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INTRODUCTION

The early years of the seventeenth century saw a dramatic change in landscape painting in the Netherlands. The genre of independent landscape, which had developed only a century before, was transformed from a fantastic creation that celebrated the artist's imagination into a vivid evocation of the Dutch countryside.

Jan van Goyen's Dune Landscape with Figures from around 1632 (Fig. 1) embodies the new type of landscape, and will represent the new style throughout my discussion in this Introduction. In this painting Van Goyen used a low horizon, placing his viewer on a level with the scene. He created an impression that the viewer is standing on the scrubby foreground where the gray expanse of sky, and even the modest dune, seems to loom above. He limited his colors to warm brown, yellow, and grayish green, with only the slightest variations in color and saturation to suggest a continuous recession to the windmill and church spire in the distance. He introduced no biblical or allegorical narrative. Instead his figures are a formal element of the unidealized landscape, a vertical counterpoint to the flat horizon. When Van Goyen painted his Dune Landscape he was a leader in this new artistic development in the Northern Netherlands. His were among the earliest paintings to champion the indigenous landscape as an appropriate subject.

But such naturalism was completely unknown in the Southern Netherlands, where a long-established Mannerist landscape tradition was still dominant. The Entry of the Animals into Noah's Ark (Fig. 2), painted by Jan Brueghel I in Antwerp in 1613, is
characteristic of this elegant, stylized landscape tradition. In this Introduction
Brueghel’s painting will serve as a counterpoint to Van Goyen’s Dune Landscape,
representing this older tradition. A comparison of Van Goyen’s and Brueghel’s
paintings highlights the astonishing change in style embodied in the new naturalistic
landscape. Brueghel peopled his richly colored landscape with an array of figures and
exotic animals gathered in the service of the narrative. Contemporaries would have
considered this a landscape painting, and indeed Brueghel chose this subject because it
called for an outdoor setting. But he constructed his landscape to accommodate the
narrative. By using a high horizon Brueghel spread out the landscape below the viewer,
and he organized the expanse of space with a conventionalized color scheme, painting
the foreground brown, the middle ground green, and suggesting atmospheric
perspective by painting the furthest distance in blue. The lush landscape itself does not
record a real place, but is an imagined paradise.

Until recently writers interpreted naturalistic paintings like Van Goyen’s as the
inevitable expression of a heartfelt appreciation for the Dutch countryside. J. Q. van
Regteren Altena wrote of Van Goyen,

I imagine of the lyrical Van Goyen much enraptured silence or, better still, a
mild Dutch oath, when facing the endlessness of the limpid waters became too
much for him... Are his prospects anything else but spontaneous joy at the
grandeur of the Dutch strand, of all the light that is shed over land and sea?1

1. De Nederlandse geest in de schilderkunst, (Zeist, 1941). Cited in translation
by E. de Jongh, "Real Dutch Art and Not-So-Real Dutch Art: Some Nationalistic
To twentieth-century viewers, who take the nineteenth-century tradition of plein-air painting for granted, it may seem more natural for Van Goyen to have depicted the landscape of his immediate surroundings than to have invented an unknown countryside. To paint in this new landscape style, however, was not the "path of least resistance" for artists trained in the Southern Netherlands tradition, but a radically new way of approaching landscape representation. The apparent spontaneity of such works is itself a self-conscious artistic convention reflecting choices and modifications of elements from the older tradition.²

It is the thesis of this study that artists achieved such radical changes in style by altering aspects of their painting practice: the materials and the techniques they used to create their paintings. Specifically, a number of landscape painters working in the Northern Netherlands in the 1610s and 1620s radically modified a set of landscape painting techniques that had been strictly followed in the Southern Netherlands for a century. Their own artistic training had been based on these meticulous techniques, which contributed to the recognizable Mannerist style of paintings like Brueghel's Noah's Ark. By consolidating this painting tradition into a few, rapidly executed steps, artists like Van Goyen created naturalistic works like the Dune Landscape. In doing so, they brought about the most revolutionary development in Netherlandish landscape painting since its development as an independent genre in the work of Joachim Patinir.

100 years earlier. The seventeenth century was a period of fertile artistic development and great diversity. The naturalistic landscapes that form the focus of this study represent one of many different forms of landscape painting to grow out of the sixteenth-century landscape tradition. With the goal of establishing a detailed understanding of the relationship between painting practice and artistic style, the chapters that follow will trace the development of this one path in the development of Netherlandish landscape painting.

Changes in artistic style may be observed and described, but they are difficult to quantify. Art historical research may single out an element new to an artist's work and such research may suggest the possible sources of inspiration—among them other works of art or meetings with other artists. But without documentary evidence of the artist's opinions, it is hard to establish whether the change was deliberate or reflected a half-conscious appropriation. Technical examination of the materials and techniques of paintings offers another avenue for research. In effect, such examinations yield an additional body of documentary evidence that can, on occasion, pinpoint artistic choices. If technical study establishes that an artist varied his painting practice in a specific way—by abandoning one pigment in favor of another, or by altering the way he applied his paint—and if the technical change was reflected in a visual change, this is evidence for a moment of conscious artistic choice.

In this study I have considered changes in painting practice in the context of the dramatic change in style that accompanied the emergence of naturalistic landscape paintings of the early seventeenth century in the Northern Netherlands. This preliminary
study has revealed the self-conscious process by which painters developed a new visual vocabulary to paint these innovative works. The new documentation of this technical study helps to pinpoint moments of deliberate innovation.

**Methodology of the technical study**

The literature on the technique of landscape paintings is not extensive. In his valuable essay in the catalogue of the exhibition Dutch Landscape: The Early Years, Haarlem and Amsterdam 1590-1650, David Bomford discussed the materials and studio practices available to landscape artists at this period and presented the results of a number of examinations, but was not able to consider broader issues of development over time. My own previous publications include studies on the painting practices of the tonal landscape painters Jan van Goyen and Salomon van Ruysdael, and a very brief overview of the findings of the present study. The rest of the literature includes


scarcely more than a dozen studies in all on the materials and techniques of individual landscapes painted in the Southern and Northern Netherlands in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.  

A technical study that seeks to consider broad issues of stylistic development calls for as representative a sample as possible. The present publication can only be considered a preliminary report on an on-going study, but already the results give intriguing evidence that artists in the Northern Netherlands changed their style of landscape painting by consciously altering their working methods.

To date this study has included technical examinations of 64 paintings, which are listed in an appendix. All of these paintings were produced in The Netherlands from the late sixteenth century to the middle of the seventeenth century. All are easel paintings painted in oil on canvas or panel. Virtually all of the paintings were examined and photographed in conservation studios using a stereomicroscope for highly magnified study of the surface. Equipment for infrared reflectography, an important technique for studying underdrawings and artists’ changes, was available in roughly half the examinations. X-radiographs, when available, were invaluable for studying compositional changes and the brushwork of hidden paint layers. Microscopic paint

6. These publications are cited in the relevant chapters of this study.

7. Also see Appendix 1 for further details on the examination methodology.

8. The paintings are visually typical of oil paint. Except for occasional biological staining of paint cross sections (which confirmed this observation), medium analysis was not used in this study. Some artists painted in watercolor on canvas or painted miniatures on vellum, but because of the differences in technique this study did not include such works.
samples were available for analysis from most paintings in the study. Some paintings had been sampled during earlier conservation treatments, and I was able to sample most of the other paintings examined during the study. Both paint cross sections, which include all the layers of a painting, and dispersed pigment samples, which isolate a specific paint layer, were taken.\(^9\)

However, no matter how small the sample size, it is sometimes impossible to sample a painting—or some areas of a painting—safely and unobtrusively. It is neither practical nor ethical to require uniform sampling of every painting in a study. For this reason, the information available from paint samples varies from one painting to another, and must be interpreted in context. This information is analogous to the results of archival research, where the irregular survival of historical records also leaves lacunae. The results of both paint analysis and archival research are invaluable, but neither can be statistically valid, both require qualified inferences to bridge the gaps.

For most paintings in the present study paint, analysis permitted accurate identification of the ground structure, which has important implications for the artist’s preferences for the painting’s surface texture and overall tonality. The conclusive identification of pigments in the paint layers, however, was necessarily limited to the available samples, and so this information was more irregular. For this reason it has not always been possible to trace developments in the pigment mixtures used for specific features (for example, in foliage highlights) since there are only a few samples of any one such

\(^9\) See the Appendix I for details on the analytical methods used.
feature. Even more rarely are there enough samples to determine a painting’s complete palette.

Fortunately, examination with the stereomicroscope complements the analysis of paint samples. It is often possible to determine the order in which the artist painted the various areas of a painting, based on minute overlaps of paint. And even without taking samples for conclusive analysis, examination of the paint surface magnified fifty times often permits an educated estimate of the pigments used. Because of the necessary limitations on sampling, the primary focus of the present study is on the handling of paint: the brushwork and the sequence in which the layers of the painting (and the various parts of the composition) were painted. A secondary focus of this study is on the specific materials used. Though at present this assessment is limited by the samples available, more detailed conclusions may be possible as the study continues.

**Historical overview and the technical context for studying landscape style**

Through the sixteenth century the production of independent landscapes, paintings in which the landscape was the primary visual focus, was centered in the Southern Netherlands. Joachim Patinir developed landscape as an independent genre in Antwerp in the 1510s and 1520s. In his so-called “world landscapes” Patinir employed a high horizon and elevated viewpoint to depict vast, detailed panoramas.¹⁰ These

---

landscapes, created from a multitude of assembled details, were peopled with (usually) small-scaled figures in religious narratives. Many artists of the next two generations took up the speciality, and Netherlanders soon became known throughout Europe as landscape specialists. In the productive studios of the next generation, painters like Herri Bles codified the traits of Patinir’s landscapes into a set of conventions for landscape representation that artists continued to rely on into the seventeenth century.

Landscape painting in Antwerp during the rest of the century developed along two lines. At mid-century Pieter Bruegel’s landscapes, best known through his prints, brought a new grandeur and naturalistic detail to the world landscape tradition. By the end of the century both panoramic landscapes and more intimate scenes of forests and countryside were current in the Mannerist landscapes of Antwerp, particularly in the work of Pieter Bruegel’s son, Jan Brueghel I. But both types of landscapes continued to share in the basic conventions formalized in the early sixteenth century. Like Noah’s Ark they were invented landscapes, virtually always peopled with a narrative. The space was developed with a high horizon and a stylized atmospheric perspective based on three zones of color: brown foreground, green middle ground, and blue distance.

In the last two decades of the sixteenth century, an uprising against Spanish rule erupted into a war that eventually established a political division between the Southern Netherlands and the Northern Netherlands. Waves of emigration from the Southern Netherlands included landscape specialists who brought this established landscape tradition with them to the Northern Netherlands. In the North the tradition took root and flourished in the work of émigrés such as Gillis van Coninxloo and Roelandt
Savery, who made a speciality of dense forest landscapes. Though these forest landscapes were popular and influential, they do not represent a revolutionary break with the Southern Netherlandish tradition.

However, in the 1610s in Haarlem other Northern Netherlandish artists diverged into a fundamentally new way of approaching landscape. Narrative content almost entirely disappeared from these works. Instead artists focused on a convincing, and apparently spontaneous, evocation of the local countryside. The first explorations were made in drawings and prints, but soon Esaias van de Velde employed many of the new developments in a small number of experimental paintings. By the late 1620s and early 1630s, artists like Jan van Goyen developed the naturalistic approach into the "tonal phase" of landscape. In muted, monochrome paintings like Van Goyen’s Dune Landscape they created a newly unified vision. In apparently off-hand glimpses of local scenes a continuous recession toward a low horizon and extraordinarily restricted colors banished the last traces of the conventions of the Southern Netherlandish landscape tradition.

The changes in landscape painting style raise important questions on the motivations and the self-awareness of the artists. To what extent did artists like Coninxloo and Savery, or Van de Velde and Van Goyen consider their paintings variants of the existing landscape tradition and to what extent did they see themselves as turning down a new path? The study of painting technique offers insights into these issues. In this study I have focused on specific formal aspects of landscape paintings that clearly changed in the transition from the Mannerist landscape style practiced in
Antwerp through the early seventeenth century to the naturalistic landscapes painted shortly after in the Northern Netherlands.

Each of these changes can be expressed as a question that technical study can help answer. The changes took place over time, and there is of course diversity within the work of any one painter and even greater variation among works by different artists. These issues will be discussed in detail in the following chapters. However, in order to frame the questions that will recur throughout this study in the most general terms possible, the stylistic changes discussed in the next few paragraphs will be reduced to a simplistic direct comparison. “Mannerist landscapes” (represented here by Jan Brueghel’s Noah’s Ark) refer to paintings in the South Netherlandish landscape tradition as it was practiced in Antwerp at the end of the sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth centuries, and “naturalistic landscapes” (represented here by Jan van Goyen’s Dune Landscape with Figures) refer to the paintings produced by Esaias van de Velde in the 1610s and 1620s and especially to the early tonal landscapes produced by Van Goyen and his contemporaries in the 1620s and 1630s.

Probably the most distinctive aspect of the change in landscape style is the change in color from the bright, clear tones of the imaginary landscapes in the Southern Netherlandish Mannerist tradition to the narrow range of browns, tans, and grayish greens that the Northern Netherlandish painters of naturalistic landscape used to suggest the Dutch countryside. Even the skies form a striking contrast. Most Mannerist landscapes are set under brilliant blue skies, varied by the pale yellows and shell pinks of sunset clouds, while the gray skies of the naturalistic landscapes convincingly
suggest the uncertain climate and moist atmosphere of The Netherlands. A logical question is whether the difference in tonality resulted from only minor changes in procedure: in this case artists might continue to use the same pigment mixtures, but slightly vary the proportions. Another possibility is that the limited tonalities resulted from unintentional changes such as fading or degradation of inexpensive pigments. But a third possibility is that painters achieved these color differences through conscious artistic choices: by replacing brightly colored pigments with more muted equivalents or by entirely abandoning pigments in certain color ranges. Technical study suggests that the change in color was, in fact, not unconscious or accidental.

The range of pigments available to artists remained consistent in The Netherlands throughout this period. As well as the ubiquitous white lead, chalk, carbon blacks, and brown earth colors, they could choose from several pigments in each color range. Blues included the minerals azurite (and its synthetic equivalent blue verditer) and costly ultramarine, which was made from the semi-precious stone lapis lazuli. Less expensive alternatives were smalt, made from ground blue glass, and the blue dye, indigo. Red pigments included the brilliant scarlet vermillion, and the crimson red of various red lakes (dyes precipitated onto a colorless material to form a transparent pigment), as well as the duller tones of red earths (ochers). Yellows

included the lemon-toned lead-tin yellow, the more orange-toned orpiment, and lakes made from yellow dye as well as yellow earths. Green pigments included the minerals green earth and malachite (and its equivalent, green verditer), as well as the synthetic products verdigris and transparent copper greens, but artists considered all of these greens problematic. In 1678 (with the same range of green pigments available to him) Samuel van Hoogstraeten reported that verdigris was too harsh and it discolored, green earth was too pale, and that what he called “ashes” was fugitive.12 Instead painters more often mixed blues and yellows to create greens. A few of these pigments, such as indigo and orpiment, were rarely found in any landscape, but most were found in at least some paintings during the course of the study. As far as the samples available permitted direct comparisons between paintings, there is evidence that the later, naturalistic painters did limit their palettes. In the skies, where pigment evidence was available for most of the paintings examined, there is clear evidence that painters achieved the change in style by changing the pigments they used.

Another question raised by the striking difference of style is the importance of figures to the compositions in these two groups of paintings. Mannerist landscapes virtually always incorporated a narrative that called for an open-air setting; however small, the figures were integral to the paintings’ subjects. Figures in naturalistic landscapes seem almost incidental; their role was to further the impression created by

the landscape. In the simplest terms, one can ask whether or not the figures themselves are physically integral to the composition. Through technical study it became clear which painters saw the figures as part of the landscape composition from the start, and which added figures only after they had fully developed the landscape. Often infrared reflectography showed whether the painter prepared his composition with an underdrawing, and whether the figures appeared in this initial conception. With x-radiography and close examination with a stereomicroscope it was clear which artists added the figures over a completed landscape, which painted the figures along with the landscape, and which held open spaces in the paint of the landscape ("reserves") into which they later incorporated the figures.

Yet another difference between Mannerist and naturalistic landscapes is the structure of the landscape space itself. This structure is related to the difference in coloring but it is not exactly the same issue. Mannerist landscape painters defined the space with three distinct zones: a brown foreground, a green foliage middle ground, and a blue (usually mountainous) distance. Even in black and white reproductions, without benefit of color distinctions, these zones are usually clearly differentiated. Formal qualities such as alternating lighted and shadowed areas, and compositional designs that place the different zones at different elevations, contribute to the differentiation. Naturalistic landscape paintings are certainly more limited in color, which tends to diminish the appearance of a division into zones, but nonetheless the spatial recession seems smoother and more continuous than in Mannerist landscapes. Technical study has proved rewarding in this instance as well. After examination with
the stereo microscope, it is clear that for some artists the structural division into zones was integral to their conception of the landscape; they painted each zone in turn, in effect treating each as a separate project. Other artists worked continuously over the surface of their paintings. Not surprisingly, these painters’ compositions are among the most seamlessly constructed.

Finally, an important difference between Mannerist and naturalistic landscapes is an increased freedom in the handling of paint. While many Mannerist landscapes were painted with an elegant, controlled touch, many naturalistic landscape paintings give an extraordinary impression of spontaneity. Montias has suggested that such paintings were, in fact, painted within a shorter period of time. Though the change in handling might have been motivated by artistic concerns, he suggests that there was an economic advantage; the effect was a rise in artists’ productivity, and a reduction in their “per-unit” costs. It is, in fact, possible through technical study to estimate how long it took to produce a painting. Just as fresco painters’ giornate, the areas of wet plaster that they worked on in one day, can be distinguished, it was usually clear with high magnification whether paint overlapped an earlier day’s work that was already dry, or whether two layers or two adjacent areas were painted on the same day, blending the wet paints. This study did confirm that the naturalistic painters’ freedom of handling genuinely speeded the production of their paintings. It also revealed that the apparent

spontaneity of the naturalistic landscape painters' work seems to be artistically motivated rather than done for economic reasons.

This technical study offers insight into the beginnings of a landscape painting tradition native to the Northern Netherlands. There is striking evidence that landscape artists deliberately turned aside from a long-established tradition of landscape painting techniques to develop a new set of painting practices that were better suited to naturalistic representations of the indigenous landscape. The preliminary results of this study suggest that the moment of decisive innovation can be found in the landscape paintings of Esaias van de Velde.
Antwerp in the sixteenth century: the development of the landscape painting genre

By the middle of the sixteenth century a well-established tradition of independent landscape depiction had arisen in Antwerp, largely springing from the work of Joachim Patinir. In the brief span between 1515, when he registered in the Antwerp artists' guild, and his death in 1524, Patinir developed the enormously influential style of all-encompassing, panoramic landscape paintings known as the "world landscape" (Weltlandschaft). Patinir placed his primary focus on the landscape. Rather than serving as a background to the narrative, the vast expanses of his landscapes typically dwarf the human figures. Patinir's new form of painting has survived to us today in perhaps twenty autograph works and a much larger production of studio variations. Independent landscapes also appeared in the early years of the sixteenth century in the Danube region, especially in the prints of Albrecht Altdorfer and Wolf Huber, and in Venice, in the paintings of Giorgione and his followers. But the

---

Antwerp world landscape tradition founded by Patinir was the most influential form of the genre.\(^\text{15}\)

The linguistic development of the word “landscape” parallels the development of this new genre of painting. The evolution of the word’s modern use offers compelling evidence that by the middle of the sixteenth century the works of art that today modern viewers call landscapes were already seen by contemporaries as an independent genre.\(^\text{16}\) Originally, landscape did not have an art-related meaning, but indicated a province or an area of land. By the end of the fifteenth century landscape (also landschap, paysage, landschaft) had a new meaning: an artistic depiction of natural scenery, rather than the land itself.\(^\text{17}\) At first the word was used for landscape backgrounds only. Early evidence appears in a contract for an altarpiece written around 1490 in Haarlem (Gibson’s earliest citation of the modern use of the word).\(^\text{18}\) Before this time contracts specifying an outdoor setting itemized all the natural features to

---


16. In his book on the world landscape Gibson surveyed the evolution of the term: Gibson, “Mirror of the Earth”, 53, 116 n. 68. Except as noted, the following discussion draws on Gibson’s survey.

17. In a similar way the Dutch words, grond (ground) and landouw (field), were sometimes used in the seventeenth century to describe landscape paintings rather than the actual land. See Lydia de Pauw-de Veen, De begrippen "schilder", "schilderij", en "schilderen" in de zeventiende eeuw. Koninklijk vlaamse academie voor wetenschappen, letteren en schone kunsten van België: Klasse de schone kunsten, XXXI, 22 (Brussels: Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België, 1969): 160.

appear in the background. In the 1490 contract the single word, landscape, now conveyed the same meaning. The depiction of scenery gradually became the dominant meaning of landscape. Sixteenth-century inventory references trace a growing consensus that, after Patinir's innovative style, landscape depictions were no longer limited to the backgrounds of altarpieces. The word landscape increasingly was used alone in inventories, without reference to a narrative subject. Though these works always included figures, contemporaries began to consider them landscapes, rather than history paintings set outdoors.

As these references in contracts and inventories suggest, Patinir's innovation—to make landscape the primary focus of the painting—grew out of a long Netherlandish tradition of paintings with landscape backgrounds. From the beginning of the fifteenth century such backgrounds had been an important feature of Netherlandish painting. In the calendar pages of illuminated manuscripts, the best-known being the Très riches heures du Duc de Berry by the Limbourg brothers (painted before 1416), landscape backgrounds as well as the activities of figures conveyed the time of year. In altarpieces painted in the second quarter of the fifteenth century, Jan van Eyck and his contemporaries carried closely observed detail into vistas seen over a balcony or glimpsed through a window. By the beginning of the sixteenth century it seems likely that the busy Antwerp workshops of artists such as Quentin Massys and Joos van Cleve included artists who specialized in the landscape components of the shop's production.19 In all these works, however, the landscape was a background to the

figures, the primary visual focus of the painting. Patinir's innovation was to reverse this balance. In most of his paintings the primary focus was the landscape, in which small figures carried out the narrative.

In Patinir's works, such as the St. Jerome at the Prado (Fig. 3), foreground figures embody the theme of the painting, but the landscape is the visual focus of the painting. It also carries much of the painting's meaning. Patinir chose subjects such as the hermit Jerome in meditation, the Baptism of Christ, or the Rest on the Flight because they called for a natural setting, and he organized the composition so that the setting itself predominated. An extremely high horizon achieved a "bird's eye view" in which a vast panorama spread out below the viewer almost filled the frame. Though he convincingly rendered the multitude of individual details, he organized them selectively into a strikingly stylized whole. Within the varied topography he juxtaposed craggy rock masses under threatening clouds and a fertile, sunlit plain leading to a distant harbor. In earlier landscape backgrounds artists often indicated atmospheric perspective by painting a glimpse of pale blue mountains in the distance beyond green trees and fields; they placed their figures in a foreground that was lush and green or brown and rock, depending on the narrative. In his independent landscapes, Patinir codified a convention that organized the space into three distinct zones of color with a brown foreground, green middle ground, and blue distance.

In a painting by Patinir the landscape itself is charged with meaning, with the figures serving as a key to the subject or theme. Falkenburg has suggested that paintings such as the Prado St. Jerome served to focus religious meditation. The
landscape offered the viewer a choice between the two paths of life: the arduous track up the mountain behind Jerome representing the contemplative life, or the smooth path through low-lying fields representing a worldly existence.\textsuperscript{20} Gibson also sees the landscape as rich with associations: the rocky eruption of mountains in the distance conveying the arduous life of a hermit and perhaps specifically evoking the traditional Byzantine representation of Mount Sinai, the lovingly detailed depiction of the vast panorama suggesting the world from which Jerome has turned away.\textsuperscript{21} However one defines the specifics of Patinir’s meaning, it is clear that his landscapes were neither naturalistic nor purely decorative.

The generation after Patinir saw more artists embrace landscape as their speciality. A sharp rise in landscape production in the middle of the sixteenth century was generated by artists such as Lucas Gassel, Cornelis Massys, and most especially by Herri Bles, known almost universally in the literature as “the industrious Herri Bles”.\textsuperscript{22} They simplified Patinir’s style by painting in a broader manner, with less emphasis on the accumulation of detail. These painters developed a more unified structure, often using trees rather than exotic rocky masses to define their spaces.\textsuperscript{23} Aside from purely

\textsuperscript{20} Falkenburg, Joachim Patinir.

\textsuperscript{21} Gibson, “\textit{Mirror of the Earth}”, 10-13.

\textsuperscript{22} For artists of this generation see Gibson, “\textit{Mirror of the Earth}”, 17-36, Franz, 78-98, 108-114, both with references to earlier literature. I will follow Gibson who cites André Piron (Joachim Le Patinier, Henri Bles, Gembloux, 1971) in using the name Herri Bles, the form used by Lampsonius, rather than Herri met de Bles, the form used by Carel van Mander: idem, 26.

\textsuperscript{23} Gibson, “\textit{Mirror of the Earth}”, 17.
aesthetic motives, this gradual development may partly be related to the rate of production in their busy workshops.

The output of this second generation of landscape painters is testament to an efficient workshop structure. A master might not only paint landscapes himself, but also might assign assistants to paint sections of some works and to paint copies or variants of the most popular compositions.24 Such prolific production was facilitated by efficiently organized workshops using consistent painting techniques. In the Bles workshop variations of detail in the crowded landscapes were created not with entirely new elements but by selecting and recombining motifs from a stock set of about twenty details.25 Gibson illustrates this process with the Parable of the Good Samaritan at Namur (Fig. 4), probably produced by the workshop. The water mill, the section of caves and a suspended bridge, the farm building, and the blind man led by a child all recur in varying combinations in numerous other paintings, often in the same position within the composition. The shop almost certainly had records of motifs in the form of drawings such as those in the Berlin and “Errera” sketchbooks, which seem to date from the 1530s and 1540s.26 As Gibson suggests motifs may also have been organized


25. Gibson, Mirror of the Earth, 31-32.

in a master composition that established their relative positions from which the master selected a few elements for any one painting. Such a workshop procedure allowed Bies to produce variations and replicas to meet the demands of a voracious art market. By contrast, in the early stages of his career, before there was such demand for his work, Bies apparently worked alone. It is striking that the cluster of works from Bies’ earliest career (those that are most dependent on Patinir’s model) includes only unique compositions; there are no workshop replicas.27

As more Antwerp artists took up the new genre, the city became known for its landscapes, which were widely exported. Artists from the Netherlands were seen throughout Europe as the specialists of this new genre, a specialization that was already reflected in comments made early in the sixteenth century. In Germany, Dürer evaluated Patinir as “der gut landschaft mahler.”28 In Italy, Michelangelo acknowledged the Flemish ability to render “what they call landscapes”, though he simultaneously disparaged the speciality.29 Apparently the speed with which landscape

---


27. Gibson, “Mirror of the Earth” 27.


was recognized as a new artistic speciality varied from one region to another, almost certainly reflecting the degree to which the paintings themselves were appreciated. In the England of 1606, Henry Peacham still felt the need to define landscape for his audience: “Landtskip is a Dutch word & it is as much as wee shoulde say in English landship, or expressing of the land by hills, woodes, Castles, seas, valleys, ruines, hanging rocks, Citties, Townes, &c. as farre as may bee shewed within our Horizon.”

**Technical studies of sixteenth-century Antwerp landscapes**

There has not been extensive research on the techniques of the landscape painters of the sixteenth century, but some recent work offers remarkable evidence for the consistency of technique within the Southern Netherlandish landscape tradition. An exhibition and conference organized at the Art Museum of Princeton University in 1995 inspired technical studies of four landscapes from the second quarter of the sixteenth century. Three are by Herri Bles: The Road to Calvary, a Landscape with Saint John the Baptist Preaching, and The Sacrifice of Isaac, the painting used in this discussion to illustrate some of the techniques observed (Fig. 5). Another, an

---


unfinished painting representing The Arrival at Bethlehem, is attributed to an artist close to Lucas Gassel. A detailed discussion of the technical studies of these four paintings is important in order to define the tradition of landscape painting technique that artists like Bles established. In many aspects the painting technique described in these studies is strikingly close to that of Antwerp landscapes of almost a century later. The parallels between sixteenth-century landscapes and the early seventeenth-century Antwerp landscapes examined in the course of this study, which will be discussed below, show that the technical aspects of the Southern Netherlandish landscape painting tradition were as long-lived as the formal aspects.

The technique of these sixteenth-century paintings grew out of the Early Netherlandish traditions of the fifteenth century, but these painters modified these traditions in significant ways. Many of these modifications must relate to a greatly

---


33. For overviews of fifteenth-century Netherlandish technique see, among others, P. Coremans, et al L'Agneau Mystique au laboratoire, examen et traitement Les Primitifs Flamands, III, Contributions à l'étude des Primitifs Flamands 2 (Antwerp and The Hague, 1953); Lorne Campbell, Susan Foister, Ashok Roy, "The Methods and
isolating layer presumably fixed the underdrawing and sealed the absorbent ground.\textsuperscript{37}

When the underdrawing was executed on top of the isolating layer, as in the Bles paintings, that layer became a true upper ground, a preparatory layer applied before any aspect of the artist’s design. The earliest paintings analyzed in which the underdrawing lies on top of the upper ground are works by Jan van Scorel from around 1520.\textsuperscript{35}

Painters of the fifteenth century executed meticulous underdrawings on the chalk/glue ground in a water-based medium with a brush. Later in the century, when a white lead upper ground became typical, this underdrawing medium was no longer practical. Since a water-based ink would not have adhered easily to the oil-based upper ground, a sketchy black chalk underdrawing became the norm.\textsuperscript{39} Moreover, the brush-marked surface of the oil-based upper ground lent itself to rapid notations in chalk,\textsuperscript{40} rather than minutely detailed underdrawings that the surface would have interrupted.

Both these features, the acceptance of an irregularly textured painting surface and a

\textsuperscript{37} Filedt Kok, "Lucas van Leyden", Carel van Mander, Het Schilder-Boeck, waer in voor eerst de leerlustighe iueght den grondt der edel vry schilderconst in verscheeyden deelen wort voorgedraghen. Daer nae in dry deelen t'leuen der vermaerde doorluchtighe schilders des oude, en nieuwen tyds. Eyntlyck d'wtlegghinghe op den Metamorphoseon pub. Ouidij Nasonis oock daer lem (Haeriem [Haarlem]: van Wesbvsch, 1604): fol. 47v; Miedema, Den grondt, 256-258.

\textsuperscript{38} Faries and Bonadies, “Analysis of the Cincinnati Sacrifice.”

\textsuperscript{39} Van Asperen de Boer, Faries and Filedt Kok, “Painting Technique and Workshop Practice,” 108.

\textsuperscript{40} Van Asperen de Boer, Faries and Filedt Kok, “Painting Technique and Workshop Practice,” 108.
reliance on a comparatively summary underdrawing, reflect a progressive loosening and simplification of painting technique in the course of the fifteenth century.41

Bies prepared the landscapes of his paintings with a loose and suggestive underdrawing. The degree of detail in the landscape varies to some extent, but Bies underdrew the figures in full. (Fig. 6)42 Only one major figure was not underdrawn, a man looking into the water at the lower right of the Cleveland Saint John Preaching. The significance of this detail has not been explained, but the unique absence of underdrawing seems to make it clear that this represents a revision late in the creation of the painting.43 The unfinished Arrival at Bethlehem shows a slightly different approach: the figures of the narrative were all underdrawn, while those that play out genre details (in the one finished area) were not, and were painted over the completed landscape.44 In each case, the approach to the figures makes it clear that they, and the narrative they acted out, were seen as integral to the paintings' compositions.

41. Périer-D'leteren, Colijn de Coter.

42. Muller, "Analysis of the Princeton Calvary;" Chong, "Analysis and Iconography of the Cleveland Baptist;" Faries and Bonadies, "Analysis of the Cincinnati Sacrifice."

43. Chong, "Analysis and Iconography of the Cleveland Baptist."

44. Ainsworth, "An Unfinished Painting." Interestingly, Ainsworth cites two versions of David and Bathsheba (at the Wadsworth Atheneum, Hartford, and the Isabella Stuart Gardner Museum, Boston) with varying approaches to the figures. In the Hartford painting all figures related to the narrative were underdrawn, while onlookers were painted in over a completed setting; in the Boston painting no figures were underdrawn. While the handling of the landscapes is very similar, the figures in the two paintings seem to be by different hands. This raises the question of collaboration by assistants, or specialists, in the figures.
The paint layers are remarkably simple when compared to fifteenth-century technique. In that century colors had been built up in repeated layers, from light base tones through dark glazes. The reflective quality of the ground was exploited in the final color so that light colors, such as flesh tones, received the thinnest application of paint, and the deepest shadows received the thickest build-up. By the sixteenth century, paint layers were typically thinner and the layer structure was simpler.\textsuperscript{45}

Bles painted his landscapes from background to foreground, working in defined areas, rather than ranging over the entire painting. This widely followed practice offers at least two clear benefits. One concerns the rendering of space; if the paint of closer elements overlaps that of the distant areas the recession is far more convincing. The other concerns the artist's choice of colors. Artists such as Patinir and Bles used zones of different colors—the conventionalized brown foreground, green middle ground, and blue distance—to establish atmospheric perspective. As Van de Wetering has pointed out, artists before the nineteenth century worked with small palettes on which they (or their assistants) laid out a restricted range of the specific pigments they would need for that work session.\textsuperscript{46} This limited the area that could be painted before the artist changed

\textsuperscript{45} Van Asperen de Boer, Faries and Filedt Kok, "Painting Technique and Workshop Practice," 108-109.

to a new palette. It also encouraged artists to limit the range of colors they used within any one working area.

With the underdrawing as a guide, Bles first painted the landscape, leaving reserves for the figures. His initial paint layer, which probably covered the entire panel, was an underpaint that only distinguished broad areas of color in the landscape. This technique presages the painting procedures of the early seventeenth-century Mannerist landscape painters that are discussed in the next chapter. In the Cincinnati Sacrifice of Isaac, a transparent brown wash paint lies under most of the foreground. This layer served as a general base tone to that part of the landscape, and at the same time suggested the general topography with loosely brushed strokes. In the middle-ground landscape Bles' underpaint was an unmodulated green layer with reserves for his figures. After painting the underpaint, Bles completed the landscape with another paint layer and final foliage details, but he still reserved openings for the figures. Finally, he returned to paint the figures into the reserves, exploiting the light-colored

47. Muller, “Analysis of the Princeton Calvary”, Faries and Bonadies, “Analysis of the Cincinnati Sacrifice.” The unfinished Arrival at Bethlehem landscape, however, is worked to completion only in the lower left (Ainsworth). Whether this represented standard practice in the Gassel shop would have to be verified by microscopic examination of other, finished, paintings.

48. Most of the Bles studies did not consider the presence or absence of an underpaint layer as a separate stage of the painting process, but his use of this procedure can be inferred from the published examinations. In a discussion of the practice of later Mannerist landscape painters, where I invariably observed this practice, Stephen Bonadies confirmed that Bles followed this procedure in the Cincinnati Sacrifice (telephone conversation with the author, May 3, 1996).

49. Faries and Bonadies, “Analysis of the Cincinnati Sacrifice.”
ground that showed in these openings. A photomicrograph of the head of Isaac shows the light ground shining through the thin paint of the figure, except where the hair slightly overlaps the background at the back of the head (Fig. 7).^{50}

Pigment analysis has been carried out only on the Princeton Road to Calvary from around 1536, and the Cincinnati Sacrifice of Isaac of around 1540,^{51} but even this limited sample presents intriguing evidence about developments in Bles' materials during the course of his career. Though the earlier painting shows a more archaic use of pigments, the pigments used in the slightly later Cincinnati painting are remarkably similar to those of the Mannerist landscapes from the early seventeenth century (discussed in the next chapter). Bles mixed the blue pigment azurite with white lead for the sky of the Princeton painting, while he used smalt in the Cincinnati work for both the sky and the far distance. In the Princeton Calvary he painted the foliage of the middle distance with the green pigments verdigris and copper resinate, while in the foliage of the Cincinnati landscape he relied on azurite (presumably mixed with a yellow pigment). Elsewhere, the palette included earth colors and black, as well as strongly colored pigments, such as lead-tin yellow, red lake and vermilion. The use of azurite for the sky, and verdigris and copper resinate for the foliage, suggests a more old-fashioned range of materials in the Princeton painting. Both artificial copper greens

---

50. Sometimes after completing the figures, Bles returned to make revisions to the landscape; the light green paint that sets off Isaac's dark profile is such a revision.

and copper resinate have been identified in sixteenth-century paintings, but such strongly colored greens were ill suited to representing the varieties of green in foliage, and by the early seventeenth century they were largely abandoned. The replacement of azurite in the sky by smalt is also interesting. The limitation of azurite to the foliage could reflect difficulties in obtaining supplies (Van Mander reported that this became a problem after the Turks conquered Hungary and its mines, in 1526), but a conscious aesthetic decision may also have been a factor. In a feature that can also be seen in early seventeenth-century landscapes, Bles juxtaposed the violet-toned blue of smalt (in the sky and far distance) to the green-blue of azurite and the mixed greens of foliage (in the nearer distance and middle ground), giving an impression of distance through atmospheric perspective. Given the high level of production in his studio it is not surprising that he chose smalt, an inexpensive pigment made from blue glass, rather than the other option for a violet-toned blue, the precious ultramarine, made from lapis lazuli.

The preliminary evidence from the technical study of these sixteenth-century landscapes suggests that these artists had begun to codify painting techniques into a

52. Van Asperen de Boer, Faries and Filed Kok, “Painting Technique and Workshop Practice,” 109.

53. Van Mander, Het Schilder-Boeck, fol. 200v.

54. Johannes Alexander van de Graaf, Het De Mayerne manuscript als bron voor de schildertechniek van de barok (Mijdrecht: Drukkerij Verweij, 1958): 43, cites relative prices of blue pigments listed in Watin, L’art du peintre, doreur, vernisseur, Liège, 1774. At that time in France a pound of smalt cost 1 liv. 4 fols, a pound of azurite cost 9 liv., while ultramarine cost 96 liv. for just one ounce.
recognizable set of practices, giving predictable visual results. Since all workshop members must have been familiar with the procedures, they would have facilitated group production. As the discussion of early seventeenth-century Antwerp landscape technique will show, many of the practices of the Bles workshop were in use almost a century later. This continuity seems to document a remarkably long-lived tradition of landscape painting technique.

**Pieter Bruegel the Elder: paintings and drawings**

In a comparatively short career that lasted from 1551 or 1552, when he entered the Antwerp guild, to his death in 1569, Pieter Bruegel the Elder at once brought the world landscape tradition to its culmination, and opened paths to new developments in this genre. Both his compositions and some aspects of his technique were enormously influential. Some of his works, however, were far more accessible than others: drawings probably circulated more widely than did paintings, while prints had by far the widest dissemination. For this reason, this discussion will focus on the paintings, drawings, and prints in turn.

Bruegel's landscape paintings are rightly seen as masterpieces of the genre, but their direct influence on the development of naturalistic landscape has perhaps been exaggerated. In the monumental series of *The Months* commissioned by Nicolaas Jonghelink (each is over one and a half meters wide) Bruegel built on the long tradition

of manuscript illuminations depicting landscapes with seasonally appropriate rural activities (Fig. 8).\textsuperscript{56} In an economy of technique well suited to a cycle of unusually large paintings intended to be seen at a distance he painted these works thinly, and the resulting restricted tonality appears naturalistic.\textsuperscript{57} Indeed the weather effects he incorporated, and the realistic, local character of the foregrounds and figures reveal Bruegel’s close observation of his world. Nevertheless, in four of the five surviving panels an exotic rocky landscape in Patinir’s tradition still falls away below the high foreground, a reminder that these paintings are the culmination of the world landscape tradition as much as a harbinger of naturalism.\textsuperscript{58}

Toward the end of his life Bruegel’s landscape paintings were still more naturalistic, but their influence on naturalism in landscape was limited by the fact that his paintings were not widely accessible.\textsuperscript{59} Bruegel was something of an exception to a tendency toward increased specialization and mass-production in the Southern Netherlands in the sixteenth century. Aside from his landscapes, which will be discussed here, he produced biblical, allegorical, and genre paintings and hellish fantasies in the fifty-year-old tradition of Hieronymus Bosch. Because wealthy collectors like Jonghelink bought and directly commissioned his paintings he probably

\textsuperscript{56} Gibson’s discussion of The Months (“Mirror of the Earth”, 69-74) includes references to the previous literature.

\textsuperscript{57} Gibson, “Mirror of the Earth”, 72.

\textsuperscript{58} Gibson, “Mirror of the Earth” 64.

\textsuperscript{59} See, for example, The Peasant and the Birdnester of 1568, Grossman, Pieter Bruegel, pls. 140-142.
had greater freedom to explore a variety of genres than contemporaries who painted for the open market. At the same time, the paintings were closed away in these collections. Only the engravings Cock issued after Bruegel's drawings reached more modest markets. These engraved landscapes in the world landscape tradition tended to be more conservative than his paintings. Bruegel's and Cock's selection of the images to be issued as prints colored contemporary perceptions of Bruegel. His peasant genre scenes enjoyed great popularity, and a widely-held view characterized him as a satirist. Domenicus Lampsonius, among others, called him a second Bosch. However Abraham Ortelius, who personally knew Bruegel and so must have known the full range of his works, wrote sensitively of the artist's response to nature and of his landscapes in his Album Amicorum. Bruegel's wider contributions to naturalistic landscape were appreciated more gradually, as later artists came to have access to autograph paintings and drawings. Some of his most important innovations appeared in other artists' work only toward the end of the century.

The limited literature on Bruegel's painting technique offers a fascinating glimpse into the artist's innovative approach, which, nevertheless, seems not to have

60. Gibson, "Mirror of the Earth", 60.


had far-reaching effects on landscapes until the seventeenth century. In a manner similar to Bles and his contemporaries, Bruegel used a chalk/glue lower ground on which he laid a thin (usually white lead) upper ground. He, too, sketched out his composition in a rapid black chalk underdrawing that included the figures. However, Bruegel often applied the paint itself in a single layer, brushed or smeared irregularly over the white ground to suggest texture. In the Census at Bethlehem, he smudged a thin brown paint to suggest the wall of a building, and to convey the snowy landscape he left the ground itself uncovered for the white passages. In a remarkable economy of technique, he worked over these first areas of color with quick, calligraphic details that left most of the first paint layer exposed. In the large series of the Labors of the Months, this procedure was even more simplified, reduced almost to a wash technique over the very perceptible underdrawing.


67. This technique is clearly visible with the naked eye, for example in the Harvesters of 1565 (New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art).
Predecessors like Bles, and succeeding generations of landscape artists, like the Mannerist painters discussed in the next chapter, used a standardized technique in which they first laid out the entire composition with broad zones of mid-tone underpaint. For their final paint, they worked in far more detail, completing only a small section at a time. Bruegel’s extraordinarily rapid technique may have been a personal variant on this procedure, in which he reduced the detailed final painting stage to brief notations, and left the underpaint exposed.\footnote{68}

Limited access to Bruegel’s paintings in private collections must certainly have limited the influence of his technique. A generation later even a connoisseur and artist like Carel van Mander, who published a biography of Bruegel in his Schilder-Boeck of 1604, could speak of few paintings from personal experience. More of his discussion seems to be based on second-hand descriptions of paintings at the imperial court in Prague, and on a familiarity with the prints.\footnote{69} His comment that in his paintings Bruegel “made the ground of his panel or cloth tell, by painting loosely over it,”\footnote{70} while accurate, does not reveal a close familiarity that would have allowed an artist to recreate Bruegel’s personal technique.

