CHAPTER TWO

Indoor-Outdoor: The Studio around 1500

CHRISTOPHER S. WOOD

The studio is not just a place where art is made; crucially it is a place where art is made by an artist. The studio is a workplace under the control of a creative subjectivity. Although this place was not actually called a “studio” until the nineteenth century, the idea that a painter’s or a sculptor’s working space was somehow different from those of other craftsmen was well established by the mid-sixteenth century.¹ The shift from the medieval conception of the workshop to the modern idea of the studio is not always easy to discern: the physical spaces where art was made did not change drastically over the course of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, nor did the working methods. Art in this period went on being made in much the same kinds of rooms with much the same tools and materials. But the concept of what art was, and where its point of origin ultimately lay, did change.

In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries works of art came to be understood as transfigurations of an artist’s experience of the world. This shift can be understood as a loss in confidence in the capacity of traditional picture-making procedures to grasp reality.² Those traditional models of pictorial mimesis had mistrusted the perceptions and experiences of the picture maker and had tended to underrate and minimize the contribution of the individual to the work of art. But in the fifteenth century, perhaps in order to cope with what seemed an increasingly confusing array of possible referents, art began to reground itself in perception. The artist was now expected to adapt reality to a set of representational schemas that would mediate between his own perception of that reality and his beholders’ perceptions. Mimesis was understood less as the direct imitation of the cosmos
than as the imitation of an experience of some perceptible portion of the cosmos. The transformation of that experience into intelligible pictorial formulas was understood as a procedure controlled, start to finish, by an individual artist. And the studio was the place where such performances were carried out. The artist now needed a private space where he could gather together and focus upon bits of the perceptible world. In the fifteenth century, as if to dramatize this new performative mode of art making, artists began staging and transfiguring experiences in their work spaces—drawing directly from natural objects like small rocks or dead animals, but also the human body, even the unclothed body. It was this practice of life drawing that most decisively distinguished the modern artist’s studio from the pre-modern workshop.3

At the time, the best available model for what the artist now seemed to be doing was the activity of the solitary scholar in his study, surrounded by a few carefully selected fragments of reality (texts, specimens), struggling to make sense of those fragments. The model of the scholar’s study was not a perfect fit. Art making remained in practice a collective, collaborative enterprise. And the model of the study did not make room for the really new element of the artist’s practice, drawing from life. Life drawing, in fact, had less in common with the labors of the scholars than with the practical experiments of the natural philosophers, with anatomical investigations, with the trials of the alchemists. But there was no single term for the place where such experiments, such experiences, were staged. The activity of the scholar had the advantage of prestige and long tradition, and so it became the leading model for the new breed of artists.

Some painters and sculptors around 1500 literally chased the apprentices and assistants from their workshops because they preferred to study alone like scholars, indeed like gentleman scholars. Leonardo da Vinci spelled it out, with a formulation that reveals the eccentricity of the desire for privacy in this period: “To the end that well-being of the body may not injure that of the mind, the painter or draughtsman must remain solitary, and particularly when intent on those studies and reflections which will constantly rise up before his eye.”4 Filippino Lippi and Andrea Mantegna also had studies (studi).5 These must have been primarily private chambers for scholarly or theoretical pursuits and for collections, for that is what the word studio meant in this period.6 But solitude per se was not the new criterion. Already in the Middle Ages, painters, especially manuscript illuminators, had been depicted as solitary laborers.7 The novel ideas were that the foundation of
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art making was the direct engagement with the physical world, and that that engagement was a labor of the mind and had to be pursued in private. Leonardo explicitly associated privacy with life drawing, for instance in a passage where he predicts that a painter will meet resistance if he says to his companions, “I will go my own way and withdraw apart, the better to study the forms of natural objects.”8 Still other artists, looking for both privacy and foundational experiences, abandoned their workshops and went out of doors to make drawings. Their studio was not a closed cabinet but the encounter with a wilderness.

Not all artists felt compelled to wander about outdoors or shut themselves away from the world. But the idea of the studio, once it emerged, permanently shifted the ground of art and art making, for all artists. Between the sixteenth and the nineteenth centuries the studio became a powerful symbol of the artist’s exemption from social convention and of all the mystery and ungroundedness of artistic talent.

The contours of the idea of the studio were visible already in antiquity. We can glimpse them in Pliny’s anecdote about Alexander the Great’s visit to the work space of his court painter Apelles. When the monarch began to hold forth on the art of painting, Pliny reports, Apelles would “politely advise him to drop the subject, saying that the boys engaged in grinding the colors were laughing at him. . . . So much power did his authority exercise over a king who was otherwise of an irascible temper.”9 Here the artist was already sovereign. Equally we see the artist’s work space, in the ancient anecdotes, figuring as a private space, for instance in the stories told about erotic relationships—with models, even with the works themselves—unfolding behind doors closed to the world. Such passages were read and re-read in the Renaissance.10 And yet there is something missing in all the antique lore. The ancient sources never broached the possibility that the imaginative transformation of the real into the fictional might be grounded in the private and nontransferable experience of the individual artist. When in modernity the painter was recast as an experiencing subject, his studio visitor also took on a new identity. The modern patron penetrates the workplace not as a merely incompetent critic, as in Pliny’s anecdote, but as a second subjectivity and the destination of the artist’s fictionalizing transformation of his own nontransferable experience. Such complications were the new ingredients that the Renaissance added. But the Renaissance was hardly capable of articulating these theses to itself, so as a result the retellings of the antique anecdotes usually come across as little more than

Christopher S. Wood
38
retellings, thus reinforcing the modern illusion that the Renaissance was after all just a simple repetition of antiquity.

The idea of the artist’s experience as the matrix of art was not clearly articulated in art-theoretical texts, or any texts, of the early modern period. Nor was there an early modern theory of the studio. Artists, academicians, and biographers writing about art between the fifteenth and the eighteenth centuries were trying to bring under conceptual control a tumultuous cataclysm of changes in the social reality of art making: changes in the formats and functions of paintings and sculptures, new political expectations from the image, shifts in the professional and social standing of the artist. Writers on art tried to reground art making by coordinating it with natural philosophy (Leon Battista Alberti, Leonardo da Vinci), through idealist models of the relationship between form and content (Giovanni Paolo Lomazzo, Federico Zuccaro, Giovanni Pietro Bellori), by harnessing it to religious (Counter-Reformation) or political (the French Academy) programs, by theories of taste and reception (Roger de Piles, Denis Diderot). But all this vast body of writing rarely spells out the real meaning of the revolution unreeling over this period, namely, the redefinition of art as the imaginative transfiguration of experience into fictional material by an artist. The classical concept of art persisted, and, as Wolfgang Iser points out, the classical concept always minimized the performative element in mimesis. The artist’s new authority to perform such a transfiguration struck the key blow against the long-accumulated customs of art making and the traditional economic and social position of the artmaker.

