world, the


opening vistas of perpetually moving matter. And yet what the figures look at is barely
insinuated by Frederick’s burin and Abraham’s pen. These beeldjes teach the fleeting, the
observation of birds, clouds, light, shadow. The subtlety of Bloemaert’s pen and
Frederik’s burin do not capture the meteoric changes but instead portray the process of
blowing, shifting, changing.

In van Mander’s poem on artistic process, nature teaches the movement of color,
the fleetingness of light shadow. Van Mander told the pupil to step outside and study
nature, to imitate the shifting of light. Without using words, Bloemaert’s beeldjes
stimulate the student to put down the book and observe shifting patterns of light and
clouds outside the studio. As Van Mander’s passage makes clear, this study of nature also
considers the draftsman’s body as a site of reflection, reverberation, and “return-
seeming.” Like the shifting clouds under consideration, the body, too, grows, changes,
moves through landscapes and is, ultimately, transient.

At the end of the painter’s Lives, van Mander reminds the reader that all art is
“but a shadow.” He returns the reader to the field, with a Biblical allusion: “And also that
no one will elevate himself too vainly on account of his art which I have previously
called but a shadow of real life and a flower (een bloem), for I know that our life is
nothing but a fleeting shadow and a transient flower of the field.”187 Watching light’s
passage across mountains, valleys, faces, and bodies is a study of one’s own movement
through life. As Bloemaert’s beeldjes traverse through barely-intimated landscapes, faint
lines alluding to perpetually changing matter reflected on the medium of the skin and the

---

187 “Eyidlilinghe wensch ick, niemant mijnen ghedaen arbeydts halven my t’ondancken, t’zy om mijn
onvolvomenheyt, oft yet dat him mishagen mocht. Noch dat niemant sich hem te ydelijck verheffe op fe
Const, die ick vorrhenen een schaduw van t’rechte wesen, en een bloem heb gheheeten, wetende dat oock
ons leven niet en is als een wijckende schaduwe, en een onghedeurighe Veldt-bloem.” Van Mander,
Schilderboeck, fol. 300.
page, the printed drawing manual teaches the student to see the changing nature of his
own body and its surfaces. Nevertheless, the study of the perpetually changing (like
Lamy’s geometry) also may lead to knowledge of the hidden divine. Van Mander’s
reverie on nature belongs to a tradition of literature, which sought to raise oneself through
reflection on nature; for example the Neo-Stoicism of Guillaume du Vair (1556-1621)
and his beholding of the natural world in *Holy Philosophy* (1584) or the writings of the
Jesuit Robert Bellarmine (1542-1621) and his ascent to God through nature, as seen in
*The Ascension of the Mind to God through the Ladder of Created Things* (1614). As
Guillaume du Vair instructs his reader in his treatise on Stoicism, “Take away from the
eyes of our minds the troublesome clouds and mists which ignorance or covetousness
doth cast before them, to the end that our reason being cleared by the light of thy divine
truth, we may always addresse our selves unto the searching and following after that
which is true and everlasting good, which shall continue for ever and ever.”
Wanderers, vagabonds and pilgrims progress through the lessons of the *Tekenboek*, a
study not only of the figures populating the rural countryside of Utrecht but also speaking
to wider questions of bodies moving through variegated landscapes, the pilgrims of
Comenius’s treatise or the Stoics of du Vair’s instructions, an unending journey for the
self. In the *Artis Apellae liber*, this search begins in the sensory world of experience and
travels through the heart.

---

188 See also, Jones, *The Good Life*, 141-142.
The pen’s tapered strokes mimic the hatched lines of an engraving, shadowing the inflections and contours of an aged man (fig. 108). Beard falling, eyes downcast, brow gathered, forehead creased, heavy white highlights on the collar, under the eyes, along the cheekbones contrast with the quick rhythm of pen lines and hatches. The uncertainty of an ear lobe and the black ink splotch for the organ’s cavernous interior (among other infelicities) betray the hand of a copyist. In the Munich Staatliche Graphische Sammlung, this pen, charcoal and wash study is catalogued as “in the style of Abraham Bloemaert.”

This drawing copies a “type” of face that dominates the Artis Apellae liber, the continual reimagining and reworking of the aging face. Disconnected from the bodies of saints and genre figures, these faces (which once may have acted as studies for Jeremiah, Peter or allegories of Winter) dominate Bloemaert’s drawing lessons. As opposed to the rote-copied hatched lines shading the faces of the Munich study, Bloemaert’s pen and Frederik’s burin rapidly and assuredly incise, hatch, squiggle, twirl and draft various visages. In lesson 15, Bloemaert presents faces (like the Munich study) from various angles (fig. 109). Patterns of balding, beards and gazes contrast against one another; each beard and brow formed by a rhythmic concordance of wavy lines and staccato pen strokes. A putti’s head butts itself from the page, its finely delineated hair contrasting with the coarseness of the gathered brows and stares of the aged men. In lesson 38, a bearded head in profile similar to that of the Munich study turns in three different
gradations (in profile, towards the viewer, away from the viewer). A hand proffers a sphere (fig. 110). In lesson 16, Bloemaert gives three-elder variations; a hand fingers a seashell (fig. 111). Lessons of bearded aging men, their eyes turned down and away, dominate the exercises of the Artis Apellae liber.

Neither portraits of a patron nor a historical personage, these faces are called in the literature of Dutch painting tronies, a term used in seventeenth-century inventories to describe paintings of heads (most often anonymous). One of the most famous examples of the tronie may be considered Vermeer’s A Girl with a Pearl Earring (fig. 112). Although scholars agree that tronies articulate expression, their classification and difference from allegorical figures, genre figures and portraiture continues to be a matter of debate. While certain models reappear, tronies are not “portraits.” These heads do not represent a person’s “outward pose” or attributes. Tronies are not titled with names. These single-figure works (often on wood panel and slightly smaller than life)

---

190 For an overview of the tronie etymologically and historiographically, see: Dagmar Hirschfelder, “Portrait or Character Head? The Term Tronie and its Meaning in the Seventeenth Century,” The Mystery of Young Rembrandt (Wolftratshaun: Edition Minerva, 2001) 82-90. Hirschfelder points out that when Karel van Mander uses the term tronie for a portrait, he juxtaposes it with conterfeytels. The scholars Franziska Gottwald and Dagmar Hirschfelder have sought to distinguish the term tronie from “head study,” arguing that head studies were products for the workshop whereas tronies were meant for the open market. For the printed drawing book, I consider the term tronie and “head study” somewhat interchangeable as the books were both for the market and the workshop, see: Dagmar Hirschfelder, Tronie und Porträt in der niederländischen Malerei des 17. Jahrhunderts (Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag, 2008); Franziska Gottwald, Das Tronie, Muster, Studie und Meisterwerk: die Genese einer Gattung der Malerei vom 15. Jahrhundert bis zu Rembrandt (München: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 2011).


192 In later centuries, dealers and print publishers would attach names as titles to anonymous tronies to increase the value, see: Gerdien Wuestman and Diane Webb, “Withered Nell or Rembrandt’s Aunt? Prints of “Tronies” and their Titles,” Simiolus 32.1 (2006): 58-77. Lycke de Vries suggests that Rembrandt’s buyers and patrons were not necessarily supposed to recognize the model, “even if he himself had been the
catch an anonymous person in thought, frozen in a brief moment of inner reflection.

Some look directly at the viewer, as in Vermeer’s *Girl with a Pearl Earring*, but more often the subjects avert their gaze from the viewer’s so that “the twain shall never meet.”

While some *tronies* study laughter (such as those by Frans Hals), Bloemaert’s *tronies*, in their indefinable, ineffable, “inwardness,” border on the melancholic.

The Head

“Head Studies” commanded an important role in sixteenth-century workshop pedagogy. Karel van Mander commends Frans Floris (1517-1570), who traveled to Italy and returned to Antwerp to run a successful workshop, for his ability to act as both a master of a successful workshop and as a teacher training students to become independent masters. According to a student, Floris would indicate the compositional design (for a history painting) to his apprentices on the canvas, then he would tell them “Put in these or those heads; for he [Floris] always had a good few of those to hand on panels.” Through copying the “head studies” and inserting them into larger history compositions, Floris’s students “gained courage and experience so that they saw no problem in setting up canvases and designing something themselves and painting from their imagination.” As this excerpt from Floris’s biography demonstrates, “heads on...
panels” provided pedagogical models for students to gain confidence in building forms through chiaroscuro (bringing a face into relief with the study of light and shadow). The scholar Kurt Bauch likens the “head study” to the drapery study, both pedagogical tools in the workshop to master relief, expression, light and shadow. Nevertheless, the development of head studies as independent works for the market (in a way that drapery studies did not, aside from the assiduous collector) continues to drive discussions of the intersections between pedagogical and market forms in seventeenth-century practice.

Rembrandt’s painted work dominates the scholarship on tronies, yet his paintings cannot be studied separately from his prints (figs. 113, 114). True to the authorial aporias of the Rembrandt workshop, the corpus of influential Rembrandt tronie engravings contains works made not only by the master himself but also by his collaborator, the engraver and artist Jan van Vliet (fig. 115). Artists such as the peripatetic Florentine engraver and draftsman Stefano della Bella (1610-1664) also utilized Rembrandt’s tronies within his own printed drawing books (fig. 116). The development of the tronie in Netherlandish painting cannot be studied without due attention to the printed production of tronie series, as the painted and printed tronies went hand in hand.

Rembrandt’s contemporary Jan Lievens (1607-1674) is considered the major influence on
Rembrandt’s own innovative work within the amorphous genre of the *tronie*. Outside of his influential painted production, Lievens designed an “iconic” series of printed *tronies* entitled *Variae effigies* (1630-32). Here, Lievens displays a variety of “types,” from noblemen (fig. 117) to bearded old men (figs. 118, 119). In Flanders, Michael Sweerts (1618-1664), who briefly ran a drawing academy in Brussels, devoted one of his few print projects to a series of *tronies*, the 1656 *Diversae facies* (fig. 120). Sweerts’ series of printed faces (like Lievens’) surveys a variety of types from the Ancient philosopher (fig. 121) and the precocious child (fig. 122) to the turbaned bust (fig. 123).

*Tronie* print series (such as those by Lievens and Sweerts) take part in a pattern book tradition to which the printed drawing book is indebted as well. Like the *tronie* print series, the printed drawing book publishes patterns of facial types—schematizations of various ages and classes. As may be seen in the previously discussed first lesson of the *Artis Apellae liber*, Bloemaert displays the various parts of the human face (fig. 124). Eyes look away and towards the viewer, lips barely smile, a nose sniffs, a lock of hair grazes against an ear, a moustache crowns an upper a lip. Bloemaert draws, and the student copies the parts of the face, the building blocks of structure. Just as the body is broken down part by part (hands, arms, legs, torsos), so facial features are presented discretely—the better to be combined and recombined in many different faces.

Necessary to understanding the role of *tronies* in a printed drawing book such as the *Artis Apellae liber* is the consideration of the play between the model and the “archetype.” In her recent work on *tronies*, Franziska Gottwald discusses the genesis of


the *tronie* in medieval and early Renaissance model books, such as the *Bohemian Model Book* (fig. 125), in the Kunsthistorisches Museum Vienna. Works such as the *Bohemian Model Book* (*Musterbuch*) provided patterns and *exempla* of faces for an artist’s workshop. A late-medieval predecessor to Lievens’ and Sweerts’ *tronie* series, the *Vademecum* (or *Bohemian model book*) consists of a small portable collection of head studies. Drawn with silverpoint on parchment and framed with wood, each “page” consists of four head studies arranged in a gridded window composed of four panels. In one four-panel window, the artisan places two silverpoint drawings of Christ crowned with thorns (one in the upper-left corner, the other in the lower-right corner) in opposition to a grieving Mary and an angelic face. In one panel, Christ bears his Cross and casts his eyes down in sorrow. In the other silverpoint, Christ crowned with thorns beseeches the viewer directly.

In the windows opposite Christ, a Mary-like figure and an angelic face bear witness to the Christ figure’s suffering. Within a single “window frame,” these four panels display a range of emotions and their accompanying expressions pivoting around Christ’s suffering, from Christ’s sorrow and humility to the gaze with which he meets

those who look upon him. In the *Bohemian Model Book*, the artist creates a dramatic juxtaposition between Christ’s humanity and suffering and its mimesis in the faces that look upon him.

Painters who would have consulted works like the *Bohemian Model Book* to depict Christ’s face confront the process of making a life-like face that emotionally moves the viewer from a schematic representation found in a model book. On unfolding the life-like from the schematic, Herbert Kessler describes the relationship between drawing and copying: the drawing (the drawn figures in a model book such as the *Bohemian Model Book*) acts as the “archetype” and the copy (the copy made by the artisan) materializes the “archetype.”

Between the space of the schematic drawing and its material realization, the icon forms. An artist using the *Bohemian Model Book* might copy the outline of Christ as *Man of Sorrows* as a model. But then the artist would add relief, particular attention to an aspect (tears, blood, hands, thorns), interpreting the model of Christ to become a particular image of devotion. The use of the model book within the workshop for history painting and altarpieces presents an artistic problem that artists of the *tronie* also consider: the creation of the singular from the universal, the material copy from the archetype. Prints of drawings—such as the faces populating the *Artis Apellae liber*—are the schemata for faces that artists will give new form in paint. The medieval model that Kessler describes is no different than the model guiding the structure of the *Artis Apellae liber*. Only here the archetype is the printed image and its realization is the drawn copy.