\footnote{68} The published studies of Bruegel’s technique do not distinguish between underpaint and final paint. To evaluate the actual painting sequence it would be necessary to examine several of Bruegel’s paintings looking for the features that are considered in this study.


\footnote{70} Van Mander, Het Schilder-Boeck 233 v18-22.
More importantly, Bruegel must not have trained many artists. Since Bruegel’s technique depended on his remarkable gifts, it would not have been easy to teach it to assistants. He did not produce great numbers of paintings for a wide audience as did Patinir and Bles, and few replicas were produced during his lifetime, suggesting that he did not, in fact, run a large workshop.71 His brilliant technique would have been particularly ill-suited for use in specialized landscape workshops, where many hands shared in the production, dividing up the painting process into clearly defined stages. Thus Bruegel did not employ many assistants who could have learned and passed on his methods. Moreover, his sons, Pieter Brueghel II and Jan Brueghel I, both painters, were only small children when he died in 1569; their training took place in other studios.

Jan Brueghel I, whose practices will be discussed in the next chapter, did not mimic his father’s technique, but worked in an extraordinarily refined manner within the standardized Mannerist landscape painting procedures. Though he must have had access to at least some works by his father, who died when he was a year old, his training was certainly more conventional. Van Mander says Pieter Goetkindt was his teacher.72 Another candidate is his maternal grandmother, the artist Marie Verhulst, who raised the Bruegel children after their mother’s death when Jan was ten.73 She is

71. Gibson, “Mirror of the Earth”, 60.
72. Van Mander, Het Schilder-Boeck, fol. 234.
often described as a miniaturist; if this were true it would be very interesting in light of
the delicacy of Jan I’s technique. In any case, Jan’s refined handling was far more
appropriate for his small scale, precious works than his father’s free brushwork.

Pieter II, on the other hand, replicated his father’s paintings many times over. While his repetitions gave certain compositions (mostly peasant scenes rather than
landscapes) an extraordinarily wide currency, he did not transmit his father’s painting
technique. The emphasis in his busy studio was on the design of the image more than
on its execution. A technical study of several of the son’s signed paintings suggests that
their widely varied quality was due to the hands of many assistants, while the
underdrawings (which laid out the compositions) seemed usually to be autograph.
Though this division of labor may surprise modern viewers who think of the painted
surface as the definitive statement of artistic expression, this practice was efficient for
workshop collaboration. The dominant figure in the workshop designed the
composition in an underdrawing (or a cartoon) that specified most details. The critical
decisions having been made, competent assistants could then execute the actual
paintings over this underdrawing, with only minor revisions by the master.

---

74. Gibson, Mirror of the Earth, 125, n. 105 suggests that there is no firm
documentary support for this.


76. Françoise Thomaes-Van Hauwaert, "La véritable signature de Pierre
Brueghel le Jeune: son dessin sous-jacent," Dessin sous-jacent Colloque V: Dessin
Bruegel’s most influential innovations in the development of a naturalistic landscape were in his drawings. Soon after he entered the Antwerp guild in his early twenties, in 1551 or 1552, he traveled to Italy, returning in 1555. An Italian trip was by now a frequent feature of the early careers of Netherlandish artists, among them Jan van Scorel, Maerten van Heemskerck, and Jan Gossaert who devoted themselves in Italy to a study of modern Italian painters and antiquities. Bruegel, however, responded to two quite different influences that had a lasting impact on his art: the forest landscape prints of the Venetian artistic tradition, and the actual landscapes of the Alps.

The influence of Venetian forest landscapes on Bruegel’s art stemmed largely from woodcuts by Domenico Campagnola, Titian, and Girolamo Muziano (whom Bruegel could have met in Rome). This inspiration can be seen in the serpentine trunks and dense roots of the forest interior in Bruegel’s drawing Landscape with Five Bears (Fig. 9). The forest theme was circulated in the form of an etching, the Temptation of Christ (Fig. 10), that Hieronymus Cock based on Bruegel’s drawing, and also in Bruegel’s drawings of forest interiors (many of which were copied by other artists). Such works played a decisive role in the development of the forest landscape in the

work of his son, Jan Brueghel I, and Northern Netherlandish artists including Gillis van Coninxloo and David Vinckboons.78

From the evidence of drawings Bruegel made on his Italian trip, his passionate interest seems to have been the study of landscape he discovered crossing the Alps, to and from Italy.79 This interest in making life drawings of the Alps is a striking contrast to the practice of earlier Netherlandish artists, few of whom drew extensively from life. At most, earlier artists seem to have drawn individual motifs, and to have used them to enliven their imaginary landscapes. There is some evidence for the practice of drawing landscapes. For example, a fragmentary landscape painting in London by an unknown artist in the circle of Patinir, a River Among Mountains, includes a tiny artist at the lower left drawing the view.80 Yet the painting itself, like virtually all contemporary works, is a composed landscape. There also are strikingly naturalistic sketches in the Errera sketchbook of 1530 to 1540, mentioned above, but such sketches do not seem to have been developed into finished paintings or drawings.81 On his travels, however,


80. National Gallery, London, illustrated in Gibson, “Mirror of the Earth”, fig. 5.7.

Bruegel drew extensive landscapes from life which he worked up into finished drawings on his return to the studio.

In a Landscape with St. Jerome in Washington (Fig. 11) Bruegel developed a view of hills and a distant valley with a Venetian-inspired foreground dominated by a magnificent twisting tree. He worked the foreground trees with a dense mass of curving, parallel strokes. He drew the scene below with discontinuous touches. He used stippled strokes and shorter parallel lines to describe the valley in the middle ground. In the furthest distance his touch faded to tiny dots, creating a convincing impression of aerial perspective as the mountains appear to dissolve into haze.

Bruegel used the on-site drawings as a visual resource throughout his career, bringing a new grandeur to the panoramic world landscape tradition that was widely transmitted in engravings after his designs. In his biography of Bruegel in the Schilder-Boeck of 1604 Carel van Mander vividly conveyed both the importance of the mountain studies to Bruegel's own art and their impact on contemporaries: "On his travels he drew many views from life so that it is said that when he was in the Alps he swallowed all those mountains and rocks which, upon returning home, he spat out again onto canvases and panels, so faithfully was he able, in this respect and others, to follow Nature."82

Hieronymus Cock’s landscape prints after Bruegel and the Master of the Small Landscapes

By far the most important route for the dissemination of Bruegel’s influence was through the prints issued by Hieronymus Cock at his publishing house, “Aux Quatre Vents.” Of the several print publishers operating in Antwerp from the middle of the century, Cock’s was the most active and the most original. As well as publishing reproductive prints after paintings, Cock was one of the first publishers to issue sets of landscape prints. While paintings were usually purchased singly, encouraging workshops to repeat successful formulas, landscape print series were collected in sets. The variations of subject and composition that were needed to avoid monotony within any one set sparked new developments in landscape, and helped create a buying public open to innovation.

Immediately upon his return to Antwerp Bruegel produced designs that Cock issued as the set of twelve Large Landscapes. In transforming his landscape drawings for public presentation, Bruegel imbued the conservative landscape formulas with an unprecedented grandeur that must have been inspired by his personal experience of the Alps. The compositions are clearly in the world landscape mode, with a high foreground and a vast distance. But as the print of The Penitent Magdalene (Fig. 12) demonstrates, Bruegel profited from the experience of his landscape studies to bring an


authenticity to the depiction of rock faces and forests that had not been seen in the work of earlier landscapists such as Patinir and Bles. Moreover, the convincingly vertiginous development of space far surpasses their compositions. Only some of the prints in the set incorporate a narrative subject and in those, as in the Magdalene, the grandeur of the landscape dwarfs the figures. In achieving the compositional variety that a print series called for, Bruegel emphatically focused his prints on the landscapes themselves.

While Van Mander's description (quoted above) of the influence of the Alps on Bruegel's art clearly shows that compositions and landscape types of the Large Landscapes were influential, the atmospheric qualities of Bruegel's drawing style, with its discontinuous touches, were not conveyed through these prints. Executed in a combination of engraving and etching, the prints replaced the atmosphere of Bruegel's drawings with fully rendered detail. 85 To judge from the output of the "Quatre Vents" most of Cock's buyers preferred a style of printmaking with crisply defined forms. To achieve such a style, the majority of the prints from the "Quatre Vents" were engravings (sometimes incorporating a little etching, as in the Large Landscapes). Even the printmakers who produced the greatest number of the house's etchings, the brothers Jan and Lucas van Doetechum, developed an extraordinarily disciplined technique that closely imitated engraving. 86 At this time etching usually seems to have


been valued for the opportunity to produce reproductive images rapidly rather than for the aesthetic qualities of autograph prints.87

However a small number of landscape print series put out by the “Quatre Vents” were of pivotal importance to the development of new techniques that were particularly suited to landscape representation. These series used etching in a far more innovative way than in the rest of the publishing house’s output. There were already precedents for exploiting the expressive qualities of the etched line in prints incorporating landscape. From the second decade of the sixteenth century, Albrecht Altdorfer used the medium in his forest landscapes.88 Timothy Riggs cites, in particular, prints from the School of Fontainbleau in the 1540s.89 In the etchings that Cock executed himself in the early years of the publishing house—a set of views of Roman ruins possibly after his own drawings—he worked with a forceful, freely drawn style that exploited successive bites of the plate to vary the quality of the line.90 In the “Small Landscapes”, two series issued in 1559 and 1561, Cock’s printmaker worked in a comparatively free style of etching in rendering the most naturalistic landscapes that had yet been offered publicly. If the prints were executed by Jan or Lucas van


90. Riggs, Hieronymus Cock, 127-130, 256-266.
Doetechum as Riggs suggests, they modified the usually conservative Van Doetechum etching style to suit the innovative landscapes. In these rural views of the environs of Antwerp the designer, the “Master of the Small Landscapes” (possibly Joos van Liere), 91 used a low horizon to focus the viewer’s attention on a few trees, rough roads, and unprepossessing farm buildings. The masses of fine parallel lines that regularized the shadows of the prints were varied by the clusters of rapid, curved dashes indicating the irregular contours of the open foregrounds and a stippled handling that indicated distant trees only by their outer contours (Fig. 13). Pieter Bruegel’s influence may have contributed to this new informality. The single autograph plate he etched for the “Quatre Vents”, the Landscape with Rabbit Hunters of 1560 (Fig. 14), extended the evanescent dotted and dashed handling used in the distance of the drawing in Washington (discussed above) in a freer, more varied handling throughout much of the image. 92


92. Gibson, “Mirror of the Earth”, 66; Riggs, Hieronymus Cock, 135-6; Franz, Zeitalter des Manierismus, 219-221. The discussion of this issue in the literature has been somewhat confused by the fact that a number of Bruegel forgeries by Jacob Savery that exaggerate this dotted handling were accepted as works by Bruegel until recently (see the reattributions by Mielke, review of Dessins des anciens Pays-Bas, 1986 and idem, Pieter Bruegel: Die Zeichnungen). The false dates on the forgeries
Some of the most strikingly original developments in landscape representation that have been discussed in this chapter—the spontaneity of Pieter Bruegel’s landscape drawing style and the innovative use of etching to represent the indigenous landscape in Cock’s print series after the Master of the Small Landscapes—did not have an immediate effect on landscape painting in Antwerp. However, the inheritance of these developments is most clearly seen in landscape representation in the Northern Netherlands at the beginning of the next century, which will be discussed in later chapters. Antwerp, instead, supported a relatively conservative style of landscape painting that grew out of the world landscape tradition. In this context Cock’s landscape prints after Bruegel’s designs, which breathed new life into the world landscape tradition, had greater impact than his naturalistic drawings and late paintings.

The succeeding generations of Antwerp landscape painters, discussed in the next chapter, codified the achievements of Patinir, Bles, and Bruegel into an easily recognizable, decorative style of landscape painting. While their compositions acknowledged the prints after Bruegel, their painting technique was directly inherited from the first generation of landscape artists.

coincide with the years in which Cock issued the two small landscape series. See my further discussion of these forged drawings as a reflection of early seventeenth-century attitudes toward Bruegel in Chapter 4. Nonetheless, Bruegel’s latest drawings demonstrate an increasing use of this dotted landscape drawing technique. See, for example, the landscape in The Beekeepers from around 1568, (Munz, Bruegel: The Drawings, cat. 154) and Summer dated 1568, (idem, cat. 152). This implies that it was an increasingly characteristic aspect of his drawing practice during the time that the Small Landscapes were issued.
CHAPTER 2: MANNERIST LANDSCAPE PAINTING IN ANTWERP IN THE EARLY SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

Specialization and convention in Antwerp 1569-1635: from the death of Pieter Bruegel to the death of Joos de Momper

For most Antwerp painters in the two generations after Pieter Bruegel's career, professional specialization became a fact of life. Zirka Filipczak has pointed out that half a century before such distinctions appeared in the Northern Netherlands, the Antwerp guild of St. Luke no longer designated all its members who painted simply as schilder, but divided them into sub-categories such as huysschilder (house painter), doekschilder (canvas painter), and waterschilder (watercolor painter). In the course of this transition schilder came to mean "artist" in the modern sense. In distinguishing themselves from craftsmen and laborers, fine artists attempted to claim a new level of social importance.93 A small number of artists were indeed paid at rates far above those of most artisans, and increased interest in collecting in Antwerp sparked rising prices for rare and desirable paintings as well as a rash of forgeries of "old masters".94

Nonetheless, most artists' earnings at this period continued to be comparable to those of artisans. Market forces, as well as aesthetic inclinations, may have encouraged specialization on the part of many artists. The increasingly difficult economic conditions


94. Idem, 44.
resulting from the rebellion to wrest the Netherlands from Spanish control made experimentation economically risky. Even within the genre of landscape artists, often focused on sub-specialities; they tended to paint the types of works for which they had built a reputation. Artists introduced variations in established forms only gradually, balancing the market appeal of novelty (Jan Brueghel I, for example, was one of a number of artists at the turn of the century to introduce landscapes dominated by a forested foreground) with the safety of a recognized product.

The same economic pressures encouraged artists to work as efficiently as possible. In a tendency that was already apparent in the Bles workshop, they organized their studios for stream-lined production, turning out a high volume of paintings. Artistic collaborations between painters who specialized in specific aspects of paintings also allowed paintings to be produced in as short a time as possible. There were many levels to the art market. As well as autograph works by major painters, there was a market for lower-priced copies of successful compositions. Antwerp inventories of the period show that while the subject of a work of art was almost always of interest, authorship was important only to a minority of collectors.95

Such uniformity might seem restrictive, but it allowed artists to produce recognizable products that appealed to a well-established market. While individual artists distinguished themselves from their colleagues by specializing in specific types of landscape, almost all landscapes in the Southern Netherlands as late as the 1620s can

still clearly be identified as descendants of the panoramic world landscape of Patinir and Bles. These painters codified a set of recognizable artistic conventions derived from the world landscape tradition to create the decorative Mannerist landscape style of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century.

Mannerist landscape painters sought a greater compositional unity than their predecessors did. The painters of world landscapes in the middle of the sixteenth century assembled their compositions through an accumulation of details. In these works the viewer looked down from a great height on plains and mountains, harbors and forests. A precipitous drop divided the foreground from the middle ground, and sometimes another marked the break from middle ground to distance. Mannerist landscape painters generally adhered to a greater topographical unity and suggested a smoother recession into space, preserving a high horizon, but moderating abrupt changes of level. They narrowed the scope of their compositions, with “side-wing” coulisses that framed the view, restricting what had been a limitless expanse in the panoramic world landscapes. Yet they still divided their compositions into clearly defined zones of distance, assigning each zone a separate color—brown foreground, green middle ground and airy blue distance—and juxtaposing lighted and shadowed areas with elements from one zone sharply silhouetted against the zone behind. This formalized scheme, familiar from Patinir’s works in the first quarter of the sixteenth century, is consistently found in Southern Netherlandish landscapes into the 1630s.

The Entry of the Animals into Noah’s Ark of 1613 by Jan Brueghel the Elder (Fig. 2) has much in common with the Large Mountain Landscape (Fig. 15) painted by
Joos de Momper in the 1620s, though Brueghel’s touch is extraordinarily refined and De Momper’s has a bravura dash. Neither landscape is based on reality, and indeed each uses the well-established formula to depict a different sort of ideal landscape. The high horizon of both paintings places the viewer above the foreground and the distant prospect beyond it. Both artists achieved recession into space by alternating strongly contrasted elements. In this way bright areas alternate with shadowy areas, and at the sides of the compositions coullisses in the form of trees, mountains, or ridges of land alternate with open, low-lying areas. Most distinctively, the colors of the landscapes are organized into strictly defined zones: brown, green, and blue.

Both landscapes are creations of the imagination. An effect such as the modulation in the skies from intense blue to the yellowish clouds at the horizon is more a symbol of light effects than a faithful transcription of observed reality. Finally, neither of these landscapes would have been considered complete without the figures. Brueghel’s numerous figures clearly play out an explicit narrative. Without them, the landscape would be an empty stage set. But though De Momper’s figures are smaller in scale, and often contributed by a collaborator, the structure of his landscapes always anticipated their inclusion. Southern Netherlandish landscapes continued to underscore the role of man within the often vast expanse of nature.
The conventions of Mannerist landscape painting technique

This study included technical examinations of a number of Mannerist landscapes painted in Antwerp in the early seventeenth century. These examinations revealed a strikingly consistent painting practice. From the range of materials and painting procedures that were current in the Southern Netherlands, the landscape painters almost unanimously chose a specific set of practices that were found again and again in the paintings examined. Just as these artists consistently followed a set of compositional conventions, they followed technical conventions as well, and this regularized technique contributed to the landscapes' consistent style. The technique of these paintings is so consistent that the features they share in common can be outlined in detail before discussing individual variations in specific paintings.

The most common painting support for the Mannerist landscapes examined was an oak panel, the typical wood used for paintings in the Netherlands, though both copper panels and canvas were used as well. Many artists, including landscape painters, chose their support based on the size of the planned work: they used wood panels for small to moderate-sized paintings and canvas for larger works, while copper was used most often for small, refined paintings. The texture of the support must certainly have played a role in this selection, for in small paintings the smaller scale of the composition required a more precise handling of paint, which would have been

96. Van Mander, Het Schilder-Boeck, chapter 8, verse 3 describes the use of either canvas or Norwegian oak. Norgate, who described limning, or miniature painting, recommended the use of parchment, stretched or mounted on pasteboard: Ogden and Ogden, English Taste in Landscape, 171.
disrupted by a prominent texture in the painting support. A well-prepared oak panel offered a smooth painting surface, while a prepared canvas inevitably retained a certain weave texture that would interrupt small brush strokes. Copper panels could be prepared with a surface smooth enough to allow minute handling and an uninterrupted, enamel-like surface. At the same time, the expense of a copper panel made paintings on this support particularly precious.

Mannerist landscape artists prepared both panels and canvas with light-colored grounds that established a uniform painting surface. These ground preparations completely covered the support, obscuring both its texture and color. Most of the paintings examined used a double ground: a lower ground of inexpensive material such as chalk in a glue medium, which filled irregularities in the texture of the support, and an upper ground in an oil medium. This upper ground sealed the absorbent surface of the chalk/glue layer, preventing it from drawing the oil medium from the paint layers. It also played an important optical role. The upper grounds of the paintings examined were usually made with white lead and were only lightly toned with other pigments. The resulting off-white or light gray painting surface gives the paintings a light tonality that reflects light back through the thin paint layers.

In all the Mannerist landscapes the artists laid out the composition with an underdrawing on the prepared support. In many cases they probably used studio drawings as models for their designs. As the discussion of individual paintings will show, these underdrawings vary in complexity, variations that reflect differences in workshop practice. In most of the paintings examined the underdrawing situated at
least the major elements of the topography, the foliage, and the figures. Some
underdrawings laid out the composition in great detail, even positioning individual tufts
of grass.

The first paint was a single layer of underpaint, which established the landscape
zones with broad areas of several different colors. Though it could not be
conclusively established in every painting examined, in most works this underpaint was
completed over the entire painting before the artist proceeded to apply the final paint
layers. This means that before he painted the composition in any detail, the artist had
defined the space with broad areas of mid-tone color, a procedure that is conceptually
different from painting over forms outlined with a black underdrawing on the light
ground. Mannerist artists conceived of the space in terms of color. In the simplest
paintings the underpaint could comprise three flat areas of color: a light blue for the
distant zone, a mid-tone green for the middle distance, and a brown or tan for the
foreground. More complex underpainting laid out distinct zones of space, but also
established some variety of tones (usually light and shadow) within the color range
assigned to each zone. In most of the works examined this underpaint was an

97. In this study I will use the term, underpaint, to describe a first paint layer in
various colors that established the tone of the final paint layers. Such a layer is
sometimes called the dead color (De Mayerne’s manuscript uses the term in this way
several times. Van de Graaf, Het De Mayerne manuscript, 142-143, no. 22; 150, no.
31a; 151-152, no. 33). However, the term was also used for a monochrome preliminary
design in transparent brown paint. To avoid confusion I will use the term, monochrome
painted sketch, for such a layer (for a survey of the two meanings of dead color see
Wetering, Ernst van de, "Painting Materials and Working Methods," in A Corpus of
Rembrandt Paintings, by Josua Bruyn, Bob Haak, S. H. Levie, Pieter J. J. van Thiel,
and Ernst van de Wetering, Vol. I. (Dordrecht, Boston, Lancaster: Martinus Nijhoff,
undetailed base for the final paint. In some works, however, this was a more loosely handled layer, in which the artist indicated some forms with the actual brush strokes of the underpaint.

Mannerist landscape artists applied their final paint in a methodical manner. Beginning with the sky, then working from back to front, they painted from the most distant landscape up to the foreground, a procedure that clarified the organization of space. The painters finished each zone in turn, before moving to the next. As discussed above, this procedure may have been partly motivated by the necessity of preparing a strictly limited palette for each session of painting.98 But because these artists strictly segregated the zones of space by color, the process also shows that, as with Patinir and Bles, they conceived of their compositions as a series of discrete zones. There is no evidence that artists tried to break this pattern, incorporating any of their colors into more than one zone. The painters closely followed the composition laid out in the underdrawing. At the boundary between two zones, the underdrawing served as a guide to avoid laying any paint where elements of the next zone would substantially overlap it. They left precise unpainted reserves for the foliage or rises in ground, then filled in the areas when they painted the nearer zone. The painting process itself was meticulous and unhurried. Even within any one zone extensive areas of wet-into-wet painting were rare. Usually the artist allowed one layer to dry fully before returning to add further details.

98. Van de Wetering, "The use of the palette."
As a group, the Mannerist Antwerp landscapists used a brighter palette than the naturalistic landscape painters whose work will be discussed in a later chapter. The range of pigments found in these paintings included smalt, ultramarine, and azurite (all blue pigments), lead-tin yellow, vermilion and red lake, as well as the ubiquitous white lead, black, and yellow, red and brown earth colors. These artists were remarkably consistent in their choice of pigments and the way they used them. The purplish-blue pigments smalt or ultramarine (though the much more costly ultramarine was less common) were used for skies and the most distant mountains. For the slightly nearer mountains these artists typically turned to azurite, a greener blue, creating a conventionalized atmospheric perspective and a subtle transition toward the greens of the middle ground. These artists prepared their greens by mixing blue and yellow pigments since, as discussed in the Introduction, the green pigments available at this time were problematic. Technical examinations indicated that strongly colored pigments, such as ultramarine, vermilion, and red lake, were used with some regularity. Pink and yellow evening skies and brightly costumed figures expanded the tonal range beyond the browns, greens, and blues of the landscape itself.

Finally, it is obvious from technical study that the figures in these landscapes played a significant compositional role, while the ways painters incorporated the figures

99. Yellow lakes have not been conclusively identified, but the difficulties of identifying these pigments means that they might easily be present, without having been noted.

100. Exactly this procedure was described by De Mayerne in a note on landscape procedures in the manuscript describing artists' methods that he wrote between 1620 and 1646: Van de Graaf, Het De Mayerne manuscript, 154, no. 34c.
into the landscape varied depending on the extent of collaboration with other painters. Figures were considered an integral part of a landscape composition of virtually every painting. In many cases the figures were planned from the start in the artist’s underdrawing. In cases of collaboration a second artist might sketch and paint the figures after the landscape had been painted, but he virtually always introduced them into an open space in the landscape that the first artist had kept for the purpose.

To interpret the techniques of landscape paintings produced in Antwerp at the end of the sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth centuries, and how these techniques influenced the aesthetic qualities of the paintings, it is important to understand workshop practice and the circumstances under which these paintings were made. Some artists worked entirely on their own, producing paintings for discerning collectors. Others worked in more or less collaborative workshops in which specialization permitted a more rapid production for the open market. Other artists worked as common laborers mass-producing paintings. This technical study has identified at least one case in which a painting considered to be a copy or replica was, in fact, made using somewhat different procedures that reveals its origin in a mass-production studio. Such evidence has important implications for attributions. The relatively small number of paintings by any one artist examined in the study to date precludes a chronological discussion of technical developments within the Mannerist landscape style. Instead this discussion will use a few examples, both autograph works and collaboratively produced paintings, to illustrate the range of workshop conditions in which landscape paintings were produced in early seventeenth-century Antwerp.
Mannerist landscape painting technique at the highest level: Jan Brueghel I

Some of the finest Mannerist landscapes were, as the modern viewer tends to expect, autograph works painted by extraordinarily gifted artists who worked on their own. Jan Brueghel I painted flower still lifes and landscapes such as the Noah's Ark (Fig. 2) in which he translated his father’s vision into a personal idiom of great refinement. Brueghel’s appointment in 1606 as court artist to the archdukes Albert and Isabella must have set aside some financial pressures. Like his father, Brueghel does not seem to have had a large workshop. Only one student, Daniel Seghers, is recorded. Many of Brueghel’s paintings seem to be entirely autograph, including the work that forms the focus of this discussion. When other artists did contribute to Brueghel’s paintings, he routinely collaborated with specialist colleagues of equal stature, and these, too, are works of the highest standard.

The question of whether Brueghel at times employed workshop assistants to contribute to his own paintings or to make replicas under his supervision is more difficult. Ertz points to the striking difference in quality between the 448 paintings he attributes to Jan Brueghel (including autograph replicas) and the more than 3,000 paintings that have been attributed to him at various times. This great disparity in


quality suggests that many replicas of his compositions were not made under his supervision, but were made in independent studios. Indeed, the examination of one such copy, discussed later in this chapter, supports such a conclusion. Nonetheless, some subtle variations within the group of paintings accepted by Ertz suggest that Brueghel may have employed a small number of highly qualified assistants, who met his high standards, to work under his direct supervision.\(^\text{104}\)

A **Paradise Scene** by Jan Brueghel I (Fig. 16), an autograph work on a small copper panel, will serve to illustrate the typical painting procedure for Southern Netherlandish Mannerist landscapes of the early seventeenth century. The handling of this small copper panel is exquisite, as the choice of the smoothest and most costly support would suggest—it shows the most refined technique of all the Mannerist landscapes examined in this study—but its structure typifies the paintings examined from this group of works. The copper support was prepared with a very thin gray ground.\(^\text{105}\) The ground is very slightly brush-marked, giving a delicately grooved texture to the surface. Far more delicate than the surface of canvas or even most wood panels, this texture creates an elusive surface variation that is almost imperceptible to the naked eye.

---

104. I am grateful to Arthur K. Wheelock Jr. for his comments on his examination of the Budapest Noah’s Ark, which Ertz considers an autograph replica of Brueghel’s painting now in Malibu (Fig. 2). Wheelock feels the Budapest work is by a different hand.

105. The panel was lightly scored to facilitate adhesion of the ground, but this texture is not visible on the surface.
Brueghel laid out the composition on the prepared support with a simple underdrawing that records a few major features in fine outlines (Fig. 17, Fig. 18). The underdrawing gives the impression of an artist who placed the important masses of his composition with respect to one another, but who had a clear image of the overall composition, and had no need to set down every detail. Such an underdrawing, without repeated lines or shifts of placement, could be evidence that elements of the composition were based on drawings or oil sketches in the studio. A number of the animals in this painting also appear in other of Brueghel’s paradise gardens; the lion and lioness and the rolling leopard, for example, all appear on a larger scale in the Getty Noah’s Ark of 1613 (Fig. 2), while the lions, very much enlarged, feature in Rubens’ monumental Daniel in the Lions’ Den of almost the same period.\(^{106}\) He outlined the major foreground animals including the dog, tiger and leopard illustrated in this detail. The more distant animals, the horses and hedgehog, do not appear in the underdrawing, but were developed during the painting process. The only landscape features Brueghel drew were the tree trunks, which he indicated by pairs of vertical lines. He apparently had no need to specify any other landscape features, such as foliage, the contours of land masses, or the transitions from one zone of distance to another. The tree trunks alone defined the setting.

While Brueghel’s underdrawing had focused primarily on the animals, he developed the landscape setting with his underpaint, first painting the sky and then the foreground underpaints. While he differentiated zones of distance with the traditional Mannerist color scheme—a blue distance, green middle distance, and dark green and brown foreground—he modulated his underpaint within each zone, rather than establishing a single tone. That is to say, in the green middle distance he varied the underpaint within a range of greens: from a blue-green under the furthest trees, to a yellow-green under the middle tree, to a darker blue-green under the forest shadows. In the brownish foreground he varied the underpaint from dark green-brown under the large framing tree on the right, to a pale greenish tan under the high ground, to a gray under the water. This underpaint stage consisted only of juxtaposed patches of color without foliage details and must have been dragged thinly enough to leave the underdrawing visible. With its completion, Brueghel had organized his landscape with masses of color, while still retaining the underdrawing to guide his painting of the figures.

Some days later, after the underpaint had dried, Brueghel began his final painting. He worked from the back of the composition to the front in a series of discrete stages. In each stage he painted both animals and foliage at the same stage, integrating them into the composition. Using the underdrawing as a guide, he carefully skirted any nearer figures that overlapped the area he was painting, leaving a reserve. He painted the nearer area on another day and placed figures into the reserves. As
described in the discussion of Patinir and Bles, such a sequence is important for rendering space since near elements overlap those at a greater distance from the viewer.

The painting sequence can be established by close examination with a stereo microscope because tiny overlaps of paint resulted when this process was followed. For example, a photomicrograph of the head of the leopard overlapping the black dog (Fig. 19) shows that when Brueghel laid in the gray paint of the dog he carefully skirted the space for the leopard. The strokes of his gray paint echoed the underdrawn shape of the ear and top of the head. After the paint had dried, Brueghel painted the leopard into the reserve, slightly overlapping the paint of the dog at the edges.

By comparing a photomicrograph of the peacocks behind the tiger's rump (Fig. 20) to the infrared detail (Fig. 18) one can see how precisely the artist followed the underdrawing in organizing the space. The paint of the bird's legs stops abruptly at the fine line of underdrawing outlining the tiger. When Brueghel later painted the tiger he exactly filled in that reserve. This refined and precise working method left nothing to chance.

In this tiny, precious landscape Jan Brueghel handled his paint with an extraordinary finesse. As a photomicrograph of foliage and golden fruit shows (Fig. 21), his unhurried working procedure often required two or even three separate applications of paint in addition to the underpaint to complete a single area: usually a dark color first, then a mid-tone, and finally highlights. Brueghel balanced the blues-greens, yellow-greens and browns of his landscape with the tawny colors of the wild cats and the vivid colors of the birds against the deep blue sky at the left. His palette
almost certainly included vermilion, red lake, lead-tin yellow, and a high quality ultramarine blue in addition to the standard landscape colors. Under very high magnification the extraordinary delicacy with which he varied the proportion of ultramarine to indicate the distance mountains dissolving into the sky (Fig. 22). Brueghel’s labor-intensive painting practice, his choice of an expensive copper panel as support, and his use of vividly colored, costly pigments made this jewel-like painting a precious object in itself.

**Collaboration in the workshops of Antwerp**

Although Brueghel’s painting is by far the most refined of the Antwerp Mannerist landscapes examined in this study, the basic working procedure he followed is typical of paintings produced by a single artist. However many fine landscapes, including works by Brueghel, were joint productions; in early seventeenth-century Antwerp collaboration was a regular practice. Brueghel also painted landscapes in which Hendrik van Balen, Frans Snyders, and Peter Paul Rubens contributed figures and animals. Occasionally patrons specifically commissioned joint works. As a gift for the archdukes Albert and Isabella on the occasion of their visit in 1618, the city of Antwerp commissioned twelve of the leading artists to paint a pair of paintings

---

107. This painting’s size and immaculate condition precluded sampling for analysis, but these pigments are quite recognizable with the stereo microscope when compared to similar paintings where sampling was possible (See, for example, 287).
depicting the Five Senses. In effect, through such a commission, the patrons declared
their esteem for the skills that such strict specialization fostered. From commissions at
the highest artistic level, through more routine collaborations between well-respected
artists, to workshops that were organized for efficient group production and
reproduction, a great many Antwerp landscapes were jointly produced.

A number of the works examined for this chapter are characteristic of the
organized production of art in the southern Netherlands in the early years of the
seventeenth century. These works closely followed most of the painting procedures
discussed with the Paradise Scene, a uniformity of practice that may have contributed
to the efficient production of paintings by collaborating artists or workshops producing
paintings for the open market. Because this working practice could easily be broken
into smaller steps, these steps could be assigned to more than one artist. With such a
system, each participant clearly understood their own and their collaborators'
responsibilities. Though the paintings discussed below illustrate various forms of
collaboration and various levels of quality, they share an uncommonly homogeneous
landscape painting technique. This consistent painting practice yielded a consistent

An anonymous Landscape with Tobias and the Angel at The Walters Art
Gallery, (Fig. 23), illustrates a common pattern of collaboration, in which an


109. The traditional attribution to Denis Alsloot, with figures by Hendrik de
Clerck, is now under examination. See curatorial file 37.350, The Walters Art Gallery.
unknown landscape artist painted the entire work before the figures were added. The landscape artist worked on a panel prepared with a chalk lower ground and a streaky gray upper ground, or imprimatura. An infrared reflectogram detail showing the fence above the heads of Tobias and the angel (Fig. 24, Fig. 25) reveals that the charcoal black-containing imprimatura was applied with pronounced diagonal brush strokes. The landscape artist rapidly sketched out his composition over this lively surface with a fairly complete underdrawing. As the reflectogram shows, this painter made no provision for the figures. The composition of the landscape itself, in which two empty paths opened to fill most of the foreground, clearly anticipated the addition of figures, but no reserve was left for them. Instead, the second artist added figures over the finished landscape. This process implies a fairly loose collaboration, in which the panel was passed from one studio to another for completion, rather than a joint effort in a shared work space.

As in the Brueghel Paradise Scene the landscape artist covered the panel with an underpaint, blocking out the major zones of the landscape, before returning to paint the final image from back to front. He defined the lighted and shadowed areas within each zone of distance in this underpaint stage. He painted the foreground in a pattern of alternating dark and light areas, with a warm brown in the shadows and a yellow-tan underpaint in the lights. The junction between the two underpaint colors can be seen through the leaves of the final paint layers in a detail from the foreground (Fig. 26). He underpainted the shadowed rocky island in the center of the composition with sketchy gray-green underpaint (Fig. 27), the middle distance with cool greens, and the more
gray-green underpaint (Fig. 27), the middle distance with cool greens, and the more distant mountains on the right with a strong blue-green (primarily azurite with lead-tin yellow) (Fig. 28 and Fig. 29).

Both Jan Brueghel I, in the Paradise Scene, and the landscape artist of the Landscape with Tobias and the Angel applied an underpaint layer over the entire surface before proceeding to the final paint layers. But the landscape artist of the Tobias used the underpainting in the final image to a much greater degree. This difference illustrates the range of possibilities within the standard Mannerist landscape painting procedures. In his minute and precious work, Brueghel took many days to paint the final image over the initial underpaint. The anonymous landscape artist, certainly working for a more modest market, worked far more rapidly. In the Paradise Scene Brueghel almost covered his layer of underpaint. The anonymous artist used his underpaint as an important part of the final image, in most areas loosely applying his final paint with just one or two colors to lay out the details. Over the blue-green underpaint of the mountain zone he quickly stippled foliage details with a yellow-green (here, primarily lead-tin yellow with some azurite) (Fig. 28 and Fig. 29). In the foreground zone he noted final details with a rich, transparent brown over the brown underpaint, and with light yellow and touches of gray-green over the yellow-tan

110. This is partly a function of the small size of this painting—in larger paintings Brueghel used the underpaint to a greater degree in the final image—but it serves to illustrate the range of handling found in Mannerist landscapes.

111. Both brown underpaint and brown final details from the foreground include smalt, as well as the expected earth colors; in the underpaint there are also small amounts of azurite. The paint has probably darkened with age to some degree,
underpaint (Fig. 26). In areas such as the central island and parts of the foreground he applied almost no final details, using the underpaint in which he had already described the forms with expressive brush marks as the final image (Fig. 27).

Paintings examined in this study have revealed a number of different procedures for collaboration between landscape and figure painters. In this case, the underdrawing shows that the landscape artist made no plans for the figures, other than to compose a landscape with an open area of road in the foreground. If the landscape artist had known how the figures were to be arranged he could have left reserves in the landscape paint so that the figures would be painted directly onto the light-colored ground. Instead the second artist painted the figures over the completed landscape and the dark paint below somewhat obscured his colors in the thinner passages (Fig. 24). Apparently the landscape painter did not add the final details needed to incorporate the figures into the landscape. Instead a smudged gray paint around the figures' feet is all that incorporates the figures into the landscape. This gray is similar to the paint used in the figures but bears no visual relationship to the warm brown details of the landscape in the foreground.

Evidently a landscape without figures would not have been saleable, but these artists did not collaborate closely. It is not clear which of the two painters decided on the subject for the staffage. Little is known about the contractual arrangements made at

but the addition of the two blue pigments, which no longer significantly affect the color of the paints, must have been intended to harmonize with the green and blue middle and distance zones.
this time between collaborating artists.\textsuperscript{112} Indeed, it is entirely possible that the staffage painter determined the subject since the generic landscape provided would have suited various narratives with travelers. Alternatively, both artists could have been under contract to a third party. The studio records of Jan Brueghel II illustrate such arrangements. In 1632, for example, he sold 46 square landscapes on canvas that he had commissioned from two other artists, a landscape and a figure specialist.\textsuperscript{113}

Both Jan Brueghel I and the landscape painter of \textit{Tobias and the Angel} worked within the established conventions of landscape painting, adapting those conventions to meet the demands of their markets. They shared an easily recognizable style, in part a function of their shared painting practices, that must certainly have contributed to their success in their respective markets. Their compositions and subjects also would have been instantly recognizable and that familiarity added to their appeal. The composition of the \textit{Tobias}, with a wooded foreground, mountainous background, and a central

\textsuperscript{112} Many of the documentary references suggest collegial relationships between equals, mentioning that an artist provided the staffage for a landscape, but not indicating a supervisory role. See Jan Denuncé, \textit{Letters and Documents Concerning Jan Brueghel I and II}, Historical Sources for the Study of Flemish Art, III (Antwerp and The Hague: Edition "de Sikkel" and Martinus Nijhoff, 1934); Franz, "Kollektive Werkstattsschöpfungen." A recent publication by Elizabeth Honig addresses these issues: "The Beholder As Work of Art: A Study in the Location of Value in Seventeenth-Century Flemish Painting," \textit{Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek} 46 (1995): 253-97; on collaboration see, especially, 262-269. A dissertation that I have not yet been able to consult should be important for these questions: Sabine Strahl-Grosse, "Begriffsgeschichte und Erscheinungsform," Ph.D. diss., Tuduv-Studien. Reihe Kunstgeschichte, 50 (Munich: Tuduv, 1991).

\textsuperscript{113} Denuncé, \textit{Letters and Documents}, no. 40.
island reached by a high footbridge, was a commonly used formula. Brueghel frequently painted variants on the theme of paradise landscapes.

Jan Brueghel II seems to have worked for a more prosaic market than had his father, court artist to Albert and Isabella. His correspondence and day book give a picture of a busy studio. Brueghel himself painted both original works and replicas of paintings by his more famous father. He dealt in the work of other artists, providing his cousin and business agent, Chrysostoom van Immerseel, with paintings by recognized artists such as Sebastian Vrancx to sell in Spain. He also hired studio hands whom he paid by the day, like workmen, to produce numerous inexpensive paintings and to paint copies. The price range fetched by the studio output varied to an astonishing degree. The works at the highest end were paintings by Jan II himself. His work did not fetch the prices of his father’s work, but he was nonetheless handsomely

114. See, for example, the Landscape with Cephalus Receiving the Gifts from Procris by Alexander Kierincx in the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, Richmond (illustrated in Peter C. Sutton, Masters of 17th-Century Dutch Landscape Painting, exh. cat. (Museum of Fine Arts, Boston: 1987), pl. 4).

115. Ertz, Jan Brueghel Der Ältere, 236-249. Arthur K. Wheelock, Jr. has noted that such repetitions are also a means of speeding production (personal communication).


117. Klaus Ertz has assigned a number of replicas after Jan I’s compositions that are not of his high quality to Jan II. See the catalogue in Ertz, Jan Brueghel der Jüngere.

118. Van Immerseel, in fact, found Vrancx’s oil paintings too expensive to market in Spain, and asked instead for water colors by the same artist. Denuncé Letters and Documents, no. 17.
rewarded. Brueghel cited the fl. 1600 paid by a Polish prince for a painting by his father and Rubens, and offered to copy the work himself for fl. 500, or charge fl. 250 for a copy by his assistants.\textsuperscript{119} At the other end of the spectrum, in a bill of 1632 Brueghel’s costs for the landscapes that he commissioned from two other painters (discussed above) came to less than fl. 3 for each painting.\textsuperscript{120}

Copies of famous compositions seem to have been popular at every level of the art market. They were something of a tradition in the Brueghel family. The busy workshop of Pieter Brueghel II specialized in copies of works by Pieter Bruegel the Elder.\textsuperscript{121} The copies by Jan Brueghel II after compositions by Jan Brueghel I are particularly fine. Some inferior copies can perhaps be attributed to his hired artisans. Other even more pedestrian replicas may have been copied from these copies in unrelated studios.

A Noah’s Ark at The Walters Art Gallery in Baltimore (Fig. 30) illustrates such distant copies. This composition is one of a number of copies after the original by Jan Brueghel I, now at the J. Paul Getty Museum in Malibu, (Fig. 2).\textsuperscript{122} Some of his father’s qualities are still evident in the three replicas of this composition that Klaus


\textsuperscript{120} Denuncé, Letters and Documents, no. 40.

\textsuperscript{121} Marlier, Pierre Brueghel le Jeune; Folie, "Pierre Brueghel le Jeune."

\textsuperscript{122} Ertz, Jan Brueghel Der Ältere, 236-249.
Ertz attributes to Jan Brueghel II himself. This version seems to have been produced at a still greater remove from the original. Without comparative technical studies of a number of replicas, however, it is impossible to say whether this version should be attributed to Jan Brueghel II’s hired workmen or to an even more mundane workshop. The technical study of this painting illustrates an extremely simplified painting procedure. This workshop followed most of the standard landscape painting techniques, but made modifications to facilitate production of the most mechanical sort.

Some of the modifications, in fact, may suggest that this was a general shop specializing in copies rather than one that specialized in landscape.

