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Gaspard Dughet (1615-1675), one of the most prolific and influential landscape artists of the seventeenth century, remains today one of the least studied (fig. 1: Luigi Garzi Portrait of Gaspard Dughet).¹ A monograph, three smaller exhibitions, and a number of articles, most dating from more than twenty-five years ago, make up the current literature devoted solely to the artist.² Compared to the scholarly works written on Claude Lorrain, Dughet is virtually neglected. Although his paintings have been catalogued, little scholarship has been dedicated to Dughet’s drawings and his work as a draughtsman is not well understood. For this thesis, I have chosen to focus on a group of chalk drawings, which have long been attributed to the artist, but are in fact copies done in the later seventeenth or early eighteenth century. Ann Sutherland Harris first addressed this problem, which will be published in a forthcoming article. In addition to attempting to determine which artists are responsible for these drawings, I have also explored the question of why these drawings were created by examining Dughet’s influence during his lifetime and into the eighteenth century.

It is my contention that a Northern artist working in Italy in the circles of Isaac de Moucheron (1667-1744), Johannes Glauber (1646-1726), Abraham Genoels (1640-1722), or Jan Frans van Bloemen, (1662-1749) executed a number of these drawings. Dughet’s influence on these artists is discernible in their paintings, as well as the drawings and

¹ Kenneth Clark. Landscape Into Art. Boston: Beacon Press, 1961, p. 70, refers to Dughet as “one of the most underrated artists in the history of painting.”

² The monograph is Marie Nicole Boisclair. Gaspard Dughet, sa vie et son oeuvre (1615-1675). Paris: Arthêna, 1986. The exhibitions include Marcel Roethlisberger. Gaspard Dughet: Rome 1615-1675. New York: Richard L. Feigen, 1975, which consisted of only a few paintings, Anne French. Gaspard Dughet Called Gaspar Poussin, 1615-75: A French Landscape Painter in 17th Century Rome and His Influence on British Art. London: The Greater London Council, 1980, the most extensive exhibition devoted to the artist, which included paintings and drawings by Dughet and British artists who were influenced by his work. The final exhibition is Christian Klemm. Gaspard Dughet und die Ideale Landschaft: Kataloge des Kunstmuseum Düsseldorf Handzeichnungen. Düsseldorf: Kunstmuseum Düsseldorf, 1981, which presented drawings by Dughet in the Kunstmuseum as well as works by a number of his followers.
prints. The drawings cannot be attributed with certainty to any single artist, but bear some stylistic similarities to the graphic oeuvre of these artists. Based on stylistic and technical evidence, including the chosen medium and watermarks, it is apparent the drawings date to the late seventeenth or early eighteenth century. As the drawings were not executed by one artist, but by a number of different hands, I have endeavored to catalogue the largest group of these drawings based on technique and manner.

Born in 1615, the son of a French pastry chef living near the Piazza di Spagna in Rome and an Italian mother, Dughet is best known today as the brother-in-law of Nicolas Poussin. He entered Poussin’s household in 1631 after the older artist married his sister, Anna. According to his earliest biographers, Baldinucci and Pascoli, Poussin encouraged Dughet to pursue landscape after realizing the young artist’s talent for the genre. Dughet’s choice of specialty may also relate to the unusual structure of Poussin’s workshop as he did not have access to live models. Dughet’s figures, like Claude’s, are not well constructed, often displaying ungainly proportions and showing a lack of knowledge of human anatomy. A number of works are, in fact, collaborations with other artists, including Guglielmo Cortese, Charles Le Brun, Pier Francesco Mola, Pietro Testa, Carlo Maratta, Jan Miel, and Filippo Lauri, all of whom would paint the figures while Dughet executed the landscapes.

After leaving Poussin’s studio in 1635, Dughet may have traveled to Naples, Perugia, and Florence, where he supposedly came into contact with Pietro da Cortona while working at the Palazzo Pitti. Upon his return to Rome, he may have studied under

---

3 Dughet’s travels are recorded by Baldinucci. The complete translation is in Roethlisberger 1975, p. 10. Roethlisberger provides translations for the early biographies of Dughet, including Baldinucci, Orlandi, Pascoli, Lanzi, Mariette, and Dézallier d’Argenville. Two paintings from the Palazzo Pitti are reproduced in Boisclair 1986, cat. nos. 73 and 74, figs. 98 and 99 and are dated to 1641, the same time Cortona was
Claude Lorrain. It is unclear whether or not he was actually a pupil in Claude’s studio, but he certainly absorbed the work of the French artist, as he did other landscape specialists, including Giovanni Francesco Grimaldi and Herman van Swanevelt. Dughet received his most important commission in 1647 for the decoration of the church of San Martino ai Monti in Rome. The frescoes, which depict events from the lives of the prophets Elijah and Elisha, whom the Carmelites believed were the true founders of their order, were a popular stop for tourists and artists alike, well into the nineteenth century (figs. 2 and 3: Interior view of the church of San Martino ai Monti and Copy after Hubert Robert Interior of San Martino ai Monti). After his work at San Martino, Dughet was working at the Palazzo Pitti. The paintings, however, were not in the collection until the nineteenth century.

4 Baldinucci claims that Dughet entered Claude’s studio after returning to Rome (Roethlisberger 1975, p. 10). Eckhart Knab, in his article “Observations about Claude, Angeluccio, Dughet, and Poussin,” Master Drawings. Vol. 9, no. 4, Winter 1971, pp. 367-383, believes Baldinucci’s assertion because of the similarities between Claude’s frescoes and Dughet’s, which he supposes Dughet could only have seen just after their completion as Claude did not work in fresco after the mid-1630s. Boisclair 1986, pp. 41-42, argues that Dughet most likely accompanied Poussin and Claude on their sketching excursions while he was still in Poussin’s studio and thus would have been introduced to the older artist. Her argument is reasonable as Dughet had already been working as an independent artist for at least five years and would not have found it necessary to continue working in the studio of another artist.

5 Much scholarship has been devoted to this series. See Ann B. Sutherland. “The Decoration of San Martino ai Monti-I,” The Burlington Magazine. Vol. 106, no. 731, February 1964, pp. 58-69 and “The Decoration of San Martino ai Monti-II,” The Burlington Magazine. Vol. 106, no. 732, March 1964, pp. 115-120, for the documents connected with the project and for descriptions of each artist’s contribution to the series. Also see Ann Sutherland Harris. “A Lost Drawing by Dughet for a Fresco by Giovanni Francesco Grimaldi,” The Burlington Magazine. Vol. 110, no. 780, March 1968, pp. 142-145, for an analysis of who was in charge of designing the frescoes. Harris believed that Dughet may have executed the initial designs for the frescoes, not Grimaldi. She has since retracted this argument, which was based on a drawing believed to be by Dughet for one of Grimaldi’s frescoes. For a complete investigation of the iconography of each fresco, see Susan J. Bandes. “Gaspard Dughet and San Martino ai Monti,” Storia dell’arte. Vol. 26, 1976, pp. 45-60. Finally, for the best analysis on the dating of the frescoes, see Johanna Heideman. “The Dating of Gaspard Dughet’s Frescoes in San Martino ai Monti in Rome,” The Burlington Magazine. Vo. 122, no. 929, August 1980, pp. 540-546. The author disputes Harris’s earlier argument that Dughet was first given the commission. Instead, she argues that Dughet only took over the decoration of the church after Grimaldi left for Paris in the fall of 1648, which seems more logical as Grimaldi was the older artist with an established reputation.

6 See Bandes 1976 for a complete history of the order and the relevance of the episodes depicted in the frescoes. The frescoes were singled out for praise by Baldinucci, see Roethlisberger 1975, p. 10. Although written in the seventeenth century, Baldinucci’s Notizie de’ Professori del Disegno was not published until
recognized as one of the preeminent landscape painters in Rome. He worked consistently until his death in 1675, executing both easel paintings and frescoes for some of the most influential and important patrons in Rome, including the Borghese, Colonna, Chigi and Pamphili families, and for artists such as Gianlorenzo Bernini, Carlo Maratta, and Charles Le Brun. He also painted canvases for the Spanish ambassadors in Rome and for King Philip IV. Despite his brother-in-law’s connections with some of the most important French patrons, Dughet, who thought of himself as a Roman, did not work for the French. He did, at times, adopt the surname Poussin and was more often referred to as Gaspard Poussin than as Dughet.