We have to read between the lines of the published art theory of this period to detect this underlying theme. To take an example: Netherlandish art theorists in the seventeenth century were preoccupied with the conceptual opposition between drawing naer het leven (after life) and uyt den gheest (from the mind). But the theoretical antithesis is misleading, for both models were in fact symmetrical aspects of the same overall move toward authorial rejection of convention and custom. The idea that the artist’s experience was the true ground of art stood behind both naer het leven and uyt den gheest. The phrases denoted two different aspects of this subjective foundation: naer het leven put the stress on observation, whereas uyt den gheest emphasized the imaginative, even fantastical, transformation of the real. But as subjectively centered mental processes the two modes of making were more alike than they were different. This accounts for the otherwise puzzling proximity of the two procedures—indeed, radicalized to the extremes of obsessively

indoortooutdoor

39
faithful transcriptions of natural data and fanciful stylish flourishes—within the oeuvres of single Netherlandish artists around 1600, when the theoretical opposition was first being articulated—for example, in the works of Jacques de Gheyn and Hendrik Goltzius.\textsuperscript{12}

\textit{The Romance of the Studio}

The drawing \textit{Nude Man in Landscape} by the German artist Wolf Huber, a contemporary of Albrecht Dürer, can serve as an emblem of the breaching of the traditional workshop in the Renaissance (fig. 2.1). The drawing, now in Hamburg, was made probably around 1505, with pen, white heightening, and gray interior modeling, on paper prepared with a blue ground.\textsuperscript{13} \textit{Nude Man in Landscape} has the feel of a finished work, a complete account of its subject within the conventions of the independent pen drawing. Huber has posed his hulking figure in a landscape with a cluster of buildings in the hills, winding fence rows, and a spiky pollard willow. But what is the subject? The conjunction of figure and setting points toward no known story. No attributes identify this nearly but not quite nude man as either a pagan mythological character or a Christian hermit or martyr. This man has no business standing about outdoors. In his breechcloth he would appear to have forgotten to put on his clothes. He has stumbled out of a private space and is not prepared to occupy a social identity.\textsuperscript{14}

In the end, it is the breechcloth that identifies him: he is a workshop model, perhaps an apprentice, who has posed in the painter’s shop, like the curly-haired model seen in four different poses in two drawings in the same technique, pen on a colored ground with white heightening, both dated 1513 and now in Amsterdam (fig. 2.2).\textsuperscript{15} With its similar heightening or sheen on the body, this second drawing is closely related to Wolf Huber if not actually by him. Here the models are presented in a minimal, abstract setting—no setting at all really—whereas in the Hamburg drawing Huber had inexplicably planted his model in a fictional landscape, forcing the naked man, not dressed for fiction, to step outside and into his role prematurely.

One has the feeling that something has gone badly awry in the Hamburg drawing. It is as if too many epochal innovations converged at once: the nude, drawn in the workshop from the live model; the landscape, grounded in local topographical peculiarities; and finally the very idea of an independent drawing, the drawing understood not as a preparatory or mnemonic device but as a self-contained package of meaning, a work of art. All
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FIGURE 2.1.
Wolf Huber
_Nude Man in Landscape._
Pen, ink, and heightening on blue ground, ca. 1505.
(© Kunsthalle, Hamburg; photograph by Elke Walford)

FIGURE 2.2.
German, Male Nudes.
Pen, ink, and heightening on brown ground, dated 1513.
Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.
of these were novelties in the period, colliding on this sheet of paper in a kind of historical gridlock. Huber’s drawing is a diagram of the imperfect fit of life drawing into Renaissance workshop practice. Drawing the nude from life and drawing landscape from life were two aspects of the break out of traditional workshop practice, and equally two aspects of the challenge to traditional iconography. But because nude models were not posed out of doors, the plein air nude had to be a fictional monster, a pasting together of parts.

Drawing directly from the nude or nearly nude model began in northern Italy in the early fifteenth century. Apprentices were the first models. Within a few decades scrutiny of the adolescent or postadolescent boy’s body had become workshop routine, especially in Florence. A slouching boy by Filippino Lippi, to take a single example, in a metal-point drawing on bluish gray grounded paper, holds his pose by leaning on a pole (fig. 23). All the major Florentine painters in the second half of the century drew from the live model. They made their apprentices either undress, or dress up, draping them with heavy cloths of the sort that apostles or other saints wore. And they made their apprentices draw each other. Florentine painters in this period were constantly looking for ways to pull together new compositions, new ways of organizing human bodies into legible, expressive hieroglyphs of human emotion and action. Lanky apprentices were bent and stretched into unprecedented attitudes.

For the first time, painters’ shops began to manufacture their own stock of original figural motifs instead of relying on conventional two-dimensional patterns preserved in chains of copied drawings, handed down from shop to shop, or even purchased. Drawing, for centuries, had meant drawing after other works. Drawing had basically been a reproduction technology, a mechanism for preserving and replicating a reservoir of usable forms. The traditional artist’s shop was not fundamentally a place for undertaking investigations or conducting research, or for initiating experiences of the world, but a place for preparing, copying, assembling, fitting together, refining, finishing. Life drawing appeared to overturn all this. Many fifteenth-century Italian drawings are no longer patterns but instead the residue of performances, deposits of encounters in real time between attentive subjects and never-before-witnessed objects.

By the late fifteenth century, workshop drawings by Florentine artists were finding their way across the Alps. German and Netherlandish artists were able to peer into the Italian painting workshop without leaving their
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FIGURE 2.3.
Filippino Lippi,
*Boy Leaning on Pole.*
Metal point and
heightening on
bluish-gray ground,
ca. 1480. Staatliche
Kunstsammlungen,
Dresden.
hometowns. Drawing from the model was not an everyday exercise in the northern European artist’s shop. Jan van Eyck had obviously studied a pair of nudes to paint the Adam and Eve on his Ghent Altarpiece. But few fifteenth-century northern drawings done directly from the human figure have survived. And there is only a handful of examples of northern studies of apprentices, for instance, a German drawing in Erlangen of a boy sleeping in a chair. In the North, apprentices were evidently not expected to undress, and it seems that northern artists did not routinely draw from models simply as an exercise, in order to understand the structure and surface of the naked body. Yet the idea of the studio as the site of a subjective encounter was already unfolding in the North. Even more so than Italian artists, northerners took the face-to-face encounter between the first Christian painter, Saint Luke, and the Virgin Mary, as the ideal model of what happens generally in the workshop. Netherlandish and German painters since the early fifteenth century saw themselves in the mirror of this session.

Life drawing distinguished painting and sculpture from other crafts, and the painter’s or sculptor’s workshop from an ordinary place of production and business, such as a cabinetmaker’s or a textile dyer’s shop, or even a goldsmith’s shop. Life drawing opened painting up to the concept of “vivacity,” that is, the idea that painting might be an interpretation of how and what people see. It is hard to peer back through the intervening centuries and reexperience the radical novelty of the idea that art might be grounded in ordinary sensory experience. Medieval commentators on art, usually clerics, were alert to the danger of the artist’s solipsism and self-projection, a form of idolatry. There is indeed a basic illogic to the grounding of art in experience, for why after all should we “double” or repeat our perceptions? For earlier epochs that did not routinely value individual experience, this was an insurmountable objection. The earliest successes in the matching of pictorial schemas to perception immediately became powerful rhetorical tools and were exploited for their iconic (Jan van Eyck), affective (Rogier van der Weyden), or uncanny (Hieronymus Bosch) impact.