In the Baltimore painting the animals are distributed across a strangely open composition, in which care seems to have been taken to avoid the challenges of the original’s complex interlocking of animal and landscape forms. The recession into space is less successful than in Brueghel’s original, as it relied on exaggerated contrasts of light and dark areas and abrupt transitions of color for atmospheric perspective. The outline of the dark foreground is sharply silhouetted against the light middle ground, and the central trees, which in the original are a luxuriant mass, have become insubstantial. In the original these trees are differentiated by a subtly lighter tone in the nearer trees but in the copy the central trees are arbitrarily and decoratively divided into

123. Ertz, Jan Brueghel der Jüngere, 279-280. In the monograph on Jan Brueghel I (Jan Brueghel Der Altere, 246, 247 fig. 319, 526 n.291), Ertz grouped the Walters painting with what he termed a number of high quality replicas. These included versions in Dessau and Madrid that he later attributed to Jan Brueghel the Younger in the 1984 monograph, but in that work he made no mention of The Walters painting.
colors: the nearer trees are yellow-green and the trees slightly more distant trees are blue-green.

The painting process was broken into a number of steps that were carried out by different artists, though it is not possible to say exactly how many participated. Of the four major stages in this painting—the underdrawing, the underpaint, the final paint in the figures, and final paint in the landscape—the underdrawing and the final paint in figures were far more skillfully executed than the other two stages. This might be a basis for seeing the underdrawing and figure painting as the work of one master artist with one or two assistants carrying out the underpaint and landscape.

The character of this painting was established in the underdrawing, which defined the composition in every detail. Over a double ground (a thin, warm imprimatura over a chalk lower ground) this artist underdrew the composition with a fluent, calligraphic stroke. The underdrawing included all the landscape features and all but the distant figures; even the alternating zones of light and shade were outlined or indicated with hatch marks (Fig. 31 and Fig. 32). This very specific underdrawing left no detail to the discretion of the painters that followed. As discussed above (in Chapter 1) in connection with the workshop of Pieter Brueghel the Younger, this practical procedure ensures that a senior member of the workshop was responsible for the genesis of the painting, while less skilled hands could be entrusted with completing some or all of the painting stages.

Another studio member loosely brushed underpaint over the landscape portions of the underdrawing. This painter was probably not one of the senior members of the
workshop, but a workman-like assistant who cautiously skirted the figures with wide reserves and strictly followed the patterns laid out by the underdrawing. Comparison of the infrared and visible light details, for example, shows that it was the artist of the underdrawing who had already established exactly where the zones of light and shadowed ground would fall. In effect, this painter “colored in” the underdrawing without attempting to define the landscape further with the underpaint. Though the random pattern of brush strokes gives the surface some liveliness, this assistant did not try to build the forms of the landscape with the underpaint as did the landscape artist of the Tobias painting.

The underpaint established the play of colors of the finished work. It defined the foreground with a warm brown, the middle ground with greens (including a blue-green for the more distant trees in the central group), and established a grayish variation on the color of the sky under the nearer trees. Somewhat surprisingly, the underpaint included an intense pink under the sky on the left. This particular procedure was not observed in the other paintings examined, but it was a successful shortcut to developing the shell-pink glow in the sky that features in so many paintings of this style.

In fact, this workshop made ingenious use of the strongly colored underpaint to give the final image a fairly wide range of color, despite the use of relatively inexpensive painting materials. The smalt used for the sky, for example, is a pale blue by comparison with the intense blue, probably ultramarine, of the Paradise Scene (Fig. 16). However this sky is far more colorful than the use of smalt alone would indicate. The thin paint of the sky, dragged over the bright pink underpaint on the left and over
the warm imprimatura on the right, effectively created the colored clouds at the left and
the shadowed clouds on the right side of the sky that usually are achieved by a gradual
(and more time-consuming) blending of small amounts of red lake or black into the
pigment mixture of the sky.

The figure painter painted the animals over the underdrawing in the large
openings left in the underpaint. The artist of the underdrawing had simplified Jan
Brueghel's complex composition, in which the landscape forms and animals were
interlocked. In revising the composition he slightly reduced the scale of the figures and
spaced them out over the landscape, probably to facilitate the separation of
responsibilities between the figure painter and landscape assistant. The landscape artist
worked in the usual back-to-front sequence, but only after the figures had been
finished, filling in the scene around them in a perfunctory fashion. With mechanical
strokes he cautiously skirted each figure (Fig. 33). This caution created halos of
exposed ground and underpaint around the figures that disrupt the space. The figures
do not fit convincingly into the landscape.

In all of the other Antwerp landscapes examined the artists painted the
landscapes first, and then either painted the figures into reserves in the landscape or (in
some collaborations) painted the figures over the completed the landscape. Though
these paintings always incorporated narrative figures, these standard painting sequences
highlight the primary importance given to the landscape and the logical rendering of
space. The workshop that produced the Noah's Ark replica reversed this practice by
painting the figures first and then filling in the landscape around them. It is also
significant that the most competent artist painted the figures, while a comparatively unskilled assistant painted the landscape. Although the figures are not of the quality of either Jan Brueghel I or his son, they clearly were painted by the dominant figure in this collaboration. It may be that the master of this workshop (perhaps the painter of the figures) was not himself a landscape specialist. To such a painter the spatial disjunctions created by this painting sequence might have been acceptable in the interests of a clear rendition of the animals.

The workshop that produced the Baltimore Noah’s Ark worked out a system of collaboration through which the members of a busy workshop could replicate a well-known composition. Quite a different category of landscape paintings—decoration rather than fine art—was truly mass-produced. Van Mander reported that in Mechelen more than 150 workshops produced watercolor paintings on canvas that served as an inexpensive alternative to tapestry decorations. Paintings in this “täschlein” technique, which Van Mander said was particularly well suited to landscape, were produced almost in assembly-line fashion. Some specialists painted only costumes, others contributed only landscapes, while others painted cartouches with inscriptions. Just a few named artists are associated with this tremendous output. This is partly because so few paintings in this fragile technique survive, but at this modest level of painting production there does not seem to have been an emphasis on individual authorship.

124. Van Mander, Het Schilder-Boeck, 203r, 250r, 258r, 259r, 260r.

125. In his biographies in Het Schilder-Boeck (Miedema, Karel van Mander: The Lives) van Mander mentioned just 25 artists in connection with Mechelen. Most of those, whom Van Mander presumably considered the most important artists associated
The market for Antwerp landscapes

The single-minded efficiency with which a landscape painter and a figure
specialist painted *Tobias and the Angel*, or the shortcuts taken by the workshop
copying Brueghel’s *Noah’s Ark* emphasize the economic pressures that artists in
Antwerp felt at this time. The landscape artist of the *Tobias* made the most efficient use
he could of the basic Mannerist painting practice, and the shop that produced the
Baltimore *Noah’s Ark* adapted that practice to accommodate team production, but
neither varied its essentials. This shared system of painting and shared compositional
conventions gave both these paintings and Brueghel’s *Paradise Landscape* a common
Mannerist style despite individual variations.

These paintings were enormously popular and were widely exported. As
described above, Jan Brueghel II had such an export business. But even after
considering the large numbers of Antwerp landscape paintings that survive in museum
collections today it is hard to conceive of the astonishing volume produced, and the
market demands that called for such production. The circumstances under which run-
of-the-mill landscape paintings in Antwerp were produced can be illustrated by an
example of a surviving ensemble: the redecoration of the Winter Room at Rosenborg
Castle outside Copenhagen between 1618 and 1620. It is not clear how frequently such

with Mechelen, are known today for their paintings on more durable supports, and not
all are known as landscape specialists. There must have been a far greater number of
anonymous workers staffing the 150 specialized workshops. A rare exception survives
at the Mauritshuis: a *tuchlein* landscape by Hans Bol, whose work in this medium Van
Mander praised. See E. and V. Bosshard-van der Bruggen, "Konservierung einer
decorative schemes were assembled. The specifics of this commission, however, can help modern viewers who tend to think of paintings as the personal aesthetic expression of individual artists recognize the possibilities for cooperative production that were inherent in the codified system of landscape painting in Antwerp at this period.

In a technical study of the Winter Room Jørgen Wadum has established that an unknown Antwerp art dealer was commissioned to provide 75 landscape paintings in short order. He accomplished this by subcontracting to a number of artists of widely varying talents, and he ensured a degree of uniformity by providing the panels and frames. Most of the panels and frames were made after the guild regulation of December 1617 that required the carpenter's personal mark to be added to the reverse of each; in the case of the Winter Room paintings these marks show that a number of craftsmen contributed. Impressions in the wet paint left by the frames are testament to the speed with which the paintings were installed.

The attributions of the paintings, too, give a sense of how many studios were called on to meet the demand. Three paintings by Louis de Caullery illustrating the proverb "Sine Cerere et Baccho friget Venus" (without Ceres and Bacchus Venus freezes) form the iconographic focus of the room. Of the remaining seventy-two landscape paintings, a few may have come from the dealer’s existing stock but most seem to have been newly commissioned. Twenty-four paintings are attributed to Joos de Momper the Younger and his studio with a number of different collaborators for the

126. Wadum, "The Winter Room". See also Ertz, Josse de Momper der Jüngere, 312-320.
figures. Among the finest paintings in the decorative program are the paintings by De Momper in which Jan Brueghel I contributed the figures. Another fifteen paintings are attributed to an associate of Sebastian Vranck, and the rest must have been painted in a number of different studios. The heterogeneous mixture of paintings from many workshops of varying quality—which apparently were seen as an acceptably harmonious whole in the context of the decorated room—highlights the function of landscape paintings as a market commodity in early seventeenth-century Antwerp. It was only possible to assemble a decorative program from the products of many workshops thanks to the extremely consistent style of landscape painting practiced in Antwerp, a uniformity based on a conservative dependence on the long-established technical tradition.

**Joos de Momper and the evolution of Mannerist landscape technique**

Joos de Momper the Younger, who specialized in village, winter, and mountain landscapes, was one of the last exponents of Mannerist landscape, which he practiced until his death in 1635. De Momper worked with a loose, vivid brushwork: an evocative handling of paint that suggests rather than delineates the scene. Nonetheless, in virtually every aspect of his practice, De Momper subscribed to the essentials of the technical tradition of Mannerist landscape paintings. His rapid handling was a personal variant on this tradition and was well suited to large paintings intended to be read at some distance. It was also a recognizable way of working that put a personal stamp on
De Momper's style. But however rapidly he worked, De Momper did not skip any of the fundamental stages of traditional landscape technique.

In two large paintings by Joos de Momper the Younger in Raleigh, De Momper collaborated with two different figure painters, but his practice for collaboration was consistent. In his monograph on De Momper, Klaus Ertz dated the Village Scene (Fig. 34) to the middle of the 1620s, and attributed the figures to Jan Brueghel II.\(^{127}\) He dated the Winter Landscape (Fig. 40) to the second half of the 1620s and attributed the figures to Sebastian Vrancx.\(^{128}\) In each case De Momper finished the landscape before passing the canvas to his collaborator. In neither case did he add final landscape details where the figures were to be painted, but left those areas with the underpaint exposed.

Both canvases were prepared with a gray double ground (a lower layer of chalk and an upper layer of white lead toned with black), and on this preparation De Momper laid out the landscape with a quickly noted underdrawing. He outlined tree trunks and, as an infrared reflectogram detail shows (Fig. 35 and Fig. 36), indicated foliage with succinct scribbles for masses of leaves. The figures do not appear in the underdrawing. Given the scale of the paintings, these laconic notations could only have served to position landscape elements; De Momper developed the specific features of the composition in the paint.

---

127. Ertz, Josse de Momper der Jüngere, 136, 142, 572. In his monograph on Brueghel, Ertz attributed the figures to a follower of Jan Brueghel I, Ertz, Jan Brueghel Der Ältere cat. 278.

128. Ertz, Josse de Momper der Jüngere, 255-256, 584.
De Momper laid out the *Village Scene* over the underdrawing with a broadly brushed underpaint. He defined the furthest distance with a gray-blue; in the middle distance he used a greenish blue for the shadowed area on the right, and a yellow-green for the lighted center. To an even greater extent than the artist of the *Tobias*, he used the underpaint as part of the final image, painting some features of the final image entirely in this stage. In the middle zone he suggested the distant whitish road and the yellow land beside it using one loaded brush stroke each in white and yellow, with a glimpse of the gray ground between to define the boundary (Fig. 37). In the foreground he worked the underpaint in thin washes that modified the color of the gray ground.

Like all the other Mannerist landscape artists studied, De Momper allowed the underpaint stage to dry before returning for the final painting. For the final painting De Momper worked in zones from the back of the composition toward the front. In each zone he worked in discrete stages over a number of days. For example, he painted the buildings of the *Village Scene* on three different days—painting the mid-tones first, then the darks, and finishing with highlights—allowing the paint to dry between each session. In some areas the final painting consists only of a few fluent details: creamy impasted highlights or the calligraphic details of the foreground in transparent brown paint. The large scale of the painting affected De Momper's practice; details are widely spaced, often allowing the underpaint to serve the primary role in the final image.

In each painting the figure painter placed figures and animals (and, in the case of the *Village Scene*, boats) into the foreground areas where De Momper had avoided painting any landscape details (Fig. 38 and Fig. 41). These artists' working practices...
differed somewhat from De Momper's, either from personal preference or from the practical requirements of inserting figures into a composition. Both Jan Brueghel II and Vranckx sketched the figures into place over the landscape with a thin paint before working them up with the final paint. In the Village Scene, Brueghel sketched the figures in a thin brown paint, which can be seen both with the microscope through gaps in the finished paint and (since the paint included some black pigment) with infrared reflectography. He used the sketch in the finished image, varying the degree of finish to suggest distance. In both of the loaded boats, for example, he sketched the boat itself, the figures, and the cargo in one sitting. In the nearer boat he then worked up the cargo with a yellow paint, but in the furthest boat, with raised sail, the sketch alone served as the final image (Fig. 39).

The snowy Winter Landscape offered De Momper the opportunity for even more efficient variants in his technique. He created the grayish tone of the snow in parts of this painting without the use of any underpaint. In such passages he let the unmodified gray ground fill the role of underpaint and worked the snowy final details directly on the ground (Fig. 41). He created the fine branches bent down by snow with vivid, direct painting in a single color (Fig. 42).

Joos de Momper loosened the traditional landscape painting process to a degree that created his characteristically vivid, virtuoso handling. But De Momper did not in any way repudiate that tradition. Even when he worked with somewhat muted colors, he divided his paintings into the three familiar zones of distance, and worked each zone up independently. He painted over many days, allowing each stage to dry before
returning to the painting. And even though he sometimes took the shortcut of using the ground color as the underpaint in places, he preserved the basic Mannerist structure in which an underpaint in a range of colors defined the broad areas of the composition and established the color scheme of the final painting.

**Successors to the Antwerp Mannerist landscape tradition**

This brief discussion will consider two techniques that were observed in three paintings probably dating from the 1630s. These were painted at the end of the Mannerist landscape tradition, when artists began to introduce variations in the long-established painting methods. These two techniques—the use of a monochrome painted sketch, and the execution of large areas in a single sitting, painting wet-into-wet—have not been observed to date in any of the Mannerist landscape paintings discussed.

By the 1630s history and genre painters (Rubens and Brouwer among others) often laid out their compositions with a monochrome painted sketch, usually in a dark brown, fluid paint and often superimposed over a brief underdrawing. Such a sketch could be purely linear or it could also include broad areas of wash that defined shadows. After it was dry, the artist applied the final paint layers directly over the sketch, at times entirely hiding it, and at times allowing it to play a prominent role as

---

129. As noted earlier, to avoid confusion in this study I use the term, painted sketch, for such a layer. Though such a sketch was sometimes called a "dead color" the same term was also applied at other times to the layer I call a colored underpaint. a first paint layer in various colors that established the tone of the final paint layers. Van de Graaf, *Het De Mayerne manuscript*, 142-143, no. 22, 150, no. 31a; 151-152, no. 33; Van de Wetering, "Painting materials and working methods," 20-24.
shadows in the final image. This sketch was qualitatively different from the details in brown paint seen in landscapes such as De Momper's Village Scene because it served as a preliminary design rather than the final touches.

Two paintings by successors to the Mannerist landscape tradition, a later follower of Joos de Momper and the young David Teniers, included a limited use of the brown painted sketch. In each case, the artist restricted the brown sketch to the brown foreground of the composition, maintaining the traditional three zones of color. But in each case the brown sketch was not a final step, analogous to the dark paints applied over the landscape by figure painters; nor was the brown paint simply the foreground zone of the underpainting stage. These two artists, like contemporary history painters, designed their compositions in a brown painted sketch as an independent part of the design process, before applying any paint.

One is a Mountain Landscape in Oberlin (Fig. 43). Though the museum attributes the work to Joos de Momper, it seems more like the work of a later imitator. In his monograph Klaus Ertz associated this painting with a group of mountain landscapes to which he assigned the name of Joos de Momper's son, Philippe. Though clearly close to De Momper's handling, the technique of this landscape seems to echo De Momper without achieving his evocative fluency and variety of touch (Fig. 44).


131. Ertz, Josse de Momper der Jüngere, 425, 426, 638.
While this artist mimicked De Momper's handling, his procedure varied in one important aspect. In this painting he indicated a few major forms of the landscape in a brief underdrawing over the white ground, but he then seems to have sketched out the foreground and dark landscape mass on the left with a transparent brown paint (Fig. 45). The important difference between this brown paint and the brown foregrounds of traditional Mannerist landscapes is that this artist painted the brown sketch as an independent design stage. It is not part of the colored underpaint. Only after the brown sketch was dry did he return to the traditional painting sequence: laying out the sky and then a range of colored underpaints. This artist seems to have adapted the brown painted sketch that was current in the practice of genre and history painters in Antwerp, as discussed above, and made it function within the traditional landscape procedure.

A brown sketch also was observed in another painting by a successor to the Mannerist landscape tradition. David Teniers the Younger painted *Saints Anthony and Paul in a Landscape*, in Oberlin (Fig. 46), in the mid-1630s, when he was strongly under De Momper's influence. Teniers did a quick underdrawing in the landscape using a dry drawing medium, but he laid out the figures and the cottage using a brown-black painted sketch. This sketch was restricted to figures and architecture rather than the landscape proper, but in a significant departure from traditional Mannerist landscape technique Teniers made this sketch at the beginning of the painting process, not over a completed landscape. In painting the landscape he used the sketch just as

contemporary history and genre painters did: to guide him when he left reserves for the foreground figures, and to serve as shadows in the final image.

In one other aspect, Saints Anthony and Paul in a Landscape and the final painting to be discussed in this chapter, the Vista from a Grotto (Fig. 48) in Washington, seem "modern" by comparison with traditional Mannerist landscapes. In each case the artist abandoned the intermediate stage of an overall mid-tone underpaint, proceeding directly from the design to the final painting. Teniers worked his final paints directly over the underdrawing and painted sketch and though he worked from the back of the composition to the front in clearly defined zones of different colors, he painted each zone in a single sitting, wet-into-wet; he did not build up successive details in discrete layers. Most surprisingly, he painted even the largest of these zones, the rocks and cavern of the foreground, in one sitting (Fig. 47).

One final painting to be discussed here in the context of successors to the Mannerist landscape tradition illustrates the difficulty of attributing paintings within a strongly conventionalized tradition. The Vista from a Grotto is attributed by the National Gallery of Art to Joos de Momper, and by Ertz (in his monograph on De Momper) to David Teniers. A project to investigate this attribution by technical means is still in progress, but there seem to be parallels to some of Teniers' techniques in the Saints Anthony and Paul in a Landscape. The absence of figures may indicate

133. Ertz, Josse de Momper der Jüngere, 410, cat. A213.

134. A technical study of a Landscape with a Grotto by Joos de Momper (Yale University Art Gallery inv. no. 1965.134) is planned.
that this is an unfinished work, which was never completed by a figure painter, or it may be a sign that landscape painting was reaching new levels of independence. However, whether it is attributed to De Momper or to Teniers, this small landscape’s extraordinarily loose technique seems to place it at the end of the Mannerist landscape tradition.

The artist added a coarsely brushed gray ground over a previously prepared double ground (a chalk layer, with a thin imprimatura of earth and bone black over it). He apparently revised the ground structure for aesthetic reasons. Both the color and the vigorous brush texture of this gray layer appear throughout the final image, and there are no colored underpaints to obscure it. The handling of paint is vivid and direct, but a microscope is needed to appreciate this painting’s extraordinary freedom: the entire panel was painted in one sitting, wet-into-wet. This artist worked from the back of the composition to the front in discrete zones, but close examination reveals that along the borders the paint of each zone picked up traces of the still-wet paint of the area behind (Fig. 49). In virtually all the Mannerist paintings examined the sky was painted in a first stage along with the landscape’s underpaint; later details were painted over the dry paint. But this artist painted the weeds that trail down from the opening of the cave directly into the wet paint of the sky, creating a range of tones by swirling his dark paint into the pale layer below (Fig. 50).

In large works like the Village Scene and Winter Landscape, Joos de Momper worked with a freedom that contributed to his personal style, but he did not eliminate any steps in the usual landscape painting process. He laid out the landscape with an
overall mid-tone underpaint before returning to execute the final painting. Possibly further study will reveal that in small works De Momper could set aside procedures that were essential to the landscape painting tradition, such as the use of zones of colored underpaint, and the ordered working method that built up detail over a matter of days. Or further study might possibly indicate that De Momper’s technique underwent a radical change in his last years. It is perhaps more likely that a continued investigation will confirm the preliminary evidence of a strikingly similar technique in the *Vista from a Grotto* and the wet-in-wet foreground of Teniers’ *Saints Anthony and Paul in a Landscape* suggesting that the Washington painting might be attributed instead to the young Teniers. In any case, the loosening of the technique seen in these paintings is evidence that in the course of the 1630s in Antwerp the technical tradition of Southern Netherlandish landscape painting lost its hold after 120 years of dominance. Artists varied what had, until this time, been a virtually unvariable procedure.

In the context of the Northern Netherlandish paintings of the 1610s and 1620s that will be discussed in later chapters, these successors to the Antwerp Mannerist landscape tradition seem more reactive than innovative. But this brief discussion of three later paintings highlights how persistent that conservative tradition was. For over a century Antwerp landscape painters seem to have taken for granted that they must paint on light-colored grounds; that they must lay out their composition in an underdrawing; that they must block out the zones of distance with colored underpaints, and then work up the final painting zone by zone in a meticulous, disciplined method.
Even as Antwerp artists in the 1630s worked in a looser technique and abandoned the colored underpaint stage, they preserved the traditional broad color range and division into zones of distance. On the other hand, Northern Netherlandish landscape painters were willing to turn away from this tradition. Their ability to undertake a new approach to landscape is the basis for their achievements in developing a newly naturalistic form of landscape.

This chapter has described a conservative working method, based on long-standing tradition, which the Mannerist landscape artists of Antwerp followed with remarkable unanimity. This chapter’s focus on these paintings may somewhat obscure the fact that such unanimity is unusual. In any technical tradition there is scope for individual variations, and some of these have been noted in this chapter. But the revelation of this study is not the degree of variation from the standard practices of Southern Netherlandish landscape technique, but the remarkable degree to which Antwerp landscape painters followed that standard practice.
CHAPTER 3: THE SOUTHERN NETHERLANDISH LANDSCAPE

TRADITION IN THE NORTH: GILLIS VAN CONIXLOO AND ROELANDT SAVERY

The landscape painting tradition centered in Antwerp from its sixteenth-century beginnings evolved and thrived well into the seventeenth century. Around the turn of the century, this tradition established outposts in the Northern Netherlands. Here the tradition underwent further evolution in a range of artistic responses to the South Netherlandish tradition. This chapter will focus on two painters—Gillis van Coninxloo and Roelandt Savery—who evolved influential new landscape types but remained faithful to the South Netherlandish tradition in the organizing principles and, especially, in the technique of their landscape paintings. By the 1620s, the period of Savery’s later career, there was already great diversity within North Netherlandish landscape painting. As a counterpoint to Coninxloo’s and Savery’s practices, the chapter will close with a brief discussion of two paintings by Cornelis Vroom and Jacob Pynas, whose more experimental painting techniques reflected different pictorial goals.

Emigration to the Northern Netherlands

The developments in landscape painting in Antwerp discussed in the first two chapters must be seen against the background of the uprising of the Low Countries against Spanish rule. The dislocations of war created the difficult economic conditions that shaped the Antwerp art market. In 1585 Antwerp was retaken from the insurgents
by the Spanish, and subsequently its port was idled through the blockade of the River Scheldt by the forces of the United Provinces. The drastic effect of war on the art market is documented by the rent for the Schilderspand, the official gallery for the sale of pictures. In 1540, when the gallery was set up at the Bourse, it was the first such permanent exhibition space in Europe. In 1565 the director was paying an annual rent of 1,258 florins. Over time the charges were adjusted downward to reflect the gallery's income, and by 1598 the rent was just 200 florins a year. The policies of the Roman Catholic Spanish government also had an effect on the production of art in Antwerp. After 1585 Philips Galle, who had focused the production of his publishing house on the market for humanist prints, seems to have found a more favorable market for works with an emphatically Catholic iconography. A most important consequence of religious persecution and the dramatic drop in trade was an exodus to the Northern Netherlands. Merchants, skilled artisans, and many artists left the city. In the 1580s the population of Antwerp was scarcely half the level of 1550.

The Northern Netherlands profited dramatically from the misfortunes of the south. With the blockade of Antwerp, Amsterdam became the dominant port in the region. This, combined with the arrival of many skilled craftspeople and merchants, contributed to an unprecedented level of economic prosperity. As Jan Briels has pointed out, the population influx had a significant effect on the development of art in

135. Filipczak, Picturing Art in Antwerp, 21, 41.


137. Filipczak, Picturing Art in Antwerp, 213, n. 3.
the Northern Netherlands. In the 1580s and 1590s the artistic community was
suddenly enlarged by the arrival of many talented artists in the middle of their careers,
and by their children, many of whom embarked on artistic careers. The art-buying
public, too, was expanded by merchants and intellectuals whose taste had been shaped
in the Southern Netherlands.

At this time there was no established tradition of independent landscape
painting in the Northern Netherlands, though history painting and portraiture were both
well-established specialities. Landscape settings were used for biblical narratives (for
example in the works of Lucas van Leyden, Jan van Scorel, and Maerten van
Heemskerck), but the figures and the narrative predominated. Though Heemskerck
did paint at least one independent landscape, the Panoramic Landscape with the

138. J. G. C. A. Briels, "De Zuidnederlandse immigratie in Amsterdam en
Haarlem omstreeks 1572-1630: Met een keuze van archivale gegevens betreffende
de kunstschilders" (Ph.D. diss, Rijksuniversiteit Utrecht, 1976). J. G. C. A. Briels,

139. For the lack of independent landscapes see, for example, recent surveys of
painting in the Northern Netherlands at the end of the sixteenth century and beginning
of the seventeenth century in Bob Haak, The Golden Age: Dutch Painters of the
and Ger Luijten, Ariane van Suchtelen, Reinier Baarsen, Wouter Th. Kloek, and Marijn
Schapelhouman, ed., Dawn of the Golden Age: Northern Netherlandish Art
Abduction of Helen of Troy of 1535 now in Baltimore,\textsuperscript{140} he painted this work in Rome for Italian buyers who saw Netherlandish artists as landscape specialists.\textsuperscript{141}

It is not surprising that independent landscapes were first produced in the Northern Netherlands by émigré artists in the 1580s and 1590s.\textsuperscript{142} Some of the first arrivals settled in Middelburg, in Zeeland,\textsuperscript{143} but soon Southern Netherlandish artists established themselves further north as well, particularly in Amsterdam and Haarlem.\textsuperscript{144}

\textsuperscript{140} Rainald Grosshans, \textit{Maertin van Heemskerck: die Gemälde} (Berlin: H. Boettcher, [1980]).

\textsuperscript{141} The technique of the Panoramic Landscape also reveals its Italian origins. In this work Heemskerck used materials that were typical in Rome at the time: oil paint on a coarsely-woven canvas with a gesso ground. Northern paintings on canvas were still typically executed in the tüchlein technique described above (paint with a glue medium on unprimed canvas). See E. Melanie Gifford, "Maerten Van Heemskerck's Panoramic Landscape With the Rape of Helen: An Italian Painting by a Northern Artist," \textit{The American Institute for Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works: Abstracts of Papers Presented at the Eighteenth Annual Meeting, Richmond, Virginia, May 30-June 3, 1990} (Washington, D.C.: A. I. C., 1990). There is intriguing archival evidence that Heemskerck (or another Northern artist) may have continued to produce such works for Italian clients some years after his return to the Netherlands. The correspondence of a Haarlem merchant based in Antwerp describes paintings he commissioned from "our Martin" on behalf of an Italian colleague. The works he ordered sound extraordinarily like the Baltimore painting: oil paintings on fabric depicting landscapes with mythological scenes and ruins. See Florence Edler, "Deux tableaux inconnus de Martin van Heemskerck," \textit{Mededeelingen van het Nederlandsch Historisch Instituut te Rome} second series, VI (1936): 87-90.

\textsuperscript{142} J. G. C. A. Briels, "De zuidnederlandse bijdrage tot het ontstaan van de Hollandse landschapshilderkunst circa 1600-1630" (Master's thesis, Université Catholique de Louvain, 1967).


\textsuperscript{144} Most of the following biographical data are cited in Sutton, \textit{Dutch 17-th Century Landscape}. See also Briels, "De zuidnederlandse bijdrage," 20-101 for useful biographies (some out of date) of 175 Northern landscapists associated with the South.
New arrivals such as Hans Bol and Gillis van Coninxloo were mature artists when they moved to the north. Bol settled briefly in Middelburg and Bergen op Zoom in 1584/6, then moved to Dordrecht, Delft, Haarlem, and finally to Amsterdam in 1591 for the last two years of his life. Coninxloo also spent a short time in Zeeland after leaving Antwerp in 1585, then spent 8 years in the Protestant expatriate community of Frankenthal, in Germany. In 1595 he arrived in Amsterdam, where he, too, finished his career, dying in 1607. Younger emigrants born in the 1560s and 1570s, such as Jacob Savery and David Vinckboons, began their training in Antwerp, where Savery studied with Hans Bol and possibly Coninxloo, and Vinckboons studied with his father, Philip. They moved to north with their families, completing their training in Haarlem and Amsterdam, Savery with Bol and Vinckboons with an unknown master. Artists such as Esaias van de Velde and Hercules Segers were born to expatriate families in Amsterdam and Haarlem, and trained with older émigrés such as Gillis van Coninxloo.

Artists from the Southern Netherlands brought with them the long-established landscape tradition of narrative subjects set in a fantastic, rocky scenery no more representative of the actual landscape in the Northern Netherlands than in the South. Their works also followed Mannerist landscape conventions in which spatial recession was defined by three arbitrary zones of color and an abstractly constructed system of coulisses. The older painters also brought with them the technical tradition of landscape painting and trained younger artists who worked with them in these techniques.
However, to attribute virtually all subsequent developments in landscape painting in the Northern Netherlands to the influence of Southern Netherlandish émigrés, as Jan Briels seems to do, ignores the difference in the artistic climates of the North and the South. The great wave of immigration was primarily limited to the 1580s and 1590s. After this period only an occasional artist moved permanently to the North.145 At least in part, this pattern must be due to a considerable restoration of the economy of the Southern Netherlands in the first two decades under the archdukes Albert and Isabella.146 By considering the children born in the North to immigrant families as Southern Netherlandish immigrants, Briels exaggerates the importance of immigration as the primary influence on artistic developments in the Northern Netherlands.

In the Northern Netherlands the wave of immigrants intersected with, and contributed to, an intellectual and cultural climate that was evolving into something qualitatively different from the climate of the Southern Netherlands. The degree of difference, and the point at which Northern and Southern Netherlands considered themselves to be different is a matter of some debate.147 However, even a discussion

---


limited to landscape representation offers abundant evidence that there was a
difference. After the first decade of the seventeenth century, stylistic and technical
developments in landscape of the Northern Netherlands no longer paralleled
developments in the south, but diverged in new naturalistic directions.

Landscape in the north, however, did not evolve in isolation. Artists continued
to travel freely in both directions, not only during the 12 Year Truce of 1609 to 1621,
but during periods of hostility as well. There was a long-established association of
Haarlem artists with Antwerp publishing houses, especially that of Hieronymus Cock.
Just the year after the recapture of Antwerp by the Spanish, the Antwerp publishing
house of Plantin offered to establish Haarlemer Hendrick Goltzius there for eight years
while he engraved Bernardo Passaro’s illustrations for the Natalis Bible. In 1613
Rubens, Jan Brueghel I, and Hendrik van Balen were sent by the archdukes on an
official diplomatic mission to the Northern Netherlands. Jan Porcellis, who had
emigrated to Rotterdam with his parents as a child in 1584, fell into bankruptcy during

Netherlandish Art, 1580-1620, exh. Cat. Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum," Art Bulletin
LXXVII, no. 1 (1995): 145-48; Catherine Levesque, Journey Through Landscape in
Seventeenth-Century Holland: the Haarlem Print Series and Dutch Identity (University
Park, PA: Pennsylvinia State University Press, 1994); H. Perry Chapman,
"Propagandist Prints, Reaffirming Paintings: Art and Community During the Twelve
Years Truce," The Public and Private in Dutch Culture of the Golden Age, ed. Arthur

148. See Orenstein et al., "Print Publishers.", including a discussion of Goltzius’
letter of 29 June, 1586 published by L. W. Nichols, "Hendrick Goltzius. Documents
and Printed Literature Concerning His Life," Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek 42-

149. Sutton and Wieseman, Age of Rubens, 209.
his early career there and moved to Antwerp around 1615. Here he seems to have
undertaken to alleviate his financial difficulties through an agreement to mass-produce
paintings at a rate of two a week for twenty weeks. In 1622 he returned to the
Northern Netherlands, continuing his career in Haarlem.\textsuperscript{150} It is clear that though
immigration was of enormous importance, it was not the only form of personal contact
between artists from the North and the South.

Not only artists, but works of art as well traveled freely. Before the 1590's
landscapes in the Northern Netherlands were almost exclusively a product imported
from the Southern Netherlands. After this time landscape paintings and prints from the
Southern Netherlands continued to circulate in the Northern Netherlands. Just a few
examples will illustrate the prevalence of Southern landscapes in the North. In 1608
artists in the Amsterdam guild complained of "Brabant mass-products" sold in that city,
suggesting that such imports were an established source of competition to the growing
Amsterdam art market.\textsuperscript{151} It must be assumed that landscapes, a major part of the art
market in Antwerp, formed a significant part of the exports as well. Sixteenth-century
world landscapes also appear in Northern Netherlandish inventories. Marten van

\textsuperscript{150} John Walsh, "The Dutch Marine Painters Jan and Julius Porcellis: I Jan's
Early Career, II: Jan's Maturity and 'De Jonge Porcellis'," \textit{The Burlington Magazine}

\textsuperscript{151} Briels, "De Zuidnederlandse immigrantie," 108-109, cited by Marten Jan
Bok, "Art-Lovers and Their Paintings: Van Mander's Schilderboeck As a Source for
the History of the Art Martket in the Northern Netherlands," \textit{In Dawn of the Golden
Age: Northern Netherlandish Art 1580-1620}, exh. cat. ed. Ger Luijten, Ariane van
Suchtelen, Reinier Baarsen, Wouter Kloek, and Marijn Th. Schapelhouman
Papenbroeck, for example, an émigré merchant with a comparatively small collection, owned a landscape by Bles that showed a peddler set upon by monkeys. ¹⁵²

Drawings must have been another source of influence. Artists are particularly likely to have owned drawings by older artists, purchased at estate sales, or received as gifts or inheritances from teachers. The 1637 inventory of the painter Jan Bassé, who had emigrated from the Southern Netherlands by 1595, included a collection of drawings attributed, among others, to Pieter Bruegel.¹⁵³ In this case the subject is not specified, but the North Netherlands interest in Pieter Bruegel’s landscape drawing style that is documented in the early years of the seventeenth century (this interest is discussed in the next chapter) makes it almost certain that some landscape drawings by Bruegel were in the North.

The writings of Carel van Mander, who had arrived in Haarlem from the Southern Netherlands in 1583, offer documentary evidence of the attitudes toward the Southern Netherlands landscape tradition of the most forward-looking artistic circles in the Northern Netherlands at the end of the sixteenth century. In 1604 he published Het Schilder-Boeck, including an art treatise written in verse, Den Grondt der Edel Vry Schilder-const. The chapter of this poem devoted to landscape is the first theoretical

---

¹⁵². Van Mander, Het schilder-Boeck, fol. 219 v. Gibson suggests that this is the painting now in Dresden (Mirror of the Earth, 26 and fig. 2.51).

writing to deal with the genre. It clearly reflects the intellectual climate within which
Van Mander, Goltzius and Cornelis Cornelisz van Haarlem founded the "Haarlem
Academy" at the turn of the century (he probably wrote Den Grondt between 1596 and
1603).155

Van Mander’s writings have been cited as evidence of a new wind of naturalism
blowing through Haarlem at the turn of the century.156 He organized the chapter on
landscape as advice to a young artist whom he invites to walk in the countryside as the
sun is rising, and indeed his emphasis on observation and the natural effects that he
points out to his imagined companion are striking: “See there in front of us, hunters are
walking with their dogs through the green dewy fields: see how that trodden dew turns
a lighter tone of green, showing their footprints, and so giving away their route”
(stanza 7).157 His recommendation to make landscape drawing from life (naar het leven)

154. Van Mander, Den Grondt, Chapter 8. For a translation of this chapter into
modern English prose, see Brown, Dutch Landscape, 35-43; this is the source of the
passages that I have cited in translation. For commentary, see Miedema, Den Grondt,
vol 1, 534-558.

155. Hessel Miedema, "Karel van Mander’s ‘Grondt der edel vry schilder-
const,” Journal of the History of Ideas 34 (1973): 661 citing Helen Noë, Carel van
Mander en Italië: beschouwingen en notities naar aanleiding van zijn "Leven der dees-

156. For example by E. K. J. Reznicek, Die Zeichnungen von Hendrik Goltzius
mit einen beschreibenden Katalog (Utrecht: Haetjens Dekker & Gumbert, 1961): 17-
26. See Miedema, "Karel van Mander's ‘Grondt.’" for an alternative view.

157. Siet ginder voor ons die Jaghers met Honden
Lopen door die groen overdouwde velden.
Hy siet dien gheslaghen douw ons vermelden/
En met een groender groente hem verlappen/
Alwaer sy henen zijn/aen t’spoor der stappen.
a part of the artist’s early morning ritual seems to be a new practice, and is reflected in
three astonishingly direct drawings of the landscape around Haarlem by Goltzius. The
new emphasis on landscape drawing that Goltzius’ drawings and Van Mander’s treatise
reflect is vitally important for the newly naturalistic approach to landscape in the
Northern Netherlands and will be discussed in more detail in the following chapter.

In the context of landscape painting Van Mander articulated an approach that
shows him to be firmly rooted in the Southern Netherlandish landscape tradition.
Clearly he described independent landscape paintings rather than landscape
backgrounds for history paintings. But it would be anachronistic to expect Van Mander
to recreate the countryside he had seen on that morning walk. In fact, though he
recommended observation of the local landscape, the landscapes he described, with the
“gruesome” rocks of the Alps, cascading waterfalls, and fir trees (stanzas 34, 33),
could only have been directly observed by artists who made long journeys. For the
average Northern Netherlandish artist such a landscape was far more accessible in other
works of art, specifically in landscapes of the Southern Netherlandish tradition.

Van Mander accepted the premise, as did Antwerp artists, that a landscape
would include a narrative and that the landscape itself must be adapted to suit the story:
“It is useful to know beforehand the narrative, whatever you may choose from Biblical
stories or subjects from the poets, in order to adapt your landscape accordingly”
(stanza 41).¹⁵⁸ A human presence, even beyond any narrative function, was desirable:

¹⁵⁸. T’waer goet/waert ghy u stroryken voorweter
Schriftich/of Poetich naer u benoeghen/.
Om u Landtschap daer naer t schicken beter
"Show the countryside, town and water filled with activity, and make your houses look inhabited and your roads walked on" (stanza 42).\textsuperscript{159}

Van Mander also described a compositional structure like that of South Netherlandish landscape paintings. The space was defined by zones of distance: “Both on canvas or panel the ground is usually divided into three or four parts” (stanza 18).\textsuperscript{160}

The foreground was set off by contrasting it against the middle ground, and by the use of large repousoirs: “First of all it is important to show clear contrasts in the foreground, as it pushes the other planes into the background. Ensure that something large is painted in the foreground, as was done by Bruegel and other great artists who are acclaimed for their contribution to landscape painting.” (stanza 19).\textsuperscript{161} Even the specific painting procedures that Van Mander occasionally described are entirely in the Southern Netherlandish tradition. When he said that “In the distance our blue-colored woods are painted on a ground of azurite” (stanza 32)\textsuperscript{162} he described the typical underpaint of the blue distance in an Antwerp landscape.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{159} Jae maeckt u Landt/ Stadt/ eenen Water behandelt/
U Huysen bewoonth/ u weghen bewandelt.
\item \textsuperscript{160} Welche men pleeght op doerken/ oft panneelen/
Wel veel in drien oft in vieren te deelen.
\item \textsuperscript{161} Alvooren onsen voor-grondt sal betamett
Ailtits hardt te zijn/om d'ander doen vteden/
En oock voor aen yet groots te breghen ramen/
Als Brueghel/en sulcke van groeter namen/
Die men van Landschap den pallem mach dieden:
\item \textsuperscript{162} En achter uyt ons blaeuw-verwighe bosschen/
Op gronden van assche/
\end{itemize}
Van Mander described landscape paintings enriched by direct observation (naar het leven), but which ultimately were created from the artist’s imagination (uyt den gheest). Plainly, Van Mander described not some new form of landscape, but composed, fantastic landscapes in the Antwerp tradition: what he called “U clevn Weerelt ghemaeckt” (your manufactured small world).  

Sources of the forest landscape in the Northern Netherlands

The first new landscape specialty in the Northern Netherlands was the forest interior, beginning in the late 1590s in the work of Gillis van Coninxloo, and soon after with David Vinckboons and Roelandt Savery. These forest paintings, especially the work of Coninxloo, are sometimes cited as opening a line of development leading to the naturalistic landscapes of the 1610s and 1620s. Recent research into the origins of the forest landscape, and the results of this technical study, do not entirely support that view. Specifically in terms of their technique, forest landscapes are among the last


landscapes painted in the Northern Netherlands that scarcely modify the landscape tradition born in Antwerp.

For many years the development of the forest interior was attributed to the forceful artistic personality of Coninxloo. However, it is now clear that a significant impetus behind the creation of this mode of painting was the example of Pieter Bruegel. Some 30 years after Bruegel’s death, artists seem to have taken new notice of certain themes in his art that were not abundantly illustrated in prints but were found in the less widely known paintings and drawings. This “Bruegel renaissance” is documented by reinterpretations and recreations of his work. Both Hans Bol, who had worked in Mechelen and Antwerp before moving to the North at the age of about fifty, and his student Jacob Savery were important figures in this renewed interest.

Bruegel’s work was more widely known through his prints than through his paintings, though a few artists may have had personal knowledge of some of the latter. The muted tonalities of his landscapes, especially his latest works, were largely passed over in the conventionalized landscapes painted in Antwerp toward the end of the century. If it could be established that Northern Netherlandish artists were aware of this limited color range a case could be made that Bruegel’s late landscapes contributed to seventeenth-century developments in tonal landscape painting. Yet, as discussed in the

166. The pioneering study was by Eduard Pletzsche, Die Frankenthaler Maler: ein Beitrag zur Entwicklungs geschichte der niederländischen Landschaftsmalerei1910. Reprint ed. (Soest: Davaco, 1972). For a survey of the literature see Devisscher, "Entstehung der Waldlandschaft."