Dughet did not restrict himself to frescoes and easel paintings; he also produced at least eight etchings, numerous landscapes for stage sets, backgrounds for fountains, bed screens, and musical instruments. A prolific artist, Dughet worked quickly “at such a
speed that in a single day he could start and finish a canvas of five palms with various figures.”11 In her monograph, Marie Nicole Boisclair has recorded over four hundred paintings by the artist. According to Baldinucci, he may have had as much as 25,000 scudi at his death, but had probably spent most of his earnings on hunting, his favorite pursuit.12

Dughet is best known as the “purest of pure landscape painters.”13 His works, depicting idealized views from around the Roman countryside, were vastly popular in Italy and also in England, where they inspired the next generation of artists such as Richard Wilson (ca. 1713-1782) and Thomas Gainsborough (1727-1788) in the British Isles, Italian artists like his only pupil Crescenzio Onofri (ca. 1640-after 1712) and Andrea Locatelli (1695-1741), and northern artists working in Italy, for example, Caspar van Wittel, or Gaspar Vanvitelli (ca. 1653-1736), Isaac de Moucheron (1667-1744) and Jan Frans van Bloemen (1662-1749), better known as Orrizonte.

The status of landscape as a genre was, from the middle of the seventeenth century onwards, quickly on the rise. Landscape frescoes and easel paintings became a necessary part of the decoration in many Roman palazzi and country estates.14 New theoretical treatises appeared that dealt with the artist’s portrayal of nature and how best

11 Baldinucci, translated in Roethlisberger 1975, p. 11.
12 Ibid p. 11, Dughet was an avid hunter and loved the countryside. He owned houses at Tivoli and Frascati as well as two in Rome.
14 Luigi Salerno. Pittori di Paesaggio del Seicento a Roma. Rome: Ugo Bozzi, 1977-78, p. 519, even states that “Dughet started a whole new tradition with the decorative friezes and rooms with landscapes that he painted in various Roman palazzi.”
Artists at the French Academy in Rome, which was established in 1666, were encouraged to venture out into the Roman countryside and draw from nature. Although landscape still held one of the lowest positions on the hierarchical scale of genres in the French Academy, it was a popular subject in the eighteenth century. As Poussin’s idealizing, classical style was the model for the French Academy, which was founded in 1648; the works of his followers were often copied. Dughet’s landscapes, especially those from his later period, would have also appealed to Rococo artists, who favored a more romantic style, the *genre pittoresque*.

Dughet’s paintings fell between the two generally accepted modes of landscape painting, the heroic and pastoral, best defined by Roger de Piles in 1708. The heroic landscape was associated with history painting and the representation of nature as completely idealized, whereas the pastoral style was closer to actual nature “without ornament and without artifice.” The two genres, analogous to those in poetry, could be

---

15 See Marianne Roland Michel. “Landscape Painting in the 18th Century: Theory, Training, and its Place in Academic Doctrine,” in *Claude to Corot: The Development of Landscape Painting in France*. Alan Wintermute, ed. New York: Colnaghi, 1990, pp. 99-109, for an analysis of the views on landscape painting in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Also see Salerno 1977-78, p. 519, where the author notes that Carlo Maratta, a classical artist and president of the Academy of St. Luke, worked with Dughet. Thus landscape “was appreciated even in classicist circles.”

16 Roland Michel 1990, especially pp. 106-108, for more on the French Academy in Rome and both Vleughel’s (director from 1724 to 1735) and Natoire’s (director from 1751 to 1775) passion for drawing from nature. Also see Marianne Roland Michel. *Le Dessin Français au XVIIIe Siecle*. Fribourg, Switzerland: Office du Livre, 1987, pp. 233-237, for more on Vleughels, Natoire, and the view of landscape in the French Academy in Rome.


18 Ibid, p. 87, this style, named in the 1720s, was characterized by a “decorative manner, with curving arabesque forms, irregularity and asymmetry of design, but with forms generally derived from natural ones.”

19 Roger de Piles. *Cours de peinture par principes*. Paris: Jacques Estienne, 1708, cited in Roland Michel 1990, p. 99, this distinction was recognized before de Piles, but his work provides the best summary.

20 Kitson 1990, p. 15, quotes from de Pile’s definitions of the heroic and pastoral.
combined. By creating works that were more topographical than either Poussin or
Claude, by focusing more on the actual landscape rather than buildings or ruins, but still
representing idealized views of nature, and portraying simple peasant types, Dughet’s
paintings could be viewed as a blending of the two styles.21

Pascoli divided Dughet’s development into three phases, which, based on
documented works, appears to be a valid and accurate survey of Dughet’s chronology.22
The earliest period is the most naturalistic and continues into the 1640s (fig. 4:
*Landscape with a Cowherd*, ca. 1637). In these paintings, Dughet focuses on details,
describing each tree and plant. His work often recorded smaller areas, concentrating on a
section of the forest, or even just a group of one or two trees, instead of the larger vistas
favored by his master, Poussin. It is now generally accepted that the group of paintings
and drawings once given to the Silver Birch Master are, in fact, some of the earliest
examples of Dughet’s work.23

The second phase, beginning in the 1650s, is more classical, characterized by
idealized landscapes with more open and balanced compositions that are closer to
Poussin (fig. 5: *The Anointing of the Kings*, San Martino ai Monti, ca. 1650). The works

21 Ibid, p. 23. Luigi Lanzi in the *Storica Pistorica* from 1789, even goes so far as to compare Dughet to
Torquato Tasso, stating that both “composed imaginary landscapes” and that Dughet was an artist who
represented truth, the translation is provided in Roethlisberger 1975, p.14.


564, March 1950, pp. 69-73, was the first to group these paintings together and created the name, based on
the species of tree represented in all the paintings. He believed that the paintings and connected drawings
were done by a follower of Dughet in the 1640s. In a later article, “The Silver Birch Master, Nicolas
Poussin, Gaspard Dughet and Others,”*The Burlington Magazine*. Vol. 122, no. 929, August 1980, pp. 577-
582, he attributed the paintings and drawings to Dughet. The letter was written in reaction to Clovis
Whitfield’s article “Poussin’s Early Landscapes,” *The Burlington Magazine*. Vol. 121, no. 910, January
1979, pp. 10-19, in which the author gave all the works in the group to Poussin himself. Whitfield also
observed that the trees in the paintings were not, in fact, silver birches as this species is not common in
southern climates.
from this time reflect Dughet’s study of Claude and Pascoli described them as showing “greater simplicity, truth, and compositional excellence.”24 In these works, Dughet’s lighting becomes softer and closer to Claude’s, although his palette is comprised of more neutral colors.

The third period, lasting from the early 1660s until his death, incorporates a more lyrical approach to nature and more dramatic settings, which represents a style closer to what is now known as the Baroque (fig. 6: Rocky Landscape with Figures and Waterfall, 1671-1673). These paintings, often described as picturesque and romantic, were the most sought after by collectors, especially British travelers on the Grand Tour. Illustrating “undisciplined nature,” the landscape was often broken and rocky and included a body of water, such as a lake, a river, or Dughet’s favorite motif, a waterfall.25 All of his work focuses on the interaction of light and shade to create movement and distinctive planes that make the landscape come alive. Dughet’s romanticized landscapes represent idealized views of the countryside, often with classical figures. Unlike his brother-in-law, his scenes appear to avoid higher intellectual aspirations, as he concentrates on depicting simple, lovely views populated with tranquil and contented peasants, instead of representing narratives of obscure ancient and Biblical texts. He generally avoids the theatrical drama of storm landscapes, such as those by Salvator Rosa, another important landscape painter whose influence was profound in the north, especially in Great Britain.

During his time in Poussin’s studio, Dughet would have learned the basic skills necessary to become a painter. This would have included how to prepare a canvas, which pigments to use and how to apply the paint to the canvas. What he might not have

24 Translated by Roethlisberger 1975, p. 12.
experienced, however, was the typical training for an artist in the seventeenth century. Poussin did not have what was considered a standard studio as Dughet was his only pupil. Although he preferred to draw after wax models or wooden figurines instead of employing live models, Poussin did work from models at times. Passeri and Bellori both state that the artist visited the studios of Domenichino and Sacchi, artists whose practices were closely modeled on those of the Carracci studio. Sandrart and Bellori also asserted that Poussin would draw after the model as part of the final stages in the execution of a painting, after he had definitively determined the composition. No academy drawings from the artist, however, have survived to this day. Instead, Poussin’s extant drawings are composition studies, representing both initial sketches and finished presentation drawings, nearly all done in pen and ink and wash.

Based on Dézailler d’Argenville’s classification of types of drawings, which includes thoughts, or early composition studies, finished drawings, studies, or figure drawings and parts of the composition, academies and cartoons, Poussin’s graphic oeuvre is seemingly incomplete. Dughet’s training was quite exceptional when compared to other artists working in the early seventeenth century. He would not have worked

---

25 Salerno 1977-78, p. 528.


consistently from the model, from which he would have learned correct human anatomy and movement of the body. This deficiency is reflected in Dughet’s figures.

For landscapes, Poussin left the studio and worked directly from nature, setting off on sketching trips with other artists, including his fellow Frenchman, Claude. He carefully recorded the effects of light and the overall structure of forms, displaying little interest in details. Like his composition drawings, Poussin worked primarily in pen and ink and wash (fig. 7: A Path Leading into a Forest Clearing, ca. 1635-40). There are, however, a number of difficulties involving the connoisseurship of Poussin’s landscape drawings. Unless a drawing can be connected with certainty to a painting, it is often difficult to confirm Poussin’s authorship.

As Harris notes, Poussin’s landscapes before the 1630s represent only vaguely described types of plants and trees whereas his work after 1630 includes more definable flora, a change that certainly affected Dughet’s evolution and his depiction of nature. It is also possible that Dughet, who grew up in an area of Rome inhabited by many artists and who was interested in art from a young age, may have inspired Poussin’s new treatment of the plant life. The influence between the artists may not have been completely one sided as Dughet’s earliest work, done before entering Poussin’s studio, may have shaped how Poussin viewed nature at the time.

---

29 Rosenberg 2000, pp. 68-75, provides a careful study of d’Argenville’s writings on drawing.

30 De Grazia and Steele 1999, p. 64, Sandrart, who knew Poussin during his stay in Rome from 1628-1635, records the artist going out on sketching trips with friends.

The young student would have accompanied Poussin on his sketching trips, drawing after trees, rocks, and anything that struck his fancy (fig. 8: Torrent, undated). Poussin recognized his brother-in-law’s precocious talent for representing nature and, aware of the shortcomings of his own studio practice, must have encouraged the younger artist to pursue a career as a specialist in landscape painting, a genre that was not well respected in the early seventeenth century.

Dézailler d’Argenville has divided Dughet’s drawings into three categories based on medium: pen and ink, brush and white heightening, and black chalk. He does not discuss the style of the drawings, but his comments reveal that collectors in the eighteenth century were aware of, and expressed interest in, Dughet’s drawings, even if the comments are not helpful in determining what constitutes an authentic drawing by the artist. The pen and ink and wash drawings attributed to Dughet almost all correspond to paintings completed before 1650, including his work at San Martino ai Monti. These drawings resemble Poussin’s landscapes in pen and wash, displaying a fluid handling of the wash and fine lines for the contours of the trees, rocks and other elements. There is always a clear definition of space, with sharper divisions between the various tones, and

---

32 Harris, forthcoming publication.
33 Dézailler d’Argenville, p. 71: “Les Desseins du Guaspre, touchés du’un grand goêût, sont comme se tableaux, extrêment finis: il ya en a dont le trait est fait à la plume, lavé de bistre ou d’encre de la Chine; d’autres sont au pinceau, relevés de blanc, souvent même avec des touches de pierre noire: les beaux sites du Guaspre, sa belle maniere de feuiller les arbres, leurs figures extraordinaire sont les caracteres essentials de sa main.” Chiarini 1969, p. 750, notes that there is only known example of the second type, which is brush with white heightening.
34 A possible exception is a drawing in Cape Town, South Africa (pen and brown ink with brown wash and traces of black chalk, 361 x 383 mm), published in Marco Chiarini. Gaspard Dughet 1615-1675. Cahiers du Dessin Français, no. 7. Paris: Galerie de Bayser, 1990, no. 23 and which corresponds to a painting dated to around 1670, Boisclair 1986, cat. no. 345, fig. 379. Harris believes the drawing to be by Jean-François Millet. It certainly bears few stylistic similarities to Dughet’s earlier pen drawings, with much darker wash and contours or outlines to define the trees. The painting, whose current location is unknown, must have been in France at some point as Millet never traveled to Italy.
the composition is arranged to allow the viewer’s eye to travel into the distance. Little scholarship has been devoted to Dughet’s work as a draughtsman and his early pen and ink and wash studies are the least understood.

A particularly beautiful drawing, which employs the use of brush tip, is a study of rocks done directly from nature that appears to be related to a fresco at the Palazzo Muti-Bussi (figs. 9 and 10: *Landscape with Waterfall and Fisherman* and *Study of Rocks*, 1635-1637). Here, Dughet carefully records the shadows and highlights of the rocks and the foliage. The best known examples from this early phase are connected with his frescoes at San Martino ai Monti. There are four drawings attributed to Dughet for the single fresco of *The Anointing of the Kings* alone. A drawing for *Elisha Crossing the Jordan* is an excellent example of Dughet’s style at this time (figs. 11 and 12: Fresco and drawing, ca. 1648-1651). His use of wash is similar to Poussin, but the transitions are more delineated. The drawings from San Martino ai Monti were done at the start of his classical phase and are characterized by more open spaces and a lower horizon.

While close to the final paintings, there are some differences, most notably in the absence of figures. Dughet may have completed the initial composition studies before

---

35 The drawing was published by Chiarini 1990, cat. no. 18. Harris, in a personal communication, is unsure of its attribution. The technique is unusual, but the drawing is exquisite and may be the result of Dughet working directly from nature. The drawing was later adapted to form the rocky hillside on the left side of the fresco.

36 These drawings are thoroughly discussed in Harris’s forthcoming article. They include a study at the Fogg Museum, Harvard University, (pen, brown ink and brown wash, 305 x 280 mm, 12 x 11”) and one at Städelisches Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt (pen, brown ink and brown wash, 197x 142 mm). Both are accepted by Harris as autograph. The other two, at the Hermitage, St. Petersburg (brush tip and brown ink, 412 x 403 mm) and at Chatsworth (black chalk with touches of white chalk, 428 x 309 mm) are rejected by Harris. She believes the Hermitage drawing may have been done by Dughet’s pupil, Crescenzio Onofri, who used the same composition for a painting at the Palazzo Doria Pamphilj, see Salerno 1977-78, cat. no. 108.11. As for the Chatsworth drawing, which is the only one of the four to include figures, Harris considers the handling of the chalk too “finicky.” The figures in the drawing do not correspond to the final painting. It was suggested that Dughet made the drawing for his own records and planned to reuse his composition at a later date, but no painting exists, nor did Dughet ever exactly repeat a composition.
consulting with the advisor on the project, J.B. de Lezana, an assistant general of the Carmelite order and friend of Prior Filippini, who commissioned the decoration of the church.\textsuperscript{37} Dughet devoted a great deal of time to planning each composition, as shown by the number of surviving drawings. This was his most important commission to date and would establish his reputation in Rome.

After his work at San Martino ai Monti, Dughet’s choice of medium changes to black chalk, often on blue or gray paper, with white heightening, a technique not found in Poussin’s oeuvre (figs. 13 and 14: \textit{Landscape with Elijah and the Angel}, ca. 1663 and \textit{Study for Landscape with Elijah and the Angel}).\textsuperscript{38} These drawings are characterized by a delicate handling of the chalk and subtle gradations of tone. Dughet loved to exploit the painterly quality of the medium by carefully blending the chalk and employing lines of varying thickness to create an atmospheric effect. The figures are usually barely sketched and are often not shaded. Short, rapid strokes indicate that Dughet executed the drawings quickly, much as he did his paintings. Despite this trait, the artist always manages to create a convincing illusion of clearly defined planes receding into space.