---


203 Kessler, “Configuring,” 133.
The drawing that began this chapter, *in the style of Bloemaert*, does not copy one of the heads within the *Artis Apellae liber*, although there are close resemblances between that head and many of the bearded aging men in the *Tekenboek*. “In the style” suggests that there is something *Bloemaertesque* about this face. It is *Bloemaertesque* in the tension between the “life-like” and the archetype around which Bloemaert constructed his work, in the use of impasto white wash against soft charcoal shading (characteristic of Bloemaert’s drawing facture), in the beard and the hair, forehead creased, eyes looking down. The draftsman took a Bloemaertean archetype—a study of a bearded older man in profile formed through an attention to chiaroscuro—and copied it. In his study of the face and expression, the copyist conveyed the outward graphic expression of Bloemaert’s *maniera*.

**The Heart**

Within the heart, artists argued that the passions are received and conveyed to the soul. As Alberti states, “It is extremely difficult to vary the movements of the body in accordance with the almost infinite movements of the heart.”

204 Karel van Mander, in *The Depiction of Emotions, Passions, Desires and Sufferings of Men*, discusses the senses and the heart: “No man is so constant (*staanvastisch*) that he can overcome so entirely his heart and the inclinations of this weakness, but the emotions and passions from within disturb his heart and senses, so that the external limbs react and through a perceptible

---

The heart and the senses work in tandem. It is the sense perceptions received in the heart that become reflected in the outer body. Van Mander’s use of the word constant (staanvastisch) must have resonated with one of the canonical works of the late-sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Justus Lipsius, *De Constantia* (1584), translated into Dutch by Jean Moretus in 1584, with the title *Twee boecken vande stantvasticheyt*. Famous for his “Neostoicism,” Lipsius wrote his work on constancy during the civil wars of the Low Countries. In an imagined dialogue between Lipsius and a “wise friend” Langius, the two debate how to endure the sorrow of war. Lipsius describes the state of the Low Countries from the war: “see how your country of Belgiva is afflicted with sundry calamities and swung on every side with the scorching flame of civil wars: the fields are wasted and spoiled, towns are overthrown and burned, men taken captive and murdered, women defiled, and virgins deflowered, with such other like miseries as follow after wars.” Nevertheless, despite the rampage and wreckage, Lipsius’s friend reminds him to remain “constant.” In order to endure, Lipsius must no longer identify with his emotions of joy and sorrow, which destroy the soul’s equanimity. Lipsius advocates for finding “the cultivation of an emotional state, that of the unimpassioned and undespairing observer of events.” In contrast, van Mander’s discussion of the emotions and passions, argues that no man may be so constant—staanvastisch—that he can completely overcome his emotions to be the unimpassioned observer.

---


Like his Netherlandish counterpart van Mander, Joachim von Sandrart uses the same trope about the interplay between the heart and the senses in his *Teutsche Academie*. For Sandrart, the heart acts “in genuine correspondence with the senses,” as may be seen when a face turns red in the presence of the things that it desires. Sandrart states that the movement from the outer senses’ perception of a desired thing into the inner senses, intellect and heart, happens in the blink of an eye. In the end, the face announces the movements of the heart, displaying the “inner-man." For all three theorists, the study of expression is an examination of how the passions stimulate the heart. This interrelationship between the heart and the senses derives from the Aristotelian tradition that human passions revolve around a relationship to an object. When the object is good (a subjective goodness in the mind of the perceiver), the object arouses the passions of love, desire and joy. When the object is bad, the object stimulates the passions of hatred, avoidance, and sorrow. The soul’s reaction to an outer object or body creates facial movements. For these theorists, the soul receives in the heart the perceiver’s reactions to objects in the outer world.

The importance of the interrelationships among the heart, the senses and objects in the world is grounded, furthermore, within a Christological tradition of love that

---


continued into the seventeenth century and became a crucial way of mediating the confessional divides. The relationship between the heart and the Passions goes back to Augustine (354-440), who sought to unite the Passions under love. In the City of God 14:7, Augustine describes love as the uniting force for all the Passions: “Hence the love that is bent on obtaining the object of its love is desire, while the love that possesses and enjoys its object is joy; the love that avoids what confronts it is fear, and the love that feels it when it strikes is grief.” Augustine goes on to unite love (amor) and charity (caritas): “If a person’s intention is to love God and also to love his neighbour even as himself, not according to man but according to God, he is beyond any doubt called a man of good will because of this love. And although this disposition is more commonly termed ‘charity’ (caritas) in Holy Scripture, yet it is also designated as ‘love’ (amor) according to the same sacred writings.”

Philippus Rovenius (the Apostolic Vicar of the Holland Mission) grounds his major tome on piety within neo-Augustianism, devoting an entire chapter of his Institutiones Christianae pietatis to Caritas, which he deems the highest of the virtues, the end of the most perfect, the rest of the mind. Quoting Timothy 1:5, “Now the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience and of faith unfeigned,” Rovenius stresses how Charity unites the “body” and transforms the soul to

---

212 Augustine, City of God, 14:7, 287-289.
God, connecting the separate members as neighbors.\textsuperscript{214} Both the members of the individual’s body are harmonizes into a whole as the person turns toward God, and the disparate members of the communal body are brought into harmony through the realization of \textit{Caritas}.

\textit{Caritas}, the love of one’s neighbor as one’s self, was also a popular allegorical figure for early-modern artists (figs. 126, 127).\textsuperscript{215} Indeed, Bloemaert devotes one of the chiaroscuro woodcuts in his \textit{Artis Apellae liber} to the figure of \textit{Caritas} (fig. 128). Unlike earlier representations of the allegorical figure, Bloemaert’s rendition appears distraught, as \textit{Caritas} struggles to offer her breast to the child in her arms. A child attempts to pull her flowing dress over his head to protect himself, while a separate child stands in profile, disconsolately looking down at the ground. In contradistinction to other images of \textit{Caritas} that are composed around a harmony of suckling breasts, falling drapery and romping children, this allegorical figure exhibits discord, as one child stands aside, another attempts to find cover and the other cries instead of taking the mother’s breast.

The attention that Bloemaert gave to \textit{Caritas} in his \textit{Tekenboek} suggests that it is not just an inclusion of a popular allegorical figure as a pattern for painting. Bloemaert’s \textit{Caritas}, like his other chiaroscuro woodcuts (such as the \textit{Saint in Prayer}), reveals another mode of perception beyond the eyes, ears and noses that structure the opening lesson. His insertion of \textit{Caritas} also points to the fact that the role of charity itself in society was under extreme pressure in the seventeenth century during the process of confessionalization. Theologians such as Rovenius and Pascal turned to this Augustinian

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{214} “Charitas etiam est perfectio nostra, quia Deo nos unit, ultimo sini nos copulat, & animam nostram in Deum transformat, membra Christi viventia nos faciens, & aliis membris, id est proximis nostris nos connectens.” Rovenius, \textit{Institutionum}, 1002.

tradition of charity towards one’s neighbor in a period defined by religions fracture and dissent.

Recently historians have considered how the problem of charity in the sixteenth and seventeenth-century Netherlands challenged long-held views of a Christian Community united in the taking of the Eucharist. Following the designation of the Reformed Church as the State Church in 1572 and the transference of Catholic properties to support the Reformed Church, the Catholic Church struggled to provide poor relief for the members of its body. Charles Parker has studied how the appropriation of Catholic property for the Calvinist republic challenged the remaining Catholic priesthood in Utrecht, creating a financial crisis for the Holland Mission.\textsuperscript{216} No longer receiving the revenues from their landed endowments, Dutch Catholics had to find the means to provide for the poor (a necessary pillar of the church). As Parker describes, charity was one of the central foci of the Holland Mission, for “the overriding purpose of Catholic charity was to serve the faithful within the body of Christ.”\textsuperscript{217}

As scholars such as Parker argue, the importance of charity to keeping the faithful within the “body of Christ” continued as a persuasive metaphor into the seventeenth century, despite the dismembering of the “one body” into separate creeds and congregations: Anglican, Calvinist, Catholic, Lutheran. In \textit{Corinthians} 12:12, Paul stresses the aggregation of one body: “As the body is one, and hath many members and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so also \textit{is} Christ.” From the medieval period and the writings of theologians such as Thomas Aquinas, the body was

\textsuperscript{216} Parker, 191.
\textsuperscript{217} Parker, 230.
seen as the metaphor for the civic state.\textsuperscript{218} Indeed, “the socio-political body metaphor”
crossed class and confessional divides, “as God cared for the individual, so the body
politic cared for the bodies and souls of all its subjects. The moral and spiritual health of
the community was thus linked to such practical material concerns as poor relief.”\textsuperscript{219}
Nevertheless, while the importance of poor relief as a metaphor for Calvinists and
Catholics shared the enactment of the communion, community and care of the “body”,
the ritual of charity was integral to the process of confessionalization.

When the property of the Catholic Church came under the jurisdiction of the
Reformed Government, the Catholic Church and its representatives lost the means to care
for the needy within their parishes. In turn, the Reformed Church began to develop
strictures about the constitution of charity and those in need of care.\textsuperscript{220} By the end of the
seventeenth century, confessions would be “caring for their own,” and indeed, some
confessions avoided reaching out to and integrating into their fold the less desirable poor
and needy members of the “communal body.” Instead of viewing society as a “Christian”
community united in \textit{pietas} (as discussed in the introduction), people turned more
towards caring for a body composed of a specific set of believers and the “civic body”
fell under the jurisdiction of an increasingly secularized state.\textsuperscript{221} These concerns of
charity, poverty and the fracturing of the communal body—socio-political arguments that
would have dominated a city such as Utrecht, where the Catholic population lost its

\textsuperscript{218} Ernst H. Kantorowicz, \textit{The King’s Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology} (Princeton:
\textsuperscript{219} Abel Athouguia Alves, “The Christian Social Organism and Social Welfare: The Case of Vives, Calvin
and Loyola,” \textit{The Sixteenth Century Journal} 20.1 (1989) 6-7. For the “canonical” study on the role of poor
relief in early-modern society and its ability to cross confessional divides, see: Natalie Zemon Davis, “Poor
Relief, Humanism and Heresy,” \textit{Society and Culture in Early Modern France} (Stanford: Stanford
University Press, 1965).
\textsuperscript{220} Charles H. Parker, \textit{The Reformation of Community: Social Welfare and Calvinist Charity in Holland,
\textsuperscript{221} Alves, “Christian Social Organism,” 20.
majority land-shares and revenues under the Reformed Church—cannot be absent from
the work of Bloemaert, an artist engaged not only with theological questions within his
work but also with his role as a citizen of Utrecht.

The *Tekenboek* is a pedagogical treatise on drawing the human body, a work that
would be utilized in workshops such as Bloemaert’s, composed of many different
members of a communal body united through faith in Christ rather than a specific
confession (*pietas*). Images such as *Caritas* within the *Tekenboek* speak not only to the
problem of “charity” in seventeenth-century Utrecht but also to the role of charity in
artistic practice, running a workshop and being part of a guild and corporation. *Caritas*—
charity—is not only a mimetic performance of care for the Christian body (as Christ
ministered to his own congregants) but also the means to heal the Christian community,
now a dismembered figure in the seventeenth century. Bloemaert’s figure of Charity,
attempting to protect and feed her distraught children, does not suggest an idealization of
the role of *Caritas* in society but instead speaks to the urgency for *Caritas* to continue to
sustain her different children.

In a drawing of a beggar (now in the British Museum), Bloemaert presents a
wounded man, arm and leg wrapped in a sling, holding out a bowl for alms (fig. 129).
This attention to the “less-desirables” of society reflects a seventeenth-century awareness
of the restructuring of classes and wealth as the various churches developed new ideas
about giving to the poor and about the jurisdiction of the church versus the state for
caring for either the members of the religious or civic body. The image of *Caritas* in a
printed drawing book—devoted to teaching students how to draw and see the world—not
only points towards the specific historical problem of “charity” itself in seventeenth-
century Utrecht but also to the theological discussions of “charity” as a mode of perception and expression. *Caritas* evokes a form of love free from desire, friendship and romance. Instead, *Caritas* is the ability for individuals to summon compassion and good will towards other people. Through acts of charity, individuals have the opportunity to come closer to God because they are imitating God’s love for humanity. If the world is perceived through *Caritas* (love), questions such as age, religion, or race become irrelevant as the individual tries to live a life of compassion towards others regardless of their different or shared qualities.

The importance of *Caritas* for pedagogy and perception in the seventeenth century may be seen in works as diverse as Francis Bacon’s *The Advancement of Learning* (1605) and popular emblem books, such as the Flemish painter and theorist Otto van Veen (1566-1629) and his *Amoris divini emblemata* (1615). In the *Advancement of Learning*, Bacon asserts *caritas* as “the sole legitimate end of learning.”

Binding the pursuit of knowledge to the moral virtue of *Caritas* (love) maintains the exploration of the world as a means to understand the relationship to one’s self and God. Similarly, the opening image for van Veen’s *Amoris divini emblemata* demonstrates the heart’s necessary role in perceiving the world, knowing God and understanding the self. A cupola of clouds recede into a dome, in which van Veen engraves the phrase *oculvs non vidit, nec avris avditut* (“Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard”) from Corinthians 2:9 (fig. 130). Sensory knowledge is limited, whereas the power of the heart as a conduit to
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222 Peter Harrison, “Curiosity, Forbidden Knowledge, and the Reformation of Natural Philosophy in Early Modern England,” *Isis* 92.2 (2001) 280. Bacon quotes Corinthians 13:1: “If I spake, saith he, with the tongues of men and angels, and had not charity, it were but as a tinkling cymbal.” Bacon asserts the role of *caritas*, for if knowledge “were severed from charity, and not referred to the good of men and mankind, it hath rather a sounding and unworthy glory than a meriting and substantial virtue.” Francis Bacon, *Advancement of Learning*, ed. G.W. Kitchin (Philadelphia: Paul Dry Books, 2001).
knowledge is infinite: “But as it is written, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him.” Van Veen’s title page declares that there is a form of knowledge that belongs to the heart alone. In the following image, van Veen pictures a cupid named *Amor divinus* lifting up a cherubic woman named *Anima* who has fallen to the ground (fig. 131). Divine love raises the soul. Through the heart’s capacity to love and know God, the soul lifts.