167. Arndt, "Geschichte de Waldlandschaft," Gerszi, "Bruegels Nachwirkung".
previous chapter, the evidence suggests that Bruegel’s paintings were remarkably inaccessible.

Van Mander used Bruegel as the exemplar of all that landscape painting should be, yet the three paintings he recorded in Amsterdam collections are all scenes of peasant festivals, which would have had only limited landscapes. He praised Bruegel’s landscape compositions, which he would have known through engravings. He praised the coloring of Bruegel’s landscapes,168 and described the way his ground could be seen through the thin paint,169 which could imply first-hand knowledge of the landscape paintings. However, as discussed above, second-hand descriptions of Bruegel’s landscapes in the imperial collections in Prague are the most likely source of Van Mander’s emphasis on Bruegel’s landscape painting and his limited observations on Bruegel’s handling of paint.170

Hans Bol is another artist who might have seen some of Bruegel’s paintings—his long career in the South overlapped with Bruegel’s lifetime. If he knew the landscape paintings well he could have conveyed an awareness of the coloring to his students, including Jacob Savery. However, a painting on copper by Jacob Savery

---


dated 1600\textsuperscript{171} demonstrates that Savery was not influenced by Bruegel's coloring. In this Winter Landscape Savery recapitulated and conflated elements from three panels of Bruegel's monumental series of the Months to create a single season.\textsuperscript{172} Though Savery knew the compositions, he apparently did not know, or did not wish to emulate, the coloring of Bruegel's original paintings. He based the foreground on the brushy brown foregrounds of Bruegel's Return of the Herd and The Gloomy Day, a choice of this dull, snowless winter scenery that could suggest a precocious naturalism. However, when Savery reintroduced the tiny skating scene and snowy mountains that Bruegel had painted in the middle ground and distance of the Hunters in the Snow he fell back upon a conventionalized, Mannerist landscape coloring scheme. Bruegel's steely, almost monochromatic gray, white, and beige became a frosted parody of the standard green and blue zones of distance.

Drawings, being more portable and more easily copied than paintings, probably offered Pieter Bruegel's influence a wider avenue into the Northern Netherlands. As we know from the inventory of artist Jan Basse's collection (mentioned above) there were Bruegel drawings in the North. As discussed in the first chapter, Bruegel's explorations of forest interiors were limited to his drawings, where he fused his observations of nature and his awareness of Venetian woodcuts. Artists had access to one such drawing of a tangled forest interior, the Landscape with Five Bears (Fig. 9) in

\textsuperscript{171} The painting was sold at Phillips, London, December 18, 1984, lot 78; Briels, Peintres flamands en Holland, 358-361, fig. 466.

\textsuperscript{172} Reproduced in Grossman, Pieter Bruegel, figs. 87-96, 107-111.
the form of Cock's engraving of The Temptation of Christ (Fig. 10). That same
drawing, and others showing dense forests, also circulated in the form of copies by
other artists, such as a drawing at the British Museum (Fig. 51).173

Finally, not only was Bruegel's work known directly or indirectly, but a number
of late sixteenth and early seventeenth century artists continued to work within pictorial
traditions he established. Paulus Bril and Jan Brueghel the Elder, both of whom were
inspired by the elder Bruegel's work, explored forest themes in Rome in the early
1590s.174 Bril's compositions circulated in the form of prints by Egidius Sadeler.175 A
number of other artists also depicted forest motifs at this time, among them Hendrick
Goltzius and Jacques de Gheyn.176

173. Teréz Gerszi, "L'influence de Pieter Bruegel sur l'art du paysage de David
Vinckboons et de Gillis d'Hondecoeter," Bulletin Du Musée Hongrois Des Beaux-Arts
53 (1979): 220-221, attributed to Bril. The copy has usually been attributed to Jan
Brueghel the Elder (Brown, Dutch Landscape, cat. no. 11). For other drawings after
Bruegel's forests as well as drawings in this mode by Northern Netherlandish artists,
see Gerszi, "Bruegels Nachwirkung" and idem, "L'influence de Pieter Bruegel."

174. Gerszi, "Bruegels Nachwirkung."

175. Devischer, "Entstehung der Waldlandschaft", 191-202, Gerszi, "Bruegels
Nachwirkung"

176. See John Oliver Hand, J. Richard Judson, William W. Robinson, and
Martha Wolff, The Age of Bruegel: Netherlandish Drawings in the Sixteenth Century,
Goltzius (Oxford, Ashmolean Museum) and cat. 51, The Trunk of an Old Tree with a
Man Seated on the Roots by Jacques de Gheyn (Amsterdam, Rijksprentenkabinet,
Rijksmuseum).
Gillis van Coninxloo

Gillis van Coninxloo arrived in Amsterdam in 1595 after an eight year stay in the Rhineland town of Frankenthal.\(^{177}\) Although Coninxloo does not seem to have taken up pure forest landscapes until after his arrival in Amsterdam, when he came into contact with Jacob Savery and the legacy of Hans Bol, he was the preeminent master of this genre and had a profound impact on painting in the Northern Netherlands.\(^{178}\) His deep forest interiors have an enveloping immediacy that profoundly affected Northern Netherlandish artists. These paintings reinforced a growing interest in naturalism in the Northern Netherlands while depicting what was for that area a distinctly exotic landscape. His reputation was so commanding that Van Mander reported ironically that the formerly sparse trees in Holland had begun, to the best of their abilities, to grow in the lush fashion of his forests.\(^{179}\)

Until he moved to Amsterdam, Coninxloo had worked within the panoramic world landscape style. One work in this tradition is the Landscape with Venus and

\(^{177}\) Plietzsche, Die Frankenthaler Maler, 270-288.


\(^{179}\) Van Mander Het Schilder-Boeck, fol. 268.
Adonis (Fig. 52) in Cleveland, probably dating from around the time of his move. In this composition, which was examined for this study, Coninxloo juxtaposed a forested foreground high above a rural middle ground and mountainous panoramic landscape. This work shares the somewhat cold and metallic version of the three Mannerist zones of color that can be found in other paintings from the late sixteenth century, including works by Bol and Jacob Grimmer (who had remained in Antwerp). The foreground combines dark grays and browns, the middle ground is blackish green, and the distance a deep grayish blue.

Technical study of this painting shows that some ten years after his departure from Antwerp Coninxloo did not vary from the conventions of Mannerist landscape. His procedures are those of the Antwerp painters, and they reveal that Coninxloo shared those artists' conception of the structure of a landscape. Strictly segregated zones of distance defined the space, not only through compositional features (the high foreground, the castle on a rise marking the further limit of the middle ground), but also by broad areas of color established in the underpaint stage.


181. See, for example, color reproductions of panels by Bol (Briels, Peintres flamands en Holland, 308, fig. 382) and Grimmer (Franz, Zeitalter des Manierismus vol. I pl. 32).

182. The painting's worn surface and extensive repaint from old restorations obscured the examination, but even the limited examination that was possible seems to support this conclusion.
The copper support of this work facilitated a detailed and ordered handling, though this painting does not have the precious eloquence of Brueghel's much smaller *Paradise Scene* on copper, discussed in the previous chapter. Coninxloo, for example, prepared his panel with a single, thin layer of gray ground, accepting the fact that the ground did not completely obscure the scored lines that prepared the surface of the copper. The precision of the painted forms argues that Coninxloo must have used a preparatory design on the prepared surface, but none was observed in infrared examination. An underdrawing could have been hidden from view with infrared reflectography by the extensive restorations obscuring the surface, or Coninxloo could have drawn with white or red chalk on the gray ground, forms of underdrawing that cannot be perceived with this examination technique.

Coninxloo applied underpaint in thin washes of color. The gray ground shows the underpaint, giving the painting its cold tonality (Fig. 53). He defined the space with an emphatic juxtaposition of light and dark areas and zones of color, both of which he established in the underpaint stage. Within a zone he sometimes made slight variations of tone, as in the underpaint of the distance where he varied the pigment proportions to shade the color from a lighter to a deeper blue. But primarily he juxtaposed broad colors that designated light and dark areas within a zone. He used both a yellow green and a darker green for the middle ground valley and woods at the left. He underpainted the foreground coulisse on the left with an opaque dark brown. He did not work the underpaint to shape the landscape forms, but simplybrushed out areas of color with a neutral, horizontal stroke (Fig. 54).
Coninxloo applied his final paints in a disciplined, schematic manner. There seems to be little wet-into-wet painting. Instead, he superimposed the separate colors of each zone in at least three sittings, usually working from dark to light. Within each zone he worked in a restricted palette, often working almost in monochrome with a range of values in a single color rather than in a range of different colors. He built the foreground tree trunks with a first layer of transparent brown, almost hidden by stippled touches of paint in progressively lighter grays (Fig. 55), and the distance in a narrow range of cold blue greens (Fig. 53). The figures of Venus and Adonis are closely integrated into the landscape (Fig. 56). The dark color that can be seen through their abraded surface is the dark green underpaint, without final landscape details under the figures. Coninxloo must have left fairly specific reserves when he painted the final landscape details, then he used a dark paint to sketch the figures into the reserves and worked them up in colors.

The technique of the Landscape with Venus and Adonis, and Coninxloo’s approach to the structure of his landscape are entirely consistent with the South Netherlandish Mannerist landscape tradition. He focused attention on the figures, painted as an integral part of the landscape, by placing them on a high wooded foreground. He set this foreground off against a panoramic landscape spread out below, and distinguished the zones of distance by strong color differences, which he established in the underpaint and continued in the limited color ranges of the final paint in each area.
In the last twelve years of his life, however, Coninxloo closed the focus of compositions such as the Landscape with Hunters of 1605 (Fig. 57) to a densely wooded foreground that almost fills the frame. In these extraordinarily evocative paintings tiny figures almost disappear in the brown shadows of the gnarled trunks and tangled masses of exposed roots. In some late paintings Coninxloo focused the composition entirely on the forested foreground. \(^{183}\) However, in the narrow glimpses into the distance along paths or in interior glades that he included in paintings like the Hunters he preserved the Mannerist formula of a green middle zone and, occasionally, the blue distance. This manner of painting suggests that he continued to think in terms of the three zones of distance to the end of his career; in effect, Coninxloo must have conceived the compositions in which the forest fills the view as consisting entirely of the brown foreground zone.

It has not been possible to carry out technical examination of any of Coninxloo’s late forest paintings. However, examination of exhibited paintings with low magnification suggests that he did not modify the traditional system of colored underpaints for the three zones. The Landscape with Hunters seems to be based on this system, including a golden brown for the dominant foreground. If he had painted each zone in the limited range of colors and handling that he used in the Cleveland Venus and Adonis, this work, consisting almost entirely of the foreground, would have been an unrelieved brown. Instead, he varied his handling of paint and enlarged the range of

\(^{183}\) For example, the Forest Landscape of 1598 in Vaduz, reproduced in color in Sutton and Wieseman, Age of Rubens, 452.
colors that he used within each zone. In the *Landscape with Hunters* the blue distance is extremely thin, perhaps consisting of the underpaint alone. Other areas vary from thin, exposed underpaint to thick, superimposed layers of color in the lightest passages. Within the green middle-ground glade and the dark foreground, Coninxloo varied the touch and texture from thinly dragged layers to loaded touches of paint. He seems to have laid out much of the foreground over the golden brown underpaint, applying details in a transparent brown paint similar to the first layer of the tree trunks in the Cleveland *Venus and Adonis*. Unlike that painting, however, where the final layer of greens and grays hid the brown paint, the brown details on a golden underpaint dominates the darkest areas of this work. Only on parts of the large trunk on the right do superimposed touches of gray suggest patches of dappled light. And though he still based the forested foreground on browns and dark greens Coninxloo introduced lighter areas that range from grayish mid-tone greens to light yellowish tones.

In Coninxloo’s late paintings the new theme of a forest interior evolved into a mature and influential form. During his years in Amsterdam other artists took up the theme of wooded landscapes, though few of their works were as evocative and moody as Coninxloo’s deep brown, almost deserted scenes. David Vinckboons’ first forest interiors are very close to Coninxloo’s. Soon he adapted a format in which elegant modern figures appear in more open forest views. Light playing through the trees dappled these paintings with more pale greens and tans than seen in Coninxloo’s dark, moody paintings. Two years before his death Jacob Savery used a forest setting for his
Orpheus Among the Animals of 1601. While artists in Antwerp had painted animal allegories in landscapes during the second half of the sixteenth century, Savery, in using an evocative forest setting, created a new genre that later enjoyed remarkable success in the work of his brother, Roelandt Savery.

Roelandt Savery

After Jacob Savery’s death in 1603 his younger brother and student, Roelandt, traveled to Prague, where he was documented by 1604. As court painter to Emperor Rudolf II and, after Rudolf’s death in 1612, to his brother and heir, Matthias, Savery moved in the highest artistic circles. Art at the court in Prague was marked by a refined, stylized artistic vision like that of Bartholomeus Spranger and by the naturalistic observation epitomized by Joris Hoefnagel’s animal studies. Kaufmann has observed that Rudolfine artistic practice is in some ways analogous to rhetorical principles. He suggests that an artist’s approach depended on the artistic mode, or

185. On the development of this genre, and Jacob’s role, see idem, 190-205.
genre, in which he worked; history paintings called for ideal imitation of other works of art, while painters of lower genres such as landscape, Savery’s documented speciality, incorporated motifs drawn from life, giving their imagined scenes a greater sense of verisimilitude within an idealized context.\(^{187}\)

Savery had access to Joris Hoefnagel’s manuscripts of animal studies, and drew on them for his own work as early as 1603.\(^{188}\) Between 1606 and 1608 the emperor sent him on an expedition through the Tirol to make topographical drawings, and that dramatic scenery marked his art for the rest of his career. In the spirit of Rudolfine artistic practice, Savery’s drawings document directly observed details, but he incorporated them into invented landscapes. In fact, a group of drawings labeled “naer het leven,” traditionally attributed to Pieter Bruegel, have been recognized as the work of Savery, who used these figure studies as sources for details in paintings.\(^{189}\) He was closely connected to other Netherlandish landscape artists, sharing motifs with Paulus van Vianen of Utrecht and Pieter Stevens of Antwerp, who were also employed by the


emperor,\textsuperscript{190} and he could have had contact with Jan Brueghel I, who was in Prague in 1604.\textsuperscript{191} While Savery’s experience in Prague gave him a wealth of visual material to draw on, his fundamental conception of landscape, based on the Southern Netherlandish tradition in which his brother had trained him, did not alter but was enhanced by close contacts with other artists working in this mode.

Savery returned to Amsterdam in 1613 to settle the estate of his sister-in-law, and took charge of his niece, Catharina, and his nephew, Hans II, who became his student and assistant. Over the next five years he spent time in Amsterdam, Prague, and Haarlem, and in 1618 settled in Utrecht, where he joined the guild in 1619. After moving to Utrecht, Savery codified his work into a number of successful and eminently saleable themes, which he and an unknown number of assistants painted with success for twenty years. He took up the theme of exotic animals in a forest as a personal speciality, and though his access to the Emperor Rudolf’s menagerie is often cited as a critical influence, his brother Jacob’s development of the genre in Amsterdam is probably more significant than the opportunity to make life drawings in Prague.\textsuperscript{192}


\textsuperscript{191} Sutton and Wieseman, Age of Rubens, 209.

\textsuperscript{192} There is evidence that some drawings of exotic animals were not, in fact, made from life in the menagerie. A drawing of three elephants and a monkey (Sacramento, Crocker Art Museum, 1871.101) may reflect Rudolf’s interest in natural history, but there is no evidence that he actually owned an elephant. See Kaufmann, Drawings from the Holy Roman Empire, cat. 63.
Savery's conception of landscape, like that of Van Mander, was essentially in the Southern Netherlandish landscape tradition. He incorporated details that were based on close study and life drawing, but used them in highly structured, imaginary compositions. For many years he painted characteristic landscapes stamped with an exotic Tyrolean flavor that featured a rocky, forested foreground opening onto brief views of panoramic vistas beyond. Such a work, The Drink (Fig. 58), is one of a number of related compositions in which cattle pick their way on a rocky path around the fantastic ruin of a round tower dominating the middle ground. The perilous scenery calls to mind Joos de Momper's mountain panoramas, but here the forested foreground dominates the composition, and the scale is set by just a limited view of the valley at the right. Savery did not substantially alter the mode in which he worked for two and half decades. At least two of the versions of The Drink date from around 1616, before he left Amsterdam,\(^{193}\) and in 1624 in Utrecht he painted a third version of this same composition, which was examined for this study (Fig. 66).\(^{194}\) Savery continued to paint such fantastic compositions in Utrecht until his death in 1639.

**Savery and the Utrecht market for landscape paintings**

The potent impression that Coninxloo's late paintings made on his contemporaries has led some to characterize the forest landscape as the opening phase

\(^{193}\) Müllenmeister, *Roelant Savery*, 278, cat. 169 (reproduced in color, plate 32), 272, cat. 168.

\(^{194}\) Müllenmeister, *Roelant Savery*, 272, cat. 168A.
of Northern Netherlandish naturalism in landscape painting. Indeed, Coninxloo and Savery modulated the Southern Netherlandish landscape compositional conventions in ways that had lasting effects on their Northern Netherlandish contemporaries. The dominance of Coninxloo’s landscapes over their inhabitants, and the limited tonality of both painters’ forest scenes laid the groundwork for the next generation to turn their focus on the local landscape. Both artists painted their newly dominant foregrounds in a wider range of browns—light and dark browns, grays and tans—than was typical in Southern Netherlandish landscapes. In effect, much of each composition was almost monochromatic. In another way Savery was in tune with the growing interest in naturalism in the Northern Netherlands. During his time in Amsterdam and Haarlem between 1613 and 1618, his use of the landscape drawings he had made in the Tirol for closely observed details coincided with a new emphasis in those cities on landscape drawing from life. In their limited tonality and naturalistic detail, the forest interiors mark an important step away from bright fantasy vistas whose significance was bound to a narrative and may have contributed to later naturalistic innovations.

Yet in significant ways, the forest landscapes were bound to the Mannerist landscape tradition of the Southern Netherlands. Like Coninxloo, Savery did not reject the convention of three zones of color. On the contrary, while the brownish

195. Among others: Bengtsson, Rise of Realistic Landscape Painting, 16; Stechow, Dutch Landscape Painting, 65-66.

196. I am grateful to Arthur K. Wheelock, Jr. for his comments on Coninxloo’s and Savery’s influence on their contemporaries that led to my revisions of this part of my argument.
foregrounds cover much of the paintings’ surface area, the vistas beyond the
foreground still showed the other two conventionalized zones of distance. However
small the views, they included a green middle ground and a pale blue distance. The
aspects of Savery’s exotic landscapes based on his drawings in the Tirol lent his
paintings a quality of naturalism in details such as fallen fir trees. Yet the mountainous
terrain was itself a Mannerist type. Pieter Bruegel’s studies on his travels through the
Alps had imbued the convention with a new potency, and Van Mander’s description of
Alpine scenery with gruesome rocks, waterfalls in which stones “hang like icicles,” and
fir trees which “have fallen down so awkwardly you could scarcely believe it in a
dream” seems like a premonition of Savery’s paintings before he had even reached the
Tirol.197 For the rest of his career, Savery’s paintings drew on the early mountain
drawings. He seems not to have responded to the local, Netherlandish landscape.

Furthermore, this technical study shows clearly that though Savery worked in
Prague and the Northern Netherlands he, like Coninxloo, continued to use the working
methods of the Southern Netherlandish landscape tradition. While Savery was working
in Utrecht, artists like Esaias van de Velde and Jan van Goyen in The Hague and
Leiden dramatically altered traditional landscape painting practices to create a newly
naturalistic type of landscape painting. Savery, in fact, owned two paintings by

197. Van Mander, Den Grondt, chap. 8, stanza 35. Translation from Brown,
Dutch Landscape, 41.

“Merckt hoe daer de steenen/als ysen keghels/
Aen de rootsen in dien waterval hanghen”
... “En hoe weemt ligghen die/wie soudt ghedrooomen”
Esaias.\textsuperscript{198} Yet the technical innovations made by Esaias and Van Goyen, which will be discussed in the next two chapters, do not seem to have affected him. Just as he modified, but did not overturn, the compositional conventions of Mannerist landscape, he did not abandon the Southern Netherlandish technical tradition, but made subtle variations in it.

In the absence of written records such as diaries, letters, or treatises, it is difficult to establish artists’ motivations. However, artists’ actions can contribute to our understanding. While Coninxloo and Savery significantly modified the compositional conventions of Mannerist landscape painting, they did not take exception to the underlying concept that painted landscapes should depict exotic—often imaginary—lands. Savery’s adherence to the established practices of landscape painting, which were particularly suited to the depiction of fantasy landscapes, suggests that his goal was not to decisively overturn that tradition. Conversely, there is circumstantial evidence that Savery’s move from Amsterdam to Utrecht helped him to maintain access to a market that was receptive to his landscape style.

The Mannerist landscape style was favored by upper-class collectors in the North,\textsuperscript{199} and the painters of forest interiors catered to the aristocracy and the upwardly

\textsuperscript{198} A lawsuit filed immediately after his death lists some of his collection, including “two small works by Esaias van de Velde, original” (twee kleine stukkxkens sijnde principaealen van Isaias van de Velde’); cited by Bok, "Art-Lovers and their paintings," 316.

mobile. In Vinckboon's forests the figures depict the country pursuits of the wealthy, such as elegant picnics or hunting (a pursuit that was by law restricted to the nobility).\textsuperscript{200} When Savery moved to Utrecht in 1618, he was a famous artist. With the imprimatur of an appointment to the imperial court of Prague, his paintings must certainly have had an aristocratic cachet. While the style of landscape painting in much of the Northern Netherlands evolved into a far more naturalistic mode in the 1620s and 1630s, Savery's paintings continued to find a congenial market in Utrecht and among upper-class buyers.\textsuperscript{201} Though Amsterdam certainly had an upper-class elite to whom such paintings appealed (in 1621 an Amsterdam merchant bought a Noah's Ark from Savery for 650 guilders),\textsuperscript{202} aristocratic tastes dominated the art market in Utrecht, where the rural nobility was a more influential social force than in other cities in the United Provinces. Artistic tastes in court circles at The Hague also favored Utrecht artists, and Savery was seen as one of the leading figures. In the inventories of the collections of the stadtholder, Prince Frederick Hendrik, artists from the Southern Netherlands and Utrecht predominated, including four paintings by Savery.\textsuperscript{203} And

\textsuperscript{200} Briels Peintres flamands en Holland, 348-351.

\textsuperscript{201} For a discussion of patronage issues in The Hague, Utrecht, and Amsterdam, see Alison McNeil Kettering, The Dutch Arcadia, Pastoral Art and Its Audience in the Golden Age (Totowa, N.J.: Allanheld and Schram, 1983): 11-19.

\textsuperscript{202} Bok, "Art-Lovers and their paintings," 315.

when in 1626 the States of Utrecht wished to make a princely gift, they paid Savery 700 guilders for a painting to be presented to Amalia van Solms, the wife of Frederick Hendrik.204

Landscape painting in Utrecht in the seventeenth century had a distinct character shaped, at least in part, by the preferences of art buyers in that city for Mannerist and, in later decades, Italianate landscapes. Utrecht collectors like Baron Vincent van Wytterhorst owned Mannerist and Italianate landscapes by Utrecht artists, including Savery; even when Van Wytenhorst bought art outside Utrecht, he avoided naturalistic landscapes.205 In other parts of the Northern Netherlands market preferences in the 1620s and 1630s might have penalized Savery for his stylized paintings, but the art market of Utrecht, dominated by the nobility with a taste for Flemish artists,206 seems to have welcomed him. The careers of other landscape painters reflect these market forces as well. Gillis de Hondecoetre, who was strongly influenced by Savery during his years in Utrecht, moved tentatively away from a Mannerist style and toward greater naturalism after he left Utrecht for Amsterdam (where he is recorded by 1628).207 And Herman Saftleven, whose early works painted in Rotterdam


206. Kettering, Dutch Arcadia, 13-16.

reflect the naturalistic landscapes of Jan van Goyen, turned to an Italianate style after his move to Utrecht in 1632. Shortly after his move he shared a commission with Abraham Bloemaert, Cornelis Poelenburgh, and Dirck van Lisse for a cycle of arcadian paintings illustrating Il pastor fido by Guarini.208

The study of Savery’s painting techniques indicates that he produced his mountain and forest scenes using the painting practices of the Southern Netherlandish landscape tradition in which he had been trained. He subtly modified the compositional formulas and color schemes of Mannerist landscapes, but he carried out these changes without changing the essential features of the long-established landscape painting techniques. Indeed, Savery’s move to Utrecht shows a conscious decision to continue working in the Southern Netherlandish mode of landscape. His painting technique contributed to the refined, decorative qualities that appealed to the Utrecht market. In his autograph paintings, he worked in an extraordinarily meticulous and labor-intensive practice, something that was only economically feasible because of the high prices he received for his work. He also seems to have trained studio assistants to produce paintings that approximated his style, almost certainly for lower prices.

**Standard painting practice in the Savery workshop**

Five paintings associated with Savery were examined for this study. All these works date from the years in Utrecht, at least four from Savery’s first decade in the

city. The technical study offers substantial evidence on the characteristics of his refined and meticulous painting methods during the productive second half of his career. Though this was not the period of his greatest innovations, Savery’s work was well received—and well rewarded—in Utrecht. His painting process reflects the high prices he received, and this process contributed to the stylized, decorative qualities of his paintings.

Any consideration of Savery’s painting practices is complicated by difficult questions of workshop participation. Yet technical examination can also shed light on this issue. Five paintings are, admittedly, a limited sample but this preliminary study offers evidence that supports distinctions between the paintings that can be made on the basis of style. The discussion will begin by characterizing Savery’s approach to landscape through the common features in three paintings with very similar structures: *The Creation of Birds of 1619* (Fig. 59), *Orpheus with Beasts and Birds of 1622* (Fig. 63), and *Landscape with the Flight into Egypt of 1624* (Fig. 66). The basic painting procedure is very similar in these three works. But as the discussion of the

---

209. I am most grateful to Joaneath Spicer, Murnaghan Curator of Renaissance and Baroque Art, The Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore, for discussions on Savery and on the attributions of the paintings examined in this study, including a fruitful discussion in the galleries of the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, in March, 1996.


technical examinations will show, differences in handling suggest that Savery himself painted the London Orpheus and the Washington Flight, but that a workshop assistant versed in Savery’s methods was responsible for the Cambridge Creation of Birds. The discussion will broaden to consider two other works which vary significantly from the standard set of painting procedures: Orpheus of 1628 (Fig. 71)\textsuperscript{213} and the undated Landscape with Ruins and Animals (Fig. 75). In the first case, there is evidence for collaboration in a work of the highest quality. Examination of the second, and far more modest, painting suggests that Savery’s workshop may have adapted his techniques in the production of lower-priced variants.\textsuperscript{214}

The Cambridge and Washington paintings all have light-colored grounds that contribute to the light, clear tonalities of the paintings. The Cambridge Creation of Birds was painted on a panel prepared with a warm tan ground, the Cambridge Orpheus was painted on a copper panel prepared with a yellowish-gray ground, and the Washington panel has a white ground.\textsuperscript{215} Infrared reflectography was not available in every examination, but when it was used no underdrawing was observed (one

\textsuperscript{213} Müllenmeister, Roelant Savery, 299, cat. 213.

\textsuperscript{214} Montias, “Cost and value,” 465, n. 15 notes his suspicions that some paintings attributed to Savery in Amsterdam inventories were in fact copies or imitations, apparently on the basis of a considerable disparity in the values recorded.

\textsuperscript{215} The two wood panels have double grounds. The color described is an upper ground over a chalk first ground. The copper panel was prepared with a single ground. The different ground colors subtly affect the overall tone of each painting, although Savery virtually never painted so loosely that the ground itself serves as a color in the final image. With this limited sample it is hard to estimate how much the choice of a specific ground color was deliberate, and how much was happenstance.
exception to this observation will be discussed below). Savery could have used white, red, or brown drawing materials that would not be perceived by this method, or could have drawn in a delicate technique that was obscured by the several layers of paint in his complex technique. As in Coninxloo’s *Venus and Adonis*, the precision of the painted forms in all Savery’s paintings argues that he must have routinely laid out some preliminary design on the prepared panel. By the same reasoning, the precision of the paintings suggests that when Savery applied his underpaint, he worked thinly enough for the underdrawing to show through.

Savery not only continued to use the underpaint stage of the traditional Southern Netherlandish landscape painting system, he gave it an important role in defining his compositions. His underpaint entirely covered the panel with areas of soft mid-tone colors. These laid out not only the range of tones in the landscape but included patches of underpaint for the largest animals in the compositions. In his underpaint Savery made the traditional color distinctions of the three zones of distance, but he significantly enlarged the color range within each zone, especially in the dominant brown foregrounds, which he subdivided into brown shadowed areas and tan lighted sections. With these color variations, and with more pronounced variations of light and dark than Coninxloo’s, he wove a complex and decorative pattern over the surface of the painting. The Washington *Flight into Egypt* gives a glimpse of green middle distance in a glade beyond the central tower, and a blue panoramic distance on the right, but the brown foreground occupies by far the greatest part of the composition. Savery extended this brown color harmony to include not only a warm
brown underpaint in the shadows, but also a range of tans and grays in the lighter foreground that range from a bluish gray under the stream to a mauve gray under the ruined tower (Fig. 67).

Savery used the underpaint in a sophisticated way to evoke elusive visual effects. In the middle ground trees of the Cambridge Orpheus with the Beasts and the Birds (Fig. 64) he used a gray-green underpaint beneath the conifers, and yellow green under the light-colored trees. He did not abruptly juxtapose the different colors of underpaint, but suggested the play of dappled light by interlacing the strokes of color where the trees overlap. In the Washington Flight into Egypt Savery exposed a band of underpaint to create the rays of light that pierce the clouds to the left of the tower (Fig. 68). The contrast between this band and the fully developed foliage beside it suggests the dazzling effect of bright sunlight. The exposed underpaint created a streak of bleached, unsaturated color and indistinct detail.

Savery’s painting sequence in his final paint was essential for the crisp contrasts and meticulous details that characterize his paintings. Beginning with the furthest distance he worked up the final paints one zone at a time, and painted each zone over several days. In the landscapes there are scarcely any passages of wet-into-wet painting, or of blended colors. Instead, he worked by superimposing touches of distinctly different paints, first dark colors then lights, over the mid-toned underpaint. In each zone he painted the landscape first, reserving spaces for the animals, then painted the animals into these reserves before moving to the next zone. Only when it
would have been impractical to hold a reserve (for the smallest, most distant animals) did he paint figures over the completed landscape.

Savery must have been able to see some preliminary design through the underpaint, because at the lower edge of each zone he left extraordinarily detailed reserves for overlapping elements from the nearer zone. By using exact reserves he avoided overlaps that would have diminished his characteristic sharp contrasts and silhouettes. A detail of the Cambridge *Orpheus with the Beasts and the Birds*, with a dark goat silhouetted against the sparkling waterfall, illustrates his precise touch and meticulous reserves (Fig. 65). In the brightly lit waterfall he painted over tan underpaint in a series of stages—grays, brown, and a ruddy peach color—and he finished with streaks and minute touches of white to create the splash of falling water. But even in these tiny points of white paint Savery left exact reserves for the two curving goat horns that he was to paint next.

Savery developed the final details in the painting process, having designed most of the composition by the time he had completed the underpaint stage. As did most Southern Netherlandish landscape painters (or their collaborators), Savery began painting the figures by sketching them onto the underpaint in a thin, brown-black paint. Savery, however, used this procedure more extensively than the Antwerp painters and laid out landscape details as well. In the Washington *Flight into Egypt* infrared reflectography revealed the broad calligraphic lines of this elegant painted sketch. Close examination with magnification revealed that most of the lines seen in the infrared image correspond to dark painted outlines applied over the underpaint that can still be
glimpsed through gaps in the final paint layers. An infrared detail from the lower right of the Washington painting shows how Savery outlined the head of a cow, and described the landscape with dots and sinuous contours (Fig. 69).

Like Coninxloo, Savery described the darkest foreground with transparent brown details over a golden underpaint (Fig. 70). But Savery expanded the range of colors and of values in the foreground more than Coninxloo had. Just as he used a wider range of tones in his underpaint, he also expanded the range of his final paints, especially in brightly lit foreground passages. He added final details in gray and tan, but also in ruddy pink, yellow, and white over the gray and tan underpaints of the waterfall in the Cambridge painting and the stream in the Washington painting (Fig. 65; Fig. 67).

Savery’s refined and meticulous painting technique was labor-intensive and time-consuming, but only this procedure, in which he waited for each day’s work to dry before returning, could produce such a rich texture of crisply defined details. Savery’s materials, too, reflect his exacting standards; his skies depended on the pure color of costly ultramarine. In both the Washington Flight into Egypt and the Cambridge Creation of Birds he first laid out the blue sky with a layer with a dark tone of the blue-glass pigment, smalt. This was an inexpensive way to establish the basic blue color, but even strongly colored smalt cannot duplicate the depth of tone of ultramarine. In both cases Savery enriched the color with a far more costly second layer based on ultramarine.\(^{216}\)

\(^{216}\) Just one sample was available from the sky of the Cambridge Orpheus with the Beasts and the Birds, but it too includes ultramarine and lead white. This sample, which was taken from a light-colored area of sky at the edge of the panel, has only a
When Savery moved to Utrecht in 1618, he must have established a workshop to meet the demand for his work. His nephew and assistant, Hans Savery, joined him in December of 1619, but as an exceptionally successful artist Savery is likely to have had other assistants as well whom he had brought with him when he moved. The creations of Birds (Fig. 59) at Cambridge seems to be an example of the workshop’s production. Though it is signed and dated 1619, it does not seem to be an autograph painting. A comparison to Orpheus with the Beasts and the Birds (Fig. 63), also at Cambridge, illustrates the difference in handling. Although the paintings are of almost the same size, the animals in The Creations of Birds are broadly painted. They have none of the acutely rendered detail of the many creatures in the Orpheus. The foliage of the The Creations of Birds is soft and formless, with a formulaic repetition of the patterns of leaves and branches. The trees in the Orpheus are closely observed: spindly fir trunks bristling with bare branches, the tenuous hold of roots and branches in an overhanging bank. The compositional structure is close to that of the Cambridge Orpheus, with animals and landscape details silhouetted against a brightly lighted waterfall, yet the workshop assistant had not mastered Savery’s complex interweaving of lighted and shaded areas.

The Creation of Birds tellingly illustrates the difference between painting procedures and artistic skill. This painter followed Savery’s procedures, but his single layer of paint for the sky, but there may have been more layers in the more strongly colored areas.

perfunctory execution could only superficially recreate Savery’s virtuoso manner. This artist laid out the landscape with an underpainting in Savery’s typical colors—yellow green and gray green under the middle ground foliage; gray, tan, and warm brown under the foreground—and he included patches of underpaint color for the major animals. But because the areas of color meet in sharply defined boundaries the underpaint conveyed nothing of the light dappled through trees that Savery’s interwoven strokes of underpaint suggested. This artist also used the same materials as Savery, but without his finesse. Just as Savery did in the Washington Flight into Egypt, he painted the sky with a first layer of paint based on smalt, then painted the deep blue areas with a second, ultramarine layer (Fig. 61). Here again, however, he made an abrupt tonal transition that is entirely different from the subtle blending of Savery’s sky.

In the painting sequence as well, the artist of The Creation of Birds followed what must have been the standard practice in Savery’s studio. This artist painted the landscape zones in turn from the back of the composition to the front. In painting the middle ground he left strictly defined reserves into which he later painted the foreground animals. Yet minor short-cuts in the painting procedures make this landscape qualitatively different from an autograph work. This artist painted the middle ground animals in the same sitting as the landscape, rather than waiting for the landscape paint to dry. Because the wet paint blended slightly at the boundaries between the animals and the foliage he lost the crisp distinctions that are so typical of Savery’s paintings. A direct comparison of the small waterfalls in The Creation of Birds and Orpheus with the Beasts and the Birds (Fig. 62, Fig. 65) shows that the two details
were painted in the same procedure: streaking and stippling white paint over the tan underpaint and darker details of the rocks. Yet in The Creation of Birds the workshop assistant using this procedure did not convey the brilliant scattered light or the complex surface pattern that Savery did in the autograph painting.

**Collaboration and workshop adaptations of Savery’s technique**

This discussion has focused on the uniform use of materials and techniques in three paintings that seem to have been painted by Savery himself or in his workshop following his painting practice. However in two other works, the Orpheus in London, and the Landscape with Ruins and Animals in Baltimore, aspects of the technique deviate from the paintings described above in significant ways. The Orpheus seems to represent an artistic collaboration of the highest quality, while the Baltimore painting is a late evocation of Savery’s style in a reduced and streamlined technique. The following discussions, first of the Orpheus, and finally of the Baltimore landscape, will complete this chapter’s consideration of the technical evidence for Savery’s workshop procedures.

In two of the paintings discussed in the previous section, the Cambridge Orpheus with the Beasts and Birds and the Washington Flight into Egypt, the consistent handling suggests that Savery himself painted both the landscape and the animals. Savery’s standard practice in these paintings included an underpaint stage that indicated both animals and landscape with broad areas of mid-tone. Then in his final paint he completed each zone of the composition in a number of sittings, finishing each
by painting the animals into reserves in the landscape. The third work, the Cambridge
Creation of Birds, seems to have been painted by a workshop assistant closely
following the same procedures. The most significant difference in this painting was that
within each zone this artist saved time by painting both the animals and the landscape at
the same time, wet-into-wet.

In a few works, however, Savery may have enlisted the participation of
specialized artists outside his immediate workshop. A Paradise Landscape in a private
collection in the Netherlands includes the naked figures of Adam and Eve depicted in
the foreground. It has been suggested that these figures, of a scale and anatomical
detail that is unusual in Savery’s work—in the Cambridge painting Orpheus is a tiny
figure in the shadows at the upper right—were the work of Cornelis Poelenburgh.218
Likewise, Joaneath Spicer has proposed that the London Orpheus was produced
through a collaboration in which the figure of Orpheus (Fig. 74) was painted by
Cornelis Poelenburgh, the major animals by Savery, and the background animals by a
studio assistant.219 The technical study offers intriguing evidence that supports this
suggestion.

The painting sequence of the London Orpheus seems to have placed a greater
emphasis on the figures than in the other three works discussed. Most of the figures in
this work seem to have been completed before the landscape was painted, a reversal of

218. Mai, Roelandt Savery, cat. 51. The authors of the catalogue express
doubts on the reading of the inscribed date of 1625 (the year Poelenburgh returned
from Italy) and propose a dating of 1626-28 based on stylistic grounds.

the practice observed in the other works. Within the figures themselves there are differences in the painting process and in the handling of paint. Over most of the painting’s surface, as in the Washington Flight into Egypt, infrared reflectography of the London Orpheus revealed no underdrawing. One area, however, formed a significant exception: traces of a fine linear underdrawing are visible in the figure of Orpheus.

Savery’s complex handling makes the painting sequence of his works hard to interpret, but infrared reflectography and close microscopic examination of the surface suggest the following sequence. On the tan ground of the prepared panel Poelenburgh drew the figure of Orpheus (it cannot be determined whether Savery also indicated the forms of the landscape at this stage, though this seems a reasonable procedure). In the next stage Savery or his assistants laid out the entire landscape with a broadly brushed underpaint in the familiar range of mid-tones: blue-green in the distance; yellow-green in the middle ground; gray, tan, and brown in the foreground. This underpaint seems to have left the figure of Orpheus in reserve, but unlike the other paintings examined the other figures were not indicated at this stage.

Next, the two primary collaborators painted the major figures. Savery painted the foreground animals onto the underpainted landscape, first laying out their forms with a brown-black painted sketch. An infrared reflectogram detail of the cow on the right (Fig. 72, Fig. 73) reveals both the broad forms of the landscape underpaint showing through the cow, and curvilinear lines of the painted sketch like those in the
Washington Flight into Egypt.\textsuperscript{220} As in the Washington painting, those dark lines are partly visible in the final image, where they serve as shadows. At this same stage Poelenburgh painted the final image of Orpheus into the reserve in the underpaint. Not only was the working procedure different in the figure of Orpheus—with an underdrawing and a reserve held in the landscape underpaint—but the handling of paint in this figure also differs from the rest. Where long, curving strokes of paint describe the major animals, the paint in Orpheus lays out the forms with straight, brush-furrowed strokes and quick, short strokes parallel to the long direction to build volume.

Finally, the landscape setting was painted, working one zone at a time from the distance toward the foreground. As in the Washington Flight into Egypt and the Cambridge Orpheus, this process took many days with the paint drying between each sitting. In the distance and middle ground the animals were painted at this stage, integrated into the landscape in what seems to be the standard procedure. In the foreground, however, the landscape was painted around the already completed figures with extraordinary finesse. Based on this working procedure, and on the more schematic quality of both the landscape and animals in the distance and middle ground, Spicer’s suggestion that an assistant painted these figures seems convincing. It also

\footnote{220. Differences between the equipment used for reflectography at the National Gallery of Art, Washington, and at the National Gallery, London, contributed to differences in the resulting infrared reflectograms. The platinum silicide thermal imager used in Washington was configured to an infrared wavelength range of 1.5-2.0 \( \mu \text{m} \), while the vidicon camera used in London was sensitive in the region of 0.9-1.4 \( \mu \text{m} \). In the case of the London Orpheus the underpaint was more apparent in the vidicon image (working at shorter wavelengths) while the image captured at the longer wavelengths emphasizes the brown-black painted outlines of the Washington Flight into Egypt.}
seems possible that the same assistant was responsible for the more distant parts of the landscape. Savery himself may have painted the complex and closely observed foreground foliage.

A fifth painting examined in the study, the Landscape with Ruins and Animals (Fig. 75) at The Walters Art Gallery, has recently been reattributed by Joaneath Spicer to Savery’s nephew, Hans Savery II. 221 This painting may date a decade or more later than the other paintings examined in this study. Though the composition evokes works by Roelandt Savery, 222 the abbreviated methods and materials reflect a hybrid of Savery’s methods and practices that only became current after the development of tonal landscape painting. 223 The result is a distant echo of Roelandt’s complex and subtle paintings.

Though the painting is severely abraded, it was possible to evaluate the technique. The oak panel was prepared with an extremely thin ground that allows the tone of the wood to show through. Using this tone in some areas, and a thin colored underpaint in others, Hans Savery blocked out the sky, and the major areas of the landscape. The colors are a muted echo of his uncle’s rich palette. The sky is pale blue, and the underpaints of the landscape are predominantly tans and browns. He sketched both architecture and animals over the foreground underpaint with a dark brown paint,

221. Personal communication, Joaneath Spicer, The Walters Art Gallery. The painting also is not accepted by Müllermeister, Roelant Savery.

222. See for example, Müllermeister, Roelant Savery, 278-279, cat. 172, 173, 174.

223. These practices will be discussed in Chapter 5.
then he painted the final details in a kind of shorthand (Fig. 76). In one aspect of the final painting, Hans still followed his uncle’s practice. He held reserves in the landscape for the foreground animals and incorporated these animals in another sitting. However, he painted the landscape in an extraordinarily reduced painting procedure. He often used the underpaint as the mid-tone and the sketch as the shadows, adding just a few details in light-colored paint. The close similarities of this painting technique to the techniques of the tonal landscape painters (which will be discussed in the last chapter) suggests that those artists’ efficient techniques had an effect even on painters whose pictorial goals still reflected the ideals of Mannerist landscape painting. Hans Savery may have adapted his uncle’s painting practice to produce less expensive paintings for a market that admired Roelandt Savery’s work, but could not afford his complex and labor-intensive paintings.