Whereas Poussin viewed drawing as simply a tool or “an obligatory passage leading from the idea to the painting,” Dughet appears to have held the practice in higher esteem, producing drawings that could stand alone as finished works.\textsuperscript{39} Poussin’s drawings are his ideas recorded on paper. They reveal how he works through the creative

\textsuperscript{37} For more on the project see Heideman 1980, p. 545 and Bandes 1976. Such a complex and uncommon iconographical project could not have been the invention of the artist. Dughet would have had to have been directed as to exactly which figures to include and their placement within the landscape.

\textsuperscript{38} A number of these drawings are currently located in the Kunstmuseum, Düsseldorf. They were purchased by the artist Lambert Krahe (1712-1790), who spent more than twenty years in Rome, leaving in 1756. See both Klemm 1981 and Dieter Graf. \textit{Master Drawings of the Roman Baroque from the Kunstmuseum Düsseldorf}. London: Victoria and Albert Museum, 1973, for more on the collection.
process, moving from an initial idea to the final composition, sometimes producing a series of drawings that display only slight changes between them. Although composition drawings for landscapes that show the artist’s working process were not common in the seventeenth century, Claude being the exception, Dughet’s early drawings reveal his thought process, moving from a sketch done after nature to a final composition study. His later drawings, however, are usually more finished. Although they can be connected to paintings, they are often close to the final work and do not illustrate the transition from the preliminary sketch to the finished painting. The apparent lack of preliminary sketches, which were important in the artist’s early career, may be due to the fact that he might have painted out of doors, directly from nature. Mariette was the first to propose this in his entry on Dughet in the *Abecedario*. Although a number of Dughet’s paintings are based on actual sites around Rome, including Tivoli, the majority are idealized, imaginary views. Even if Dughet did paint directly from nature, he did not record the landscape exactly as it appeared. It may simply be that by 1650, when he begins working in black chalk, his proficiency as an artist had progressed so that he did not need to make extensive preparatory studies prior to beginning work on a composition.

---

39 Rosenberg 2000, p. 30. Also see Chiarini 1969, p. 750, for more on Dughet’s drawing process.

40 Harris publication forthcoming, Claude always carefully planned his paintings and recorded the finished compositions in the *Liber Veritatis*.

Dughet’s chalk drawings may not have been initial sketches, but presentation drawings meant to be shown to the patron for final approval or kept as records, much like Claude’s *Liber Veritatis*. Dughet may have saved the drawings to prevent repeating compositions. No exact copies of paintings are found in his entire oeuvre. None of the drawings are securely signed or dated. If Dughet had kept the drawings as records, it is possible that he would have noted the date on the drawing. A further study investigating the provenance of the drawings and of Dughet’s possessions upon his death would be necessary to determine how often the artist kept his drawings or if they were given to the patrons or sold as independent works of art.

Marco Chiarini was the first scholar to address the issue of Dughet’s work as a draughtsman. His pivotal article from 1969 attached a number of drawings to paintings, using Dézallier d’Argenville’s classification system as a touchstone. His work is vital to the scholarship on the artist, but it is not without flaws. Chiarini attributed drawings to Dughet based primarily on whether the drawing corresponded to a known painting and did not consider the issue of copies. Glancing through his 1990 catalogue of Dughet’s drawings, one wonders how all of the works could possibly be by the same hand. Chiarini includes drawings done in a variety of media and techniques, a number of which look nothing like the drawings that can be definitively attributed to Dughet. Though an

---

42 Chiarini 1969, pp. 753-754, questions the function of Dughet’s drawings. The author believes that many of them may be studies done after paintings and were meant to record the final composition. Harris publication forthcoming, also believes that Dughet’s later drawings may have functioned as records to help the artist “avoid repetition.”

43 See Chiarini 1990, the pen and ink drawings in this catalogue present a number of problems.

44 Harris publication forthcoming has proposed alternative attributions for sixteen of the forty-nine drawings in Chiarini’s study. There are at least nine other drawings which she believes should not be given to Dughet.
artist’s style may vary throughout his career and depending upon his chosen medium, some consistency must be apparent. The best example of this discrepancy is a group of drawings given to the False Amand hand (see Appendix for complete list of known drawings by this artist).

These seventeen drawings, done in both red and black chalk, are characterized by the use of regularized, overall parallel hatching and bold contour lines, forming zigzags around the foliage. They lack the subtle changes in tonal quality and careful construction of space that are typical of Dughet’s black chalk drawings. The overall hatching often intersects planes, eliminating the clear transition from foreground to background and producing a flattened appearance, with the lines creating only surface patterns, not three-dimensional forms. Harris bestowed the name False Amand on this artist based on a drawing attributed to Jacques-François Amand (1730-1769) in the Indianapolis Museum of Art by Pierre Rosenberg (fig. 15: View of a Town in the Vicinity of Rome). The drawing does not appear to be by Amand, especially when compared to a signed drawing in the Carnegie Museum of Art in Pittsburgh (fig. 16: Classical Landscape with Chestnut Sellers, ca. 1760). The handling of the chalk is entirely different, with the Pittsburgh drawing displaying softer hatching and delicate contour lines. Ironically, Rosenberg was

45 Pierre Rosenberg. French Master Drawings of the 17th and 18th Centuries in North American Collections. Art Gallery of Ontario. Greenwich, CT: New York Graphic Society, 1972, cat. no. 1 (red chalk, 241 x 381 mm) the drawing was once in Mariette’s collection and was attributed to Dughet until Rosenberg gave it to Amand.

the first to attribute to Dughet a red chalk drawing in Weimar, which is by the False Amand Hand (see Appendix no. 6).  

Fourteen of these drawings were done in red chalk, an unusual medium for landscape in the seventeenth century, when it was typically employed for figure and drapery studies. Domenichino did, however, occasionally use red chalk for his landscapes. He is usually cited as the impetus for Dughet’s choice of medium as Poussin worked closely with the Bolognese artist in the 1620s and 1630s. There are, however, distinct differences in the type of chalk employed by the two artists. Domenichino favored the more orange colored chalk that could be used to create fine lines and subtle changes in tone, while the chalk used by the False Amand hand is darker in tone and drier in effect. This kind of chalk was more common in the eighteenth century and is similar in color and appearance to the chalks used by French artists, such as Hubert Robert and Jean-Honoré Fragonard, two masters of eighteenth century landscape drawing. This type of chalk was, nevertheless, available in the seventeenth century as all chalk at that time was natural and varied in color from a light orange to an almost purplish hue.

---


48 Harris publication forthcoming, notes that Domenichino, his student Gian Angelo Canini, and Aniello Falcone were, apparently, the only Italian artists of the seventeenth century who used red chalk for landscapes.

49 Ibid, discusses the differences between the types of chalk.

50 For more on the history of red chalk, see Marjorie B. Cohn. “Red Chalk: Historical and Technical Perspectives. Part I: Aspects of Historical Usage,” and Deborah D. Mayer and Pamela B. Vandiver. “Red Chalk: Histories and Technical Perspectives: Part II: A Technical Study,” in *Drawings Defined*. Walter Strauss and Tracie Felker, eds. New York: Abaris Books, 1987, pp. 165-181. Fabricated chalks, which were made from natural hematite and binders, became available around 1750. Synthesized chalks, made from manufactured hematite, were not available until about 1800. The natural color of red chalk can be altered by either wetting the chalk, which produces a darker, denser tone or by applying a damp brush over
If Dughet were the artist responsible for these drawings, the earliest would date to around 1647-1651, while he was working on the decoration of San Martino ai Monti. There are at least three drawings that are connected to the frescoes and two are related to a fresco by Grimaldi (fig. 17: Giovanni Francesco Grimaldi *Elijah and His Servant Seeing a Cloud Rising from the Sea*, 1647-1648 and see Appendix, nos. 1-3).\(^{51}\) There are two drawings after this fresco, one in black chalk and the other in red chalk. Both have been attributed to Dughet (fig. 18: Study after *Elijah and His Servant*, undated).\(^{52}\) The black chalk drawing may be by the False Amand artist, but it is certainly not by Dughet. It displays the same bold contours as the False Amand hand and there is some overall hatching on the mountain in the background, but the handling of the chalk is slightly softer than the technique of the False Amand artist, but not as fine as Dughet’s. There are no delicate changes in tone and the middle ground is flattened. The viewer’s eye does not travel as easily through the landscape into the distance. The figures of Elijah and his servant have been eliminated, but there are two smaller figures in the middle ground.