As Walter Melion’s brief explication on this emblem book shows, divine love is inseparable from staring upon the image of Christ’s face; Melion describes the movements of the heart in relationship to seeing Christ: “If the power of love compels the lover constantly to behold the object of affection, it also increases the desire to see again what we have once seen.”

Through love (the uniting Passion of the Augustinian system), the lover becomes compelled to look upon the image of Christ. It is not enough for one merely to see the image, one must also love the subject of the representation to mirror their expression, to summon the perception of *Caritas*. The mathematician theologian Blaise Pascal (1623-1662) also continued the Augustinian tradition, describing charity as the highest order of knowledge.

In his “Proofs of Jesus Christ,” Pascal describes three orders: the material (defined by wealth and things); the intellectual (the pursuits of the mind); the supernatural (belonging to charity). Pascal’s three orders
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225 Blaise Pascal, “Preuves de Jésus-Christ,” *Pensées sur la religion et sur quelques autres sujets*, ed. Jean-Robert Armogath and Daniel Blot (Paris: Champion, 2011). The previously discussed “logicians of Port Royale” were Pascal’s first “editor” and interpreters, attempting to synthesize Pascal’s work with Descartes and Augustine. As has been pointed out, Arnauld and Nicole swerve from Pascal’s own meaning in their adherence to Cartesian doctrine, primarily in reinterpreting Pascal’s focus on the heart, see: Antony McKenna, “The Reception of Pascal’s *Pensées* in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries,” *Cambridge Companion to Pascal*, 253-263.
align with three different modes of perception. The eyes are used for the carnal or
material order; the mind for the intellectual; *amor* for the holy.\textsuperscript{226} Van Veen’s title page
suggests and Pascal’s third order of perception argues that beholding the beloved occurs
not through an outer image (through the eyes or the ears) but within the heart, within the
process of turning away from the outer senses and in towards one’s own heart.

**Academic Veneration**

In previous pattern books, Christ’s face was the most important archetype. Christ’s face
in works such as the *Bohemian Model Book* plays a role similar to van Veen’s emblems,
which Melion describes as “constitutive of a self-generating dynamic of loving
mimesis.”\textsuperscript{227} The viewer’s expression mirrors Christ’s as the viewer’s heart is moved to
reflect Christ’s suffering and humanity. In the seventeenth century, artists begin to study
the figure of the person looking upon the icon more than the iconic figure itself. Artists
therefore began to represent this process of “self-generating mimesis.” As will be seen,
this “expression” for “self-generating-mimesis” becomes canonized as “Veneration” in
the seventeenth-century Academic lecture on expression *par excellence*, Charles le Brun
(1619-1690) and his address to the Académie Royale de Peinture in 1668.

Veneration studies the expression of the icon’s viewer, the person looking upon
an object that invokes divine love. Indeed, Bloemaert made introspective works of other
figures looking at devotional images, so that the object of attention becomes not the
divine figure of word but the study of the person, who gazes upon the devotional image
or text. A series of collaborative woodcuts that Bloemaert designed and the itinerant


\textsuperscript{227} Melion, *Meditative*, 340.
German engraver Ludolph Būsinck executed demonstrate Bloemaert’s attention to the act of devotion itself (and its perceptive modes) rather than the object of devotion. In a chiaroscuro, Bloemaert shows St. Joseph in rapture (figs. 132 & 133). The woodcut fits in the palm of a hand. The surface of the incised and raised paper suggests the wrinkles, lines and creases of the palm’s skin. One of Joseph’s hands crosses his chest in a sign of devotion; the other hand raises, the fingers in a partial blessing. The tactility of Joseph’s hands mirrors the palm of the viewer; the folds of Joseph’s hands contrast with the viewer’s own. The paper’s fiber emphasizes that here is a small sculptural work to be held. Joseph’s eyes downcast, the viewer is left with the reverence of his gestures. There is a parallel between Joseph’s rapture and the viewer regarding the devotional print. Through turning the work on paper into a small sculptural study of hands, Bloemaert and Būsinck create a work with a tactile presence. The viewer looks down at the print as Joseph turns in, closing his eyes and his senses off from the exterior world to find the divine within. In the face of the print’s insistent tactility and material presence cradled in the hand of the beholder, Bloemaert asserts the moment of concentration and turning away from the material sensory world. Paradoxically, in asserting its status as a made object—literally impressing itself into the hand of the viewer—the print also engages with its own transience as a work on paper.

Bloemaert and Businck’s woodcut St. Joseph acts as a devotional work. Yet the focus of Joseph’s gaze is absent so that the object of veneration for the print’s viewer becomes Joseph’s gaze. Instead of representing the icon, this woodcut presents the act of devotion as an object of devotion. In absenting the object of the gaze, the figure becomes a study of profound veneration, a contemplation that moves beyond sensory perception

228 Roethlisberger, 212.
into the interior of the heart. Works such as the *St. Joseph* woodcut and many of the faces in the *Tekenen* demonstrate veneration, the expression generated not by an external object but by an internal reflection of faith. Based within this tradition of the “heart,” works such as these may cause a “self-generating dynamic of loving mimesis.” Only now the object of focus is not Christ’s face, but the act of looking upon another person who is contemplating Christ with veneration.

The role of veneration in theories of expression and the passions is rarely discussed in scholarship today. Nevertheless, the canonical seventeenth-century lecture on the passions and expressions devotes considerable attention to “veneration” or the expression that Bloemaert’s *St. Joseph* manifests to the viewer. Like the theorists before him, le Brun repeats the idea that “expression is also that, which reflects the movements of the heart and that which makes visible the effects of the passions.” Yet under the influence of Descartes, le Brun moves the concordance of the passions and the senses from the heart to the mind. The face becomes a reflection of the mind and not the heart.

Both le Brun and Descartes ask rhetorically whether the soul exercises itself in the head or the heart. As le Brun states: “Although the soul is linked to all the parts of the body, nevertheless there are various opinions concerning the place where, most specifically it exercises its functions.”
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the impressions of the outside world are received in the pineal gland (in the head) before reaching the soul. Both, however, acknowledge that for some theorists impressions of the outside world are received not in the pineal gland or the intellect but in the heart. As le Brun states: “Others say that it is the heart, because it is there that we feel the passions.” Yet, following Descartes, le Brun maintains that “the soul receives the impressions of the passions in the brain, and that it feels the effects of them in the heart.”

Nevertheless, despite his Cartesian influence, le Brun explores the expressions of Veneration, Profound Veneration, Rapture and Simple love—all grounded within a Christological dialogue of love between the soul and the object. Le Brun’s discussion of these Passions shows their canonical place in art theory. For Veneration: “The lowering of the eyebrows and the head marks the submission and the respect which the soul feels towards an object which it believes to be above it; the upturned pupil seems to mark the elevation of the object which it has considered and which it recognizes as worthy of Veneration.”

This mode of gazing upon an outer object with Veneration proceeds into an even deeper Veneration in which the senses play no part: “But if the Veneration is caused by an object which claims our Faith, in that case all the parts of the face will be lowered more deeply than in the preceding action; the eyes and mouth will be closed, showing by this action that the external senses have no part in this Wonder.”

Finally, there is a mode of gazing in which the “object” remains beyond the comprehension of the soul: “But if the Wonder is caused by some object which is far above the comprehension of the soul, such as the power and greatness of God, then the
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movements of Wonder and Veneration will be different.”\textsuperscript{234} For this expression, le Brun describes the eyes as “raised towards heaven, on which they seem to be concentrated as if to discover there what the soul cannot conceive.” Le Brun outlines three separate modes of Veneration: one based upon an object, another based upon an object of faith and a withdrawal of the senses and a third founded upon Wonder and contemplation of the divine.

While scholars draw attention to Le Brun’s indebtedness to Descartes for his conference on the Passions, Le Brun diverges significantly from Descartes in this discussion of Veneration. Although Descartes mentions Veneration, he presents it as a mode of pagan worship, divorcing it from its Christian context. Veneration becomes connected to idol worship and a concern that images or the object can act upon the viewer, so that the viewer submits to it out of apprehension: “So when the Pagans bore a Veneration to woods, springs, mountains, they did not properly reverence these inanimate things, but the Divinities which they thought presided over them.”\textsuperscript{235} Descartes moves the reception of the sensory world and its binding to the soul from the heart to the head, while moving the Passion and expression of Veneration from Christological to Pagan worship. Le Brun, on the other hand, keeps the expressions and Passions of Veneration within the context of divine love, grounding himself in a tradition of art theory that connected the passions and expressions to the “infinite movements of the heart.”

\textsuperscript{234} Montagu, 133.
\textsuperscript{235} René Descartes, \textit{The Passions of the Soule} (London, 1650) 135.
Otherhood

Throughout the 1630’s, Bloemaert repeatedly painted the same face. On small wood panels, Bloemaert depicts over and over the same aging woman. These works are some of two-dozen tronies that Bloemaert made between 1632-1641. As Roethlisberger notes, these works cannot be “explained.” They are not “serial,” “moral,” “narrative” or “anecdotal.”

In An Old Woman (signed ABloemaert fe. 1632), Bloemaert paints an aging woman’s profile, mouth slightly open, thin lips, chin jutting forward (fig. 134). In 1634, Bloemaert paints her again (fig. 135). This time, her body turns towards the viewer as she gazes down. The viewer comes to recognize the signature wrinkles of her face. Lines across the bridge of her nose, in the corner of her eyes, dimpled landscapes across her cheeks. Painting again for an oval pendant in 1635 or 1637, again in profile, Bloemaert uses thick white impasto to mimic the wrinkles and veins across her forehead (fig. 136). In 1635, he paints her again (fig. 137). Now the wrinkled incisions around her lips, eyes and nose run deeper. She looks with concentration upon an object outside the small canvas’s frame. Again Bloemaert paints her in 1635 / 36 (fig. 138). Again her profile looks down at something beyond the line of the canvas. The wood of the panel emerges against the light coating of paint, the wood’s rigid vertical lines contrast with the incisions of her face. In 1641, Bloemaert paints the final study in this series of works signing the tronie ABloemaert 1641 (fig. 139). Across this nearly ten year period, the face has visibly aged, the figure frailer, older, and yet recognizably the same as the 1632 model.

---
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The words “psychological,” “interiority,” “physiognomy” and “inwardness” are frequently utilized when discussing tronies and Dutch portraiture; for example, as Frederic Schwartz writes about Rembrandt’s faces (portraits and tronies): “it would be superficial psychologizing to claim that Rembrandt painted ‘character,’ ‘inner man,’ or ‘the human soul’—a persistent myth from which we have not yet fully escaped—it is nonetheless clear that Rembrandt’s portraits used many of the same techniques that create the centripetal quality of tronies in order to suggest a general sense of ‘inwardness.’”

Scholars have had difficulties putting their fingers on the pulse of this “inwardness.” Beginning with Alois Riegl’s Das Holländische Gruppenporträt (1902), the portrayal of the face in Dutch painting has been seen as the art of attentiveness (Aufmerksamkeit), a form of “inwardness” or “absorption.” Heralded as one of the first scholarly works to consider the “beholder” (the viewer of the painting) in formal analysis, Riegl’s book entails a careful analysis of a changing relationship between subjects and objects, a development that he tracks in the evolution of the “Dutch Group Portrait” from the early Netherlandish painter based in Haarlem Geertgen tot Sint Johns (1465-1495) to Jan de Bray (1627-1696), a Dutch “Golden Age” master also working in Haarlem.

In his study, Riegl examines the emergences of the subject who sees the world as a reflection of his own consciousness: “The artists of Holland were the first to realize that the viewing subject can take mental control over all the objects in a painting by making them part of his or her own consciousness.” Although Riegl’s analysis is cautious, it has opened the door for interpretations of Dutch portraiture (and tronies) as mirrors for
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the viewing subject’s own consciousness. The recent literature on tronies attests to this phenomenon, so that tronies have become emblems of contemporary notions of consciousness and self, without attending to how notions of consciousness and self may have been in the process of invention, a process of invention to which Riegl attends in his acknowledgment of a difference between “modern subjectivity” and that of the Dutch regents.