Paradoxically, we find the workshop turning physically inward, literally closing its doors and windows and turning away from the street and from society, at that very moment when art is in fact reaching outward beyond inherited customs of image making in order to grasp a real world. The explanation for the paradox is that the reality outside was useless until it was brought indoors and funneled into the private experience of the artist.
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The foundational experiences named by the term “studio” broached a closed and self-sufficient art-making system, the medieval painter’s or sculptor’s workshop. And that was to become the career of the studio idea in modernity. It is an idea that repeatedly challenges classical models of artistic production. Since the fifteenth century the idea of the studio has clashed with a whole sequence of systemic, convention-based, and supra-individual models of artistic creation: workshop, academy, school, style, representational regime. Our own time is another classical moment, in that many theorists mistrust individual experience and instead tend to favor the model of a closed discursive system as the matrix of meaning. The classical position doubts the very reality of foundational experiences and disparages artistic originality as a chimera. In the discipline of art history, such skepticism about foundational creative experiences is a traditional position. It was articulated in the closing pages of Alois Riegl’s *Late Roman Art Industry* (1901): “[T]he plastic *Kunstwollen* regulates man’s relationship to the sensorily perceptible appearance of things”, and in the closing pages of Heinrich Wolfflin’s *Principles of Art History* (1915): “[T]he effect of picture on picture as a factor in style is much more important than what comes directly from the imitation of nature.” A more systematic statement of the antifoundational position was Ernst Gombrich’s *Art and Illusion* (1960). Here Gombrich argued that any encounter between an artist’s eye and the natural data, and any attempt to record that encounter in paint or chalk or stone, were governed by a system of already established pictorial conventions. The implications of Gombrich’s insight have been endorsed by skeptical philosophy and amply developed in recent scholarly work on the historical painter’s studio. One might cite any number of authors, ranging from Nelson Goodman on the myth of the innocent eye to Svetlana Alpers’s study of the elaborate stagings that formed the daily routine of Rembrandt’s studio. Another prominent recent study is Caroline Jones’s *Machine in the Studio*, which associates the “romance” of the studio with a patriarchal and intentionalist model of artistic production. Jones charts the breakdown of the romantic studio model through the careers of three American artists of the 1960s, Frank Stella, Andy Warhol, and Robert Smithson. The historical concept of the studio traced in this chapter, by contrast—the studio as the site of a foundational experience of the world or self—relies on what can only be called a romantically open-ended model of creation, one that today has become increasingly difficult to justify theoretically.
limits of the studio idea

Even in its time the romantic model of creation was hard to sustain. There were limits on the capacity of Renaissance workshops to absorb such a radical experiment into their routines. The strangeness of Wolf Huber's *Nude Man in Landscape* is its temporality: the mismatch between the punctual origin in the live encounter with the nude model and the obvious assembledness of the final drawing, involving a stretching out of time through multiple campaigns. The Huber drawing in the end does not map cleanly onto its own notional origin. Indeed, we cannot even be certain when a Renaissance life drawing was really done from life. The Amsterdam nudes, or even Huber's *Nude Man in Landscape*, look at first like studies taken directly from the model. But there are certain qualities of exaggeration, even caricature—the large feet, the fleshy facial features—that suggest the drawings are more likely copies after life drawings. The Amsterdam nudes in the event look a great deal like actual Florentine drawings, for instance, a metal-point drawing on a blue ground by Filippino Lippi (fig. 2.4). The poses are the same; in fact, it is very possibly the very same model. In that case the Amsterdam sheets were not life studies but rather copies made in 1513 probably by a student of Wolf Huber of drawings by Huber himself, now lost, that copied still other lost Florentine drawings that had somehow made their way north. Those Italian drawings that found their way into Huber's hand were themselves copies after the original life studies from the Lippi shop. So that by 1513 we are at least three steps removed, and perhaps more, from the primal scene in Lippi's workshop in Florence where an artist faced a man in a breechcloth.

The *Nude Man in Landscape* by Wolf Huber and the two Amsterdam drawings copied from Italian life drawings reveal the excessive simpicity of the microhistory of the introduction of life drawing into the Renaissance workshop offered a few pages earlier. The Hamburg drawing shows, as if in comic commentary, how ill-defined the purpose of life drawing from the nude was within the art-making system. The Amsterdam drawings show how quickly drawings that directly register an experience of the real were absorbed back into a system of copying from other drawings. The old workshop offered considerable inertial resistance to the new practices.

In the first place, the dramatic staging of compositions by apprentices, and especially in the nude, was not necessarily easy to arrange. It required private but illuminated interior spaces. Painters' and sculptors' workshops
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in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries tended to open directly onto the street, with a large “storefront” aperture that invited both customers and daylight. The shops depicted in Ambrogio Lorenzetti’s Good Government fresco from the 1330s, an allegorized contemporary street scene, give us an approximate idea of this.

The Italian painter’s shop or bottega was likely to be a ground-floor establishment on a very narrow street. An eighteenth-century ground plan of a property in Via Calimala in Florence belonging to the Ospedale degli Innocenti, described as a workshop, gives us a sense of a typical layout. The opening onto the street was a door that apparently widened into a storefront. Unless it was on a corner or had a courtyard, the shop’s only source of light was the street opening. The actual making of the pictures or statues took place in the space behind the opening, possibly even in public view. The master may have kept a small private room at the back of the workshop, called in documents the scrittoio, where he kept his accounts. But the drawing exercises reflected by the corpus of Florentine drawings, especially those employing a nude model, imply some sort of private space larger than the scrittoio, perhaps even larger than the middle space in the Via Calimala property—a space not open to the street and yet with some source of light.

We really do not have any hard data about workshop layouts in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. It seems probable that the larger and
more successful operations were able to make space for themselves by sealing off a work space distinct from the public storefront. Other artists may well have devised ingenious solutions to the space and privacy problem, perhaps renting additional space. Andrea Mantegna painted his *Madonna della Vittoria* at home. What is clear is that plenty of artists, even in Florence, did not do much life drawing. Some artists shared space; others, including Donatello, tended not to work from a stable home base at all but rather on site, perhaps in areas of churches cordoned off as temporary working space, which was no place for drawing from the live nude model.

How was life drawing in the Italian Renaissance workshop theoretically underwritten? The textual sources provide few footholds. The Florentine painter Cennino Cennini, in his treatise of around 1400, the *Libro dell’Arte*, described the copying of nature as the artist’s “triumphal gateway” and “most perfect steersman.” But later in his handbook Cennini gave instructions on how to arrive at what he calls “the exact proportions” of a man: “A man is as long as his arms crosswise. The arms, including the hands, reach to the middle of the thigh.” And so on, without any need to draw from a real man at all. The real woman was another matter. The exact proportions of the woman, Cennini announced, “I will disregard, for she does not have any set proportion.” Cennini seems to have been saying that the female body is so firmly and materially lodged in reality that it fails to point beyond itself to the ideal. For that reason, however, the earthbound female provides an opening for close nature study. Precisely because the female body cannot be constructed according to rules of proportion, she will need to be examined and drawn from life. She is like one of those “irrational animals” which Cennini also declines to discuss: “I will not tell you about the irrational animals, because you will never discover any system of proportion in them. Copy them and draw as much as you can from nature, and you will achieve a good style in this respect.” Despite the invocation of nature, life drawing figured in Cennini’s account not as the primary path, but as a last resort; not as a journey toward the uniformed, but rather as a fallback tactic that can rescue the confused artist faced with raw material that he is not able to assimilate to a pattern or to an ideal proportion schema. Cennini offered life drawing as a disciplined escape out of one’s own experience and instead toward a “good style,” whatever that might be.

Leon Battista Alberti, the humanist scholar and polymath, wrote a unique treatise on painting around 1435, about a generation after Cennini. Alberti was in close contact with the most advanced Florentine artists, Ghi-
berti, Donatello, and Brunelleschi, and is frequently invoked in art-historical literature as the arch theorist of life-drawing. But if one reads Alberti carefully, one finds that he does not actually say much on behalf of life drawing, no more than Cennini had. What Alberti says is that the parts of the body need to “correspond to grace and beauty” quantitatively and qualitatively and that to that end “one must observe a certain conformity in regard to the size of members.” To achieve this, he goes on somewhat obscurely, “it will help, when painting living creatures, first to sketch in the bones, for as they bend very little, they always occupy a certain determined position. Then add the sinews and muscles, and finally clothe the bones and muscles with flesh and skin.” This does not sound like a practical method of drawing so much as a certain abstract idea of what drawing the body involves. Alberti goes on in the same fashion: “So in painting a nude the bones and muscles must be arranged first, and then covered with appropriate flesh and skin in such a way that it is not difficult to perceive the positions of the muscles.”

It does not seem that any Italian artist of the time actually drew or painted a body in that sequence, first the bones and muscles, then the flesh. The entire process described by Alberti is best understood a kind of thought experiment, revealing that the advanced Florentine art-making procedures were driven mostly by an idea of what the end product ought to look like. Like Cennini, Alberti had in mind a classical model of solitary intellectual labor. Both Cennini and Alberti believed that the ideal end product was predicted by a concept held in the artist’s mind, and to this extent their theories of art were continuous with medieval art theory. It is undeniable that already in medieval art theory, as well as in the theories of Cennini and Alberti, the artist had a heavy responsibility. The artist’s mind was the repository of the ideal image. But this is not the same as the novel and more radical idea that the work of art had its origin in the artist’s witnessing of the world around him. The fit between the word “studio,” invoking a classical model of intellectual labor, and the more dynamic model of art making embodied in the practice of life drawing, is imperfect.

One wonders how hard artists really tried to bridge the experiential gap between the autopsy of actual human form and the graphic registration of that form. The true object of Florentine life drawing was not in the end the intimate terrain of the body but rather the disposition of the limbs and the heft of the body. This aim entailed a severe channeling of the draftsman’s experience of the body. An example is the series of chalk drawings by Andrea del Sarto preparatory to his so-called Panciatichi Assumption. 
pleted in 1525. It would seem that Andrea began by drawing the boy model clothed (fig. 2.5) and only then had him undress in order to get the anatomy right (fig. 2.6). It was of course easier to undress a boy apprentice than to draft a female into service. In the actual painting, the boy is again clothed, but in the robes of the Virgin Mary—indeed, the boy model has disappeared into his role. Posing apprentices was not so different from manipulating dolls or puppets, so-called lay figures; two wooden artist’s dolls, a pair from the sixteenth century, now in Innsbruck, are among the oldest to have survived (fig. 2.8).

In general, the impulse to break out of the workshop and draw from life was aimed at things, not other people. A live encounter between the artist and another subjectivity would have entailed existential competition. Portraiture of the individual had to involve some degree of self-suppression, as the scenes of Saint Luke painting the Madonna warn us. Early portrait drawings proceed within the tradition of iconic painting. Most early studio drawings from the life tended to treat people as objects, as dolls. The trans-gendering of the boyish doll in Andrea del Sarto’s drawings was accom-
FIGURE 2.6.
Andrea del Sarto, *Seated Male Nude*. Black chalk, ca. 1525.
Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence. (Alinari/Art Resource, N.Y.)
Figure 2.7.
Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence. (Alinari/Art Resource, N.Y.)
plished by smoothing out the knobby, bony joints and inflating the curves of the body. The boy's body is supplemented until it becomes a fictional woman, in the end a configuration not so different from those standardized clusters of drapery that used to be preserved in the stock of workshop drawings. The Renaissance artist's encounter with the human body was thus streamlined and clipped by a confident sense of what was required in the final product. Models were chosen, posed, and even seen with a firm vision of a final product in mind, often involving ideals of poise derived from antique sculpture. In many ways this was as much the case in the sixteenth century as it had been in the fourteenth. The new studio experience of the sixteenth century is inscribed in the final paintings: studio props determine hand and arm positions, for example. But the opposite is true as well: the finished painting is already present in the initial studio drawings. Drawing was not an open-ended process. This means that it is impossible to unravel the fabric of a finished Renaissance work and isolate the authentic traces of studio experience.

Since the practice of life drawing was fundamentally an assertion of the value of authorial experience, not always guaranteeing a perfect fit with the external and public aims of painting, it is not clear what professional end
tory drawing, Andrea had added the model's left foot in the lower right hand corner of the sheet because he had come to the edge of the page and had run out of room (see fig. 2.6). Running out of page is a miscalculation, an index of the direct confrontation with the real. In this case, a red-chalk study, the copyist appears to misunderstand, and has both completed the figure and repeated the added foot (fig. 2.7).\textsuperscript{45}

The workshop would appear to be as closed and self-reflexive as ever. Instead of the historical opening onto the modern studio, we seem to be witnessing the origins of the academy. This is a circular, highly self-aware system: apprentices draw from drawings they have made; they draw from a common model; and they even draw each other drawing.\textsuperscript{46} In one case we have two Florentine drawings from the same workshop, by two different hands, describing the same model at the same moment from two different angles: drawings by apprentices of still another apprentice, a boy perched on a plank, drawing (figs. 2.11, 2.12).\textsuperscript{47} One can only wonder what the des-
FIGURE 2.12.
Florentine, Seated Boy drawing.
Pen and ink, second quarter of fifteenth century.
Galleria degli Uffizi, Florence.
picted youth is drawing—one of his observers, presumably. The studio impulse toward life drawing has turned back inward upon itself in an infinite regress. In an intriguing pen drawing from the 1530s, Parmigianino drew an entire workshop—crouching and stretching in the nude, painting at the easel, drawing, measuring, working out perspective (plate 1). Parmigianino’s fantasies suggest that the practice of life drawing in workshops had something like the opposite effect from what it was supposed to have had. Instead of confronting the nude each time for the first time, artists began to think and draw from the start in terms of nudes. Obviously to make these drawings Parmigianino did not have his whole workshop undress and work naked. Instead he drew what he knew rather than what he saw, swiftly, with a kind of x-ray vision.

By the middle of the sixteenth century, life drawing had been incorporated into a more or less systematic pedagogical program in the larger painting and sculpture studios. Some leading painters, among them Vasari and Zuccaro, also wrote about art, and they harnessed life drawing to their theoretical programs. These theorists considered drawing too important to be left to chance. Vasari, for example, wrote of Raphael that until he encountered the challenge of Michelangelo, “he had never studied the nude as intensely as it requires, for he had only copied it from life, employing the methods he had seen used by Perugino.” But from this point on, he noted approvingly, Raphael enriched his naïve natural drawing manner with the systematic study of anatomy. Painting workshops that promoted the study of anatomy and antique statuary eventually came to call themselves academies. Over time they merged with the old model of the civic painter’s guild and became public institutions. The sign of this new synthesis between life drawing and the traditional collective production model is that life drawings themselves came to be called “academies.” At the beginning of the seventeenth century Agostino Carracci had a group of his life drawings published as prints. The systematization of life drawing robbed the practice of much of its original drama and erotic charge.

Only at the moment of life drawing’s institutionalization and the taming of its original adventurousness could the studio make its literal appearance in the finished work of art, no longer merely glimpsed in private drawings but a subject in its own right. The fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century studio was figured in the subject of Saint Luke painting the Madonna, but otherwise can only be glimpsed through drawings. In seventeenth-century Flanders and Holland the fictional studio scene, complete with distin-
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guished visitors, became a subject in its own right, indeed, a genre. The most self-referential painters of the epoch, Velázquez and Rembrandt, opened up their studios to the eyes of the world. Johannes Vermeer, mapping the studio back onto the painted interiors of the fifteenth-century—which had sheltered the intimate encounters between the Virgin and Saint Luke, between the Virgin and Gabriel—converted the working space itself and the fall of light into a poetic theme.

**The Bewildered Artist**

Around 1500 painting was still very far from conceiving such a poetics of the indoors. A few artists in these years actually left their workshops in search of raw material. They had found that the idea of life drawing was incompatible with the physical reality of the Renaissance workshop, a space either too small for elaborate stagings and modelings, or so big that it operated as a semipublic factory. They stopped the machinery of figuration by literally abandoning their workbenches and heading outdoors. They took the studio idea outdoors. The transferability of life drawing is proof of Michael Cole and Mary Pardo’s observation that the institution of the studio did not “quarantine” the activities sanctioned by that institution: “[T]he studio could well inform everything that went on in the building”—and even outside the building.

The most profound and important surviving documents of a direct outdoor engagement in the period around 1500 are the more than thirty landscape watercolors by Albrecht Dürer. Most of the watercolors are studies of trees and other urban and suburban subjects, such as watermills or ponds, or travel memoranda from Dürer’s first transalpine journey in 1495. In some ways the most remarkable are the drawings that address quite unprepossessing terrain, negligible and obscure crannies of the landscape, such as this rough loaf of earth labeled steinprach or quarry, a rock face in pure wash (fig. 2.13). These watercolors were Dürer’s private notations of potential pictorial motifs. They served as aides-mémoire and could be exploited later in public works. Dürer transposed this quarry, for example, into the flinty background of his Saint Jerome engraving of about 1496 (fig. 2.14).

Few of Dürer’s contemporaries joined him under an open sky. Early sixteenth-century artists who took their drawing equipment outdoors can almost be numbered on one hand, at least as far as we can tell from the surviving drawings: Leonardo da Vinci, Fra Bartolommeo, Titian, Albrecht
FIGURE 2.13.
Albrecht Dürer, Quarry. Watercolor, ca. 1495.
Kunsthalle, Bremen.
FIGURE 2.14.
(Photograph by the author)
accompanied by an apprentice, a red-haired boy in a white tunic and leggings sitting on a millstone and drawing absorbedly on his drawing tablet, head down. It is the true German equivalent of the Florentine images of the busy drawing apprentices. The drawing also functions for us, proleptically, as the resolution of the awkward paradox of the Wolf Huber *Nude Man in Landscape* (see fig. 2.1), a drawing that sets traditional workshop procedure and the new life drawing in tense opposition. Perhaps indeed the apprentice is a kind of autobiographical personage, a memory of Dürer’s own boyhood sketching trips. Dürer’s decision, registered by this watercolor, to turn his back on the panorama and instead draw the unprepossessing mill and the scrabbly terrain around it is a figure for the effort generally to dash the
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Altdorfer, and Wolf Huber, as well as Dürer himself. Later in the sixteenth century, especially in the Netherlands, the practice began to take root. Landscape prints and paintings even depicted artists sketching out of doors, for example in the engraving *River Landscape with Mercury and Psyche* after Pieter Bruegel. In this print the two draftsmen peer from a high knoll over a panoramic valley. Such figures can be understood both as symbolic reaffirmations of the topos of the scrupulous objectivity of Netherlandish painting and as reflections of a new contemporary practice of plein-air draftsmanship. In Italy the practice was not widespread, or expected of students, before about 1600, unless the object of outdoor study was a building or an ancient ruin.

And yet the idea of outdoor study was close at hand, for one of the main conceptual models for the early modern scholar's studio had been the hermit's wilderness retreat. Studies, private refuges from household and world, were novelties in the early Renaissance, much prized by gentlemen and scholars. The Tuscan notary Lapo Mazzei wrote in a letter to a friend in 1595: "I remain alone at home, in bed and in my study, as happy as the good hermits are on the mountain, and I feel no winds either from left or right." He was thinking of the hermit saints of myth, like Saint Jerome the scholar seated at his makeshift desk in the wilderness, his cardinal’s garb discarded. The hermit’s experiment was a cultivation of perplexity, or losing one’s way in order to find one’s way. In a sense the anchorite’s impulse to stray beyond the safety of the walls, to enter into a kind of voluntary bewilderment under an open sky, was the true origin of the modern studio. Such comments as Lapo Mazzei’s on the experience of the study foreshadowed the outdoor painting studio. Mazzei and Saint Jerome retreated from the busy, practical world just as Dürer abandoned the workshop. Hermit, scholar, and artist were each seeking nontransferrable, nonsubstitutable encounters with some authentic layer of reality that would bring enlightenment. And it does seem right to say that what Dürer was looking for in his encounters with irregular form, with the meaningless debris of rock and branch, was precisely a moment of private confusion, of entanglement in the real, that would break the circle of figuration and artifice and instead bring him up hard against something sensate.

Dürer actually depicted the outdoor studio in a remarkable and rarely discussed watercolor in Berlin, the *Watermill with Draftsman* (fig. 2.15). The scene is a rocky hillside presumably in the country surrounding Nuremberg. Dürer has chosen a hillside perch perhaps for its panoramic view. He is ac-
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schema and head upcountry. It is extraordinary that he has decided to promote this pebbly slope into a motif. This is pure terrain; even the focal point or notional subject matter, the watermill itself, was literally constructed out of the terrain. The meaningless foreground rambles over more than half the sheet. Dürer’s brush has tackled a pile of debris, a superfluity of data; and yet his brush stays stuck to the gaze, moving about in fits and starts, accounting for a field of vision in fragments. And the result is less a composition than a direct trace of the lawless encounter. In his attentiveness to the arbitrariness of nature, the draftsman arrives at the source of—and begins to comprehend—a natural energy, discovering and mimicking a dynamic chaos he has found outdoors.

The outdoors has become the real studio. The move outdoors was actually rehearsed by the stories told at the time about artists. In Renaissance accounts of artists’ lives, prodigies might well be discovered in the wild: Lorenzo Ghiberti in his Commentarii, around the middle of the fifteenth century, told of “a boy of wonderful talent who portrayed from nature a sheep: Cimabue, the painter, came across this boy sitting on the earth, alongside the road to Bologna, drawing that sheep on a flat stone.” This rustic genius was Giotto. Giorgio Vasari would later retell and embellish the story, and even transpose it to the lives of Andrea Castagno, Andrea Sansovino, and Domenico Beccafumi. In each case the prodigy was discovered out of doors. He belonged to no workshop but rather stood outside established art, at least at the start. For Cimabue did not of course join Giotto in the dirt but instead took the boy with him to Florence, to his workshop.

The wild in these discovery myths was more than simply the antithesis of the workshop, the place beyond method and rule. It was also the primeval nursery of the arts. Alberti had imagined the history of sculpture beginning out of doors. Vasari, in his preface to the Lives, drew an explicit parallel between the historical prodigy and the mythical first artists: “In our own time,” wrote Vasari, “simple children, brought up roughly in primitive surroundings, have started to draw instinctively, using as their only models the trees around them, the lovely paintings and sculptures of nature, and guided only by their own lively intelligence. But the first men were more perfect and endowed with more intelligence... and they had nature for their guide, the purest intellects for their teachers, and the world as their beautiful model. So is there not every reason for believing that they originated these noble arts [i.e., painting and sculpture]?” Art, too, was woven into the great pastoral fable this epoch was telling itself.
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The word studio derives from the Latin *studium* and therefore connotes zeal and eagerness in the pursuit of knowledge, a random, centrifugal wandering that led who knows where and that was stigmatized already in antiquity as curiosity, or excessive care. Curiosity is the common denominator that links these landscapes back to the project of life-drawing from the nude model. The quest for form in the landscape was historically analogous to the first fascination with the nude. Dürer began drawing from the nude at exactly the moment he started taking his watercolors outdoors. His pen drawing of a nude woman, now in Bayonne and dated 1493, before his first trip to Italy, is in fact the earliest surviving northern drawing unquestionably done from the nude model (fig. 2.16).68 She is a nonideal, knock-kneed woman, whose very smile strikes us as the afterglow of a real, intersubjective encounter. Three years later Dürer made a pen drawing of the interior of a women's bathhouse (fig. 2.17).69 Dürer is conducting research here, research for flesh, although perhaps only virtual research, for it is not at all clear he ever had quite this scene before his eyes. The bath scene was a northern topos traceable back to van Eyck and van der Weyden.70 He represents his own curiosity in the form of an only dimly visible man peeping through a half-opened window, spying on the society of bathers and attendants. Dürer figures the bathhouse as a parable of the intrusion of life drawing into the painter’s workshop. This is a shop not open to the street but rather tightly sealed from air and eyes. The “work” of the sauna—sponging, brushing, scrubbing, combing, kneading, birching—is a preparation for the display of the body, a preparation of the body so it can be admired. And this, in a sense, is also the work of the painter’s shop. Dürer’s *Women’s Bathhouse* is the first studio scene.

Such a bathhouse operating behind the facade of a Nuremberg street must have extended a powerful invitation to the curious eye. It was a museum of the unseen, of the perhaps never-to-be-seen. But just as in the Florentine *bottega*, the idealizing pressure of desire soon interfered with simple curiosity. Dürer’s eye distinguished nude from naked and converted the naked into the nude. There is actually only one shapeless, ordinary body here, standing in for the real, while the other five women are young and flexible, bending toward the ideal. One of them is actually attended by putti as if already lodged inside a painting.

We have seen with the Florentine nude studies how vulnerable such experiments were to relapse, to a fall back to making, schemas, and habits. As with the nude studies, so it went with landscape. Immediately there were
cases of copied landscape motifs, even copies after the craggiest and most irregular and, one would think, least copiable bits. A pen drawing in Erlangen, for instance, to all appearances a study from life, in fact lifts its irregular patch of landscape straight from Dürer’s *Saint Jerome* engraving, which, as we have seen, was itself built around a watercolor life study of a corner of the landscape.\(^1\)

Dürer tried to represent the dialectic between theory and craft in his most important engraving, the *Melencolia I* of 1514 (see fig. 1.18).\(^2\) There is no place made for life drawing in this complex diagram. The heavy winged figure stands for the artist: she has come out of the wild and back to civilization, represented by the corner of classical architecture and by the drafting compass in her hand. Saint Jerome’s lion has been replaced by a sleeping
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dog. But the winged figure is far from ready to take up her craft again, represented by the abandoned tools at her feet, and by the scribbling putto, head bent to his tablet like one of the Florentine workshop apprentices, and indeed sitting on a millstone just as was the apprentice in Dürer’s Watermill with Draftsman (see fig. 2.15). Her concerns, symbolized by the sphere and the bizarre polyhedron, a cube with truncated corners, are abstract and theoretical. She is the kind of artist who would assemble pictures like this one: diagrams built out of fragments of perceivable reality, pictures never conceived as a whole account of optical experience. No sooner had optical experience won its place in the workshop, with the introduction of the routine of life drawing, than it has lost it again. Melencolia’s morbid, wild gaze shows that she no longer knows what to look at.
The Italian response to the *Melencolia I*, and in effect to Dürer’s *Women’s Bathhouse* as well, is Enea Vico’s engraving of the inside of the Florentine sculptor Baccio Bandinelli’s studio, or “Academy,” from the early 1540s (fig. 2.18). Bandinelli’s academy promoted theory, which absorbed and tamed life drawing and kept it safely indoors, preventing it from threatening craft. Here craft and theory combine forces to shelter and reorient the artist. The coiled sleeping dog establishes a direct link back to Dürer’s *Melencolia I*. A dozen apprentices, like apostles, work under this artist’s guidance. The objects of study in this studio are not breathing, pulsing nude bathers but plaster casts of works of art. There are torsos and busts, fragments of skeletons, and books on the shelf above. The place is morbid, foreshadowing the emotionally turbid Romantic studio as interpreted by Marc Gotlieb in this volume. There is no natural light here at all, only fire. But it makes no difference, because in this studio no one looks up from his drawing tablet.
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Afterlife of the Renaissance Studio

The original idea of the studio, the idea of the absolute authority of the individual creator, is sometimes hard to perceive amid all the clutter and business-like activity of the later sixteenth-, seventeenth-, and eighteenth-century painter’s or sculptor’s work space, the “old master” studio. On the face of things, the old master studio can resemble the premodern workshop: a head of operations surrounded by assistants, apprentices, perhaps even family members. But since the seventeenth century, at least, the market for paintings and drawings has drawn a sharp distinction between the center and the periphery of the working space. The assignation of market value rests on the possibility of a clear ex post facto identification of the authorial punctum of the workshop, the point of origin through which reality was gathered and processed. Oddly, one of the terms that catalogers and dealers came to use to designate the anonymous collectivity of possible in-house sources other than the presiding master was precisely the word “studio.” A work of art is assigned to the “studio” when it cannot be attributed to the head of the workshop, or indeed to any other discernible individual. The old master studio of the catalogers is therefore a terminological monster composed of an artist and a “studio.” It embraces both temporalities of art making, the collective and the performative.

The idea of individual authorship needs the protection of the art market because it is so fragile. According to the strict classical model, matching—the subjective comparison of experience to pictorial schemata—is overwhelmed by making. Experience never manages to break into the clear; nothing is ever invented or found, there is only recombination. Pictorial description, like any other contrivance, is sustained by conventional routines. Experience itself is preformed by cognition and channeled by socialization. In the end, as Vasari realized, it is easier to found the institution of artistic authorship on mind, imagination, disegno. Life drawing is a misunderstanding imbedded cameo-fashion inside the history of art. The studio is a nonplace, a pastoral place, lost somewhere between the medieval workshop and the early modern academy. And indeed since the 1960s, as Caroline Jones has shown, the individualistic experiential model of authorship has been emphatically discredited and the proud artist reabsorbed in classical fashion back into the coils of collectivity and discursivity.

And yet somehow the studio model survives to this day. Certainly it survives as a popular myth and as a social and a commercial fact. The studio
model survives because it stands for everything that is truly different about artists, and artists themselves still cling to it in symbolic (if seldom thoroughgoing) defiance of the commercialization of their work by the gallery and publicity system. But, more important, the idea of the studio persists because the academic, classical model of a closed and impersonal system does not quite “cover” art. Nor does the idealist, imagination-based model of art making. The entire experiment of the authorial processing of the world, including the by now nearly obsolete practice of life drawing, veers close to the impulses that lie at the root of art making: mimicry, doubling, impersonation, illusionism, witnessing, the struggle to stabilize the external world. The classical model is an incomplete account of art and the studio always has to be reexcavated from within it. The introduction of the visible into painting in the fifteenth century—topographical and physiognomic portraits, closely observed objects and textures—was much more than a rhetorical device. The introduction of the visible recast art making as the subjective transfiguration of ordinary, familiar experience. The perceptual field of the artist served as a “preformation” into which the subject could enter and find itself.

Life drawing, identified in this chapter as the crucial indicator of the new model of art production, may appear today to be a clumsy, excessively literal way to overcome the hiatus between the subject and the external world. Already in the sixteenth century, as we have seen, life drawing failed to establish itself as the indispensable practical core of workshop activity. It would seem that the true function of life drawing in the Renaissance was precisely to serve as a symbolic acting-out or literalization of the new performative basis of art. Life drawing dramatized the transfiguring power of art by beginning with a set of seemingly shared experiences and then defamiliarizing them through bracketing and selection. Life drawing was not a self-explanatory routine but a radical reframing of perceptual experience. The project of the transformation of perceptions did not reveal perception as the natural shared foundation of art, but rather just the opposite: it revealed the ultimate incommunicability of perception. As Niklas Luhmann argues, art makes perception available for communication. But it does so “by using perceptions contrary to their primary purpose.” Art seeks an “irritating” relationship between perception and communication, and then communicates this irritation. Life drawing, and the development of art based in perceptual experience, produced paradox: an art that was stubbornly, literally rooted in some (at least apparently) unmediated encounter with the
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world, yet could not be traced back to that world. Life drawing pushed the art idea to its horizon, narrowing the channel from world to work so as to dramatize the tremendous fictionalizing power of that channel, the creative subject. It is as if the visual arts needed to do this to assert their new claim to legitimacy. Poetry, at least since Petrarch, had already established its groundedness in subjectivity. There was no need to assert it with some new discipline or theatricalization such as life drawing. The subject had always been there, in grammar, and only needed to be voiced. At the same time, the new insistence on perception as an originary point prevented or at least forestalled the immediate assimilation of art making to textual models, or what would later be known as the *ut pictura poesis* paradigm. Life drawing, at the very least, thematized this resistance to textuality.

All this explains why life drawing needed to play a cameo role in the history of art, and no more. Once the subjectivity of the visual arts had been established and institutionalized in the Renaissance, there was no need constantly to reassert it. One could even safely entertain the principle of *ut pictura poesis*, as seventeenth- and eighteenth-century art theory did. The conception of art as fundamentally an aspect of the self-reflection of the subject is a long story, one that may not quite be finished. Life drawing itself, it is true, the primal clash between eye and thing, has become a self-consciously archaizing or even reactionary activity. Among amateur artists life drawing flourishes, perhaps as a way of privately recapitulating the origins of modern art. But for the most ambitious artists, the problem of subjectivity is either no longer posed or is taken for granted, or has anyway lost its urgency. Art today is still in many ways about perception, but the old ways of focusing perception—in staged encounters between object or scenario and fixed eye—no long seem compulsory. It is as if it has been recognized that art can be “about” visuality without having to go through with the staged visualization process that life drawing represents.

What happens in the studio is not so clear anymore. The breakdown of the life-drawing discipline has left a blank space. If anything this makes the artist’s authority even more mysterious and inexplicable. For beyond the threshold of the studio, even today, social conventions and expectations are magically overturned. What you may or may not say, what is given or not given as a gift, the improbable significance of a mere scrap of paper bearing pen scratches, in any other setting a discard—everything that happens inside the studio is charged with peculiar meaning. An artist today will tell you that what he or she does is, simply, make things. But hiding behind this
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unfathomable, archaic operation is something like matching, an engagement with the extrasubjective to which this making always stands in dialectic. The performance of fictionalization today, whatever form it takes, is historically and conceptually continuous with the deliberate, solitary staging of optical experience that the fifteenth- and sixteenth-century artist was hoping to set in motion when he closed the door on his household and his assistants. Artists even today, no matter how skeptical of the mythologies of authorship, performance, and creativity, will tell you as they are leaving their homes in the morning that they are on their way to the studio.
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shared attention to the geometry of vision, Martin Kemp pai’s Ghiberti’s chapter with Piero della Francesca’s learned treatise on linear perspective, De perspective pingendi of the 1470s; see M. Kemp, Science of Art, 26–29. Piero’s reputation as a mathematician of rank was broadcast by the well-published mathematician Luca Pacioli, who collaborated with Leonardo in Milan.


62. For the painting, see Ferrari, “Luca Giordano.”


64. See Alpers, “The Studio.”

65. See Godlieb, “Poussin’s Lesson.”

66. Our identification of the putto-like figure as a sprite, or “genius”-intraining, is inspired by Dempsey, Inventing the Renaissance Putto, and Pfisterer, Donatello.

67. Compare, for example, Arasse, L’ambition de Vermeer.

CHAPTER II. INDOOR-OUTDOOR: THE STUDIO AROUND 1500

This essay owes much to critical comments by Michael Cole and Mary Pardo and by the other participants in the symposium; and to Brian Lukacher.

1. Not until the early nineteenth century was the space where the painter or sculptor works called a studio, both in Italian and in English, thus finally differentiating it from the workshop or bottega. See the Grande Dizionario della Lingua Italiana and the Oxford English Dictionary. Modern French—and, following it, German—still calls the artist’s studio an atelier, which originally designated a carpenter’s workplace. See also the remarks by Cole and Pardo in this volume.

2. For the analysis of the breakdown of the classical model of mimesis and the performative conception of art as a compensation for this loss, see Iser, The Fictive and the Imaginary, 287, and generally chap. 6.


4. Richter, The Literary Works of Leonardo, no. 494. Vasari reported that Michelangelo was equally “a lover of solitude, devoted as he was to Art, which
demands the whole man, with all his thoughts, for herself. . . . Art demands earnest consideration, loneliness, and quietude; she cannot permit wandering of the mind.” See Vasari, Lives, i: 419; and Vasari, Vite, 7:270.
6. The Italian word studio denoting a private chamber for study dates from the fourteenth century.
7. Alexander, Medieval Illuminators, figs. 33 (thirteenth century), 46 (fourteenth century), 49 (mid-fifteenth century). Sometimes the painter was represented together with a scribe.
10. Warnke, Court Artist, on the topos of the studio visit, 204, 232–33; and 40–41 on Apelles and Alexander. Filipczak, Picturing Art, 25–29, on Apelles and on the topos of the lay visitor to the studio in northern Europe. On the artist’s model and the artwork itself as objects of erotic desire, see Kris and Kurz, Legend, Myth, and Magic, 72, 116–17.
12. Wood, "Curious Pictures and the Art of Description,” and Swan, "Ad vivum,” 352 and 353–72, respectively. See also Melion, Shaping the Netherlandish Canon, 65–66 and n. 18 on the interchangeability of the terms wyt den gheest and wyt zijn selven in van Mander.
13. Hamburg, Kunsthalle, inv. no. 1953/58, 22.6 x 15.7 cm. See Winzinger, Wolf Huber, no. 7.
14. De Tolnay wondered whether it was not an image of a “lunatic,” spellbound by the influence of the heavenly bodies; cited in ibid., 74.
15. Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, inv. nos. 51.09, 51.10; ibid., nos. 163, 164. 21.4 x 14.4 cm; 21.5 x 14.5 cm. The grounds are brown.
17. Dresden, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, inv. no. C.21 (verso). 27.2 x 8.4 cm. See Goldner et al., The Drawings of Filippino Lippi, no. 21.
18. See Ames-Lewis, Drawing in Early Renaissance Italy, chap. 4; Scheller, Exemplum; Bambach, Drawing and Painting.
19. Erlangen, University Library, inv. no. 1 J 3. See Bock, Zeichnungen, no. 31, attributed to the Housebook Master, ca. 1480.
20. See the comments on this tradition by Perry Chapman in this volume; Filipczak, Picturing Art, 11–24; and Marrow, “Artistic Identity in Early Netherlandish Painting,” 53–59.
21. See Camille, The Gothic Idol, 27–49; p. 31 cites the warning of Theophilus, twelfth-century author of a technical treatise on art: “You can do nothing of yourself.”
27. Oxford, Christ Church Picture Gallery, inv no. JBS 32. 20.7 x 40.8 cm. See Goldner et al., The Drawings of Filippo Lippi, no. 116 (recto). Winzinger considered the Amsterdam sheets copies after life drawings by Huber done in the Florentine manner.
28. A woodcut by Hans Burgkmair illustrating Emperor Maximilian’s autobiographical Weissung gives an even better idea. The emperor is visiting an armorer’s shop; visible at the right edge is one of the shutters to the wide storefront aperture. See Hausberger and Biedermann, Hans Burgkmair, no. 187.
29. Thomas, The Painter’s Practice, 32–36, and fig. 25, and generally chap. 3, on the location and layout of Italian Renaissance painting workshops. See also Huth, Künstler und Werkstatt, 32, on shops.
30. According to a document of 1458, Paolo Uccello kept a private workroom near the common work space. Wackernagel, The World of the Renaissance Artist, 309 n. 6.
31. Welch, Art and Society, 85, 86, 88, where she also argues that painters became more mobile and flexible in this period. On the arrangements made by Michelangelo and Giambologna, see the comments by Cole and Pardo in this volume.
35. Ibid., 48–49 (chap. 70).
37. See the remarks by Cole and Pardo in this volume on the terms disegno, concetto, and esemplum, with notes 24–26.
38. The painting is in Florence, Palazzo Pitti, inv. 1912, n. 191.
39. Florence, Uffizi, inv. no. 32F (verso), Andrea del Sarto, no. 53.
40. Florence, Uffizi, inv. no. 303F. Ibid., no. 54.
41. See Meder, Die Handzeichnung, 394, on men used as models for women. Artists did find opportunities to draw the female body; Lorenzo Lotto’s account books mention a female model; a chalk drawing by Rosso Fiorentino from the early 1520s is a record of such an encounter; Florence, Uffizi, inv. no. 6478F; see Carroll, “The Drawings of Rosso Fiorentino,” no. D 9.
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42. On Gliederpuppen or lay figures, see Huth, *Künstler und Werkstatt*, 35.

43. Paris, Louvre, Cabinet des Dessins, inv. no. RF. 5531, 5532. 19.3 x 9.3 cm., 19.0 x 8.8 cm. See Melli, *Maso Finiguerra*, nos. 105–6; and Degenhart and Schmitt, *Corpus der italienischen Zeichnungen*, figs. 849b, 487a.

44. For yet more similar drawings of male legs from the same group, see Mellii, *Maso Finiguerra*, nos. 134 and 135 (New York, Morgan Library, inv. nos. 1986, 1987: 1, 5). Another example of an apparently traced pair: Paris, Louvre, Cabinet des Dessins, inv. no. RF. 5544, 5545; Mellii, ibid., nos. 118–19; Degenhart and Schmitt, *Corpus der italienischen Zeichnungen*, I, 2, ills. 849f, 849e, where the left leg and the belly seems to have been traced.

45. Florence, Uffizi, inv. no. 302F (recto), See Andrea del Sarto, no. 55. The left side of the torso, visible under the arm in no. 303F, is hidden in this drawing, proving that it is a copy. In the catalog entry cited here, however, Annamaria Petrioli Tofani leaves open the possibility that Andrea himself made the copy.


47. London, British Museum, inv. no. 1895–9–15–440 (recto), ibid., I, 2, fig. 572. Florence, Uffizi, inv. no. 120F (recto); and ibid., no. 349, pl. 298c and p. 427; authors argue that the London drawing is an inferior copy of the Florence drawing. Both are considered Florentine, second quarter of fifteenth century.


49. See the comments by Cole and Pardo in this volume on Vasari's and Benedetto Varchi’s conceptions of drawing as a “record of mental activity.” See also Williams, *Art, Theory, and Culture in Sixteenth-Century Italy*, chap. 1, “Vasari’s Concept of Disegno,” and generally on the articulation of an idealist program for art by Varchi, Giovanni Paolo Lomazzo, Federico Zuccaro, and others.


51. *Scuola perfetta per imparare a disegnare...* (Rome: Pietro Stefani), Bartsch 18, 158–70, nos. 1–81. See Bohlin, *Prints and Related Drawings by the Carracci Family*, 57.

52. On academics generally, see Barzman, *The Florentine Academy*, 98–101, on life drawing; Jacobs, “(Dis)assembling Marsyas,” esp. 434–41. See also remarks by Perry Chapman in this volume on the allegorical “Academy” engraving by Johannes Stradanus (fig. 4.6).


54. In this volume Perry Chapman ingeniously turns the tables on Rembrandt and Vermeer, interpreting the former’s *Artist in His Studio* as the image of an intellectual painter with academic ambitions, and the latter’s *The Art of Paint-
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ing as a reassertion of the Netherlandish empirical tradition (i.e., painting directly from life).

54. Cole and Pardo in this volume.


56. Bremen, Kunsthalle. 29.2 x 22.4 cm. Strauss, *Drawings of Albrecht Dürer,* no. 1495/51.

57. Bartsch 61. 32.4 x 22.8 cm.

58. Bastelaer, *Les estampes de Peter Bruegel l'Ancien,* no. 1. A drawing of the same scene, dated 1555, in the Musée des Beaux-Arts, Besançon, is probably a copy after the lost Bruegel original. A painted panel in the National Gallery, London, inv. no. 1298, is derived from this composition. See also Gibson, "Mirror of the Earth," pp. 63–64.


60. Conisbee, "Pre-Romantic Plein-Air Painting," 413–28. Sandrart reported that Claude Lorrain was making oil studies from nature in the 1650s.


64. Schlosser, *Lorenzo Ghiberti’s Denkwürdigkeiten,* 1:35.


68. Bayonne, Musée Bonnat, inv. no. 1272–674. 27.2 x 14.7 cm. Strauss, *Drawings of Albrecht Dürer,* no. 1493/3.

69. Bremen, Kunsthalle. Initialed and dated 1496. 23.1 x 22.6 cm. Strauss, *Drawings of Albrecht Dürer,* no. 1493/4 (Strauss considers the initials and date spurious). Like the *Quarry* (fig. 2.13), this drawing was lost at the end of World War II. They were only recently returned to Bremen by the Russian government.

70. Bartolomeo Fazio in 1456 described paintings (both now lost) by Jan of Gaul (van Eyck) depicting “women of uncommon beauty emerging from the bath” along with many other details, and by Rogier of Gaul (van der Weyden) depicting “a woman sweating in her bath, with a puppy near her and two youths on the other side secretly peering in at her through a chink, remarkable for their grins”; Baxandall, *Giotto and the Orators,* 107–8. For a detailed discussion of some later reflections of the Eyckian bath scene, see Held, “Artis Pictoriae Amator,” 43–51, 53–58.
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72. See also Cole and Pardo’s reading of this print as a “studio picture” in this volume.
73. Although no one would have known Dürer’s drawing, there was an anonymous contemporary woodcut based on it: Strauss, Drawings of Albrecht Dürer, appendix 1, 6; Meder, Dürer-Katalog, 249. For the Enea Vico, see Bartsch XV. 305. 49. 30.6 x 52.5 cm. See also Barzman, The Florentine Academy, 4–5.
74. For clear testimony of this, see the negotiations between Peter Paul Rubens and his client Sir Dudley Carleton: Rubens asks 1,200 florins, for example, for a Last Judgment “begun by one of my pupils, after one which I did in a much larger size for the most serene Prince of Neuburg, who paid me 3500 florins cash for it: but this one, not being finished, would be entirely retouched by my own hand, and by this means would pass as original.” Letter of April 28, 1618, in Magurn, The Letters of Peter Paul Rubens, 61.
75. The origins of this usage in art-historical writing are not clear; the Oxford English Dictionary gives no example earlier than 1908.
76. The formulation is Marc Gotlieb’s, via viva voce.
77. Jones, Machine in the Studio.
80. “The text game proceeds as a transformation of its referential worlds, which gives rise to something that cannot be deduced from these worlds.” See Iser, The Fictive and the Imaginary, 281.
81. This at least is the argument of Henrich, Versuch über Kunst und Leben.

CHAPTER 3. BENEDICTUS ARIAS MONTANUS AND THE VIRTUAL STUDIO AS A MEDITATIVE PLACE

1. On Montanus, the basic sources are González Carvajal, “Elogio histórico del Doctor Benito Arias Montano”; Rekers, Benito Arias Montano; and Hänse1, Der spanische Humanist Benito Arias Montano. For a recent comprehensive bibliography of the scholarship on Montanus, see Lazcano, “Benito Arias Montano: bibliografía,” 1167–95. On Montanus’s official and scholarly activities in Antwerp, see Hänse1, Der spanische Humanist Benito Arias Montano, 12–129, and De Landsheer, “Benito Arias Montano and the Friends from His Antwerp Sojourn,” 39–61. My claim that he is an originator of the scriptural emblem book
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