The red chalk drawing (fig. 19: Study after *Elijah and His Servant*) is even more quickly sketched than the black chalk sheet. There is no blending of the chalk and the regularized hatching cuts through the foliage, which creates a flat space and does not result in a brighter color. Red chalk was the preferred medium for training a young artist as it was difficult to erase. For more on the uses of red chalk for figure drawing and its development within the French Academy, see James Henry Rubin, “Academic Life-Drawing in Eighteenth Century France: An Introduction,” in *Eighteenth Century French Life-Drawing*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977, pp. 17-42.

\(^{51}\) See note 32 above for another black chalk drawing at Chatsworth that is after one of Dughet’s frescoes, but is not by the False Amand hand.

\(^{52}\) Harris 1968, once attributed the drawing to Dughet. She now believes it is a copy by another artist after Grimaldi’s fresco, this issue will be addressed in her forthcoming article. The drawing is located in the École des Beaux-Arts, Paris (black and white chalk on blue paper, 425 x 317 mm) and is published in Emmanuelle Brugerolles and David Guillet. *Poussin, Claude and Their World: Seventeenth Century*
allow for the study of light filtering through the leaves. The artist has chosen to include
the figures from the fresco, but does not depict the cloud over the ocean that is the central
focus of the story. The drawing may have been done on site after the fresco and then was
reworked in the black chalk drawing as there are similarities between the two drawings
that are not present in the fresco, the most obvious of which is the small group of trees at
the right. Whereas the trees in the fresco are taller and have more leaves, the trees in both
drawings have been shortened and are almost bare. The second drawing in black chalk
may be a preliminary sketch by the artist for one of his own compositions.

The other red chalk drawing is related to the fresco by Dughet of *The Vision of St.
Simon Stock* (fig. 20: Study after *The Vision of St. Simon Stock*). Like Dughet’s pen and
ink studies for the series, the figures are not present. Yet the drawing bears no stylistic
similarities to the type of drawing that Dughet was producing at this time in his career, as
he was working in pen and ink and wash. It is executed in the same manner as the other
False Amand drawings, with overall parallel hatching and strong contours. There are no
changes in tone and the space is flattened. Scholars, such as Chiarini, have explained the
differences in quality between these drawings based primarily on the fact that red chalk is
drier than black.\(^{53}\) Though somewhat true, red chalk can also be used to create
atmospheric effects as demonstrated by the many refined drawings created by French
artists in the eighteenth century.

Another problem that cannot be explained if these drawings are to be attributed to
Dughet is the unchanging style. Whereas Dughet’s preferred medium shifts from pen and

---

\(^{53}\) Chiarini 1969, p. 753, “The slightly drier handling conditioned by the medium, which lacks the
ink and wash to black chalk sometime around 1650, he would have first used red chalk in this distinctive manner while working on the frescoes at San Martino ai Monti from 1648 until 1651 and continued working in the same technique until his death. There are, on the other hand, some changes in his handling of black chalk. As Chiarini notes, the later drawings use less contrast as the chalk is softer and there is no “precise definition of the various planes of the composition.” This may relate to the shift in his style of painting in the 1660s, as his brushwork became more painterly and his scenes more dramatic. Although there is some variation in the treatment of the chalk, ranging from stronger contours and more definite changes in tone, there is always some consistency in the handling, which includes a thorough blending of the chalk and a clear representation of three-dimensional space. The drawings by the False Amand hand, which include works in black chalk, have none of these characteristics. They are executed in the in the same manner from the earlier drawings of the frescoes at San Martino ai Monti in the late 1640s to drawings connected to his series of gouache paintings done for the Colonna family in the early 1670s. Comparing two of the drawings, one by Dughet and another by the False Amand hand, best reveals the differences between the two artists.

The Metropolitan Museum of Art owns two drawings attributed to Dughet, one in black chalk, the other red (figs. 21 and 22: *Landscape with Fishermen*, undated and *Landscape with Figures on the Bank of a River*, undated). Although neither is atmospheric softness of black chalk, combined with the typical cross-hatching for the shadows is far removed from the chromatic richness and subtlety of the S. Martino studies.”

54 Ibid, p. 754.

55 The red chalk drawing was published by Nicolas Turner. “A Newly Discovered Late Landscape Drawing by Gaspard Dughet (1615-1675),” in *Arte Collezionismo Conservazione: Scritti in Onore di Marco Chiarini*. Florence: Giunti, 2004, pp. 311-313, as a new drawing by Dughet that had just recently appeared on the art market. He accepts, without question, this drawing and another red chalk sheet by the same hand
connected with any known painting, the black chalk drawing is close to Dughet’s typical manner and the red chalk drawing is a variation of another drawing in the British Museum. By comparing the two drawings side by side, it is clear that they were not made by the same hand. The black chalk drawing, with its soft handling of the chalk and sensitive shading, belongs to Dughet’s later period, around the same time as the gouaches in the Palazzo Colonna.  

It is similar in style to a drawing in the Staatliche Museen, Berlin (fig. 23: *Mountainous Landscape with a Fortress*, undated), displaying the same subtle transitions in tone and the broken, curving features of the landscape that allow the viewer’s eye to travel into the distance. The treatment of the reflections in the water is also characteristic of Dughet’s black chalk drawings. By carefully blending the contour lines of the rocks in the water, but leaving some highlights and making use of the texture of the paper, the artist is able to convincingly portray reflections. In contrast, the lines in the red chalk drawing that are meant to represent the reflections of the trees seem to sit on top of the water and are not blended. There are no soft transitions in tone or variations in line quality or thickness and the drawing has an overall linear quality. There is also the even parallel hatching in both the background and foreground, which destroys the effect of different planes receding into the distance.

This drawing can also be compared to the example in the British Museum (fig. 24: *Landscape with Figures on the Bank of a River*, undated), which is in black chalk with white heightening. The composition in the two drawings is not exactly the same.

---

56 In a letter in the museum’s curatorial file on the drawing, Chiarini affirmed the attribution to Dughet and dated it to later in his career.

57 Chiarini 1990, cat. no. 45 (black chalk, 305 x 458 mm).
In the Metropolitan Museum drawing, the foreground has been expanded, with the lake being much larger and the figures farther apart. The British Museum drawing displays the same characteristics as Dughet’s other black chalk drawings, with sensitive changes in tone and meticulous blending of the chalk. The drawing from the Metropolitan Museum is by the False Amand hand. It is executed in the same rapid style, which indicates that it was a copy after an original painting by Dughet. The artist was only interested in recording the composition, not in replicating Dughet’s interest in the interaction of light and shade. These same features are present in all the drawings that are by the False Amand hand.

The drawing from the British Museum and the one at the Metropolitan Museum are not the only examples in which two sheets representing the same subject have appeared in two different media. There are two drawings related to the painting *Imaginary Landscape*, now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, (fig. 25: *Imaginary Landscape*, 1657). One, in the Staatliche Museen in Berlin, is in black chalk (fig. 26: Study for *Imaginary Landscape*, 1657). The other, in a private collection in New York, is a red chalk drawing (fig. 27: Study after *Imaginary Landscape*). Both are close to the painting, but the drawing in Berlin incorporates a few minor changes, most notably in the figures in the middle ground. Instead of the three individuals standing by the edge of a lake, there is only one. The position and shape of the broken tree on the right is also different. In contrast, the red chalk drawing, which again displays the overall parallel hatching, is closer to the final painting. The three figures are in the middle ground and the broken tree appears as it does in the painting. It is unlikely that Dughet would have

---

58 The drawing is reproduced in Chiarini 1969, fig. 61 (black chalk with white heightening on blue paper, 289 x 410 mm).
found it necessary to create two preparatory drawings that are nearly identical, especially this late into his career. What purpose then would the red chalk study, which copies the painting exactly, serve? Brugerolles, in writing of the two drawings at the École des Beaux-Arts done in red chalk and related to paintings from the Palazzo Colonna, believes they were done by Dughet for engravings, which were never executed (see Appendix nos. 8 and 9). The hypothesis that the drawings might have been intended for prints may be correct, as at least one of the False Amand chalk drawings reverses the composition of the painting, but they were not done by Dughet. It is also possible that drawings that are in reverse of the paintings may actually be counterproofs of original drawings by Dughet or counterproofs of copies after Dughet.

There are two drawings in Düsseldorf that represent the same subject, except reversed, one in black chalk, the other in red (figs. 28 and 29: *Arcadian Landscape*). Another red chalk drawing, formerly in the Zettler collection in Munich, is almost exactly identical to the red chalk sheet in Düsseldorf, but is in the same direction as the black chalk drawing (fig. 30: *Arcadian Landscape*). There is no connected painting, so the black chalk drawing probably represents a lost composition. The red chalk drawing in Düsseldorf appears to be a counterproof of the drawing from Munich. It is identical to

---


60 See Appendix, no. 4 for a drawing that is in reverse of the painting. It is also possible that the drawing was done after an engraving of a composition by Dughet or as a counterproof from an original drawing by Dughet.

61 Klemm 1981, cat. nos. 11 and 12, Klemm calls the red chalk drawing a copy and notes that is probably a counterproof.

62 Sold at Emil Hirsch, Munich, *Handzeichnungen Sammlung Zettler*. March 5, 1921, lot 109. The drawing is inscribed “Gaspre,” which indicates that it may have once been in a French collection.
the Munich drawing, being nearly the same size, exhibiting the same differences as compared to the black chalk drawing, and some of the lines of parallel hatching run from right to left, as if made by a left handed artist. This group is important as the Dughet drawings from Düsseldorf were collected by the artist Lambert Krahe (1712-1790), who was in Rome from 1736 until 1756. We now have a terminus ante quem for when the drawings could have been produced. The counterproof owned by Krahe had to have been made before he left Rome in 1756.

So if Dughet is not responsible for these drawings, who created them and why? Although Harris has suggested that the artist was a Frenchman working in Rome in the early eighteenth century, I am proposing that the drawings are, in fact, the work of a Northern artist who lived in Rome at the end of the seventeenth century or at the beginning of the eighteenth century. While the drawings do have some stylistic similarities to the red chalk landscape drawings produced by Robert and Fragonard during their stay in Italy in the 1750s, including the color of the chalk and the rapid, broad strokes, there are also a number of drawings done by Northern artists that can be compared to the False Amand sheets. Dughet had many Dutch and Flemish followers, including Jan Frans van Bloemen, Abraham Genoels, Adriaen van der Cabel (ca. 1631-1705), Isaac de Moucheron, Johannes Glauber, Adriaen Frans Boudewijns (1644-1711), and Jan Joost van Cossiau (1660-1732/34). I do not believe that any of these artists are the False Amand hand, but that someone working in their circle executed these drawings, perhaps an artist who was close to either Isaac de Moucheron or Johannes Glauber, both of whom did etchings after Dughet’s paintings.63

---

63 The influence of Dughet on the graphic work of his Northern followers was briefly addressed in an article by Chiarini, “Gaspard Dughet: ses liens avec ses contemporains et les paysagistes nordiques
Dughet’s most important follower from outside of Italy was Jan Frans van Bloemen, who was known as Orizzonte. He enjoyed great success in Rome, painting for the Colonna and Pamphili families, and was hailed as the heir to Dughet. A pen and wash drawing in Florence clearly demonstrates the influence of Dughet on his graphic oeuvre (fig. 31: View of Rome, undated). Van Bloemen employs the same sharper contrasts in wash seen in Dughet’s early drawings as well as similar compositional elements, including a path leading into the distance. Another drawing, in black chalk and gray wash, which is attributed to van Bloemen in an old inscription, is even closer to Dughet’s later drawings (fig. 32: Landscape with Fishermen, undated). The composition, set in the idyllic Roman countryside, is framed by trees on either side with a waterfall in the center, a feature that often appears in Dughet’s paintings. The figures are drawn in the same sketchy manner, as are the leaves on the trees. The delicate handling of the chalk clearly eliminates this artist as the possible False Amand hand. As van Bloemen’s drawings have not been thoroughly studied, it is difficult to determine authorship on drawings that are not signed. Most of van Bloemen’s drawings were done in pen and ink and wash, the preferred medium for the majority of Dughet’s followers.

---


65 The drawing is owned by the Horne Foundation and published in Marco Chiarini. I disegni italiani di paesaggio dal 1600 al 1750. Treviso: Libreria Editrice Canova, 1972, cat. no. 129 (pen and brown wash, 230 x 330 mm).

66 The drawing is from a private collection in Washington D.C. (black chalk with gray wash, 270 x 389 mm) and is published in Busiri Vici 1974, cat. no. 13d.
There are two exceptions to this, Adriaen Frans Boudewijns and his cousin Frans Adriaens Boudewijns the Younger (1673-1766), both of whom produced red chalk drawings of Italianate landscapes (fig. 33: Frans Boudewijns the Younger Italianate Landscape, 1712). There is no evidence, however, that either of these artists ever visited Italy. The elder Boudewijns worked closely with Genoels while both were in Paris in the late 1660s. One of the False Amand drawings has been attributed to the younger Boudewijns (see Appendix, no. 16). Compared to the drawing in the Courtauld Institute, the one in the royal collection displays bolder strokes and more overall parallel hatching. The Courtauld drawing is softer, with slight changes in tone done by carefully blending the chalk, instead of simply using parallel hatching. The color of the chalk used by Boudewijns is nearly identical to that used by the False Amand artist, as Boudewijns was working in the early eighteenth century. It is possible that the artist visited Italy and could be responsible for the False Amand drawings. Little work has been done on either of the Boudewijns and their graphic oeuvre is not well understood.

It is important to examine the etchings and engravings after Dughet from the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries to study the extent of his influence. Both Glauber and de Moucheron did etchings after paintings by the artist (figs. 34 and 35: de Moucheron Panoramic Landscape with a Cascade and Glauber Landscape with a Waterfall). The two artists visited Rome; Glauber in the late 1670s and de Moucheron

67 Christopher White and Charlotte Crawley. The Dutch and Flemish Drawings of the Fifteenth to the Early Nineteenth Centuries in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen at Windsor Castle. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994, cat. no. 571, the drawing bears an old inscription attributing it to Jan Frans van Bloemen

in the mid 1690s, and competed to produce a series of prints after Dughet upon their return to Amsterdam.\textsuperscript{69} Both artists were acquainted with the classical theorist Gérard de Lairesse (1640-1711), whose \textit{Het Groote Schilderboek} was first published in 1707. Glauber was especially close de Lairesse, who never made the journey to Italy, as they collaborated on several projects before the older artist lost his sight in 1690.\textsuperscript{70} De Lairesse was the major advocate of the classical style in the North, encouraging artists to follow the noble manner by perfecting nature and not just imitating it.\textsuperscript{71} He would have become familiar with Dughet’s work through his contact with Glauber. Abraham Genoels worked in Rome from 1674 until 1682 and produced around a hundred prints that are heavily influenced by Dughet (fig. 36: \textit{River at the Foot of a Mountain}).\textsuperscript{72} His etchings are similar in style to the False Amand drawings as they employ the regularized parallel hatching in the foliage as well as the same jagged contour lines. Few chalk drawings have been attributed to the artist and the extant examples differ in style from the False Amand drawings. A black chalk drawing in the Crocker Art Gallery in Sacramento that was previously given to Dughet, has been attributed to Genoels by Chiarini, based on the patterning of the surface and lack of depth (fig. 37: \textit{Landscape with a River and Figures}).\textsuperscript{73} Although it is clearly not by the False Amand hand, with shorter, more delicate strokes, it is weaker than Dughet’s typical black chalk

\textsuperscript{69} Wedde 1996, pp. 49-50.


\textsuperscript{72} For more of Genoels etchings, see \textit{The Illustrated Bartsch}, Vol. 5.

\textsuperscript{73} Chiarini 1994, p. 117.
drawings. It is strange that Chiarini singles out this particular drawing, yet overlooks the False Amand group, which exhibit even more obvious patterns on the surface and are flatter than the drawing in Sacramento.

While neither Glauber, Genoels or de Moucheron are responsible for the False Amand drawings, there is a red chalk sheet at Weimar attributed to Dughet that is related to other drawings by de Moucheron (fig. 38: *Stormy Landscape*). There are at least three other works by de Moucheron of the same subject (figs. 39 and 40: *Stormy Landscape*).\(^74\) They are believed to record a lost painting by Dughet, which is close in composition to a gouache painting in the Palazzo Colonna (fig. 41: *Fire During the Storm*, 1671-1673). The drawing by de Moucheron, which is now lost, is much closer to the red chalk drawing at Weimar, as it includes the figure at the right and the handling of the pen strokes is freer compared to the drawing at Leipzig. These drawings present an interesting dilemma. Were they all done by de Moucheron? Is it possible that the red chalk drawing at Weimar is by Dughet? It is nearer in style to Dughet’s black chalk drawings than the False Amand group, but with the darker chalk of the eighteenth century, thicker, bolder contour lines and some areas that are weak, including the left foreground, where the foliage is indistinguishable from the rocks. Perhaps it is by another artist who was copying the same composition as de Moucheron. It is also possible that the drawings do not represent a lost composition by Dughet, but are merely adaptations of the central part of his painting in the Palazzo Colonna and were all executed by de Moucheron.

\(^74\) David Mandrella et al. *From Callot to Greuze: French Drawings from Weimar*. Berlin: G+H, 2005, cat. no. 20, discusses two of the drawings by de Moucheron. They are also published in Wedde 1996, cat. nos. D100 and D101. There is a watercolor by de Moucheron of the same subject, published by Wedde 1996, cat. no. W52.
The entire group of False Amand drawings, as well as other drawings that are copies after Dughet, may have been done for a series of engravings or etchings. The style of the False Amand drawings, which merely record the composition, with no interest in the effects of light and shade or the preservation of depth, would indicate that the artist was only concerned with getting the composition on paper to be used later for a print or to be adapted for his own compositions.

Further evidence that argues against Dughet’s authorship is the watermark that is present on the Bowdoin College drawing (see Appendix, no. 1 and fig. 17), the drawing from Weimar (see fig. 38), and another at the École des Beaux-Arts (see Appendix no. 8). The watermark is a fleur-de-lis in a double circle, which commonly appeared in papers in the late seventeenth and into the eighteenth century. There are at least two examples of a similar watermark on drawings by de Moucheron and seven on drawings by Gaspar van Wittel, which are all found in a single collection. The watermark on the drawings attributed to Dughet is bisected by a chain line, which indicates that the paper is Italian in origin. This would imply that the drawings were done by an artist who was working in

---

75 See Wedde 1996, cat. nos. D4 and D13 for de Moucheron. J.C.N. Bruintjes and N. Köhler. *Da Van Heemskerck a Van Wittel: Disegni fiamminghi e olandesi del XVI-XVII secolo dalle collezioni del Gabinetto dei disegni e delle stampe*. Rome: Fratelli Palombi, 1992, cat. nos. 73, 78, 82, 83, 88, 92, and 107 all have watermarks that are variants of the fleur-de-lis in a double circle. There are also two similar watermarks catalogued in Edward Heawood. *Watermarks, Mainly of the 17th and 18th Centuries*. Hilversum, Holland: Paper Publications Society, 1969, nos. 1636, which is from a sheet in Rome dated to 1693 and no. 1637, which is from work in Rome from 1705. There are also twenty-one variants of the same watermark found on prints by Giovanni Battista Piranesi, ranging in date from the early 1740s until the last decade of the eighteenth century. They are published in Andrew Robison. *Piranesi-The Early Architectural Fantasies: A Catalogue Raisonné of the Etchings*. Washington: National Gallery of Art, 1986, pp. 220-224. This watermark does, however, appear prior to the late seventeenth century. There are two examples in Charles-Moïse Briquet. *Les filigranes: dictionnaire historique des marques du papier des leur apparition vers 1282 jusqu’en 1600*. Leipzig: Hiesemann, 1923, no. 7121, which dates to 1587 and no. 7125, which dates to 1577. A fleur-de-lis in a double circle also appears on an etching by Salvator Rosa, which was recently acquired by the dealer Mattia Jona. It is possible, however, that the print was made after Rosa’s death.

Italy, probably directly from paintings or original drawings by Dughet. Unfortunately, if any watermarks are present on Dughet’s black chalk drawings, they are not usually recorded in the literature. As a result, it is not possible to compare the types of watermarks present on the accepted drawings and the copies after Dughet.

The seventeen drawings catalogued in the Appendix are not the only copies after Dughet. A number of drawings done by different artists exist, with many attributed to Dughet himself. Besides presenting a complex problem on the issue of connoisseurship of late seventeenth and early eighteenth century landscape drawings, these works serve as evidence of Dughet’s increasing popularity. His exalted status extended into the eighteenth century as his works became sought after by collectors from both Britain and France. Between 1711 and 1759, at least three hundred original paintings by Dughet passed through British sale rooms. The British held Dughet’s art in the highest regard. A poem by John Nourse, dating to around 1750 and entitled “Ut Pictura Poesis,” exemplifies the attitude towards the artist;

Lo! where Poussin his magic colours spreads,
Rise tower’d towns, rough rocks and flow’ry meads;
What leagues between those azure mountains lie,
(Whose less’ning tops invade the purple sky)
And this old oak, that shades this hollow way,
Amidst whose windings sheep and oxen stray,
‘Tis thus Theocritus his landskip gives,
‘Tis thus the speaking picture moves and lives.

1989, pp. xxxii-xliii, the author examined papers from the Archivio di Stato in Florence, as well as books published in Paris between 1600 and 1696. The results of her study indicate that, with Italian papers, the watermark is always on a chain line, whereas, with French papers, and other Northern papers, it is between the chain lines.

77 French 1980, p. 9, Dughet’s paintings appeared in nearly all notable British collections in the eighteenth century. His work was also owned by artists like Richardson, Reynolds, and Gainsborough. Also see John Hayes. “British Patrons and Landscape Painting 2. Eighteenth Century Collecting,” Apollo. Vol. 83, no. 49, March 1966, pp. 188-197, for more on Dughet’s paintings in British collections.

Dughet served as a model of a classical artist whose arcadian landscapes recalled the poetry of both Theocritus and Virgil and exemplified the concept of *ut pictura poesis*. His idealized, carefully composed views of nature had a profound influence on English landscape design as well as painting. Although his works were often not as well regarded as those of Claude, he was an important artist and his paintings were easier to acquire. The elevated status of Dughet’s landscapes can be connected to their simplicity. The images of seemingly wild, untouched, yet idyllic nature appealed to many collectors and artists alike as they evoked the rustic and tranquil countryside around Rome, which many sought to recreate on their own estates.

British travelers mention Dughet as early as 1650 and he was referred to as “one of the greatest Masters in his Age” in 1695 by Richard Graham. A series of engravings after paintings by Dughet in British collections was published by Arthur Pond and Charles Knapton between 1741 and 1746. Through this series, Dughet’s paintings were made known to a wider audience. His drawings, however, were not well known in Britain. None of his works were included in the Pond and Knapton series entitled *Imitations of Old Master Drawings*, published from 1732 to 1736, and few appear in sale catalogues or inventories.


80 For more on the series, see French 1980, p. 10.

81 Ibid, p. 11, Jonathan Richardson, the famous collector and scholar, did own two drawings by Dughet
Dughet’s drawings were more common in France in the eighteenth century. As mentioned above, Dézailler d’Argenville recorded three types of drawings by the artist, but did not include red chalk as a medium. Mariette once owned the red chalk sheet in the Metropolitan Museum, as well as at least three other red chalk drawings (see Appendix for provenance of the False Amand drawings), and pen and ink drawings by the artist.\textsuperscript{82} The Metropolitan Museum drawing is still on his original mount with GASPARDUS/DUGHET POUSSIN inscribed on the left margin and Mariette’s cartouche in the center. Although Mariette’s skills as a connoisseur have been questioned, he may have been aware that these red chalk drawings were, in fact, copies. The attribution to Dughet may be based on the fact that the drawings were done after compositions by the artist. Thus the invention is originally Dughet’s, but the execution of the drawing itself is by an unknown, and unimportant, artist. Mariette’s attribution of these drawings to Dughet has always been accepted by scholars. Basing the attribution of a drawing simply on whether or not it connects with a painting and on eighteenth century connoisseurship is, however, not logical, as early sources are not always accurate, especially when one compares the drawings side by side and observes the obvious stylistic differences.

The artists responsible for this group of drawings may never be identified, but it is important to realize that they can no longer be attributed to Dughet. Stylistic comparisons, in addition to a more technical study of the medium as well as the

\textsuperscript{82} Mariette owned the pen and ink and wash study for The Anointing of the Kings, now at the Fogg Art Museum, published in Goldfarb 1989, cat. no. 39, but his inscription and attribution on the mount have been trimmed. Dughet’s drawings were also found in Crozat’s collection. See Mariette, Description de la Collection Crozat. Geneva: Minkoff Reprint, 1973, lot nos. 987 and 988, which included twenty-four and
watermarks present on a few of the drawings, reveal that these do not come from the hand of Dughet. By investigating the influence of this once revered artist, almost forgotten today, one can begin to determine which artists may be responsible. Dughet’s popularity and the admiration for his classical landscapes ensured that his work was copied by numerous artists of different origins. In particular, the work of his Northern followers must be taken into consideration. Although a methodical examination of the works of his most important followers has not uncovered the artist responsible for the False Amand group, some stylistic similarities are evident. These drawings were done simply to record the compositions and were intended for either prints or as models for the artist to adapt in his own work. They are neither preparatory studies by Dughet nor were they done as records of his own work and leaving this group in Dughet’s oeuvre diminishes his reputation as a draughtsman. The False Amand drawings and other copies after Dughet should be considered as evidence of Dughet’s status as one of the most influential and important landscape artists of the seventeenth century.

twenty-five drawings, respectively, sold in 1741. None of these drawings have been securely identified today.
Appendix: Chalk Drawings by the False Amand Hand

1. Study after *Elijah and His Servant Seeing a Cloud Rising from the Sea*, fresco by Giovanni Francesco Grimaldi at San Martino ai Monti, Rome, 1648
   Bowdoin College Museum of Art, Brunswick, Maine
   Two kinds of red chalk, laid down, 323 x 270 mm. (12 11/16 x 10 5/6”)
   Watermark: Fleur de lis in a double circle
   Literature: Goldfarb 1989, no. 38; Becker 1985, no. 62; Boisclair fig. 138.

2. Study after *Elijah and His Servant Seeing a Cloud Rising from the Sea*, fresco by Giovanni Francesco Grimaldi at San Martino ai Monti, Rome, 1648
   École des Beaux Arts, Paris
   The drawing was originally published by Harris as being by Dughet, she now believes it is a copy after Grimaldi’s fresco and not by the False Amand hand. It was probably done after the first drawing in Bowdoin. There are some slight changes between the two and both have the same distinct differences from the fresco.

3. Study after *The Vision of Saint Simon Stock*, fresco by Dughet at San Martino ai Monti, Rome, ca. 1648-50
   Red chalk, 192 x 428 mm (7 6/10 x 16 9/10”)
   For the fresco, see Boisclair cat. no. 90, fig. 120

4. Study after *Twilight Landscape with Fishermen*, Molinari-Pradelli Collection, Bologna, 1653-54
   Landesmuseum, Darmstadt. Inv. HZ 1742
   Black chalk with white heightening on gray paper, 283 x 409 mm.
   Literature: Boisclair cat. no. 125, fig. 166
   The drawing is in reverse of painting. It could have been done as preparation for an engraving, after an engraving, or as a counterproof done from another drawing.

5. Study after *Imaginary Landscape*, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 1657
   Private Collection, New York
   Red chalk, 280 x 430 mm.
   Literature: Boisclair cat. no. 165, fig. 205
Stiftung Weimarer Klassik und Kunstsammlungen, Weimar  
Red chalk, 397 x 283 mm  
Literature: Mandrella et al 2005, no. 19; Rosenberg 2001, fig. 84, p. 314.  
A painting by Claude of the *Flight into Egypt* was a pendant to Dughet’s painting. The authors of the catalogue believe that this drawing was done before it was decided who would execute which subject. Harris argues that the subject was substituted as Dughet’s painting represents an obscure scene. The artist could also be adapting the composition for his own work.

7. Study after *Landscape with Fisherman*, fresco in Palazzo Colonna, 1667-68  
Location unknown, sold at Christie’s London, Old Master Drawings, April 9, 1990, lot 92  
Red chalk, 275 x 420 mm (10 ¾ x 16 ½”)  
Provenance: P.J. Mariette (L. 1852)  
The left side of composition is based on a fresco in the Palazzo Colonna, Boisclair 1986, cat. no. 312, fig. 345.

8. Study after *Landscape with Fishermen on a Lake Shore*, Palazzo Colonna, 1671-73  
École des Beaux-Arts, Paris  
Red chalk, 277 x 421 mm  
Watermark: Fleur-de-lis in a double circle with inverted triangle above  
Provenance: P.J. Mariette (L. 1852), sale, Paris 1775 in lot 1332.  
Literature: Brugerolles and Guillet 2002, cat. no. 51; Boisclair cat. no. 360, fig. 400; Chiarini 1969, fig. 52.

9. Study after *Landscape with a Lake*, Palazzo Colonna, 1671-73  
École des Beaux-Arts, Paris  
Red chalk, 264 x 404 mm  
Literature: Brugerolles and Guillet 2002, cat. no. 52; Boisclair cat. no. 361, fig. 401

10. Study after *Landscape with a Pair of Trees*, Palazzo Colonna, 1671-73  
Albertina, Vienna  
Red chalk on ivory paper, 276 x 425 mm  
Literature: Knab and Widauer 1993, no. F279; Boisclair cat. no. 362, fig. 404  
The drawing was engraved, in reverse, by Jacob Gauermann in the early nineteenth century.
11. *Landscape with Waterfall*, undated
Musée Condé, Chantilly
Red chalk, 192 x 278 mm.
Literature: Chiarini 1990, no. 49
There is an old attribution to Dughet in lower right corner.
The drawing is not connected to any known work by Dughet.

12. *Landscape with a Road Leading to an Ancient City*, undated
Private Collection
Red chalk, 271 x 407 mm.
Literature: Turner 2004, fig. 1, p. 312.
The drawing is not connected with any known work by Dughet.

13. *Landscape with Figures Beside a Lake with a Small Waterfall*, undated
Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York
Red chalk, 280 x 418 mm.
Provenance: P.J. Mariette (L. 1852), sale Paris, 1775, lot 1372
The drawing is not connected with any known painting by Dughet, but there is a related black chalk drawing in the British Museum (reproduced in Chiarini 1969, fig. 61), which probably records a lost composition.

Indianapolis Museum of Art, Indianapolis
Red chalk, 241 x 381 mm
Provenance: P.J. Mariette (L. 1852), sale November 15, 1775, lot 1076; Earl of Warwick, sale May 20-21, 1896, no. 289 as Dughet
Literature: Rosenberg 1972, cat. no. 1, as Jacques-François Amand.
The drawing is not connected to any known work by Dughet.

15. *Mountainous Landscape with River, Waterfall and City*, undated
Albertina, Vienna
Black chalk on blue paper with white heightening, 300 x 398 mm.
Literature: Knab and Widauer 1993, no. F276; Boisclair 1986, fig. 458
The drawing was engraved, in reverse, by Jacob Gauermann, (Boisclair, cat. no. G.259, fig. 670). The drawing is not connected to any known painting.
16. Classical Landscape with an Imaginary Town, undated  
Collection of Her Majesty the Queen, Windsor Castle  
Red chalk, 413 x 543 mm  
Literature: White and Crawley 1994, cat. no. 571, as attributed to Frans Boudewijns the Younger  
There is an old inscription at bottom right in black ink by a later hand: Van Blom / Chiamato Horizonti  
The drawing is not connected to any known work by Dughet.

17. Arcadian Landscape, undated  
Location unknown, sold at Emil Hirsch, Munich. Handzeichnungen Sammlung Zettler,  
March 5, 1921, lot 109  
Red chalk, 280 x 414 mm  
Inscribed “Gaspre,” which indicates that the drawing may have been in a French collection.  
There are two related drawings in Düsseldorf (Klemm 1981, cat.nos.11 and 12). One,  
inv. no. FP4720, is in black chalk and appears to be by Dughet. The other, in red chalk  
(inv. no. FP4700), is in reverse of the Munich drawing and is probably a counterproof, as evidenced by some lines of hatching which appear to have been made by a left handed artist.
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