For Riegl, the “mature” stage of Dutch portraiture occurs when the object of the figure’s attention remains outside of the picture’s plane. “Whatever that specific something may be, however, it remains undepicted, and the viewer is forced to imagine it.” In doing this, “the viewer is inspired to search his or her personal experience and come up with an idea of what the figure is ‘attentive to.’” Contemporary viewers’ imaginations have concluded that these tronies contemplate their “inner being” as object. And yet, following in the footsteps of Riegl and marking the shift in a relationship between objects and subjects in this period, the connection between tronies and inwardness must be seen as nuanced and separated from a complete embrace of inner “consciousness.” As Charles le Brun describes, profonde Veneration entails the absence of an object and the withdrawal of the senses. The importance of veneration over terms like “inwardness” or “interiority” avoids tendentious ties to consciousness and bases the mode of reflection in the heart rather than the head. Following in the tradition of expression of the Passions, these paintings of aging faces by artists like Bloemaert document the infinite movements of the heart that occur in tandem with the aging of the body. Paintings such as Bloemaert’s series of the aging woman may be seen not as

As Joseph Koerner states, “Riegl sets the stage for an enquiry into the invention and uses of interiority as it is conveyed by the represented face.” Joseph Leo Koerner, “Rembrandt and the Epiphany of the Face,” RES: Anthropology and Aesthetics 12 (1986) 13.
studies of “mental” inwardness but as an “inwardness of the heart.” The expression of “veneration” in which the object of focus is absent and the senses are removed suggests the heart not the head.

The importance of these three together—the heart, aging and the passions—may be seen in a poem by “Father” Jacob Cats (1577-1660), a Calvinist Dutch seventeenth-century poet, who crossed confessional divides in his popularity. In this poem, Cats writes about the process of aging from the viewpoint of a subject similar to the aging tronies of Bloemaert. This subject prays over and over, “Oh God, just hold my heart alone.” As the poem opens, the old man asks: “O God, shall I still complain? / Shall I no longer be sad / As a bitter-sweet senility [senijn] / Comes to gnaw continually on my heart?” The voice says, “O no my God, o Creator no / O God, just hold my heart alone.”

The man acknowledges the aging of his body and states that not only youth but also the body are “just on loan”: “My hair is now grey from old age / That’s right as a stage to my mind / And speaks as to my inner blood / Let happiness and lust and youth sail away / All that I had but on loan / O God, just hold my heart alone.”
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241 O God, sal ick noch langer klagen?
Sal ick noch langer treurigh zijn,
Vermits een bitter-soet senijn
Koomt aen mijn hert geduerigh knagen?
O neen, mijn God, o Schepper neen;
O God, besit mijn heert alleen.
(Amsterdam: Michiel de Groot, 1663).
242 Mijn hair nu grijs van lange jaren,
Dat klopt als staegh aen mijn gemoet,
En spreekta ls tot mijn innigh bloet:
Laet vreught en lust en jonckheyt varen,
Al dat en hadje maer te leen.
O God, besit mijn heert alleen.
stanza, the old man tells God: “I want you to in true diligence / my soul and body transfer / and provided that from my heart / O God, just hold my heart alone.”

Through the heart—love of God—the soul becomes elevated to God. When the aging man asks God “to hold my heart alone,” he asks God to keep safe that in which the variances of emotion and passion are felt. If God stays his heart, his soul may be elevated. Pascal expresses a similar sentiment in his “Letter on the Possibility of the Commandments,” “for it is well said that those who love Jesus Christ at a present moment observe his commandments in the very moment at which they love him, but not that they will have the power to keep them in the future.”

Pascal’s Writings on Grace clarify the struggle of Cats’s old man, the problem of continuing to love Christ over a duration of time, of sustaining that love. As Cats’s repeated refrain clarifies, God sustains the love of Christ.

Poems such as Cats’s belong to the seventeenth-century tradition that saw the Passions as bound to reason; the Passions are at once good because God bestowed them on mankind, but they also can lead mankind astray when they are not controlled by reason. When the old man asks God to hold his heart, he is acknowledging that the sentient Passions experienced by the body (the passions of youth and body) may be easier to perceive than love of God. Within the poem, Cats’s narrator is attempting to unidentify with body, with its material composition and decomposition. His repeated refrain to God

Aen u wil ick korte dagen,
Aen u wil ick mijn lesten tijt,
Aen u wil ick in ware vlijt
Mijn ziel en lichaem over-dragen;
En mits ick dit van herten meen,
O God, besit mijn heert alleen.

to “hold his heart alone,” asks himself and God to sustain his love. Within this love, he may become free from his body and find what is infinite and unchanging.

In the expression of profound Veneration, the subject is more likely to be contemplating the heart—as Cats’s old man’s repeatedly refrains—than the interior movements of the mind. Grounding tronies such as Bloemaert’s studies of the aging woman within an “inwardness of the heart” as opposed to the head puts into question an immediate understanding of them as studies of “interiority” and the “inner being” of self. These melancholic faces with their gaze fixed upon no particular object and oblivious to the viewer’s own stare provide ambivalent surfaces upon which viewers can project. The painted faces seemingly engage with the process of reflection and remembrance; the lines and creases of worry and age running across foreheads and indenting corners of mouths and eyes become a site for the viewer to mirror his own thoughts of disappointment, loss and the complicated reflections of any individual engaged in observing his own “interior” life.

The repeated use of words like “interiority” “inwardness” and “consciousness” and “essential nature of the self” in the literature on tronies overlooks the fact that the linking between a consciousness and a self did not occur in written discourse until 1694, when John Locke first used the word “consciousness” in relationship to a definition of “self.” I raise the question of Locke’s ideas on “identity and diversity” here because they are relevant to the art-historical reception of seventeenth-century painted and printed tronies. I would argue that an interrelationship between a “self” and an “immaterial
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consciousness” guides many interpretations of the tronie genre, and yet John Locke in the 1690’s was one of the first thinkers to overtly make this connection. This is not to say that before this people did not have some idea of an immaterial tracking of their material changes (for example Montaigne’s psychological observation of himself), but Locke’s definition of “self” through “consciousness” was both a watershed and controversial because it challenged previously-held beliefs about the constancy of the self.

In his article on Rembrandt’s faces, Joseph Koerner responds to his own question about what defines the face in relationship to the world around it: “Surely it has to do with the dialectical role that the face plays in constructing us as subjects in the world; that is, we relate to the face not only as an object visible to our sight, but also as a subject, a consciousness [my emphasis] that potentially can see us.”247 Perhaps this is how the contemporary viewer interacts with the tronie in the museum. But what drove Bloemaert to consider, study and paint repetitively the same face of the same woman over a ten-year period? How can we examine the boom of tronie production in the seventeenth century and Bloemaert’s own use of tronies as pedagogical tools without an inherent supposition of a self and a consciousness? The interrelationship between a self and a consciousness was a radical idea when Locke introduced it nearly thirty years after Bloemaert’s death, uprooting fundamental principles of “self,” soul and body. In order to consider the role of tronies in the Artis Apellae liber and Bloemaert’s own oeuvre, it is necessary to understand shifting ideas of the “person” and “self” in the seventeenth century.

Prior to Locke, the sixth-century philosopher Boethius (480-524/25) gave a definition of a person that held into the seventeenth-century. Boethius combines two intersecting yet separate ideas of personhood. A person is an “individual” substance, subsisting unto itself, and this individual substance has “rational” nature and exists in relationship to a community and its social relationships. The importance of unity between rational being and substance, in one body and in one soul, ensured that there was one body and soul to be judged on Judgment Day. Amélie Rorty demonstrates that the idea of a “person” derives from both theater and law. The Greek word person (prosopon) referred to the mask that an actor would wear to perform his role. Similarly in law, “a person is the idea of a unified center of choice and action, the unit of legal and theological responsibility. Having chosen, a person acts, and so is actionable, liable. Christianity united the Greek understanding of the theatrical and juridical person into a unified concept of person, so that “Christianity made every human being with a will qualify as a person, in order to make them all equally able to receive divine judgment.”

The importance of personhood, individuation and Resurrection in relationship to the substance of the material body continued into the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The body changes, grows and decays (as may the mind), so the problem becomes how to affirm that there is one individual who will be judged for his/her actions at the end of his/her life. Bloemaert’s series of paintings of the older woman track this process of

248 “Wherefore is Person belongs to substances alone, and these rational, and if every nature is a substance, existing not in universals but in individuals, we have found the definition of Person, viz.: ‘The individual substance of a rational nature.’” Boethius, The Theological Tractates, trans. H.F. Stewart and E.K. Rand (New York: G.P. Putnam’s Sons, 1926) 85. See also Christopher Fox, “Some Problems of Perspective,” Locke and the Scriblerians: Identity and Consciousness in Early Eighteenth-Century Britain (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988) 7-26.
change. As the seventeenth-century natural philosopher Robert Boyle (1627-1691) acknowledges, when writing on the *Possibility of Resurrection*, the body is constantly in flux: “And first, I consider that a human body is not a statue of brass or marble, that may continue . . . in a permanent state; but is in a perpetual flux or changing condition; since it grows in all its parts, and all its dimensions, from a *corpusculum* no bigger than an insect to the full statue of man . . .which could not happen but by a constant apposition and assimilation of new parts to the primitive ones of the little embryo.”

The *Tekenboek* builds its lessons around this *perpetual flux* of the human body, documenting the changes from the infant to the aged. Bloemaert’s studies of infants in the *Artis Apellae liber* provide more than just images for a baby Jesus in an altarpiece or a *putto* in a mythological painting. They speak to a man who had many children and observed their adolescence. In lesson 106, a young child attempts to crawl on the paper’s ground with fleshy thighs and the undifferentiated body of baby fat, pressing small palms in the ground of the paper and attempting to move forward, a small scrotum hanging between his cheeks (fig. 140). Above this study of a child teaching itself to move, Bloemaert places a sleeping babe, a hand raising a blanket over its breathing chest. In lesson 91, Bloemaert takes the lessons of foreshortening and *verkurzung* discussed in chapter two and applies them to baby bodies, studying prone infants in variations of sleeping, tiny soles, dimpled elbows and knees (fig. 141). In the center of the lesson, an infant curls itself around a barely defined skull, the outline of two gaping holes and the
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indentation for the absent cartilage of the nose. The drawing book, therefore, could be
said not only to progress from eyes, ears, noses and limbs to full body studies but also
from birth to death.

The Tekenboek presents a body, like the description of Boyle’s body in the
Possibility of Ressurrection, which is always changing, in flux, constantly moving from
one state to another, from the fleshy infant learning to crawl to the grown man on hands
and knees struggling to rise his body. The Artis Apellae liber studies the transformations
of the human body from infancy to old age, and yet what unites these bodies, or what
these inward contemplative faces search for is not “a consciousness” of their infancy in
relationship to their decaying forms but instead another constancy. But in order to
understand why I am arguing that consciousness is an anachronistic way to understand
mid-seventeenth-century “inwardness,” it is necessary to understand why this term was
controversial when Locke introduced it.

In 1694, when John Locke defined a “self” in relationship to a “consciousness” he
created ripples in theological and philosophical discourses. In his second edition of An
Essay Concerning Human Understanding, Locke wrote in, “Of Identity and Diversity,”
that the self is found not in “indivisible substance” (Boethius) but in consciousness. The
Oxford English Dictionary, among others, cites this as the first use of the word
consciousness in relationship to self in the English language. Locke argues that what
unites a sense of self from embryo to senility is “consciousness,” namely, the awareness
of the temporal succession of one’s thoughts, actions and perceptions. “Different
substances, by the same consciousness (where they do partake in it) being united into one
person . . . whose identity is preserved, in that change of substances, by the unity of one
continued life.” Despite growth, transformation and decay in the outer body—its changing substance—the continuous identity remains within a consciousness that is conscious of its witness to this occupation.

As one of Locke’s critics (a Mr. Joseph Butler) argues, this means “that personality is not a permanent, but a transient thing: that it lives and dies, begins and ends continually.” Locke was concerned with time, the realization of a certain identity and its material composite as it unfolds over a temporal period. It is not enough to say “I think therefore I am,” as Descartes asserted. One of the driving problems of Locke’s “identity” question was how to individuate one person from another; Locke argues that “consciousness” individuates one person from another. As one Locke scholar points out: “No one else can have my consciousness any more than, any other organism can have my life.” It is this *a priori* assumption of consciousness as a means of individuation that has guided readings of *tronies*, so that when Koerner describes the viewing of a *tronie* as a relationship “to the face not only as an object visible to our sight, but also as a subject, a consciousness [my emphasis] that potentially can see us,” Koerner presupposes consciousness as the means towards individuation between the viewer and the person represented in the painting. Nevertheless, this understanding of consciousness as a means of individuation is perhaps anachronistic to Bloemaert and his own production of *tronies*. In fact, the guiding concept of *Caritas* and veneration, which I have argued drive Bloemaert’s production of *tronies*, seek not so much individuation as commonality.
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The concern for the temporal consistency of one’s person does occur in the seventeenth century prior to Locke. Only it focuses not on the relationship between one’s consciousness and one’s body, but in relationship to one’s heart and one’s mind. As Jacob Cats’s poem iterates, the persistent uncertainty here may be seen in the concern for maintaining love and knowledge of God over time—just hold my heart. Bloemaert’s series of the woman engaged in the withdrawal of her senses towards an “inner” movement of veneration documents this struggle. Poems such as Cats’s reveal insecurity about the ability to be the same person over duration of time, to link this person who loves God today with the person who struggles with faith tomorrow. Bloemaert’s ten-year documentation of the single aging woman betrays an attention to searching out what remains constant as the material body changes and decays. Theologians such as Pascal suggest that caritas (love of God and one’s neighbor) is not only what unites the individual to the self and the divine but also to others within the community. Caritas and the Christological notion of the person are two concepts of the “self” founded upon a necessary interrelationship between the individual and the community, ensuring responsibility for the actions of one person towards a neighbor.

Scholars have been obsessed with defining, describing and discussing the experience of looking at tronies and their enigmatic faces. I would suggest, however, that the role of the tronie in seventeenth-century artistic practice and pedagogy (for artists like Bloemaert) was the exploration of a form that makes the acts of classifying and description difficult—the moment of individuation—if not impossible. I am positing that tronies and their voluminous production contributed to a seventeenth-century dialogue about the ethics of relationships. Indeed, the rise of tronies as products for the market in
seventeenth-century Netherlands was inseparable from the simultaneous processes of confessionalization.

*Tronies* are grounded within an older workshop tradition of icons and the archetypical faces of religious figures. In the seventeenth century, artists began to strip away these recognizable attributes, “secularizing” these faces so that instead of being a Jeremiah or a Peter, they present an anonymous person, whose name has been lost. This process of painting anonymity in a series of unreadable interiorized expressive faces belong to a time in which artists such as Bloemaert worked within an ethical drive to realize in their lives concepts such as *Caritas* and *Pietas*. *Tronies*, whose “inwardness” is founded within a tradition of veneration, prayer and the heart, offer the viewer the chance to reflect compassion and love not by gazing upon the face of Christ but by beholding the face of an anonymous, unknown person (the Christian neighbor).

Bloemaert used the *tronie* (and paint) to explore the very coming into being of a face in front of a viewer. As Roethlisberger notes, Bloemaert’s painted *tronie* production engages with the texture and grain of the wood panel as a part of the painted image, so that the thin strokes of paint do not cover up the material make-up of the wood but instead make it part of the face’s realization. *Tronies*, in their factured play between the material of the work and the image itself, pictorialize the realization of the image, the confrontation with another face *before* it can be assigned, classified, described, given a sum of qualities. *Tronies* inscribe into their facture the materialization of the face from the archetype, the bodying forth of the form.

This is what the “dialogue” of the heart offers. Before Descartes’ linking of the head and the soul, there was an historical moment that construed the sensory experience
of the outer objects of the world processed in the heart and from there conveyed to the soul. Christological traditions are founded upon the knowledge a heart receives upon meeting an object before it becomes intellectualized, categorized, known. In attending to the role of the heart in theories of the passions, artistic discourses, emblems, philosophy and theology in the seventeenth century, it may be seen how tronies present the possibility of a moment before categorization. Between the downward gaze of Bloemaert’s tronies and the presence of the viewer, a moment opens not for the “consciousness of life’s finitude” but for the infinite possibility of love, of Caritas.
Cognitive Objects: Towards a Conclusion

While this dissertation has focused on the 1650-56 edition of the *Artis Apellae liber*, scholars most often refer to the 1740 edition, designed by Bernard Picart (1673-1733). These two works present different understandings of drawing practice, however. Indeed, it is in the differences between the 1650-56 edition and the 1740 edition that the changing role of the senses, the body and the divine in draftsmanship and pedagogy unfolds.

In 1722, Louis Renard (1678-1746), a British publishing agent, acquired Frederick’s original copper plates for the *Artis Apellae liber*, including forty plates that had never been published. In 1723, the French engraver, draftsman and entrepreneur Bernard Picart re-ordered the original 120 plates of the *Artis Apellae liber* and included the previously unpublished forty plates. In his re-ordering, Picart renumbered the original copper plates and organized the engraved plates into eight defined categories. Picart remade Abraham and Frederik’s *Tekenboek*, constructing from Frederik’s copper plates a book of eight parts with a title page preceding each section, announcing the “chapter’s” content. The first part contains fragments of the face and head. The second focuses on hands and feet. The third devotes itself to figures lightly shaded (*legerement ombrées*). The fourth explores the academic (i.e. nude) figure, both male and female. The fifth concentrates on children (*des enfans en diverses attitudes*). The sixth includes finished figures and some groups (*figures finies et quelques groupes*). The seventh brings together compositions or historical subjects. And the final eighth part comprises animal studies.

The 1740 Picart edition also includes an engraved portrait of Bloemaert, a letter directed
to the reader of the *Tekenboek*, a biography of Bloemaert, a list of the subject of the plates within the volume as reordered by Picart, and a list of engraved prints after Bloemaert’s work. As the publishers inform the reader, this list will be useful for collectors.256

Picart’s re-ordering resulted in the most often cited and consulted edition of the *Tekenboek*, the 1740 edition, published by the prominent Amsterdam booksellers Josua and Reinier Ottens. The 1740 *Tekenboek* is a memoriam not only to Abraham Bloemaert and his son Frederik but also to Bernard Picart, who died in 1733, seven years before the publishing of this *Tekenboek*. In recognition of his “reordering,” Picart retains pride of place on the title page (fig 142). The Ottens publishing firm suggest that Picart is as much an author of this work in his proper arrangement of the plates as the Bloemaerts in their design and engraving of the images. Picart is one of the last to take part in reimagining and reconstructing the *Tekenboek*, a process intimately bound to the copper plates. Once plates are lost or melted, any copy thereafter loses “material” relationship to the original *Tekenboek*.

The title page for this 1740 edition of the Picart and Ottens *Tekenboek* presents itself to painters, sculptors, engravers, draftsmen and artistic youth, male and female.257 It tells the reader that the book contains 173 prints (*Konstprenten*) made from copper plates, placed in an appropriate order by the famous Bernard Picart.258 Below this introduction to

---

256 “Deee Naamlyst is van een byzonder nut voor alle die Liefhebbers van de Papier-Konst, dewelke onledig zyn in het verzamelen van Abraham Bloemaarts Konstprenten, om hunne Kabinetten met die Konstschatten te verryken, tot vermaak der Tydgenooten, ende tot verlustiging der Neaneeven.” Abraham Bloemaert and Bernard Picart, *Oorspronkelyk en vermaard konstryk Tekenboek van Abraham Bloemaert* (Amsterdam, 1740) 7.
the work, its authors and its contents, the Ottens firm impresses a small emblem (fig. 142). In this image, a man bearing a scythe—the personification of death—approaches a woman sitting before two globes with a compass in her hand. At once an allegorical figure for drawing and for the arts of navigation and mapmaking, this woman gestures to the intersection between the meridian lines of the map. At her feet rest two globes, and a book. The ocean’s horizon recedes into the background, with ships sailing to newly discovered worlds. Crowning the image are the words *Unus Non Sufficit*. This motto—*Unus non sufficit orbis*, or, *One World is not Enough*—originates in Juvenal (ca. 1st-early 2nd c. A.D.), when he describes Alexander the Great (356-323 B.C.) and his conquering of India. Imagining Alexander’s dissatisfaction upon realizing that there were no more worlds to conquer once he prevailed over the kingdoms of India, Juvenal writes about Alexander’s yearning for yet more worlds: “One world did not suffice the Pellaean youth; He chases unhappy in the narrow limit of the world (Sat. X, Juvenal).” Integrated into the title page of the Bloemaerts’ *Artis Apellae liber*, this emblem suggests that the 1740 edition belongs to a new Enlightenment discourse on the plurality of worlds and therefore religions.

Both the 1650-56 edition and the 1740 edition begin with the lesson composed of sensory fragments (a lesson that has been a pivot for this dissertation), moving between eyes, ears, noses, and faces (fig. 143). The 1740 *Tekenboek* continues to provide studies of facial parts within the first section, so that as the section advertises, the collection of *fragments of the face and head* are organized within their properly titled section. In contrast, the Bloemaerts’ 1650-56 edition progresses from presentations of the fragmented faces to gazes, to hands and hair; the first section ends with a saint
genuflecting in prayer. In the Bloemaerts’ edition of the *Tekenboek*, the visual and the tactile culminates in rhymes among patterns of twisted shells and twisted hair, grasping hands, curled feet soles, inward glances, and chained hands, palms devoutly pressing into one another. The syncopated progression from the sensory organs to prayer becomes organized, contained and categorized into discrete parts by the 1740 Picart edition. The metaphysicality of drawing is erased as the crescendo of faith and draftsmanship become re-ordered into “finished figures” and “historical compositions.”

Picart’s separation of the lessons into discrete parts reflects the systematization of training that he received in the French *Académie*. The inclusion of Bloemaert’s biography and the list of Bloemaert’s other works on paper transforms the *Tekenboek* from a manual for the workshop—an introduction to the practice of drawing—to a collection of engraved images for the collector, a work to be kept as a precious object. Nevertheless, these two understandings of the book—one as material of the workshop, the other as object of the cabinet—do not fall into easy divisions. Picart’s renumbering of the plates engages with the materiality of the book, reforming its matter into a new work (like the clay of the potter’s wheel). Similarly, the *Artis Apellae liber* did leave the trace of Bloemaert’s *maniera* (working method) not only for students to re-imagine but also for collectors to recognize and prize.
Cognitive Beliefs

In order to understand Picart’s reconfiguring of the *Artis Apellae liber*, it is necessary to review the biography of this master of order. Picart was trained in the Academies of Paris and was shaped by late seventeenth-century confessionalism, emerging to become one of the most important engravers and actors in the eighteenth-century Amsterdam book market and intellectual circles. In his authorial enterprises, Picart examines both religion and art as objects of study. Famous in the eighteenth century as an engraver, his legacy today remains in his engravings for Jean Frederic Bernard’s *Cérémonies et coutumes religieuses de tous les peuples du monde* (1723-43), a collaborative project designed, authored and distributed by Bernard and Picart (both exiles in Amsterdam). Comprised of multiple volumes published between 1723 and 1743, this lavishly illustrated work has been declared one of the first comparative studies of religion, covering Buddhism, Hinduism, Islam, Catholicism, Protestantism, the ancient rites of Egypt and Greece, practices in the Americas and many others.

Picart’s integral participation in this project dedicated to “religious toleration” cannot be separated from his biography, written by his friend Prosper Marchand (b. 1675), a book merchant on the famous Rue St. Jacques in Paris. Written after Picart’s death in 1733, Marchand’s elegy for his friend stands out in its attention to Picart’s faith. Marchand describes Picart’s relationship not only to the Academy but also to the Catholic Church. This biography shows the inseparability of Picart’s relationship to confession and matter when considering his role as an engraver and publisher of the *Artis Apellae liber*. 
In 1689, Picart attended the *Academie de peinture*, where he studied “drawing after nature,” perspective and architecture under Sébastien le Clerc (1637-1714). After two years at the *Academie*, he won *le prix de l’Academie* from the hands of Charles le Brun himself.259 Established as an engraver, Picart traveled to the Low Countries and spent a winter in Antwerp, where he won *le prix du Dessein à l’Académie des Beaux Arts*. Following the death of his mother and the sickness of his father, Picart returned to Paris and continued to work as a successful engraver.

Before his return to Paris, however, Picart encountered in Holland an important book, *Response of Mr. Claude on the Perpetuity of the Faith of the Catholic Church on the Eucharist*, a work that would lead to Picart’s leaving the Catholic Church and France.260 The treatise takes part in one the most famous seventeenth-century theological debates, between the Port-Royal theologians (Antoine Arnauld and Pierre Nicole) and a French Protestant minister Jean Claude. The discourse revolves around whether or not the doctrine of transubstantiation is historically founded in the early Christian Church, or whether it developed in the later Middle Ages. In their *Treatise upon the Eucharist*, the Port-Royal theologians attempt to trace the *real presence* of Christ’s body in the Eucharist (and not just in sign) to the history of the early Christian Church. In their search

259 “En 1689, ayant été envoyé à l’Académie de Peinture, pour y apprendre `s desiner d’après Nature, il y apprit aussi la Perspective & l’Architecture sous Mr. Sébastien le Clerc, Homme d’un rare mérite, & qui s’est extrêmement distingué par les différens Ouvrages dont il a enrichi le public. Car il n’étoit pas seulement habile Graveur & Dessinateur, & même la premier de tous les Graveurs sur tout pour le petit; mais il excelloit encore en diverses autres Sciences, comme dans l’Architecture, la Géométrie, la Trigonométrie, la Perspective, &c. Deux ans après B. Picart remporta le prix de l’Académie; & Mr. Charles le Brun, des mains duquel il le reçut, l’encouragea par une exhortation des plus obligeantes à continuer sur le même ton.” A. Prosper Marchand, “Eloge Historique de Bernard Picart, Dessinateur et Graveur,” in *Impostures Innocentes* (Amsterdam, 1734) A.

260 “Pendant son séjour en Hollande, il a été occasion de lire la Réponse de Mr. Claude à la Perpétuité de la Foi de l’Eglise Catholique sur l’Eucharistie, & cette lecture lui ayant donné beaucoup à penser, il aurait bien voulu examiner un peu plus cette matière, en lisant les Réponses & les Repliques de part & d’autre: mais ces Livres-là ne s’étant pas trouvés à portée, & la maladie de son Père l’ayant obligé de retourner avec precipitation à Paris, il se contenta de former la resolution de reprendre cet examen après son retour en France.” Marchand, *Eloge*, 3.
for metaphysical “proofs” of God’s existence, the logicians argue that the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation reflects the beliefs of the Apostolic Church before it was corrupted. Citing the fifth-century Archbishop of Constantinople John of Chrysostom (347-407), the treatise states that the word figure does not refer to a sign but real presence, “because, moreover, the principal part of the Eucharist is not that part which is external and visible, in which the Eucharist is a figure, but, that part, which is internal and invisible, which is the body of Jesus Christ.”²⁶¹ The Port-Royal logicians attempt to prove the presence of God belongs to a tradition of the figure going back to Augustine and used by their contemporary Pascal.²⁶² For the Port-Royal theologians, the power of reason bears upon the clear elucidation of the Eucharist’s real presence:

There are things so clear, that they need not the aid of elucidation; they require only to be clearly stated. I trust that every dispassionate mind will account as such, not only this last argument, but also all the other arguments, which I have adduced in this treatise, and that they will feel at the same time convinced, that there is nothing more irrational, than the conduct of those, who, to follow their private reason, abandon the communion of the Church and the Catholic faith. Since, to pursue such a course, men must bow down their minds to the belief of so many things, so opposed to the lights of reason.²⁶³

While Arnauld and Nicole declared the obvious reason of the Eucharist, the minister Jean Claude, in Réponse aux deux traitez intitulez le Perpétuité de la foy de l’Église touchant l’Éucharistie (1668-1670), contended that the doctrine of transubstantiation did not exist until the tenth and eleventh centuries. For Claude, the bread and the wine of the Eucharist are the symbols, signs, figures and images of the body and blood of Christ. In their


²⁶² Although I have pointed out in Faces and Passions how Arnauld and Nicole at times swerve from Pascal’s meanings in their attempts to reconcile him with Cartesianism, nevertheless, the tradition of Biblical exegesis at Port Royale (founded upon a figural relationship between the Old and New Testament) belongs to both the work of Pascal and the Port-Royal logicians.

²⁶³ Arnauld, Perpetuity, 78
consecration, they become mystical signs of Christ’s body and blood without losing their “proper nature,” or sensory accidents.\textsuperscript{264}

Marchand places this public discourse among theologians on the Eucharist and its sensory accidents as the instigator for Picart’s decision to leave the Catholic Church and to join an intellectual circle of devout eighteenth-century men, who cannot be directly affiliated with one particular religion. Both Picart and Bernard left the intolerant world of Louis XIV France for the intellectual publishing communities of Amsterdam, where they could discourse freely among Spinozists, freemasons and the leading intellectuals of the day. The pivotal role that Picart’s decision to leave the Catholic Church plays in his biography (an elegy that for the most part describes Picart’s work as an artist-engraver) reflects the importance for considering Picart’s relationship to religion in his reordering of the Bloemaerts’ \textit{Tekenboek}.

In \textit{Religious Ceremonies and Customs}, Picart and Bernard sought to reduce the differences among religions into a collection of cognitive beliefs that shared an attention to a “divine.” For them, the materiality of religion—its customs and rites—imposes differences and sows intolerance. In contrast to the material nature of religious ritual and rite, Picart and Bernard argue for a universal immaterial faith.\textsuperscript{265} For the Huguenot exiles,\textsuperscript{264}

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{264} “Le sense naturel des passages des Peres qui portent que le pain & le vin sont des Symboles, des Signes, des Figures, des Images du Corps & du Sang du Seigneur, c est que par la consécratión le pain & le vin sont élévez à la Gloire d’estre les signes mystiques du Corps & du Sang de Jesus-Chrsit sans perdre leur proper nature. Le sens contraint est ou que le Corps de Jesus Christ est le signe de soy-mesme, ou que les accidens, c’est-à-dire les apparences du pain & du vin sont des signes.” Jean Claude, \textit{Reponse aux deux traitez intitulez La perpetuite de la foy de l’Eglise Catholique touchant l’Eucharistie} (Paris: l’imprimerie des Roziers, 1665) 674.

\textsuperscript{265} In their study of Bernard and Picart’s \textit{Religious Ceremonies of the World}, Lynn Hunt, Margaret Jacob and Wijnand Mijnhardt argue that neither Picart nor Bernard “can be pigeonholed as a Huguenot, a Dutch Calvinist, a deist, a pantheist, or an atheist.” Instead, Picart and Bernard sought in their quest of knowledge and faith a “deeper reflection on the significance of the religious impulse.” Lynn Hunt, Margaret Jacob and Wijnand Mijnhardt, \textit{The Book that Changed Europe: Picart and Bernard’s Religious Ceremonies of the World} (Cambridge: Belknap Press, 2010) 21. See also: Lynn Hunt and Margaret Jacob, \textit{Bernard Picart and the First Global Vision of Religion} (Los Angeles: The Getty Research Institute, 2010).
once the matter of rites and rituals is transcended, the immaterial faith in the divine among all religions may create a space for mutual tolerance and respect. This understanding of the material aspects of religion (its ceremonies and rites) as the seeds of intolerance impacts not only works such as the 1740 edition of the *Artis Apellae liber* but also Picart’s own understanding of artistic production, engraving and the *matter* of art.

In *Religious Ceremonies and Customs*, Bernard writes that the origin of images is the human spirit desiring a sensible object for devotion. For Bernard, the problem with images is that pagans believe that upon its consecration, the nature of the image is changed. Now the devotee is worshipping Divinity, when in fact he prostrates himself at the feet of metal, stone, or wood. As in the Eucharistic debates, this account of images involves the question of matter and its ability to take on the qualities of something other than what it appears to be. For the Catholic Church, the sensory accidents of the bread and wine are the surfaces, which clothe the body and blood of Christ. For Calvinists—as stated by Claude in his refutation—the bread and wine are the sign or symbol of Christ, yet the nature of the bread and wine do not change. Their surfaces are as they appear to be. The materiality of images becomes reduced to what is seen and the image itself becomes a figure, sign and symbol. A “pure material” surface that reflects only its sensory accidents and nothing else comes to symbolize the stripping away of the material customs of embodied religious practice.

While the rise of religious pluralism grew, so that other religions came to be considered not heretical but as legitimate in their own right, religion became defined by
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266 “Parmi les Paiens le common Peuple, d’ordinaire fort grossier, adoroit le metal, la Pierre ou le bois, comme la Divinite même, s’imaginant que les Images avoient changé de nature par la consécration.” Frederic Bernard, *Ceremonies et coutumes religieuses de tous les peoples du monde*, vol. 8 (Amsterdam: Chez J.F. Bernard, 1743) 104.
its “cognitive content.” As Gaukroger writes, in regards to reducing Christianity to a set of cognitive beliefs that may be compared with other beliefs: “This allows for the ‘rationalization’ of religion whereby a general ordering is possible in which beliefs fundamental to any form of Christianity can be identified and distinguished from those peculiar to particular confessional understandings.” As scholars such as Gaukroger have argued, the drive to “rationalize” religion and reduce it to “cognitive content” emerged from the devastation of the Thirty Years War and the brutality of religious fighting in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. “The price of allowing confessional conflicts to enter the civil realm was perpetual violence, and this was simply too high a price to pay.” There was no solution to the “all-or-nothing claims on which salvation hinged,” “confessional questions had to be shifted out of the public sphere into that of the private.”

While Bloemaert’s work began with the individual sensory experience leading to the metaphysical, reordering of the Tekenboek makes drawing a “cognitive enterprise,” as the exercises fall into their appropriate subject heading and categorization. The inclusion of Bloemaert’s biography and a list of Bloemaert’s engravers and designs for engraving in the 1740 edition present the Tekenboek as the material traces of Bloemaert’s immaterial gheest. I would argue that Bloemaert’s pedagogy is guided by a rationality of faith, perhaps best realized in the seventeenth-century writings on the heart. The Artis Apellae liber presents a drawing pedagogy guided not by geometric reasoning or an attempt to legitimize the process and practice of drawing; instead it is instantiated in the practice of copying that begins in the “images of the flesh” and ascends to the artist’s

---

268 Gaukroger, *Collapse of Mechanism*, 44.
own internal perceptions. Whereas the Bloemaerts’ edition of the *Artis Apellae liber* is founded within the heart, the 1740 edition is grounded within the *cogito*, the material traces of his *gheest*.

Drawings have always been the products of bodies that lived, worked, ate, slept, procreated, prayed, suffered, died and were buried. Looking at seventeenth-century drawing through the lens of a figure like Bloemaert, who was a brilliant draftsman but nevertheless a minor artist in the Western canon, helps to disentangle the threads of artistic divinity that attach themselves to draftsmen such as Michelangelo and Rembrandt. Bloemaert bridges these two traditions. He belongs to an older craft and guild tradition of the workshop and the model book, while pointing forward to the singular artist in the studio. From the 1650-56 edition of the *Artis Apellae liber* to the 1740 Picart edition, the practice of art becomes a “cognitive” process (a material reflection of the immaterial mind in the head), ignoring the social practice of art as “embodied” in the heart. The formation of a “community of believers” united in ritual and ceremony pervaded the civil body, so that even institutions such as artists’ guilds and “drawing academies” were founded upon the concept of the communal body and artists’ relationships to one another, a sense of sociability stressed in the importance of concepts such as *Caritas*. From the opening lesson of the *Artis Apellae liber*, there is a “movement inward” in artistic practice, pointing towards a movement away from this sociability. The artist comes to practice not only in the community of the workshop but also in the solitude of the studio. While this form of solitariness may be grounded within ideals of ascetic practice, it becomes tied to a “personal, inward, committed” relationship to one’s artistic production,
a relationship that will lead ultimately away from the collective to the individual “genius.”

In this dissertation, I have attempted to show how questions of faith and knowledge in the early-modern period extended beyond “hidden symbolism,” “iconography,” and whether the artist was Calvinist or Catholic. The ability to sustain an exploration of the world in the context of an interrogation of faith penetrated into both the practice of art and the artist’s understanding of his own body. The complexity of Bloemaert’s confessional period influenced artistic practice and communities. Bloemaert did not seek a specific “Catholic” pedagogy of drawing. Instead his work manifests a cross-confessional approach and shares similar aspects of projects by pedagogues of varying confessions, such as Johann Comenius’s Orbis Pictus. Nevertheless, the Artis Apellae liber also did not shy away from the role of devotion, prayer, the Eucharist and religion in its representations and in making parallels between drawing and devotion.

Drawing is perhaps the most important medium through which to consider the interchange between metaphysics and art in the seventeenth century because it still bears this legacy. In their intimacy and seeming traces of a particular gheest (a term that suggests both intellect and spirit), drawings today prompt discussion that still struggles and circles around the relationship between the material and the immaterial, as drawings often are interpreted as material traces of an artist’s mind. Charles de Tolnay summarizes this dialectic: “one of the most striking charms of a drawing,” is “the vacillation between spirit and matter, artistic illusion and material object.”

270 De Tolnay, Old Master Drawings, 14.
What constituted matter and what constituted an immaterial spirit was up for debate in the seventeenth century. Drawing explored matter and bodies, spirit and divinity. When Maurice Merleau-Ponty describes the body as an “intertwining of vision and movement,” this understanding begins to be realized formally in the act of drawing the nude body in the workshop and in the artistic vocabulary—wel-dragen, welstandt, grace—that surrounds the practice.\(^\text{271}\) When David Rosand writes that one “of the basic assumptions of traditional connoisseurship and appreciation is that drawings offer us the most intimate expression of artistic creativity and personality,” he suggests a strikingly modern understanding of drawing.\(^\text{272}\) As *Faces and Passions* demonstrated, even our notion of a self (and its dependence upon a consciousness as witness) was not born until the end of the seventeenth century, and indeed previously the self had been understood in relationship to the person and his moral and legal obligations to a wider community. This is not to deny that theorists such as Roger De Piles might note the “character of the mind” versus the “character of the hand,” but de Piles’s understanding of “character” must be seen more in the context of the French *honnêteté*, and the problems of “constancy,” “judgment,” and “habitual will” that arose with Neo-Stoicism and early-modern “spiritual exercises.”\(^\text{273}\)

Drawing is a practice. The ability to draw emerges from years of training and learning to master one’s self and one’s senses through exercises. Looking at drawing in relationship to the confessional debates of the seventeenth-century and their intersections


with problems of epistemology and perception reveals that for these artists more was at
stake than the revelation of particular genius or individual personality. The European
continent had been soaked in the blood of people fighting wars over questions about the
perception of the Eucharist and its surface, the presence or absence of God on the altar,
and whether knowledge of the world and the divine could be attained through the Book
of Nature, the Word or other material mediations. Artists’ academies, guilds, and the
driving concepts of Pietas and Caritas mediated these problems so that printed drawing
books, travelling throughout Europe, provided a cross-confessional site to engage on the
page with questions about what even constituted “matter” and “spirit,” the universal and
the particular.

Moreover, the importance of the heart for artistic practice points towards the
collaborative and social body engaged in early-modern drawing practice. There is an
inherent tension in writing about drawing, between the cogito and the heart, a tension that
I have argued was born out of the different drawing pedagogies of the seventeenth
century (one geometric, one sensory), which were reflections of a wider philosophical
discourse on metaphysics and whether God may be known rationally (through the cogito)
or through the rationality of faith (through the heart). In Picart’s reordering, the fluidity
between devotion, daily life, religion and art becomes crystallized. Picart disengages
drawing practice from devotional practice and works towards making art a surface for
reflection, the historical traces of Bloemaert’s gheest, the material inscriptions of his
immortal mind and intellect. Nevertheless, the bodies that wander through the lessons
of the Artis Apellae liber bear within their status as wanderers, peasants and soldiers the
fraught history of the seventeenth century, presenting an encyclopedia of Bloemaert’s world, according to his life’s dedication to his practice.
Bibliography

Primary Sources


Bloemaert, Abraham and Bernard Picart. Oorspronkelyk en vermaard konstryk Tekenboek van Abraham Bloemaert. Amsterdam, 1740.


Comenius, Johann Amos. Visible World: or, a nomenclature, and pictures of all the chief things that are in the world, and of means employment therein. Translated by Charles Hoole. London, 1728.


Hoogstraten, Samuel van. *Inleyding tot de hooge schoole der schilderkonst: anders de zichtbaere werelt*. Rotterdam: Franisois van Hoogstraeten, 1678.


Passe, Crispjn van de. *Light der teken en schilderkonst.* Amsterdam: Crispijn van de Passe, 1643-44.


Sichem, Christoffel van. ‘*t Schat der zielen, dat is: het geheele leven ons Heeren Iesu Christi: naer de vyer evangelisten*. Amsterdam: P.I. Paets, 1648.

Spinoza, Benedict de. *Korte verhandeling van God, de Mensch en deszelfs welstand*. Amstelodami: Muller, 1869.


**Secondary Sources**


Grove, Laurence. “Jesuit Emblematics at La Flèche (Sarthe) and their Influence upon René Descartes.” In The Jesuits and the Emblem Tradition, selected papers of the Leuven...


Figure 1. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederick Blomaert engraved, *A Young Draftsman*, engraving and woodcut, 305 mm x 223 mm, 1650’s (British Museum Collection of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 2. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederick Bloemaert engraved, “Lesson 12,” *Arts Apellae liber*, engraving, 213 mm x 173 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 3. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederick Bloemaert engraved, “Lesson 18,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 185 mm x 150 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 4. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederick Bloemaert engraved, “Lesson 36,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 214 mm x 174 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 5. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederick Bloemaert engraved, “Lesson 33,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 215 mm x 175 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 6. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederick Bloemaert engraved, “Lesson 2,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 190 mm x 148 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 7. Giacomo Franco, “Lesson 2,” De excellentia et nobilitate delineationis libri duo, 240 mm x 160 mm, 1611 (Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam).
Figure 8. Jusepe Ribera, *Studies of the Nose and Mouth*, etching, 139 mm x 213 mm, ca. 1622 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Fig. 9. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederik Bloemaert engraved, “Lesson 105,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 212 mm x 171 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Fig. 10 Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederik Bloemaert engraved, “Lesson 16,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 220 mm x 175 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Fig. 11. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederik Bloemaert engraved, “Lesson 11,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 213 mm x 173 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Fig. 12. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederik Bloemaert engraved, “Lesson 14,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 220 mm x 175 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Fig. 13. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederik Bloemaert engraved, “Lesson 22,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 210 mm x 170 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Fig. 14. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederik Bloemaert engraved, “Lesson 23,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 210 mm x 170 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Fig. 15. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederik Bloemaert engraved, “Lesson 69,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 212 mm x 171 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Fig. 16. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederik Bloemaert engraved, “Lesson 34,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 182 mm x 152 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Fig. 17. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederik Bloemaert engraved, “Lesson 31,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 213 mm x 174 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Fig. 18. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederik Bloemaert engraved, “Lesson 50,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 215 mm x 172 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Fig. 19. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederik Bloemaert engraved, “Lesson 63,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 187 mm x 151 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Fig. 20. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederik Bloemaert engraved, “Lesson 64,” Artis Apellae liber, engraving, 214 mm x 173 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 21. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederick Bloemaert engraved, “Lesson 52,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 214 mm x 173 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 22. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederick Bloemaert engraved, “Lesson 55,” Artis Apellae liber, engraving, 215 mm x 173 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 23. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederick Bloemaert engraved, “Lesson 85,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 215 mm x 175 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 24. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederick Bloemaert engraved, “Lesson 54,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 215 mm x 174 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 25. Agostino Carracci, *Details of a Head and Figure Study*, pen, ink and red chalk, 127 mm x 265 mm, n.d. (The Royal Collections, Windsor Castle).
Figure 26. Agostino Carracci, *Studies of Heads and Figures, Details, Caricatures and Trees*, black and red chalk, pen and grey and brown ink, 500 mm x 370 mm, n.d. (The Royal Collections, Windsor Castle).
Figure 27. Agostino Carracci, *Studies of Feet and an Annunciation*, pen and brown ink, 258 mm x 162 mm, n.d. (The Royal Collections, Windsor Castle).
Figure 28. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederick Bloemaert engraved, “Lesson 3,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 190 mm x 148 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Fig. 29. Jusepe Ribera. *Studies of a Male Head in Profile*, red chalk on ivory paper, 250 mm x 206 mm, 1620-1622 (Department of Prints and Drawings, Princeton University).
Figure 30. Odoardo Fialetti, *Il vero modo*, etching, 99 x 140 mm, 1608 (British Museum Collection of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 31. Odoardo Fialetti, *The Large Book of Drawing*, engraving, 138 mm x 157 mm, n.d. (The Warburg Institute, London).
Figure 32. Giacomo Franco, “Lesson 2,” *De excellentia et nobilitate delineationis libri duo*, 240 mm x 160 mm, 1611 (Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam).
Figure 33. Giacomo Franco, “Lesson 24,” *De excellentia et nobilitate delineationis libri duo*, 250 mm x 17 mm, 1611 (Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam).
Figure 34. Luca Ciamberlano and Francesco Brizio, *Le livre de dessein*, engraving, 171 mm x 119 mm, n.d. (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 35. Luca Ciamberlano and Francesco Brizio, *Le livre de dessein*, engraving, 174 mm x 122 mm, n.d. (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 36. Luca Ciamberlano, *Le livre de dessein*, engraving, 152 mm x 111mm, n.d. (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 37. Luca Ciamberlano, *Le livre de dessein*, engraving, 152 mm x 111mm, n.d. (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 38. Jusepe Ribera, *Studies of Ears*, etching, 145 mm x 219 mm, ca. 1622 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 39. Jusepe Ribera, *Studies of Eyes*, etching, 145 mm x 218 mm, ca. 1622 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 40. Crispijn van de Passe, “Introductory Lesson,” *Van ’t light der teken en schilderkonst*, engraving, 280 mm x 185 mm, 1643 (Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam).
Figure 41. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederick Bloemaert engraved, “Lesson 31,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 213 mm x 174 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 42. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederick Bloemaert engraved, “Lesson 19,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 185 mm x 153 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 43. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederick Bloemaert engraved, “Lesson 48,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 215 mm x 173 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 44. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederick Bloemaert engraved, “Lesson 56,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 182 mm x 151 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 45. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederick Bloemaert engraved, “Lesson 59,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 215 mm x 174 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 46. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederick Bloemaert engraved, “Lesson 2,” *Arts Apellae liber*, engraving, 190 mm x 148 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Fig. 47. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederick Bloemaert engraved, “Lesson 78,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 135 mm x 178 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 48. Joannes Janssonius, “Title Page,” Diagraphia, sive ars delineatoria, engraving, 1616 (Letterenbibliotheek, Utrecht).
Figure 49. Lucas Ciamberlano, *Fundamentales regulae artis pictoriae et sculpt*, executed by C.J. Visscher, ca. 1640 (Letterenbibliotheek, Utrecht).
Figure 50. Lucas Ciamberlano, *Fondamento del later (sic!) de desegnia... intagliate per Lucas Ciamb[erlano] in Roman: fondamenten der Teyckenkonst*, executed by Claes Jan Visscher, 1651 (Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam).
Figure 51. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederik engraved, printed in Lucas Ciamberlano, *Fundamentales regulae artis pictoriae et sculpt*, executed by C.J. Visscher, ca. 1640 (Letterenbibliotheek, Utrecht).
Figure 52. Odoardo Fialetti, “Interior Scene with Sketching Class,” etching, 110 mm x 154 mm, 1608 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).

Figure 53. Pier Francesco Alberti, Academia d’Pitori, etching, 410 mm x 527 mm, 1600-1630 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 54. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederick Bloemaert engraved, “Saint in Prayer,” *Artis Apellae liber*, 185 mm x 153 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 55. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederick Bloemaert engraved, “Caritas,” *Artis Apellae liber*, 190 mm x 152 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 56. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederick Bloemaert engraved, “Mother and Child,” *Artis Apellae liber*, 213 mm x 173 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 57. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederick Bloemaert engraved, “Variations on Three Graces,” *Artis Apellae liber*, 189 mm x 149 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 58. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederick Bloemaert engraved, “Holy Family,” *Artis Apellae liber*, 214 mm x 174 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 59. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederick Bloemaert engraved, “Angel Smiting the People” *Artis Apellae liber*, 211 mm x 172 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 60. Crispijn van de Passe, “Saint,” *Van 't Light der Teken en Schilderkonst*, woodcut, 270 mm x 180 mm, 1643-44 (Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam).

Figure 61. Crispijn van de Passe, *Van 't Light der Teken en Schilderkonst*, woodcut, 180 mm x 280 mm, 1643-44 (Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam).
Figure 62. Crispijn van de Passe, “Saint,” *Van ’t Light der Teken en Schilderkonst*, woodcut, 280 mm x 170 mm, 1643-44 (Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam).

Figure 63. Crispijn van de Passe, “Saint,” *Van ’t Light der Teken en Schilderkonst*, woodcut, 170 mm x 280 mm, 1643-44 (Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam).
Figure 64. Crispijn van de Passe, “Drawing in the Workshop,” Van ’t Light der Teken en Schilderkonst, engraving, 380 mm x 300 mm, 1643-44 (Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam).
Figure 65. Jan van Eyck, *Madonna and Child in a Church*, oak with polychrome, 310 mm x 140 mm, 1425 (Gemäldegalerie, Berlin).
Figure 66. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederik Bloemaert engraved, *Portrait of Thomas à Kempis*, engraving, 460 mm x 290 mm, 1635-1649 (Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam).
Figure 67. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederick Bloemaert engraved, “Lesson 98,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 190 mm x 152 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 68. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederick Bloemaert engraved, “Lesson, 57,” Apellae liber, engraving, 182 mm x 152 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 69. Christoffel van Sichem and Pieter Paets, “Title Page,” *Die alleen-spraecke der zielen met Godt, door Thomas van Kempen*, engraving, 1628 (Bibliotheek van de Universiteit van Amsterdam).
Figure 70. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Boëtius Bolswert engraved, “Title Page,” ‘t Bosch der eremyten ende eremittinnen, van Aegypten ende Palestinen, engraving, 1619 (Bibliotheek van de Universiteit van Amsterdam).

Figure 71. Christoffel van Sichem and Pieter Paets, “Title Page,” ‘t Bosch der eremyten ende eremittinnen, van Aegypten ende Palestinen, met Figureuren van Abraham Bloemaert, engraving, 1644 (Bibliotheek van de Universiteit van Amsterdam).
Figure 72. Maarten van Heemskerck and Pieter Paets, “Title Page,” De passie onses Heeren Jesu Christi, in Figureuyren uyt-ghebeeldt, engraving, 1629 (Bibliotheek van de Universiteit van Amsterdam).

Figure 73. Christoffel van Sichem and Pieter Paets, “Title Page,” Bibels tresoor, ofte der zielen lusthof : uytgebeeld in Figureuren, door verscheeyden meesters, engraving, 1646 (Bibliotheek van de Universiteit van Amsterdam).
Figure 74. Christoffel van Sichem and Pieter Paets, “Title Page,” 't Schat der zielen, engraving, 1648 (Bibliotheek van de Universiteit van Amsterdam).
Figure 75. Christoffel van Sichen and Abraham Bloemaert, “Title Page,” Bibels tresoor, ofte der zielen lusthof: uytgebeelt in Figureuere, door verscheeyden meesters, engraving, 1646 (Bibliotheek van de Universiteit van Amsterdam).
Figure 76. Abraham Bloemaert and Boëtius Bolswert, “Christ,” *Sacra Eremus*, engraving, 1619 (Bibliotheek van de Universiteit van Amsterdam).
Figure 77. Boëtius Bolswert, “Potter’s Workshop,” Goddelijke wenschen verlicht met sinne-beelden, ghedichten en vierighe uyt-spraecken der oud-vaders, engraving, 1629 (Bibliotheek van de Universiteit van Amsterdam).
Figure 78. Abraham Bloemaert, *Kneeling male Figures with standing male Figure behind*, drawing in graphite with white body color, 397 mm x 301 mm, n.d. (Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge).
Figure 79. Abraham Bloemaert, *Two prone nude male Figures and study of a pair of feet*, drawing in black ink and graphite with white highlights, 397 mm x 301 mm, n.d. (Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge).
Figure 80. Abraham Bloemaert, *Study of a foot and two studies of a man carrying a basket upon his shoulders*, drawing in brown ink and wash with red chalk and white body color, 397 mm x 301 mm, n.d. (Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge).
Figure 81. Abraham Bloemaert, *Moses Striking the Rock*, drawing in black ink, graphite and white highlights, 500 mm x 350 mm, 1601-1610 (Universitetsbibliotek, Uppsala).
Figure 82. Cornelis Cornelisz. van Haarlem, *Wedding of Peleus and Thetis*, oil on canvas, 246 cm x 419 cm, 1592-93 (Frans Hals Museum, Haarlem).
Figure 83. Hendrick Goltzius, *Tantalus*, from *Four Disgracers*, engraving, 336 mm x 336 mm, 1588 (Princeton University, Prints and Drawings Collection, Princeton).
Figure 84. Hendrick Goltzius, *Icarus*, from *Four Disgracers*, engraving, 336 mm x 336 mm, 1588 (Princeton University, Prints and Drawings Collection, Princeton).
Figure 85. Hendrick Goltzius, *Phaeton*, from *Four Disgracers*, engraving, 336 mm x 336 mm, 1588 (Princeton University, Prints and Drawings Collection, Princeton).
Figure 86. Hendrick Goltzius, *Ixion*, from *Four Disgracers*, engraving, 336 mm x 336 mm, 1588 (Princeton University, Prints and Drawings Collection, Princeton).
Figure 87. Hendrick Goltzius, *Sleeping Girl*, chalk on paper, 258 mm x 302 mm, 1594 (Private Collection, USA).
Figure 88. Rembrandt van Rijn. *Standing Male Nude*, pen and brown ink, brown wash and white highlight, 199 mm x 137 mm, c. 1646 (Graphische Sammlung Albertina, Vienna).
Figure 89. Designed by Karel van Mander, engraved by Jacob Matham, *Blazon of the Flemish Chamber of Rhetoric at Haarlem*, engraving, 336 mm x 249 mm, 1602 (British Museum Collection of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 90. Frans Floris, “Studies after Antique Sculpture,” pen in brown ink and brown wash, 213 mm x 296 mm, 1540-45 (Kupferstichkabinett, Basel).
Figure 91. Frans Floris, “Studies after Antique Sculpture,” pen in brown ink and brown wash, 210 mm x 298 mm, 1540-45 (Basel Kupferstichkabinett, Basel).

Figure 92. Frans Floris, “Studies after Antique Sculpture,” brown pen and ink and brown wash, 191 mm x 235 mm, 1540-45 (Stedelijk Musea, Bruges).
Figure 93. Heinrich Vogtherr, *Eighteen Headresses*, woodcut, 167 mm x 128 mm (Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam).
Figure 94. Anonymous, *Leg and Grotteschi*, pen, brown ink and wash, c. 1500 (The Hermitage Museum, Collection of Prints and Drawings, St. Petersburg).
Figure 95. Abraham Bloemaert, *Peasant’s Cottage*, pen and brown ink with brush and brown over black and red chalk, 172 mm x 272 mm, c. 1600 (Cleveland Museum of Art, Cleveland).

Figure 96. Abraham Bloemaert, *Bridge and Gate*, pen and brown ink and wash over red and black chalk, 175 mm x 272 mm, c. 1600 (Cleveland Museum of Art, Cleveland).
Figure 97. Abraham Bloemaert, *Haman*, black chalk, pen and brown ink, brown wash, white body color, 310 mm x 180 mm, 1592-93 (Musées royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique, Brussels).
Figure 98. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederick Bloemaert engraved, *Artis Apellae liber*, “Lesson 2,” engraving, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 99. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederick Bloemaert engraved, “Lesson 3,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 180 mm x 148 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 100. Johann Amos Comenius, “Title Page,” Orbis sensualium pictus, woodcut, 1659 (Bibliotheek van de Universiteit van Amsterdam).
Figure 101. Johann Amos Comenius, “The External Senses,” *Orbis Sensualium pictus*, woodcut, 1659 (Bibliotheek van de Universiteit Amsterdam).
Figure 102. After Abraham Bloemaert, engraved by Jacob Matham, *Veronica’s Veil*, engraving, 428 mm x 321 mm, 1605 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 103. El Greco, *Saint Veronica with the Sudarium*, oil on canvas, 840 mm x 910 mm, 1577-1580 (Museo de Santa Cruz, Toledo).
Figure 104. Francisco de Zurbarán, *St Veronica’s Veil*, oil on canvas, 700 mm x 560 mm, 1631-36 (Nationalmuseum, Stockholm).
Figure 105. Designed by Abraham Bloemaert and engraved by Frederick Bloemaert, “Lesson 112,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 212 x 172 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 106. Designed by Abraham Bloemaert and engraved by Frederick Bloemaert, “Lesson 49,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 215 mm × 172 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 107. Designed by Abraham Bloemaert and engraved by Frederick Bloemaert, “Lesson 53,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving 215 mm x 172 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 108. Anonymous, *Copy After Abraham Bloemaert*, pen, wash, white highlights, 375 mm x 283 mm, n.d. (Staatliche Graphische Sammlung, Munich).
Figure 109. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederick Bloemaert engraved, “Lesson 15,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 220 mm x 175 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Collection of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 110. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederick Bloemaert engraved, “Lesson 38,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 214 mm x 173 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Collection of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 111. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederick Bloemaert engraved, “Lesson 16,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 220 mm x 175 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Collection of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 112. Johannes Vermeer, *Girl with a Pearl Earring*, oil on canvas, 450 mm x 390 mm, ca. 1665 (Mauritshuis, The Hague).
Figure 113. Rembrandt Harmensz. van Rijn, *Rembrandt’s Mother as a Prophetess*, oil on panel, 350 mm x 290 mm, n.d. (Bohlen and Halbach Collection, Essen).
Figure 114. Rembrandt Harmensz. van Rijn, *Head of Rembrandt’s Mother*, etching, 57 mm x 60 mm, 1628 (Fine Arts Museum, San Francisco).
Figure 115. Jan van Vliet after Rembrandt Harmensz. van Rijn, *Unidentified Old Man*, etching, 148 mm x 130 mm, 1628-1668 (Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam).
Figure 116. Stefano della Bella, *Livre pour apprendre à dessiner*, etching, 84 mm x 64 mm, 1647-1652 (Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam).
Figure 117. Jan Lievens, *Variae effigies a Johanne Livio Lugd. Batav*, etching, 160 mm x 143 mm, 1630-1632 (British Museum, Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 118. Jan Lievens, *Variae effigies a Johanne Livio Lugd. Batav*, etching, 160 mm x 143 mm, 1630-1632 (British Museum, Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 119. Jan Lievens, *Variae effigies a Johanne Livio Lugd. Batav*, etching, 160 mm x 143 mm, 1630-1632 (British Museum, Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 120. Michael Sweerts, “Title Page,” *Diversae facies in usum iuvenum et aliorum*, etching, 90mm x 81mm, 1656 (Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam).
Figure 121. Michael Sweerts, *Diversae facies in usum iuvenum et aliorum*, etching, 90 mm x 81 mm, 1656 (Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam).
Figure 122. Michael Sweerts, *Diversae facies in usum iuvenum et aliorum*, etching, 90mm x 81mm, 1656 (Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam).
Figure 123. Michael Sweerts, *Diversae facies in usum iuvenum et aliorum*, etching, 90 mm x 81 mm, 1656 (Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam).
Figure 124. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederick Bloemaert engraved, “Lesson 2,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 190 mm x 148 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Collection of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 125. Anonymous, *Bohemian Vademecum*, silverpoint on parchment, fifteenth century (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna).
Figure 126. Hans Sebald Beham, *Caritas (Liefde)*, engraving, 39 mm x 25 mm, 1539 (Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam).
Figure 127. Jacob Matham, *Caritas (Liefde)*, engraving, 217 mm x 144 mm, 1585-1589 (Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam).
Figure 128. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederick Bloemaert engraved, “Caritas,” *Artis Apellae liber*, woodcut, 190 mm x 152 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Collection of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 129. Abraham Bloemaert “A Crippled Beggar,” pen and brown ink, 122 mm x 80 mm, n.d. (British Museum Collection of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 130. Otto van Veen and Gijsbert van Veen, “Occulus non vidit,” *Amoris divini emblemata*, engraving, 130 mm x 110 mm, 1615 (Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam).
Figure 131. Otto van Veen and Gijsbert van Veen, “Amor Divinus and Anima,” *Amoris divini emblemata*, engraving, 130 mm x 110 mm, 1615 (Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam).
Figure 132. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Ludolph Büsinck engraved, *St. Joseph*, chiaroscuro woodcut, 72 mm x 60 mm, 1612-20 (Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam).
Figure 133. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Ludolph Büsinck engraved, *St. Joseph*, chiaroscuro woodcut, 72 x 60 mm, 1612-20 (Rijksprentenkabinet, Amsterdam).
Figure 134. Abraham Bloemaert, *An Old Woman*, oil on panel, 345 mm x 260 mm, 1632 (Graf Harrach’sche Familiensammlung, Rohrau).

Figure 135. Abraham Bloemaert, *An Old Woman*, oil on panel, 375 mm x 280 mm, 1630-35 (Unknown Location).
Figure 136. Abraham Bloemaert, *An Old Woman*, oil on panel, 370 mm x 270 mm, 1634 (Private Collection, Munich).

Figure 137. Abraham Bloemaert, *An Old Woman*, oil on panel, 370 mm x 280 mm, 1635/37 (Unknown Location).
Figure 138. Abraham Bloemaert, *An Old Woman*, oil on panel, 370 mm x 270 mm, 1636 (Stockholm, Nationalmuseum).

Figure 139. Abraham Bloemaert, *An Old Woman*, oil on panel, 375 mm x 280 mm, 1641 (Private Collection).
Fig. 140. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederick Bloemaert engraved, “Lesson 106,” *Artis Apellae liber*, woodcut, 217 mm x 171 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Collection of Prints and Drawings, London).
Fig. 141. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederick Bloemaert engraved, “Lesson 91,” *Artis Apellae liber*, woodcut, 190 mm x 153 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Collection of Prints and Drawings, London).
Figure 142. “Title Page,” Oorspronkelyk en vermaark konstryk Tekenboek van Abraham Bloemaert, engraving, 1740 (Bibliotheek van de Universiteit van Amsterdam).
Figure 143. “Detail of Title Page,” Oorspronkelyk en vermaark konstryk Tekenboek van Abraham Bloemaert, engraving, 1740 (Bibliotheek van de Universiteit van Amsterdam).
Figure 144. Abraham Bloemaert designed, Frederick Bloemaert engraved, *Arts Apellae liber*, “Lesson 2,” engraving, 190 mm x 148 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
Appendix:

*Artis Apellae liber*, 1650-1650
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “A Young Draftsman,” *Artis Apellae liber*, woodcut and metal engraving, 190 mm x 148 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 2,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 190 mm x 148 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 3,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 190 mm x 148 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 213 mm x 173 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 6,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 220 mm x 173 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 7,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 215 mm x 173 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 8,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 215 mm x 173 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 9,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 213 mm x 173 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 10,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 213 mm x 173 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 11,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 213 mm x 173 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 12,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 213 mm x 173 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 13,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 213 mm x 173 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 14,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 220 mm x 175 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 15,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 220 mm x 175 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 16,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 220 mm x 175 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 17,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 180 mm x 148 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 18,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 185 mm x 150 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 19,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 185 mm x 153mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 20,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 185 mm x 153 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 21,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 213 mm x 172 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 22,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 210 mm x 170 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 23,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 210 mm x 170 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 24,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 210 mm x 170 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 26,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 212 mm x 173 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 27,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 212 mm x 173 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 28,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 212 mm x 173 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 29,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 185 mm x 148 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 30,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 213 mm x 174 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 31,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 213 mm x 174 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 33,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 215 mm x 175 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 34,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 182 mm x 152 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 35,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 214 mm x 174 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 36,” Artis Apellae liber, engraving, 214 mm x 174 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 37,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 187 mm x 151 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 38,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 214 mm x 173 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 40,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 190 mm x 152 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 41,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 215 mm x 173 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 42,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 183 mm x 152 mm (British Museum, Collection of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 43,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 215 mm x 173 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 44,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 217 mm x 176 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 45,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 214 mm x 171 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 49,” Artis Apellae liber, engraving, 215 mm x 172 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 50,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 215 mm x 172 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 51,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 185 mm x 142 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London). *Artis Apellae liber,*
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 52,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 186 mm x 150 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 53.” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 215 mm x 172 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 54,” Artis Apellae liber, engraving, 215 mm x 174 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 56,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 182 mm x 151 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 57,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 182 mm x 150 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 58,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 185 mm x 141 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 60,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 213 mm x 173 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 62,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 188 mm x 151 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 63,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 187 mm x 151 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 64,” *Artis Apellae liber* engraving, 214 mm x 173 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 65,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 152 mm x 189 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 66,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 216 mm x 173 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 67,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 213 mm x 172 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 69,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 212 mm x 171 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 70,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 146 mm x 189 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 71,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 151 mm x 190 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 72,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 215 mm x 172 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 73,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 215 mm x 172 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 74,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 189 mm x 149 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 75,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 214 mm x 174 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 76,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 211 mm x 172 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 77,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 187 mm x 151 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 78,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 135 mm x 178 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 79,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 173 mm x 217 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 80,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 213 mm x 172 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 81,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 217 mm x 175 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 82,” Artis Apellae liber, engraving, 183 mm x 150 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 83,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 190 mm x 150 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 84,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 215 mm x 173 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 85,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 215 mm x 175 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 86,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 190 mm x 151 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 87,” Artis Apellae liber, engraving, 215 mm x 174 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 88,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 188 mm x 152 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 89,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 213 mm x 174 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 90,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 191 mm x 150 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 91,” Artis Apellae liber, engraving, 190 mm x 153 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 92,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 193 mm x 154 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 93,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 214 mm x 172 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 94,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 192 mm x 154 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 95,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 191 mm x 154 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 96,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 190 mm x 150 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 97,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 175 mm x 213 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 98,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 190 mm x 152 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 99,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 182 mm x 151 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 100,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 215 mm x 172 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 101,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 214 mm x 173 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 102,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 215 mm x 173 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 103,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 190 mm x 151 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 104,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 218 mm x 173 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 105,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 212 mm x 171 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 106,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 217 mm x 171 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 107,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 212 mm x 174 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 108,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 213 mm x 173 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 110,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 210 mm x 172 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 111,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 217 mm x 171 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 112,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 212 mm x 172 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 113,” Artis Apellae liber, engraving, 215 mm x 171 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 114,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 151 mm x 187 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 115,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 216 mm x 172 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 116,” Artis Apellae liber, engraving, 215 mm x 171 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 117,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 213 mm x 173 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 118,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 213 mm x 172 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 119,” Artis Apellae liber, engraving, 217 mm x 169 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).
After Abraham Bloemaert by Frederik Bloemaert, “Lesson 120,” *Artis Apellae liber*, engraving, 223 mm x 173 mm, 1650-56 (British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, London).