Savery’s painting technique in context: landscape painting technique in the 1620s

A range of landscape types were produced in Northern Netherlands in the 1620s. As has been discussed in this chapter, in Utrecht Savery preserved the fundamental aspects of South Netherlandish landscape painting technique. At the same time Esaias van de Velde—whose work forms the focus of the next chapter—incorporated dramatic technical innovations he had initiated in the 1610s in Haarlem. During this same period a number of other North Netherlandish landscape painters moved beyond the conventions of Southern Netherlandish compositions.
Several of their paintings were examined in the course of this study.\textsuperscript{224} The accumulated evidence suggests that a number of artists were experimenting with the long-established painting procedures for landscape. Esaias van de Velde's concerted efforts to reconsider traditional landscape painting techniques in the search for a new naturalism reflect just one line of exploration. Other painters seem to have modified traditional methods as they developed the evocative rather than the descriptive aspects of the landscape tradition. The diversity of techniques highlights the traditional aspects of Roelandt Savery's painting technique. Two paintings will be discussed here: Cornelis Vroom's \textit{Landscape with a River by a Wood} in London (Fig. 77), and the \textit{Landscape with Narcissus} by Jacob Pynas (Fig. 79), also in London.

Cornelis Vroom of Haarlem was the son of the successful marine painter, Hendrik Conelisz Vroom. After a brief early period of marine paintings Cornelis devoted the rest of his career to a personal approach to landscape that was neither naturalistic nor explicitly Italianate in spirit.\textsuperscript{225} Vroom painted a work now in London, the \textit{Landscape with a River by a Wood} (Fig. 77) in 1626.\textsuperscript{226} Vroom's painting is not overtly naturalistic, but in this early landscape, he modified South Netherlandish

\textsuperscript{224} See Appendix 1 for a table of paintings examined in this study. Aside from the works by Savery and Esaias van de Velde, this study has included North Netherlandish landscape paintings from the 1610s and 1620s by Arent Arentsz., Gerrit Claesz. Bleker, Abraham Bloemaert, Hendrik Goltzius, Jacob Pynas, and Cornelis Vroom.


\textsuperscript{226} Keyes, \textit{Cornelis Vroom}, cat. P 27.
practice to create a more subtle spatial recession with his characteristic color range
dominated by browns, yellows, and grayish greens. He established the color of each
area in an underpaint, but the areas are not sharply distinguished as they were in the
standard Southern Netherlandish practice and in Savery’s landscapes. He used the
underpaint to develop the tonal balance and spatial definition of his composition, but
did not restrict himself to sharply defined bands of color receding into the composition.
Vroom exploited the colors of traditional Southern Netherlandish landscape in personal
adaptations that contribute to his painting’s stylized yet unconventional coloring.
Rather than painting a light blue band of distant landscape based on the violet-blue tone
of smalt, he blended yellowish and bluish tones in the underpaint, worked wet-into-wet.
Throughout the foreground and middle ground the underpaint is a web of grayish green
and yellow passages. He furthered this atmospheric perspective by painting the distant
trees with a stippled “sponged” technique using a cold blue that incorporated large
pigment particles of deep red lake (Fig. 78).\textsuperscript{227}

Jacob Pynas, the member of the “Pre-Rembrandtist” group who focused most
particularly on landscape, worked in a number of cities\textsuperscript{228} He and his brother, Jan
Pynas, were in Rome from 1605 until around 1608, when Jan was back in Amsterdam.

\textsuperscript{227} It was not possible to sample this area of the painting, but the very large
red lake particles were recognizable under high magnification with a stereo microscope.

\textsuperscript{228} Biographical information is taken from the entry in Sutton, \textit{17th-Century
Dutch Landscape}, 422. From the same source: on Jacob Pynas see Luigi Salerno,
\textit{Pittori di paesaggio del seicento a Roma (Landscape Painters of the Seventeenth
Documentary evidence places Jacob in The Hague in 1622 and in Leiden around 1626. In 1632 he moved to Delft, where he joined the guild.

In 1628 Pynas painted the **Landscape with Narcissus** (Fig. 79), initiating his composition with a few notes in a simple, linear underdrawing. He did not use a colored underpaint in the traditional South Netherlandish fashion. Instead he laid out all of the composition except the furthest distance in a painted sketch using a warm brown paint. Pynas’ painting is the earliest use of an overall monochrome painted sketch found in any of the landscapes examined in the course of this study, and the characteristically Pre-Rembrandtist color range of tans and blackish greens is underlaid by a distinctly warm brown tonality.

In the **Landscape with Narcissus**, Pynas worked over his painted sketch methodically. His painting sequence reveals that he still conceived of his composition in sharply defined zones. He painted from the distant landscape toward the foreground, completing each zone before painting the next and using the painted sketch as a guide to leave exact reserves so that paint of nearer zones did not overlap paint in the more distant areas (Fig. 80). Pynas exploited the brown tone of the painted sketch in parts of the final image. In the foreground he handled the final paint so loosely that the brown sketch consistently served as the shadow tone of the final image (Fig. 81). Like Antwerp Mannerist landscape painters and like Savery, Pynas executed this painting in strictly defined zones of space. However, because he began the composition with the single brown color, the **Landscape with Narcissus** has a unified tone that is entirely unlike those artists’ work.
In their forest landscapes Gillis van Coninxloo and Roelandt Savery developed important innovations in the compositional types of the Mannerist landscapes of the Southern Netherlandish tradition. Though both painters clearly still conceived of their compositions in distinct zones of space, which they designated with the traditional zones of brown, green, and blue landscape, their focus on the brown foreground created an inherently limited tonality. The acceptance of that limited tonality, and Savery’s particularly subtle modulations of color within the brown foreground must have contributed to the abandonment of the three color system of defining landscape space. The limited staffage in Coninxloo’s late forest interiors, and Savery’s fruitful use of his landscape drawings from the Tirol for naturalistic detail in his paintings must also have contributed to an artistic climate that increasingly focused on the landscape itself.

Nonetheless, both painters must be considered participants in the Southern Netherlandish landscape tradition, creating exotic imaginary landscapes that appealed to an aristocratic audience. Savery maintained this tradition in Utrecht well after most other artists in the Northern Netherlands had turned in new directions, and in doing so he contributed to a new incarnation of this tradition in the work of Italianate painters. \(^{229}\)

For Savery, at least, figures remained an integral part of his composition. His use of a

\(^{229}\) I am grateful to Arthur K. Wheelock, Jr. for this observation, which I touch on briefly in the Epilogue.
stron gly colored, mid-tone underpaint, and costly materials such as ultramarine blue clearly illustrate his interest in richly colored, precious paintings. His meticulous final painting executed in many sittings gave his paintings a crisply detailed, decorative surface entirely unlike the rapid notations of the naturalistic landscape painters.
CHAPTER 4: ESAIAS VAN DE VELDE'S INNOVATIONS IN PAINT

Growing naturalism in the Northern Netherlands: drawings and prints

A change in attitude toward landscape occurred in the Northern Netherlands in the last decade of the sixteenth century. At the end of the century, as discussed above, there was no landscape painting tradition native to the North. Most Mannerist landscape paintings were shipped north from the active art market of Antwerp, although, with the influx of émigrés in the 1580s and 1590s, a certain number of landscapes were produced there as well. However, around the turn of the century new attitudes toward landscape in the North opened the way for a naturalistic type of landscape that was unique to this area. The change first took place in landscape drawings and prints, but soon thereafter artists began producing paintings that participated in this radically new approach to landscape. Esaias van de Velde was the first to translate this new vision of landscape from graphic representations into paint, a process that also involved technical innovations he brought to his paintings. As a basis for understanding his innovations, this discussion will first examine the developments in landscape prints and drawings in the Northern Netherlands at the opening of the seventeenth century.

Two currents can be discerned in landscape drawings at this time. One is a new interest in the practice of drawing landscape from life. The second is a complementary interest in a set of pictorial techniques that came to be associated with landscape representation. Both currents can be traced to the middle of the sixteenth century.
specifically to the work of Pieter Bruegel the Elder and his circle. The intellectual climate in Haarlem art circles in the 1590s shifted attitudes toward landscape drawing and recast these two artistic currents in terms of contemporary art theory. The practice of landscape drawing from life coincided with the interests of the so-called Haarlem “academy” of Carel van Mander, Hendrick Goltzius, and Cornelis Cornelisz van Haarlem. Though this group specifically sponsored life drawing from the nude, the counterpart in landscape representation is open-air sketching. As discussed in Chapter 2, Van Mander made this practice, and the close observation of nature that it inspires, a central tenet of his recommendations to young landscape artists in Het Schilder-Boeck. The complementary interest in pictorial techniques associated with landscape coincided with a keen awareness at this same time of the particularities of earlier artistic techniques. Van Mander made many references to the techniques of earlier artists in Het Schilder-Boeck. This interest is eloquently expressed by Goltzius’ “Meisterstiche,” six virtuoso prints in the styles of earlier masters. In one of these prints, the Adoration of the Magi after Lucas van Leyden, there is evidence that Goltzius recreated not only Lucas’ style, but modified his own engraving technique and materials to capture the characteristic silvery tone of his model.


232. Research by Kimberly Schenck, Paper Conservator of the Baltimore Museum of Art (publication in preparation), indicates that in at least one impression of
When Van Mander published *Het Schilder-Boeck* in 1604, his description of Abraham Bloemaert, the leading figure of the Utrecht artistic community, drawing out-of-doors suggests that Bloemaert had been following this practice for some time.\(^{233}\) Van Mander says that collectors sought out these drawings of “pleasant and amusing peasant cottages, farm implements, trees and fields.” Most of these drawings were not views of recognizable locations, but were graceful, lovingly detailed records of selected elements that he later incorporated into his paintings and designs for engravings.\(^{234}\) These drawings are in the spirit of Van Mander’s recommendations in his chapter on landscape, even to the choice of dilapidated farm buildings: “Roofs and walls ought not to be shown with bright red bricks, but rather in turf, reeds, or straw, holed and patched. You can also plaster them in a fantastic manner, and show moss growing on them.”\(^{235}\) Though made from life, Bloemaert’s detailed renderings of such features lend

---

the *Adoration* Goltzius modified his ink to further the silvery appearance.


234. See, for example the sheet published in Luijten, et al, *Dawn of the Golden Age*, cat. no. 318 (École Nationale Supérieure des Beaux-Arts, Paris); Bloemaert drew a number of small studies of plants (cabbages, gourds, garden sorrel) on one side and a dilapidated shed on the other.


“Niet met schoon roo teghelen/ eer met rosschen
Van aerde/ riet/ en stroo/ lappen en breken/
Oock vreemdljck beplaeesteren/ en bemosschen/
these drawings, and the works into which he incorporated these details, a "picturesque" charm more than verisimilitude.²³⁶

Around this same time in Haarlem, Hendrick Goltzius was making imaginary landscape drawings that were inspired by the work of two earlier artists: Pieter Bruegel's alpine drawings, and woodcuts after Titian. In his drawings, as in the Meisterstiche, Goltzius clearly acknowledged the artistic debt in a virtuoso recapitulation of the techniques found in his artistic sources. As Reznicek has observed, his response to these two sources led him to employ two very different drawing techniques.²³⁷ When he followed the Venetian model, he worked with a broad pen, massing parallel lines in sinuous curves that model the contours of the landscape.²³⁸ In a work that pays homage to Bruegel, Goltzius drew a mountain pass in short, delicate pen strokes (Fig. 82). Though Goltzius had only just returned from Italy, traveling through the Alps himself, he recreated the experience from imagination (uyt den gheest), seen through the prism of Bruegel's drawings of his alpine travels. For this

²³⁶ Here I use picturesque in the modern sense of the word to mean charming or quaint. Boudewijn Bakker (in “Schilderachtig”) notes that the close association of the Dutch words pittoresk and schilderachtig (painter-like or suitable for painting) did not come about until the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Though Van Mander did not use the word schilderachtig in this passage, Bakker has noted his association of the word with commendable landscape representation. Van Mander’s use of the term seems to convey an artfully particularized handling more than naturalism.


²³⁸ See Arcadian Landscape with Figures (Collection of the Duke of Devonshire, Chatsworth House) signed and dated 1593, published by Reznicek, "Conception of landscape," fig. 2.
work he quoted Bruegel’s drawing style. He built forms with series of short, discontinuous touches instead of linear contours, and modulated passages of light shading rendered in fine parallel lines by superimposing brief, hooked strokes for darker shadows. 239

At this time the style of Pieter Bruegel’s landscape drawings (see, for example, Fig. 11) was much admired. Van Mander wrote that “he had a very pure and subtle technique with the pen with which he drew many small views from life.” 240 In fact, the style of dotted and dashed strokes associated with Bruegel became a convention of landscape drawings to the extent that it is now hard to know when contemporaries were referring to autograph drawings by Bruegel and when they were actually looking at contemporary copies (or outright forgeries) in this mode.

A group of landscape drawings with false Bruegel signatures and dates from 1559-1562 have been recently reattributed by Hans Mielke to Jacob Savery. 241 In their dotted, atmospheric handling these drawings clearly reflect Savery’s familiarity with Bruegel’s drawing style. The drawings had continued to be attributed to Bruegel even though scholars had expressed occasional doubts about some sheets. One drawing with

239. It is intriguing that Goltzius did not recreate the disciplined long straight lines and cross-hatching of engraving that Hieronymus Cock used to model the rock formations of the Large Landscape series after Bruegel’s designs (see Fig. 12), nor did he imitate the wirey touch with which Bruegel scratched the shading in his one autograph etching (Fig. 14).


a genuine signature by Jacob Savery was even at one time accepted as Bruegel’s work.\textsuperscript{242} Savery must have produced these drawings in the late 1590s. One, a River Landscape with a Castle,\textsuperscript{243} was issued in 1598 in a print by Jacques de Gheyn,\textsuperscript{244} who credited Bruegel for the design (Fig. 83, Fig. 84). This print is another reflection of the “Bruegel Renaissance” at the turn of the century, which was discussed earlier in the context of Bruegel’s contribution to the development of the forest landscape. It is significant that Bruegel’s name, rather than Savery’s, was associated with the directness and apparent lack of artifice with which De Gheyn recorded Savery’s drawing. In his own far more formal landscape etchings, Savery rendered the middle ground landscape in a solidly massed version of the stippled technique, but he framed the view with a dark foreground enclosed by elegant, sinuous trees.\textsuperscript{245} Savery’s “Bruegel” drawings, and the presumably more widely circulated print by De Gheyn, contributed to a growing convention by which the Bruegel drawing style was seen as particularly appropriate for directly observed landscape drawings.

\textsuperscript{242} Landscape with a Castle, New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, inv. no. 1985.101, published by Mielke, review of Boon, Dessins des anciens Pays-Bas, fig. 4.

\textsuperscript{243} Hand, Judson, Robinson, Wolff, \textit{Age of Bruegel}, cat. 97, 251-253.


\textsuperscript{245} See, for example, a print published by Hondius in 1602, reproduced in David Freedberg, \textit{Dutch Landscape Prints of the Seventeenth Century} (London: British Museum Publications, 1980), fig. 11.
This visual vocabulary is reflected in three landscape drawings by Goltzius from around 1603, his spare panoramic views of the countryside around Haarlem (Fig. 85). In the now-familiar repertoire of parallel dashes, he rendered a continuously receding space that is almost entirely free of compositional devices such as dark foreground repoussoirs or side coulisses. Goltzius seems to have consciously chosen the drawing style he had used for his homage to Bruegel’s alpine drawings to render his views of the immediate locale.

Depictions of local landscapes in seventeenth-century prints and drawings have a prototype, as has often been noted, in the two series of etchings based on designs by the Master of the Small Landscapes discussed in Chapter 2. These prints, which depict regional views, primarily farms from Brabant, were initially issued in Antwerp by Hieronymus Cock in 1559 and 1561.246 The directness conveyed by the Bruegel style of drawing is analogous to the visual qualities of the etching technique used in these prints. When Cock first published the first series in 1559, both the style, which was influenced by Pieter Bruegel’s landscape drawings, and the etching medium were unusual for his publishing house, which more often published engravings in the world-landscape style. These prints, more informal and direct than any other print series issued by Cock’s publishing house, the Quatre Vents, were enormously popular, as the number of reprints evidence. Cock himself immediately reissued the two series in

1561. Around 1600 Theodoor Galle took over the Antwerp publishing house of his father, Philips Galle, devoting most of his production to republishing older plates. In 1601 he issued a combined reprint edition from the original plates of the two series, attributing the designs to Cornelis Cort.

The Small Landscape series had a potent, if somewhat delayed, effect on landscape representation. As Goedde has demonstrated, artists in the first decade of the seventeenth century, including Hendrik Goltzius, Jacques de Gheyn, and Claes Jansz Visscher, consciously created an impression of immediacy by selecting the graphic vocabulary of Pieter Bruegel the Elder and the Master of the Small Landscapes from the available artistic conventions. The rapid drawing technique they devised for open-air drawings and drawings suggestive of direct observation, contrasts with the

247. In this reissue the two series were combined into a single series. Bastelaer, *Prints of Peter Bruegel the Elder*, 77: State B, Second edition.


249. Bastelaer, *Prints of Peter Bruegel the Elder*, 78, Third edition. Later in the century, at least in Antwerp, the Small Landscapes' association with Bruegel's style seems to have been lost. Theodoor Galle's son, Johannes, reissued the series yet again, rearranging them into four series of twelve (Bastelaer, *Prints of Peter Bruegel the Elder*, 88: State C, Fourth edition, and State D, Fifth edition). He made minor revisions to a number of the plates, and significantly reworked the four plates that served as the four new title pages, in the process diminishing the resemblance to Pieter Bruegel's drawings. He replaced the short, radiating strokes on the shadowed sides of foliage with dense masses of horizontal lines, and introduced new figures including brigand bands. In effect, Johannes Galle does not seem to have valued the plates' Bruegel-like quality, but obscured it in updating the plates for reissue.

250. Goedde, "Naturalism as Convention."
more formal landscape drawings of artists like Abraham Bloemaert or even their own more finished landscape drawings.²⁵¹

Cock's series seem to have been valued from their first appearance. While Galle's reissue may have brought the series to the attention of a new generation of artists,²⁵² Northern Netherlandish artists were already familiar with the original Cock editions, and they certainly associated them with Pieter Bruegel. It is probably not by chance that Jacob Savery's Bruegel imitations, clear evidence for a Bruegel revival in the North, bear false dates ranging from 1559 to 1562, which almost exactly coincide with those printed on the title pages of Cock's original issues of the Small Landscapes. Claes Jansz Visscher's own edition of the Small Landscape series, which he published in 1612, consisted of 24 etchings that he made by copying Cock's original prints, all but one of which he derived from Cock's 1561 series. This suggests that he owned—or had access to—prints from the original 1561 edition, rather than Galle's reprints.²⁵³ Most significantly, he attributed the designs not to Cort as Galle had, but to Pieter Bruegel.

Visscher regularized and formalized the delicate stippled touch of Cock's anonymous etcher into an orderly language. A comparison of one of Cock's original

²⁵¹ See, for example, several drawings illustrated in Luijtjen, et al, Dawn of the Golden Age: Bloemaert, ca. 1600-1605, cat. 319; Goltzius, ca. 1596, cat. 313; de Gheyn c. 1603, cat. 316; Visscher, ca. 1605, cat. 323.

²⁵² As suggested by Freedberg, Dutch Landscape Prints, 28, and Gifford, "Jan van Goyen," 74.

prints (Fig. 13) with Visscher’s recreation (Fig. 86) indicates that Visscher’s touch was even more delicate and stippled than the original, and that he abstracted what he must have perceived as the essence of this style. To render the contours of the land under the wall he converted the rapidly noted horizontal strokes of the Cock print into ordered series of parallel miniature dashes. Trees became smoothly rounded forms in which short strokes conveyed the darkest tones, and orderly clouds of dots rendered mid-tones defining the curved forms. Visscher’s rendering of Cock’s series must have helped form the convention of this graphic style as particularly appropriate to landscape representation.

Visscher, who began his career as an etcher and publisher of maps, quickly contributed to the creation of a market niche issuing series of landscape prints. In 1612 or 1613, around the same time as his copies of the Small Landscapes, he published an etched series of views around Haarlem, Plaisante Plaetsen, after his own designs (Fig. 87). In those years he also etched a series after Cornelis Claesz van Wieringen for another publisher, David de Meyre, and, in 1620, he acquired the plates for his own firm. He was one of several publishers to issue series of landscape prints by the prolific Jan van de Velde II. Other artists and publishers quickly joined the expanding market. Jan Pietersz Beerendrecht of Haarlem published series of landscape etchings by Esaias van de Velde beginning in 1614 and Broer Jansz in The Hague

254. For a summary of Visscher’s activities in this area see Orenstein et al, “Print Publishers,” 189-194, from which most of the following information was derived.

255. Hollstein, Dutch and Flemish, XXXVIII, cat. 149-160.
published Willem Buytewech’s etchings in a series around 1616. Nevertheless, the young Visscher consolidated his position as a dominant force in this market. In 1621 he reissued Buytewech’s series after acquiring the plates from Broer Jansz, and, as late as the 1640s, he bought the plates for series by Jan van de Velde and Esaias van de Velde.

This vigorous print publishing market in the Northern Netherlands contributed to the view that familiar, unprepossessing scenes were suitable subjects for landscape representation. As discussed in Chapter 1, the multiple images of landscape print series encouraged artists to experiment with variations on the standard images, and probably fostered a taste for novelty among collectors. The association of the etching medium with the print series’ informal, direct style further focused the convention of naturalistic landscape. A consensus developed that the appropriate mode for local landscape was neither a crisp, formal engraving style, nor the sinuous lines of Venetian landscapes, but the evanescent dots and dashes associated with Pieter Bruegel’s drawings.

Two of Visscher’s early landscape series exemplify the relationship between etching technique and the degree of informality. The series after Cornelis Claesz van Wieringen’s designs combined local Netherlandish details with exotic ruins and mountains. In etching these designs, which are not entirely naturalistic, Visscher worked in a formal style. He filled most of each plate with densely cross-hatched lines that curve to follow the forms, in a style akin to engraving (Fig. 88). While Van Wieringen’s dark, washed drawings invited a dense treatment, Visscher (or David de

Meyre who commissioned this series) may also have felt that a technique that echoed engraving was suited to these imaginary scenes.\textsuperscript{257} The other series, Visscher's prints in his own landscape series with views of the environs of Haarlem, is far more naturalistic. In etching these designs, Visscher primarily used a stippled touch similar to that seen in his copies of the Small Landscape series (Fig. 86). Only in the narrow repoussoir foregrounds did he alter his style and etch a dark network of regular cross hatching. These foregrounds gave a more formal quality to images that otherwise approached the brevity of life drawings. It is intriguing to consider that Visscher might have dispensed with this dichotomy in favor of a new informality if he had developed the series further.

As it appeared, the series included twelve prints, but the title page implies that nine more prints might once have been anticipated.\textsuperscript{258} In the twelfth, and last, print Visscher changed his etching style in the foreground. In this view of the ruins of the Huis te Kleef he executed the entire print, including the foreground, in a free manner using short, curved strokes.

Visscher was based in Amsterdam, but many of his drawings and his print series Plaisante Plaetsen include views of the countryside around Haarlem, which was famous for its rural beauty. In those years Haarlem saw an astonishing gathering of artists who shared a concern with landscape. Esaias van de Velde, born in Amsterdam to émigré parents, moved to Haarlem in 1609, and entered its Guild of Saint Luke in 1612. In

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{257} See, for example, a drawing from Chatsworth reproduced in Luijten, et al, \textit{Dawn of the Golden Age}, p. 105.
\item \textsuperscript{258} Luijten, et al, \textit{Dawn of the Golden Age}, cat. 327.
\end{itemize}
that same year that Willem Buytewech, arriving from Rotterdam, and Hercules Segers, who had been studying in Amsterdam with Coninxloo, also became master painters in Haarlem. Jan van de Velde, a Haarlem resident and cousin of Esaias van de Velde, joined the guild two years later. The innovative landscape prints of Esaias van de Velde, Jan van de Velde, and Buytewech were pivotal in the development of a new mode depicting the local scene. Most of Seger’s very personal vision falls outside of this discussion, but a small number of his prints also reveal a sensitivity to the issues of naturalistic landscape current in Haarlem at this time.259 The following brief discussion will illustrate some of the ways in which Esaias and Buytewech built on Visscher’s accomplishments in this field.

Esaias van de Velde carefully structured his earliest dated etching, the Village of 1614 (Fig. 89),260 with emphatically diminishing buildings flanking a road that wanders into the distance, but he conveyed a greater impression of informality than did Visscher in his prints. Esaias discarded Visscher’s foreground repoussoir elements and created the impression that his landscape continued uninterrupted beyond the lower edge of the composition. With a varied handling that included loose masses of parallel strokes as well as dots and dashes, he achieved a more convincing atmospheric perspective throughout the continuous recession of the composition’s open center.

259. See, for example, a unique impression of A Country Road with Trees and Buildings, London, British Museum (Haverkamp Begemann, Hercules Segers, cat. no. 37). I am grateful to Arthur K. Wheelock for his observations on this point.

Esaias' series of ten low, horizontal etchings, dating from 1615 or 1616,\textsuperscript{261} is a landmark in the development of the type of landscape that suggests direct observation of the local scene. At least one, the *Pasture and Road near the Church Tower of Spaarnwoude* (Fig. 90) is directly derived from an open-air drawing of the *View of Spaarnewoude* (Fig. 91).\textsuperscript{262} Esaias preserved the drawing's sense of immediacy in the etching, making only small concessions to formalize it for publication. For example, in this directly observed drawing the extraordinarily open foreground is evidence of Esaias' objective recording of the scene, while in the print he added just a few details to close the foreground at the lower margin. He translated the drawing's quick pen lines and touches of wash with clusters of parallel strokes and the familiar dots and dashes in the print.

Willem Buytewech's landscape series of around 1616 represents an effective, albeit personal, use of the graphic vocabulary of naturalistic landscape.\textsuperscript{263} Buytewech's individual vocabulary is evident in the wavering parallel lines of tone in the water, the dotted touch of the lighter foliage, and the faintly stippled texture of the upper part of the sky. He indicated shadowed tree trunks, glimpsed between lighted trunks, by massing horizontal lines (Fig. 92). The extraordinary skies of these tiny plates have a

\begin{footnotes}

\footnote{261. Keyes, *Esaias van den Velde*, E 10–E 19.}

\footnote{262. Keyes, *Esaias van den Velde*, E 12, D 133.}

\end{footnotes}
finesse that is unparalleled in the other landscape etchings. Buytewech may have
furthered the visual possibilities of etching with a technical innovation. It has been
suggested that he might have used a roulette to create the delicate tone in parallel lines
of stippled touches. 264

The significance of this sudden outpouring of landscapes that clearly evoke the
character of the local scene has been the subject of much discussion. 265 As Chapman
points out, it does not seem accidental that artists like Visscher and Buytewech, who
created these new landscapes, were at the same time producing overtly nationalistic
prints. 266 The newly independent status of the United Provinces had only just been
acknowledged by the truce of 1609. In 1610 Visscher illustrated a map of Holland with
labeled images illustrating the sources of Holland's prosperity: the sea, the land, and the
people. 267 In 1615 Buytewech’s Allegory of the Deceitfulness of Spain and the Liberty
and Prosperity of the Dutch Republic depicted the Dutch lion guarding the gate of the
Garden of Holland against two-faced Spain, her leopard, and her troops. 268


265. See, among others, Freedberg, Dutch Landscape Prints, and Levesque, Journey Through Landscape.

266. Chapman, "Art and Community."


A number of the print series include images of the ruins left by the Spanish troops in the 1570s and 1580s when war was waged on Northern Netherlands soil. The print series evidence an increasing interest in these ruins.²⁶⁹ The freely etched last plate in Visscher’s Plaisante Plaetsen series is the only representation in the series of a ruin, the Huis te Kleef. Jan van de Velde took ruins as his subject in his series from 1615, though he depicted classical ruins as well as local ruins with nationalist associations and enfolded them in his lush landscapes.²⁷⁰ On the other hand, Buytewech’s series of about 1616 starkly silhouetted the three Dutch ruins he depicted against the sky, emphatically offering them for the viewer’s meditation. These images of ruins overtly evoked the struggle for independence from Spain. In creating these particular images during the Twelve Year Truce, from 1609 to 1621, artists participated in the establishment of a collective identity for the new political entity, the United Provinces.²⁷¹

How, then, should one characterize the appeal of the naturalistic landscape print series and the naturalistic paintings that appeared soon after? In the 1610s landscape painting was dominated by artists producing imaginary landscapes in the Southern Netherlands tradition: in Amsterdam, David Vinckboons’ graceful wooded picnics


²⁷¹. Chapman, “Art and Community.”
and the exotic Tyrolean forests of Roelandt Savery, newly returned from Prague; in Middelburg, Adriaen van de Venne’s elegant paintings of aristocratic amusements produced for the court at The Hague. Patriotic imagery that contributed to a collective identity in the Northern Netherlands featured in all styles of landscape representation. However, the naturalistic landscape print series offered a broader set of associations. Naturalistic landscapes contributed to the perception that the indigenous landscape of the Northern Netherlands was worthy of a nascent national pride.272

The appeal of naturalistic landscape prints and drawings of the first two decades of the seventeenth century depended on an artistic style that was qualitatively different from the landscapes in the mainstream Southern Netherlandish tradition. Artists like Esaias van de Velde and Buytewech turned away from the Southern Netherlandish tradition of grand panoramic landscapes like those in the engravings published by Hieronymus Cock after Pieter Bruegel the Elder. Instead they derived the graphic conventions of naturalistic landscape representation from the quite different style of Bruegel’s landscape drawings from life. These artists rendered their prints with a set of artistic conventions that self-consciously defined the new style. By lowering the horizons and opening the foregrounds they made their viewers became participants in the scenes. The typical local scenery, often mundane, reinforced this sense of immediacy. Most importantly, they used a shared set of artistic conventions that consciously conveyed the impression not of an artfully assembled composition, but of rapidly noted direct observation. Through the convention that equated this graphic style

---

272. Freedberg, Dutch Landscape Prints, 30.
with direct observation, the viewer was made aware of the process by which the artist recorded the scene.

Landscape prints of course cost far less than landscape paintings, and this must have been a factor in their appeal. It is unlikely, for example, that many of print buyers could have afforded the meticulous, precious landscapes of Roelandt Savery. Yet many prints in Mannerist landscape styles also were available. Buyers of naturalistic landscape prints must have chosen these works out of an appreciation for the airy, atmospheric renderings of the indigenous landscape. Within a few years these same qualities were available in landscape paintings as well.

Innovations in Paint: Esaias van de Velde’s early career

By the 1610s, specific techniques had come to be associated with representations of the local scene in both landscape drawings and in printmaking. In paintings, however, artists continued to represent imagined landscapes using the techniques of the Antwerp landscape tradition brought to Amsterdam by émigré artists. Esaias van de Velde was the first to paint landscapes that incorporated the naturalistic innovations of the landscape print series.

Esaias was born in Amsterdam in 1587, soon after the arrival of his parents from Antwerp. In 1609 Esaias’ father died and he moved with his mother to Haarlem, where his recently married sister was living. Esaias was well acquainted with

273. For Esaias van de Velde see Keyes, Esaias van den Velde. Biographical data cited here are drawn from Briels, Peintres Flammands en Hollande. 18–26.
the Southern Netherlandish method of painting landscapes as he was trained as a painter in the Amsterdam émigré community. His father, the painter Hans van de Velde, was presumably his first teacher. He probably also studied with Gillis van Coninxloo or David Vinckboons, or both. Technical study of Esaias’ paintings has revealed not an abrupt repudiation of Southern Netherlandish painting traditions, but subtle and thoughtful modifications through which he shifted the emphasis of his paintings toward the naturalism of contemporary landscape drawings and prints. In fact, certain graphic techniques used in the prints may be reflected in Esaias’ innovations in painting techniques. The years in Haarlem, from around 1612, when he joined the guild, until 1618, when he moved to The Hague, were a period of intense experimentation for Esaias. He produced far more prints than paintings at this period, and it is generally agreed that the prints were the primary vehicle for his remarkable innovations. His early paintings, though they clearly participate in the new spirit of naturalism, are often described as conservative by comparison with the prints. But technical study of the paintings from this brief period reveals conscious experimentation and innovation that had lasting implications for the development of a native Dutch landscape pictorial tradition.

The earliest of Esaias van de Velde’s paintings examined for this study is the Summer Landscape, or Road to Emmaus (Fig. 93), dating from 1612 or 1613. This work is from the very earliest years of Esaias’ production as an independent master.

274. Stechow, Dutch Landscape Painting, 20-21.

275. Keyes, Esaias van den Velde, cat. 7.
and some three or four years after he left Amsterdam and the immediate influence of Vinckboons. Aspects of the painting are clearly within the Southern tradition as it was practiced in Amsterdam. In choosing the biblical subject and in painting a pair of Seasons (a pendant winter scene with the Flight into Egypt, Fig. 94, is now lost),\(^{276}\) Esaias followed a sixteenth-century Netherlandish tradition of seasonal landscapes. He assembled his composition by placing a broken stump, trees, and a moated castle alternately on the sides and center of the image so that the viewer's eye—and the road—zig-zag to the hilly distance around these compositional elements. The repetitive rendering of foliage is conventionalized, and, in another reference to the established landscape painting conventions, a patch of yellow and pink sky at the left refers to the light source, the sun low in the sky beyond the painting's lefthand margin. Yet Esaias' broad brushwork, which in the sky threatens to overwhelm the small composition, and a distinctly limited tonal range suggest that he was not attempting a landscape in the elegant and refined Mannerist tradition, but already sought something qualitatively different.

Esaias sketched out the major landscape features, but not the figures, over a coarsely brush-marked white ground in a quickly noted black underdrawing (Fig. 95). This drawing shares many of the characteristics of the landscape drawing of Spaarnwoude, apparently made on the site, that Esaias reinterpreted in an etching for the series dating from about 1615 or 1616 (Fig. 91, Fig. 90). The drawing of Spaarnwoude is extraordinarily direct, without the decorative qualities of Esaias'  

\(^{276}\) Present location unknown. Keyes, Esaias van den Velde, cat. 14.
finished drawings from this period. In both the open-air drawing and the underdrawing, he represented the topography with zig-zags and with long lines that break and jog; he indicated clumps of foliage with quick clusters of curves and loops, and arching tree trunks with long, springy lines. The transformation from the suggestive underdrawing to the conventionalized foliage in the painting is reminiscent of the process by which Esaias formalized the outdoor sketch when he used it as the design for the etching in the print series. It seems that Esaias perceived both the open-air drawing and the underdrawing as functional works for his personal use, something different from the finished works he offered publicly.

Unlike Antwerp landscapists and émigrés like Roelandt Savery, Esaias did not use a complete underpaint in a range of colors that define the zones of the composition. Instead, following the underdrawing, he brushed a thin brown paint over the foliage, building, and landscape to tone down the white ground. This brown, which shows

277. For example, Keyes, Esaias van den Velde D 66, D 172.

278. It was not possible to include the black and glittery underdrawing in the limited paint cross sections taken, but through the stereo microscope it seemed to be a dry medium typical of black chalk; it is certainly not ink. This is intriguing, in view of the fact that Esaias took up chalk as a medium for landscape drawing only around 1616; his surviving landscape drawings from this period are in pen and ink. Fifteen of the drawings survive from the first black chalk sketchbook of 1618-1620. Keyes suggests that in these works, which were drawn in chalk alone on unprepared paper, the medium yielded a new freedom of handling that facilitated open-air drawing. Esaias’ practice had a decisive influence on Dutch, open-air landscape drawing, especially in Jan van Goyen’s many sketchbooks. See George Keyes, "Esaias van de Velde and the chalk sketch," Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek 38 (1987): 136-45, and Keyes, Esaias van den Velde, 34-35, 55-57.

279. From the examination it was not clear whether this was a uniform toning, or whether the brush strokes helped define the forms sketched out in the underdrawing.
through the final paint in many areas, is an important factor in the painting’s coloring, which has a far more narrow tonal range than contemporary Mannerist landscapes. Similarly, he avoided the Mannerist zones of color in the final paint as well. Instead he worked in a consistent range of browns and grayish greens that he varied only in value, shifting from lighter tones in the distance to the darkest colors in the repoussoir foreground.

Esaias began this final painting in the sky, where he rapidly brushed out furrowed strokes of lead white, blue smalt, and black with a broad brush (Fig. 96). At the left he created the rosy clouds by adding red lake and yellow to the basic paint mixture.\textsuperscript{280} He overlapped the edges of the underdrawn trees with dabs of paint to establish the glimpses of sky that would be visible between the leaves. Without stopping, he rendered the dark green of the foliage and the black V-shapes that indicate a few flying birds with a few brief strokes pushed into the wet paint of the sky. He carried out the rest of the painting in a limited number of systematic stages. The foliage throughout consists of a dark green, followed by a mid-tone green, and yellow highlights, all applied in rapid dabs. He worked many areas wet-into-wet, in the distance the tiny figures were painted into the still-wet strokes (Fig. 97).

Esaias added the narrative figures of Christ and the two disciples over the completed landscape. This formed in an independent stage of the painting process, a

\textsuperscript{280} It was not possible to sample this area. The estimated use of red lake and, probably, lead-tin yellow is based on magnified surface examination.
procedure that was observed in all of his paintings examined for this study (Fig. 98). Although he must have intended some staffage to occupy the broad, open space of the road in the foreground, he did not plan the figures in the underdrawing. He seems not to have had a clear idea of their eventual placement when he painted the landscape, since he made no provision for them in painting the landscape. There is, in fact, a striking sense of disjunction between the figures and the landscape. The present ghostly impression of the figures is partly due to the increasing transparency of their paint with age. ESAIAs may have been aware that this might be a problem, since he positioned the group over the lightest part of the road. By not planning the figures' location until after the landscape was complete ESAIAs had some difficulty in accommodating the group. To avoid overlapping the dark, detailed foliage paint beyond the road he was forced to position two of the three figures beside the road rather than on it. This procedure is radically different from that observed in earlier landscapes. Although artists had traditionally painted the smallest-scale figures on top of landscapes they tended to plan the primary, narrative figures from the first, underdrawing stage (as in Jan Brueghel's Paradise Scene) or at least to have a clearly defined space held open in the composition (as in Joos de Momper's paintings). In the Oberlin Summer Landscape ESAIAs seems to have given the landscape his entire attention until it was completed to his satisfaction.

281. The subject of the journey to Emmaus was also probably part of his original plan. The moated castle, a frequent feature of landscapes at this period, could here refer to the village of Emmaus, called castellum in Latin See James Hall, Dictionary of Subjects and Symbols in Art (New York: Harper & Row, 1979): 178-179.
In two paintings from 1614, the Winter Landscape (Fig. 99) in Cambridge and Farms Flanking a Frozen Canal (Fig. 103) in Raleigh, Esaias experimented with issues that he also explored in etchings: a matter-of-fact rendition of typical scenery, figures with little narrative significance, and the convincing development of a broad, flat space. He also experimented with painting technique in ways that had important implications for later artists.

In both paintings Esaias evolved the composition within the pronounced horizontal format that he developed further in the print series of 1615/16. Though the sky of the Raleigh painting later was much enlarged by additions to the panel, the original format of both panels, like that of the etching series, was probably approximately 1:2. Both paintings depict a flat, local landscape unrelieved by hills. Though figures approaching the viewer in the Cambridge painting are soldiers in the rakish costumes familiar from paintings in the Southern Netherlandish style, the flat landscape deprives them of dramatic flair. They do not approach from behind a side coulisse, nor descend a steep path as they would in an Antwerp landscape’s

---

282. Keyes, Esaias van den Velde, cat. 71, cat. 89.

283. At some time in the past the upper and lower edges of the original panel were trimmed to the current dimensions of 12.7 cm high by 31.9 cm wide, and additional sections of panel were added at the top and bottom. A narrow strip 1.6 cm high was added to the lower edge and the sky was much enlarged by the addition of a section 11.4 cm high to the upper edge. See David Goist, "Case Study of an Early Dutch Landscape," Preprints; ICOM Committee for Conservation: 9th Triennial Meeting, Dresden, German Democratic Republic, 26-31 August 1990, ed. Kirsten Grimstad, (Los Angeles: ICOM Committee for Conservation, 1990), 648-52.
composition. In the Raleigh painting local inhabitants pursue their business with backs
turned to the viewer.

The Cambridge winter landscape’s panel was prepared with a standard double
ground; a lower ground typical of chalk smoothed the panel and a moderately thick
upper ground gave a uniform painting surface. Unlike the preparations of most
Southern Netherlandish landscapes, the upper ground here is not white but gray. The
white is toned with charcoal black, and earth colors.284 The color of the ground is
important to this painting, contributing to the painting’s steely tonality. Over it Esaias
drew most details of the composition: the buildings, trees, fence, and the slight
variations in the topography (the underdrawing is clearly visible through the paint: Fig.
100). Guided by the underdrawing, he toned several areas with a broadly applied
underpaint in a few limited colors: a brushy gray for the trees at the right, a warmer tan
for the trees at the left, and a warm buff under the farm buildings. In other places he left
the gray ground exposed. These underpainted passages, and the ground itself, play a
more pronounced role in the final image than in the Oberlin Emmaus. In fact, aside
from the figures, they contribute almost all of this work’s limited variations in color.
By comparison with the Oberlin painting, the final painting stage was remarkably
abbreviated. Following the underdrawing Esaias painted virtually the entire
composition in quick, calligraphic notations with brown-black paint. In a few areas he
added a few limited touches in a mid-tone, but in most places the underpaint—or the

284. This painting was not sampled. The panel is typical of oak, and the ground
composition was estimated from surface examination under high magnification.
exposed gray ground—serves this function. He finished the landscape with a few deft lines of creamy white highlight (Fig. 101). As in the Oberlin painting, Esaias painted the figures in a final step, sketching them with brown-black paint over the completed landscape, then quickly filling in the final details (Fig. 102).

In these two winter landscapes Esaias’ compositions depended on an interplay between the horizontal emphasis of the wide composition with its flat horizon and a plausible rendering of depth. In the Cambridge Winter Landscape the road on the left moves into the distance in a series of bends around the bare tree and sections of fencing. This movement into depth is balanced by an open space on the right whose continuous recession to the screen of buildings and trees in the middle distance is expressed only by slight variations of light and dark and the diminishing forms of a few browsing sheep. It seems possible that Esaias decided part way through the development of the painting to include this open space, which is not unlike the open field in the drawing and etching of Spaarnwoude. Fragments of underdrawing beyond the row boat offer evidence that in his first drawing the further of the two foreground fences extended across the composition to the right so that the only path into the distance would have been along the winding road.\(^{285}\)

Esaias’ more radical changes to the composition of the Raleigh Farms Flanking a Frozen Canal document a frankly experimental work. Both his compositional changes

---

\(^{285}\) This painting has not been examined by infrared reflectography or photography, but with a stereo microscope much of the underdrawing can be seen clearly through the paint. Above the boat are roughly horizontal lines that could extend the fence rails, as well as a pair of short vertical lines similar to those that define the fence posts.
and his choice of materials created visual analogies to the landscape print series. His initial composition seems to reveal a recognition that the horizontal format would yield a static, frieze-like design unless he took care to establish an unmistakable spatial recession. However his compositional changes suggest that he thought better of the exaggerated perspective he used at first. Pentimenti in several of the buildings show that he modified an original composition in which he used steep diagonals to create an emphatic recession to a vanishing point at the end of the canal.

Originally, the long building on the right had a single roof line; a detail of the infrared reflectogram shows pronounced diagonals both in the lines of underdrawing visible at the lower edge, and in the outline of the original ribbed roof. In repainting this roof Esaias shifted it to an almost horizontal form and incorporated a gabled end that interrupted the earlier sharp recession (Fig. 104, Fig. 105). In a similar way he modified the building on the left side of the canal and introduced the tall central privy, each time diminishing his emphasis on the recession.

It is telling that Esaias revised the figures as well as the landscape. In this painting, as in all his works examined in this study, he painted figures over the completed landscape, an indication that he considered the painting completed. However in this painting he returned to revise both the figures and the setting. The revised foreground figures are considerably smaller than those he painted originally—the couple at the left replaces a larger man—and he shifted the couple skating in the center slightly lower. In effect, Esaias first painted staffage that rapidly diminished from large foreground figures to tiny figures in the distance, and distributed them evenly along the
canal's length. He replaced them with figures whose scale was far less varied. In fact, in
the final image he painted six similar-sized figures in an almost horizontal array across
the foreground.

With each of these changes Esaias softened the emphatic diagonal recession of
the canal that he had first laid out. By muting the emphatic recession, and by adding
horizontal elements to the composition, achieved a more subtle flow into depth within
the horizontal format. The landscape print series of 1615/16 may have profited from his
experimental revisions in this work. In these prints Esaias interrupted strong diagonal
recessions with horizontal compositional elements, or pierced such horizontals with
glimpses of diagonally receding space (Fig. 90).

Esaias also used his painting materials in an experimental way echoing the
graphic language of naturalistic landscape that he and his contemporaries used in the
several early print series. Because of its many revisions, the painting sequence in the
Raleigh painting is not always clear. Nevertheless, examinations have established the
basic materials and structure that he used, and they are unusual. Esaias worked not on
an oak panel with a traditional light-colored ground, but on a poplar panel prepared
with a gray-black ground of black and earth pigments with a little white lead (Fig.
106). 286 It is not clear why Esaias chose this ground and support, but such an unusual

286. For this information I am indebted to William P. Brown, Associate
Conservator of the North Carolina Museum of Art, who took additional paint samples
in 1996. The pigment mixture probably includes some chalk as well. Goist, 649,
reported a preparation of a black pigment (with some yellow earth) rubbed into the
grain of the wood, and I cited this in an earlier publication (Gifford, "Style and
Technique," 74).
choice implies that he sought out the visual effects inherent in these materials. Possibly he chose poplar because he wanted a smoother working surface than oak for such a small panel. The use of the unusual and irregular gray-black ground may have been a conscious choice to give the panel visual interest.

The unorthodox combination of support and ground created a stippled wood grain pattern layer. The ground fills the openings in the wood grain, creating dark lines, but is almost invisible over the high points. In parts of the composition Esaias left this wood surface visible as part of the final image. In painting the ice he exploited this feature, exposing the horizontal streaks of the wood grain to create the reflections of the buildings (though here the effect is somewhat exaggerated by abrasion of the paint). In painting the blasted tree at the left (and here the paint is not worn) he used the wood grain in a similar way, exposing the blackened streaks of the wood panel to enliven the cavity in the trunk (Fig. 107). The effect of the dashed pattern of the wood seen in the shadows of the tree trunk or on the ice is strikingly reminiscent of the stippled handling of such passages in the landscape print series, both by Esaias himself (Fig. 89) and others such as Buytewech (Fig. 92).

In this experimental painting Esaias recognized the visual qualities of the wood panel with its stippled grain pattern, and exploited this pattern as part of his image rather than obscuring it with a thick light-colored ground. With this recognition, Esaias may have made an important step in translating into paint the brevity and immediacy of etching, that was central to the naturalism of the many series of landscape etchings. Though this is the only painting by Esaias included in this study to date that exploits the
wood grain in this way, it does not seem to be unique. Judging from reproductions of paintings from the same period, similar effects apparently exist in other works.\textsuperscript{287}

Although this study has not found that such a use of the wood panel in the final image was a routine feature throughout Esaias’ career, his pupil, Jan van Goyen, later developed the technique into a central element of his own painting practice. As the Bruegel-inspired graphic vocabulary had become a consciously referenced convention of naturalistic landscape drawings and prints, Esaias adapted painting technique in an equally conscious reference to this tradition. The reference was not lost on his student Van Goyen, and probably was not lost on the buyers of naturalistic prints and of Esaias’ newly naturalistic paintings.

\textbf{Esaias’ middle years}

Around 1617 Jan van Goyen spent about a year in Haarlem as Esaias van de Velde’s student.\textsuperscript{288} Not surprisingly, Van Goyen’s earliest paintings, from the middle of the 1620s, are remarkably similar to paintings of Esaias’ that he would have seen during his apprenticeship. Because of this similarity, Esaias’ works from this time, the

\textsuperscript{287} For example, the privately owned \textit{Winter Landscape} of around 1614, included in Luijten, et al, \textit{Dawn of the Golden Age}, cat. 336. I hope to examine this painting as this study continues.

late 1610s or around 1620, have often gone under the name of his more famous pupil.

However, the work of Esaias, a mature artist in 1620, was more sophisticated than the comparatively conservative paintings that the young Van Goyen produced (such as the *Landscape with a View of a Village* of 1626, which will be discussed in the next chapter). Two of the paintings examined for this study have been attributed to the early Van Goyen (both have added, false Van Goyen signatures), and both have recently been reattributed to Esaias. Both are winter landscapes: the *Tower by a Frozen River* (Fig. 108) in Leiden of ca. 1618/19,²⁸⁹ and the *Frozen River with Ice Activities* (Fig. 109) in Haarlem around 1620.²⁹⁰ Though they are busy, populated scenes, Esaias’ compositions achieve an open, convincing sense of space that escaped the young Van Goyen for several more years.²⁹¹ Both paintings have an easy naturalism and informality that stems from Esaias’ now-accomplished technique, with its subtle modifications of the older Mannerist landscape painting tradition. These two paintings illustrate the way

²⁸⁹ Beck, *Jan van Goyen II*, 547; Keyes, *Esaias van den Velde*, cat. 81. In microscopic examination for this study the now-effaced false signature at the lower right was read as: IV GOIEN/1612. Though this false signature is very old, so that most of the painting’s crackle pattern extends through the signature paint as well, some areas (for example, the cross-bar of the “G”) seem to interrupt pre-existing cracks. Though the date is stylistically implausible for Van de Velde and virtually impossible for Van Goyen (who was 16 years old in 1612) it is interesting that the “forger” did use the early form of Van Goyen’s signature.


²⁹¹ See, for example a winter landscape by Van Goyen with a village and a wooden bridge, very similar to the Haarlem painting: Beck, *Jan van Goyen II* cat. 37. The younger artist painted a four-square, almost symmetrical composition, and blocked the recession along the frozen canal with the solid, centered bridge and an even distribution of figures that fills the space.
Esaias had built on the technical experimentation of his earliest paintings to develop a newly naturalistic language of painting.

The two panels (the Haarlem painting is rectangular, the Leiden painting is a small tondo) were prepared with an opaque, whitish ground. Samples from the Haarlem painting show a typical double ground structure: a chalk lower ground and slightly toned upper ground based on white lead and chalk. Esaias laid out the major features of the composition (but not his figures) with an underdrawing that was far more abbreviated than the designs under the Oberlin Summer and the Cambridge Winter Landscape. Over the underdrawing, he applied his first paint in the sky, and underpainted most of the composition with thin washes of paint. In his choice of pigments Esaias sometimes followed, sometimes modified the older tradition. In each painting pinkish clouds, rendered with admixtures of a red lake, still reflect Mannerist conventions. However, in both the Haarlem and the Leiden paintings Esaias used a

292. The Leiden painting was not sampled, but is visually similar.

293. The Haarlem painting was examined by J.R.J. van Asperen de Boer and Bernice Tjemkes using infrared reflectography who observed a fragmentary underdrawing. See Bernice Tjemkes, "Onderzoek met behulp van infrarood reflectografie bij enige schilderijen van Jan van Goyen en Esaias van de Velde" (Unpublished research paper under the supervision of J.R.J. van Asperen de Boer, University of Groningen, [1982]): 10. Underdrawing was also seen through the paint in microscopic examination (at the left, in the chimney and the large tree). Equipment for infrared reflectography was not available during the examination of the Leiden painting, but evidence of underdrawing also is clearly visible with a stereo microscope (in the chimney the drawing indicated the outlines and the near edge). There is no evidence for underdrawing in the figures, and they were painted over the completed landscape.
grayish grade of smalt to paint a muted blue sky. While smalt, as discussed earlier, was far less costly than ultramarine, artists at this time could choose the color of the smalt they used. Grades were available in a range from pale to deep blue. The blue of the Esaias’ skies is considerably more dull than the intense color of Jan Brueghel’s ultramarine blue skies or of even of Joos De Momper’s skies based on a strong blue smalt.

Esaias laid down his delicate underpaint in a mid-tone wash like that of the Cambridge painting. In the Leiden painting he used a grayish tone in the trees and the buildings on the right, a warm tan in the tower. In the Haarlem painting he used similar colors: a transparent brown in the buildings, and in the trees a gray that he tinted toward a hazy green by the addition of a few grains of azurite to the earth, black, and white lead pigment mixture (Fig. 110, Fig. 111). In each case, the underpainting plays an important role in the final image as it often shows through the final paint. The brushy handling contributes to the lively surface. In passages such as the streaky foreground ice of the Haarlem picture the horizontal streaks of the underpaint may, like the exposed wood grain in the Raleigh winter landscape, represent a conscious quotation of similar horizontal strokes in the landscape prints.

294. In the Leiden tondo the left part of the blue sky has been overpainted, but the original appearance survives in the central area. The identification of the pigments are estimated, based on examination at high magnification with a stereo microscope; no paint samples were analyzed.

Esaias applied his final paint layer after the sky and underpaint were dry. Though the limited color range does not betray the sharp divisions into zones of space that typify the Southern Netherlandish tradition, Esaias did apparently mentally divide his landscape into a series of sections. He worked from the back of the composition to the front, bringing in turn each section to completion. Within a section he worked with great freedom, often painting wet-into-wet. He painted the distance of the Haarlem Frozen River in one sitting. He rapidly worked the screen of trees, the land and ice before them, before deftly depicting the curved wooden bridge with strokes he pushed into the still-wet paint behind (Fig. 112). In each section Esaias began with a broad mid-tone and then worked up the detail. He began first with darks and then finished by quickly applying the lights. The mid-tone could be either a new application of paint or the washed underpaint that he left visible. In the Haarlem painting, especially, he used the degree of finish to convey a sense of depth. In the closest building on the left his final paint is fairly complete, with a solidly-applied mid-tone. In the more distant buildings on the right he conveyed an atmospheric perspective by using the brushy underpaint alone as the mid-tone, adding over it only limited details. Only after the landscapes were completed did Esaias people them with figures, distributing them in a formally pleasing arrangement. He sketched them with a dark paint that he then rapidly worked up in color.
Paintings for the court: Esaias in The Hague

In 1618 Esaias moved to The Hague, where he joined the guild on October 10. The Leiden and Haarlem winter landscapes were either painted around the time of his move or soon thereafter. With the move to The Hague a new thread appeared in Esaias' work. In addition to naturalistic landscapes that built on the Haarlem innovations, he began to paint more graceful, arcadian landscapes that drew on the Mannerist Southern Netherlandish tradition. He moved easily back and forth between the two modes of landscape, developing his work along parallel paths: one more naturalistic, one more refined and elegant. Presumably these latter paintings appealed to the court-influenced market of The Hague. Technical study reveals that as he modified his painting style, Esaias modified his painting practice. He executed his naturalistic paintings with the innovative techniques he developed during his Haarlem years, while his elegant, more conservative paintings acknowledge the traditional Southern Netherlandish practices in which he had been trained to a greater degree.

The Hague was the seat of the court of the Prince of Orange, stadtholder of the United Provinces. Prince Maurits, stadtholder until his death in 1625, was succeeded by his half-brother Frederik Hendrik. Also in The Hague after 1621 were Frederik V, deposed king of Bohemia, and his wife Elizabeth Stuart (the daughter of James I of England), who set up a fashionable court in exile. In 1625 Frederik Hendrik married Amalia van Solms, who had been a lady-in-waiting to Elizabeth. Though Maurits’...
interest in the arts seems to have been limited, Frederik Hendrik had visited the courts of France and of England, and he and his wife had a taste for international, courtly art, in particular for Southern Netherlandish painting. An inventory of his collections made between 1632 and 1634 lists primarily works by Southern Netherlandish painters including Peter Paul Rubens, Anthony van Dyck, and landscape artists like Jan Brueghel and Alexander Kierincx.297

The Landscape with a Courtly Procession near Abtspoel Castle of 1619 (Fig. 113) was clearly associated with the stadtholder’s court at The Hague.298 Prince Maurits, staunchly Calvinist, had an affair with a Catholic lady, Margaretha van Mechelen, whose family home was Abtspoel. The identification of the castle is confirmed by drawings by Roelant Roghman around 1647,299 and Abraham Rademaker in the eighteenth century,300 and the entourage appears to wear the livery of Prince Maurits.301 Though for religious reasons Maurits could not marry Margaretha, they had a son, and the painting remained in the possession of his descendants until 1954.

297. Drossaers and Lunsingh Scheurleer, Inventarissen


300. Keyes, Esaias van den Velde, 124.

301. Keyes, Esaias van den Velde, 124. Wouter Kloek (cat. no. 337, Luijten, et al, Dawn of the Golden Age) points out that Maurits’ carriage was usually drawn by a matched team of four white horses, as it is in Esaias’ painting of 1626 (Prince Maurits and Frederik Hendrik Accompanied by the Winter King and his Consort at the Rijswijk Horse Fair, Keyes, Esaias van den Velde, cat. 16). This carriage, however, might be similar to the second carriage in that procession.
The painting’s exact function and subject are uncertain, but it conveys the gentle pleasures of rural courtly life.\textsuperscript{302} Such a large and impressive painting was almost certainly commissioned.\textsuperscript{303} Although it is not a literal memento of excursions by Maurits and Margaretha, Abtspoel Castle is recognizable. Nevertheless, Esaias did not record its actual setting, near the Warmond Toll-Gate, but set the castle in an invented, idyllic countryside.\textsuperscript{304} The audience for this painting would have appreciated the elegant conceit of a known house set in an imaginary landscape, quite different from the plausible reality of his renderings of local scenes. The composition, with graceful, arcing trees in woods that open along two vistas, is reminiscent of the forest landscapes of David Vinckboons. The depiction of the rural entertainments of the court also brings to mind Adriaen van de Venne’s paintings of the four seasons with entertainments that included a hawking party of Prince Maurits and his retinue.\textsuperscript{305} The coloring of Esaias’ painting (predominantly brown in the foreground, yellow-green in the middle ground, and blue-green in the distance) recapitulates the Southern

\textsuperscript{302} Though there may be an iconographic program, it seems unlikely that this large painting, owned by the lady herself, can be interpreted as a negative commentary on the liaison between Maurits and Margaretha. See Bruyn’s suggestion along these lines that the acrobat entertaining the procession represents an overt assertion that court life “was part of the topsy-turvy world” or that “the fact that the coach is about to ford the stream...is reckless behavior...avoided by any good Christian,” (Bruyn, “A Turning Point,” 118-119), and comments by Blankert, “Review of Dawn of the Golden Age.”

\textsuperscript{303} It measures 102 cm x 176 cm.


Netherlandish zones of color. Though more muted than Van de Venne’s colors, this painting is vibrant when compared with Esaias’ naturalistic paintings.

In the *Procession Near Abtspoel* Esaias achieved the formal resemblance to Southern Netherlandish-inspired court art, like that of Van de Venne, by returning to aspects of the older landscape painting practice. The support and ground cannot be directly compared to the other works examined in this study, since this is the only canvas painting analyzed for this project. Esaias painted far more often on panel, but for such a large painting canvas was the logical choice: lighter, less expensive, and more stable than an out-sized panel would have been. The opaque gray ground (two layers toned with charcoal black and earth: Fig. 114) was thickly applied to smooth the texture of the canvas. The color is similar to that of the opaque ground in the Cambridge *Winter Landscape*, but unlike that sketchily handled work, where the ground color played a prominent part in the final image, Esaias covered most of this gray ground with a colored underpaint. To the limited extent that he allowed it to show through the final paint, Esaias’ gray ground (rather than the white typical of South Netherlandish Mannerist paintings) slightly muted the strongly colored paint layers.

Esaias established both the zones of the composition and the strong coloration with an underpaint layer that is far more substantial and more strongly pigmented than the thin washes of color he used in the Cambridge and Leiden winter landscapes. This

---

306. Keyes’ catalogue lists only 16 canvas paintings among 187 accepted works. A few are small paintings, but most are among Esaias’ rare, large works. See, for example, the *Meeting of the Apostle Philip and the Ethiopian Eunuch*, (Keyes, Esaias van den Velde, cat. 10), 156 x 193 cm.
underpaint, like the underpaints of Mannerist landscapes, established the painting's strong coloring. Esaias began by broadly brushing the sky, rendering the bright blue at the top of the painting with white lead and a strongly colored smalt only slightly modified with black and earth (Fig. 114), changing to a lighter color near the horizon. He painted the sky well into the area where the foliage was to be painted, then worked his way down the painting with a green underpaint as broadly handled as the sky. In some areas of the middle ground this dull green served as the base tone for the foliage. In other areas he varied it with a second layer of paint applied with the same broad handling, in effect a second layer of underpaint. He brushed out a bright blue-green to establish the base tone for the foliage beyond the figures (Fig. 115). With a swath of yellow he established the slanting sunlight on the meadow in the middle ground on the right (Fig. 116). In the foreground Esaias used a transparent brown-black, applied in brushy handling that defined forms such as the gnarled roots of the central tree; in effect, the foreground brown served not only as an underpaint defining the brown tone but as a painted sketch, which defined design elements as well.

Working from the back of the composition to the front, Esaias painted the details of the landscape over the broad underpaint, often exploiting it as part of the image. In areas such as the meadow the underpaint stands alone as the final image. In the mass of sunlit foliage he worked in just one or two tones of green stippled over the underpaint and sky; in the center of the foliage the solid blue-green underpaint creates the strong color of the middle distance while the edges of the foliage, stippled over the sky, lighten the effect. In the foreground, which is more detailed, the brushy brown
underpaint shows through in much of the final image, where it serves as the shadows in
passages like the gnarled roots. In these areas the final paint consists only of quickly
worked touches of final paint in muted greens and tans.

Not surprisingly, in a work that represents known persons and that may have
been commissioned by them, Esaias seems to have given more consideration to the
placement and rendering of the figures than in other works. The more incidental
figures, such as the young man perched on the bank at the right, or the vagabond
acrobat, were probably painted over a fairly open part of the landscape in his usual
procedure. But at least some of the figures of the cavalcade (for example, the two
leading riders, Fig. 117), seem to have been planned in the brown sketch or underpaint
that Esaias used to lay out the foreground. Here the final landscape details end at the
edges of the riders’ forms, leaving reserves into which Esaias later painted the
figures. 307

In its technique as well as in formal aspects such as the subject, composition,
and coloring, Esaias seems to have intended the Procession Near Abtspoe to appeal to
tastes at the stadtholder’s court. Although he did not ape court tastes in an exact
imitation of South Netherlandish landscapes, he selectively returned to aspects of the
technical tradition practiced by Jan Brueghel and Roelandt Savery to produce a
painting that consciously participated in that tradition. The brighter palette, the zones

307. The only sampling opportunity within the figures, in the torso of the rider
behind the coach, did not offer conclusive evidence on the painting sequence of the
figures. A cross section taken from this area showed that this fairly small figure’s
costume lies over a single layer of green landscape in this area, it did not include any
brown underpaint/sketch.
of distance indicated by a solid underpaint rather than a thin tonal wash, and the integration of the figures with the composition are analogous to the Southern tradition. Such technical choices are evidence of a conscious change of style.

Two paintings from the last decade of Esaias’ life illustrate the extraordinary fluency with which he painted both elegant, imagined scenes and naturalistic landscapes. The tiny tondo of 1625 depicting a Road Between a Farm and Water in Cleveland (Fig. 118) is one of these charming invented landscapes in which the goal is more decorative than documentary. The Winter Landscape of 1623 (Fig. 121), in London, is an extraordinary prelude to the naturalistic landscapes of the next generation.

Although the graceful arc of the road around the still water defines the lower half of the Cleveland composition, this tondo is dominated by the vertical pair of feathery trees that Esaias painted in a stylized contrast of colors, one green and one golden. Esaias has here created his delicate decorative effects with techniques that are similar to those he used for the large Minneapolis painting, but modified to suit the diminutive scale. He prepared the panel with a double ground. As in the Cambridge Winter Landscape a first chalk-based layer smoothed the panel, and a thin gray upper ground was the final painting surface. However, the visual role of this preparation is more like that of the Minneapolis painting. Rather than using the gray throughout the final image (as in the Cambridge painting where it is the source of the steely winter tonality), Esaias’ subsequent paint layers almost entirely covered the gray ground. In the final effect, the ground only subtly mutes the colorful paint layers.
Infrared reflectography offers little evidence that Esaias laid out the details of the composition at this stage with an underdrawing. As he had in the large Procession Near Abtspoel, he seems to have painted the sky first and then laid out the broad areas of the landscape, the zones of foliage, water, and road, with colored underpaint. He worked the sky in two layers with a quick wet-in-wet handling that gives it a lively sense of immediacy. In a touch reminiscent of the much coarser Oberlin Emmaus from the previous decade, he painted the birds into the wet strokes of paint. After the sky was dry, he indicated the rounded contour of the distant foliage with a thinly washed light green underpaint that suggests atmospheric perspective (Fig. 119). In the nearer foliage he diminished the effect of distance by increasing the proportion of black and azurite for a deeper green underpaint. He indicated the road with an underpaint whose lively brushwork gives detail to the foreground.

Though Esaias must have had his composition in mind, the most important elements—the central trees, the farm, and the figures—do not appear in the underpaint. Instead he made brief "underdrawing" notations on top of the underpaint before proceeding with the final painting. The trunks of the central trees, and perhaps some details of the farm building, appear in infrared reflectography. Following these drawing notes, he painted the final image from back to front, leaving reserves in the background paint to accommodate the buildings and the two slender tree trunks. In this intimate format he exploited subtle differences of handling both to build the space and for decorative effect. He suggested distant trees with a simple, stippled touch while he developed closer foliage in greater detail with an elegant, calligraphic handling. He
painted the central trees into the space reserved in the background paint, working directly on the sky and landscape underpaint. As in most of his other works, Esaias added the figures to a completed landscape, sketching them in with a brown-black paint and working them up with the quickest of color notations.

Esaias created marked color contrasts of the Road Between a Farm and Water through conscious choices. He set the pinkish building against the bank of trees whose blue-green he established in the azurite-based underpaint. Most striking of all is the vibrant contrast he established between the green and the golden trees in the center (Fig. 120), which is reminiscent of similar mannered effects in Antwerp landscapes such as the Noah's Ark after Jan Brueghel the Elder (Fig. 30). The result is not an accidental effect, but the deliberate result of Esaias' choice of pigments.

The London Winter Landscape of 1623 (Fig. 121), a completely plausible rendering of a raw winter day, forms a remarkable contrast to the graceful Cleveland tondo. The painting is dominated by the expanse of cold blue sky over a landscape rendered almost in monochrome. The foreground, which Esaias quickly noted in dark paint, is in some ways closer in spirit to his chalk drawings than to elegant, painterly works like the Cleveland tondo.

The ground of this painting is extraordinarily thin, barely filling the texture of the wood panel. A cross section from the sky (Fig. 122) shows that this almost

308. The size of the panel limited the opportunities for sampling, but surface examination at high magnification confirmed that the color of the golden tree comes from a high proportion of earth pigments rather than a discolored transparent copper green.
imperceptible layer of chalk and white lead is textured on its underside by the wood grain. The pinkish buff color that dominates the painting through the loosely handled paint is due less to the small amounts of black and earth pigment Esaias used to tone the ground than to the oak panel itself. The color and even the grain of the wood appear throughout much of the final image (Fig. 123).

Working directly onto this thin preparation Esaias situated the main elements of the foreground landscape with a loose and suggestive underdrawing. He indicated the foliage along the horizon with a few looped strokes, but made no provision for the figures (Fig. 124). The foreground underdrawing, rendered in firm, dark strokes, is visible through the thin paint in some areas, and Esaias seems to have incorporated it into the final image. The lighter, looser loops on the horizon served only to indicate the general placement of the foliage masses along the profile of the distance, an aide-memoire that even the thinnest paint in the sky completely covered.

Esaias’ first paint application can only be considered a faint echo of the full underpainting stage of a South Netherlandish landscape. In this stage he laid out the sky with a small amount of pale smalt mixed with white lead. In the upper part of the sky he painted a second, darker layer into the first (Fig. 122). Along the horizon he painted the trees and town profile wet-into-wet with the sky, working the delicate gray-green paint thinly to expose the pinkish buff color below. He continued this first application of paint in the foreground, following the guide of the underdrawing. In some areas he left the panel’s thinly applied ground visible to serve as the first tone,
while in others he sparsely indicated the forms of the road and hillocks with tan and gray-green underpaint.

When this underpainting was dry, Esaias sketched out the details of the image in a monochrome paint that ranges from gray to black. This dark, sketchy paint echoed and exploited the firm underdrawing of the foreground and together they dominate the final image. In a final stage, after the dark paint had dried, he completed the painting with a few touches of creamy mid-tones and final highlights painted wet-into-wet. When the entire landscape was complete, he superimposed the small figures over it, sketching them in dark paint and working them up with brief touches of subdued color.

The London Winter Landscape disproves the idea sometimes put forward that Esaias’ paintings were inherently more conservative than his graphic works, and that the paintings he made after his move to The Hague were particularly so.309 The severe, open space, almost devoid of narrative content, is close to one of the earliest etchings from Esaias’ Haarlem period (Fig. 125).310 Paintings like the Cleveland tondo probably were intended to appeal to the fashionable court circles that were also interested in Southern Netherlandish landscapes, and the equally elegant paintings produced in Utrecht. But though this is a painting, the limited tonal range and the combined effect

309. Briels, for example, suggests that landscape paintings called for narrative content, which dominated the qualities of the landscape itself, while etchings, outside the realm of “official art,” were not under this constraint. Peintres Flamands en Holland, 378.

310. Keyes, Esaias van den Velde, E 22.
of the underdrawing and dark, sketchy paint is analogous in its graphic effect to Esaias’
drawings.

The underdrawing of the distance is qualitatively different from that of the
foreground. The looped strokes on the horizon, which were covered and so fulfilled a
practical function only, are not found in the drawings. But the foreground is closely
analogous to drawings from 1625 and 1627 that are noteworthy for their economy of
means (Fig. 126). 311 The small tree branches were underdrawn and then painted in
clusters of elongated arcs like those drawings. In both painting and drawings pairs of
lines, or overlapping, staggered lines, describe the buildings and the twisted tree trunks,
while Esaias indicated the road and small hillocks with simple curves or slightly
deflected lines. This graphic vocabulary is quite unlike the heavily worked black chalk
and the stubby curves of the bare trees in the earliest chalk drawings (Fig. 127). 312 It
also differs from the chalk and wash drawings in a sketchbook that Keyes dates to
around 1624, the year after Esaias painted the Winter Landscape (Fig. 128). Those
compositions are filled with activity, and the chalk drawings alone, with their jagged
outlines and zig-zag filling-in of the foreground, are busier than the Winter Landscape’s
underdrawing and paint combined. Far from being conservative, the Winter Landscape
both in its handling and its composition, is as radical as any of the graphic works.

As George Keyes has made clear in his monograph, an understanding of Esaias
van de Velde’s work, and his contributions to seventeenth-century landscape, cannot be

311. Keyes, Esaias van den Velde D 73, D 86, D 88.
312. Keyes, Esaias van den Velde, D 77.
limited to the production of his early years in Haarlem. Such an approach sacrifices the achievements of his years in The Hague to a definition of Esaias as a single-mindedly progressive artist. 313

For the purposes of this study, the emphasis in the next chapter will be on Esaias’ technical innovations in naturalistic landscape, and his influence on Jan van Goyen and the tonal landscapists of the next generation. This emphasis will, to a degree, perpetuate the notion of Esaias’ work in The Hague as inherently conservative, his work in Haarlem as progressive because it contributed to a naturalism that is in tune with modern taste. But the technical study also offers intriguing evidence of how easily, and how deliberately, Esaias moved between naturalistic and more refined styles. The evidence that he modified significant aspects of his painting technique to achieve different styles serves to confirm his self-conscious distinction between these two threads in his art.

Esaias’ elegant paintings produced in The Hague did not maintain the tradition of South Netherlandish landscape to the degree that Roelandt Savery did in the works discussed in the previous chapter, either in the formal aspects of his compositions or in the techniques by which he created them. There are greater parallels to the techniques of other contemporaries in the Northern Netherlands such as Jacob Pynas and Cornelis Vroom, whose work also was discussed above. But in all these artists’ works, as in Esaias’ court-inspired paintings, the selective maintenance of much of the South Netherlandish technical tradition contributed to a bucolic, composed landscape.

313. Keyes, Esaias van den Velde, 16-17.
The technical evidence also confirms that the new naturalism that typifies the other thread of Esaias’ art was not incidental in any way, but resulted from his conscious choices. The fact that he painted landscapes in both styles, and that he varied his techniques to achieve this, is evidence that landscape as a subject does not inherently drive the artist toward naturalism as has sometimes been suggested. 314 And though winter scenes offer artists the option of working in a more limited, naturalistic palette the choice of this subject does not inevitably result in austere, tonal works, 315 as paintings by Adriaen van de Venne and by Hendrik Avercamp document. 316 Moreover, Esaias’ motivations in developing a naturalistic painting style cannot have been based primarily on economic concerns. 317 He probably did paint a work like the London Winter Landscape in a shorter time than a comparably sized painting in his refined style. However, his move to The Hague where tastes favored artists who earned

314. Lyckle de Vries, for example, suggests that the rise of “realism” in Haarlem between 1610 and 1620 is a function of specialization in the genres of landscape and scenes of modern life: "The Changing Face of Realism," In Art in History/History in Art: Studies in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Culture, ed. David Freedberg, and Jan de Vries, (Santa Monica: Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1991), 234.

315. Stechow notes progressive character of Esaias’ winter landscapes, Dutch Landscape Painting, 21.

316. See, for example, two paintings illustrated in Luijten, et al, Dawn of the Golden Age: Avercamp’s early painting from Amsterdam (repr. in color, 262) and the Winter from Van de Venne’s four seasons in Worcester (repr. in color, 271).

317. Montias, "Cost and Value".
comparatively high prices,\textsuperscript{318} and the predominance of works in his refined style after this move, suggest that he saw greater chances for economic rewards in this style.

The naturalism that characterized landscape in the early seventeenth century reflects a conscious turn away from that tradition. The landscape prints by Claes Jansz Visscher, Willem Buytewech, and Esaias van de Velde replaced composed landscapes executed in engraving. These artists produced light-filled, atmospheric landscapes that drew on the graphic vocabulary associated with Pieter Bruegel the Elder. They used a rapidly noted etched technique to convey spontaneity, giving the viewer an impression of joining the artist in direct observation of the landscape. Esaias’ innovations in painting technique similarly redirected the established landscape painting tradition. The graphic language of naturalistic prints and drawings served as inspiration and as model for these changes. In the earliest work studied, the Oberlin \textit{Summer Landscape}, the underdrawing was never intended to be seen, and it shows striking parallels to the quick personal notations of Esaias’ open-air drawing. In the Raleigh \textit{Farms Flanking a Frozen Canal}, his conscious exploitation of the wood grain in parts of the design emulated the stippled handling that characterizes so many of the landscape prints. In the underdrawing of the London \textit{Winter Landscape} of 1623 he seems to have used the underdrawing of the foreground in the final image, where the combination of the underdrawing and Esaias’ sketchy dark paint is remarkably close in spirit to his drawing style from a few years later.

\textsuperscript{318} Chong, “Market for Landscape Painting.”
For a painter like Esaïas van de Velde, trained in the South Netherlands landscape painting tradition, representing the local landscape in a naturalistic manner was not the “path of least resistance” but a self-conscious decision to undertake a new artistic direction. This break with tradition was far more profound than simply adding local details to the landscape subject, or painting with a looser brushwork. Artists who worked within the South Netherlands tradition, such as Jan Brueghel I, also introduced elements of the Netherlands countryside into their paintings. But Brueghel’s paintings cast the Flemish countryside in the familiar context of stylized zones of color and precious, jewel-like detail. An Antwerp painter like Joos de Momper developed a remarkably free handling of paint and, as Montias has noted, this must have contributed to the prices that De Momper’s paintings received: closer to Van Goyen’s prices than to Brueghel’s. Yet De Momper’s eloquently abbreviated manner preserved all parts of the Mannerist landscape painting process, including the separate underpainting stage, and he never rejected the formal organization of landscape space into three zones of color. Both Brueghel and De Momper were able to modulate and modernize the Southern Netherlands landscape tradition without rejecting its central organizing principles. Esaïas used that tradition selectively, working in a radically new technique for his most naturalistic paintings and retaining aspects of the older tradition for his paintings intended for the court-oriented market of The Hague. Van Goyen, after his earliest works, entirely rejected the practices of the Mannerist landscape tradition.

CHAPTER 5: JAN VAN GOYEN AND THE PRACTICE OF NATURALISTIC LANDSCAPE

Jan van Goyen's paintings, rapidly executed and limited in tonality, give the impression of a shorthand notation that grew naturally out of direct observation of the local landscape. However he created this impression through conscious artistic choices. Throughout his career, Van Goyen developed new ways of painting to convey a sense of spontaneous naturalism. Van Goyen's painting practices, which were crucial to achieving his naturalistic landscape style, grew out of the experiments of his final teacher, Esaias van de Velde. Van Goyen's father apparently sent him from the age of ten on a series of apprenticeships that seem to have little effect on his later paintings. From 1615 to 1616 he traveled to France, but around 1617 he returned to spend a year with Esaias, just nine years his senior, in Haarlem.

The year with Esaias van de Velde was certainly the decisive influence on Van Goyen's art. By 1618 when Esaias moved to The Hague and Van Goyen returned to Leiden, Esaias was painting works like the Leiden Tower by a Frozen River (Fig. 108): thin, rapidly worked compositions with a remarkably unified space, muted tonality, and

320. For a catalogue of Van Goyen's paintings and drawings, see Beck, Jan van Goyen I-III. For an overview of Van Goyen's life (including a useful biographical outline in table form) and essays on aspects of his work, see the catalogue of the exhibition in Leiden: Christiaan Vogelaar, Jan Van Goyen, exh. cat. (Stedelijk Museum De Lakenhal, Leiden: 1996).

limited narrative. He had taken up drawing out-of-doors in black chalk on unprepared paper, the technique Van Goyen was to make his own, filling a lifetime of sketchbooks. Over the course of the year Van Goyen must have become aware of Esaias’ investigations of the previous few years: the landscape etchings and the technical experimentation in paintings like the Raleigh Farms Flanking a Frozen Canal.

Van Goyen’s earliest paintings, those from the first half of the 1620s, owe more to the works Esaias painted in 1617-1618 when Van Goyen studied with him than to Esaias’ works from the 1620s—either the sketchy, naturalistic works like the London Winter Landscape of 1623 (Fig. 121) or the elegant, refined compositions like the Cleveland Road between a Farm and Water of 1625 (Fig. 118). In the second half of the 1620s Van Goyen joined Pieter Molijn and Salomon van Ruysdael in painting typically Dutch dune scenes, and in the process developed a revolutionary new form of landscape, the “tonal” landscape. Molijn and Ruysdael worked in Haarlem and Van Goyen in Leiden, but the artists seem to have been in close contact. In 1634 Van Goyen paid a fine to the Haarlem guild for having worked in the house of Salomon’s uncle, Isaack van Ruysdael, without being registered in the Haarlem guild. In this brief period Van Goyen seems to have been the follower, with Molijn initiating the form.

322. As Stechow notes, the earliest such work is by another artist: Pieter Santvoort’s Landscape with a Road and Farmhouse of 1625 in Berlin (Dutch Landscape Painting, 22-25, fig. 23). Sutton points out with justification that as the dramatically modern qualities of Santvoort’s 1625 painting are unique in his short career (he died in 1635), his contribution to this development must have been limited (Sutton, Dutch Landscape Painting, 480-481). On Molijn, see Eva Jeney Allen, "The Life and Art of Pieter Molyn" (Ph.D. diss, University of Maryland, 1987). On Ruysdael see Wolfgang Stechow, Salomon Van Ruysdael, Eine Einführung in Seine Kunst, Mit Kritischen Katalog Der Gemälde (rev. ed. Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1977).
Molijn's famous *Dune Landscape with Trees and Wagon* of 1626 (Fig. 129) may owe some of its radical brevity to its tiny size. But the forceful wedge-shaped composition, which reduced the zone of distance to a barely perceived notation on the rim of the dune, seems consciously revolutionary.

By the 1630s, however, Van Goyen was decisively in the lead of these developments. He was an innovator throughout his career, taking the lead in introducing new compositional types. Technical study has also revealed his innovative painting practices. His methods were not only extraordinarily efficient—Beck catalogues a surviving oeuvre of over 1200 paintings—they exploited the visual characteristics of his materials in new ways. Van Goyen's painting practices, initially inspired by Esaias van de Velde's experiments, were particularly well suited to rendering plausible images of the local scene. His prolific output had a profound effect on a multitude of imitators. This final chapter considers Van Goyen's practices in a series of paintings chosen from throughout his career.


324. For a catalogue of paintings and drawings, see Beck, *Künstler um Jan van Goyen*. 
Van Goyen’s earliest works

Just as the compositions of Jan van Goyen’s earliest work were heavily dependent on the example of Esaias van de Velde, his early techniques also acknowledged Esaias’ practice but in some ways were more conservative than the older master’s. The space of Van Goyen’s colorful Village Scene of 1626 (Fig. 132), divided into a series of overlapping zones sharply defined by shifts of color and lighting, is considerably less sophisticated than Esaias’ earlier Tower by a Frozen River (Fig. 108), discussed above, with its smooth diagonal recession along the frozen shore. The younger artist’s painting procedures offer a fascinating glimpse into the work of a developing artistic personality. Certain procedures correspond to those of Esaias. Other aspects of the technique can be directly linked to the old-fashioned qualities of Van Goyen's painting. But in this work there also are already intimations of the direct approach to painting that was to mark Van Goyen’s mature work.

It was not possible to examine the Village Scene for an underdrawing using infrared reflectography. Two round panels in the Rijksmuseum from 1625, however, a pair depicting a summer and a winter scene,325 have been examined by this technique. On these little panels Van Goyen laid out the landscape in detail (down to the shadow cast by the central tree in the summer scene) with a loose, scribbled drawing, but he did not include the figures (Fig. 130; Fig. 131).326 In the recent examinations with a stereo

325. Beck, Jan van Goyen II, cat. no. 108 and Beck, Jan van Goyen II, cat. no. 9.

326. Tjemkes, "Infrarood reflectografie." I am grateful to Prof. van Asperen de Boer for allowing me to consult the reflectograms of the two Rijksmuseum tondos.
microscope it was seen that in both of the 1625 paintings and in the Village Scene of 1626 Van Goyen added the figures after completing the landscape. He sketched them in a dark paint, and then worked them up in colors, just as Esaias had done in the Tower by a Frozen River from the previous decade.

In the Village Scene Van Goyen laid out most of his landscape with a substantial first layer of paint, far more solid than Esaias’; which he later worked up in detail. The painting technique makes it clear that the distinction into zones, which is a dominant formal aspect of the composition, was integral to the painter's conception of the work. He painted each zone of the composition independently, and within each zone worked in a number of stages some days apart. A photomicrograph taken from the right side of the composition (Fig. 133) reveals that the dark green of the middle ground was painted over the lighter distance after all details of that zone were dry. This deliberate way of working is more reminiscent of Savery’s method described above than of Esaias’ rapid painting over a lightly washed underpaint. Only in passages such as the left foreground is there an intimation of the loose technique that Van Goyen would develop. Though he worked in a series of steps in this area also, allowing each color to dry before returning with another, he worked loosely. Here the superimposed brush strokes created a suggestive web of colors.

Aspects of Van Goyen’s palette also seem less naturalistic (and more old-fashioned) than that of the older master. He painted the sky with a much stronger blue

Interestingly, the underdrawing for the winter scene shows a modest farm building rather than the diminutive castle, which Van Goyen invented at the painting stage.
small than Esaias chose for the Tower by a Frozen River; this small was almost as strongly colored as Savery's ultramarine, though less expensive. To create the striking aqua blue of the far distance, Van Goyen mixed a very dark red lake into an otherwise typical blue paint made with azurite. 327 This mixture, and the resulting color, are not typical either of Mannerist landscapes (where the distance is usually painted with azurite and white lead) or of the gray-green mixture Van Goyen frequently used in his mature paintings. It is, however, reminiscent of the pigment mixture in the distant foliage of Cornelis Vroom's Landscape with a River by a Wood of 1626 discussed in Chapter 3, which is also an unusual cold tone of blue. Both artists may have been experimenting with variations on the traditional landscape formulas without yet seeking plausibly naturalistic colors.

In one respect Van Goyen's early paintings, including the Village Scene, are more directly painted than most of Van de Velde's works. As Esaias did, Van Goyen painted the sky at the same time that he laid down the underpaint for the rest of the composition. In this same stage, however, Van Goyen also completed the final details of the horizon, working rapidly into the wet paint of the sky. This was his way of rendering the distance indistinct, creating atmospheric perspective. Esaias created a similar effect, but almost always in two stages: by painting the details of the horizon with a feathery touch over the dry paint of the sky and underpaint wash. In the

327. The identifications of the pigments are estimated, based on examination at high magnification with a stereo microscope, no paint samples were analyzed.
confidence with which Van Goyen painted the horizon we can see a premonition of the directness that was soon to characterize an entire painting.

**Van Goyen in the late 1620s**

Van Goyen achieved an astonishingly rapid transition from the conservatism of the *Village Scene* to the assurance of his mature works. His response to dune landscapes such as Pieter Molijn's 1626 work (Fig. 129) can be seen in works from the late 1620s, such as a *Cottage on a Heath* in London, of around 1629 (Fig. 134).328 The development of his compositions was paralleled by—was in fact achieved through—an equally dramatic development of new painting techniques.

Van Goyen painted the *Cottage on a Heath* on a panel prepared with the typical ground for a wood panel at this period. The wood was first smoothed with a thin chalk ground. An upper ground, or *primuersel*, of white lead and chalk lightly toned with earth colors faintly echoed the color of the wood panel itself. He drew the composition rapidly, scribbling heavily for the nearer parts of the composition, indicating distance with a lighter touch. The horizon is barely noted in the underdrawing at all (Fig. 135). Interestingly, he did roughly indicate the two major figures in this underdrawing, though the minor figures were rendered in paint only, along with the trees of the horizon.

By this time Van Goyen had essentially abandoned the use of a separate underpaint stage to lay out the colors of the composition's zones: the stage of the

328. Beck, Jan van Goyen II, cat. no. 1197A.
painting process that was central to Mannerist landscapes, and that survived as a light wash in Esaias’ paintings. His first paint layer in this work was closer in character to a monochrome painted sketch, ranging only from dark gray to dark brown, with which he sketched out the landscape and both the major and the secondary figures. This sketch is visible as the charcoal-gray darks of the greenish middle ground and the warm browns in the yellowish foreground, where it served as a shadow tone.

Some time later, after the sketch had dried, Van Goyen completed A Cottage on a Heath in a single sitting, working so loosely that the warm color of the ground and panel featured throughout the final image. He first laid in the sky then, as he had in the Village Scene, painted the horizon into the wet paint (Fig. 136). From here, however, he continued working from the distance toward the front of the landscape. He painted each compositional area in turn: building up first the mid-tones then lights, adding occasional dark details, but always working wet-into-wet. Throughout, the painted sketch served as the rapidly brushed shadows and lent the painting a unified tonality. Even the underdrawing played a role. The scribbled loops of drawing now clearly visible (for example below the two seated men, Fig. 137) were almost certainly always visible through such translucent brown paints. In the late 1620s Van Goyen seems already to have realized new benefits by allowing all stages of his painting procedures to play a role in the finished image. This practice was not only efficient, it expanded his painting’s visual interest and brought to it a new sense of immediacy.

As the use of a monochrome painted sketch became widespread, many seventeenth-century artists made it an integral stage of their pictorial practice. A
number of artists who used this technique will be discussed in the Epilogue. Van Goyen, however, quickly moved beyond the use of such a sketch as an independent stage of the painting process. In his mature work he followed Esaias van de Velde’s lead in using a sketch-like handling in his final paint layers.

The mature works

In 1678 Samuel van Hoogstraeten described an episode in which Van Goyen entered into a competition with François van Kibbergen and Jan Porcellis to paint a landscape in a single day. If the story were true it would probably have taken place between the late 1620s, when Van Goyen and Kibbergen were young artists embarking on their careers, and Porcellis’ death in early 1632. In fact, however, Van Goyen’s earliest dated compositions of the type that include the details outlined in the story—an old bulwark with gate and jetty, reflections in rippled water, and ships and laden barges—are not from the late 1620’s, but from 1634. Hoogstraeten took liberties to contrast the three approaches to landscape, rather than recording a literal report on the techniques of Van Goyen’s paintings from the late 1620s. He probably described the painting methods he believed Van Goyen used in his well-known

329. Hoogstraeten, Inleyding, 237-238. For discussion of this passage see Wetering, Leidse schilders, Walsh, “Jan and Julius Porcellis” 737-738; and the introduction by Brown in Dutch Landscape, 31-33.

330. “...hier zagmen een oude steevest met poort en waterhooft voor den dag komen, en in’t aenkabelende water wederglassen, scheepen en schuiten, met vraagt of reyzigers belaaden.” (Hoogstraeten, Inleyding, 237, my translation. I am most grateful to Jaap Engelsman for his corrections of my translation). For paintings of this compositional type see, for example, Beck, Jan van Goyen II, cat. no. 630.
paintings from the mid-1630s onward, works that for him epitomized Van Goyen's practice.

Hoogstraeten's story was probably a topos, a rhetorical device that contrasted the three artists' working methods. By extension, Hoogstraeten contrasted the differing ways they conceived of, and structured, their landscape compositions. Knibbergen was the most methodical, working from the back of the composition to the front, completing each section by routine. Porcellis, the established master, began work only after long thought; in the end, however this process resulted in a selective naturalism that won the contest. Van Goyen's method was described as a virtuoso performance: skilled, but almost instinctive.

In Hoogstraeten's account Van Goyen began his painting for the contest by working over his entire panel in dark and light areas giving the effect of an agate, or marbled paper; then from within this "chaos of paints" he drew out a multitude of detail "that he made recognizable with little difficulty and with many small touches [of the brush]." 331 Clearly, Hoogstraeten described a very direct method of painting, though he may have exaggerated to contrast Van Goyen's directness with the other artists' methods. In any case, this technical study has shown how quickly the young painter achieved the artistic confidence that the story illustrates.

331. "...hy zijn geheel paneel in't gros overzwadderende, hier light, daer donker, min noch meer als een veelverwige Agaat, of gemarbert papier," "...die hy met weynig moeiten en veel kleyne toetsjes kenlijk maekte," (Hoogstraeten, Inleyding, 237, my translation).
The Dune Landscape in Leiden (Fig. 1, Fig. 139) shows that by around 1632 Van Goyen was already in full command of the painting practices that typify his works from the 1630s and early 1640s. The recent examination has shown that he painted his entire image from sky to foreground in a single sitting, wet-into-wet. The handling is as brilliant as Hoogstraeten described, but Van Goyen was somewhat more methodical than the writer would have us believe.

Van Goyen allowed the warm tone of the ground with which he prepared the panel to show throughout much of the image. He apparently did not underdraw the composition (unless with some brief notations in a material such as white chalk that would no longer be perceptible), nor even use a monochrome painted sketch to lay out his design in a distinct, preparatory stage. He painted from the back of the painting's space toward the front, but with none of the mechanical quality for which Hoogstraeten faulted Knibbergen. He first laid in the overcast sky in a pale grayish blue created with so pale a grade of smalt that it was almost colorless, and an admixture of black to give

---

332. The time span over which a painting was completed can only be estimated, based on the degree to which overlapping paint pushed aside the paint lying below. Since oil paints dry over a matter of days, depending on the pigments used and atmospheric conditions, some degree of wet-into-wet painting might be possible over slightly more than a day; paints applied a day or two after the first layer would push it aside only to a degree. A test of drying times using modern lead white paint established that such an effect might be apparent after about 24 hours of drying. See David Bomford, Jo Kirby, John Leighton, and Ashok Roy, Art in the Making: Impressionism, exh. cat. (National Gallery, London: 1991): 92. In the Dune Landscape all overlapping paints were swirled into completely wet paint below.
a subtle "optical" blue. Along the horizon, he pushed the gray-green paint of the small scrubby trees into the wet paint of the sky, exposing the tan ground to serve as a third color. He completed each nearer section of the landscape in turn, swirling the upper edge into the wet paint of the section behind. Like the trees of the horizon, the figures at the left were painted into the wet paint of the sky and of the rise of land on which they stand. The transparent brown paint of the shadowed foreground is not a preliminary painted sketch but was painted at the same time as the rest of that area. Van Goyen now incorporated the sketch stage directly into the painting process, and worked the final, light-colored paints of his foreground into the wet brown. Possibly the first work in this transparent brown is the mottled agate pattern that Hoogstraeten described.

Van Goyen produced the entire work with fluent wet-into-wet painting that absorbed all stages of the painting process. Just a single element, the spar standing out of the water at the lower right, was added after the rest of the painting had dried. He abandoned the underpaint seen in the Village Scene of 1626. The transparent brown paint, which had been a preliminary painted sketch in the Cottage on a Heath, here was simply the darkest of the paints, swirled wet-into-wet along with the mid-tones and highlights.

The Windmill by a River of 1642 (Fig. 140) exemplifies Van Goyen's brilliant mature technique, using paint alone to create effect at once painterly and distinctly

333. When they are hazily seen through a matrix of white lead, like that of any paint used for a sky, black particles scatter proportionally more of the blue end of the light spectrum, giving a faintly cool cast to the resulting color.
graphic. He prepared his panel with the standard thin, two-layered ground (similar to that of the *Cottage on a Heath* described above), but here he added more golden-brown earth to the upper ground, for a pinkish-buff color that more obviously echoed that of the wood. Over this moderately toned surface, he began his image in paint. Infrared reflectography has revealed no underdrawing. The handling of the paint is extraordinarily rapid and evocative. As in the *Dune Landscape*, Van Goyen painted from back to front, completing each area then moving to the next with little pause. He often worked just with two or three colors, loosely brushing the general form of an area with a mid-tone, then working it up with calligraphic details in a darker paint (Fig. 141). He emphasized the fall of light on the central rise of ground with a more painterly handling of the bright yellow. As in the youthful *Village Scene* (and as Esaias van de Velde had) he painted the figures after the landscape, sketching them in a dark paint and working that up with color. Here, however, he painted the figures almost immediately, incorporating them into the still-wet paint of the landscape. The sense of rapidity, of a swiftly-noted image jotted down in a burst of activity, is reinforced by the recognition of a row of fingerprints in the sky along the right edge of the panel (Fig. 142). Van Goyen did not leave his landscape on the easel for long days of contemplation and amendment, but immediately set it aside. Only days later, when the paint had dried, did he add the monogram and date in the lower left corner.

The *Windmill by a River* is one of Van Goyen's classic "tonal" landscapes; he used muted colors, but his palette was not at all monochromatic. With a limited range of colors he played a subtle harmony of grayish green, a clear yellow typical of lead-tin
yellow,\textsuperscript{334} and the gray-blue sky, against the pinkish ground. In the foreground this ground tone is only somewhat modified by the paint over it. In the sky he worked his paint solidly in the lightest and darkest passages, while in transitions he brushed the paint vigorously, allowing the ground to peep through as a warm, contrasting mid-tone. In the water, his horizontal brush strokes implied ripples on the surface, and in places he dragged the paint thinly, allowing the appearance of the ground to imply the reflected clouds.

Because he worked with a limited color range and no longer distinguished zones of distance through the use of colored underpaint Van Goyen did not have to set up a separate palette for each area of the painting, but could paint continuously from the back of his composition toward the foreground.\textsuperscript{335} Though his limited palette clearly is related to a unified conception of space it is not entirely clear which issue was of primary concern. In effect, the use of a limited palette permitted Van Goyen to work over the whole painting. Conversely, if he wished to work over the whole painting he would have to use a limited palette.

The Panoramic View of a Wide River of around 1644 (Fig. 143) is another of Van Goyen's mature works in which infrared reflectography has not revealed an underdrawing. This examination technique has not been used to examine a great number of Van Goyen's paintings, but one study found comparatively complete

\footnotesize{334. The identification of the pigment was estimated, based on examination at high magnification with a stereo microscope; the paint samples available did not include the yellow of the foreground.}

\footnotesize{335. Van de Wetering, "The use of the palette."}
underdrawings in early works from the 1620s and early 1630s, while only occasional, or incomplete, underdrawings were observed in later works.\textsuperscript{336} There may be black underdrawings in paintings that have not been examined, and the possibility remains that the artist made some preliminary notations with white chalk, which would not be perceived with infrared reflectography. However, it is likely that in some of these paintings he worked directly from drawings or sketchbooks. The earlier study found that the \textit{Panoramic View of a Wide River}, which is closely based on a page from the sketchbook of 1644, has no black underdrawing.\textsuperscript{337} We can imagine the artist at work in the studio with the open sketchbook close at hand, translating the image into paint. In a landscape of 1642,\textsuperscript{338} the same study found that the large figures of the cows and milkmaid were underdrawn in some detail, while the simple landscape was indicated only schematically. This comparatively complete underdrawing may have supplemented Van Goyen's use of a black chalk drawing from life that is closely related to the figure group.\textsuperscript{339} Perhaps in this painting, which is dominated by the figure group to a greater degree than most of Van Goyen's paintings, the artist required a more careful organization of the composition.

\footnotesize

\textsuperscript{336} Tjemkes, "Infrarood reflectografie."


\textsuperscript{338} Beck, \textit{Jan van Goyen} II, cat. no. 997.

\textsuperscript{339} Location unknown, illustrated in Vogelaar, \textit{Jan van Goyen}, cat. 27, fig. 90.
The Panoramic View of a Wide River also reflects the mature Van Goyen's remarkable sensitivity to the visual qualities inherent in his painting materials. He painted this work in virtually one sitting. The brilliant wet-into-wet technique can be seen in a photomicrograph of the foliage at the left (Fig. 144). Here he used just two colors of green, but by swirling them into the light paint of the water, he created a lively range of tones.

As in earlier paintings, he used the ground in the image. Van Goyen's use of an inexpensive combination of white lead and chalk (commercially available under the name lootwit) in the oil-bound upper layer would make his typical double ground faintly translucent. In this painting, as in many from his maturity, the ground was so thin that both the color and the grain of the wood could be seen through it. Van Goyen used these lines as ripples in the water of the river. In the shadows, this stippled pattern and the warm tone dominate, while in the lighter water he echoed the wood grain with the brush marks of his paint and with the delicate web of horizontal strokes that he used for reflections (Fig. 145).

The effects Van Goyen achieved in the Panoramic View of a Wide River are reminiscent of Esaias van de Velde's experiments in the Winter Scene of 1614 and, in

340. Since the refractive index of chalk is very close to that of oil, chalk alone would disappear in an oil medium. Lootwit was frequently used in grounds or underpaints, while the more expensive, and more opaque, pure lead white (schelpwit) was used for final paint layers. See J. A. van de Graaf, "Betekenis en toepassing van 'lootwit' en 'schelpwit' in de XVIIde-eeuwse Nederlandse schilder kunst," Bulletin Institut Royal du Patrimoine Artistique 4 (1961): 198-201 and Truusje Goodings and Karin Groen, "Dutch Pigment Terminology I: a Seventeenth-Century Explanation of the Word 'Schelpwit'," ed. Ann Massing, Hamilton Kerr Institut Bulletin Number 2 (1994): 84-87.
turn, of the early landscape print series. The pattern of wood grain in the shadows of
the water calls to mind the parallel strokes in the lower right corner of Buytewech's
etching discussed in Chapter 4 (Fig. 92), while the cluster of paint strokes that creates
the reflection of the mill in the painting corresponds to the reflected trees in the print.
Even in his skies Van Goyen may have made use of the wood grain at times. In this
painting the effect is hard to evaluate since the sky was damaged in early
restorations.\textsuperscript{341} However, in paintings in good condition one can still see a distinction
between darker clouds, where the paint is thinly dragged and the wood grain seems to
play a role, and light clouds, where the thickly applied white paint obscures the support
entirely. While it is not possible to be certain that this was the intended effect, there is a
striking similarity to etched landscapes (such as another from the Buytewech series,
(Fig. 146) where the sky ranges from dense parallel lines for the darkest passages, to
lightly stippled half tones, to untouched clouds. The visual language with which the
landscape print series created a sense of immediacy and direct observation seems to
have lived on in Van Goyen's paintings.

Not all of the paintings from Van Goyen's maturity were so rapidly executed as
was this work. Even with the somewhat looser handling that artists naturally adopt for
paintings on a larger scale, it would have been difficult to complete the View of Leiden
(Fig. 147) in as short a time as the Panoramic View of a Wide River. Van Goyen

\footnote{341. Overpaint and a later addition to the upper part of the panel, which
enlarged the sky, were removed during conservation treatment by Michel van de Laar
in 1987 (unpublished treatment report on file, Conservation Department, The
Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam).}
clearly painted the View of Leiden in two stages. When he painted the landscape itself he also painted the central sailboat and distant boats and buildings, working into the wet paint of the sky and water. Days later he returned to add the cows and rowboat of the foreground over paint that had fully dried. It seems unlikely that Van Goyen first conceived of the composition with a completely unpopulated foreground, then changed his mind. More probably, this reflects a method that broke the process of painting a larger work into stages that could each be accomplished in a reasonable time.

Two trends in Van Goyen's painting materials can be seen in his later works. One is the appearance of the wood grain and its use as an element of the design (as in the Panoramic View of a Wide River, discussed above). In some paintings, such as the View of Rhenen in Baltimore (Fig. 148) this effect was even more pronounced.\textsuperscript{342} Some of these paintings, in fact, have been described as being painted directly on the wood panel. Analysis, however, has shown that Van Goyen did use a ground, but that he used new materials to increase its transparency. The materials he adopted are so unusual, and the visual effects so pronounced, that it seems this new procedure must have been a conscious choice on Van Goyen’s part. The ground of the View of Rhenen and the View of Leiden consists of virtually colorless smalt mixed with chalk and toned with yellow earth in an oil medium.\textsuperscript{343} In a paint cross section this can be seen as a

\textsuperscript{342} Beck, Jan van Goyen II, cat. no. 385. The painting is dated 16(4?)6. The third digit of the date is incomplete, and could also be read as a fragmentary "5".

\textsuperscript{343} A third painting included in this study, Shipping Scene, dated 1651, Corcoran Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C. (Beck, Jan van Goyen II, cat. no. 311) has the same pigment mixture for the ground. In the View of Leiden this mixture was used as the upper ground over a thin chalk lower ground. It is possible that in the Baltimore
glassy yellow layer (Fig. 149). On the painting it is virtually invisible. Van Goyen must have painted these works on a surface that looked more like varnished wood than the usual prepared panel. In these late works, the wood grain took on an even more prominent role than it had in earlier paintings with thin, tan grounds. Passages depicting reflections in the rippled water are astonishingly reminiscent of Esaias van de Velde’s reflections in the frozen canal of the Raleigh painting from 1614 (Fig. 103). Van Goyen applied his paint in short strokes and discontinuous streaks, alternately exposing and echoing the dark pattern of the oak grain (Fig. 150).

In another trend, Van Goyen tended toward more strongly colored blue skies in his later paintings. He used this very deep blue in both the View of Rhenen and the View of Leiden. In virtually all the paintings examined, from all periods of his career, Van Goyen consistently chose virtually colorless smalt to make the transparent brown details of his foregrounds. However, for his skies at different periods he chose different grades of smalt from the wide range of smalt available, giving strikingly varied effects. In the brightly colored early works he used smalt ranging from a moderate blue to a brilliant blue, almost the color of ultramarine. Works from the most tonal period, from

and Washington paintings a similar chalk lower ground was used to smooth the panel, but that the small samples did not include this layer.

A similar ground, consisting primarily of ground glass with lead white, and toned with small amounts of yellow earth, vermilion, and ultramarine, was observed by Marigene H. Butler and Karen Ashworth in a Winter Scene of 1668-69 by Adriaen van de Velde. See the unpublished analysis report dated January 6, 1987 by Marigene H. Butler, on file in the Conservation Department, Philadelphia Museum of Art, cited by Sutton in the introduction to 17th-Century Dutch Landscape, 7. The appearance of the wood throughout the painting contributes to the "rose-brown tints" commented on by Stechow, Dutch Landscape Painting, 98.
the 1630s and the early 1640s, ranged from moderately blue smalt to smalt so pale as
to be virtually colorless. By the later 1640s and 1650s Van Goyen returned to bluer
skies; again his smalt ranged from a moderate color to a very intense blue. This change
probably reflects new tastes in the style of landscape. Younger artists, such as Jacob
van Ruisdael, also painted more intensely blue skies. Where Ruisdael used ultramarine
in his skies, however, Van Goyen continued to use the far less expensive smalt. 344

Later interpretations of Van Goyen's visual effects

Jan van Goyen's subtle effects have not always been understood by later
generations. The appearance of the wood grain in his images is often described as the
result either of damage (abrasion resulting from harsh cleanings) or of the transparency
of aged oil paint. While these condition problems can contribute to the appearance of
wood grain, this effect, seen in works by Van Goyen in immaculate condition, cannot
have been entirely accidental. Esaias van de Velde had experimented along these lines
in the Winter Scene of 1614. In his paintings Van Goyen did more than allow the grain
to be seen, he echoed it and amplified it with delicate brush strokes. The grain played
an increasing role in Van Goyen's images through his career, and in later paintings he
modified his materials, using a transparent ground based on colorless smalt, to exploit
its appearance more fully.

344. Paula DeChristofaro and James Swoke, "A Technical Analysis of the
Materials and Methods of Jacob Van Ruisdael," Papers Presented by Conservation
Students at the Third [sic] Annual Conference of Art Conservation Training
Programmes, (Kingston, Ontario: Queen's University, 1982), 70-90.
In 1718 Houbraken maintained that Van Goyen's monochromatic paintings were not the result of artistic choice, but of the unfortunate fading of a blue pigment he called "Haarlem blue". The remark was reiterated in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, becoming a standard explanation for the appearance of tonal landscapes, which were at odds with later tastes.\(^{345}\) Haarlem blue has been tentatively identified as one of a number of blue pigments, including blue earths, blue verditer, and smalt.\(^{346}\) Smalt is known for a type of degradation (known as "smalt disease") in which the glassy particles progressively lose their blue color, and the smalt-containing paint layer takes on a patchy yellowish appearance. Since only smalt has been identified in Van Goyen's skies, it seems the most likely candidate for "Haarlem blue". It seems far more likely, however, that the variations of color in the skies of Van Goyen's paintings resulted from his artistic choices rather than from some flaw in his materials. Though the late works include bright, unaltered smalt in the skies as well as almost colorless

---


smalt in the transparent browns, the most tonal paintings include colorless smalt in both the skies and the browns of the foreground. It is too much to believe that Van Goyen's smalt degraded selectively in the skies of the paintings from the tonal period only.

There is no doubt that Van Goyen's painting practice was efficient. Michael Montias has pointed out economic motivations that could lie behind such novel techniques. By severely limiting the hours required to produce a painting an artist could reduce the asking price, gaining a market advantage at least until other painters did the same.\textsuperscript{347} There were certainly competitive pressures on artists. Hoogstraeten introduced his anecdote of the painting competition by saying that "in the early years of the century the walls of Holland were not yet so densely papered over with paintings as in later years."\textsuperscript{348} As the habit of rapid production grew (and the supply of paintings increased) artists were driven to create a painting every day.\textsuperscript{349} Porcellis, after he had gone bankrupt in his early years, worked almost at this pace: he entered into a contract in Antwerp to deliver two paintings a week for twenty weeks.\textsuperscript{350} Van Goyen's paintings did achieve significantly lower prices than the labor-intensive works of Roelandt Savery. He was far better represented in middle-class collections than, for instance, the

\textsuperscript{347} Montias, "Cost and Value."

\textsuperscript{348} "In’t begin deezer eeuw waeren de wanden in Holland noch zoo dicht niet met Schilderyen behangen, alszetans wel zijn." (Hoogstraeten, Inleyding, 237, my translation. As above, I am most grateful to Jaap Engelsman for his corrections to my translation).

\textsuperscript{349} Hoogstraeten, Inleyding, 237.

\textsuperscript{350} Walsh, “Jan and Julius Porcellis,” 657.
more expensive Italianate landscapists such as Jan Both, whose work appeared in upper-class collections. 351

Yet there must have been more than the market at work in the development of such novel images of the Dutch landscape. Van Goyen's enormous output suggests that the images themselves were well received. His techniques were singularly well-suited to characterizing the local scene, through his choice of materials and by exploiting their visual characteristics.

From the eighteenth century, Van Goyen's subtle effects seem not to have been recognized or appreciated, they were seen as defects and his painting practice was blamed. Even by the late seventeenth century Samuel van Hoogstraeten's admiration for Van Goyen's extraordinary technique was grudging: such fluency must imply a lack of thought. Technical study, however, has highlighted Van Goyen's conscious artistry: his extraordinary sensitivity to the visual possibilities of his materials and to the landscape he depicted.

351. Chong, "Market for Landscape Painting," 113, 118. Chong cites archival references between 1626 and 1650 giving an average price of 75.5 guilders for 10 paintings by Savery, and 57.7 guilders for 8 paintings by Both, compared with an average price of 17 guilders for 11 paintings by Van Goyen.
EPILOGUE: OVERVIEW AND THOUGHTS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The heirs of the sixteenth-century founders of Netherlandish landscape painting originated a multiplicity of approaches to landscape in the seventeenth century. A diversity of compositional type and artistic style resulted as many branches grew out from the originating trunk. This diversity was enhanced as the separation of the Northern and Southern Netherlands—first acknowledged in the Twelve Years’ Truce of 1609 to 1621—established two increasingly distinct societies. In this study I have considered one of those branches of landscape painting: the development of a radically naturalistic approach to landscape painting practices in Haarlem and its legacy in the work of the tonal landscape painters. I have juxtaposed this type of landscape to two types that were among those most closely preserving the compositional principles and technical practices of the Southern Netherlandish tradition: Mannerist landscape painting as it was practiced in Antwerp at the end of the sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth centuries, and the forest landscapes in the Northern Netherlands in the early seventeenth century. The narrow focus reflects the nature of technical research, which by its nature is premised on minutely detailed studies. The most fruitful interpretations of artistic practice grow out of a substantial body of information on closely related paintings, rather than a broad survey of diverse works. Nonetheless, in this Conclusion I will touch on the diversity of landscape painting styles and some broader trends of seventeenth-century painting technique as a context in which to interpret the results of this study.
The Introduction of this study opened with a comparison of Jan van Goyen’s *Dune Landscape* of around 1632 (Fig. 1) and *The Entry of the Animals into Noah’s Ark* (Fig. 2) painted by Jan Brueghel I in 1613. In the Introduction these paintings served as representatives of, respectively, the naturalistic style of landscape painting and the Mannerist landscape painting style. The shift of painting styles that these two works represent was accompanied by equally dramatic changes in the artists’ painting practices and in their approaches to landscape representation.

Jan van Goyen—for filling sketchbooks with his rapidly noted chalk drawings of the Dutch countryside and returning to the studio to paint landscapes in a day or two—is a modern figure. Van Goyen’s *Dune Landscape* seems immediate and accessible. The composition is formally beautiful, with a dark sky towering over a low, flat horizon accented by the vertical of the small figures. But the spare, brownish scene also seems familiar, plausible. The viewer can imagine that the painter knew this scenery intimately, and he participates in the artist’s observation of the local landscape.

By comparison, Jan Brueghel—working for weeks or more to produce extraordinarily refined paintings destined for princely collections—seems to be a figure from an earlier age. *The Entry of the Animals into Noah’s Ark* evokes a fantasy, an idyllic glimpse of the antediluvian world. Brueghel’s charming landscape is richly colored and visually replete. He invested the landscape with as much diversity as he did the exotic animals waiting to enter the ark, bringing together in one scene lush forests, a copse, and a single bare tree; marsh, stream, open meadows, and distant mountains.
This dramatic change in style parallels a fundamental shift in the conception of landscape representation. For a century Southern Netherlandish artists from Joachim Patinir to Joos de Momper laid out vicarious journeys for their viewers. Whether these were the moral landscapes of Patinir, designed for the viewer’s meditation, or the exotic mountain scenes of De Momper, painted to serve the armchair traveler, they were the creative product of the artist’s imagination. At the beginning of the seventeenth century in the Northern Netherlands the landscapes of Gillis van Coninxloo and Roelandt Savery filled the same function, with impenetrable forests and rocky Tyrolean scenery that must have seemed both alien and romantic to the art collectors of Holland. During the Twelve Years’ Truce from 1609 to 1621, as a new orientation toward landscape representation arose in the Northern Netherlands, new landscapes sought to evoke the familiar landscape of the Dutch countryside and celebrate its quiet charms. Rather than taking the viewer to a prospect over a thrilling and forbidding vista the new landscapes, first prints and later paintings, invited the viewer on a country walk.

The early seventeenth century in the Netherlands was a period of profuse artistic growth and rapid evolution. Artists of this period originated new genres of painting—naturalistic landscape is just one of these genres—and new approaches to the practice of painting. If Mannerist landscape painters were among the most conservative artists in their choices of materials and techniques, and naturalistic landscape artists were among the most radical, neither group was working in isolation. Both groups
should be seen in the context of widespread changes in artistic taste and the concurrent changes in technique that they shared with a great many contemporaries.

**Naturalistic landscape technique in context**

The artists considered in this study were among many who participated in two general trends in painting technique in the early years of the seventeenth century: progressively more free handling of paint and a limited tonality. The first of these trends had begun in the sixteenth century and many artists in the seventeenth century painted with a loose and open touch. This was not, of course, a universal practice. Rembrandt, whose late work epitomized a broad suggestive handling of paint, had as his first student Gerrit Dou, the founder of the Leiden school of fijnschilders whose work was premised on a high level of refinement that concealed the painter’s touch.\(^{352}\) Van Goyen’s rapid technique may have been an extreme, as Houbraken suggested, but a variety of artists worked in a loose and suggestive manner.\(^{353}\)

The second trend is a tendency toward a unified, and at times quite limited, tonal range that can be seen in many artists’ work and in many genres. For example, Adriaen van de Venne turned his attention in the 1620s from the rich landscapes in the


\(^{353}\) For discussion of Houbraken’s comments on Van Goyen’s technique, see Chapter 5.
Southern Netherlandish tradition that he painted in Middelburg in the 1610s to grisailles, usually of low-life characters and often with emblematic themes (Fig. 151). Van de Venne’s grisailles are an extreme example of monochromatic painting, but there seems to have been a taste for muted, monochromatic images at this time. Wheelock cites Constantijn Huygens’ admiring reference to the “beautiful brown picture” created by the camera obscura. His comment can be seen as evidence that a taste for limited tonalities coincided with the appeal of the image generated by this optical device.

These trends toward a looser handling and muted colors were often related. Such paintings tended to create suggestive rather than literal representations. They often exploited elements from various stages of the painting process, such as the ground or underpaint, in the final image. Nonetheless such broad tendencies did not yield a uniform style of painting. Within these trends there were various approaches to painting in general, and landscape painting in particular. Artists employed many variants of such techniques in realizing their personal aesthetic goals.

354. For example, Poor Luxury, 1635, Rotterdam, Museum Boymans-van Beuningen, illustrated in Peter C. Sutton, Masters of Seventeenth Century Dutch Genre Painting, exh. cat. (Philadelphia Museum of Art, Philadelphia: 1984): plate 26. In his catalogue entry (idem 333-334) William Robinson notes that the date on the earliest of Van de Venne’s grisailles has recently been read as “1618” (Göteborg Konstmuseum, Malerisamlingen [1979]): 99, cat. no. 86.

Painters must have been aware of each other's practices. In the interests of clarity this study has followed one line of development in landscape painting. However technical influences, like stylistic influences, did not only descend in a direct line from master to protégé. They intermingled as artists adopted techniques that suited their needs. Without a great deal more information on the techniques of many groups of landscape painters, the web of influences is difficult to trace. However, this study will conclude with a few suggestions for future areas of research.

In the context of this study Gillis van Coninxloo and Roelandt Savery have served to represent landscape artists in the Northern Netherlands who preserved the essential features of the South Netherlandish tradition of landscape painting technique. This restricted their participation in the two trends of technique outlined here. They contributed to the widespread trend toward a limited tonality through a compositional emphasis on the brown foregrounds of their forest scenes, but they retained stronger blues and greens in the distance. And Savery, especially, did not participate in the trend toward a free handling of paint. His disciplined manner of painting rivaled that of the most refined Mannerist painters in Antwerp.

Yet Savery was not retardataire, and Utrecht, where he found a ready market for his stylized landscapes in the 1620s and 1630s, was not an artistic backwater. The heirs to Savery's interpretation of the South Netherlandish tradition were the Italianate landscape artists of Utrecht. Like Mannerist paintings these works presented an

356. I am grateful to Arthur K. Wheelock, Jr. for his comments on the relationship of Savery's paintings to the work of Italianate landscape artists.
idealized rather than a plausibly natural landscape. In many of these paintings also space was depicted through an atmospheric perspective based on zones of color that hark to the South Netherlandish tradition. In Herman Saftleven's landscape for the Hunter Sleeping on a Hillside of 1642 (Fig. 152) a spreading green plain and ephemeral blue mountains lie below the high ground of the substantial brown foreground.

Italianate landscapes realized prices substantially higher than the paintings of the naturalistic landscape artists, and appeared more often in inventories of wealthy collections. This may suggest that like Savery, they followed labor-intensive painting practices, and perhaps that they too used costly materials such as ultramarine. A technical study might consider, for example, whether these artists continued Savery's South Netherlandish practice of establishing zones of distance in an underpainting stage or mimicked the effect with more direct techniques. Such a study would offer valuable insights into the degree to which inherited aspects of style were achieved through inherited painting practices.

Another group of artists participated in the two general trends—toward free handling and limited tonality—in ways that closely resemble the tonal landscapes of Pieter Molijn, Salomon van Ruysdael, and Jan van Goyen. Jan Porcellis left Haarlem for Antwerp in 1615. After his return to the Northern Netherlands in 1622, he produced spare, silver-gray marine paintings (Fig. 153). He knew Van Goyen (who sold him a house in Leiden in 1629) and his work almost certainly contributed to the


development of Van Goyen's tonal landscapes by the end of that decade. In Haarlem in the 1620s Pieter Claesz and Willem Claesz Heda painted still lifes whose almost monochrome tonalities and low viewpoints present an approach that is strikingly in sympathy with tonal landscape (Fig. 154). These artists seem to have shared the aesthetic goals of the tonal landscape painters, and it is intriguing to consider whether they used analogous painting practices. However, without further research such speculation is fruitless. Individual paintings cannot be compared directly to the paintings in the present study because the compositional requirements of the genres are different. But a broader technical investigation of these painters' practices compared to those of earlier still life and marine painters would offer a fascinating parallel to this study. It might, for example, reveal whether Porcellis followed a pattern of development similar to Esaias van de Velde and Van Goyen, paring down an inherited technical tradition to its visual essentials, and which of these artists moved first toward tonalism.

The monochrome painted sketch in landscape

Among the many landscape artists who participated to some degree in the trends toward free brushwork and a more unified tonality some painters can be grouped in a broad way by an imaginative, evocative approach to landscape. These paintings have more in common with South Netherlandish landscapes than with naturalistic landscapes that give an impression of dispassionate observation. They preserved the tendency of the South Netherlandish landscape tradition to organize the space in terms
of tonal masses, but they painted without the precision of Jan Brueghel's or Roelandt Savery's touch. On the other hand, they did not follow the lead of Jan van Goyen or Esaias van de Velde (in his most naturalistic works) who brought a graphic handling to their paintings. Instead, a number of these landscape artists achieved painterly, suggestive effects and brought a new tonal unity to their works by using a technique that has been touched on briefly in this study: the monochrome painted sketch. With this technique they began their paintings by laying out the composition in brown or black paint.

There is a great difference between such a painted sketch and the colored underpainting that typified Mannerist landscape paintings. This difference represents a decisive change in artists' approach to their compositions. Rather than conceiving of the space by juxtaposing masses of mid-tone color, as Mannerist landscape painters did, artists who began with a monochrome painted sketch conceived of their compositions in terms of a unified tonality and a painterly rendering of light and shadow. The discussion that follows outlines a few of the issues that the author plans to pursue in future research.

The rise in the use of a monochrome painted sketch by seventeenth-century painters may be related to the concept of "houding", which Taylor has discussed as a development of art theory in the Northern Netherlands over the course of the seventeenth century.359 As an artistic concept, houding seems to have conveyed a goal

of spatial unity achieved through a balanced handling of both color and contrasts of light and dark. While Van Mander did not use the term in 1604, and Philips Angel used it in only passing in 1642, by 1668 Willem Goeree discussed houding in detail as an established concept. The increasing use of a monochrome painted sketch, with the attendant tonal and spatial unity, seems to parallel a growing interest in houding.

It is not yet clear when the monochrome painted sketch came into widespread use, but it seems to have been used in figure painting before it was used in landscape. As early as 1609 Rubens laid out the architectural setting and at least parts of the figure group in Samson and Delilah (National Gallery, London) with a translucent red-brown paint, and Frans Hals laid out the figures in his portraits in this technique. In the landscape paintings examined for this study, none of the Antwerp Mannerist artists used a monochrome sketch throughout the landscape proper. However the figures in collaboratively painted works usually were laid in over the underpaint or final paint


with a brown or black painted sketch. Landscape specialists must have felt the technique was inappropriate to their rendition of space. A single color used throughout the painting, as a brown sketch is, would have subverted the traditional division of the space into zones of color. Even the freely handled paintings of Joos de Momper were still premised on the three zone color scheme, which he established in three zones of colored underpaint. In the forest landscapes of Coninxloo and Savery brownish details were always applied in the final painting process over an underpaint layer. Only in the latest Antwerp paintings examined, such as Teniers’ Saints Anthony and Paul in a Landscape from the mid-1630s (Fig. 46), was a partial brown sketch employed, but it was restricted to the brown foreground zone.

The earliest landscapes in this study to use a true painted sketch (an overall design applied before any other paint) were the Landscape with Narcissus by Jacob Pynas (Fig. 79) and Salomon van Ruysdael’s Farm Buildings in a Landscape (Fig. 138), both of 1628, and Jan van Goyen’s Cottage on a Heath (Fig. 134) of around 1629. This limited sample cannot establish who first introduced the technique into landscape painting, but clearly the practice is associated with some of the earliest landscapes of limited tonalities painted in Haarlem and Leiden. Pynas used a narrow range of cold

363. In part this is because a dry drawing medium such black chalk would have not have adhered well to the painted surface. Landscape artists were certainly not ignorant of the technique. For example, Jan Brueghel I used the oil sketch technique to make life studies of faces and animals, yet a monochrome sketch was not observed in his landscape passages, as noted above in the discussion of Jan Brueghel I’s Paradise Scene. See Haverkamp-Begemann, “Purpose and Style,” 112-113.

364. As noted in Chapter 3, Pynas was recorded in Leiden around 1626 (Sutton, 17th-Century Dutch Landscape, 422).
greens over his sketch and Ruysdael’s and Van Goyen’s paintings were truly tonal landscapes.

Peter Paul Rubens is the best known exponent of the monochrome painted sketch. The technique is easily seen in his oil sketches, where the final paint consists only of touches of color.\textsuperscript{365} He also exploited the technique brilliantly in his paintings, where he exposed the warm brown of his sketch and characteristic streaky imprimatura to create vivid shadows in flesh tones.\textsuperscript{366} In a recent exhibition catalogue Brown discussed the stylistic development of Rubens’ landscapes through his career, but his useful essay on the technique of the landscapes did not undertake a survey of changes over the course of his career.\textsuperscript{367} It would, for example, be important to know if early works such as the background of The Judgement of Paris from around 1600, which are faithful to Mannerist landscape style, also were painted in the traditional Mannerist structure.\textsuperscript{368} There is evidence of a brown sketch in the tan foreground of paintings from Rubens’ middle years, such as A Shepherd with his Flock in a Woody Landscape.


\textsuperscript{368} London, National Gallery. See Brown, Rubens's Landscapes, 26 and pl. 18.
of around 1620, but it will require further microscopic examination to establish whether the green middle ground was based on an initial sketch in the same brown paint. In the magnificent late landscapes such as the Landscape with Het Steen (Fig. 155) of around 1636 Rubens did lay out forms with a brown sketch. In these late paintings Rubens may, as Gibson has said, have “brought the history of the Flemish world landscape to a truly splendid conclusion,” but his painting technique indicates that his goals had moved beyond those of the Mannerist landscape painters. Despite Rubens’ broad division of his panorama into zones of color, the Landscape with Het Steen has a greater tonal unity than most paintings by his contemporary, the Mannerist landscape specialist Joos de Momper. Further technical study could clarify the contribution of the painted sketch to this unified effect.

How Rubens came to incorporate a monochrome painted sketch into his landscapes also will require further investigation, but one intriguing line of inquiry

369. London, National Gallery. See Brown, Rubens’s Landscapes, 54, pl. 48. The Watering Place (also London, National Gallery), also shows evidence of a sketched foreground, but poses more difficult questions. The composition was expanded and issues of collaboration have been raised: idem 52-55 and pls. 46, 47, 93, 98, 101.

370. London, National Gallery. A paint cross section from the lower right confirmed that the warm brown details were painted directly over the orange-brown imprimatura (personal communication, Ashok Roy). See Brown, Rubens’s Landscapes, 61-63, pl. 51, 58, 103. For the use of the brown sketch in this painting, see 102. The discussion does not indicate whether the use of this sketch is limited to the broad foreground, or extends under the entire painting, but a large detail of the contemporary Landscape with a Rainbow in the Wallace Collection (Brown, Rubens’s Landscapes, pl. 67) shows what may be a dark sketch in the distant fields.

would be to consider the rare landscapes of Adriaen Brouwer, who primarily painted genre scenes. Brouwer was born in the Southern Netherlands in 1605 or 1606, but spent the 1620s in Amsterdam and Haarlem. He returned to the Southern Netherlands in 1631/2 and worked in Antwerp until his early death in 1638, Brouwer, who made extensive use of a monochrome painted sketch in his genre scenes, may have learned of the technique in Haarlem. Houbraken believed that he studied with Frans Hals, though there is no documentary evidence to confirm this. 372 An early work, Tavern Yard with a Game of Bowls, used a simple landscape setting based on tones of green. 373 But in Antwerp he painted atmospheric landscapes such as the Dune Landscape by Moonlight (Fig. 156) of around 1635-1637 which Rubens probably owned. Brouwer’s free handling and the brown-black tonality of his painting (which seems likely to be based on a monochrome painted sketch) must have contributed to the conception of Rubens’ Landscape with Moon and Stars (Fig. 157) at the Courtauld Institute. 374 Technical examination would be invaluable to establish when—or whether—Brouwer used a painted sketch in his landscapes, and how this relates to the technique of Rubens’ nocturne. If, in fact, Brouwer derived some of the atmospheric qualities of his landscapes from an overall monochrome sketch, the examination of David Teniers’

372. Sutton and Wieseman, Age of Rubens, 406.

373. Privately owned. Illustrated in Sutton, Dutch Genre Painting, cat. 63.

374. For discussions of these two paintings see Brown, Rubens’s Landscapes, 76, pl. 72, 73; Jeffrey M. Muller, Rubens: the Artist As Collector (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989): 20, 141-142, pl. IV (published in reverse), V; Stechow, Dutch Landscape Painting 179, fig. 360.
Landscape with Saints Anthony and Paul, discussed in Chapter 2, would support the originality of Brouwer’s use of the technique in landscape (as opposed to genre). Teniers was certainly influenced by Brouwer—and his use of the monochrome sketch—in genre paintings. Yet in this landscape (contemporary with Brouwer’s landscapes) he used a sketch only in the freely handled foreground (where it was associated with the figures). The broader concept of Teniers’ landscape, with strongly colored zones of distance, was based on De Mompers’ example.

If Brouwer may prove to be a technical as well as a stylistic link between Haarlem and Antwerp in the 1620s and 1630s, Hercules Segers may offer a similar link between Gillis van Coninxloo’s richly nuanced interpretations of the South Netherlands landscape tradition and Rembrandt’s exotic landscapes. Segers trained in Amsterdam with Coninxloo before his death in 1606, joined the Haarlem guild in 1612, but then spent the years from 1614 to 1631 in Amsterdam. He died in The Hague between 1633 and 1638. Rembrandt was intimately familiar with Segers’ landscapes. He owned eight of his paintings in 1656, and reworked one of them, the Mountain Landscape, now in Florence.


376. Sutton, 17th-Century Dutch Landscape, 484-485.


378. Uffizi. Schneider, Rembrandt’s Landscapes, 71 and 239, n. 24, fig. 57.
Rembrandt built exotic landscapes such as the *Stormy Landscape* (Fig. 158) in Braunschweig on a brown monochrome sketch. Segers, too, made extensive use of a fluid brown paint in works such as the *Landscape with a Lake and a Round Building* in Rotterdam (Fig. 159). While Segers' fluent, suggestive touch certainly had an impact on Rembrandt's landscapes, an obvious question is whether he also used a monochrome sketch. If Segers' brown paint is a first step—a monochrome sketch—he may have influenced this aspect of Rembrandt's painting practice as well. More direct technical comparisons will be possible after the completion of research on Segers' techniques currently in progress at the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam. If, on the other hand, Segers' brown paint, like Coninxloo's, is actually a final paint layer over a mid-tone underpaint, Rembrandt must have learned elsewhere of the monochrome painted sketch.

Jacob Pynas, whose use of brown sketch in the *Landscape with Narcissus* was discussed in Chapter 3, could also have taught Rembrandt to begin his landscape compositions with a sketch. Both Rembrandt and Jan Lievens premised their earliest paintings, from the period of their association in Leiden in the later 1620s, on a brown painted sketch as the preliminary design. 379 Both artists had studied with Pieter Lastman, but though the technique of Lastman's paintings has not been studied in

depth, it is not clear that he used such a sketch in landscapes. Houbraken reported that after his brief study with Pieter Lastman in Amsterdam, Rembrandt studied with Jacob Pynas. This would presumably have been in 1624 or 1625, very possibly in Leiden. Houbraken further suggests that this study with Pynas influenced the technique of the young Rembrandt, who imitated the older artist’s way of painting in brown tones. The technical study offers intriguing evidence on the source of this coloring and its possible influence on Rembrandt.

In the 1620s Rembrandt’s final paint virtually always covered the sketch, but in the next decade he made masterly use of it. As he did in the Stormy Landscape he allowed the brown tone to show in shadowy, suggestive passages, while he emphasized the focal point of his compositions with a more finished handling that hid the sketch. The distinctive character that the brown sketch lends his painting may be the “brown tone” that Houbraken suggested he borrowed from Pynas.

380. In an unpublished lecture given in London in 1992 I suggested that Lastman did use such a sketch. (“Lievens’ technique in the 1620s: The Luteplayer in the context of Lastman and Rembrandt,” Rembrandt: The Master and His Workshop, A Symposium on Recent Technical Research, May 22-23, 1992, London, National Gallery). At that time I offered as evidence the brown details visible in the architectural passages of Lastman’s Christ and the Woman of Canaan (Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum). With further research into landscape painting techniques I have realized that these passages, which are painted over an initial mid-tone underpaint, are qualitatively different from the painted sketches that Pynas (and Rembrandt) applied directly over the ground.

381. Schneider, Rembrandt’s Landscapes, 226, n.1 summarizes the divided opinions on the date of Rembrandt’s study with Lastman, ranging from 1622 to 1624. As noted above, Pynas could have been in Leiden around the time of Rembrandt’s return.

This discussion comes full circle, from the imaginative landscapes by Rubens, Brouwer, Segers and Rembrandt that built on the painterly qualities of the South Netherlandish tradition to the naturalistic landscapes of Esaias van de Velde, with a consideration of Rembrandt’s tiny Winter Landscape in Kassel (Fig. 160), dated 1646. This work, which repeatedly has been compared to Esaias van de Velde’s Winter Landscape of 1624 at The Hague,\textsuperscript{383} seems to be a conscious celebration of Esaias’ works. Rembrandt painted much of this landscape wet-in-wet. Since Rembrandt’s 1656 inventory included four small landscape paintings “nae t’leven,” it has been suggested that this tiny painting might be a unique survival: a landscape painted on the spot.\textsuperscript{384} Detailed technical study, which could confirm whether the painting was in fact painted at one sitting, could also offer insights into Rembrandt’s perception of the essential features of the older artist’s work. Rembrandt seems to have begun his winter landscape with a painted sketch, his usual procedure, but one that Esaias did not use. If, in fact, he painted this work out-of-doors in a single sitting that, too, would run counter to Esaias’ practices. Yet the rapidity of Rembrandt’s handling captured the graphic, sketchy quality of Esaias’ final paint layers and suggests that Esaias’ self-consciously created impression of directness was the quality that appealed to Rembrandt.

\textsuperscript{383} Schneider, Rembrandt’s Landscapes, 191-192, summarizes the extensive literature on this painting.

\textsuperscript{384} See Alan Chong’s catalogue entry in Sutton, 17th-Century Dutch Landscape Painting, 429-432.
Conclusion

The contrast between the Kassel Winter Landscape and most of Rembrandt’s landscape oeuvre highlights the diversity of landscape in the Netherlands. From meticulous landscapes of Jan Brueghel and Roelandt Savery, to the broad, suggestive landscapes of Rubens and Rembrandt, to the rapidly noted impressions of Van Goyen, these landscapes all drew upon and modified the South Netherlandish landscape painting tradition. Varying aspects of these artists’ painting techniques correspond to their diverse approaches to landscape. Brueghel and Savery, preserving the essential approach of the world landscape tradition, must have seen a landscape painting as a composition to be slowly assembled, built up over many days with a refined execution of deliberate stages. Rubens and Rembrandt responded directly to landscape in their outdoor drawings, but in the broadest sense they both created painted landscapes that continued the South Netherlandish tradition of landscape as the product of artistic imagination. They both employed a technique that seems to have been a new feature of landscape painting, the monochrome painted sketch. Rubens and Rembrandt had different ways of working, but each painted with a broad, suggestive touch that allowed the sketch to contribute a newly unified tonality to richly colored landscapes. Esaias van de Velde and Jan Van Goyen pursued a line of development that took them further from the South Netherlandish landscape tradition. Esaias does not seem to have employed a monochrome painted sketch, and Van Goyen used a separate sketch stage only in his early tonal works. He soon adopted an extraordinarily direct painting procedure. Though many of his landscapes must be composed, his handling gave his
paintings a quality of reportage that inverted the imaginative heritage of the South Nederlandish tradition.

The decisive change in style in the early years of the seventeenth century that marked the emergence of a naturalistic landscape painting native to the Northern Netherlands represented a self-conscious decision by artists to turn in a new direction. The results of this preliminary technical study have established that painters of naturalistic landscape turned away from the long-established tradition of South Nederlandish landscape painting techniques to depict the indigenous countryside with a radically new way of painting. Esaias van de Velde's decisive innovations translated the achievements of naturalistic landscape drawings and prints into a painting technique that grew out of that graphic vocabulary. Jan van Goyen developed a vocabulary for the handling of paint that is analogous to the etching technique of the early landscape print series in its sense of immediacy and direct observation. With dots and dashes, and rapidly noted details "drawn" in dark paint, his paintings almost give the viewer the impression of being present at their creation.

This study opened with the thesis that artists achieved such radical changes in style through deliberate changes in their artistic technique. Technical examination has identified a number of points in the painting process where painters of naturalistic landscapes in the Northern Netherlands modified traditional Mannerist landscape technique. In these identifiable moments of decision artists significantly revised the pictorial conventions of landscape representation.
APPENDIX 1: EXAMINATION METHODS AND PAINTINGS EXAMINED

To date this study has included technical examinations of 64 paintings, which are listed below. Virtually all of the paintings were examined and photographed in conservation studios using a stereo microscope for highly magnified study of the surface. Equipment for infrared reflectography, an important technique for studying underdrawings and artists' changes, was available in roughly half the examinations. X-radiographs, when available, were invaluable for studying compositional changes and the brushwork of hidden paint layers.

Microscopic paint samples were available for analysis from most paintings in the study. Some paintings had been sampled during earlier conservation treatments, and I was able to sample most of the other paintings examined during the study. Both paint cross sections, which include all the layers of a painting, and dispersed pigment samples, which isolate a specific paint layer, were taken. Dispersed paint samples, consisting of a few grains of pigment from the paint surface, were mounted for examination by polarized light microscopy. This technique permits the identification of specific pigments on the basis of optical properties. Microscopic paint cross sections were taken from existing areas of paint loss. The cross sections were mounted in polyester resin and ground and polished for examination by reflected light microscopy. This technique permits the examination of the pigments in the context of the paint layer structure. A number of the cross sections were also analyzed by scanning electron microscopy/energy dispersive spectroscopy (SEM/EDS). This technique provides the elemental composition of the paint layers from which the pigments used can be
inferred. Some samples were examined using biological stains, which permit preliminary identification of the binding mediums used.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artist/Attribution</th>
<th>Painting Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pieter Bruegel the Elder, follower of</td>
<td>Temptation of St. Anthony</td>
<td>1550/75 c.</td>
<td>Washington, National Gallery of Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anonymous Antwerp artist(s)</td>
<td>Tobias and the Angel</td>
<td>1620s c.</td>
<td>Baltimore, The Walters Art Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pieter Brueghel the Younger</td>
<td>Peasant Marriage Festival</td>
<td>1620/38 c.</td>
<td>Baltimore, The Walters Art Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joos de Momper, follower</td>
<td>Sacrifice of Isaac</td>
<td>1620s c.</td>
<td>Baltimore, The Walters Art Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joos de Momper, follower</td>
<td>Winter landscape</td>
<td>1620s c.</td>
<td>Baltimore, The Walters Art Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Brueghel I</td>
<td>Paradise Scene</td>
<td>1620 c.</td>
<td>Montreal, private collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joos de Momper, (figures by Jan Brueghel I?)</td>
<td>Village Scene</td>
<td>1623/8</td>
<td>Raleigh, North Carolina Museum of Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joos de Momper or David Teniers</td>
<td>Vista from a Grotto</td>
<td>1625 c. or 1635 c.</td>
<td>Washington, National Gallery of Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joos de Momper (figures by Sebastian Vranx?)</td>
<td>Winter Landscape</td>
<td>1625/9</td>
<td>Raleigh, North Carolina Museum of Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippe de Momper attr. to</td>
<td>Mountain Landscape</td>
<td>1630 s c.</td>
<td>Oberlin, Allen Memorial Art Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Brueghel I, copy after</td>
<td>Noah's Ark</td>
<td>1630 c.</td>
<td>Baltimore, The Walters Art Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Teniers the Younger</td>
<td>Saints, Anthony and Paul in a Landscape</td>
<td>mid-1630 s.</td>
<td>Oberlin, Allen Memorial Art Museum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Paintings examined for Chapter 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artist/Maker</th>
<th>Painting Title</th>
<th>Year/Significance</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gillis van Coninxloo</td>
<td>Landscape with Venus and Adonis</td>
<td>1595 c.</td>
<td>Cleveland Museum of Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Vinckboons, manner of Hendrik Goltzius</td>
<td>Forest Hunting Scene</td>
<td>1610s</td>
<td>Baltimore, The Walters Art Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendrik Goltzius</td>
<td>The Fall Of Man (signed)</td>
<td>1616</td>
<td>Washington, National Gallery of Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roelandt Savry, workshop?</td>
<td>The Creation of Birds</td>
<td>1619 s/d.</td>
<td>Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hans Savery, attr.</td>
<td>Landscape with ruins and animals</td>
<td>1620/40 c.</td>
<td>Baltimore, The Walters Art Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roelandt Savery</td>
<td>Orpheus with Beasts and Birds</td>
<td>1622 s/d</td>
<td>Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pieter Lastman</td>
<td>Lamentation of Abel</td>
<td>1623/4 c.</td>
<td>Amsterdam, Rembrandthuis (stolen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roelandt Savery</td>
<td>Landscape with the Flight into Egypt</td>
<td>1624 s/d</td>
<td>Washington, National Gallery of Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Bloemaert</td>
<td>Parable of the Tares in the Field</td>
<td>1624</td>
<td>Baltimore, The Walters Art Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornelis Vroom</td>
<td>Landscape with a River by a Wood</td>
<td>1626 s/d</td>
<td>London, National Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerrit Claesz Bleker</td>
<td>Staghunting in dunes</td>
<td>1627</td>
<td>Haarlem, Frans Halsmuseum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roelandt Savery (figure by Cornelis Poelenburgh?)</td>
<td>Orpheus</td>
<td>1628 s/d</td>
<td>London, National Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Pynas</td>
<td>Landscape with Narcissus</td>
<td>1628 s/d</td>
<td>London, National Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esaias van de Velde</td>
<td>Summer Landscape (Road to Emmaus)</td>
<td>1612/3 c.</td>
<td>Oberlin, Allen Memorial Art Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esaias van de Velde</td>
<td>Winter landscape</td>
<td>1614 s/d</td>
<td>Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esaias van de Velde</td>
<td>Farms Flanking a Frozen Canal</td>
<td>1614 s/d</td>
<td>Raleigh, North Carolina Museum of Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esaias van de Velde</td>
<td>Tower by a Frozen River</td>
<td>1618/9 c.</td>
<td>Leiden, Lakenhal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esaias van de Velde</td>
<td>Landscape with a Courtly Procession near Abtspool Castle</td>
<td>1619 s/d</td>
<td>Minneapolis, Institute of Fine Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esaias van de Velde</td>
<td>Winter scene</td>
<td>1620 c.</td>
<td>Haarlem, Frans Halsmuseum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esaias van de Velde, follower</td>
<td>Mountain landscape</td>
<td>1620/9 c.</td>
<td>Haarlem, Frans Halsmuseum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esaias van de Velde, imitator</td>
<td>Village with Trees</td>
<td>16??</td>
<td>Haarlem, Frans Halsmuseum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arent Arentsz</td>
<td>Fishers on the shore</td>
<td>1620/25 c.</td>
<td>Baltimore, The Walters Art Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esaias van de Velde</td>
<td>Winter Landscape</td>
<td>1623 s/d</td>
<td>London, National Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esaias van de Velde</td>
<td>Road between a Farm and Water</td>
<td>1625 s/d</td>
<td>Cleveland Museum of Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Painting</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan van Goyen</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>1625 s/d</td>
<td>Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan van Goyen</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>1625 s/d</td>
<td>Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pieter Molijn</td>
<td>Landscape with an Open Gate</td>
<td>1628/30 c.</td>
<td>Washington, National Gallery of Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan van Goyen</td>
<td>View of a Village</td>
<td>1626 s/d</td>
<td>Leiden, Lakenhal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salomon van Ruysdael</td>
<td>Farm buildings in a Landscape</td>
<td>162(8) s/d</td>
<td>Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan van Goyen</td>
<td>Landscape with Figures</td>
<td>1628 s/d</td>
<td>Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan van Goyen</td>
<td>A Cottage on a Heath</td>
<td>1629 c. (signed)</td>
<td>London, National Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pieter Molijn</td>
<td>Sacking of a village</td>
<td>1630 c.</td>
<td>Haarlem, Frans Halsmuseum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan van Goyen</td>
<td>Dune Landscape with Figures</td>
<td>1633 c.</td>
<td>Leiden, Lakenhal (on loan from the Rijksdienst Beeldende Kunst, The Hague)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salomon van Ruysdael</td>
<td>Fishers on the Shore</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>Baltimore, The Walters Art Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan van Goyen</td>
<td>Ice Scene with Ruins of the Huiste Merwede</td>
<td>1638</td>
<td>Leiden, Lakenhal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pieter Mulier</td>
<td>Sailboats in a Stiff Breeze</td>
<td>1640 c.</td>
<td>Baltimore, private coll.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan van Goyen</td>
<td>A River Scene with a Hut on an Island</td>
<td>1640/5 c.</td>
<td>London, National Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan van Goyen</td>
<td>Fishermen Hauling a Net</td>
<td>1640/5 c.</td>
<td>London, National Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan van Goyen</td>
<td>Panoramic View of a River with Low-lying Meadows</td>
<td>1641 s/d</td>
<td>Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan van Goyen</td>
<td>A Windmill by a River</td>
<td>1642 s/d</td>
<td>London, National Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salomon van Ruysdael</td>
<td>Landscape on the River Meuse</td>
<td>1643</td>
<td>Baltimore, Museum of Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan van Goyen</td>
<td>The Valkhoff at Nijmegen</td>
<td>1643 s/d</td>
<td>Baltimore, The Walters Art Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan van Goyen</td>
<td>View of Dordrecht from the Dortse Kil</td>
<td>1644 s/d</td>
<td>Washington, National Gallery of Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salomon van Ruysdael</td>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>1644</td>
<td>Kansas City, Nelson Gallery/Atkins Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan van Goyen</td>
<td>A Watergate</td>
<td>1644 s/d</td>
<td>Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan van Goyen</td>
<td>Panoramic View with a Wide River</td>
<td>1644 c.</td>
<td>Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum (on loan to Bredius Museum, The Hague)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan van Goyen</td>
<td>Watergate</td>
<td>1644(5?) s/d</td>
<td>Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan van Goyen</td>
<td>View of Rhenen</td>
<td>164(5?)6 s/d</td>
<td>Baltimore, Museum of Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan van Goyen</td>
<td>View of Viannen</td>
<td>1649 s/d</td>
<td>Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan van Goyen</td>
<td>View of Leiden</td>
<td>1650 s/d</td>
<td>Leiden, Lakenhal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan van Goyen</td>
<td>A Shipping Scene</td>
<td>1651 s/d</td>
<td>Washington, Corcoran Gallery of Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan van Goyen</td>
<td>Near Dordrecht</td>
<td>165(4?) s/d</td>
<td>Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2: LIST OF ARTISTS REFERED TO IN THE TEXT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altdorfer, Albrecht</td>
<td>1480?-1538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arentsz, Arent</td>
<td>1585/6-1631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avercamp, Hendrick</td>
<td>1585-1635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bleker, Gerrit Claesz</td>
<td>ca. 1600-1656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bles, Herri</td>
<td>ca. 1500-1550/59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloemaert, Abraham</td>
<td>1566-1651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bol, Hans</td>
<td>1534-1593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosch, Hieronymus</td>
<td>ca. 1453-1516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bril, Paulus</td>
<td>1554-1626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brouwer, Adriaen</td>
<td>1605/6-1638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruegel, Pieter I</td>
<td>1525?-1569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brueghel, Jan II</td>
<td>1601-1678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brueghel, Pieter II</td>
<td>1564-1638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brueghel, Jan I</td>
<td>1568-1625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buytewech, Willem Pietersz</td>
<td>ca. 1591/92-1624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claesz, Pieter</td>
<td>ca. 1597-1660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleve, Joos van</td>
<td>1485?-1540/41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cock, Hieronymus</td>
<td>ca. 1510-1570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coninxloo, Gillis van</td>
<td>1544-1607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dou, Gerrit</td>
<td>1613-1675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyck, Anthony van</td>
<td>1599-1641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyck, Jan van</td>
<td>ca. 1390-1441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gassel, Lucas</td>
<td>ca. 1500-ca.1570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gheyn II, Jacques de</td>
<td>1565-1629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goltzius, Hendrick</td>
<td>1558-1617</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gossaert, Jan</td>
<td>d. ca. 1532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goyen, Jan van</td>
<td>1596-1656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grimmer, Jacob</td>
<td>ca. 1525-ca. 1590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hals, Frans</td>
<td>1582/3-1666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heda, Willem Claesz</td>
<td>1594-1680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heemskerck, Maarten van</td>
<td>1498-1574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huber, Wolf</td>
<td>ca. 1490-1553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keirincx, Alexander</td>
<td>1600-1652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knibbergen, François</td>
<td>1597/8-1665 or later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lastman, Pieter</td>
<td>1583-1633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lievens, Jan</td>
<td>1607-1674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limbourg, Pol, Herman, Jean</td>
<td>d. 1416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisse, Dirck van der</td>
<td>d. 1669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mander, Karel van</td>
<td>1548-1606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massys, Quentin</td>
<td>ca. 1465-1530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massys, Cornelis</td>
<td>ca. 1505-12-after 1557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molijn, Pieter de</td>
<td>1595-1661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Momper, Joos de II</td>
<td>1564-1635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neyn, Pieter de</td>
<td>1597-1639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patinir, Joachim</td>
<td>ca. 1475-1524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poelenburgh, Cornelis van</td>
<td>1594/5-1667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcellis, Jan</td>
<td>ca. 1584-87-1632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pynas, Jacob</td>
<td>ca. 1585-after 1656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pynas, Jan</td>
<td>1581/82-1631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rijn, Rembrandt van</td>
<td>1606-1669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubens, Peter Paul</td>
<td>1577-1640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ruysdael, Salomon van 1600/03-1670
Saftleven, Herman 1609-1685
Saenredam, Pieter Jansz 1595-1665
Santvoort, Pieter van 1604/5-1635
Savery, Hans 1597-1655
Savery, Jacob 1565/67-1603
Savery, Roelandt 1578-1639
Scorel, Jan van 1495-1562
Segers, Hercules 1589/90-1633-38
Teniers, David II 1610-1690
Velde II, Jan van de ca. 1593-1641
Velde, Esaias van de 1587-1630
Velde, Hans van de 1552-1609
Venne, Adriaen van de 1589-1662
Vinckboons, David 1576-c.1632
Visscher, Jan Claesz 1586/87-1652
Vrancx, Sebastian 1573-1647
Vroom, Hendrick Cornelisz 1566-1640
Vroom, Cornelis ca. 1591-1661
Wieringen, Cornelis Claesz van ca. 1580-1633
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Fig. 1 Jan van Goyen, *Dune Landscape with Figures*, ca. 1632, panel, 33 x 54.5 cm, Leiden, Stedelijk Museum de Lakenhal (on loan from the Rijksdienst Beeldende Kunst, The Hague).

Fig. 2 Jan Brueghel I, *The Entry of the Animals into Noah's Ark*, signed and dated 1613, panel, 54.6 x 83.8 cm, Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum.
Fig. 3 Joachim Patinir, _St. Jerome_, ca. 1515-1519, panel, Madrid, Prado.
Fig. 4 Herri Bles or Workshop of Bles, **Parable of the Good Samaritan**, ca. mid-1540s, panel, Namur, Société Archeologique.
Fig. 5 Herri Bles, *The Sacrifice of Isaac*. Cincinnati Art Museum.
Fig. 6 Bles, *Sacrifice of Isaac*. Infrared reflectogram: detail, head of Isaac. Courtesy Molly Faries.

Fig. 7 Bles, *Sacrifice of Isaac*. Detail, head of Isaac. Courtesy Stephen Bonadies, Cincinnati Museum of Art.
Fig. 8 Pieter Bruegel the Elder, *Return of the Herd*, signed and dated 1565, panel, 117 x 159 cm, Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum.
Fig. 9 Pieter Bruegel the Elder, *Wooded Landscape with Five Bears*, dated 155(4), pen and brown ink on paper, 27.3 x 41.0 cm, Prague, Narodni Galerie.
Fig. 10 Hieronymus Cock after Pieter Bruegel, *Landscape with the Temptation of Christ*, etching, 30.9 x 44.1 cm, Boston, Museum of Fine Arts.
Fig. 11 Pieter Bruegel the Elder, *Landscape with the Penitence of Saint Jerome*, signed and dated 1553, pen and brown ink on paper, 23.2 x 33.6 cm, Washington, National Gallery of Art.
Fig. 12 Published by Hieronymus Cock after Pieter Bruegel, The Penitent Magdalene, from the series The Large Landscapes, ca. 1555-1560, etching and engraving, 33 x 42 cm, Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art.
Fig. 13 Published by Hieronymus Cock, after the Master of the Small Landscapes, Praediorum Villarum, plate 10, 1561, etching retouched with engraving, ca 137 x 194 cm, Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art.
Fig. 14 Pieter Bruegel the Elder, *The Rabbit Hunters*, signed and dated 1566, etching, 21.4 x 29.2 cm, Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art.
Fig. 15 Joos De Momper the Younger, *Large Mountain Landscape*, c. 1620s, canvas, 209 x 286 cm, Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum.
Fig. 16 Jan Brueghel I, Paradise Scene, signed, copper panel, 19 x 15 cm, Montreal, Collection of Mr. and Mrs. Michal Hornstein.
Fig. 17 Brueghel, *Paradise Scene*, detail right side.
Fig. 18 Brueghel, Paradise Scene. Infrared reflectogram, detail right side.
Fig. 19 Brueghel, Paradise Scene. Photomicrograph, black dog and head of leopard. (magnification 3.5x)
Fig. 20 Brueghel, *Paradise Scene*. Photomicrograph, peacocks and rump of tiger. (magnification 3.5x)
Fig. 21 Brueghel, Paradise Scene. Photomicrograph, foliage and fruit (magnification 27x)
Fig. 22 Brueghel, *Paradise Scene*. Photomicrograph, distant mountains against the sky (magnification 175x).
Fig. 23 Anonymous Antwerp landscape artist with figure painter, Landscape with Tobias and the Angel, ca. 1620s, panel, 71 x 111.5 cm, Baltimore, The Walters Art Gallery.
Fig. 24 Tobias and the Angel. Detail, foreground figure group.

Fig. 25 Landscape with Tobias and the Angel. Infrared reflectogram detail, fence and heads of figure group.
Fig. 26 Landscape with Tobias and the Angel. Detail, lower left.

Fig. 27 Landscape with Tobias and the Angel. Detail, rocky middle distance.
Fig. 28 Landscape with Tobias and the Angel. Photomacrograph (2.5x): right side, location of sample 1463.
Fig. 29 Landscape with Tobias and the Angel Paint cross section. From bottom: chalk ground; (upper ground missing); bright blue underpaint: azurite; black and lead tin yellow; foliage highlight: lead tin yellow and azurite. Photomicrograph, 230x.
Fig. 30 Copy after Jan Brueghel I, Noah's Ark, panel, 65.4 x 94.5 cm, Baltimore, The Walters Art Gallery.
Fig. 31 Copy after Brueghel, *Noah's Ark*, detail: goat in middle distance left.

Fig. 32 Copy after Brueghel, *Noah's Ark*. Infrared reflectogram detail: goat in middle distance, left.
Fig. 33 Copy after Brueghel, Noah's Ark. Detail: dogs at left center.
Fig. 34 Joos de Momper, *Village Scene*, canvas, 133.3 x 188 cm, North Carolina Museum of Art, Raleigh.
Fig. 35 De Momper, Village Scene. Photomacrograph (2.5x): left side, middle distance foliage.

Fig. 36 De Momper, Village Scene. Detail, infrared reflectogram. Foliage indicated with loose scribbles.
Fig. 37 De Momper, Village Scene. Photomacrograph (2.5x): road in middle distance, center.

Fig. 38 De Momper, Village Scene. Detail: figure group in center foreground.
Fig. 39 De Momper, Village Scene. Photomacrograph (2.5x), figure and bales in boat, left middle ground.
Fig. 40 Joos de Momper, *Winter Landscape*, canvas, 118.1 x 165.9 cm, North Carolina Museum of Art, Raleigh.
Fig. 41 De Momper, Winter Scene. Detail, foreground figures.

Fig. 42 De Momper, Winter Scene. Photomacrograph, 2.5x: snowy foliage, middle ground, center.
Fig. 43 Attributed to Joos de Momper, *Mountain Landscape*, panel, 50 x 92.9 cm, Allen Memorial Art Museum, Oberlin.
Fig. 44 Attributed to De Momper, Mountain Landscape. Detail, cliff face in middle distance, right.
Fig. 45 Attributed to De Momper, *Mountain Landscape*. Detail center foreground: details in brown paint.
Fig. 46 David Teniers, *Saints Anthony and Paul in a Landscape*, mid-1630s, panel, 53 x 85.3 cm, Oberlin, Allen Memorial Art Museum.
Fig. 47 Teniers, *Saints Anthony and Paul in a Landscape*, detail right foreground: cavern and yellow foliage painted wet-into-wet.
Fig. 48 Joos de Momper or David Teniers, *Vista from a Grotto*, ca. 1625 or ca. 1635, panel, 50.9 x 51.7 cm, Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art.
Fig. 49 De Momper or Teniers, *Vista from a Grotto*, photomicrograph: left side: dark foreground paint wet-into-wet with light water (magnification 4x).
Fig. 50 De Momper or Teniers, *Vista from a Grotto*, photomicrograph: trailing weeds painted wet-into-wet with sky (magnification 12x).
Fig. 51 After Pieter Bruegel the Elder, *Forest Landscape with Wild Animals*, pen and brown ink on paper, 34.4 x 25.7 cm, London, British Museum, Department of Prints and Drawings.
Fig. 52 Gillis van Coninxloo, *Landscape with Venus and Adonis*, signed with monogram, ca. 1595, copper panel, 37.8 x 53.6 cm, Cleveland Museum of Art.
Fig. 53 Coninxloo, *Venus and Adonis*, detail, middle distance.
Fig. 54 Coninxloo, *Venus and Adonis*, detail, lower right, visible brush strokes of underpaint.
Fig. 55 Coninxloo, *Venus and Adonis*, detail left side, tree trunk.
Fig. 56 Coninxloo, *Venus and Adonis*, detail, figure group.
Fig. 57 Gillis van Coninxloo, *Hunters in a Landscape*, signed in monogram and dated 1605, panel, 58.5 x 83.5 cm, Speyer, Historisches Museum de Pfalz.

Fig. 58 Roelandt Savery, *The Drink*, signed, ca. 1616, panel, 42 x 83.5 cm, Kortrijk, Museum voor Schone Kunsten.
Fig. 59 Attributed to Roelandt Savery, *The Creation of Birds*, signed and dated 1619, panel, 20.6 x 25.4 cm, Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum.
Fig. 60 Attributed to Savery, *The Creation of Birds*, detail, sky.
Fig. 61 Attributed to Savery, The Creation of Birds, paint cross section from sky. From bottom: chalk ground, imprimatura (seen as a thin line of red and black particles), first layer of sky (white lead and smalt), final layer of sky (white lead and ultramarine). Photomicrograph, 250x.
Fig. 62 Attributed to Savery, *The Creation of Birds*, detail middle distance, waterfall.
Fig. 63 Roelandt Savery, *Orpheus with Beasts and Birds*, signed and dated 1622, copper panel, 22.5 x 26.3 cm, Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum.
Fig. 64 Savery, *Orpheus with Beasts and Birds*, detail middle ground, horses and foliage.
Fig. 65 Savery, *Orpheus with Beasts and Birds*, detail foreground, goat painted into reserve in middle ground waterfall.
Fig. 66 Roelandt Savery, Landscape with the Flight into Egypt, signed and dated 1624, panel, 54.3 x 91.5 cm, Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art.
Fig. 67 Savery, *Landscape with the Flight into Egypt*, detail, ruined tower.
Fig. 68 Savery, *Landscape with the Flight into Egypt*, photomicrograph, underpaint exposed in ray of sunlight (magnification 4x).
Fig. 69 Savery, Landscape with the Flight into Egypt, infrared reflectogram detail, lower right.
Fig. 70 Savery, Landscape with the Flight into Egypt, photomicrograph, foreground: brown details over gray paint (magnification 4x).
Fig. 71 Roelandt Savery, *Orpheus*, signed and dated 1628, panel, 53.0 x 81.5 cm, London, National Gallery.
Fig. 72 Savery, *Orpheus*, detail right side, kneeling cow.
Fig. 73 Savery, Orpheus, infrared reflectogram detail, right side, kneeling cow.
Fig. 74 Savery, *Orpheus*, detail, figure of Orpheus.
Fig. 75 Hans Savery II, Landscape with Ruins and Animals, panel, 51.6 x 71.3 cm, Baltimore, The Walters Art Gallery.
Fig. 76 Hans Savery II, *Landscape with Ruins and Animals*, detail left center, ostrich painted into reserve in architecture.
Fig. 77 Cornelis Vroom, Landscape with a River by a Wood, signed and dated 1626, panel, 31.3 x 44.2 cm, London, National Gallery.
Fig. 78 Vroom, Landscape with a River by a Wood, detail, distant trees.
Fig. 79 Jacob Pynas, *Landscape with Narcissus*, signed and dated 1628, panel, 47.9 x 63.9 cm, London, National Gallery.
Fig. 80 Jacob Pynas, *Landscape with Narcissus*, detail, right side, light-colored foliage painted onto reserve in dark-colored zone behind.
Fig. 81 Pynas, Landscape with Narcissus, detail, right side, brown painted sketch serving as shadows in loosely painted foreground.
Fig. 82 Hendrick Goltzius, *Pass in the Rocky Mountains*, signed and dated 1594, Haarlem, Teylers Foundation.
Fig. 83 Jacques Savery. Landscape with a Castle, falsely signed and dated "BRVEGEL・1561," brown ink over black chalk, 14.5 x 18.9 cm, Berlin, Staatliche Museen Preussicher Kulturbestiz.
Fig. 84 Jacques de Gheyn II after Jacques Savery, Landscape with a Castle, inscribed “Brvegel. in. 1561,” engraving, Amsterdam, Rijksprentenkabinet.
Fig. 85 Henrick Goltzius, Dune Landscape near Haarlem, signed in monogram and dated 1603, pen and brown ink, 8.7 x 15.3 cm, Rotterdam, Museum Boymans-van Beuningen.
Fig. 86 Claes Jansz Visscher, after the Master of the Small Landscapes, View of a Farm, plate 11 of Regiunculae et Viclae...Brabantiae, 1612, etching, 11.2 x 16.5 cm, Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art.
Fig. 87 Claes Jansz Visscher, Plaïjsante plaets aende duyn kant, plate 10 of Plaisante Plaetsen, ca. 1612-1613, etching, 10.4 x 16 cm. Amsterdam, Rijksprentenkabinet.
Fig. 88 Claes Jansz Visscher after Claes van Wieringen, plate 12 of Pleasant Places, 1613, etching, 13.9 x 19.3 cm, Amsterdam, Rijksprentenkabinet.
Fig. 89 Esaias van de Velde, *Village*, 1614, etching, 12.2 x 17.1 cm, Amsterdam, Rijksprentenkabinet.
Fig. 90 Esaias van de Velde, *Pasture and Road near the Church Tower of Spaarnwoude*, plate 3 of *Landscapes, primarily Views in the Neighborhood of Haarlem*, ca. 1615-1616, etching, ca. 9 x 18 cm, Amsterdam, Rijksprentenkabinet.

Fig. 91 Esaias van de Velde, *View of Spaarnwoude*, drawing, 8.7 x 17.8 cm, Amsterdam, Rijksprentenkabinet.
Fig. 92 Willem Buytewech, *The Charcoal Burner*, plate 8 of *Verscheyden lantschapjes*, (1616) reissued by Claes Jansz Visscher 1621, etching, 8.9 x 12.5 cm, Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art.
Fig. 93 Esaias van de Velde, *Summer Landscape (Road to Emmaus)*, ca. 1612-1613, panel, 20.6 x 31.9 cm, Oberlin, Allen Memorial Art Museum.

Fig. 94 Esaias van de Velde, *Winter Landscape (Flight into Egypt)*, ca. 1612-1613, panel, 20 x 32 cm, formerly Lucca, Mansi collection.
Fig. 95 Esaias van de Velde, *Summer Landscape*, detail, infrared photograph.
Fig. 96 Esaias van de Velde, *Summer Landscape*, detail, sky.
Fig. 97 Esaias van de Velde, *Summer Landscape*, detail, distant figures.

Fig. 98 Esaias van de Velde, *Summer Landscape*, detail, primary figure group.
Fig. 99 Esaias van de Velde. Winter Landscape, signed and dated 1614, panel, 21 x 40.6 cm, Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum.
Fig. 100 Esaias van de Velde, *Winter Landscape*, detail, buildings in distance, with visible underdrawing.

Fig. 101 Esaias van de Velde, *Winter Landscape*, detail, foreground.
Fig. 102 Esaias van de Velde, Winter Landscape, detail, rider.
Fig. 103 Esaias van de Velde, Farms Flanking a Frozen Canal, signed and dated 1614, composite panel: original section (illustrated here) 12.7 × 31.9 cm (present dimensions with additions to top and bottom 25.7 × 31.9 cm), Raleigh, North Carolina Museum of Art.

Fig. 104 Esaias van de Velde, Farms Flanking a Frozen Canal, detail, buildings right side.
Fig. 105 Esaias van de Velde, *Farms Flanking a Frozen Canal*, infrared reflectogram detail, buildings right side.

Fig. 106 Esaias van de Velde, *Farms Flanking a Frozen Canal*, paint cross section from tree trunk (area of Fig. 107). From bottom: wood of panel, grayish ground (black and earth pigments with white lead, and probably chalk), dark detail (thin brown-black layer), yellow highlight (yellow earth, white lead) (magnification 700x). Courtesy William P. Brown.
Fig. 107 Esaias van de Velde, *Farms Flanking a Frozen Canal*, detail left side, hollow tree painted with exposed wood grain.
Fig. 108 Esaias van de Velde, *Tower by a Frozen River*, falsely signed and dated "IV GOIEN 1612", round panel, 25 x 25.4 cm, Leiden, Stedelijk Museum De Lakenhal.
Fig. 109 Esaias van de Velde, Frozen River with Ice Activities, false monogram "VG", ca. 1620, 28.5 x 37.5 cm, Haarlem, Frans Halsmuseum on loan from the Rijksdienst Beeldende Kunst.
Fig. 110 Esaias van de Velde, Frozen River with Ice Activities, detail right side, trees over thinly washed underpaint.

Fig. 111 Esaias van de Velde, Frozen River with Ice Activities, paint cross section from area of Fig. 110, from bottom: white lower ground (chalk), whitish upper ground (lead white and chalk lightly toned with black and earth pigments), thinly washed underpaint (white lead, azurite, earth, black). (magnification 224x).
Fig. 112 Esaias van de Velde, Frozen River with Ice Activities, detail wooden bridge painted wet-into-wet with background, figures added later.
Fig. 113 Esaïas van de Velde, *Landscape with a Courtly Procession near Abtspoel Castle*, signed and dated 1619, canvas, 102 × 176 cm, The Minneapolis Institute of Arts.

Fig. 114 Esaïas van de Velde, *Landscape with a Courtly Procession near Abtspoel Castle*, paint cross section, sky upper right, from bottom: gray lower ground (white lead, chalk, charcoal black, brown earth), gray upper ground (white lead, chalk, charcoal black, smaller proportion of brown earth), sky (white lead with strongly colored smalt). (magnification 224x).
Fig. 115 Esaias van de Velde, *Landscape with a Courtly Procession near Abtspoel Castle*, paint cross section, foliage underpaint area of Fig. 116, from bottom: gray lower ground (white lead, chalk, charcoal black, brown earth), gray upper ground (white lead, chalk, charcoal black, smaller proportion of brown earth), blue-green underpaint (azurite with small amount of earth and black). (magnification 224x).
Fig. 116 Esaias van de Velde, Landscape with a Courtly Procession near Abtspoel Castle, detail right side middle distance, broad yellow paint over blue-green underpaint.
Fig. 117 Esaias van de Velde, Landscape with a Courtly Procession near Abtspoel Castle, detail of riders on right.
Fig. 118 Esaias van de Velde, Road between a Farm and Water, signed and dated 1625, round panel, diameter 17.7 cm, The Cleveland Museum of Art.
Fig. 119 Esaias van de Velde, *Road between a Farm and Water*, detail left side, middle distance.

Fig. 120 Esaias van de Velde, *Road between a Farm and Water*, detail, central trees.
Fig. 121 Esaias van de Velde, *Winter Landscape*, signed and dated 1623, panel, 26 x 30.5 cm, London, National Gallery.
Fig. 122 Esaias van de Velde, *Winter Landscape*, paint cross section from upper edge of sky, from bottom: thin ground barely smoothing the texture of the wood panel (white lead, chalk, earth, black); pale sky (white lead, very pale smalt), darker sky (white lead, gray-blue smalt). (magnification 224x).
Fig. 123 Esaias van de Velde, *Winter Landscape*, detail, middle distance and horizon, thinly handled to exploit the tone of thin ground and wood panel.
Fig. 124 Esaias van de Velde, Winter Landscape, infrared photograph.
Fig. 125 Esaias van de Velde, *Farm to the left of a Frozen River*, ca. 1613-1615, etching, 6.8 x 9.2 cm, Leiden, Prentenkabinet der Rijksuniversiteit.
Fig. 126 Esaias van de Velde, Villagers Skating on a Frozen Pond, signed and dated 1625, black chalk with brown wash, 18.9 x 14.3 cm, Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art.
Fig. 127 Esaias van de Velde, Farm to the Right of a Frozen River, signed and dated 1616, black chalk, 13.2 x 25.4 cm, New Haven, Yale University Art Gallery.
Fig. 128 Esaias van de Velde, The Village Street, ca. 1624, black chalk and wash, Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art.
Fig. 129 Pieter Molijn, *Dune Landscape with Trees and Wagon*, signed and dated 1626, panel, 26 x 36 cm, Braunschweig, Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum.
Fig. 130 Jan van Goyen, *Summer*, signed and dated 1625, panel, diameter 33.5 cm, Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum.
Fig. 131 Jan van Goyen, *Summer*, detail, infrared reflectogram assembly. Courtesy J. R. J. Van Asperen de Boer.
Fig. 132 Jan van Goyen, *Village Scene*, signed and dated 1626, panel, 32 x 59 cm, Leiden, Stedelijk Museum De Lakenhal.

Fig. 133 Jan van Goyen, *Village Scene*, photomicrograph, details of foreground zone painted over completed middle ground. (magnification 6x).
Fig. 134 Jan van Goyen, Cottage on a Heath, signed, ca.1629, panel 39.7 x 60.5 cm, London, National Gallery.
Fig. 135 Jan van Goyen, Cottage on a Heath, detail right side, infrared photograph.
Fig. 136 Jan van Goyen, *Cottage on a Heath*, detail, wet-into-wet handling of horizon.
Fig. 137 Jan van Goyen, *Cottage on a Heath*, detail, figures.
Fig. 138 Salomon van Ruysdael, **Farm Buildings in a Landscape**, signed and dated 162(8), panel, 30 x 46.7 cm, Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum.

Fig. 139 Jan van Goyen, **Dune Landscape with Figures**, ca. 1632, panel, 33 x 54.4 cm, Leiden, Stedelijk Museum De Lakenhal (on loan from the Rijksdienst Beeldende Kunst, The Hague).
Fig. 140 Jan van Goyen, *A Windmill by a River*, signed and dated 1642, panel, 29.4 x 36.3 cm, London, National Gallery.
Fig. 141 Jan van Goyen, *Windmill by a River*, detail, rider in middleground.
Fig. 142  Jan van Goyen, Windmill by a River, detail right edge, fingerprints into wet paint.
Fig. 143  Jan van Goyen, Panoramic View of a Wide River, ca. 1645, panel, 22 x 31.5 cm, The Hague, Museum Bredius (on loan from the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam).
Fig. 144  Jan van Goyen, Panoramic View of a Wide River, photomicrograph left edge, green paint of foliage painted wet-into-wet with paint of water. (magnification 6x).
Fig. 145 Jan van Goyen, *Panoramic View of a Wide River*, photomicrograph, reflections in water. (magnification 6x).
Fig. 146 Willem Buytewech, Ruins of the Chapel at Enkenduynen, plate 9 of Verscheyden lantschapjes. (1616) reissued by Claes Jansz Visscher 1621, etching, 9.3 x 13.3 cm, Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art.
Fig. 147 Jan van Goyen, *View of Leiden*, signed and dated 1650, panel, 66.5 x 97.5 cm, Leiden, Stedelijk Museum De Lakenhal.
Fig. 148 Jan van Goyen, *View of Rhenen*, signed and dated 16(47)6, panel, 57.2 x 81.3 cm, Baltimore Museum of Art.
Fig. 149 Jan van Goyen, *View of Rhenen*, paint cross section from sky, from bottom: transparent ground (almost colorless smalt, chalk, yellow earth), sky (white lead with bright blue smalt).
Fig. 150 Jan van Goyen, *View of Rhenen*, detail, reflections in water.
Fig. 151 Adriaen van de Venne, Poor Luxury, signed and dated 1635, panel, 33 x 60 cm, Rotterdam, Museum Boymans-van Beuningen.

Fig. 152 HermanSaftleven, Cornelis Saftleven, Hunter Sleeping on a Hillside, signed and dated 164(2), panel, 36.8 x 52 cm, Boston, Collection of Maida and George Abrams.
Fig. 153 Jan Porcellis, Seascape, signed and dated 1629, panel, 27 x 35.5 cm, Leiden, Stedelijk Museum De Lakenhal.
Fig. 154 Willem Claesz Heda, *Vanitas Still Life*, signed and dated 1621, panel, 45.5 x 69.5 cm, The Hague, Museum Bredius.
Fig. 155 Peter Paul Rubens, *An Autumn Landscape with a View of Het Steen in the Early Morning*, ca. 1636, panel, 131.2 x 229.2 cm, London, National Gallery.
Fig. 156 Adriaen Brouwer, *Dune Landscape by Moonlight*, c. 1635-1637, panel, 25 x 34 cm, Berlin, Staatliche Museen, Gemäldegalerie.
Fig. 157 Peter Paul Rubens, *Landscape with the Moon and Stars*, c. 1637-1638, panel, 64 x 90 cm, London, Courtauld Institute Galleries, Princes Gate Collection.
Fig. 158 Rembrandt van Rijn, *Stormy Landscape*, signed, ca. 1637-38, panel, 52 x 72 cm, Braunschweig, Herzog Anton Ulrich-Museum.
Fig. 159 Hercules Segers, *Landscape with a Lake and a Round Building*, signed, ca. 1620s, canvas on panel, 29.3 x 45.7 cm, Rotterdam, Museum Boymans-van Beuningen.
Fig. 160 Rembrandt van Rijn, Ice Scene near Farm Cottages, signed and dated 1646, panel, 16.7 x 22.4 cm, Kassel, Gemäldegalerie Alter Meister, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen.