

| Joos van Cleve and Albrecht Dürer: A Hypothetical Relationship¹

In 1519, the future looked bright for master painter Joos van Cleve. He had married Anna Vyts that year and had made a pair of portraits of himself and his young spouse, of which only his *Self-Portrait* survived (**fig. 1**).² It shows the artist in his early to mid-30s, no doubt proud of his accomplishments, since he was chosen by his brethren of the Guild of Saint Luke to become their dean (*deken*) for a year, together with the glass painter Symon van Dale. That was an honour, certainly at his young age, but one that came with huge responsibilities and financial burdens. The young couple lived near the Capelle van Gratien, amidst Joos's colleagues in what one could regard as the artists' quarter in Antwerp, around the church of St James, Kipdorp and the Keizerstraat.³ Apparently things were going quite well for the young and ambitious painter, who had become free master of the painters' guild eight years earlier in 1511.⁴

Joos van Cleve had arrived from the Lower Rhine area, where he had been working as an assistant of Jan Joest, a renowned master painter, and together with Barthel Bruyn the Elder participated between 1507 and 1509 in the production of the famous altarpiece for the high altar in the church of St Nicholas in Kalkar (**fig. 2**).⁵ After this apprenticeship the young painter made his way to Antwerp, possibly after a short stay in Cologne or Bruges. His first years in Antwerp were not overly successful. He produced portraits and small devotional images, but his luck changed for the better in 1514 or 1515, when he received an enormously prestigious commission for an altarpiece, the triptych with the *Death of the Virgin*, for the private house

¹ I am indebted to many friends and colleagues, in particular Dagmar Eichberger, Dan Ewing, Larry Silver, Jan Van der Stock, Federica Veratelli, Micha Leeftang, Martin Schawe, Jan Schmidt, Mirjam Neumeister, Piotr Borusowski, Anna Kielczewska, Marcin Wawrzyńczak and Antoni Ziemia.

² Museo Nacional Thyssen-Bornemisza, Madrid, inv. no. 1930.128. John Oliver Hand, *Joos van Cleve. The Complete Paintings* (New Haven & London, 2004), pp. 47, 61, 64, 126, cat. no. 22.

³ The house was no doubt in a street that is now called the Gratiekapelstraat, off the Keizerstraat. Many other master painters, such as Jan de Beer, Adriaen van Overbeke, Hendrick van Wueluwe and Goossen van der Weyden lived in that area. See Maximiliaan P.J. Martens, "Antwerp Painters: Their Market and Networks," *Jaarboek Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten Antwerpen*, 2004/05 (2006), pp. 69–72.

⁴ He was inscribed as "Joos Van Cleeve, scildere" [*schilder* – 'painter'] in the Ledgers (*Liggeren*) of the Guild of Saint Luke. See Philippe Rombouts and Théodore van Lierus, *De Liggeren en andere historische archieven der Antwerpsche Sint Lucasgilde onder lijfspreuk: 'Wt ionsten versaemt'*, (2 vols.) (Antwerp–The Hague 1864–1876), vol. 1, p. 75; Hand, *Joos Van Cleve*..., op. cit., p. 5, n. 1 and p. 203, n. 4.

⁵ On Jan Joest as a painter, see Ulrike Wolff-Thomsen, *Jan Joest von Kalkar. Ein niederländischer Maler um 1500* (Bielefeld, 1999); Lioba Schollmeyer, *Jan Joest. Ein Beitrag zur Kunstgeschichte des Rheinlandes um 1500* (Bielefeld, 2004). On the complicated history of the altarpiece itself, which is still on the High Altar in the church of St Nicholas in Kalkar, see Hans Peter Hilger, *Stadtpfarrkirche St. Nicolai in Kalkar* (Kleve, 1990), pp. 65–113.

chapel of the Hackeney Family in Cologne (**fig. 3**).⁶ This triptych led shortly afterwards to a second important commission from Nicasius and Georg Hackeney, a much larger triptych, albeit with the same subject, for the Sankt Maria im Kapitol in Cologne (**fig. 4**).⁷ It was possibly Jan Joest, Joos' former employer, well connected to the rich and influential Hackeney family, who pointed these clients in the direction of his erstwhile apprentice.⁸

This double project set Joos van Cleve's career as a successful entrepreneur in motion and led to many new and important commissions, the result of his rapidly growing network of merchants in the city of Antwerp. However, the first major project was his involvement in the creation of a compound altarpiece that was produced alongside the two triptychs for the Hackeney family and which was to be placed in the chapel of the Saint Reinhold Brotherhood in Our Lady's Church in Gdańsk in 1516 (**figs. 5–7**).⁹ Around the same time Joos van Cleve and his studio must have produced a large triptych with the saints Peter, Paul and Andreas for the Church of São Pedro in Funchal, on the island of Madeira (**fig. 8**).¹⁰ Shortly afterwards several local commissions followed, such as the *Crucifixion Triptych* for Marcus von Kirch and Margriete Schats from Mechelen in 1518–19 (**fig. 9**).¹¹ In 1516 Joos van Cleve decided to

⁶ Wallraf-Richartz-Museum, Cologne, inv. no. 430. On this triptych see Hand, *Joos van Cleve*..., op. cit., pp. 24, 26–31, 116–17, cat. no. 7; Micha Leeftang, *Joos van Cleve. A Sixteenth-Century Antwerp Artist and His Workshop* (Turnhout, 2015), pp. 95–101. Nicasius Hackeney was a close confidant of Emperor Maximilian I and he would be appointed Imperial Treasurer in 1499. The private chapel for which the triptych was intended, was part of the house that Hackeney had rebuilt on the north side of the Neumarkt in Cologne and which would become the imperial residence in that city.

⁷ Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen, Alte Pinakothek, Munich, inv. no. WAF 150–152. See Hand, *Joos van Cleve*..., op. cit., pp. 69–70, 143, cat. no. 47. John Hand dated the picture to c. 1523–24, but Micha Leeftang placed the triptych much earlier, before 1518, both on stylistic and formal arguments. As she stated convincingly, the altarpiece must have been finished before the elder brother Nicasius Hackeney passed away in 1518, and she argued with reason that Joos van Cleve probably worked on the wings of both triptychs simultaneously. The triptych was installed 1524 in the Sankt Maria im Kapitol near the rood screen the brothers Hackeney had ordered from Mechelen in 1517, but was only installed 1523. See Leeftang, *Joos van Cleve*..., op. cit., pp. 97–101.

⁸ As was suggested by Micha Leeftang. See Leeftang, *Joos van Cleve*..., op. cit., pp. 96, 105.

⁹ *The Saint Reinhold Altarpiece*, after 1945 taken by the Polish authorities to the National Museum in Warsaw (inv. no. M.Ob.2190 MNW), is probably the most conclusive published work by Joos van Cleve: Jan Białostocki, "New observations on Joos van Cleve," *Oud Holland*, 70 (1955), pp. 121–29; Ryszard Szmydki, "Retables anversois en Pologne. Contribution à l'étude des rapports artistiques entre les anciens Pays-Bas Méridionaux et la région de Gdańsk au début du XVI^e siècle," *Verhandelingen van de Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België. Klasse der Schone Kunsten*, 48 (1986), pp. 23–125; Hand, *Joos van Cleve*..., op. cit., pp. 31–35, 117, cat. no. 8; Micha Leeftang, "The Saint Reinhold Altarpiece by Joos van Cleve and his Workshop: New Insights into the Influence of Albrecht Dürer on the Working Process," in Molly Faries et al., *Making and Marketing: Studies of the Painting Process in Fifteenth- and Sixteenth-Century Netherlandish Workshops* (Turnhout, 2006), pp. 15–42; John Hand, "Der Künstler und seine Kundschaft. Die Altarretabel Joos van Cleves und ihr Handel in Europa," in *Joos van Cleve. Leonardo des Nordens*, Peter van den Brink, ed., exh. cat., Suermondt-Ludwig-Museum, Aachen, 2011 (Stuttgart, 2011), pp. 34–39; Leeftang, *Joos Van Cleve*..., op. cit., pp. 47–60, 112–18.

¹⁰ Museu de Arte Sacra, Funchal, inv. no. MASF 27. The altarpiece was possibly commissioned by Simão Gonçalves da Câmara, the third captain of Funchal. See *Joos van Cleve. Leonardo*..., op. cit., pp. 158–59, cat. no. 2 (Alice Taatgen); Leeftang, *Joos van Cleve*..., op. cit., pp. 118–23. There was a direct trading route between Madeira and Antwerp and it was probably easier for local clients to order altarpieces from Antwerp than from Lisbon or Coimbra. Since Italian and German merchants played an important role in the distribution of Portuguese goods, merchants from Genoa, Cologne and Portugal were well connected among each other in Antwerp. On this subject, see Leeftang, *Joos van Cleve*..., op. cit., pp. 118–20 (with additional bibliographical references).

¹¹ Museo Nazionale di Capodimonte, Naples, inv. no. HS 257–258. Hand, *Joos van Cleve*..., op. cit., pp. 41–43, 119, cat. no. 10; Hand, "Der Künstler...", op. cit., pp. 44–46; *Joos van Cleve. Leonardo des Nordens*, op. cit., pp. 159–60, cat. no. 3 (Alice Taatgen); Leeftang, *Joos van Cleve*..., op. cit., pp. 122, 124–26.

take on an apprentice, Claes van Brugghe, but he must have employed several assistants as well, journeymen, well-trained painters without the means or ambition to start a workshop of their own.¹²

One year after his marriage to Anna Vyts, their first child, Cornelis, was born, and at the same time Joos was re-elected Dean of the Guild of Saint Luke, this time with another colleague, the master painter Jan de Cock, and he joined the Confraternity of the Onze-Lieve-Vrouwe-Lof, devoted to the Virgin Mary, in Antwerp's Our Lady's Church, which can at best be described as a late medieval social-network organisation.¹³ The painter was incredibly active, not only socially or in his role as one of the deans of the Guild, but as a master of his studio as well, painting portraits of Antwerp's citizens and producing altarpieces for his high-profile clients. In the summer of 1520 Joos van Cleve was at the peak of his powers, a young father, a very talented painter and successful entrepreneur with a fast-growing international network. It was at that very moment, early August, that Albrecht Dürer, the most famous artist of his time with the status of a modern-day superstar, arrived in Antwerp.

Dürer's Arrival in Antwerp

Since 1515, Albrecht Dürer was entitled to a yearly privilege or life rent from the ruling Habsburg emperor, Maximilian I. This privilege, 100 Rhenish guilders, was to be paid into Dürer's account every single year by the city government of Nuremberg, out of the tax revenues for the imperial treasure.¹⁴ In addition, in a letter dated 8 September 1518, Maximilian had granted the artist a one-off payment, this time 200 Rhenish guilders, again to be paid from the Nuremberg tax revenues.¹⁵ After Emperor Maximilian passed away in January 1519, the city magistrates decided to keep a lid on the payments, until the Emperor's successor, his grandson Charles V, was crowned King of Germany and would give his blessing to the re-installment of the artist's privilege, on the same conditions as his grandfather. Clearly afraid that the city magistrates would forget about the 1518 grant after the death of their beloved sovereign, Dürer wrote them a letter on 27 April the next year, in which he asked to have this large sum paid into his account. He even stated in his letter that he was willing to use the

¹² For an overview of Joos van Cleve's altarpieces in general, see Hand, "Der Künstler..." op. cit., pp. 31–63. Micha Leeftang gives a clear and comprehensive overview of the artist's known commissioned altarpieces, see Leeftang, *Joos van Cleve...*, op. cit., pp. 91–95 (followed by a detailed geographic outset – Cologne and other German commissions, Gdańsk, Madeira, Antwerp and the Netherlands and finally Genoa – see pp. 95–157).

¹³ See Roland A.E. Op de Beeck, *De Gilde van Onze-Lieve-Vrouwe-Lof in de Kathedraal van Antwerpen* (Antwerp, 1978). Joos is mentioned in the accounts of the fraternity: Antwerp, Rijksarchief, Archief Onze-Lieve-Vrouwe-Lof Gilde, Rekeningenboek 1, fol. 192r (1520): "Ten selven daghe [27 april 1520] ontfanghen van meest[er] Joes van / Cleve scildere byde capelle van gracien voer syn incoemste – I [selling] X [deniers] [Brabants]". ("Received on this day [27 April 1520] from master painter Joes van Cleve [residing] near the Capelle van Gracien for his entry fee I [shillings] X [denari] [Brabant]"). I am very grateful to Jan Van der Stock for the transcription of the entry.

¹⁴ The original letter of Maximilian to the Mayor and City Council of Nuremberg, dated 6 September 1515, in which the Emperor instructed the city to pay Albrecht Dürer 100 Rhenish Guilders every single year, did not survive. An 18th-century copy is in the Nuremberg City Archive. See Jeffrey Ashcroft, *Albrecht Dürer, Documentary Biography*, (2 vols.) (New Haven & London, 2017), vol. 1, pp. 415–16, no. 99; *Dürer war hier. Eine Reise wird Legende*, Peter van den Brink, ed., Suermondt-Ludwig-Museum, Aachen; National Gallery, London, 2021–22 (Petersberg, 2021), p. 647, cat. no. 250, and Thomas Schauerte, "Begegnung mit sich selbst. Albrecht Dürer in Aachen und im Jülicher Land," in *Dürer war hier...*, op. cit., pp. 151–52, figs. 85–86.

¹⁵ The letter, that was sent directly from Augsburg where the Emperor attended the Diet or Reichstag, is kept in the Nuremberg State Archive. See Ashcroft, *Albrecht Dürer...*, op. cit., vol. 1, pp. 493–94, no. 127.

house of his parents as a guarantee.¹⁶ Evidently, the city council had agreed to release the sum of 200 guilders to the artist in 1519 already, but apparently had failed to inform Dürer on this matter before he made his way to Antwerp.¹⁷

Dürer's most explicit reason to make this long journey, together with his wife Agnes and the young maid Susanna, was therefore an economic one, and based upon Dürer's notes in his famous travel journal it is evident that the re-installment of this life rent was his first priority and would continue to absorb him until Charles V, on 12 November 1520 in Cologne, sent out his letter of confirmation, which led to a sigh of relief: "My *confirmatia* from the Emperor to my Lords of Nuremberg was issued on the Monday after St Martin's, after much effort and travail."¹⁸ Nevertheless, it was most certainly not the only reason Albrecht Dürer would come to Antwerp, the town that would become his place of residence during this eventful journey. Curiosity, new horizons, exotic encounters and especially recognition of his status as the world's best artist with the lucrative commissions that would go with it, were no doubt on his mind when he set off from Nuremberg to Antwerp on 12 July 1520.

There is, however, another reason Albrecht Dürer went through so much trouble to come to Antwerp, closing his studio and taking his wife Agnes with him. It is more than likely the City Council of Antwerp had invited the artist to become their city painter. In a letter requesting an annuity from the Nuremberg City Council, dated 17 October 1524, Albrecht Dürer stated the following: "Note that nineteen years ago the authorities in Venice offered me an appointment and two hundred ducats annual stipend, similarly a few years ago, when I was in the Netherlands, the Antwerp Council wanted to pay me a salary of three hundred Philip gulden a year, exempt me from tax, and provide me with a fine house for nothing, and in both places [Venice and Antwerp] pay me extra for everything I painted for the City government" (fig. 10).¹⁹ Unfortunately there are no other documents that corroborate Dürer's

¹⁶ This letter, too, is kept in the Nuremberg State Archive, see Ashcroft, *Albrecht Dürer...*, op. cit., vol. 1, pp. 503–04, no. 138. See also: Peter van den Brink and Susan Foister, "Einleitung," in *Dürer war hier...*, op. cit., p. 35, fig. 2, as well as p. 647, cat. no. 252 (Peter van den Brink).

¹⁷ The first of two drafts that were drawn up by Erasmus Strenberger for Dürer and the Nuremberg delegates in late August 1520 in Brussels, still mentions the neglected sum of 200 guilders, but not so the second draft. Apparently, the Nuremberg delegates, when confronted with Strenberger's first draft, must have reassured the artist that the payment was already accredited the year before. The Nuremberg City Tax Account of the year 1519 does indeed confirm this, since two payments to Albrecht Dürer can be found in there, 300 guilders, being the outstanding life rent instalments of 1516, 1517 and 1518, as well as 200 guilders, the extra grant that was promised to him in September 1518. Two of these drafts, both autograph copies, survive. One is in the Berlin print room, the other letter was in a private collection in Basel in 1969. The present whereabouts of the latter are unknown, see Ashcroft, *Albrecht Dürer...*, op. cit., vol. 1, pp. 639–42, nos. 165.1–2. The Nuremberg City Tax Account for the years 1519–20 is nowadays in the State Archive in Vienna, the summary of expenditure in the Nuremberg State Archive, see *ibid.*, pp. 645–47, nos. 165.5–06.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 566. The original journal did not survive; it probably fell victim to fire at the time the Coalition Wars flooded the southern regions of the German lands, including Nuremberg, at the end of the 18th century. Two early copies are in the Nuremberg State Archive and the Bamberg State Library. See *Dürer war hier...*, op. cit., p. 647, cat. nos. 257–58 (Peter van den Brink), and Christof Metzger, "Zeichnen und Aufzeichnen. Dürers Zeichnungen der niederländischen Reise," in *Dürer war hier...*, op. cit., pp. 200–06.

¹⁹ State Archive, Nuremberg, inv. no. STAN, Rst. Nbg., A-Laden, Akten 145/15a (9). See Ashcroft, *Albrecht Dürer...*, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 734, no. 198.1. It is inconceivable that Dürer made this story up to impress the Nuremberg City Council, since he might have been asked to offer proof to back up this remarkable assertion. To be able to obtain his annual stipend, Dürer had offered the City Government a fund of one thousand Rhenish guilders, from which that stipend could be paid. Therefore, he had absolutely no need to fence with additional arguments to convince the City Council.

statement, but I have not the slightest doubt that the city of Antwerp made him such an offer, either before his arrival, or after.²⁰

Albrecht and Agnes Dürer arrived in Antwerp on Thursday, 2 August 1520, and went straight to their lodgings in the Wolstraat, which was run by Jobst Plankfelt, as Dürer called him (**fig. 11**).²¹ That same night Dürer would dine with Bernhard Stecher, who was the chief representative of the Fugger Bank in Antwerp, a clear token that the artist's arrival had not gone unnoticed. Two days later his host gave him a lengthy tour in the newly built house of the Antwerp mayor, the so-called Hof van Liere, named after its owner Arnold van Liere. Dürer was completely taken by surprise by this amazing city palace in Brabantine-Gothic style and he gave a special praise to the refined tower, of which he would later make a drawing in his silverpoint drawing book.²²

On Sunday, 5 August, three days after their arrival in Antwerp, Albrecht and Agnes Dürer were invited to a large welcoming banquet in the Guildhall – Den Bonte Mantel – on the Antwerp main square (Grote Markt). This festive banquet was organised by the Guild of Saint Luke in Albrecht Dürer's honour, and no doubt it must have been initiated by Joos van Cleve and his fellow dean Jan de Cock. Dürer's detailed account of that evening is clearly marked by pride and emotion, as well as gratitude towards his colleagues: "And on Sunday, it was St Oswald's Day, the painters invited me to their hall with my wife and the maid, and had set it all out with silver cutlery and other precious tableware, and splendid food. All their wives were there too. And as I was conducted to the table, the company rose to their feet and lined the way, as if some great lord was entering. There were present most eminent and renowned persons who bowed deeply and showed me humble deference. They vowed they would do everything, whatever lay in their power, once they knew my pleasure. And as I was sitting there amidst such honour, there entered the Syndicus [*Ratsbote*] of the Antwerp Council²³ with two servants and presented to me four cans of wine with the compliments of the City Councillors, who bade me know that this gift was in my honour and a mark of their good will. I returned them humble thanks and pledged my humble service. Thereupon came Master Peter, the city carpenter, who presented me with two cans of wine, in token of his willing service.²⁴ When we had spent a long and convivial evening together lasting late into

²⁰ Jeroen Stumpel, "Luther in Dürers Tagebuch. Die Lutherklage, ihr Autor und die Protestantenverfolgung in Antwerpen," in *Dürer war hier...*, op. cit., p. 134.

²¹ The names Dürer wrote down in his journal, were phonetically derived. His landlord's correct name was Joost Blankveld. A drawn portrait of him by Albrecht Dürer, probably from his journal, has survived and is now in the collection of the Städel Museum in Frankfurt am Main (inv. no. 699). See Metzger, "Zeichnen und Aufzeichnen...", op. cit., pp. 192–93; Peter van den Brink, "In grossem Stil. Albrecht Dürers Porträtzeichnungen der niederländischen Reise," in *Dürer war hier...*, op. cit., p. 304 and p. 619, cat. no. 32.

²² Ashcroft, *Albrecht Dürer...*, op. cit., vol. 1, p. 555. The drawing of the tower can be found to the right of the portrait Dürer took of Lazarus Ravensburger, now in Berlin (Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett, inv. no. KdZ 35). See Fedja Anzelewsky, Hans Mielke, *Albrecht Dürer. Kritischer Katalog der Zeichnungen im Kupferstichkabinett Berlin* (Berlin, 1984), pp. 99–100, cat. no. 95 (Hans Mielke). With regard to Dürer's silverpoint drawing book: Metzger, "Zeichnen und Aufzeichnen...", op. cit., pp. 194–200; Arnold Nesselrath, "Zu Albrecht Dürers Silberstiftskizzenbuch," in *Dürer war hier...*, op. cit., pp. 229–57.

²³ Adriaen Herbouts was the Attorney-General and public orator to the Antwerp authorities. In September 1520 Dürer drew his portrait. Early March 1521 Dürer presented to him his complete oeuvre of prints. A few weeks later they would dine together and Herbouts returned the gift with a small panel that was painted by Joachim Patinir, *Lot and His Daughters*. See Ashcroft, *Albrecht Dürer...*, op. cit., vol. 1, pp. 563, 575, 576.

²⁴ This was Peter Teels, sculptor and carpenter to the city, from whom Dürer would buy his prepared panels and frames for his paintings and wooden supports for his portrait drawings.

the night, they did us the honour of lighting our way home with lanterns, bidding me accept the assurance of their good will and their ever-ready help in whatsoever I wished to do. For that I thanked them and went to my bed.”²⁵

There is no way of knowing what Dürer’s *status quo* was on that festive evening with regard to the potential offer the City of Antwerp had made, nor are we aware that if such an offer had been made already, how much of it was known to the deans of the Guild of Saint Luke, let alone to the other members present. It is remarkable, however, given the fact that the deans were responsible for organizing this festive banquet, perhaps even at their own expense, that Dürer did not single them out. This accounts especially to Joos van Cleve, the most successful painter in Antwerp at that very moment. Moreover, Albrecht Dürer would not mention Van Cleve a single time in this journal that covered his stay in the Low Countries until the very end.

Artistic Antipoles

As artists, masters of their trade, these two characters could not have been more different, although they were both proud and ambitious men who strived for perfection in their work. It is certainly no coincidence that both Dürer and Van Cleve translated their pride into self-assured self-portraits in several of their altarpieces.²⁶ Joos van Cleve painted himself this way at least four times, as a bystander in the background on the two altarpieces with the *Adoration of the Magi* in Dresden, although these two self-portraits seem to have been applied as a last-minute decision, since initially different faces had been prepared in the underdrawing.²⁷ Apparently, this holds true for his self-portrait as Saint Reinhold on the exterior wing of the *Reinhold Altarpiece* as well, since it seems that in the original layout a bearded saint was foreseen (figs. 12–13).²⁸ Nevertheless, the impact was of a completely different nature than a modest face in the background. Since the facial type of Saint Reinhold, unlike John the Baptist on the other exterior wing, had not developed into a stereotype and the notion that the artist’s face most likely was unknown to the members of the brotherhood, this remarkable feature probably went completely unnoticed. His fourth self-portrait, several years later, as a servant pouring the wine for Christ and his apostles in the *Last Supper*, the predella of the *Santa Maria della Pace Altarpiece* for the church of that name in Genoa (now in the Louvre),

²⁵ Ashcroft, *Albrecht Dürer*..., op. cit., vol. 1, pp. 555–56.

²⁶ This was certainly not a common procedure, not in Nuremberg, nor in Antwerp, although a few of Joos van Cleve’s colleagues did include their self-portraits into important paintings they produced, such as the Master of Frankfurt (Hendrick van Wueluwe), Gerard David and Bernard van Orley.

²⁷ Leeflang, *Joos van Cleve*..., op. cit., pp. 34–45. Apparently Joos followed the same routine as with his (self) portrait on the Kalkar altarpiece – on which he worked as an apprentice under Jan Joest – where his portrait appears on top of an underdrawing of the features of a woman (ibid., pp. 10–11, figs. 1.2–4).

²⁸ Infrared reflectography was performed with a Grundig 70 H television camera outfitted with a Hamamatsu N 214 IR vidicon (1981), a TV macromar 1:2.8/36mm lens, and Kodak wratten 87 A filter cutting on at 0.9 micron placed behind the lens, with a Grundig BG 12 monitor set at 875 lines. Any photographic documentation is done with a Canon A-1 35 mm camera, a 50 mm macrolens, and Kodak Plus X film and/or Ilford film, ASA 125. The IRR-assembly/assemblies reproduced here was/were made with Adobe Photoshop 5.5 and consist(s) of images which were scanned on 1012 dpi with Polaroid SprintScan 35/Plus from photo negatives belonging to the archive of Prof. Molly Faries at the RKD.

seems to have been planned as such from the beginning (figs. 14–15).²⁹ Whether or not we should attach a different meaning or value to that is, however, difficult to say.

It is clear, though, that the self-portraits in Warsaw and Paris are effectively “disguised,” whereas those in Kalkar and Dresden can be labelled as no more than “accidental.” I am therefore not entirely convinced that Joos van Cleve’s inclusion of these self-portraits was meant as a marketing strategy, as Micha Leeﬂang has suggested, although it is not impossible.³⁰ In Dürer’s case these self-portraits were clearly less “hidden,” with the exception of his self-portrait as a drummer on one of the exterior wings of the so-called *Jabach Altarpiece* of c. 1503 (fig. 16).³¹ The other four known self-portraits present the artist in full length, in combination with his signature, date and a text. On the *Feast of the Rose Garlands*, which he painted 1506 for the confraternity of the German merchants for their chapel in San Bartolomeo in Venice, Dürer is holding a letter with a text *Exegit quinque | mestri spatio Albertus | Durer Germanus | .M.D.VI.* (‘Albrecht Dürer, a German, created [this work] in five months, in 1506’) and his well-known monogram (fig. 17).³² Two years later he painted himself, together with his friend Conrad Celtis, almost as Dante guided by Virgil, amidst the *Torment of the Ten Thousand Christians* (*Martyrdom of Saint Achatius and His Legion on Mount Ararat*), a commission for Frederick the Wise of Saxony. This time the text is applied to a stick the artist holds in his hand: *Iste fatiebat [faciebat] an[n]o domini 1508 | alberto Dürer aleman[us]* (‘Albrecht Dürer, a German, made this [work] in the year of our Lord 1508’) (fig. 18).³³ In his slightly later altarpieces for Jacob Heller in Frankfurt (1509) and Matthäus Landauer (1511), Dürer poses in the background, his hand resting on a large tablet, in both cases with a text in Latin, his signature and the date (fig. 19).³⁴ As with the two previous examples, Dürer has

²⁹ On the *Santa Maria della Pace Altarpiece*, now in the Musée du Louvre in Paris (inv. no. 1996), see, i.a., Hand, *Joos van Cleve...*, op. cit., pp. 75–78, 159, cat. no. 73, and Leeﬂang, *Joos van Cleve...*, op. cit., pp. 140–43.

³⁰ Leeﬂang, *Joos van Cleve...*, op. cit., pp. 36–37.

³¹ Of this altarpiece only the wings survive. These were cut and split when they were still in Cologne. The inside wings landed in Munich, the outside wings with *Job on the Dung Heap* in the Städel Museum in Frankfurt (inv. no. 890) and *Drummer and piper* in the Wallraf-Richartz-Museum in Cologne (inv. no. WRM 0369). The altarpiece is named after the Cologne collector Everhard Jabach, who most likely acquired it in the late 16th century. On the outside wings, see Fedja Anzelewsky, *Albrecht Dürer. Das malerische Werk* (Berlin, 1971), pp. 175–79, nos. 72–73; *Der frühe Dürer*, Daniel Hess, Thomas Eser, eds, exh. cat., Germanisches Nationalmuseum, Nuremberg, 2012 (Nuremberg, 2012), pp. 422–23, cat. nos. 109–10 (Daniel Hess); *Albrecht Dürer. His Art in Context*, Jochen Sander, ed., exh. cat., Städel Museum, Frankfurt am Main, 2013 (Frankfurt am Main, 2013), pp. 316–17, cat. nos. 13.2–3 (Jochen Sander). The figure of the younger bearded magus in the *Adoration of the Magi* of 1504, now in the Uffizi in Florence (1890.1434), another painting for Frederick the Wise, may possibly be another “hidden” self-portrait.

³² National Gallery, Prague, inv. no. O.P. 2148. The altarpiece was heavily damaged when it was brought into safety because of the raids of the Swedish Army during the Thirty Years War, in 1631. Its present condition dates from 1839–41, when it was restored by Johann Gruss, but that cannot conceal the fact that the painting is in a ruined state. See Anzelewsky, *Albrecht Dürer...*, op. cit., pp. 187–99, no. 93; *Albrecht Dürer. The Feast of the Rose Garlands 1506–2006*, Olga Kotkova et al., eds, exh. cat., National Gallery, Prague, 2006 (Prague, 2006).

³³ Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, inv. no. GG 835. See Anzelewsky, *Albrecht Dürer...*, op. cit., pp. 212–18, no. 105; *Albrecht Dürer*, Christof Metzger, ed., exh. cat., Albertina, Vienna, 2019 (Vienna, 2019), pp. 294–99, 458, cat. no. 125 (Julia Zaunbauer and Christof Metzger).

³⁴ The *Saint Thomas Aquinas Altarpiece* was commissioned by Jacob Heller for his altar in the Frankfurt Dominican Church, on which Dürer worked between 1507 and 1509. The exterior of the movable wings were produced in Dürer’s studio, whereas the four fixed panels were painted later by Mathis Gothart Nithart (Grünwald). The centre panel was sold to Maximilian I of Bavaria and the convent received a copy by Jobst Harrich of Nuremberg in return. The original centre panel was destroyed by a fire in 1729. The various surviving parts are divided between the Staatliche Kunsthalle in Karlsruhe and the Frankfurt Historical Museum. See Anzelewsky, *Albrecht Dürer...*, op. cit., pp. 219–26, no. 107V–115K; Jochen Sander and Johann Schulz, “I will make something that not

put himself deliberately in the spotlight as a German *pictor doctus*, a form of presentation of the self that was completely alien to Antwerp at the time, but which fitted Dürer perfectly fine as the outstanding individual artist he saw himself to be and which can be regarded as a continuation of his remarkable presentation in the earlier *Self-Portrait* of 1500 (fig. 20).³⁵

When he arrived in Antwerp, twenty years after that iconic *Self-Portrait* had been painted, Albrecht Dürer approached the age of fifty. He had made his fame outside Nuremberg primarily as a printmaker. From the start of his career he produced engravings and woodcuts on an enormous scale, and he was able to connect this incredible productivity with the utmost quality, both in technical as in artistic respects.³⁶ In addition he was able, with the aid of his mother Barbara and his wife Agnes, to set up a distribution network that made it possible for his prints to be available everywhere in Europe. From the start of his career he made use of agents or colporteurs who were bound by contracts to the Dürer Enterprise.³⁷ His mother Barbara sold his prints locally at the Nuremberg market, and his wife Agnes did the same at fairs, such as those in Frankfurt am Main.³⁸ Artists everywhere in Europe made use of his brilliant engravings, such as *Adam and Eve* and the three *Meisterstiche* (*Melencolia I*, *Knight*,

many men can equal.' Dürer and the *Heller Altarpiece*," in *Albrecht Dürer. His Art in Context*..., op. cit., pp. 219–33, no. 8; *Albrecht Dürer*..., (2019), op. cit., pp. 302–15 (Christof Metzger). The *All Saints Altarpiece*, now in the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna (inv. no. GG 838) was made for the so-called Twelve Brothers House in Nuremberg, commissioned by Matthäus Landauer with the artist in 1508 and finished three years later. Anzelewsky, *Albrecht Dürer*..., op. cit., pp. 228–30, no. 118.

³⁵ Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen, Alte Pinakothek, Munich, inv. no. 537. See Anzelewsky, *Albrecht Dürer*..., op. cit., pp. 164–68, no. 66; Joseph Leo Koerner, *The Moment of Self-Portraiture in German Renaissance Art* (Chicago–London, 1993); *Albrecht Dürer. Die Gemälde der Alten Pinakothek*, Gisela Goldberg, Bruno Heimberg, Martin Schawe, eds, exh. cat., Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen, Munich, 1998 (Munich, 1998), pp. 314–53, cat. no. 6.

³⁶ We know of more than 100 engravings and etchings and more than 80 single-leaf woodcuts, not counting his woodcut cycles and book illustrations, which would increase the number of woodcuts to c. 350. As stated by Schmidt at least 70.000 woodcuts and 20.000 engravings by Albrecht Dürer must have circulated at the end of his life, perhaps even as much as 175.000 or 50.000, not counting the huge amounts of contemporary copies by local print makers or fashionable copyists like Marcantonio Raimondi. These amounts start from the assumption that woodcut blocks and copper plates were used some 200 to 500 times on average. See Wolfgang Schmidt, "Dürer's Enterprise: Market Area, Market Potential, Product Range," in *Economic History and the Arts*, Michael North, ed. (Cologne, 1996), p. 37.

³⁷ From at least 1497 onward, Dürer made use of professional agents for the international distribution of his prints, to important trade centres, such as Antwerp, Rome, Lyon or Venice. These agents, among them Konrad Schweitzer, Georg Kohler and Jakob Arnold, were bound to him by contracts. The contracts between Albrecht Dürer and Konrad Schweitzer and Georg Kohler, dated 8 July and 26 July 1497 respectively, have survived in the Nuremberg State Archive: Ashcroft, *Albrecht Dürer*..., op. cit., vol. 1, pp. 65–67, nos. 7–8. The contract between Dürer and Jakob Arnold did not survive, but a second contract between the artist and Hans Arnold, to stand guarantee for his brother, has: *ibid.*, pp. 90–91, no. 13; Thomas Eser, "Materialien für eine Dürer-Matrix von 1471 bis 1505," in *Der frühe Dürer*..., op. cit., pp. 545–47, nos. 40–41, 55. On the subject of Dürer's use of colporteurs and the early distribution of his prints, see Werner Schultheiß, "Ein Vertrag Albrecht Dürers über den Vertrieb seiner graphischen Kunstwerke," *Scripta Mercaturae*, vol. 1–2 (1969), pp. 77–81; David Landau, Peter Parshall, *The Renaissance Print 1470–1550* (New Haven–London 1994), pp. 347–54; Dörte Bersebach, Dorothee Hemme, "Gerissen, gestochen, aus Kunst gelöst. Produktion, Vertrieb und Preise von Dürers Graphik," in *Dürers Dinge. Einblattgraphik und Buchillustrationen Albrecht Dürers aus dem Besitz der Georg-August-Universität Göttingen*, Gerd Unverfehrt, ed. (Göttingen, 1997), pp. 39–42; Anja Grebe, "Meister nach Dürer. Überlegungen zur Dürerwerkstatt," in *Das Dürer-Haus. Neue Ergebnisse der Forschung*, G. Ulrich Großmann, Franz Sonnenberger, eds (Nuremberg, 2007), pp. 124–26.

³⁸ We do know from the earliest of the ten letters Albrecht Dürer wrote to Willibald Pirckheimer in 1506, that his wife Agnes had been selling his prints at the Frankfurt Autumn trade fair that took place between August 24 and September 15, 1505, see Ashcroft, *Albrecht Dürer*..., op. cit., vol. 1, pp. 136–39, no. 29.1; Corine Schleif, "Albrecht Dürer between Agnes Frey and Willibald Pirckheimer," in *The Essential Dürer*, Larry Silver and Jeffrey Chippis Smith, eds (Philadelphia, 2010), p. 187.

Death and Devil, St Jerome in His Study), or his sublime woodcut series of the “Passion,” the “Life of the Virgin” or the “Apocalypse.”³⁹ Contractors who produced compound altarpieces (such as the Reinhold Altarpiece), benefitted greatly from Dürer’s models, and he may have felt flattered to be confronted with those imposing large altarpieces that followed his printed series, sometimes to the letter.⁴⁰ Evidently, Dürer saw printmaking as his core business and it would make him a wealthy man.

Dürer did of course paint, especially portraits, since he was able to produce them within a few days, or *Tüchlein* paintings, another format that was not too time consuming and – rolled-up – very pragmatic while travelling.⁴¹ Large altarpieces were only produced when commissioned, but these Dürer regarded as crucial, because they enabled him to leave his mark as the superb master painter and inventor he regarded himself to be. Indeed, these altarpieces were intended to make an impression on important noble or politically influential clients, or even complete populations, as in Venice, where the *Feast of the Rose Garlands* (fig. 21) became the talk of the town among painters and connoisseurs.⁴² Although these high-profile altarpieces could create an enormous spin-off,⁴³ it took a considerable time to finish them, so from a commercial point of view they carried less weight, as we can read in his letters to Heller and Pirckheimer.⁴⁴ As is clear from Dürer’s correspondence with Jacob Heller, the artist as a rule preferred not to work on two large commissions simultaneously, another reason why

³⁹ On the use of Dürer’s prints by his contemporaries in the Netherlands: Julius S. Held, *Dürers Wirkung auf die niederländische Kunst seiner Zeit* (The Hague, 1931); Stephen H. Goddard, “Assumed Knowledge. The Use of Prints in Early Sixteenth-Century Antwerp Workshops,” *Jaarboek Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten Antwerpen*, 2004/05 (2006), pp. 123–39; Dagmar Preisling, “Der Einfluss von Dürer-Grafik auf die niederländische Kunst,” in *Dürer war hier...*, op. cit., pp. 497–525.

⁴⁰ It may in fact have been a reason for Dürer to visit the area around Jülich, where many Antwerp compound altarpieces were to be found in churches, as in Linnich, Süggerath, Barmen, Aldenhoven and Siersdorf, but he may have seen them in the Low Countries and Cologne as well. On Dürer’s excursion to the *Jülicher Land*, see Schauerte, “Begegnung mit sich selbst...,” op. cit., pp. 160–65.

⁴¹ Painting portraits would not take much more than a week’s time, and when necessary, even less. We can gather from Dürer’s journal that he was able to paint the portrait of King Christian II of Denmark in a mere four days. See Ashcroft, *Albrecht Dürer...*, op. cit., vol. 1, pp. 587–89; Van den Brink, “In grossem Stil...,” op. cit., p. 314.

⁴² On 8 September 1506, Dürer wrote to Pirckheimer: “Item: my altar painting says to tell you it would give a ducat for you to see it, it’s good and the colours are beautiful. I have won a lot of praise for it but not much profit [...] I’ve shut the mouths of the painters who said I was good at engraving but had no idea how to use colours in painting. Now everyone’s saying they’ve never seen finer colours” (Ashcroft, *Albrecht Dürer...*, op. cit., vol. 1, pp. 159–60) and two weeks later, on 23 September: “[...] I too can proclaim for my part that there’s no better portrait of the Virgin in the land, for all artists praise it [...]. They say they have never seen a more sublime and lifelike painting.” (Ibid., p. 163).

⁴³ After Dürer finished his altarpiece for the German merchants in Venice, he boasted in his ninth letter to Pirckheimer, on 23 September 1506: “For the reason that I’m coming home soon, I’ve turned down over 2000 ducats’ worth of work since my altar panel was finished.” (Ibid.).

⁴⁴ More than once Dürer complained that the amount of time he has put in painting a large and prestigious altarpiece could have used much more effectively, so he could have made much more money. This is the case with the *Feast of the Rose Garlands* in Venice from where he wrote to Willibald Pirckheimer on 2 April 1506: “I can tell you too that I might have earned a mint of money if I hadn’t agreed to paint the panel for the Germans. But it takes a lot of work [...]. And that for a fee of no more than eighty-five ducats, so I can tell you, that will all go on my board and lodging” (ibid., p. 147) or with the Heller Altarpiece in Frankfurt am Main. In his third letter to Heller, dated 24 August 1508, Dürer wrote: “[...] I cannot carry out your commission for the fee of 130 Rhenish gulden because of the loss I’d incur. For I shall lose a lot of money and time [...] if you are prepared to pay me 200 gulden, then I shall carry it out as I originally proposed” (ibid., p. 214–15). In his later letters to Heller his tone remains the same. So much time and effort for a fee that is far too low.

his production of altarpieces remained limited.⁴⁵ In that regard Albrecht Dürer ran a rather conservative business model with hardly any apprentices or assistants to support him.⁴⁶

Joos van Cleve's studio was run in quite a different way, but whereas Dürer's development in the years just before his journey to the Low Countries is well established, Joos van Cleve's early career in Antwerp is still fogbound. Between 1515 and 1520 the young artist produced at least fifteen altarpieces, but probably more, since it is very likely that several did not survive, due to fire, wars or iconoclast upheavals.⁴⁷ Some of these were standardized small triptychs for a local clientele, such as the aforementioned *Crucifixion Triptych* for Marcus von Kirch and Margriete Schats in Mechelen (fig. 9).⁴⁸ Others, such as the two triptychs for the Hackeney family in Cologne (figs. 3–4), the Reinhold Altarpiece for Gdańsk (figs. 5–7), the “small” *Adoration of the Magi* in Dresden (fig. 41), or the Madeira altarpiece (fig. 8), were much larger and very different in size and shape. What most of them have in common, though, is the overall high quality, especially the amazingly lifelike portraits he added into some of these altarpieces, their sparkling colours that refer to the use of the best possible pigments and a certain “modern outlook” of the presentation in the use of fashionable dress, brocade patterns, refined still life elements or atmospheric perspective in the sublime landscapes. In addition Joos van Cleve was apparently able to adapt easily to the wishes of his international clientele and finish his work on time, which would have increased his popularity as the most important master painter in the most important art centre in Northern Europe even more.

To be able to take on so many commissions and still be able to satisfy his clients and maintain his exacting quality standards, he must have found ways to save time and effort and to run his studio in a remarkably efficient way, particularly since he produced devotional paintings and portraits of equally high quality by the dozen as well. Given the fact that he was able to produce so many altarpieces in such a short period, Joos van Cleve and his assistants must have worked on several of them simultaneously, a practice Dürer clearly avoided. This practice was most likely a combination of “superimposed” (separate execution of the

⁴⁵ In his first letter to Heller, dated 28 August 1507, Dürer wrote: “So be patient about your altarpiece. Once I have completed this work [Dürer refers here to the *Torment of the Ten Thousand Christians* for Frederick the Wise of Saxony] and dispatched it to the aforementioned Prince, I shall straightaway get on with yours [...]. It is just that I do not like to take on too much at one time, so as not to be overwhelmed. In this way I shall not keep the Prince waiting by working on his and your panel at the same time [...].” (ibid., p. 212). In his second letter, from 19 March 1508, he is even more clear-cut: “After that [the *Torment of the Ten Thousand Christians*] I shall start on your commission and, as is my practice, do no other painting until it is complete.” (ibid., p. 213).

⁴⁶ As is clear from Dürer's correspondence with Jacob Heller, the artist did all the painting on the centre panel and possibly some work on the inside wings as well, whereas the outside wings that were painted in grisaille were probably done by his younger brother Hans, who received two guilders from Heller as gratuity, an indication he was actively involved in the production of the altarpiece (ibid., pp. 226–27). However, it is certainly possible Hans Süß von Kulmbach, who was with Dürer between 1507 and 1511, painted the inside wings. For a particularly insightful short essay on Dürer's studio practice in the period before, during and after his 1505–07 journey to Venice, Christof Metzger, “From the renowned good masters: Albrecht Dürer's Workshop,” in *Albrecht Dürer. His Art in Context...*, op. cit., pp. 195–217.

⁴⁷ Several of the surviving altarpieces are incomplete, missing the wing panels, such as the “small” *Adoration of the Magi* in Dresden, the *Holy Family with Saint Anne* in Brussels or a *Crucifixion* in a private collection (Hand, *Joos van Cleve...*, op. cit., cat. nos. 16, 36 and 41), whereas two wing panels with *John the Baptist* and *Saint Anthony Abbott* lost its central panel: ibid., no. 15.1; *Joos van Cleve. Leonardo des Nordens*, op. cit., cat. no. 5 (Alice Taatgen).

⁴⁸ See n. 11. Comparable examples from the period 1515–20 are the two triptychs with the *Adoration of the Magi*, in Berlin and Prague, as well as the *Deposition Triptych* in Edinburgh, painted for Jan Pels and Digna de Herde in Antwerp (Hand, *Joos van Cleve...*, op. cit., cat. nos. 10, 17, 18 and 42).

different layers) and “juxtaposed” collaboration (joint execution of any given layer), which could only function when there were enough specialized assistants that were able to meet Joos van Cleve’s personal standards.⁴⁹

The First Large Commissions: Cologne and Madeira

As Micha Leeﬂang was able to demonstrate, Joos van Cleve most certainly worked simultaneously on the two altarpieces he produced for Nicasius and Georg Hackeney in Cologne, as follows from the examination of both altarpieces with the aid of infrared reflectography.⁵⁰ The donor wings of the larger triptych (now in Munich) were in fact prepared before those of the smaller triptych (now in Cologne) were finished.⁵¹ This must have taken place prior to 1515, when the smaller triptych was delivered to the Cologne clients.⁵² The central panel with the *Death of the Virgin* in Munich would then have been painted later, probably between 1515 and 1518.⁵³ It is more than likely that Joos van Cleve painted a large part of the small triptych himself, since it was a high-profile commission for a very influential client, and the painter no doubt wanted to make the best possible first impression. By adding his monogram IVAb in one of the windows of the central panel as well as the coat-of-arms of the Guild of Saint Luke, Joos van Cleve left a visible token of his pride, of himself and of the city he had adopted as his new home (figs. 22–23).⁵⁴

While the altarpiece wings with their donors on the interior and saints in grisaille on the exterior may be remarkably similar,⁵⁵ the central panels of both altarpieces, although they

⁴⁹ On the terms “juxtaposed” and “superimposed” collaboration: Molly Faries “Making and Marketing: Studies of the Painting Process,” in Faries et al., *Making and Marketing*..., op. cit., p. 3.

⁵⁰ The wings of both triptychs, as well as the central panel with the *Death of the Virgin* in Cologne were prepared with a liquid underdrawing that could not be detected with the aid of infrared reflectography, whereas the larger *Death of the Virgin* panel in Munich presents a visible underdrawing in a black medium (Leeﬂang, *Joos van Cleve*..., op. cit., p. 99). The triptych in Cologne was examined and documented with the aid of infrared reflectography twice, by Molly Faries on 17 August 1987 and again, on 20 October 2003 by Micha Leeﬂang and Caroline von Saint-George. Some of the IRR-material was published by Micha Leeﬂang (ibid., pp. 98–101, figs. 3.7–9). The Munich triptych was examined and documented by Bruno Hartinger in December 2002. An overview of the IRR-documentation and two IRR-details of the Munich central panel were published in Micha Leeﬂang, ‘*Uyt-nemende Schilder van Antwerpen*’. *Joos van Cleve: atelier, productie en werkmethode*, dissertation, Rijksuniversiteit, Groningen 2007, pp. 217–18, no. 3; pp. 342–43, figs. 60–61.

⁵¹ Leeﬂang, *Joos van Cleve*..., op. cit., pp. 99–101.

⁵² The Cologne triptych with the *Death of the Virgin*, intended for the house chapel of the Hackeney House on the Neumarkt, was dated 1515 on the original frame that was removed in the 19th century. See Irmgard Hiller, Horst Vey, *Katalog der deutschen und niederländischen Gemälde bis 1550 (mit Ausnahme der Kölner Malerei) im Wallraf-Richartz-Museum und im Kunstgewerbemuseum der Stadt Köln* (Cologne, 1969), pp. 22–23.

⁵³ Nicasius Hackeney does not carry a cross in his hands, unlike his brother’s spouse Sibilla van Merle, suggesting she had passed away. It is one of the arguments Micha Leeﬂang has put forward for a *terminus ante quem* of 1518 for the Munich triptych (Leeﬂang, *Joos van Cleve*..., op. cit., p. 98). It is certain that the commission for the Munich triptych dates back to at least 1515, otherwise Joos van Cleve could not have worked on the wings simultaneously. However, the central panel may have taken much longer. Nevertheless it must have left Joos van Cleve’s studio before Nicasius Hackeney passed away in 1518. The installation of the triptych on an altar near the Mechelen rood screen in Sankt Maria im Kapitol in 1524 – the triptych was probably presented elsewhere in the church before that date – may have been prompted by the death of Georg Hackeney, as an epitaph for both brothers, to honour their memory.

⁵⁴ Hiller, Vey, *Katalog der deutschen und niederländischen Gemälde*..., op. cit., pp. 23–24. The monogram IVAb stands for Joos van der Beke, the family name of Joos van Cleve.

⁵⁵ The exterior wings are indeed remarkably similar as well: on the left Saint Anne with the Virgin and Child and Saint Christopher and on the right the saints Sebastian and Roche, the coats-of-arms of both the Hackeney

depict the same subject, could not be more different. What made Joos van Cleve change the formula? In his detailed discussion on the Cologne *Death of the Virgin* and its sources John Hand points out that Joos van Cleve must have been aware of models by Hugo van der Goes, especially a composition that is known today from a drawing in Braunschweig that provided the young painter with several ideas about how to present a new and original composition.⁵⁶ Indeed, the earlier *Death of the Virgin* is an original, albeit rather curious, composition, in which the Virgin's deathbed is placed parallel to the picture plane with the apostles encircling the bed in a tenor of agitated distress that leans towards hysteria (fig. 3). In particular, the three larger apostles in their "running" postures in front of the Virgin's deathbed appear rather awkward, whereas the artist had great difficulty in getting the proportions right. The colour scheme, an interesting mixture of the soft tones of his Antwerp colleague Quinten Massijs – and Hugo van der Goes – and the more powerful primary ones he knew from his training with Jan Joest in Kalkar, is unfortunately no improvement to the bizarre composition that presents a vehement contrast to the serene beauty and stillness of the inside wings. I think these shortcomings result from a combination of sheer ambition and lack of experience. Although the Cologne triptych has always been labelled as Joos van Cleve's earliest masterpiece,⁵⁷ I am convinced that Albrecht Dürer, had he seen the triptych, would have judged it to be "not as good in design as in painting," as he would later criticize Jan Gossart's Middelburg altarpiece.⁵⁸ It is therefore not impossible that Joos van Cleve's clients preferred a different rendition of the scene, which found a reflection in the second, larger triptych.⁵⁹

The *Death of the Virgin* in Munich was most certainly an aesthetic improvement, which is partly due to the more manageable shape of the panel in comparison to the extreme landscape-format of the earlier version (fig. 4). It enabled Joos van Cleve to produce a much more compact and centralized composition and a much broader choice of models to pick from. As John Hand described: "The Virgin's bedchamber is a tangible space and Joos has carefully arranged the poses and gestures of the Apostles so that they interlock and recede spatially, converging at the head of the Virgin."⁶⁰ Because of the much more unified composition, Joos van Cleve's qualities as a colourist can be better appreciated. Not unusual, the colour red plays a decisive role in the rhythm of the composition, and it is hardly surprising that the painter had marked the areas that would become red in advance in the underdrawing.⁶¹

and Hardenrath (Nicasius Hackeney's spouse) families on the upper left and right. Because of the difference in shape (the Cologne panels are nearly square) the saints in Cologne share two niches, those in Munich only one, visible when the altarpiece is closed. For illustrations of the exterior wings: Max J. Friedländer, *Early Netherlandish Painting*, vol. 9: *Joos van Cleve, Jan Provost, Joachim Patinir* (New York–Washington, 1972), part 1: plates 32 and 34.

⁵⁶ Hand, *Joos van Cleve*..., op. cit., pp. 28–30. For the Braunschweig drawing, *ibid.*, fig. 20.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

⁵⁸ Hans Rupprich, *Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass*, (3 vols.) (Berlin, 1956–69), vol. 1, p. 162 – "[...] do [Middelburg] hat in der abtey Johann de Abüs [Gossart] eine grosse taffel gemacht, nit so gut im hauptstreichen als in gemähl." Ashcroft wrongfully translated "hauptstreichen" with "modelling of the heads" (Ashcroft, *Albrecht Dürer*..., op. cit., vol. 1, p. 570). It is possible that Albrecht Dürer in fact saw the triptych in the Hackeney House Chapel, when he made a short stop in Cologne between 25 and 28 July 1520, before he continued his journey to Antwerp.

⁵⁹ It is more than likely that the extreme horizontal format of the smaller altarpiece was forced upon the artist by his Cologne clients, since it needed to fit the house chapel.

⁶⁰ Hand, *Joos van Cleve*..., op. cit., p. 69.

⁶¹ The presence of at least three colour indications for red, in the form of the character "z" (for *Zinnober*, 'vermilion') can be found in three smaller areas where this colour was actually applied. Interestingly, in the upper part of the yellow sleeve of the young apostle carrying the bucket of holy water, two different indications can be

Although several other painted examples of the *Death of the Virgin* must have been known to Joos van Cleve, none of them seems to have motivated the painter, with the possible exception of the painting that was part of Jan Joest's altarpiece in the church of St Nicholas in Kalkar (**fig. 24**), where the Virgin's bed has been painted in an almost similar tilted and foreshortened position. However, the sober earnestness that typifies the grieving apostles in that much earlier depiction contrasts heavily with the dynamic interactions of their counterparts in Joos van Cleve's version. His use of Italianate ornamental decoration was something exceedingly modern in Netherlandish painting at the time, and Joos van Cleve applied it with full force, even in the vista to the right, where the Renaissance architecture of the city may have been based on Italian print models, or, more likely, on the fantasy architecture in paintings or drawings of some of his contemporary Antwerp colleagues, such as Jan Gossart or Pseudo-Blesius.⁶²

The composition of the Munich *Death of the Virgin* is a much improved version of the Cologne painting, and it shows Joos van Cleve's dependence on Albrecht Dürer's woodcut models. For the composition as a whole, he must have relied on Dürer's 1510 depiction of the subject (**fig. 25**), as was already suggested by Lanc in 1972.⁶³ The identical angle of the composition, the sense of space and the moving interaction between Saint John the Evangelist and the dying Virgin go back on Dürer's woodcut, without copying it directly. The same can be said for the burdened young apostle to the left carrying the bucket of holy water; this figure is based on Albrecht Dürer's woodcut of *The Angel with the Key to the Bottomless Pit*, which was published as part of *The Apocalypse*, Dürer's first book publication, in 1498 (**fig. 26**).⁶⁴

It is possible that one or more journeymen in his studio assisted Joos van Cleve with painting the second *Death of the Virgin*. Surface examination displays a more fluent brush stroke in some areas, and the overall painterly quality is somewhat dissimilar. In addition, the preparation of the composition in the underdrawing phase does not seem to follow the same approach everywhere, a possible indication that more than one hand might have worked on the painting's production.⁶⁵ However, it is more likely that assistants were put to work on two other huge projects, the Madeira triptych (**fig. 8**) and the Saint Reinhold Altarpiece (**fig. 6**), that were prepared in the studio at roughly the same time.

found, again "z," combined with "m" (or possibly "w"). Since the painting was not fully documented with IRR, it is possible more colour indications are hidden underneath the paint layers.

⁶² Curiously, this modernist outlook is balanced by the view out of the window to the left, on a town house in a combined Romanesque and Gothic style, very much in line with the city view on the Kalkar *Raising of Lazarus* (with Joos' portrait on it), where similar houses are depicted.

⁶³ Elga Lanc, "Die religiösen Bilder des Joos van Cleve," Ph.D. dissertation, Universität Wien, 1972, p. 106. See Hand, *Joos van Cleve*..., op. cit., p. 69. As a finished publication, *The Life of the Virgin* would see the light in 1511, in the same year as *The Large Passion*, *The Small Passion* and the third (and Dürer's second) edition of *The Apocalypse*. On this particular woodcut, which is dated 1510, Rainer Schoch, Matthias Mende, Anna Scherbaum, *Albrecht Dürer. Das druckgraphische Werk*, vol. 2: *Holzschnitte und Holzschnittfolgen* (Munich–Berlin–London–New York, 2002), pp. 271–73, cat. no. 183 (Anna Scherbaum).

⁶⁴ Schoch, Mende, Scherbaum, *Albrecht Dürer. Das druckgraphische Werk*..., op. cit., pp. 104–05, cat. no. 126 (Peter Krüger).

⁶⁵ The underdrawing of the figures and draperies was applied with a brush in a liquid medium, shadow areas prepared with parallel- and cross-hatching, whereas the architecture in the background was carefully prepared with contour lines in black chalk. The faces received little advance preparation, although not all the faces were documented with IRR. The man near the window to the left, wearing a blue cap, is most certainly a portrait.

The Funchal altarpiece with the saints Peter, Paul and Andrew is a recent discovery by Micha Leeﬂang as a product of Joos van Cleve's studio, and it was first presented at the monographic exhibition that was organised by the present author in 2011 (fig. 8).⁶⁶ Leeﬂang dated the huge triptych around 1515, based on its stylistic proximity to the outside wings with Saint Reinhold and John the Baptist on the altarpiece in Warsaw.⁶⁷ There are certainly several similarities, such as size and stance – the contrapposto of Saint Peter is comparable to that of Saint Reinhold, whereas John the Baptist is mirrored in the figure of Saint Paul on the left wing in Funchal. The facial types of the three saints, especially Saint Peter, are in fact comparable to some of the apostles on the two paintings of the *Death of the Virgin*. However, the overall painterly quality of the Madeira triptych is rather disappointing, and this accounts not only for the three male saints, but for the rather uninspiring landscape and the *Annunciation* on the outside wings as well.

Joos van Cleve was no doubt responsible for the layout of the three figures, which he prepared in a very detailed underdrawing in brush.⁶⁸ The draughtsman's hand is clearly experienced and has prepared every single detail of the standing saints in a very vivid manner, without hesitation. The sheer brilliance of the drawing contrasts vehemently with its translation in paint, which is especially visible in the face of Saint Peter (figs. 27–28).⁶⁹ These underdrawings in brush bring the graphic pattern of a woodcut to mind and differ from the minimalistic approach for the Munich *Death of the Virgin*.⁷⁰ Whether the underdrawing of the three large figures was produced by mechanically tracing the lines or dots that were left as the residue of a cartoon, or was drawn directly on the unpainted surface in freehand, is unclear. There is no doubt, however, that they served as a guideline for the assistants. Joos van Cleve himself took no part in the painting process, not in the figures, nor in the landscape that occupies half of the triptych's painted surface.⁷¹ The production was completely left to his studio assistants, who were at least talented enough to capture the artist's style to some degree.

We are not aware of any preparatory drawings by Joos van Cleve for the Cologne and Madeira triptychs, either full compositions or detailed studies, nor for other altarpieces he

⁶⁶ See n. 9. For the Funchal Altarpiece see n. 10.

⁶⁷ Leeﬂang, *Joos van Cleve...*, op. cit., p. 120.

⁶⁸ The Madeira Altarpiece was examined and documented by Micha Leeﬂang and Margreet Wolters during the exhibition *Joos van Cleve. Leonardo des Nordens*, in the Suermondt-Ludwig-Museum in Aachen, June 6, 2011. The results were published in Leeﬂang, *Joos van Cleve...*, op. cit., pp. 120–22, figs. 3.34–36.

⁶⁹ Infrared reflectography was performed with a Hamamatsu C 2400-07 equipped with a N2606 IR vidicon, a Nikon Micro-Nikkor 1:2.8/55 mm lens, a Heliopan RG 850 (or RG 1000) filter, with a Lucius & Baer VM 1710 monitor (625 lines). Digitized documentation was done with a Meteor RCB framegrabber, 768 x 574 pixels, colorvision toolkit (Visualbasic). The IRR-assembly reproduced here was made with PanaVue ImageAssembler and Adobe Photoshop by Margreet Wolters.

⁷⁰ This type of underdrawing has been baptized “woodcut-look” or “woodcut-convention,” since their physical appearance reminds us especially of just that. On the terminology and its use in general, see Faries “Making and Marketing...” op. cit., pp. 4–6. Joos van Cleve most certainly was not the only Antwerp-based master that made use of this graphic language. Others, like Adriaen van Overbeke and two unidentified painters, the Master of 1518 and the Master of the Antwerp Adoration applied it as well. In general, on these aspects, see Micha Leeﬂang, “Workshop practices in early sixteenth-century Antwerp studios,” *Jaarboek Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten Antwerpen*, 2004/05 (2006), pp. 233–73.

⁷¹ No underdrawing is visible in the painted landscape, indicating a different approach, possibly based on standardized drawings.

would produce later in his career.⁷² However, he must have made use of the former to be able to produce his compositions on full-size cartoons or directly on the unpainted surface of a panel, but I am convinced that he did not produce any detailed studies after life on coloured paper, as Albrecht Dürer had done so brilliantly in preparation of the *Heller Altarpiece* or the *Feast of the Rose Garlands*.⁷³ On the contrary, as an artist Joos van Cleve was an eclectic; he was most certainly not the superb inventor Albrecht Dürer was. It is likely that he – or his apprentices – drew copies after drawings or paintings by others and kept these in stock in his studio portfolio, as any other master painter would.⁷⁴ One such example might be a drawing in Rotterdam with *Two figures from the Gathering of the Manna* (fig. 29).⁷⁵ The two figures that are visible on this sheet are the result of retracing the softer contours that remained on the paper after the lines of a model drawing that was blackened on the reverse, a so-called *calque*, were traced with the aid of a stylus on a new piece of paper. The drawing in brown ink is in its graphic style extremely close to the underdrawing that we have come across in the Madeira altarpiece. Drawings like these may have been part of the stock Joos van Cleve kept, the other part consisting of woodcuts and engravings, especially those that were highly innovative, such as the prints of Albrecht Dürer.

The Reinhold Altarpiece: An Eclectic Homage to Albrecht Dürer

Joos van Cleve must have started working on the Saint Reinhold Altarpiece in 1515 or early 1516, at a time when his studio practice was already in full swing. As with the other three altarpieces that he and his assistants worked on simultaneously, no documents have survived to inform us on the precise nature of the commission, as would have been stipulated in a contract. In fact, we do not even know whether Joos van Cleve was the contractor, so it is possible that he worked as a subcontractor. We do know, however, that the altarpiece was

⁷² In the past, several drawings have been attributed to Joos van Cleve, but I believe none of these are by his hand. For a clear overview on this topic: Peter van den Brink, "Einführung: Der (un)sichtbare Künstler," in *Joos van Cleve. Leonardo des Nordens...*, op. cit., pp. 16–19.

⁷³ With regard to the detailed preparatory drawings for the *Heller Altarpiece*: Heinz Widauer, "Vorstudien zum Heller-Altar," in *Albrecht Dürer*, Klaus Albrecht Schröder, Maria Luise Sternath, eds, exh. cat., Albertina, Vienna, 2003 (Ostfildern, 2003), pp. 358–72; Christof Metzger, "Der Heller Altar," in *Albrecht Dürer...*, op. cit. (2019), pp. 302–15 and for the drawings for the *Feast of the Rose Garlands*, Heinz Widauer, "Studien zum Rosenkranzfest," in *Albrecht Dürer* (2003), pp. 326–36; Julia Zaunbauer and Christof Metzger, "Das Rosenkranzfest," in *Albrecht Dürer...*, op. cit. (2019), pp. 264–79.

⁷⁴ Peter van den Brink, "The Artist at work: the crucial role of drawings in early sixteenth-century Antwerp workshops," *Jaarboek Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten Antwerpen*, 2004/05 (2006), pp. 159–231, esp. pp. 182–88.

⁷⁵ Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, Rotterdam, inv. no. N 70. On this drawing see *ExtravagAnt! A forgotten chapter of Antwerp painting 1500–1530*, Peter van den Brink, Maximiliaan P.J. Martens, eds, Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp; Bonnefantenmuseum, Maastricht, 2005–2006 (Schoten, 2005), p. 144, cat. no. 58 (Peter van den Brink); Niklas Gliessmann, "Die Hochaltarflügel in Münstermaifeld. Motivwiederholungen als Urhebermerkmal in der Antwerpener Malerei um 1520," in "Luft unter die Flügel...". Beiträge zur mittelalterlichen Kunst. Festschrift für Hiltrud Westermann-Angerhausen, Andrea Von Hülsen-Esch, Dagmar Täube, eds (Hildesheim–Zürich–New York, 2010), pp. 224–25, fig. 12; *Nederlandse tekeningen uit de vijftiende en zestiende eeuw in Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen – Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen* (Judith Niessen) [online], at: <<https://www.boijmans.nl/collectie/onderzoek/nederlandse-tekeningen-uit-de-15de-en-16de-eeuw#footnotes>>, [retrieved: 8 January 2022]. The figures on the drawing relate directly to one of the wings of the Passion Altarpiece with scenes from the life of St Thomas à Becket that was made for an altar in the Sankt Nikolaikirche in Stralsund, but was moved in the beginning of the 18th century or earlier to the church in Waase auf Ummanz. On this altarpiece see *Antwerpse retabels 15de–16de eeuw*, Hans Nieuwdorp, ed., (2 vols.), exh. cat., Museum voor Religieuze Kunst, Antwerp, 1993 (Antwerp, 1993), vol. 1, pp. 64–69, cat. no. 9 (Herman De Smedt, Jörg Kirchner and Hans Nieuwdorp).

commissioned by the Saint Reinhold Brotherhood in the city of Gdańsk. It was one of the seven fraternities formed by benches (*Bänken*), i.e., corporations of merchants (although others, like priests or artists, were allowed to become members) that were active in this important Baltic port, based at the Arthushof, and its members were organized partly topographically (according to the division into city districts).⁷⁶ The Reinhold Brotherhood had its own chapel in Our Lady's Church since 1488.⁷⁷

Unfortunately, all original documents that relate to the commission of the altarpiece were destroyed during the Second World War, and only a few scraps of information about the altarpiece can be found in older publications. Theodor Hirsch cites from Georg Melmann's *Chronica des Landes Preussen Anno 1548*: "1516 wurde auch gefeßt die Tafel in die S. Reinholdskapelle um die Zeit Michaelis," stating that the altarpiece was installed in the chapel at the end of September or early October 1516.⁷⁸ No doubt the altarpiece would have been consecrated on 2 November 1516, All Souls' Day, the most important date on the Saint Reinhold Brotherhood's calendar. In addition Hirsch quoted from the so-called *Rechnungsbuch der Vögte* [Aldermen's Account Book] of the Reinhold Brotherhood from the year 1515: "hebbe ik gefen Bernt Tullen, dat he vor de Tafel utgefen heft 100 Mk."⁷⁹ According to Micha Leeftang this citation, which was fragmentary and did not disclose a clear context, suggests that Tullen was reimbursed by the brotherhood. According to her his status was unknown; he could have been a member himself, or perhaps he might have been the middle man between the brotherhood and Joos van Cleve.⁸⁰ As Kaemmerer and Szmydki already indicated, this interpretation cannot be correct.⁸¹ Bernt Tulle (or Thule) was in fact one of the wealthiest members of the Saint Reinhold fraternity, but he had been compromised during an uproar in Our Lady's Church on 4 March 1515, which forced the Bishop of Leslau (Włocławek), Maciej Drzewicki, on 26 April of that same year to place an interdict upon the desecrated church, which was only liberated in October 1516, when the consecration was renewed.⁸² Hirsch's reference to the text in the

⁷⁶ Leeftang, "The Saint Reinhold Altarpiece by Joos van Cleve....," op. cit., pp. 20–22; ead., *Joos van Cleve....*, op. cit., pp. 112–15. See also Paul Simon, *Der Artushof in Danzig und seine Bruderschaften, die Banken* (Berlin, 1900); Elżbieta Pilecka, *Średniowieczne Dwory Artusa w Prusach. Świadectwo kształtowania się nowej świadomości mieszczańskiej* [Medieval Artus Courts in Prussia: a testimony of forming new bourgeois consciousness] (Toruń, 2005).

⁷⁷ Theodor Hirsch, *Die Ober-Pfarrkirche von St. Marien in Danzig, in ihrer Denkmälern und in ihren Beziehungen zum kirchlichen Leben Danzigs überhaupt* (Danzig, 1843), pp. 434–35. Apparently the brotherhood took over the chapel, which was founded by the alderman (*Schöppe*) Johann Krukemann before 1457. At the time it was called the *Kapelle Sankt Johannis unter dem Thurm* or *Krukemannskapelle*. On 19 December 1488, the Saint Reinhold Brotherhood was formally acknowledged as the new owner of the chapel.

⁷⁸ Ibid., p. 435. "Michaelis," the feastday of St Michael was on September 29, 1516. See also Szmydki, *Retables anversois en Pologne....*, op. cit., pp. 23–25. Melmann's 1548 manuscript, as well as a second, corrected manuscript that is dated 1552, are kept in the State Archive in Gdańsk, resp. MS 300 R/LI/1, fol. 734–735 and MS R/LI/2, fol. 496.

⁷⁹ Hirsch, *Die Ober-Pfarrkirche von St. Marien in Danzig....*, op. cit., p. 435, n. 2. As Hirsch stated, the receipts and expenditure of 1516 were at the time already missing from the account book. Leeftang incorrectly states the amount as 10 Marks (Leeftang, *Joos van Cleve....*, op. cit., p. 112).

⁸⁰ Leeftang, "The Saint Reinhold Altarpiece by Joos van Cleve....," op. cit., p. 21; ead., *Joos van Cleve....*, op. cit., p. 112.

⁸¹ Ludwig Kaemmerer, "Ein bezeichnetes Werk des Meisters vom Tode der Maria," *Jahrbuch der königlich preußischen Kunstsammlungen*, vol. 11 (1890), pp. 153–54; Szmydki, *Retables anversois en Pologne....*, op. cit., pp. 24–25.

⁸² Hirsch, *Die Ober-Pfarrkirche von St. Marien in Danzig....*, op. cit., pp. 238–40; Kaemmerer, "Ein bezeichnetes Werk....," op. cit., pp. 153–54; Szmydki, *Retables anversois en Pologne....*, op. cit., p. 24. For the turmoil and its consequences see Henryk Rybus, "Działalność synodalna biskupa Macieja Drzewickiego w diecezji włocławskiej (1514–1531)," *Studia Theologica Varsaviensia*, 7/1 (1969), pp. 133–71, esp. pp. 141–64.

account book of the brotherhood should therefore be read differently. Tulle did penance and donated 100 Marks for a new altarpiece to rehabilitate himself. One day before the altarpiece would have been consecrated, Tulle was restored to grace by the bishop.⁸³

This interpretation makes it likely that the altarpiece was commissioned after 26 April 1515, and it must have been delivered before the end of September 1516, when it was installed in the brotherhood's chapel on its altar.⁸⁴ The sum of 100 Marks was most certainly not the full amount available for the contractor; it can only have been Tulle's share in the cost.⁸⁵ It is unclear who this contractor was, whether Joos van Cleve or the free master who was responsible for the sculpted shrine and inner wings, in whom Szmydki, following Białostocki, presumed the sculptor Jan de Molder.⁸⁶ It is certainly doubtful whether Joos van Cleve was already able to organize the production of such a compound altarpiece in 1515, both financially and logistically. The production of these retables was usually in the hands of professional contractors, such as Dierick Proudekin or Adriaen van Overbeke.⁸⁷ The time frame of slightly more than a year (and perhaps even less) in which the altarpiece had to be delivered seems rather cramped. It was certainly not impossible, however, not even for a commissioned altarpiece, such as the Saint Anne Altarpiece in Kempen, for which the painter Adriaen van Overbeke acted as contractor. That altarpiece was delivered in one year and ten days after signing the contract.⁸⁸

⁸³ Kaemmerer, "Ein bezeichnetes Werk...", op. cit., p. 154, n. 3. Hirsch does not mention Tulle by name in his description of the uproar of 1515.

⁸⁴ It is possible that the assembly of the altarpiece took place *in situ*, in the Sankt Marienkirche in Gdańsk, but it is more likely that the shrine and the wing panels were already separately assembled before transport. The Saint Anne altarpiece for Kempen was transported in parts with two wagons from Antwerp to Kempen, accompanied by its contractor, Adriaen van Overbeke, who was, as stipulated in the contract, responsible for the construction of the altarpiece on its altar in Kempen – Godehard Hoffmann, "Der Annenaltar des Adrian van Overbeck in der Propsteikirche zu Kempen – Werk und Werkstatt eines Antwerpener Manieristen," in Wilfried Hansmann, Godehard Hoffmann, *Spätgotik am Niederrhein. Rheinische und flämische Flügelaltäre im Licht neuer Forschung* (Cologne, 1998), p. 166. In some cases, such as the Kleppingaltar in the Petrikerkirche in Soest, the altarpiece was already completely assembled before it was transported – Dietmar Wohl, "Der Kleppingaltar aus der Petrikerkirche in Soest. Kunsttechnische Erkenntnisse zur Herstellung Antwerpener Altarretabel im frühen 16. Jahrhundert," *Zeitschrift für Kunsttechnologie und Konservierung*, vol. 1.1 (1987), p. 123. Unlike the Kempen and Soest compound altarpieces, the Saint Reinhold Altarpiece was no doubt shipped to Gdańsk from Antwerp, which would make prefabrication much more likely.

⁸⁵ The other donations from "disgraced" members were likely made in 1516, the year that was missing from the account book of the Saint Reinhold Brotherhood (see n. 77). The new altarpiece with double wings that was placed on the High Altar of the church in 1516 as well, was extremely expensive. According to the contract between the church wardens of Our Lady's Church and the painter Meister Michel from Augsburg, dating from 1511, a price was set for 2886 Marks (Polish Crown Marks, or Krakow Marks) (Hans Huth, *Künstler und Werkstatt der Spätgotik* (Darmstadt, 1967), pp. 126–27, no. XV). According to Theodor Hirsch this sum was already raised to 3386 Marks in 1512 and according to the church warden Gerhard Kemerer the total cost would have been more than 7000 Marks, and what's more, a later source even quoted a cosmic amount of 13550 Marks! (Eberhard Böttcher, *Historisch Kirchenregister der grossen Pfarrkirchen in der Rechten Stadt Dantzig*, Dantzig 1615, Biblioteka Gdańska Polskiej Akademii Nauk, MS 947, pp. 77–78, 84–86). See Hirsch, *Die Ober-Pfarrkirche von St. Marien in Danzig...*, op. cit., p. 442; Andrzej Wozniński, "Michał z Augsburga, Mistrz Paweł i epilog gotyckiej rzeźby gdańskiej," *Rocznik Historii Sztuki*, vol. 26 (2002), p. 6. Although the Reinhold Altarpiece was certainly smaller and Antwerp retables in general cheaper, certainly those on spec, it is impossible that it would have cost a mere 100 Marks.

⁸⁶ Szmydki, *Retables anversois en Pologne...*, op. cit., pp. 56–61. In addition Leeftang, "The Saint Reinhold Altarpiece by Joos van Cleve...", op. cit., pp. 19–20; ead., *Joos van Cleve...*, op. cit., pp. 115–18.

⁸⁷ Jan Van der Stock, "De organisatie van het beeldsnijders- en schildersatelier te Antwerpen. Documenten 1480–1530," in *Antwerpse retables 15de–16de eeuw...*, op. cit., vol. 2, pp. 47–53.

⁸⁸ Adriaen van Overbeke could not rely on standardised models and he had to prepare all sculpted and painted scenes of the altarpiece in detailed drawings, of which two are still known today. On this subject, see especially Van den Brink, "The Artist at work: the crucial role of drawings...", op. cit., pp. 201–04.

From an iconographic point of view, the Reinhold Altarpiece was fairly uncomplicated and may actually have been produced on speculation, not on commission, unlike the 1513 altarpiece for Kempen.⁸⁹ The retable is basically produced as a Marian altarpiece; when fully opened, ten episodes from the life of the Virgin are presented in sculpted groups (fig. 5). Unlike most compound altarpieces, this one has two sets of wings, and with the inside wings closed the viewer is confronted with eight painted scenes from the Life and Passion of Christ (fig. 6). On the outside wings, visible when the altarpiece is fully closed, the two standing saints John the Baptist and Reinhold can be seen, the latter with the features of Joos van Cleve (figs. 7, 12).

Confronted with a narrow time frame and a full production schedule, Joos van Cleve needed to work as efficiently as possible. He had only limited experience with the production of a compound altarpiece, as an apprentice working on the Kalkar altarpiece under the guidance of Jan Joest. He had to deliver eight paintings on the Life and Passion of Christ, plus two larger panels with the patron saints of the Saint Reinhold Brotherhood. As has become clear from the examination of the altarpiece with the aid of infrared reflectography, Joos van Cleve painted the latter panels himself.⁹⁰ He had set up the figures in a loose and sketchy underdrawing in a dry material, probably black chalk (figs. 13, 30).⁹¹ This underdrawing, clearly for his own use, differs fundamentally from what we have encountered in the Madeira triptych, where the artist had produced a precise layout for his assistants. The high painterly quality of the two standing saints surpasses those on the Madeira altarpiece by far, another indication that Joos van Cleve regarded the exterior outside wings as his most important contribution to the altarpiece, no doubt knowing that these two panels would be visible for the brotherhood members and other visitors most of the time.⁹²

With regard to the iconographic program of the first opening Joos van Cleve may have been entitled to make his own choices, although specific scenes, such as the *Last Supper* or the *Crucifixion* were customary and could not be omitted.⁹³ It is very likely that Joos van Cleve would choose those events from the Life and Passion that could be produced without too much complication, meaning subjects for which he had models at hand. In addition he had to deal with the specific shapes of the panels, depending on their place in the altarpiece (fig. 6). The four paintings with events from the Passion, on the bottom row, all had an identical,

⁸⁹ John Hand already carefully hinted at that possibility (Hand, *Joos van Cleve*..., op. cit., p. 32). Only the outside wings of John the Baptist and St Reinhold were most certainly specified by the brotherhood.

⁹⁰ The Reinhold Altarpiece was examined and documented between 17 and 20 April 2001 in the National Museum in Warsaw, by Molly Faries, Micha Leeftang, Daantje Meuwissen, Linda Jansen and Peter van den Brink, and on 8 June 2011 by Micha Leeftang and Margreet Wolters. The results were published by Micha Leeftang on several occasions: Leeftang, "The Saint Reinhold Altarpiece by Joos van Cleve...", op. cit., passim; ead., "Uytmemende Schilder van Antwerpen'...", op. cit., pp. 60–71; ead., "Was ihr wollt' Joos van Cleves Werkstatt und der Kunstmarkt," in *Joos van Cleve. Leonardo des Nordens*..., op. cit., pp. 139–43; ead., *Joos van Cleve*..., op. cit., pp. 47–60.

⁹¹ See n. 28.

⁹² The altarpiece would only be opened completely on specific feast days, whereas the second opening with the painted panels of the Life and Passion of Christ would be usually on view on Sundays.

⁹³ As is known from the contract between Adriaen van Overbeke and the Kempen Saint Anne Brotherhood, the sculpted scenes in the central shrine were very precisely stipulated, as well as the reverse of the painted wings, on which Van Overbeke was instructed to paint a *Last Judgement*. For the inside wings he was apparently free to choose various events from the life of Saint Anne; in the contract it is stated: "Item dye blader van bynnen sullen syn verzyrt aen beyden syden vp platwerck allen na der hystorien vnd van buyten vp sall stain dat ganze ordell" ('On the inside the painted wings on both sides shall be decorated with scenes from the history [of Saint Anne, PvdB] and on the outside the Last Judgement shall be shown'). See Huth, *Künstler und Werkstatt*..., op. cit., p. 128.

nearly square, size, whereas the other four subjects, the *Presentation in the Temple* (fig. 31), the *Baptism of Christ* (fig. 32), the *Last Supper* (fig. 33) and the *Agony in the Garden* (fig. 34), had to be painted on panels with two different shapes. So as not to mix up the correct iconographic sequence of the scenes that needed to be painted, artists sometimes noted down the subject of the composition-to-be in shorthand on the panels when the surface was still blank.⁹⁴ It is therefore hardly surprising to find a written text underneath the paint layer of the *Last Supper*, which could be read as *aventmael* (fig. 35).⁹⁵

Before handing out the various panels to his assistants to be painted,⁹⁶ Joos van Cleve carefully prepared eight highly detailed drawings in brush and black paint, either manually on the prepared surface of the oak panels, or with the aid of cartoons, of which the residue on the panel's surface would then be traced, a mechanical method not unlike what could be observed in the Rotterdam drawing (fig. 29).⁹⁷ These underdrawings, as stated before, had the outlook of a woodcut and were therefore a pragmatic visual guide for the assistants when they filled the drawing with paint. To save time and money, the amount of separate paint layers needed to be reduced to an absolute minimum, preferably only one or two,⁹⁸ unlike Albrecht Dürer's preparation of the Heller Altarpiece, where up to six layers of underpaint

⁹⁴ Molly Faries, "The first examples of titles in underdrawing," in *Le dessin sous-jacent dans la peinture. Colloque VII, 17-19 septembre 1987: Géographie et chronologie du dessin sous-jacent*, Hélène Verougstraete-Marcq, Roger Van Schoote, eds (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1989), pp. 145-46; Peter van den Brink, "Da Josef timmert. Een Antwerps paneeltje in Delft," in *Album Discipulorum J.R.J. van Asperen de Boer*, Liesbeth M. Helmus, Peter van den Brink, eds (Zwolle, 1997), p. 31, fig. 4; Reg Mulder, "Infraroodreflectografisch onderzoek van het Jacobus- en Antoniusretabel in de Propsteikirche te Kempen," in *Album Discipulorum*..., op. cit., pp. 139-40; Molly Faries, "Reshaping the Field: The Contribution of Technical Studies," in *Early Netherlandish Painting at the Crossroads. A Critical Look at Current Methodologies*, Maryan W. Ainsworth, ed. (New York, 2001), pp. 87-89; Ron Spronk, Catharina van Daalen, "Two Scenes from the Passion at the Harvard Art Museums: a Tale of Two Antwerp Workshops?," in M. Faries et al., *Making and Marketing*..., op. cit., pp. 48-49, figs. 9-10; Peter van den Brink, "A Shattered Jigsaw Puzzle. On a Partly Reconstructed Altarpiece by the Master of the Antwerp Adoration," *Wallraf-Richartz Jahrbuch*, vol. 68 (2007), pp. 170-71; Carmen Sandalinas Linares, Bart Franssen, Elisabeth Van Eyck, *The Polyptych of the Seven Sorrows of the Virgin in the Museu Frederic Marès. An Unusual Altarpiece*, in *Technical Studies of Paintings: Problems of Attribution (15th-17th Centuries). Papers Presented at the Nineteenth Symposium for the Study of Underdrawing and Technology in Painting held in Bruges, 11-13 September 2014*, Anne Dubois, Jacqueline Couvert, Till-Holger Borchert, eds (Paris-Leuven-Bristol CT, 2018), pp. 130-31.

⁹⁵ Leeftang, "Workshop practices...", op. cit., pp. 252-53, fig. 13; ead., "The Saint Reinhold Altarpiece by Joos van Cleve...", op. cit., pp. 23-24, fig. 10; ead., *Joos van Cleve*..., op. cit., p. 52. Although no texts were found underneath the paint layers of the other panels, they could in fact be invisible for detection with infrared reflectography, because the paint layers that covered them might be impenetrable: ead., "The Saint Reinhold Altarpiece by Joos van Cleve...", op. cit., p. 23. See n. 28.

⁹⁶ The various panels were separately painted before they were assembled as part of the finished altarpiece. When a free master used hired assistants (journeymen or *cnaepen* in Dutch) these painters did not necessarily work physically in the free master's studio, they may have used their own lodgings.

⁹⁷ For a detailed description of the separate underdrawings and their relation to the painted surfaces, the various publications by Micha Leeftang certainly suffice (see n. 88). For a detailed overview where Joos van Cleve's woodcut-like underdrawings are compared to other practices in early 16th-century Antwerp, see Leeftang, "Workshop practices...", op. cit., pp. 233-73.

⁹⁸ Because of the thin paint film the underdrawing can be seen extensively with the naked eye, although this was largely caused by a chemical process that made the paint film even more transparent. However, over time the paint surface suffered, leaving the underdrawing almost unprotected in some areas. The majority of the losses of the paint film are likely due to two early restorations of the painted panels, first in 1797 by the painter Broschmann, followed in 1825 by Johannes Baptista Breysig, professor of drawing at the Fine Arts School in Gdańsk, but the less than ideal location of a church chapel, where the altarpiece remained between 1516 and 1945 may have played a role as well, just as its dismantling in 1945 by the German occupying forces in fear of the Red Army approaching the city. In the chaos of retreat it was brought to an outside storage in Kościerzyna (Berent), where it was later discovered by the Polish authorities and transported to Warsaw.

were applied before the final paint layers were added.⁹⁹ Therefore, the underdrawing needed to play a significant role in the final outlook of the painted panels of the *Reinhold Altarpiece*, especially for the darker areas of the draperies or stone structures that for this purpose were prepared with thick parallel- or crosshatching, and for the flesh colours as well. In addition, Joos van Cleve added no fewer than 44 [sic] colour notations to the underdrawings. These colour notations, usually in the shape of a single character, served multiple purposes, but they were all pragmatic and time and cost saving.¹⁰⁰

For the preparation of his underdrawings in woodcut-style, Joos van Cleve made use of his portfolio of model drawings, but especially of Dürer's woodcuts. As can be judged from the study of the Munich *Death of the Virgin* and the Warsaw *Reinhold Altarpiece*, Joos van Cleve must have owned both woodcut sets of the Passion, published in 1511, *The Apocalypse*, first published in 1498 with both German and Latin texts and again in 1511 with a Latin text and an illustrated title page, and probably also the *Life of the Virgin* that was published in the same year.¹⁰¹ He may have acquired them directly from agents Dürer employed, or more likely from local art dealers in Antwerp, who bought Dürer's prints at fairs as in Frankfurt am Main.¹⁰² Joos must have been astonished when he was confronted with these brilliantly innovative series and the multiple inspirations they offered artists like himself. It is therefore hardly surprising to find Albrecht Dürer's inventions throughout the compositions Joos van Cleve prepared for the Reinhold Altarpiece, combined with models he took from inventions by others, such as Gerard David or Jan Joest.¹⁰³

The access to the IRR mosaics enabled Micha Leeftang to comment further on the subject, so I will limit myself to just one example to illustrate Joos van Cleve's eclectic use of Dürer's inventions. For his composition of the *Agony in the Garden* (fig. 34) Joos van Cleve took Dürer's woodcut with that subject from the *Large Passion* as a starting point (fig. 36).¹⁰⁴

⁹⁹ In his third letter to Jacob Heller, dated 24 August 1508, Dürer wrote: "And the main panel I have set out with utmost care, taking a long time over it, and it has been undercoated with two very good layers of colour, so that I am now starting to underpaint it. For I intend, once I have your approval, to underpaint some four, or five, or six times, for maximum clarity and durability, and also to paint with the finest ultramarine I can muster." (Ashcroft, *Albrecht Dürer*..., op. cit., vol. 1, p. 214).

¹⁰⁰ For a precise overview on the colour notations in the Reinhold Altarpiece and their possible functions, as well as Joos van Cleve's use of this method in general, Leeftang, *Joos van Cleve*..., op. cit., pp. 55–58. The detailed underdrawings, combined with the various colour notations, give the impression of a 16th-century version of "Painting by numbers." However, this method enabled Joos van Cleve to keep a tight control over the overall quality and unity of the ensemble, especially when he would have employed more than one assistant for the painting process.

¹⁰¹ On these four series, see Rainer, Mende, Scherbaum, *Albrecht Dürer. Das druckgraphische Werk*..., op. cit., pp. 59–105, nos. 109–26 (*Apocalypse*, 15 large woodcuts, plus title page), pp. 176–213, nos. 154–65 (the *Large Passion*, 12 large woodcuts, including title page), pp. 214–79, nos. 166–85 (the *Life of the Virgin*, 20 large woodcuts), pp. 280–344, nos. 186–222 (the *Small Passion*, 37 woodcuts).

¹⁰² On Dürer's use of agents for distributing his prints and the role of the Frankfurt fair, see notes 36–37. During his stay in Antwerp, Dürer sold many of his prints, especially to art dealers, as is shown from a notice in his journal, early August 1520: "Sebald Fischer bought from me at Antwerp sixteen *Small Passions* for 4 gulden. Plus thirty-two large books [e.g., *Apocalypse*, *Life of the Virgin* and the *Large Passion*] for 8 gulden. Plus six Engraved Passions for 3 gulden. Plus twenty half-sheets of all kinds mixed together for 1 gulden per set, total 3 gulden. Plus quarter-sheets, each at forty-five per 1 gulden, 5¼ gulden worth. Whole-sheets of all kinds, at eight sheets for 1 gulden, 5¼ gulden worth. Paid for." (Ashcroft, *Albrecht Dürer*..., op. cit., vol. 1, p. 556).

¹⁰³ Ryszard Szymycki has given an excellent overview of the possible models Joos van Cleve may have looked at: Szymycki, *Retables anversois en Pologne*..., op. cit., pp. 65–73.

¹⁰⁴ Read for a detailed discussion Leeftang, "The Saint Reinhold Altarpiece by Joos van Cleve...", op. cit., pp. 18–19, 24–27.

He took over the compositional structure of that woodcut, which was based on the triangle formed by the sleeping apostles and the kneeling figure of Christ. He reversed the figure of Christ and adapted the position of the angel to fit the complex shape of the altarpiece panel.¹⁰⁵ The angel itself he took over from the woodcut, albeit somewhat adapted, but for the reversed figure of Christ Joos van Cleve turned to another model Dürer left for him to find in his rich treasure trove: the figure of John the Evangelist in the phenomenal woodcut of *Saint John's Vision of Christ and the Seven Candles* from the "Apocalypse" series (**fig. 37**). Of the sleeping apostles, only the figure of Saint Peter was taken over directly from the woodcut into the underdrawing (**figs. 38–39**).¹⁰⁶ Joos likely left the painting there to one of his assistants, as he did with the other seven panels on the inside of the altarpiece. However, the face of Saint Peter (**fig. 40**) must have been painted by the artist himself, since it differs fundamentally from the underdrawing that was based on the woodcut, as if to take more distance from the original model. The outcome of the painting differs dramatically from the woodcut; the outspoken colours of the sleeping apostles, Christ, and especially the angel in a radiant *couleur changeant* of pinkish purple and light blue, create a different atmosphere than the woodcut was able to achieve.

However, not every composition was as successful. In particular, the *Ecce Homo*, the *Road to Calvary* and the *Crucifixion* showed Joos van Cleve's lack of inventiveness and the problems he encountered with proportions and depth of composition. Certainly, the present state of conservation of the inside paintings does not enable us to give a fair judgement, and I am convinced that Joos van Cleve must have witnessed an altogether different altarpiece when it was finished than we do now. Nevertheless, the painted panels of the *Reinhold Altarpiece* are of a better quality than almost any other comparable work known today.¹⁰⁷ However, the need to speed up production – forced by the tight time frame – resulted in paintings that probably did look like coloured woodcuts that were produced mainly by assistants. The results most likely made him feel uneasy, and I think the sheer power of invention of Dürer's woodcuts must have struck a chord with the young painter at the same time. In effect, the *Reinhold Altarpiece* turned out to be the artist's only known example of collaboration with a woodcarver's workshop in the production of a compound altarpiece. As we know now, he would seek other commissions where the quality of painting could be combined with the quality of invention. Therefore, he had to reorganise the structure of his studio and seek collaboration with specialist painters to be able to produce works of art that would be recognized differently from those large retables that were shipped out of Antwerp and Brussels by the dozen.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁵ One wonders if Joos van Cleve did this in analogy to the angel appearing to Joachim in the left wing of Quinten Massijs' *Saint Anne Altarpiece* (Musées royaux des Beaux-Arts, Brussels), equally painted in *couleur changeant*.

¹⁰⁶ See n. 28.

¹⁰⁷ The only retables of a comparable quality in their painted wings are to be found in Lübeck, the 1518 Marian Altarpiece by the Master of 1518, and in Güstrow, a Passion Altarpiece from Brussels with wings by several painters from the circle of Bernard van Orley. On the latter altarpiece, Catheline Périer-D'Ieteren, "The Painted Wings of the Passion Altarpiece of Güstrow. A Vast Collective Enterprise," in *Technical Studies of Paintings*..., op. cit., pp. 197–208. On the former Annick Born, "Le Maître de 1518 alias Jan Mertens van Dornicke (?), auteur des volets peints et des sculptures du retable de la Vierge de Lübeck?," in *Retables brabançons des XV^e et XVI^e siècles. Actes du colloque organisé par le musée du Louvre les 18 et 19 mai 2001*, Sophie Guillot de Suduiraut, ed. (Paris, 2002), pp. 579–614.

¹⁰⁸ It is useful to refer here to John Hand's view of the matter, in his monograph of the artist: Hand, *Joos van Cleve*..., op. cit., p. 35.

Joos van Cleve's Marketing Strategy: Climbing the Ladder of Success

Joos van Cleve's fresh ambition is visualized in the so-called "small" *Adoration of the Magi* in Dresden (fig. 41), which was no doubt the central part of a medium-sized triptych, of which the wings – with the possible donors – went missing.¹⁰⁹ The subject had become exceedingly popular in Antwerp, because the many merchants in the city, whether they were Italian, German, Portuguese or Netherlandish, identified themselves with the three exotic travellers from overseas, bringing their rich and exotic merchandise with them.¹¹⁰ As John Hand has previously indicated, the Dresden picture must have been painted prior to 1518, around the same time Joos van Cleve finished the *Death of the Virgin*, the centre panel of the altarpiece for St Maria in Kapitol (fig. 4).¹¹¹ Given its size, quality and modern outlook, the triptych was an important commission, almost certainly for a local client, and the triptych worked as a catalyst for Joos van Cleve's business.¹¹² The painting has much in common with the Munich *Death of the Virgin*, as indicated by the very individualized facial types, the dynamic interaction of the figures, the artist's incredible sense of colouristic rhythm and the abundance of decorative playfulness, an aspect that is taken a big step further here.¹¹³ It is clear that in Antwerp this altarpiece was regarded as a marvel, a masterpiece of the young entrepreneur, and it certainly helped Joos van Cleve to raise to the position of Dean of the Guild of Saint Luke in 1519 and settle himself in marriage.¹¹⁴

The high quality of the *Adoration of the Magi*, as much in design as in the highly polished finish, especially in the delicate and thin glazes of the faces and the astonishing sense of surface texture, mark this painting as Joos van Cleve's true early masterpiece with which he would make a name for himself in Antwerp. Most of the actual painting must have been carried out by himself, and if he did make use of specialized assistants for the landscape background or the decorative architecture, they were certainly of a different nature from the assistants he employed for the *Reinhold Altarpiece*.¹¹⁵ Nevertheless, Albrecht Dürer would

¹⁰⁹ Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Dresden, inv. no. 809.

¹¹⁰ On the topic of the merchants and the magi: Dan Ewing, "Magi and merchants: the force behind the Antwerp Mannerists' Adoration pictures," *Jaarboek Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten Antwerpen*, 2004/05 (2006), pp. 275–99.

¹¹¹ Hand, *Joos van Cleve*..., op. cit., pp. 43–45, 123, cat. no. 16; *ibid.*, "Der Künstler und seine Kundschaft...", op. cit., pp. 39–41, fig. 18.

¹¹² John Hand mentions no less than six copies after the centre panel (Hand, *Joos van Cleve*..., op. cit., cat. nos. 16.1–6), the best being the smaller panel in Brussels, there attributed to Marcellus Coffermans. The existence of so many copies is a clear indication to the painting's popularity and accessibility, probably in a chapel of an Antwerp church. The fact that only the centre panel was copied again and again suggests that the wings probably carried the donors of the altarpiece which were evidently of less interest to copyists.

¹¹³ The figural movement, sparkling colours, fluttering dresses and abundant decoration are all elements linked to what Max Friedländer would assemble under the modern term Antwerp Mannerism (Max J. Friedländer, "Die Antwerpener Manieristen von 1520," *Jahrbuch der Königlich-Preussischen Kunstsammlungen*, vol. 36 (1915), pp. 65–91). This was a trendy fashion in and around Antwerp that lasted for no more than 10–15 years, roughly between 1510 and 1525 and did not have a lasting influence. On Antwerp Mannerism, *Extravagant!*..., op. cit., *passim* and the essays by Till-Holger Borchert, Annick Born, Maximiliaan P.J. Martens, Godehard Hoffmann, Stephen Goddard, Yao-Fen You, Peter van den Brink, Micha Leeftang and Dan Ewing in *Jaarboek Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten Antwerpen*, 2004/05 (2006).

¹¹⁴ His painted self-portrait in the background is another indication of the importance Joos van Cleve attached to the altarpiece.

¹¹⁵ The sketchy nature of the underdrawing, applied with a dry material, is well comparable with the underdrawing of the saints Reinhold and John the Baptist on the outside wings of the Reinhold Altarpiece and

remain his crucial source of inspiration and perhaps even more. The dynamic, but very balanced composition is Joos van Cleve's personal interpretation in paint of Dürer's woodcut of the *Adoration of the Magi* from the 1511 series of the *Life of the Virgin* (fig. 42) and possibly even an attempt at *aemulatio*.

It is remarkable, that no large and prestigious international commissions would follow between 1518 and 1521, at least none that we are aware of.¹¹⁶ Instead, Joos van Cleve tried to secure his own niche in the competitive local art market for standardized triptychs of a modest size, either on commission, or on the basis of speculation ("on spec").¹¹⁷ Apart from these Joos produced a huge amount of small devotional pictures and especially portraits in these years (figs. 1, 53–54).¹¹⁸ It is quite possible that his position as dean of the Guild of Saint Luke, his marriage with Anna Vyts and the birth of his son Cornelis did not allow him to engage in large and laborious projects. From a logistic point of view there was an obvious advantage: he could limit the occupation of his studio with only a single apprentice – Claes van Brugghe – at work, who might have learned enough by then to take over some simpler tasks in the process of painting or even produce copies after the painter's inventions.¹¹⁹

Some of these smaller triptychs are of the utmost quality, very modern in their outlook, and apparently Joos van Cleve was able to produce many of them within a very short time. The more refined works of art, such as the already mentioned triptych with the *Crucifixion* that he painted for Marcus von Kirch and Margriete Schats in Mechelen in 1518 (fig. 9), appear to be fully autograph, although it is possible that the painter left specific areas to his apprentice or left the landscape in the background to a specialist landscape painter. For example, another *Crucifixion Triptych*, painted for a Genoese client somewhere between 1520 and 1522 (fig. 43) seems to have been the result of collaboration with a highly profiled landscape painter.¹²⁰

is a good indication that the painter himself was responsible for the painting process. