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Exhibitions must serve many purposes and many publics. This is especially true of those created by printrooms, for unlike most museum departments, only a tiny percentage of their collections can be exhibited and this for only short periods. While most printrooms possess a bewildering variety of works of art on paper, none may claim that the majority would provide truly moving experiences for the beholder. Thus their treasures are better understood as diverse witnesses—as visualized thoughts of the past six hundred years—whose interest varies with the knowledge and expectations of each viewer. Only over the course of a decade or two may a rapidly changing exhibition program begin to unfold the true resources of these cultural repositories.

The present exhibition is no exception to this essentially cumulative approach by which we strive to contribute to the knowledge as well as the pleasure of our immediate public. Despite its modesty—the works are drawn mostly from our own collection, but significantly buttressed by crucial loans—we believe that it is the first American exhibition to offer a systematic look at a fairly unknown group of artists. Together with familiar prints by Bellange, Callot, and Claude, are rather overlooked works by Boissard, Morin, Melian, Vignon, Brébiette, Chappron, Le Pautre, and others. The Gallery is very much indebted to Alvin L. Clark, Jr., National Endowment for the Arts Intern for 1987, for having assembled and documented this exhibition. His catalogue will provide a long-needed guide to a complex and neglected corner of the history of printmaking.

Even small exhibitions represent the collaboration of many persons. Once again we owe much to the generosity of Florence Selden. As was so often the wish of her late husband, Carl L. Selden, B.A. 1933, she has consistently asked to be associated with undertakings which educate not only their publics but their authors—invariably graduate students in art history. To Florence Selden especially, but also to Mr. and Mrs. Dave Williams and the Connecticut Com-

mission on the Arts, we would like to record our gratitude. A number of the exhibited prints have been graciously lent by other institutions; to Ellen D'Oench of the Davison Art Center, Wesleyan University, to Clifford S. Ackley and Sue W. Reed of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, to Wolfgang M. Freitag, Henri Zerner, and David Becker of the Fogg Art Museum, Cambridge, and to Vincent Giroud and Patricia Middleton of the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library at Yale go our heartfelt thanks for their willing help and sustaining interest. And finally, there are those who simply toil, long and hard, to bring our efforts to fruition: John Gambell who designed this catalogue with his accustomed practicality and dispatch, Lesley K. Baier who edited it, and Elise K. Kenney who checked the bibliography; Juliana D. Flower and Elisabeth S. Hodermarsky, Curatorial Assistants, who handled most of the details in the printroom, and Susan Frankenbach, Registrar, who managed the logistics of the loans. Finally, it would be negligent not to mention those who restore and preserve the works of art so that we may continue to learn from the past: matters Guy P. Livingston and Anne Harris, and conservators Lyn Koehnline and Theresa Fairbanks.

Richard S. Field
Curator of Prints, Drawings, and Photographs
The purpose of this exhibition is to offer a survey of the major French and foreign peintre-graveurs and reproductive printmakers active in France during the first half of the seventeenth century. The art of this period, dominated by the taste and patronage of Henri IV and Louis XIII, may be distinguished both from the Mannerism patronized by François I at Fontainebleau during the sixteenth century and from the full-blown classicism favored by Louis XIV at Versailles in the second half of the seventeenth century. Thus the six decades from 1600 to 1660 are pivotal ones, characterized by the slow displacement of the older accomplishments of Fontainebleau by the more modern, Baroque innovations introduced from Italy.

Printmakers played a major role in the absorption, development, and proliferation of the diverse stylistic and technical trends of this period. The present exhibition is divided into four sections, beginning with the late Mannerist art of Lorraine, followed by a brief look at parallel phenomena in Paris. It will continue with the graceful and decorative art of Simon Vouet and his circle, and conclude with early French Classicism or what has been termed Parisian Atticism. With the exception of Lorraine, the focus is on the art produced in Paris and the Ile de France. As the political and economic capital of the country, this region received the most important royal and private patronage and was, therefore, the center of significant artistic activity. The sixty-odd works authored by over forty artists reveal a variety and beauty that speak for the vitality and eloquence of seventeenth-century French art.

Although many of the persons who kindly assisted me in this undertaking are recognized in the Acknowledgments, I would like to take this opportunity to offer special appreciation to Konrad Oberhuber, Ian Woodner Curator of Drawings at the Fogg Art Museum, Harvard University, and to Richard S. Field, Curator of Prints, Drawings, and Photographs at the Yale University Art Gallery. Their excellence of connoisseurship, love for works of art on paper, high curatorial standards, and dedication to teaching, provided me with the instruction and the inspiration which enabled me to complete this work.

—ALC

1. It is generally accepted that the art of the court set the standard for the entire country (Blunt 1982, pp. 13–14). At least two recent exhibitions have made us aware of a great deal more artistic activity and patronage outside of Paris than we might have thought (Marseilles 1979 and Rouen 1984).
Reflections on the Relationship between French and Italian Art in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries

Any survey of seventeenth-century French prints must include a consideration of the peculiar relationship between French and Italian art in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Although the Renaissance and the Baroque were Italian phenomena, they were important in different ways for all of western European art. The indigenous traditions of each country either absorbed or ignored aspects of these Italian developments according to their own specific interests.

France and the Renaissance

It could be said that France received its mixture of Florentine and Bolognese Mannerism at Fontainebleau without ever having had its own Renaissance. France's last great stylistic contribution to European art was the Gothic, a style which continued to have a profound influence on French visual culture. One of the most visible signs of its continued existence was in the field of architecture. Throughout the sixteenth century, cathedrals and manor houses in France were still being expanded, planned, and built in the Gothic style. Clearly, this was not an environment that would be completely hospitable to the Italian Renaissance. Acceptance of the new style, which was often considered inappropriate for certain types of buildings, was predictably slow. Yet by mid-century, the writings of both ancient Roman and modern Italian architects such as Vitruvius and Serlio had been translated into French, and some churches and other important buildings were being built in the new Italianate style. The gradual acceptance of Renaissance Italian ideas is most evident in the field of ornament, since many Italian sculptors and craftsmen had been brought to France by the king and his court in an effort to import the graceful style of living that they had witnessed in their campaigns and travels in Italy. But without understanding or caring for the principles of classical unity that underlay the Renaissance style, many patrons simply superimposed new ornamental decorations upon existing Gothic structures. It was not until the 1540s, when the major renovations at Fontainebleau were underway, and when the Modenese architect Jacomo Vignola, the Florentine Sebastiano Serlio, and the Italian-trained Philibert de L'Orme had all arrived in France, that the country received its first full-fledged encounter with the Italian Renaissance.

The latest developments in the field of painting were also slow to reach France. Italian painters such as the Florentine Andrea Solario and even Leonardo da Vinci had been brought to France, but Solario stayed only two years and the old and sickly Leonardo died at the Château de Clos-Lucé, near Amboise, a few years after his arrival. Again, it was not until Fontainebleau that the French had an opportunity to see an important example of Italian Renaissance decorative painting.

One of the most significant inhibitors to the advancement of the visual arts in France was the refusal of both the court and the most important academics to recognize the art of painting as a liberal art. In France, only architecture, music, and poetry had been so ennobled. Painters and printmakers used their hands and were, therefore, considered craftsmen. This was too offensive to the rather strict rules of etiquette followed by the French court. It was only through the efforts of monarchs like François I, Henri IV, and Louis XIII that painting and the other visual arts received the noble status that they had been

2. Bazin 1968, p. 75.
4. For more on Solario in France, see Paris 1985. Due to illness and old age, Leonardo did little painting in France; however, he continued to draw incessantly and his drawings were influential for artists as varied as the Clouets (Mellen 1971, pp. 28–29) and the architects of Chambord (Heydenreich 1957). For more on Leonardo in France, see the two introductory essays in Paris 1952.
granted in Italy over a century before. As late as the
1630s, Louis XIII took painting lessons from Simon
Vouet to encourage the acceptability of painting
among the nobility. 5

This is not to say that France was culturally under-
developed. But the Renaissance north of the Alps was
mainly a literary, rather than a visual one. The Sor-
bonne continued to be a vital center of learning, and
even as early as the beginning of the sixteenth century,
the university had many noted classical scholars.
Indeed, Paris became the center of a lucrative trans-
lation and publication trade for the rest of northern
Europe. 6

THE IMPORTANCE OF FONTAINEBLEAU

The Château de Fontainebleau was the favored resi-
dence of François I. His decision in 1528 to update
its appearance with the latest in Italian decoration
was perhaps the most significant royal act to affect
the course of art in sixteenth- and early seventeenth-
century France. Over the next forty years, under the
direction of three successive chief painters and artistic
advisors—the Florentine Giovanni Battista di Jacopo,
who was known as Rosso Fiorentino, the Bolognese
Francesco Primaticcio, and the Modenese Niccolo
dell'Abbate—the small rural country seat was trans-
formed into an island of Italianate art and culture.
The style of painting that evolved at the chateau from
the mid-1540s to the mid-1560s, where Italian,
Flemish, and French artists collaborated on many
large decorative works, was neither purely French nor
purely Italian. It is an almost indescribable mixture
of the traditions of the many artists who worked
there. But except for the strapwork, or the stuccoed
decoration that Rosso designed to look like hardened
leather around his frescoes in the Galerie François I,
the predominant style was the Bolognese Mannerism
of Primaticcio, who was the longest-lived and most
influential of the three chief painters. The art of
Primaticcio at Fontainebleau, as carried out in the Sal
de Bal, the Porte Dorée, the Appartements de la
chambre de Mme. d'Étampes, the Appartement des
Bains, and the monumental Galerie D'Ulysse, com-
combined the rich color and the Raphael esque figural
vocabulary of the frescoes of his teacher Giulio Romano
at Mantua, and the delicate, more refined, and man-
nered forms of Correggio and Parmigianino. Primatic-
cio's style is characterized, above all, by gentle, grace-
ful gestures and an elegance of form: his slender and
elongated bodies twist, bend, and intertwine like the
vines of a carefully tended trellis. The human form
becomes an extension of the ornamental decoration
that surrounds the scenes. 7

The palace's frescoes were only one of the famed
attractions at Fontainebleau at the end of the sixteenth
century. Henri IV was eager to continue the embel-
ishment of the palace. His extensive renovations,
decorations, and additions to the chateau from the
late 1590s to the early 1620s were led successively by
Toussaint Dubreuil, Ambrose Dubois, and Martin
Frémonet. These artists comprise the Second School of
Fontainebleau and assured the continuity of the Man-
erist tradition through the first two decades of the
seventeenth century. While the style of the first school
set the standard for the decorations, the added presence
of several Flemish artists and Martin Fréminet, who
painted respectively in late Mannerist and Michel-
angelesque styles, introduced a new robustness to
Primaticcio's gentle and elegant manner. The themes
on which many of the decorations were based also
changed. The Homerian world of the gods of Olympus
gave way to the obscure romantic themes, derived
from Heliodorus, which were so popular in northern
European courtly circles at the end of the sixteenth
and beginning of the seventeenth centuries. The
activity that was required to fill the commissions of
the Second School of Fontainebleau continued to
make the chateau an important center for artists. 8

Fontainebleau was also important because of its art
collections, which included one of the greatest as-
semblages of Italian Renaissance paintings outside of

5. For an in-depth discussion of the problem of art and etiquette
in France as well as the issue of the importance of the Renaissance
and the Baroque styles, see the essay by Marc Fumaroli in New

6. A more detailed discussion of the literary aspects of the North-
ern Renaissance may also be found in the introductory essay by

7. What had not been completed at Primaticcio's death was
finished according to his designs by Niccolo dell'Abbate. See
Béguin 1960 and Paris 1972 on the art of Fontainebleau. For
more on the art of Primaticcio, see Dimier 1928.

8. The decorations for Henri IV at the chateau at the beginning
of the seventeenth century are based on Stechow 1953. The work
of the Flemish artist Gabriel D'Hooey was also important at the
chateau (de Hévéy 1950).
Italy. Artists were permitted to study the collections whenever the court was not in residence. The gardens of the chateau were also an attraction. François I had sent Primaticcio to Rome to make what would become the first great collection of copies of many of its most important antique statues. With the assistance of the Modenese architect, Giacomo Vignola, the statues were cast in bronze and eventually placed alongside the original antique and modern works in the Galerie D’Ulysse and the gardens surrounding the chateau. Thus for many French and northern European artists at the beginning of the seventeenth century, Fontainebleau continued to be a magnet for artistic activity. For some, it provided the only opportunity to both see and draw after a major assemblage of classical antiquities. Almost all of the most important painters, even Poussin, either studied the frescoes and statues at the chateau or were apprenticed to a master who had. Fontainebleau was a national treasure. Proof of its continuing significance, well into the seventeenth century, was the publication of the royally financed *Le Trésor des merveilles de la maison royale de Fontainebleau* by Père Dan in 1642.11

**FRANCE AND THE BAROQUE**

Despite the lingering influence of Fontainebleau, French artists and the Parisian public were not wholly unaware of new developments in Italian art at the beginning of the seventeenth century. Through reproductive engravings, prominent collections, and the work of a few well-traveled artists, news of the original antique and modern works in the Galerie D’Ulysse and the gardens surrounding the chateau was quicky throughout Europe. Some French artists were unsatisfied with study at Fontainebleau alone. They were eager to travel to Rome to see these new developments as well as the antique wonders of the city at first hand. With the possible exception of Poussin and Claude, the work of these artists combined the simplified compositions and the more direct narrative formulae of early Roman Baroque painting with the Mannerist figure style of Fontainebleau. This mixture seems to have been more palatable to the conservative tastes of most French patrons than the work of the Italian Baroque artists.12

Paris never really embraced the harsh chiaroscuro and blatant realism of Caravaggio. Barring the short-lived exceptions of a few well-traveled or well-placed artists, French painters who adhered to the style of Caravaggio either stayed in Rome or practiced their craft in major provincial centers like Provence or Lyons. At the invitation of Marie de’Medici, the Florentine Orazio Gentileschi came to Paris around 1625; and though he practiced what R. Ward Bissell has called a poetic and more refined version of Caravaggio’s style, he enjoyed only limited success in Paris and had little effect on the work of most Parisian artists.13 When Simon Vouet, who was also an important follower of Caravaggio in Rome, returned to Paris in 1627, he recognized the Parisian distaste for the style and significantly modified his use of color and light.14

The art of the Carracci and their school was clearly the most important influence on seventeenth-century French art. This is not surprising since the Carracci, like Primaticcio, were Bolognese artists whose powerful, but elegant and refined Classicism appealed to French patrons more than the harsh naturalism of Caravaggio’s chiaroscuro did. The Carracci saw it as their mission to fuse the painterly qualities of north Italian art with the academic rigor of Tuscan and Roman Classicism.15 The artists whom they most admired—Raphael, Correggio, and Parmigianino—were the same artists that the French had been taught to emulate by the Italian artists at Fontainebleau.16 Along with Caravaggio, the Carracci and their school were responsible for the development of the new Baroque style. The classical proportions of the Carracci’s figures, their sensitivity to subtle coloring, and their return to rationally conceived space were a great inspiration for such artists as Claude and Poussin. French artists were only marginally attracted to the Flemish Baroque of Peter Paul Rubens. Rubens came in Wildenstein 1950.

9. For more on the art collection of Francis I, see Cox-Rearick 1972; and for more on the painting collection, in particular, which was kept in the baths of the chateau, see Adhémar 1946.
13. See the introductory essay by Thuillier in Paris 1974; and Goldstein 1971.
14. The research of Charles Sterling (Sterling 1958) and the monograph on Gentileschi by Bissel (Bissel 1981, chapter five) both discuss the artist’s unsuccessful visit.
15. Crelly 1962, chaps. 3 and 5.
to Paris several times between 1622 and 1625 at the invitation of Marie de' Medici to paint the history of her life for the Palais de Luxembourg. He visited and drew after the frescoes of Primaticcio in the Galerie D'Ulysse at Fontainebleau in order to work out some of the decorative details of his own commission. Nonetheless, his series had little influence on French art until almost the end of the century, when the art critic André Félibien praised Rubens for his sensitive use of color and his powerful brushstroke. 18

By the late 1630s the Carracci and Caravaggio were dead. Younger artists who had studied with the Carracci eschewed many of the restrained, classical aspects of their mentors' compositions. A new generation of Italian artists, most eloquently represented by Pietro da Cortona, expressed a new interest in the rich but subtly blended colors and the bold almost sculptural brushwork of Titian and Rubens. This style is often referred to as the High Baroque. 19 It was represented in France by da Cortona's most prominent student, Giovanni Francesco Romanelli, who was invited to paint in Paris by Cardinal Mazarin.

Because of his later arrival and especially his willingness to alter his style to accommodate French taste, Romanelli's paintings enjoyed a greater popularity than had those of Rubens. The decorations that he and Giovanni Francesco Grimaldi, a Bolognese landscapist and printmaker, painted in the Palais Mazarin were so successful that they paved the way for the ready acceptability of the style of the new decorations of Charles Le Brun and his circle fifteen years later. 20

THE FRENCH SOLUTION

Parisian artists created an elegant parallel to the Italian Baroque. Whether it is owing to the somewhat more rational approach to religion amongst both Catholics and Protestants in France, or a desire to continue to pay homage to the remarkable artistic heritage of Fontainebleau, the French version of the Baroque became a subtle and slightly more restrained variant of the more emotional and coloristic Italian and Flemish styles. The French solution is best represented by the work of the two most significant artists in Paris in the first half of the seventeenth century: Georges Lallemand and Simon Vouet.

Lallemand was a Lorrainese artist who moved to Paris at the turn of the century and lived there until his death in 1635. Until Vouet's return from Italy, Lallemand directed the most important workshop in the city. His late Mannerist style is closely related to the brilliant manner of his more famous Lorrainese contemporary, Jacques Bellange: bold colors, dense compositions, and often idiosyncratically defined space. Their usually compressed compositions are crowded with flamboyantly dressed and elegantly gesturing figures, reminiscent of the characters frequently found in Caravaggio's genre scenes. Like Bellange, Lalleman's is an art of courtly exaggeration, and it is no accident that there are many drawings which have been alternately attributed to both artists. 21 Simon Vouet returned to Paris in 1627 after spending over a dozen years in Rome and the Near East. Although he had worked so successfully in the style of Caravaggio in Italy that he had become the first non-Italian director of the Roman Academia di San Luca, his Parisian style was a mixture of the manner of the Carracci and their Academy and the painting of Primaticcio at Fontainebleau. Until his death in 1649, Vouet and his workshop were unequaled for a certain type of grand decorative painting. His gentle, graceful style—marked by classically inspired compositions and figures with slightly elongated limbs, white porcelain-like skin, and elegantly flowing

18. More on the brilliant, but less than celebrated series by Rubens and its later influence on French artists can be found in Thuillier and Foucart 1973, Providence 1975, and Per Bjurström in New York 1987. Anthony Blunt has written more about Rubens in France and some of his students who stayed in Paris after his departure, joining the large group of Flemish artists already there (Blunt 1982, pp. 188–89). Illustrations and commentary on Rubens' drawings after Primaticcio can be found in Held 1960, pp. 53 and 161, and plate 172; Burchard and D'Hulst 1963, pp. 250–253; and van Regteren-Altena 1953. Surprisingly, one of Rubens' students, Pieter van Mol, who painted in his teacher's Baroque style, had some success in the city. He executed a series of paintings in the chapel of Jacques D'Etampes in the Carmelite church in the rue Vaugirard in Paris (Blunt 1982, p. 430, note 98, and Doria 1935). The most successful Flemish artists, however, were those who painted in the more popular late mannerist style, such as the famous portraitist Frans Pourbus (Wilhelm 1963). For more on Flemish printmakers and print dealers in Paris, see Weigert 1969.


20. The article by Roger-Armand Weigert gives details about the architectural and decorative work on the Cardinal's palace (Weigert 1962). Madeleine Laurain-Portemer's research goes into greater depth about the stylistic influence of Romanelli, and the possible political implications that might lie behind Mazarin's new decorations (Laurain-Portemer 1973 and 1975). An exhibition in Paris which focused on Mazarin as a patron of the arts is also informative (Paris 196). 21. The connection between the styles of Lalleman and Bellange will be discussed at greater length in section II.
draperies often obscuring the human form—was challenged only by the brief return of Nicholas Poussin to Paris in 1642.

Nicholas Poussin left Paris for Rome in 1629. As most French artists of his generation, he had studied the frescoes and statues at Fontainebleau, and although available documentation is inconclusive, he may also have studied with Georges Lallemant. Marino, an Italian poet patronized by Marie de'Medici and Louis XIII, remarked that Poussin made drawings after the engravings of Marcantonio Raimondi. In order to support himself when he arrived in Rome, Poussin spent over two years making drawings after antique statues for the "Paper Museum" of Cassiano dal Pozzo. Poussin’s style developed from these rigorous studies after antique statues and classical Renaissance paintings. In his late paintings of the 1650s and early 1660s, which were later regarded as examples of "perfect painting" by the French Academy, Poussin became increasingly interested in the didactic possibilities of painting. Drawing was more important than color or painterly virtuosity, which he felt often obscured the moral message of a painting. Accordingly, as Anthony Blunt has noted, Poussin sacrificed richness of color, spontaneity of design, and freedom of handling to create a style which would better convey his intended message. He studied ancient armor, weapons, and buildings to make his references to the antique more accurate. He studied the movement of light and the movement of figures in space with puppets placed on a specially designed miniature stage. He even tried to codify individual human emotions to enable viewers to read his works. These studies resulted in the austere and intellectual paintings that came to be held as the embodiment of French Classicism.

Although he had not yet created his most classical compositions, by 1642 Poussin had already established an international reputation. A group of artists in Paris, which included Laurent de La Hyre, Philippe de Champaigne, and Eustache LeSueur, admired his work and began to express dissatisfaction with the decorative style of Vouet. They developed a new style which Marc Fumaroli and Jacques Thuillier have called Parisian Atticism. While it has often been referred to as Classical, it is only relatively so. The difference between their art and the pure Classicism of Poussin's was a direct reflection of their failure to pursue the study of Roman antiquities. Hence, the Paris-based artists were unable to grasp the foundations upon which Poussin's art was created. The relatively small group of copies at Fontainebleau could not compare with the vast treasures of Rome. The palettes of La Hyre and LeSueur remained full of brilliant color, and their conception of space, unlike the rationally conceived perspective of Poussin's compositions, was often somewhat flat. Thus, Parisian Atticism of the 1640s and the 1650s was a classicizing rather than a truly Classical style that never fully broke away from the influence of the school of Vouet. Yet these Attic artists did provide a bridge to the work of Le Brun and his school in the early 1660s. Most of these later artists pursued a long period of study in Italy and were better prepared to follow in the footsteps of Poussin.

22. See William Crelly's monograph for more on Vouet's painting in Paris (Crelly 1962, pp. 49–131).
23. See the introductory essay by Elizabeth Broun, "The Portable Raphael" in Lawrence 1981.
24. Cassiano dal Pozzo was a wealthy Roman dilettante. His Paper Museum was a compendium of drawn copies after all of the remains of antiquity in the area surrounding Rome (Haskell 1980, pp. 44–46 and pp. 98–117).
cat. 36. Michel Dorigny. *Saint Margaret*. Davison Art Center, Wesleyan University.
The slow displacement of Mannerism by the new developments of the Baroque period was as characteristic of printmaking as it was of painting. In the six decades from 1600 to 1660, the tightly controlled and systematic style typical of late Mannerist engraving was gradually supplanted by an increasing tendency to exploit the painterly qualities of etching and engraving. French printmakers began to explore the possibilities of stark contrasts of light and dark, less emphatic contour lines, and unsystematic methods of hatching. There was a new sensitivity to the surface of the print. This can be seen in their increased use of the white of the sheet and the granular, gritty, almost tangible quality of their lines. These rough, unrestful surfaces, combined with a new use of line and light, resulted in a technique that was better suited to express the luminous light and graceful movement of the French Baroque style. Among the reasons for this development, the heritage of Fontainebleau, an increasing awareness of Italian Renaissance prints, and a growing preference for etching seem to be the most significant.

French printmaking, as French painting of the seventeenth century, was deeply indebted to the School of Fontainebleau. One of the most important legacies of Jean Mignon, Antonio Fantuzzi, Master L.D., and the other etchers active at the chateau was the unity of their surface. Unlike the rationally conceived space of the art of the High Renaissance and the later half of the seventeenth century, Mannerist art lives on the surface of its support. Etching rather than engraving was most suited to capturing Primaticcio's Bolognese Mannerism. As Henri Zerner has suggested, the graceful, but frozen forms and the smooth, polished precision of the contemporary engravings of Pierre Milan and his student René Boyvin were unable to capture the subtle coloring and sparkling spontaneity of Primaticcio's surfaces.

Certainly, Fontainebleau also provided an opportunity for French printmakers to understand and appreciate Italian Renaissance prints. The most influential works were the open and freely drawn etchings of Parmigianino. His works continued to be an important source of inspiration for artists at the beginning of the seventeenth century, especially for painters, who found that they need not learn the difficult, arduous, and time-consuming task of engraving. Etching offered the painter the opportunity to draw directly on the covered ground of the plate. It also offered a wider range of stylistic possibilities. Etching could be used systematically, like engraving, with swelling and tapering lines in the manner of Callot (cat. 7), or it could be used to create a print which resembles a free-hand drawing in pen and ink, such as those of Parmigianino or Vignon (cat. 18). But even when etching utilized the vocabulary of engraving, it offered a less laborious, and sometimes more delicate effect than the perfect finish of the engraver's burin.

Venetian Renaissance prints were also influential for French artists. The grand and powerful woodcuts of Titian and his followers were executed with a freedom that paralleled Parmigianino's etchings. While the woodcut was relegated to the world of popular imagery in seventeenth-century France, the significance of Titian's draftsmanship for French artists has too often been overlooked. It is known, for example, and more bibliography, see the section on prints in Paris 1972.

27. Zerner is one of the first art historians to make a distinction between the etchers and engravers who were primarily active at Fontainebleau in the 1540s and those who worked in Paris or elsewhere from the 1550s to the 1580s. See the introduction to Zerner 1969, and for a particularly insightful review of Zerner on this topic see Adhémar 1969. For works by each of these artists and more bibliography, see the section on prints in Paris 1972.

28. Zerner's comments about the greater ability of the etchings at Fontainebleau to capture the special qualities inherent in Primaticcio's paintings are discussed at greater length in Zerner 1969, pp. 15–16. The influence of Parmigianino is discussed in greater detail in Zerner 1966.
that Martin Fréminet copied the woodcuts of Titian and the Campagnola and that both Pierre Brébiette and Claude Vignon made prints after Veronese.  

Marcantonio Raimondi's engravings after Raphael, with their systematic hatching and cross-hatching, curved lines and dots, possessed a classical restraint which the French admired. The formal and regularized aspects of these engravings were significant for those of René Boyvin, Étienne DeLaunne, and Androuet DuCerceau, the most important engravers active in France in the second half of the sixteenth century. Their works utilize a similar, and often even more labored technique, to achieve smooth, almost polished surfaces. The engravings of Raimondi and Giorgio Ghisi, who actually spent two years in France, often provided French artists their only introduction to the works of Raphael. For many, however, it was Raphael's content more than Raimondi's technique that was of crucial importance. Nicholas Chappron copied Raphael's Loggie in the Vatican, but his rich and flowing etching style has very little to do with Marcantonio's or Ghisi's systematic manner. Chappron was more reliant on the work of the artists at Fontainebleau and the work of Federico Barocci of Urbino. On the other hand, Marcantonio's engravings continued to be important for artists like Thomas de Leu (cat. 11) and Léonard Gaultier (cat. 9), who carried the late sixteenth-century Mannerist tradition of tight, polished, ornamental portrait engraving into the seventeenth century.

Although Barocci produced only four prints, his influence, like that of Parmigianino, far outdistanced the small size of his oeuvre. Barocci developed a method of combining etching and engraving that was particularly remarkable for its painterly possibilities. By etching his plate again and again, he created extremely rich blacks that enabled him to achieve a wide range of color values: from the very dark blacks of the continually etched sections of the plate, and the subtle grays of the lightly worked middle tones, to the pure white of the untouched portions of the plate. He combined this technique of etching and re-etching with stippling and hatching of varying lengths. Barocci's technical achievements were also significant for artists like Jacques Bellange and Michel Dorigny. As Louise Richards has shown, Bellange often utilized Barocci's elaborate etching technique as a means of dramatizing form through strong patterns of light and dark. Although Dorigny's technique is often less labored, he too utilized Barocci's methods of creating light-filled surfaces in order to heighten the theatricality of his copy of Vouet's St. Margaret (cat. 36).

The stylistic revolution of the Carracci and their Academy was as important for French printmaking as it was for painting. Agostino, who was by far the most prolific printmaker in the group, tried to devise a style of engraving in which he could fuse the painterly, Mannerist qualities of Titian, Correggio, and Parmigianino, with the Classicism of Raphael. By varying the use of the white of the sheet, and the length, width, and curvature of his hatching, and by using a light stippling technique, Agostino was able to achieve many of the tonal and textural effects of Venetian painting. His simplified technique and chiaroscuro were extremely influential for the linear and open work of an artist like Claude Mellan (cat. 28–31). In the final analysis, however, Agostino's engravings remained more traditional than the prints of his brother, Annibale. The linear freedom and

29. Jean Le Clerc and Jacques Blanchard, often called the French Titian, also spent many years in Venice (Ivanof 1959 and Sterling 1962). Vouet and Bourdon also visited Venice and admired the works they saw there. For more on Martin Fréminet and his copies after the woodcuts of Titian and the Campagnola, see Béguin 1960. For examples of the etchings and engravings made by French artists after the work of Veronese, see the exhibition catalogue by Paolo Ticozzi (Rome 1978). The fact that Laurent de La Hyre, an artist who did not travel to Italy, was also inspired by Venetian art is particularly significant (Blunt 1982, p. 248). An indication of the wealth and variety of art represented in the major collections of Paris that would have permitted less fortunate or well-traveled artists to study after important works of Italian art is revealed in the research of Edmond Bonaffé (Bonaffé 1884).

30. For more on the work of Boyvin, see Levron 1941; on the DuCerceau, see Geümüller 1887; and on DeLaunne and his workshop, see Eisler 1965. A recent exhibition of the School of Fontainebleau, curated by Kathleen Wilson-Chevalier, attempted to include a wider array of sixteenth-century prints by studying the


32. Only six, or possibly sixteen, prints have been attributed to Parmigianino (Providence 1973, pp. 86–88 and Oberhuber in Vienna 1966).


34. Diane DeGrazia Bohlin has written extensively on the Carracci as printmakers. See the introduction to Washington 1979. Agostino was so impressed with the works of Barocci that he sent the reclusive artist a print that he had made after one of his paintings. For more on this and Barocci's less than positive response, see New Haven 1978, pp. 108–109.
textural variety of Annibale’s combined etching and engravings of the 1590s—the irregular hatching, the hastily drawn lines, and the barely indicated backgrounds—produced far more innovative prints. His technique was the most significant source for the etchings of Guido Reni, a prominent student of the Carracci. Along with the etchings of Barocci, those of Annibale and Reni served as a foundation for the printmakers of Vouet’s circle. Nothing could demonstrate this debt more than the light touch and the loose, irregular vocabulary of Chappron’s The Alliance of Bacchus and Venus (cat. 33).

Printmaking in Holland and Flanders during the seventeenth century has been characterized as a quest for tonal qualities. With the exception of a handful of etchings by Claude Vignon, which betray a passionate interest in Pieter Lastman and Rembrandt, French artists never strove as vigorously for tonal effects. They were never as experimental in their approach to etching, only rarely emulating the Dutch exploitation of the drawn qualities of the etched line, the painterly potential of granular biting, or the pictorial possibilities obtained through drastic reworkings of the plate and subtle variations of inking.

37. Washington 1979, p. 52. For more on Annibale’s influence on Reni, to the point of confusion between the two hands concerning a group of prints first attributed to Reni by Bartsch, see Birke 1987, p. 279. For more on the influence of the prints of the Carracci on the work of Claude Mellan see the conclusion of the introduction to Washington 1979.
38. See the introduction by Clifford Ackley in Boston 1981.
Nor was France the home of the painterly mezzotint. The only evidence of a taste for dramatic chiaroscuro in French printmaking may be found in the large production of popular images after Caravaggesque artists by Jean Boulanger, Daniel Rabel, Charles David, and others. Although the works of many northern artists, especially Lucas van Leyden and Rembrandt, were as avidly collected in France as they were in other parts of Europe, in the final analysis French artists were attracted to another side of the search for tone: the painterly suggestion of color and texture realized by a subtler use of line and an increased sensitivity to the surface of the print.

**The State of the Research**

The historical and, to a lesser extent, the aesthetic aspects of the history of French printmaking have received a fair amount of scholarly attention over the years. But another significant part of that history—the role of the publisher and the printseller—has only recently generated interest among scholars. The research of Jacques Kuhnmünch has revealed that by the second half of the seventeenth century, the most active center for reproductive printmaking had shifted from Rome to Paris. And Roger-Armand Weigert has discovered that despite the Parisian distaste for Caravaggio’s paintings, the single largest group of seventeenth-century prints consisted of copies of dramatic genre scenes painted by northern followers of Caravaggio.

As Weigert has shown, printers, dealers, and artists lived, worked, and intermarried within a small and closely-knit community centered around the rue St. Jacques, on the left bank near the Seine. Recent research by Paolo Bellini has more accurately described the roles of the individuals involved in the making and selling of prints. There, the tasks performed by the artist, publisher, printer, and printseller were four distinct ones, even though they were sometimes performed by the same person. The role of the artist-printmaker was, of course, to create, or in some cases, to record the designs of other artists. If he did not or could not print his own work, he sought out a printer. The role of the printer was solely to oversee the technical details of the actual printing process. If the printer did not have a license to publish the works that he printed, the artist would have to take the works to a publisher. It was understood that the publisher, who often commissioned the work, owned

---

39. Weigert has written at great length on the production of popular prints after Caravaggesque artists (Weigert 1940 and Weigert 1953). For more on France and the chiaroscuro woodcut in the seventeenth century, see the catalogue entries on Büsinck and Lallemant.
40. The role of the print as a source of information has been discussed in the standard works by Ivins 1953, and Mayor 1971. For the role of the popular print in France from the fifteenth to the nineteenth centuries see Paris 1973. One particularly interesting creator of popular woodcuts in the seventeenth century, Jacques Lagniet, deserves special note (Weigert 1969). For a discussion on the collecting of prints in northern Europe for their informative value as well as their beauty, see the essay by William Robinson in Boston 1981.
42. See note 40, above.
43. Weigert 1953.
the plate as well as the sheets or editions. Sometimes, of course, printers were also publishers; and in rare and notable cases, a large workshop engaged artists to engrave the plates and then printed and published them itself. 44 Four extraordinary figures, whose names appear frequently at the bottom of etchings and engravings published in Paris in the seventeenth century, are Israel Henriet, François Langlois, called Ciartes, and the Pierres Mariette. The varied activities of these four men, who at different times performed each of the above mentioned roles, permit students of seventeenth-century French painting and printmaking to examine the activity of the inhabitants of the rue St. Jacques, with a wealth of detail that is rarely possible. 45

44. Bellini 1975.
45. Students of seventeenth-century French prints are forever indebted to the research of Roger-Armand Weigert for much of the information that we have on this field. For a list of his writings, see Gardey 1986. For more on Langlois and the two Mariettes see Weigert 1953.
Although the independent duchy of Lorraine was officially a part of the Holy Roman Empire, politically judicious marriages at the end of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth centuries also linked it to the ruling houses of France, Florence, and Mantua. Of these, the art and culture of France had the most significant influence on the Lorrainese court. Actually, the close cultural ties between France and Lorraine had begun to strengthen early in the sixteenth century. The dukes of Lorraine had been loyal supporters of the French kings and even sent their sons to be educated at the French court. Thus by 1634, when Lorraine was annexed by France, the culture of the duchy was already predominately French, placing the work produced by Lorrainese artists well within the scope of this exhibition.

The active patronage of Duke Charles III (reigned 1545–1608) and his son Duke Henri II (reigned 1608–1624) supported a brilliant form of late Mannerist art. Dozens of sculptors, architects, and painters were employed in the capital city of Nancy: building the ville neuve, or the new city, just outside the walls of the old city; building and decorating many new churches; and extending and refurbishing the ducale palace. These decorations were directly inspired by the painting style of the Second School of Fontainebleau. In fact, two French painters, Jacques Danglus and Claude Henriet, were brought to Nancy from France to execute the most important projects. Despite its heavy dependency on Paris, Lorraine remained more intimately connected with provincial French and northern European traditions. A parallel retention of an indigenous Gothicism is evident in the flat, pointed, and curiously misshapen figures frequently found in the art of Bellange. At the same time, the infiltration of Mannerist and Early Baroque elements manifests itself in the refinement and static elegance of Boissard’s Promenading Couple (cat. 1) and Bellange’s The Gardener (cat. 3). Lorrainese artists used these very different sources to create an almost overly sophisticated art that participated simultaneously in the extremes of both elegance and repulsiveness. The courtly aspects found their most eloquent expression in works inspired by the extravagant pageantry and ornate ephemera of the theater, which was heavily patronized by the nobility. This connection might help to explain the bizarre, incredibly refined, enigmatic, and exaggerated figures often seen in the work of both Bellange and Callot. The extreme of repulsiveness was most vividly embodied by Bellange’s haggard Two Tramps Fighting (cat. 4) and Callot’s gripping Disasters of War. None of these individual characteristics were unique to Lorrainese art, but together, they take on an importance in the art of the duchy that is without parallel in any of the other centers of late Mannerism.

Etching and engraving were heavily patronized by the Lorrainese court. Some artists, such as Bellange, worked exclusively after their own designs. Others, such as Callot and François Collignon, also produced commissioned works, recording the many funerals, marriages, ballets, and other court and public cele-

1. More information on the artistic activities at the court of Lorraine in the early seventeenth century can be found in the introduction to Des Moines 1975 and Roy 1914. For more on the churches built by the many religious groups who were converging on Lorraine during the Counter-Reformation, see Pfister 1909 and the introduction to the section on religion by H. Diane Russell in Washington 1975. There is a brief discussion of Lorrainese painting and its connection with Fontainebleau in Des Moines 1975, pp. 9–10. For more, see Pariset’s article on the paintings of Jacques Bellange (Pariset 1950). Although many of his attributions to Bellange have been criticized, these works are a good example of the type of painting that was popular when Bellange was active at the court.

2. This quality is particularly noticeable in Bellange’s Three Marys (Walch 46), which is unfortunately not in the exhibition.

3. Many of the characteristics assigned to Lorrainese art in this essay refer more generally to the art of Alsace-Lorraine or Lotharingia. Boissard was active in both France and Strasbourg, a major city in Alsace (Comer 1984b).

brations sponsored by the Duke. Series of prints commemorating these events were often bound into fête books and sent to the other major courts of Europe. One of these, the 1611 production of the Pompe Funèbre de Charles III, Duc de Lorraine, is particularly important because it documents the first recorded use of etching in Lorraine. But the fact that Frederick Brentel was brought from Strasbourg to etch the plates suggests that there were as yet no resident etchers in Lorraine. It also serves as a reminder that Bellange's magnificent group of just over forty etchings were only executed after 1610, while Callot did not return to Nancy until 1621.

The etchers and engravers of early seventeenth-century Lorraine were the first French printmakers to exploit the tonal and textural qualities of etching and engraving. These tendencies are evident in the work of the two most significant artists of the period, Callot and Bellange. The work of Jacques Bellange reflects his training as a court painter, rather than as an engraver. His combination of multiple biting, stippling, burnishing, and irregular hatching makes his etchings the most painterly French prints of the period.

In two of Bellange's early works, Diana and Orion (cat. 2) and The Gardener (cat. 3), he combined a very light etching technique with burnishing, stippling, and irregular hatching to evoke the animated flickering quality of his two preparatory drawings. In contrast to the gentle technique of his earlier work, Bellange's Two Tramps Fighting (cat. 4) is a bold and gripping print, full of stark contrasts between light and dark. Irregular hatching strokes, together with crosshatching, heavy stippling, re-etched lines, and unetched areas make the sheet come alive with action. Etchings like these acted as the most important northern link between the loose and open work of the etchers at Fontainebleau in the mid-1540s and the painterly etchings and engravings of the printmakers of the School of Vouet in the 1630s and 1640s.

Unlike Bellange, who was primarily active as a painter, Jacques Callot was trained as an engraver. Although he often used the systematic vocabulary of engraving for his etchings, he frequently combined his traditional technique with a spare, linear drawing and a rich, varied surface. Callot's The Slave Auction (cat. 6) typifies his many city views and town fairs. These often complex compositions are organized by his crisp and calligraphic line. An illusion of great depth is evoked through both tonal and linear contrasts, as between the deeply bitten, heavily cross-hatched towers and the lightly etched, more summarily drawn view beyond the Pont Neuf. The dual emphasis on tone and texture is most evident in the Temptation of St. Anthony (cat. 7), one of Callot's last prints, in which the rich pattern of lights and darks, from the flat white of the sheet to the heavily etched, raised black of the demon, underlines the drama of the saint's vision.

Callot's contribution to the development of landscape in French art was considerable. The interest in pure landscape as a genre had grown steadily in the sixteenth century, particularly among northern European artists such as Albrecht Altdorfer and Pieter Bruegel, and north Italian artists such as Titian and Domenico Campagnola. Callot would have had an opportunity to see their prints in the studio of his teacher, Philippe Thomassin, when he was in Rome from 1612 to 1614. When Callot moved to Florence in 1614, his duties as a court artist brought him into close contact with such artists as Giulio Parigi and Remigio Cantagallina, whose landscape drawings in pen and ink had the most influence on Callot's early landscapes. Like Parigi, Callot favored a horizontal format and the use of thick, rhythmic crosshatching to describe the buildings, trees, or large figures in the foreground.

Callot published two sets of etchings after his landscape drawings when he returned to Lorraine in 1621. There, his interest in landscape increased and he produced boldly executed wash drawings that evoked the gentle movement and soft light of the Lorrainese countryside. Callot often translated these brush and wash sketches into pen and ink studies that may have been preparatory for further suites of landscape prints. After his death, Callot's student, François

5. The first etchings of Jacques Bellange are recorded in this book. It is assumed that he learned the art from Brentel, while assisting him in his work. For more on etching in Lorraine at the beginning of the seventeenth century, see the introduction to Des Moines 1975. For more on Brentel, see Marot 1951.

6. Although he was primarily active as a painter, the only visual documents of Bellange's style are his just over forty etchings and his just over eighty drawings. For more on the painting of Jacques Bellange at the court of Lorraine, see the records of his activity in Des Moines 1975, p. 19.

7. The two preparatory drawings are Diana and Orion, pen and brown ink and brown wash, with extraneous spots of red chalk and green paint (John S. Thatcher Collection, Pierpont Morgan Library, New York), and Hortulana, pen and brown ink, blue wash (Nationalmuseum, Stockholm).

Collignon, and his friend and publisher, Israel Henri-riet, issued two sets of etchings after Callot’s late drawings (cat. 8). These etchings were enormously popular; their unusually small, horizontal format, rhythmic crosshatching, and lightly etched backgrounds were extremely influential for the original work of such artists as Nicholas de Son (cat. 25) and Stefano della Bella (cat. 22).

ROBERT BOISSARD (ca. 1570–after 1601)

Little is known about Robert Boissard. Born in Valence, he was probably the son of Jean-Jacques Boissard, who is frequently referred to as a draftsman and man of letters. Although it is generally assumed that Boissard worked in Alsace-Lorraine, because of a series of engraved portraits of British naval and military commanders, Arthur Hind suggested that he may also have worked in England (Hind 1952).

1 Promenading Couple
   From The Masquerades, 1597
   Engraving; 199 x 134 mm
   LeBlanc 27; Linzeler 16
   Yale University Art Gallery; Everett V. Meeks, B.A. 1901, Fund
   1987.28.1
   Illustrated this page

The masque was a courtly form of entertainment in which the actors donned masks representing stock characters in comic productions. At the Florentine court in the sixteenth century, these performances were frequently combined with a ball in which the characters mingled with the courtiers. The presence of two Medici queens in France undoubtedly contributed to the importance of the masque at the French court. By the end of the sixteenth century, the masked ball had evolved into an independent form of entertainment. The fantasy and mystery of the costumed events made them especially popular as a form of relaxation from the strict etiquette and daily obligations of court life.

9. Most of these drawings are housed today in a large album of the artist’s drawings at Chatsworth. See Ternois 1962, pp. 161–165, and Ternois 1954.

Boissard’s Masquerades included twenty-four plates. The series was inspired by two earlier northern sources: the set of twelve Large Wedding Dancers by Heinrich Aldegrever (Hollstein 160–171) and the ten Masks of Jacques de Geyn (Hollstein 115–124). It was designed by his father and published in Strasbourg in 1597. The set includes scenes of elegant, promenading couples and groups of masked and unmasked figures. The verse below the couple alludes to how easily disguised evil-doers can deceive the unaware.
Jacques Bellange was active at the court of Lorraine from 1602 until 1616. He probably studied painting with Claude Henriet, who had come from France to Lorraine at the request of Duke Charles III to work on the decorations for the newly built extension to the palace complex. While it is known that Bellange journeyed to Fontainebleau, it cannot be established that he also took a study trip to Italy. It may be conjectured that he learned the art of etching from Frederick Brentel of Strasbourg who came to Nancy in 1610/11. Although Bellange became the leading painter at the court after the death of Henriet in 1608, his reputation today is based solely on prints and drawings.

2 Diana and Orion, ca. 1612
Etching; 467 x 206 mm (trimmed inside platemark)
Robert-Dumesnil 36 ii/iii; Walch 10 ii/iii
Davison Art Center, Wesleyan University
43.D1-23

Although the depiction of Diana riding on the shoulders of Orion occasionally appears in the Renaissance, the story does not appear to come from ancient mythology. Diana, one of twelve deities of Olympus, was the chaste goddess of the hunt and the sister of Apollo. The ancient Greek writer, Apollodorus, was the first to relate the myth of Orion. The giant was blinded as punishment for the attempted rape of princess Merope of Chios. An oracle told him to travel east to the edge of the world, where the rays of the rising sun would restore his sight. To guide Orion on his journey, Vulcan, blacksmith to the gods, walked ahead of the giant, while Cedallion, an apprentice in Vulcan’s forge, rode on Orion’s shoulders. His sight restored, Orion was eventually killed by Diana, who transformed his image into a constellation. A painting based on the Orion myth was first described in the Eikones by the ancient Roman rhetorician and satirist Lucian. Here, Orion is seen carrying his guide Cedallion, while Vulcan watched from the clouds above.

The story behind Bellange’s variation—probably inspired by an engraving by Giorgio Ghisi after a Luca Penni drawing—may have its roots in the medieval habit of seeking moral interpretations of the classical myths. One such text is the Mythologiae of Natalis Comes (1636). There Orion is paired with Diana: “The long-stretched storm clouds through which the giant is striding, the cloud that conspicuously rises from under the trees, expands through the valley, gathers up in the air and touches Diana’s feet, this cloud is nothing but Orion, himself, in his ‘real’ esoteric meaning.” 1 Bellange’s own verses speak of Orion’s pleasure in being the bearer of his goddess.2

1. This suggestion was first offered by Ernst Gombrich in his search for the sources that Poussin may have consulted for his painted Orion in the Metropolitan Museum of Art (Gombrich 1944). Gombrich also discussed the theme of Diana and Orion and the popularity of Natalis Comes’ Mythologiae among seventeenth-century artists. For more on the print by Ghisi and its connection with the design of Luca Penni, see the discussion by Suzanne Boorsch in New York 1985, pp. 91–93.
2. A complete transcription is given in Des Moines 1975, p. 31.

3 The Gardener, ca. 1613
Etching; 344 x 188 mm (trimmed)
Robert-Dumesnil 44; Walch 11
Yale University Art Gallery; Edward V. Meeks, B.A. 1901, Fund 1959.9.63
Illustrated p. 18

This etching is one of a set of four prints that are known as The Hortulana or Garden Series. It has been suggested that the ensemble was designed for the opening of Duke Henri II’s new Italian Garden in 1611. 1 Although little is known about this particular celebration, Bellange frequently designed costumes and decorations for court festivities. 2 The hypothesis would explain the peculiar elegance of the figure’s boneless hands; her long, tapering, aristocratic fingers; her poise; the elegance of her urn; and her classically-inspired slippers. She is surely not the average peasant dressed for a country dance. Amy Worthen has further suggested that the gardeners relate to a tradition of late sixteenth-century imagery that has yet to be fully explored.3

The Hortulana series must have been completed relatively early in Bellange’s career as an etcher: by 1615 it had already been copied by Matthaeus Mertrian of Strasbourg.

1. See the discussion by Amy Worthen in Des Moines 1975.
2. François-Georges Pariset and Bengt Dahlback have written on Bellange and the theater (Pariset and Dahlback 1954).
The hurdy-gurdy was invented in France sometime during the late Middle Ages. Although it was originally considered a courtly and sophisticated instrument admired for its beautiful harmonies, by the fifteenth century, its appeal was apparently restricted to the lower classes. The instrument had become particularly associated with beggars and blindness: artists as varied as Goltzius, Annibale Carracci, Bruegel, and Hans Sebald Beham portrayed blind beggars singing to its accompaniment. Bellange’s theme of two fighting beggars also comes from a tradition of European genre painting. Both Pieter Aertsen and Hieronymous Bosch made this the focus of some of their works.


Jacques CalLOT (1592–1635)

Jacques Callot was one of the most prolific graphic artists of the seventeenth century. He was born in Nancy in 1592 and by 1607 his father, Herald of Arms to Duke Charles III, had already apprenticed his precocious son to Demenge-Dominique Crocq, a Nancy goldsmith. Callot was in Rome as early as 1612, where he worked under the French engraver Philippe Thomassin (Bruwert 1915, pp. 59–65). From 1614 to 1621 he worked as a court artist in Florence for Grand Duke Cosimo II de’Medici. He returned to Lorraine in 1621 where he received a large number of commissions from the ducal court at Nancy. He also frequently traveled to France and the Low Countries to fill important royal and private commissions. Callot’s oeuvre is quite large, including city views, prints of court life in Nancy and Florence, scenes of the destruction of war, and scenes of both beggars and proper bourgeois ladies and gentlemen. Callot discovered and perfected a new hard ground composed of mastic and linseed oil which, unlike those previously used, remained firmly attached to the plates rather than chipping off. The artist died in Nancy in 1635.

1. Demange 1907.

During most of the seventeenth century, the French were heavily involved in the African slave trade, yet this print is one of the few seventeenth-century French images of any kind to depict this lucrative and inhumane business. It is indicative of Callot’s delight in depicting the everyday lives of the French people that he would make such an etching. As in many of his works, the slave auction in the right foreground constitutes only a small part of the activity in this busy Parisian quarter. This undoubtedly explains why the work has been more generally titled The Little View of Paris.

1. The roles of several European nations in the African slave trade has been researched by Basil Davidson (Davidson 1980, pp. 74–76).
Saint Anthony, also known as Anthony the Great, was born in Upper Egypt. On the death of his parents, he distributed his wealth to the poor and exiled himself to the desert to contemplate in total solitude. One result of his ascetic existence was vivid hallucinations (also associated with “St. Anthony’s fire” or ergotism). He is often depicted being attacked or even carried off by demons. The attacks would persist until God appeared to him in a bright light. Callot returned to older visual sources, such as the paintings of Hieronymous Bosch, and the powers of his own imagination to create one of the most memorable depictions of the saint’s hallucinations.

Although it is not commonly realized, religious works make up a large part of Callot’s extensive oeuvre. He must have had a particular interest in the life of Saint Anthony, for this is the second image of the Temptation. Below the scene is the artist’s dedication of the work to Monsieur Phelypeaux, the Seigneur de Lavrilliére.

1. See the section on religion in Washington 1975.
3. The full transcription and its translation are given in Washington 1975, p. 178.
FRANÇOIS COLLIGNON (1609/10–1657)

It is assumed that François Collignon was born sometime around 1610, the year that his baptism was recorded in the Church of St. Sebastian in Nancy. Jacques Callot recognized his talent and took him as an apprentice, indelibly stamping Collignon's style with his own. In 1631 Collignon was working in Augsburg, and by 1634 he was in Rome. He settled in Paris in 1639. Finally, the artist returned to Rome in 1647 where, except for a brief trip to Paris, he remained until his death. Collignon engraved his own designs as well as the work of others. He is known to have copied many of the works of Callot. Because of the thousands of prints in Collignon's possession at his death, it would seem that he was a publisher of prints as well.

These two works are from the second set of etchings issued by Israel Henriet shortly after Callot's death in 1635. Edouard Meaume shared Mariette's opinion that François Collignon executed them after Callot's drawings. On the other hand, Jules Lieure felt that Henriet etched the entire set. Yet there are only three plates which bear the artist's signature in the form "Henriet fec.," casting doubt on this otherwise equally justifiable attribution. It would seem that both Henriet and Collignon collaborated on the project, especially given Collignon's relationship to his former master. This is seen in the bold swelling lines of the title page, which has never been ascribed to anyone other than Collignon. We believe that Collignon also etched the Landscape with Chateau and a Duckhunter, since it does not bear Henriet's excludit. Except for the fact that the etching is in reverse, Collignon translated Callot's careful drawing almost line for line.

1. Meaume 1888, p. 475.
2. Lieure 1929, p. 162.
II. Parisian Mannerism

At the beginning of the seventeenth century, France had just emerged from the Wars of Religion. Although they ostensibly resulted from a dispute between Catholics and Protestants, in reality the great noble families had fought in hope of regaining some of the political and economic autonomy they had enjoyed before the autocratic and centralizing policies of François I. These wars had left France economically exhausted and politically unstable; but the strength, sharp mind, and winning personality of Henri IV (reigned 1589–1610) enabled France to overcome many of her internal difficulties.

From the moment that he triumphantly entered Paris in 1594, Henri began extensive building projects, employing such artists as Ambrose Dubois, Martin Fréminet, and Jacques Buein at the Louvre and at Fontainebleau. Henri was eager to patronize the arts on the lavish scale of the Valois kings in order to establish a sense of continuity between the old Valois and the new Bourbon dynasties. His court was the setting for extravagant ballets and colorful pageants, for which costumes and decorations were designed by artists such as Antoine Caron and Daniel Rabel.

This burst of late Mannerist creativity continued after the death of Henry IV in 1610, through the troubled regency of Marie de'Medici (1610–ca. 1620) and the early reign of Louis XIII. Although the return of Simon Vouet in 1627 is usually regarded as marking the end of the stylistic hegemony of Georges Lallemant and his contemporaries, a number of artists continued to paint and engrave in a retardataire fashion until the middle of the century. This protracted survival of late Mannerism may be explained by the patronage of the Précieux, a group of politically weakened and disenchanted Parisian aristocrats who continued to prefer the refined and courtly style of painting and literature popular at the end of the sixteenth century. The group’s conservative taste in the visual arts was clearly set forth in the publication of Charles de Scudéry’s Le Cabinet de Monsieur de Scudéry in 1646. Here are described the delights of an imaginary picture gallery hung with paintings, prints, and drawings by such Mannerist artists as Niccolo dell’Abbate, Martin Fréminet, Correggio, Pontormo, and Callot. It is not surprising, then, that the Précieux patronized artists such as Claude Vignon, Pierre Brébiette, and Georges Lallemant.

While etching had become the preferred medium of major printmakers in Lorraine at the beginning of the seventeenth century, conservative patronage and the unceasing demand for portraits guaranteed the continued vitality of engraving in Paris. Accordingly, many Parisian prints were engraved after portrait drawings by such well-known artistic families as the Quesnel and the Dumoustier, who were heavily patronized at the French court.

1. See Introduction, fn. 8.
2. Kathleen Wilson-Chevalier has suggested that Henry IV and his heir, Louis XIII, continued the decorations at Fontainebleau in part to stress their connection with the former kings of France (Wilson-Chevalier 1982).
3. Although the work of Daniel Rabel could not be included in the exhibition, his important role as both a designer of court ballets and an illustrator is discussed in Meyer 1979 and 1983. A recently discovered group of drawings by the artist and his workshop reveals the types of Mannerist costumes and decorations that were used in these festivities (McGowan 1986). For more on the work of Antoine Caron see Ehrmann 1955.
4. Anthony Blunt and Jean Adhémar have written the most insightful articles on the influence of the Précieux (Blunt 1957 and Adhémar 1967). For the literary tastes of the group see Stechow 1953, Paris 1968, and Blunt 1937.
5. Blunt has noted that the fashion for portrait drawings in this period led to the “setting up of regular factories for supplying them” (Blunt 1982, p. 116). The task of distinguishing the individual hands of these families has been attempted with varying success by E. Moreau-Nélaton and Irene Adler (Moreau-Nélaton 1907 and Adler 1929).
the head as a solid mass, but one which was softened by the most subtle details of physiognomy in black and red chalk.\textsuperscript{6} In the hands of the early seventeenth-century followers of the Clouets, this type of portrait drawing was still elegant but less subtle and more formulaic. Their translation into engraving, moreover, imparted an even greater stiffness. The rigidity and formality of the prints are often relieved only by the ornate dress of the sitters and the decorative ornamentalism of the frames.

The technique of Léonard Gaultier's Portrait of Pierre de Gamaches (cat. 9), for example, is similarly rooted in earlier techniques, specifically those found in the engravings of René Boyvin and Pierre Milan. The flat, horizontal striations of the background and the decorative plaques that give the viewer information about the sitter provide a foil for the detailed rendering of the head and the rich, satiny textures of Gamaches' jacket. The fine, silvery finish of the face differs markedly from the technique of the rest of the work, not unlike the late German Mannerist engravings of the Wierix family. Such a favoring of surface over volume is even more apparent in Gaultier's version of Michelangelo's The Last Judgment (cat. 10).

As had Gaultier's, the prints of Thomas de Leu remain rooted in late sixteenth-century Mannerist engraving. The systematic vocabulary of de Leu's Henri de Bourbon, Due de Montpensier (cat. 11) evokes the effect of a bas-relief. The sitter is placed in an oval frame whose interior is evenly hatched with concentric circles which evoke a smooth but shallow depth; as a result, the duke appears as a marble bust set in a niche. The perfected finish of what is portrayed is more than matched by the controlled technique of the engraving itself, outdistancing even that of Gaultier's de Gamaches.

Michel Lasne's Portrait of François Queinvel (cat. 15) demonstrates that it was possible for some early seventeenth-century portrait engravings to capture a certain liveliness and spontaneity. Lasne's success is the result of his simplification of the engraving technique of artists such as de Leu. Instead of covering his plate with hundreds of minute hatching lines, Lasne actively engaged the white of the sheet by varying the width of line and the regularity of hatching as well as limiting his reliance upon crosshatching.

Although pure engraving continued to be popular for portraits and reproductive images, a number of artists such as Stefano della Bella, Pierre Biard, and Theodore van Thulden used the etching needle in preference to the engraver's burin. Even while clinging to the more conservative vocabulary of engraving for many of their engravings, they were induced to experiment with the different textures of the etching. Stefano della Bella's View of the Tower of Calais (cat. 22), which betrays his stylistic debt to Callot, demonstrates the way in which the artist used his tight system of swelling and tapering lines to achieve both the smooth surface of the tower and the agitated quality of the water. In his dramatic scenes of war and especially in Death Carrying a Child (cat. 23), however, della Bella abandoned this systematic vocabulary and more fully exploited the rough textural qualities of the etching medium. In similar fashion, Biard utilized a variety of textures in his Allegory on Sculpture (cat. 17) to enliven a design that lacked a rationally conceived sense of space. And Theodore van Thulden eschewed crosshatching in his etching after Primaticcio's Ulysses Approaching the River of Hell (cat. 21), employing instead an open array of long and short parallel hatchings. Such irregularities optically activated the white passages of the paper which, in turn, served to capture the rhythmic volumes of Primaticcio's sinuous, Mannerist figures.

The prints of Claude Vignon, Georges Lallemant, Pierre Brébiette, and Albert Flamen reveal a new interest in exploiting the drawn quality of the etched line.\textsuperscript{7} The faulty biting, dramatic and unexpected contrasts of light and dark, extremely irregular and disorganized hatchings, and dozens of scratched and broken lines in Vignon's The Martyrdom of St. Lucy (cat. 18) induced Charles Sterling to call the artist a precursor of Rembrandt.\textsuperscript{8} Lallemant's The Beheading of St. John the Baptist (cat. 12) utilizes some of Bellange's technical devices. Lallemant enclosed his figures with emphatic contours and modelled them with dense patches of short, parallel hatching. Stippling and irregular hatching further heightened the drama of the image and enriched the surface of the print. Brébiette's Diogenes and Alexander the Great (cat. 20) bears a closer relationship to his pen and ink drawings than to the earlier engraving techniques of Gaultier. And finally, Flamen's combination of heavily drawn lines and crude, short, and irregular hatchings

6. See the monograph on Jean Clouet by Peter Mellen. For more on François Clouet, see Mongan 1947 and Adhémar 1980.
7. Maxime Préaud has suggested (in correspondence) that the work of Antonio Tempesta may have played an important role in the loosening of French printmaking techniques. Tempesta's awkward but energetic drawing style and his use of broken lines and irregular hatching may well have been an important example. Préaud's suggestion seems particularly valid for the work of Vignon and Brébiette.
8. Sterling 1934.
of varying length enabled him to describe the subtlest differences between the habitats and the forms of the various types of animals in his many wildlife series.

There is one other form of printmaking, rarely practiced in France, which was uniquely exploited for its decorative surfaces and tonal qualities: the chiaroscuro woodcut. During the 1620s, Ludolph Büsinck produced a series of chiaroscuro woodcuts after Lallemant’s designs. Although financed by Lallemant, who was the most successful artist in the city at the time, the project did not succeed. 9 Büsinck’s The Holy Family with the Infant St. John (cat. 13) and his Moses (cat. 14) demonstrate the suitability of the medium for rendering the elegant linearities and swirls of color of Lallemant’s art. In most of Parisian printmaking thus-far described, the figural vocabulary remained under the influence of the Second School of Fontainebleau while technical matters also looked back to the preferred mediums, engraving and woodcut, of the previous century. Nevertheless, many Parisian printmakers were beginning to experiment with the painterly possibilities of all the various printmaking media, especially etching.

Leonard Gaultier (ca. 1552–1641)

Léonard Gaultier was born in Mayence (Germany) to a family of French Protestant artists. F. Barré has suggested that Gaultier’s parents, like many other French Protestants, had been forced to leave their homes to avoid persecution. Nonetheless, Gaultier returned to Paris in the late 1580s. He became the engraver to Henri III and retained his court position through the reigns of Henry IV and Louis XIII. Because of his duties as a court engraver, over half of his more than 800 prints are portraits.

9 Portrait of Pierre de Gamaches, 1625
Engraving; 292 x 195 mm
Le Blanc 275
Yale University Art Gallery; Gift of Edward B. Greene, B.A. 1900
1938.158
Illustrated this page

Pierre de Gamaches (1568–1625) was a prominent French theologian and a professor at the Sorbonne. This engraving was the frontispiece to his most successful book, the Summa Theologica cum Triplice Indice of 1625, a series of commentaries on the Summa Theologica of Thomas Aquinas. Gamaches’ coat of arms appears in the upper left corner, and the tablet on the right gives his age and the date. The inscription in the cartouche describes how inadequately the engraving relays Gamaches’ virtue, his learning, or his shining speech. 1

1 A full translation of this inscription can be found in Wolf 1942.

The Last Judgment, ca. 1595
After Martino Rota (Yugoslavian, ca. 1520–1583)
Etching and engraving; 311 x 232 mm
Le Blanc 18 i/ii; Barré 510
Yale University Art Gallery; A. Conger Goodyear, B.A. 1899, Fund
1987.9.1
Illustrated p. 8

Gaultier’s work is a copy of Martino Rota’s engraving of Michelangelo’s Last Judgment in the Sistine Chapel. Although skillful, it is typical of the engraving of this period in that it sacrifices subtlety to a quest for precision.

THOMAS DE LEU (ca. 1555–1620)

Thomas de Leu was born in Antwerp to a family of publishers and booksellers. His early training was with Jean Ditmaer, a little-known engraver. By 1576 de Leu was in Paris working in the atelier of the portraitist Jean Rabel, and in 1584 he established his own studio and publishing business. He worked frequently with the engraver Léonard Gaultier and the printer Pierre Gourdelle. From 1590 until 1593 de Leu resided in Tours, but he returned to Paris in 1594, when he became engraver to Henri IV.

Henri de Bourbon, Duc de Montpensier, ca. 1595
Engraving; 155 x 106 mm
Robert-Dumesnil 464
Yale University Art Gallery; Library Transfer 1959.38.145

Henri de Bourbon, Duc de Montpensier (1573–1608) was the governor of Normandy. He also fought victoriously against the Catholic League in the Wars of Religion. The words below the portrait compare his skill at battle with the great generals of Antiquity. Although André Jouan dates this work to 1595 on the basis of style, it is typical of the portraits that de Leu continued to engrave until his death in 1621.¹


GEORGES LALLEMANT (ca. 1575–ca. 1635)

Despite the efforts of recent research, the details of Lallemand’s early life are still vague. He was born sometime around 1570 and probably studied with Claude Henriet at the ducal palace. By 1601 Lallemand had established a studio in Paris. For the next quarter of a century his studio would be the most important in Paris.

The Beheading of St. John the Baptist, ca. 1625
Etching; 216 x 298 mm (trimmed)
Robert-Dumesnil 14 i/iv (as Bellange); Weigert 17 (as Bellange)
Museum of Fine Arts, Boston; Otis Norcross Fund
40.128
Illustrated facing page

The story of John the Baptist appears in all four Gospels. He was the son of Zacharias, a priest in the Temple of Jerusalem, and Elizabeth, a cousin of the Virgin. A preacher who led an ascetic existence in the desert, John’s mission was to baptize all who wished to embrace the new Faith. He was considered the messenger of Christ, whom he had baptized in the River Jordan. John was imprisoned and eventually suffered death because of a whimsical promise made by King Herod to his stepdaughter, Salome. Aroused by the beauty of her dance, Herod unwisely declared that Salome’s wish was his command. Prompted by her mother, whom John had chastised for marrying her former brother-in-law, Salome asked for and received the head of John the Baptist.

Although this etching was once attributed to Bellange, it is not difficult to understand why Pariset reassigned it to Lallemand. The latter’s style is more informed by the Second School of Fontainebleau and Parisian painting of the early seventeenth century than was Bellange’s. The muscular body of the soldier who presents the saint’s head is far more reminiscent of the Michelangelesque nudes of Martin Fréminet, while Salome’s rhetorical gesture stands closer to the Baroque style of Rubens than to any work by Bellange. Further, the physiognomy of many of Lallemand’s heads differs significantly from Bellange’s characteristically oval faces with their refined noses and large, deep set eyes. And, as Pariset has noted, Lallemand’s poorly detailed garments do not cling to the body like the sheer, navel-revealing costumes of Bellange.
Technically considered, the flesh of the figures is not softened by the ubiquitous stippling so typical of Bellange's etchings. Thus, although Lallemant and Bellange work in similar styles, there are also important differences in their work.


LUDOLPH BÜSINCK (German, ca. 1600–1669)

Büs inck was one of the few artists to work in chiaroscuro woodcuts during the seventeenth century. Born in the small town of Meunden, near Kassel, he was trained as both painter and printmaker. He traveled to Paris in 1623 and, with the help of Georges Lallemant, began to produce chiaroscuro woodcuts after many of Lallemant's designs. Lallemant made an investment in the printing and selling of these woodcuts, but the project was apparently unsuccessful.

Büs inck returned to Germany in 1630, working as a painter and customs inspector in Meunden until his death in 1669.

13 The Holy Family with the Infant St. John, 1623
After Georges Lallemant (ca. 1575–ca. 1635)
Chiaroscuro woodcut; 309 x 216 mm
Hollstein 3; Stechow 3
Yale University Art Gallery; Everett V. Meeks, B.A. 1901, Fund
1971.2.1
Illustrated p. 28

The Holy Family was probably Büs inck’s first chiaroscuro woodcut. He used two different shades of light brown for the tone blocks and one black line block. Note how the reserved whites of the sheet have become an integral part of the drawing.
For Moses, Büsinck again employed two tone blocks: one beige and one brown. Büsinck’s accentuated use of the black line block persuaded Wolfgang Stechow to suggest the influence of the Italian chiaroscuro of Andrea Andreani. Despite the fact that the work is inscribed “Lallemant inv.,” Walter Strauss felt that the composition may have been inspired by the work of Abraham Bloemaert.


MICHEL LASNE (ca. 1590–1667)

Michel Lasne was born in Caen to a family of goldsmiths. As there is no evidence to support Mariette’s hypothesis that Lasne traveled to Antwerp to study with Theodore Galle, there remains very little known about his early training. Although he began by engraving works after the paintings of the great masters, many of Lasne’s later works—executed after his own designs—reveal the influence of Claude Mellan. He was most famous for his skill as a draftsman and as a portraitist. Lasne was named engraver and draftsman-in-ordinary to Louis XIII in 1633.

15 Portrait of François Quesnel, 1616
Engraving with etching; 251 x 167 mm
Decauville-Lachêne 417 i/ii
Yale University Art Gallery; Gift of Edward B. Greene, B.A. 1900
1939.601

François Quesnel (1543–1619) was the first painter to Henry III. He was also the designer of a well-known map of Paris and a model-maker for the mint of France. The oval border around Lasne’s engraving gives Quesnel’s rank and age (seventy-three). The inscription in the margin was added to the portrait in 1619 after Quesnel’s death. It not only claims that he was descended from a noble family, but that his painting surpassed the great works of François Clouet! It continues by praising the artist’s modesty for having, despite his great talent, declined induction into the noble Order of St. Michael.

1. See Wolf 1942, no. 226.

16 Equestrian Portrait of Louis XIII, 1634
Engraving and etching; 624 x 436 mm
Weigert 411
Yale University Art Gallery; Gift of Edward B. Greene, B.A. 1900
1939.600

In contrast to the looser handling of his portrait of Quesnel, Lasne has here engraved in a tight and systematic fashion appropriate to the formal requirements of royal portraiture. The print was designed to celebrate Louis XIII’s victory over Lorraine in 1634. Fame trumpets overhead, while putti carry the crown of France to denote Louis’ rank, palm fronds to suggest his saintliness, and laurel wreaths to celebrate his victory. The inscription in the laurel wreath alludes to France’s occupation of Lorraine and parts of western Germany during the Thirty Years War. The inscription along the bottom of the print gives Louis’ official title and informs the viewer that he can purchase the print at Lasne’s lodgings in the Louvre.

The landscape, which includes a battle scene, has been traditionally attributed to Jacques Callot, who actually published the landscape separately under his own name. It may depict the Battle of Avigliano, where the French forces fought victoriously against the Duke of Savoy.

1. Lieure no. 663.

PIERRE BIARD THE YOUNGER
(1592–1661)

Pierre Biard was born in Paris to a dynasty of French sculptors. He studied with the little-known French artist Pierre Francqueville and undertook the usual student pilgrimage to Italy, the details of which are lacking. A versatile artist, Biard worked as sculptor, architect, and printmaker; his fame rested on his now-destroyed equestrian statue of Louis XIII. Biard was named sculptor to the king in 1609 and was further honored by being named a gentleman of the king’s bedchamber in 1612. According to Robert-Dumesnil, most of Biard’s engravings reproduce works by Giulio Romano, Raphael, and Michelangelo. His ten original designs, however, are richly allegorical.
Vouet's return to Paris in 1627 was the beginning of a new period in French art. Older artists like Pierre Biard, who worked in a restrained late Mannerist style, undoubtedly felt threatened by the increasing popularity of the new Baroque manner. In this complex and autobiographical allegory Biard is protected by personifications of the cities of Rome and Venice, on the right, and from figures representing envy, ignorance, and other vices, on the left. The poem beneath the work, which extols the virtues of Classical Italian Art, suggests that the artist felt that he was being unjustly subjected to the whims of an ill-informed public.  

1. For my understanding of the complex iconography of this work, I am indebted to an unpublished paper by Thomas Michie (Michie 1980). Also, see Chaliex 1973 for more on the artist's life.

CLAUDÉ VIGNON (1593-1670)

A prolific and well-traveled artist, Claude Vignon was born in Tours in 1593 and probably studied with Georges Lallemant in Paris. He set up shop in Rome from 1617 to 1623 and also made two trips to Spain. Extremely successful both as painter and printmaker, Vignon's busy Parisian atelier produced many of the major historical and religious paintings of the day, as well as portraits and allegorical compositions. Vignon entered the Royal Academy in 1651 and died in Paris in 1670.

18 The Martyrdom of St. Lucy, ca. 1630
Etching; 207 x 262 mm
Robert-Dumesnil 23
Harvard University Art Museums (Fogg Art Museum); Gift of Belinda L. Randall from the John Witt Randall Collection
Rq281
Illustrated p. 17

Despite Bellange's masterful etching of the Martyrdom of St. Lucy, the subject is not frequently encountered in French art. In fact, Vignon's version reveals little of the rich texture and crowded space of Bellange's composition. Instead, the subject was probably inspired by images seen during his extensive travels in Spain and Italy, where the subject is more commonly depicted.

St. Lucy was martyred during the persecutions of Diocletian. The miraculous cure of her sick mother at the shrine of St. Agatha moved her to distribute her wealth to the poor in gratitude. This unaristocratic behavior so upset her fiance that he reported her to the emperor's magistrate as a Christian. Refusing to deny her new-found faith, she was sentenced to death, but like other early Christian martyrs, she was not so easily done in. Despite being tortured with molten lead poured into her ears, shorn of her breasts, and boiled in oil, she refused to succumb. Death came only by a dagger through her throat.

19 Panthea
From La Galerie des Femmes Fortes, 1647
Engraving and etching; 340 x 194 mm
Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University
Nqh21. + 647L

Images of powerful women, drawn from the stories of the Bible and the tales of antiquity, became increasingly popular at the end of the Middle Ages. Typically, these strong-willed women had performed acts of heroism or loyalty for their nation, their religion, or their husbands.

Vignon often supplied drawings for engravers, and they were frequently published by Pierre Mariette the Elder. 1 In 1647 Vignon illustrated Père Pierre Le Moyne's La Galerie des Femmes Fortes or the Collection of Strong Women. 2 Le Moyne (1602-1671) was a Jesuit poet who taught philosophy at Dijon. His book, dedicated to Catherine de'Medici, the widow of Henri IV, was obviously intended to view the regent as the most recent in a long line of admirable women such as Portia, Judith, Joan of Arc, Blanche of Bourbon, and Panthea. These women and others are each discussed separately and each appears in an engraving designed by Vignon. 3

The story of Panthea is told in the seventh book of the Cycropaedia, written by the ancient Greek general and historian, Xenophon. The wife of Abradates, King of Susa who was being threatened by Cyrus, Emperor of Persia, Panthea was taken captive. Nevertheless, the treatment she received was so honorable that Abradates determined to become a vassal of Cyrus rather than remain his enemy. Sadly, Abradates
was killed in the first battle he undertook for his new Emperor. In an act of both conjugal and national loyalty, Panthea stabbed herself on his corpse.

2. The book was published in Paris by Antoine de Sommaville, but the engravings were probably published by Pierre Mariette, as they bear his "excudit". Although the original drawing for Panthea has not survived, a few exist for other illustrations. Portia and Paulina are in the National Gallery of Ireland, Dublin; La Camme the collection of the Rugby School, England; La Montine the Cabinet des Dessins, Musée du Louvre, Paris; and Dame Chrétien et Française the British Museum, London.
3. Patrick Ramade has suggested that the engraved portraits were engraved by Abraham Bosse and Gilles Rousselet (Rennes 1980, pp. 42–46). But, as they are not signed by either artist, and Bosse was then a well-established engraver, Ramade's hypothesis must remain doubtful.

PIERRE BRÉBIEETTE (1598–1650)

Pierre Brébiette was born in Mantes, near Seine-et-Oise in 1598. He studied with Georges Lallemant in Paris in the early 1620s and then traveled to Italy. Brébiette spent most of his time in Venice, where he particularly admired the work of Titian and Veronese. By 1626 he had returned to Paris. Although there exist few paintings by Brébiette, the number of his prints and drawings suggests that he was a prolific draftsman. His etchings were drawn after his own designs, which were usually scenes from mythology, antique friezes, or bacchanals.

THEODORE VAN THULDEN (Flemish, 1606–1669)

Theodore van Thulden was born in Bois-le-Duc in 1606. He began to study painting in the studio of Abraham Bleyenberch in 1622, and by 1626 had become a pupil of Rubens in Antwerp. Van Thulden came to Paris in 1632 and made etchings of Primaticcio's frescoes at Fontainebleau and of many of the major Mannerist fresco cycles in the city. He returned to Flanders and settled in Antwerp in 1635, where he was listed among the bourgeois of the city in 1636. He left Antwerp for his native Bois-le-Duc in the 1640s. Except for a brief visit to Paris in 1647 and several commissions in Antwerp from 1661 to 1663, he lived in Bois-le-Duc until his death in 1669. As the number of his extant works demonstrates, van Thulden was a prolific painter, engraver, and etcher.

Ulysses Approaching the River of Hell
From Les Travaux d'Ulysse, 1633
After Primaticcio (Bolognese, 1504–1570)
Etching; 190 x 252 mm
Harvard University Art Museums (Fogg Art Museum); Purchase from the Gifts for Special Uses Fund
M 15589
Illustrated facing page

In 1633, van Thulden made a series of etchings after Primaticcio's Ulysses fresco cycle in the Galerie D'Ulysse at Fontainebleau. The story of Ulysses, son of the king of Ithaca, comes from Homer's Odyssey.
Ulysses' journey home from the Trojan War was beset with difficulties because he had angered Poseidon, God of the Sea, by blinding his son, the one-eyed giant Polyphemus. During the course of his travels, Ulysses was told by the sorceress Circe that he must journey to the Underworld and offer a sacrifice to the soul of the soothsayer Tiresias to learn more about pending dangers.

In this etching, the main scene shows Ulysses and his men about to cross over Oceanus, the river which bounds the earth, into the realm of the shades. With outstretched arms, Ulysses implores the river god to give him safe passage. In the background, Ulysses' men are seen loading the necessary provisions for their journey into the crowded boat.

1. Van Thulden's copies after many Mannerist fresco cycles have been comprehensively studied and well illustrated in Roy 1977, Béguin 1977, and Béguin-Guillaume-Roy 1986.

**STEFANO DELLA BELLA**
(Florentine, 1610–1664)

Stefano della Bella, the son of the sculptor Francesco della Bella, studied painting with Cesare Dandini and printmaking with Remigio Cantagallina. During his youth, della Bella was decisively influenced by Jacques Callot who was resident in Florence until 1621. At the age of thirty, della Bella moved to Paris where, except for a brief trip to Holland in 1646, he remained until 1649. His etchings, which include landscapes, cityscapes, and scenes of everyday life in the style of Callot, were extremely successful. He returned to Florence in 1650 and soon after became drawing master to the son of the Grand Duke. With the exception of a brief trip to Rome, della Bella lived in Florence until his death in 1664.
22 Two plates from the *Series of Ports*, 1646–47
View of a Corner of Calais & View of the Tower of Calais
Etchings; each 86 × 140 mm
De Vesme/Massar 795 i/ii & 796 i/ii
Yale University Art Gallery; Gifts of Allen Evarts Foster, B.A. 1906
1965.33.119 & 120

These two landscapes are from a set of ports etched by della Bella during his travels through northern France and the Low Countries in 1646 or 1647. Their feathery touch distinguishes them from the obvious debts to Callot’s more wiry and calligraphic landscapes.

23 *Death Carrying a Child*
From the *Dance of Death*, ca. 1649
Etching; 184 × 150 mm
de Vesme/Massar 88
Davison Art Center, Wesleyan University
40.D1-84.2

The skull or the living skeleton personifying Death was an ever-present *memento mori* in the imagery of the late Middle Ages as well the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It reminded the beholder that life, like wealth and beauty, was only temporary. The prudent viewer was thus expected to concentrate on the spiritual and the virtuous, rather than the more ephemeral aspects of life on earth. Della Bella probably designed his Death series in Paris because of the recognizable location of some of the scenes. In this plate, he depicted the walled cemetery of the Innocents, for centuries the final resting place for most Parisians.¹


ALBERT FLAMEN (ca. 1620—after 1669)

The latest research on Albert Flamen suggests that he was French rather than Flemish. There is no documentary evidence that he was born in Flanders; besides, all of his works were published in Paris. Because of his surname, however, it may be assumed that he was born to a Flemish family living in Paris. It is known that he lived on the rue Fossoyeurs, near St. Sulpice for most of his adult life. Except for a few works engraved after other artists, e.g., Jacques Callot and Israel de Silvestre, Flamen designed his own etchings and engravings. His keen observation and intense interest in nature do suggest a deep connection with his Flemish roots.

24 Two plates from *The Second Part of the Fresh Water Fish Series*, ca. 1645
The Loach & The Minnow
Etchings; each 97 × 167 mm
Bartsch 51 i/ii & 52 i/ii; Robert-Dumesnil 465 & 466
Yale University Art Gallery; Gifts of Allen Evarts Foster, B.A. 1906
1965.33.684 & 685

Illustrated facing page

These two etchings belong to a suite dedicated to Nicholas Fouquet, the minister of Finance to Louis XIV and a staunch patron of the arts. The series derives from a tradition of illustrated zoological encyclopedias by authors such as Konrad Gessner and Ulysse Aldrovandi which described the diversity of the species, their environment, and their habits. But, as Catherine Levesque has noted, Flamen’s work differed from these earlier publications because he was able to communicate scientific information by subtly rendered details of anatomy and habitat.¹ Even his backgrounds, which often illustrated the manner in which a fish was caught, sold, and eaten, served to further the viewer’s knowledge.

The dearth of documentation about Flamen is undoubtedly one of the reasons that two very different interpretations of the artist’s work have emerged. Levesque suggested that Flamen’s etchings of animals were intended as emblems, whose premise was that nature revealed the workings of God in the universe. On the other hand, Stephen Goddard has maintained that Flamen’s patrons, who are often identified in his dedications, were interested in these works as a privileged form of recreation.² Noting Flamen’s activities as an amateur poet and a lover of wine, Goddard would prefer to see the artist as an exponent of the “good life,” which in the seventeenth century included fishing and birding. In the final analysis, these discussions should not obscure the fact that Flamen’s works reveal both his abiding devotion to the wonder and variety of nature and his enormous capability to share this passion with others.

NICHOLAS DE SON
(Active first half of the 17th century)

Even though the name of Nicholas de Son is frequently encountered in sale catalogues, and his work can be seen in most major printrooms, almost nothing is known about his life. He engraved genre scenes and religious subjects, but was most famous for his copies after Callot. His period of greatest activity extends from the late 1620s through the 1630s. It is assumed by biographers such as Thieme-Becker and Bénézit that he was born in Reims toward the beginning of the century.

25 The Flight into Egypt, ca. 1630
Etching; 113 x 230 mm
Yale University Art Gallery; Gift of Allen Evarts Foster, B.A. 1906
1965.33.492

The Flight into Egypt is one of the most frequently depicted scenes in western art. Joseph was warned in a dream that King Herod was about to kill all of the first-born sons of the Israelites in Bethlehem, because of a prophecy that one of these infants was destined to become the "King of the Jews." To avoid the death of their child, Joseph took Mary and Jesus safely away to Egypt, where they remained until Herod's death.

The horizontal format, exaggerated architecture, and swelling-tapering lines of this etching reveal a debt to Callot's late landscapes. De Son even inserts Callot's duckhunter into this albeit pastoral but in fact seriously religious scene. Note how de Son's stiff contours, especially in the foliage, lose that essential lively brilliance so characteristic of Callot's work.
Unlike most of western Europe, from 1630 to 1650, France was slowly becoming a strong and prosperous nation. Although involved in the Thirty Years War, most of the fighting took place on the periphery of the country and had little effect on the political, economic, and cultural situation. France was beginning to reap the benefits of the political and economic reforms of Henri IV, which were continued and refined by Cardinal Richelieu, prime minister under Louis XIII. Thus, even though the country still faced grave internal difficulties, which would develop into civil war in 1648, this twenty year period was like a “calm before the storm.” Great fortunes were being made and liberally spent. Many wealthy bourgeois families had secured important court positions and were intent upon pursuing a lifestyle that befit their new status. As a group, their patronage began to rival and even surpass that of the king. The newly titled nobility—often referred to as the nobility of the robe, to distinguish them from the truly aristocratic nobility of the sword—built lavish private residences in the Marais quarter and on the outskirts of Paris. These projects employed dozens of architects, painters, and sculptors to create the sumptuous environments that bourgeois patricians and the new aristocrats required to live as gentlemen.

The Parisian paintings of Simon Vouet elegantly met the demands of these new patrons. In contrast to his Roman paintings, which were heavily influenced by Caravaggio, his work in Paris was marked by its elegant restraint and well-tempered sensuality. As well as combining the gentle Mannerism of Primaticcio and the Bolognese Classicism of the Carracci, Vouet’s paintings also synthesized the naturalism of Caravaggio and the sumptuous color, bold brushstrokes, and scintillating light of Venetian artists such as Veronese and Tintoretto. Vouet’s athletic and voluptuous male and female nudes are frequently wrapped in broad, slowly swirling draperies which endow his compositions with a gentle, lyrical movement. Their rich surfaces and saturated colors are further enlivened by a bright, luminous light, which both enhances their graceful movements and articulates their meanings.

Vouet must have realized that this stylistic adjustment was necessary for both the conservative tastes of the Parisians and the organization of a large workshop. His Roman working process, like that of many followers of Caravaggio, did not include the traditional Italian Renaissance practice of preparing major compositions through extensive series of drawings. In Paris, however, Vouet’s new position as an important decorative artist meant that he would be responsible for a huge workshop where he would be forced to entrust the execution of his ideas to his assistants. Thus, drawing and teaching demanded an increasing share of his daily activities. His talents as a teacher enabled him to gather a group of extremely gifted students and collaborators such as Jacques Sarrazin, Michel Dorigny, François Tortebat, François Perrier, Pierre Daret, Eustache Le Sueur, and Laurent de La Hyre. Some of these artists were exclusively or primarily involved in making prints after Vouet’s major commissions.

1. More on the aspirations of these bourgeois families can be found in the long essay by George Huppert (Huppert 1977) and in section I of the introduction to New York 1982.
2. Vouet probably began his career by studying with his father who was a minor sculptor. At the young age of fourteen, he was sent to England to paint the portrait of a lady. At twenty, Vouet traveled with the French ambassador to Constantinople where he made a celebrated portrait of the Grand Turk. By 1613, Vouet was working in Italy, where he stayed for the next fifteen years. Although he centered himself in Rome, he also worked extensively in Genoa and visited Naples, Parma, Bologna, Venice, and Florence. He received a major commission in the Vatican from Pope Urban VIII, and just before he left Rome in 1627, he was elected the first non-Italian director or “prince” of the Academia di San Luca. For more on Vouet’s Italian period, see Crelly 1962, chapters 1 & 2.
Although the details of his practice are scant, Vouet, like Raphael and Rubens before him, was intimately involved with the translation of his work into the print media. Perhaps the best way to understand what Vouet demanded of his copyists is to examine his drawings. As both Konrad Oberhuber and Maxime Préaud have noted, Vouet’s most significant contribution to the art of his period was his luminosity. Line is suppressed in favor of a radiant light which gently spreads over the forms and softens their contours. This light and the broad areas of shadow that it casts define the forms and endow them with a forceful, yet somewhat restrained dynamism.

The printmakers of Vouet’s circle used etching and engraving, singly and in combination, to evoke the light and movement that was central to his style. Their graphic textures consciously call attention to the surface of the print and the white of the paper in an attempt to find an equivalent for Vouet’s palpable light and material texture. For example, the variety and energy of the lines of Claude Mellan’s St. John the Baptist in the Desert (cat. 28) differ markedly from the smoothly flowing but impersonal forms of Gaultier’s and de Leu’s engravings. Nevertheless, these prints were a far cry from the scratchy, broken, and idiosyncratic lines of Vignon and Brébiette. In fact, the most notable characteristic of the prints of Vouet’s school was the tension they encompassed between the tight, systematic qualities of traditional printmaking and the freer, more open effects of newer techniques. Such a contrast is clearly seen in Dorigny’s St. Margaret (cat. 36). While on occasion this opposition was expressed in terms of the contrast between engraving and etching, that was not by any means its only outlet. The purely engraved work of Mellan is an outstanding instance.

Although Mellan was not actually a student of Vouet, the painter is said to have encouraged Mellan’s work as early as their years in Rome. Mellan’s St. John reveals their mutual interest in Caravaggio’s chiaroscuro, and is an early indication of Mellan’s sensitivity to the surface of the print. The smooth, nude body of the saint, rendered without crosshatching, is set against a dark, textural background evoked by a mixture of both irregular and systematic crosshatching. As was the case with Vouet, however, Mellan had made crucial stylistic adjustments by the time that he returned to Paris in 1636. His most significant developments were the complete avoidance of crosshatching and the simplification of his compositions. In Henri Louis Habert de Montmor (cat. 29), the white of the sheet is used as actively as the lines to suggest the liveliness of the sitter’s personality. By employing wide, parallel lines to describe the dark silk of Montmor’s mantle, and a combination of stippling and thinner lines of varying width to render the subtler details of physiognomy, Mellan energized the entire surface. Using the relatively unvaried curves of the background as a foil, Mellan breaks up the figure into flickering, undulating, irregular sculptured passages of enormous individuality and vitality. His application of the same technique to the Title Page from the Holy Bible (cat. 30) enabled him to translate the power and static monumentality of the figures in Poussin’s design. Mellan’s most famous print, The Sudarium (cat. 31), is his technical masterpiece. The entire image of the savior’s face consists of but one spiraling line, beginning at the tip of Christ’s nose. The subtlest variations of tone are achieved solely by the swelling and tapering of this one line, evoking an eerie equivalent of the miraculous appearance of Christ’s face on Veronica’s veil.

The engravings of Dorigny and Dare are not as original as those of Mellan, but their relatively broad and pronouncedly tonal techniques are significant departures from the work of earlier printmakers. In Dorigny’s Bacchanal (cat. 37), the mixture of hatching and crosshatching in the background foliage and the frequent utilization of the gleaming whites of the paper in the drapery of the dancing maenads produced a sheet full of strong value contrasts. Not only do they dissolve all surfaces in the flickering light they create, but they accentuate the activity of the figures. In Dare’s The Holy Family (cat. 38), however, the dominant note is established by systematic patterns of crosshatching suitable to the calm and reflective mood of the subject. But once again it is the polished, luminous effects that are of paramount significance and originality.

Artists such as Tortebat, Chappron, and Perrier were often attracted by the rougher possibilities of the etching needle. Although Chappron exploited the textural quality of the etching, his early work is notable for its light, feathery touch. His The Alliance of Bacchus and Venus (cat. 33) is composed of subtle changes and irregularities of hatching and texture, though it certainly avoids the blatant sketchiness of Vignon. Again, the emphasis is on variegated surfaces and gentle patterns of light and dark. Chappron pushed the contrasts between darkly etched and completely blank areas even further in The Followers of Silenus (cat. 32).
Perrier, Dorigny, and to a lesser degree, Tortebat were forceful in their use of the etching needle, yet they never really exploited its autographic, draftsmanly potential. Perrier used the white of the sheet to suggest a strong light which shines onto the intertwined bodies of his *The Wrestlers* (cat. 26) and added carefully placed hatching and crosshatching around these open areas to render the mass, volume, and rippling musculature of the two athletes. In his *St. Margaret* (cat. 36), Dorigny contrasted the open and somewhat cruder etched hatching of the dragon with the elegantly curved engraved passages of the saint in order to dramatize the triumph of good over evil. In a similar fashion, Tortebat intensified the ecstasy of his *Fainting Magdalene* (cat. 35) by actively engaging the flat whites of the paper to describe her drapery. In contrast to the light-filled foreground, the bodies, wings, and draperies of the saints that support her are lightly crosshatched and the background is submerged in textured darkness.

Thus, by using broad areas of the white of the sheet to suggest bright, luminous light, in tandem with both organized and extremely irregular patterns of hatching, the printmakers of Vouet’s circle were able to render the robust figures, luminous painterliness, and dynamic but lyrical movement that characterized Vouet’s Parisian style.

FRANÇOIS PERRIER (ca. 1590–1650)

François Perrier was probably born in Salins, near Lyons, around 1590. After some preliminary study in Lyons, he traveled to Rome around 1625, spending five years in the studio of Giovanni Lanfranco, a prominent fresco painter (Schleir 1968). In 1630, Perrier moved to Paris, where he frequently worked with his brother-in-law, Simon Vouet. He returned to Rome in 1635 to work on the decorations of the Palazzo Almagia and, ten years later, settled permanently in Paris. Important commissions there included the ceiling of the Hôtel de la Vrillière (now the Banque de France). He was also one of the twelve founding members of the Royal Academy of Painting and Sculpture in 1648. In addition to his work as a painter, Perrier was a significant graphic artist. Particularly well-known for his book of etchings after the most famous statues in Rome, he also made sets of etchings after important Roman reliefs and after Raphael’s frescoes in the Loggie of the Villa Farnesina.

1. As late as 1820, John Flaxman was recommending Perrier’s book to his students at the British Royal Academy of Painting (Haskell and Penny 1982, p. 21).
2. Now considered to be a Roman marble copy of a lost bronze by the School of Lyssipus, the statue was discovered near the Porta San Giovanni in Rome in 1583. It was purchased from the Varesi family by Cardinal Ferdinando de’Medici and was recorded in the Medici Collection in Rome that year. The statue was sent to Florence in 1677 and placed in the Tribuna of the Uffizi, where it remains today (Haskell and Penny 1982, p. 337).

26 *The Wrestlers*
From the *Segmenta*, 1638
Etching; 192 x 178 mm
Robert-Dumesnil 76
Fine Arts Library, Fogg Art Museum
Harvard University

Perrier’s *Segmenta nobilium signorum et statuarum que temporis dentum invidium evase* or simply, *Segmenta*, was the earliest illustrated volume of the finest antique sculpture in Rome. The clarity of its one hundred etchings, combined with its relatively modest cost, made it the most popular work of its kind. The *Segmenta* was such a success that it was reprinted several times, and a somewhat more lavish companion volume of antique reliefs, the *Icones et segmenta illustrium e marmore tabularum que Romae*, appeared in 1645. These publications were especially important for artists who were unable to study the sculpture in situ.

Perrier’s prints, which included more than one view of many of the statues, were particularly faithful to the existing state of the work: for example, unlike other printmakers, he made no additions to unrestored sculptures. However, he sometimes altered their actual settings: his *Wrestlers* fight in front of the Colosseum although the sculpture itself was housed in the Villa Medici. 1

27 *The Flight into Egypt*, ca. 1640
Etching; 293 x 385 mm
Robert-Dumesnil 5 i/ii
Yale University Art Gallery; Gift of Allen Evarts Foster, B.A. 1906
1965.33.813
Illustrated p. 44

Unlike the *Flight of Nicholas de Son*, which is primarily concerned with landscape, Perrier’s version focuses on the Holy Family. He shows Joseph, the Virgin, and the Christ Child about to cross a river in a boat with the assistance of two oarsmen.
CLAUDE MELLAN (1598–1688)

Claude Mellan, one of the great French printmakers of the seventeenth century, was born in 1598 to a family of coppersmiths working in Abbeville. Apprenticed to either Léonard Gaultier or Thomas de Leu in Paris in 1617/18, he made his first engraving in 1619. Five years later, Mellan left for Rome, where he studied in the atelier of Francesco Villemena and worked after the compositions of Simon Vouet. In 1636, after a brief stay in Aix-en-Provence, he became an engraver to the king and moved permanently to Paris. Although Mellan engraved a wide variety of subjects, he specialized in portraiture. He lived in his quarters in the Louvre, often in seclusion, until his death in 1688.

28 St. John the Baptist in the Desert, 1629
Engraving; 392 x 275 mm
Montaiglon 80
Harvard University Art Museums (Fogg Art Museum); Gift of Belinda L. Randall from the John Witt Randall Collection
R1465
Illustrated facing page

Although St. John is usually depicted as an emaciated and unkempt hermit, Mellan chose to represent him as a pensive and beautiful youth. Accompanied only by a lamb, John sits at the edge of a lake contemplating a cross made of reeds.¹ The lamb, which is frequently found in depictions of St. John, prefigures the sacrificial roles of both John and Christ.

¹ For more on the legend of St. John, see cat. 12.
Henri de Montmor was a member of the French Council of State and the Master of Petitions. He was also an important patron of the arts. His hôtel, which was known as the Séjour des Muses, was famous for its elegance and hospitality. Mellan was introduced to the Parisian patrician through the collector and dilettante Fabri de Piersec, whose portrait Mellan had engraved in Aix-en-Provence. Contrary to the opinion of Arthur Hind, who suggested that Mellan’s broken surfaces were inappropriate for portraiture, the lively and witty personality of Montmor seems to have been perfectly characterized by the artist’s technique. 1 This portrait is a pendant to Mellan’s engraving of Madame de Montmor. 2


NICHOLAS CHAPPRON (1612–after 1651)

Nicholas Chappron was born in 1612 in Chateaudun and studied painting and engraving in Vouet’s studio in Paris. He left for Rome, probably in 1640, with the intention of joining Poussin there in 1642. Poussin often complained of Chappron’s pompous behavior and his poor work habits. Nonetheless, Chappron’s increasingly classicizing style reveals a debt to the older artist. There are only a handful of extant paintings by Chappron. He is most famous for his series of etchings of Bacchanals in the style of Vouet and for his more classical series of etchings after Raphael’s Loggie in the Vatican, published in 1649. Except for a brief visit to Malta in 1643, it is assumed that Chaptron lived in Rome until his death sometime between 1651 and 1656.
Silenus, a gay and extremely fat rural god, is always prominently depicted in Bacchus’ merry retinue. Although he is usually inebriated, legend has it that he was still capable of displaying wisdom and prophetic gifts. In this composition, Chappron chose not to focus on the drunken leader, who rides an absurdly small donkey in the background. Instead, the artist gave center stage to a group of Silenus’ frolicking followers, who dash to keep up with the merrymaking.

The title traditionally given to this work is misleading, as ancient authors do not speak of an alliance between Bacchus, the god of wine and fertility, and Venus, the goddess of love. Like Bellange’s *Diana and Orion* (cat. 2), the scene here depicted undoubtedly resulted from a confusion of legends. Chappron’s Bacchus is clearly recognized by his laurel wreath and by the presence of several similarly bedecked members of his retinue. But his female counterpart is less surely...
identifiable as Venus. Only the inscription, which names the suckling infant in the foreground as Amor, Venus’ son, indirectly points to her participation in the scene. Amor’s presence may be symbolic, pointing to the sensual natures of both Venus and Bacchus. At the same time, Chappron’s presentation of the infant suggests a conflation of the myths of the Nurture of Bacchus and the Nurture of Jupiter, and it may therefore be an indication of even greater iconographical confusion.1

1. Most depictions of the Nurture of Jupiter show the infant suckling a goat, while those of the Nurture of Bacchus show Silenus and his band of satyrs and maenads nursing Bacchus with wine. Chappron conflates these two in a preparatory drawing for his painting, the *Nurture of Jupiter* (Ackland Art Museum, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill), showing the infant suckling on a bunch of grapes. Although he corrected the error in the painting, it demonstrates that he was quite capable of making serious iconographic mistakes (New York 1982, pp. 237-38). This is especially surprising since Chappron worked with Poussin, who was famous for his knowledge of ancient literature.

PIERRE LOMBART (1612–1682)

There is very little information about the life of Pierre Lombart. A student of Simon Vouet, he engraved religious compositions and portraits after important Baroque painters as well as his own designs. Sometime in the 1640s he traveled to England where he led a successful career as a portrait engraver (Colvin 1905). He returned to Paris around 1662 and was accepted into the Royal Academy eleven years later. Lombart was best known for his equestrian portrait of Charles I (Layard 1922) and for a set of engraved portraits after Van Dyck, known as the Twelve Countesses.

34 *Adam and Eve in Paradise*, ca. 1650
Engraving; 430 x 544 mm
Museum of Fine Arts, Boston; Harvey D. Parker Collection
P4701

Although Lombart studied in Vouet’s studio and was known for importing that master’s elegant Baroque style to England, his *Adam and Eve* does not reflect his Parisian training. Its execution seems intentionally naïve, perhaps in response to conservative British tastes. The sheer number and variety of animals in the work suggest that it represents *The Naming of the Animals*.

FRANÇOIS TORTEBAT (1600–1690)

François Tortebat was born in Paris around 1600. Little is known about his training or his work before he entered the studio of his future father-in-law, Simon Vouet, around 1628. Along with Michel Dorigny, Tortebat became the leading etcher/engraver after Vouet’s compositions. He also specialized in portraiture. Elected to the Royal Academy in 1663, he died in Paris in 1690.

35 *Fainting Magdalene*, 1666
After Simon Vouet (1590–1649)
Etching; 396 x 253 mm
Robert-Dumesnil 8
Harvard University Art Museums (Fogg Art Museum); Gift of Belinda L. Randall from the John Witt Randall Collection
R4272
Illustrated p. 50

Although she was one of the most important early Christian saints, Mary Magdalene is first mentioned in the Bible as a prostitute who, in accordance with ancient Jewish law, was to be stoned to death as punishment for her sins. The Magdalene became a follower of Jesus when he intimidated the crowd by asking the person who was free of sin to cast the first stone. She is frequently depicted in modest garb contemplating a skull and the cross. Imagery connected with the Magdalene was especially important in France, where she was supposed to have lived as a hermit in later life.1

Although the death of the Magdalene is rarely depicted, the story of her assumption was a common subject for artists: angels transported her to heaven seven times a day to show her the glories she would enjoy there. But the angels in the present etching merely offer support. As the inscription below notes, it is uncertain whether the Magdalene is dying or languishing with love. What is clear, however, is that she loved: indeed, she is overcome by her devotion to Christ.

This print is a copy of a painting by Vouet from the late 1630s.2 The fact that it was not engraved until 1666, well after Vouet’s death, is an indication of both the popularity of Vouet’s work and the continuing importance of the cult of the Magdalene in the decades following the Counter-Reformation.

1. The discovery of her relics in France in the thirteenth century led to the rapid growth of her cult.
MICHEL DORIGNY (1617–1665)

Dorigny was born in Saint-Quentin to a family of bureaucrats in 1617. He was apprenticed to Georges Lallemant for five years beginning in 1630 and probably entered the studio of his future father-in-law, Simon Vouet, sometime in the late 1630s. He assisted Vouet with major decorative commissions and, after the master's death, became a prominent decorative painter in his own right. Dorigny worked so closely with Vouet that his paintings and drawings have often been attributed to the older artist. He is most remembered today, however, for his work as a printmaker. Dorigny and his brother-in-law, François Tortebat, obtained the exclusive rights to engrave the work of Vouet after his death in 1649 (Guiffrey 1874). Dorigny also engraved two sets of Bacchanals after his own designs. He was elected to the Royal Academy in 1663, and died in Paris two years later.

36 St. Margaret, 1639
After Simon Vouet (1590–1649)
Etching and engraving; 342 x 194 mm
Robert-Dumesnil 70
Davison Art Center, Wesleyan University
57-30-1
Illustrated p. 14

The Roman prefect of Antioch wished to marry a beautiful Christian virgin known as Margaret, but the young woman continually spurned his advances. Insulted by her refusal to comply, he had her tortured and thrown into a dungeon. There Satan appeared in the form of a dragon and devoured her. Cross in hand, Margaret forced the monster to burst open and emerged triumphant and unharmed. She was later beheaded for praying that women in childbirth, by invoking her, might safely deliver their offspring as easily as she had been delivered from the belly of the dragon.

37 Bacchanal, ca. 1655
Engraving; 263 x 196 mm
Robert-Dumesnil 7 ii/ii
Museum of Fine Arts, Boston; Harvey D. Parker Collection
P4543

Bacchanals were frequently the subject of Vouet's large secular commissions. Dorigny, who assisted him with many of these works, was clearly inspired by his master's style. Surprisingly, in these later prints, he returned to engraving after having relied so heavily on etching to copy many of Vouet's compositions.1

Pierre Daret (1604–1675)

Pierre Daret was born in Paris around 1604. He trained with such highly talented printmakers as François Poilly (cat. 55) and Guillaume Vallet. And although it is not certain that he studied with Vouet, the large number of etchings and engravings after Vouet's works suggests that he was closely associated with the busy atelier. It would seem—given that Daret's printed oeuvre numbers over six hundred—that his principle activity was that of printmaker, but in fact he was a successful painter and highly respected teacher. Daret died in Dax in 1675.

38 The Holy Family, 1640
After Simon Vouet (1590–1649)
Engraving and etching; 417 x 258 mm
Weigert 46
Harvard University Art Museums (Fogg Art Museum); Gift of Belinda L. Randall from the John Witt Randall Collection
R1389

Although Vouet was frequently busy with large decorative commissions, he was also famous for painting tender scenes of the Virgin and Child. The inscription below this Holy Family informs the viewer that the original painting by Vouet was completed in 1640 and was hung in the Achères Chapel of the Oratorian church in Paris.
cat. 46. Gabrielle Perelle. *Landscape with Two Travelers and a Castle*. Yale University Art Gallery.
From 1640 until 1660 France was beset with difficulties which once again threatened the economic and political gains achieved by Henri IV and Cardinal Richelieu. In 1643 Louis XIII died, leaving his heir Louis XIV—then only five years of age—and a council of regency to govern the realm. In a surprising political maneuver, Louis' widow, Anne of Austria, assumed power and promptly placed it in the hands of Cardinal Mazarin, her prime minister. The nobility viewed this situation as another opportunity to regain former privileges. But Mazarin, trained by Richelieu, proved to be a more skillful opponent than the nobility had anticipated. His one grave error was to temporarily lose the support of the middle class which, because of its newly gained wealth and status, had grown loyal to the crown. This combination of noble intrigue, middle class opposition, and the problems arising from royal bankruptcy, resulted in the outbreak of a civil war known as the Fronde (1648–1653). Although still in his teens, Louis XIV declared his majority in October of 1652, and by mid-1653, both the court and Mazarin had become firmly entrenched in Paris. Making peace was not difficult since both lower and middle classes had grown tired of the lack of sustained direction from the nobility. By the time Mazarin died in 1661, the stage was set for the absolutism of Louis XIV that dominated the second half of the seventeenth century.

Despite these events, the arts continued to flourish. Indeed, the work of this period provided the model which served as a standard for the next two centuries. Although Mazarin created what was rumored to be the most impressive private collection of art outside of Italy, the most significant patronage continued to come from the new aristocracy or from wealthy bourgeois dilettantes like Michel de Marolles, Pierre Seguier, and Everhard Jabach. They continued to patronize the atelier of Simon Vouet until his death in 1649, but there was a growing dissatisfaction with his fluid and decorative manner. One indication of this shift in taste was the fact that Vouet was not asked to be one of the founding members of the Royal Academy of Painting and Sculpture in 1648. Instead, the new Academy looked to the art of Claude Lorrain and Nicholas Poussin for direction.

The artists who founded the Academy, such as Laurent de La Hyre, Eustache Le Sueur, and Philippe de Champaigne, painted in the style we have already referred to as Parisian Atticism to distinguish it from the true classicism of Claude and Poussin. Attic art is characterized by a melange of late-Fontainebleau Mannerism and Vouet's decorative lyricism, on the one hand, and an increasingly restrained and sober manner derived from the work of Poussin and the most classical followers of the Carracci, such as Domenichino and Albani, on the other. Although the brief return of Poussin from Rome (1640–1642) was a major event for French artists, his art was not their only source of inspiration. Francesco Romanelli was busy with several major commissions which presented an opportunity to experience a florid Baroque style; and the Bolognese landscapist, Giovanni Francesco Grimaldi, who is said to have brought the art of Claude to Paris, was also active for his hôtel were the most famous of the artist's career. Seguier was also one of the earliest patrons of Charles Le Brun (see Crelly 1962, chapter 4). The famous drawing collection of Everhard Jabach, which he also sold to the crown, formed the basis of the Cabinet des Dessins in the Louvre (see the preface and introduction to Paris 1977). For more on the collectors of this period, see Bonaffé 1884.
th there in the 1640s. Furthermore, a number of French artists including Rémy Vuibert, Charles Errard, and Jacques Stella returned from their Roman studies in the late 1630s and mid-1640s and, unlike Poussin, established ateliers in Paris. While their work is more informed by their absorption of Italian antiquity and the early Baroque painting of the Carracci and consequently left behind the lyricism of Vouet, it could not yet encompass the classical austerity of Poussin’s late paintings. Thus, we would propose to expand the rubric Parisian Atticism to include a much larger group of artists active in Paris during the 1640s and 1650s.

Unlike the more unified vision of the printmakers of the School of Lorraine and the circle of Vouet, the major etchers and engravers of this period defy all but the most cautious generalizations. The rough lines and granular surfaces of the engravings of Claude, Morin, and Le Pautre are strikingly different from both the crisp, curved lines and smoother finish of the engravings of Nanteuil and Poilly, and from the faulty biting and scratched lines of Vignon and Brébiette. Abraham Bosse's systematic use of the etching needle bears little relationship to the open, drawn quality of Bourdon’s etched line. Yet, these artists do share a few predispositions, most significant of which is their conscious avoidance of Vouet’s light and movement. Their figures assume more weight and inner balance; and Vouet’s emphasis on mobile light gave way to rich shadows that appear to be part of the mass of the forms themselves. The resulting images seemed more substantial, tactile, and materially present.

Although they worked in very different styles, Jean Morin and Robert Nanteuil are traditionally seen as the two greatest portrait engravers of the century. Morin used a roughly etched technique to capture the spontaneity of his sitters' personalities, whereas Nanteuil’s highly polished compositions are most notable for their combination of technical and emotional reserve. A striking aspect of Morin’s Portrait of Pierre Mangis de Granges (cat. 47) is the contrast between the rich, dark crosshatching of de Granges’ mantle and the lightly etched passages of the background, where hundreds of short, diagonal flicks over an even pattern of horizontal lines promote a painterly, almost sfumato-like surface. This contrast, combined with the lack of harsh contour lines, such as those found in the work of earlier portraitists like Gaultier and de Leu, imparts a sense of material solidity to the figure.

Where Morin’s portraits were painterly and relatively atmospheric, Nanteuil’s were precise, marmoréan, and psychologically more distant. His orderly mixture of engraved lines and stippled dashes to describe the shrewd face and assured presence of Cardinal Mazarin (cat. 53) represents the high-watermark of royal portraiture under Louis XIV. The decorative garland bordering Nanteuil’s engraving is typical of the robust ornamental style of the mid-1600s, which differed markedly from the delicate and exaggerated Mannerist ornament popular at Fontainebleau at the beginning of the century. Yet in Nanteuil’s hands, such decoration is not nearly as Baroque as that rendered in the heavy etchings of Le Pautre’s Grotesques and Moresques of Rome (cat. 52). His foliage and imagery is full of the deep shadows and quivering irregularities so natural to the etched line, qualities that impart a new tactile solidity to his grotesque beings—not unlike that of Morin’s portraits. Such convoluted richness of design was greatly admired by Louis XIV and his decorators at Versailles during the second half of the seventeenth century.

Most of Abraham Bosse’s oeuvre was etched, though his needle was disciplined by the right and ordered technique of the engraver’s burin. A totally similar feeling for order pervades the space of his images, reflecting his serious interest in perspective. Throughout the series of the Artists in Their Studios (cat. 43), Bosse employed open, but organized patterns of swelling and tapering lines in the foregrounds and more

3. Roethlisberger 1967 and John Spike (in correspondence) have both stressed the importance of Grimaldi’s presence in Paris for Parisian landscapists. For more on Romanelli and Grimaldi, see Bellini 1974 and our introduction, note 20.

4. Parisian Atticism has been traditionally applied to the group of artists who never traveled to Italy but began to pull away from the decorative manner of Vouet—Laurent de La Hyre, Philippe de Champaigne, and Eustache Le Sueur (New York 1982, pp. 144–46). But perhaps this term should also apply to a second group of artists such as Stella, Errard, and Vuibert, whose work not only tempers Vouet’s particular type of elegance, but also reveals the fact that its creators made the important trip to Rome to study the antique. Their work often influenced other talented, but poorly traveled artists. For example, the mature forms and compositions of Eustache Le Sueur are nearly as classical and well-drawn as those of most of the French artists who had spent part of the 1630s in Rome. Certainly, the work of the second group of artists can also be distinguished from the austerity of Poussin’s late classicism, which, as was previously mentioned, did not crystallize until the mid-1640s. Thus, it is both appropriate and useful to view these two groups of artists as part of the same Parisian phenomenon, and to group them under the now somewhat expanded label of Parisian Atticism.

5. Many of my observations for the School of Vouet and Parisian Atticism are indebted to discussions with Konrad Oberhuber. Some of his research has been published in Cambridge 1984.
lightly etched and less dynamic lines in the backgrounds. But it is the richness of these smoothly flowing surfaces, their palpable shadows and diffused highlights, that invoke a feeling of intimacy and warmth that would have been unobtainable with the burin. This conscious manipulation of atmospheric lights and darks enlivens his otherwise formulaic technique and animates his scenes of daily life.

The open and freely drawn etchings of Claude Lorrain unveil a new chapter in the history of French printmaking. Although rarely as successful as his paintings and drawings in capturing the subtlety of his poetic visions of classical decay, they are imbued with his feeling for the gentle landscape of the Roman campagna and the romance of rural life. Claude’s etchings also reveal a debt to the Mannerist etchings of his Lorrainese predecessor, Jacques Callot. In two early works, *The Dance on the River Bank* (cat. 39) and *Seaport with Ruined Tower* (cat. 40), he used Callot’s device of layering a deeply etched foreground over a more lightly etched middleground, which is followed by a summarily drawn background. The resulting vistas appear bleached by brilliant light and attenuated by great distances. But Claude went beyond Callot in his use of coarse and gritty surfaces as equivalents for the rough textures and atmospheric dissolution of the natural world. In his last etching, *The Goatherd* (cat. 41), Claude eschewed all systematic hatching in favor of short, broken, and irregularly drawn lines which evoke the light-filled and feathery foliage of the trees and the gentle curls of the distant clouds. Large, unetched areas of the sheet and the low horizon line underscore the endless vista of the sky and water.

Claude’s romantic and atmospheric etchings exerted a profound influence on the work of artists such as Henri Mauperché, Herman Swanevelt, and Laurent de La Hyre. Of these, Swanevelt was most sympathetic to Claude’s use of the etching needle. This was undoubtedly a result of their close working relationship in Rome in the late 1620s and 1630s. Swanevelt’s debt to Claude may be seen in his *Evening* (cat. 42), especially in the manner in which the granular materiality of the trees of the foreground sets off the lightly etched luminosity of the figures and foliage of the background. Nonetheless, the craftsmanlike treatment of the foliage, the high horizon line, and the lack of clearly defined space, point to his greater retention of the vocabulary of Mannerist landscapists such as Callot. Laurent de La Hyre also exploited the contrast between light and dark passages of his sheet in order to invoke a sense of atmospheric perspective; still many of his etchings lack the romantic staffage and graphic variation that fill the best impressions of Claude’s etchings with such intimations of life and color. Mauperché, on the other hand, was much more ambitious in his adaptation of Claude’s style and technique. The hundreds of irregularly drawn, fine lines of his etchings evoke a microcosm of leafy movement and feathery light. For the most part, however, he was not able to emulate Claude’s deep and fluid spaces, as may be seen in his *Landscape with Tobias and the Angel* (cat. 45).

Silvestre, Perelle, and Bourdon represent a more conservative strain of French printmaking, an attraction to the orderly and systematic qualities of etching and engraving, which seems to have increased as the century wore on. The correct one-point perspective of the view of Versailles in Silvestre’s title page from *The Pleasures of the Enchanted Isle* (cat. 51) borrows the precision of a draftsman’s plan. The right networks of parallel hatchings and intricate textures of Perelle’s etched set, *Six Landscapes* (cat. 46), emphasize the bravura of the technician rather than the vision of the painter. And although the blunt lines of Bourdon’s early *Flight into Egypt* (cat. 50), have the open and vivid quality of a pen and ink drawing, the precise organization of his hatching and his lack of open space create an elegant but stark image.

The work of these very different artists may point to the transitional nature of this period. In the second half of the century, the arts were dominated by the taste, patronage, and regulations of Louis XIV and the Academy. As Paris became the leading center of reproductive engraving, and as engraving itself became an accepted category within the French Academy, the spontaneity and irregularity of the etching needle was all but eclipsed by the crisp precision of the burin. After 1660, the sparkling originality of *peintre-graveurs* such as Bellange, Vignon, Claude, and Brébiette—even the highly original pictorialism of Mellan’s burin—was displaced by the ordered and systematic manner of such highly skilled engravers as Gilles Rousselet and Charles Audran. It was not until the great illustrators of the mid-eighteenth century

---

6. Claude Lorrain’s first and largest group of etchings was executed in the 1630s. But three factors—his self-imposed exile in Rome, his extensive knowledge of the early Baroque landscape tradition, and the importance of his work for Parisian artists of the 1640s and 1650s—have determined his inclusion in this section rather than in those concerned with Parisian and Lorrainese Mannerists. For more on the two phases of Claude’s print production, see H. Diane Russell’s introduction to the section on prints in Washington 1982.
that France would equal its achievements of 1600 to 1660 and once again make an original, inventive contribution to the history of printmaking.

CLAUDÉ GELLÉÉ, called LE LORRAIN (1600–1682)

Claude Lorrain was born in Champagne, in the duchy of Lorraine in 1600. When his parents died in 1612, he was sent to Freiburg-im-Breisgau to live with his brother, a maker of intarsia. In 1613, Claude traveled with an older relative to Italy where, except for a brief period in Lorraine from 1625 to 1627, he remained for the rest of his life. Claude studied with the Italian landscape painter, Agostino Tassi, from 1613 to 1615, and with the Dutch landscapist, Godfrey Wals, in Naples from 1618 to 1622. Thus it is not surprising that Claude, too, specialized in idyllic and classical landscape painting. So successful that he became the highest paid painter in Rome, he was also a significant graphic artist whose prints and drawings were avidly collected. Claude's activity as a printmaker may be divided into two distinct periods: the first, in order to earn a living before he had established his reputation, lasted from the late 1620s until 1640; the second, marked by the production of five etchings, from the 1650s and 1660s. The fact that he owned an etching press when he died indicates his clear attachment to printmaking and the possibility that he intended to continue production.

39 The Dance on the River Bank, ca. 1637
Etching; 132 x 200 mm (trimmed)
Robert-Dumesnil 6 iii/iii; Russell 24 iii/iii
Yale University Art Gallery; Gift of Leonard C. Hanna, Jr., B.A. 1913
1947.414
Illustrated facing page

40 Seaport with Ruined Tower, ca. 1638
Etching; 130 x 190 mm (trimmed)
Robert-Dumesnil 13 iii/iii; Russell 29 iii/iii
Yale University Art Gallery; Gift of Edward B. Greene, B.A. 1900
1928.109

ABRAHAM BOSSE (1602–1676)

Bosse was born in Tours in 1602. He may have studied with the Flemish publisher and engraver, Melchior Tavernier, in Antwerp in the early 1620s, but by the middle of the decade he had settled in Paris. Most famous for his prints depicting the everyday lives of the fashionable middle classes, Bosse executed over 1500 prints ranging from genre scenes and portraits to historical and allegorical subjects and book illustrations. Bosse also pursued interests in the theory of perspective and the technical aspects of printmaking. His most famous book, the Traité des Manières de Graver en taille douce was published in 1645; and he taught perspective at the Royal Academy from its inception in 1648. Made an Honorary Academician in 1651 (engravers were not permitted to join until
cat. 42. Herman Swanevelt. Evening. Yale University Art Gallery.


In these etchings, Bosse has given a visual description of the various activities of artists at work. The sculptor discusses the many finished works in his studio with a group of interested patrons, and the painter enlists the arts of flattery and conversation to discover how his patron wishes to see himself. The printers run copper plates through the printing press and hang the damp sheets up to dry. The printmakers are depicted concentrating on the physical process of making art. On the left, an etcher holds a plate covered with ground through which he scratches lines with an échoppe. On the right, an engraver pushes his burin against a plate which rests on a leather cushion stuffed with sand. The screen separating them, known as a *dow*, is glazed with oiled paper to diffuse the light.

1661), Bosse was ejected from the Academy after arguing with Charles Le Brun about artistic theory and practice. His own views concerning many of the controversial issues were published in 1667.

43 Four plates known as the *Artists in Their Studios*, 1642–43
*The Sculptor in His Studio, The Printers in Their Workroom, The Engravers in Their Studio, & The Painter in His Studio*  
Etchings with engraving; each 257 × 321 mm  
Blum 204, 205, 356 & 1076  
Yale University Art Gallery; Gifts of Peter A. Wick, B.A. 1943  
1986.126.1-4  
*Illustrated this page*
that falls on the engraver's shiny plate. In the background, two patrons examine finished prints.¹

¹. The Engravers are discussed at length in Mayor 1971, no. 461.

MICHEL CORNEILLE THE ELDER
(1603–1664)

Corneille was born in Orléans in 1603 and entered Vouet's studio in Paris soon after the latter returned from Rome in 1627. Despite his training, some of Corneille's earliest documented paintings reveal his preference for a more austere and monumental style (Auzas 1961). Primarily active as a painter, he made only a few etchings. In 1648, he was one of the twelve founding members of the Royal Academy, of which he later became rector. Corneille also taught his two sons, Michel the younger and Jean Baptiste, both of whom became important painters in the second half of the century.

44 Noli Me Tangere, ca. 1650
After Raphael (1483–1520)
Etching; 465 x 243 mm (trimmed)
Huber & Roost 3; Weigert 3
Yale University Art Gallery; Gift of Ralph Kirkpatrick, Hon. M.A. 1965
1966.118.11

After Christ's resurrection, he appeared to Mary Magdalene as she stood weeping near the empty tomb. Recognizing him, she reached out to embrace him. But because he was now more than human, he responded to her gesture by saying "noli me tangere" or "do not touch me". He then directed the Magdalene to find the apostles and tell them that he had arisen. Corneille depicts the moment when the Magdalene discovered the identity of the man she first mistook for a gardener.
HENRI MAUPERCHÉ (1602–1686)

Mauperché was born in Paris in 1602. As a student of Louis de Boullongne, the Elder, he specialized in small, idealized landscape paintings. Mauperché was honored by being commissioned to decorate the Grand Cabinet at Fontainebleau. He later became a professor at the Academy in 1655. Mauperché’s fifty-odd landscape etchings, most of which were executed after his own designs, stand alone in the annals of French landscape prints because of their wispy execution and delicate forms.

45 Landscape with Tobias and the Angel, ca. 1645
Etching; 195 × 272 mm
Robert-Dumesnil 8 i/ii
Yale University Art Gallery; Everett V. Meeks, B.A. 1901, Fund
1957.9.21
Illustrated p. 59

Tobias was the dutiful son of Tobit and Anna of Nineveh. His father, having become blind, dispatched Tobias to Media in order to collect moneys owed. The seventeenth century was most fond of depicting the archangel Raphael who, disguised as a mortal, became Tobias’ traveling companion and assured his safe passage. In this scene, Raphael reveals himself to an awestruck Tobias.

GABRIELLE PERELLE (ca. 1603–1677)

Perelle, the son of a farmer, was born in Vernon-sur-Seine around 1603. His talent for drawing was brought to the attention of the Duc de la Vieuville, who sent him to study in the atelier of Daniel Rabel. Little else is known about his career. Most of his works were derived from his own designs, but he also etched compositions after Poussin and Silvestre. Together with his sons, Adam and Nicholas, Perelle was responsible for over 1500 etchings and engravings which included views of Rome, Paris, and Versailles, as well as the monuments of Paris. The styles of father and sons are so similar that it is often difficult to distinguish between their hands. Many of the extant prints were published posthumously throughout the eighteenth century.

JEAN MORIN (ca. 1590–1650)

It is surprising that we know so little about one of the greatest French portrait engravers of the seventeenth century. Jean Morin was born in Paris sometime around 1590. Although he is reputed to have been the son-in-law of Philippe de Champaigne, the latest research of Jean Mazel and Maxime Préaud, who are cataloguing the Bibliothèque Nationale’s holdings of Morin’s prints, has uncovered no proof of this familial
tie. Morin worked in a mixture of etching and engraving after his own designs and those of other masters, particularly the portraits of Champaigne. While rarely mentioned, Morin also etched a number of landscapes.

47 Portrait of Pierre Maugis de Granges, 1648
After Philippe de Champaigne (1602–1674)
Etching with engraving; 314 x 247 mm
Robert-Dumesnil 67; Hornibrook & Petitjean 32
Yale University Art Gallery; Gift of Edward B. Greene, B.A. 1900
1938.185
Illustrated facing page

Pierre Maugis de Granges was the Maître d'Hôtel de Louis XIII.

48 Portrait of Augustin de Thou, the Elder, ca. 1640
Etching with engraving; 316 x 250 mm
Robert-Dumesnil 77; Hornibrook & Petitjean 42

Yale University Art Gallery; Gift of Edward B. Greene, B.A. 1900
1938.182

Augustin de Thou (d. 1544) was the President of the Parliament of Paris from 1535 to 1544.

LAURENT DE LA HYRE (1606–1656)

La Hyre, the son of a minor painter, was born in Paris in 1606. He began his studies in his father's studio, and in 1622, continued for two years at Fontainebleau. La Hyre also spent 1625 in Lallemant's studio in Paris. By the early 1630s, he was well established as both a history and a landscape painter. Because of his friendship with Abraham Bosse, La Hyre is said to have been passionately interested in perspective; the fact is that his son did become a noted mathematician. In 1648 he was one of the founding members of the Royal Academy.
49 Three plates from a set of Six Landscapes, 1640
The Pond, The Dead Tree & A Cluster of Trees
Etchings; each 101 x 158 mm
Robert-Dumesnil 29 i/ii, 30 i/ii & 32 i/ii
Davison Art Center, Wesleyan University
40.D1-82.1,2 & 4
Illustrated p. 61

50 The Flight into Egypt, ca. 1650
Etching; 187 x 231 mm
Robert-Dumesnil 17 iii/iii
Yale University Art Gallery; Gift of Allen Evarts Foster, B.A. 1906
1965.33.484

SEBASTIAN BOURDON (1616–1671)

Bourdon was born to a family of French Protestants in Montpellier. After traveling extensively in France as an itinerant student painter, he was recorded in Rome in 1634. Denounced by the Inquisition as a heretic, he fled Rome in 1637 and returned to Paris, where in 1648 he became one of the founding members of the French Academy. In 1652, Bourdon traveled to Sweden at the request of Queen Christina. He returned to Paris in 1654 and became rector of the Academy.

ISRAEL DE SILVESTRE (1621–1691)

Silvestre was born in Nancy in 1621. Because both parents died around 1630, he went to live in Paris with his uncle, the publisher and engraver, Israel Henriet. It is generally assumed that Silvestre received his earliest training in his uncle’s atelier. At the time, Henriet was the publisher of both Claude and della Bella and not surprisingly their etchings exerted a decisive influence on the young artist. From 1640 until 1655, Silvestre worked and traveled extensively in Italy, where he earned a considerable reputation for his topographical etchings. By the time that he re-
turned to Paris in 1655, he had significantly altered both his style and technique. Instead of etching in the manner of Callot and della Bella, he had begun to experiment with the more rigorous and systematic medium of engraving. Silvestre now frequently received commissions from Louis XIV, including the work for which he is most famous, *The Pleasures of the Enchanted Isle* of 1664. He became the master of drawing to the Dauphin in 1669.

51 Title page from *The Pleasures of the Enchanted Isle*, 1664
Etching and engraving; 281 x 427 mm
Fauchez 318-1
Davison Art Center, Wesleyan University
63-33-1.1
*Illustrated facing page*

In May of 1664 Louis XIV ordered an elaborate, week-long celebration ostensibly to honor his mother, Anne of Austria, and his wife, Maria-Theresa. Actually, the themes of the operas and ballets indicated that the festivities were probably intended to honor the king’s mistress, Louise de La Vallière. An interesting feature of this engraving is that it records the Chateau de Versailles—which was originally a small hunting lodge used by Louis XIII—before the extensive additions of the 1670s and 1680s. The inscription, encircled by fourteen coats of arms beneath the view of the chateau, announces the event and emphasizes that the escutcheons are listed in order of the noblemen’s appearance in the procession and not in order of their qualité or rank.

1. Marie 1940.

JEAN LE PAUTRE (1618–1682)

Born and educated in Paris, Le Pautre studied with Adam Philippon, an important, early seventeenth-century designer of ornamental decoration. It is all but certain that Le Pautre learned the arts of etching and engraving from Philippon, since his first eighty works derived from Philippon’s designs. In due course, Le Pautre became the foremost ornament engraver of the seventeenth century, and is considered to have originated the style of ornament decoration now associated with Louis XIV. His printed oeuvre numbers well over 1500. Le Pautre became a member of the Academy in 1667.

During the course of the seventeenth century in France, the clear, Classical ornament of the Renaissance and the elegant, twisted Mannerist ornament of Fontainebleau were slowly displaced by the heavy bravura of Baroque interior decor. One of the most significant sources for the new style were Pietro da Cortona’s frescoed decorations in the Palazzo Barberini, Rome, and those in the Pitti Palace, Florence. Many of these designs were imported to France by da Cortona’s most successful student, Francesco Romanelli, and
important source, however, were the drawings of the well-traveled woodcarver, Adam Philippon, whose works were engraved by Jean Le Pautre. His earliest works after Philippon date from 1643, although most of his original etchings and engravings may be placed between 1657 and 1667.¹

Grotesques are a style of ornament characterized by fanciful or fantastic human forms interwoven with foliage, while moresques are ornamental designs of Moorish origin. In the present etchings, every angularity is avoided by a skillful weaving of decorative components: figures, shell work, cartouches, and masks. All these dynamic forms are further enlivened by the clear highlights and dark shadows of the rich etching technique. Such heavy, tactile designs provided the basis for the full-blown French Baroque decorations of the second half of the century.


ROBERT NANTEUIL (1623–1678)

Nanteuil was born in Reims in 1623 and, until he was twenty-three, studied literature with the Jesuits and the Benedictines in his native city. In 1645, he moved to Paris and entered the studio of his godfather, Nicholas Regnesson. Nanteuil began his career as a portraitist by making pen-and-ink drawings, pastels, and portrait etchings in the manner of Jean Morin. His mature oeuvre consists of dozens of engraved portraits of the most important people of his period. Beside being the teacher of engravers such as Nicholas Regnesson II and Nicholas Poitou, Nanteuil was also a noted, albeit minor poet. He became an engraver-in-ordinary to Louis XIV in 1659.

53 Portrait of Cardinal Jules Mazarin, 1656
Engraving; 345 x 267 mm
Robert-Dumesnil 179; Petitjean & Wickert 158 i/ii
Yale University Art Gallery; Gift of Edward B. Greene, B.A. 1900
1938.220

Jules Mazarin was the prime minister under Louis XIV.

54 Portrait of Louis XIV, 1676
Engraving; 522 x 437 mm
Robert-Dumesnil 162 iii/xi; Petitjean & Wickert 143 ii/xvi
Yale University Art Gallery; Gift of Edward B. Greene, B.A. 1900
1937.318
Illustrated facing page

FRANÇOIS POILLY THE ELDER (1622–1693)

Poilly was born to a family of goldsmiths and engravers in Abbeville. He studied with his father until 1646 and spent the next four in the studio of Pierre Daret (cat. 38). In 1649 Poilly departed for Rome where he enjoyed considerable success as a reproductive engraver. He returned to Paris in 1656 where he established his own atelier, training young engravers like Gerard Edelinck and his son, François the Younger. Throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries members of the Poilly family were important as both engravers and printmakers. Poilly himself became an engraver to Louis XIV in 1664.

55 The Flight into Egypt, ca. 1660
After Guido Reni (Bolognese, 1575–1642)
Engraving; 442 x 312 mm (trimmed)
Museum of Fine Arts, Boston; Harvey D. Parker Collection
P3951

64
EXHIBITION CATALOGUES


BOOKS AND ARTICLES


Béguin 1963  Sylvie Béguin, “Two Projects by Martin Fréminet for the Chapel of the Trinity at Fontainebleau,” MD 1, no. 3 (1963) 30-34.


Béguin, Guillaume, Sylvie Béguin, Jean Guillaumie, and Alain Roy, La Galerie D’Ulysse à Fontainebleau, Paris, 1986.


Bellini 1975 ———, “Printmakers and Dealers in Italy during the 16th and 17th Centuries,” Print Collector, no. 13 (May-June 1975) 17-45.


Bonaffé 1884 Edmund Bonaffé, Dictionnaire des amateurs français au XVIIe siècle, Paris, 1884.


Goldstein 1971 Carl Goldstein, “Forms and Formulas: Attitudes towards Caravaggio in Seventeenth-Century France,” *Art Quarterly* 34, no. 3 (Fall 1971) 345-55.


Hollstein German  F. W. H. Hollstein, *German Engravings, Etchings, and Woodcuts ca. 1400–1700*, Amsterdam, 1954–.


Metcalfe 1912b ————, "A Prince of Print-Collectors: Michel de Marolles, Abbé de Villeloin (1600–1681)," *PCQ* 2 (1912) 316-40.

Metcalfe 1915 ————, "Claude Mellan (1598–1688)," *PCQ* 5 (1915) 258-93.


Stechow 1938 Wolfgang Stechow, "Ludolph Büsinck, a German Chiaroscuro Master of the Seventeenth Century" *PCQ* 25 (1938) 392-419.


Stechow 1948 ————, "Drawings and Etchings by Jacques Fouquetier," *GBA* 34 (Dec. 1948) 419-34.

Stechow 1953 ————, "Heliodorus' *Aethiopica* in Art," *JWCI* 16 (1953) 144-52.


Tietze-Conrat 1925 Erica Tietze-Conrat, *Der Französische Kupferstich der Renaissance*, Munich, 1925.


Weigert 1949 ———, "La Réalité dans l'art français du XVIIe siècle, les graveurs de la vie populaire," *Maandblad voor den Beeldende Kunsten* (1949) 100-05.


Wildenstein 1957 ———, "Inventaire de Laurent de La Hire (1657)," *GBA* 49 (May-June 1957) 341-43.


Yale University Art Gallery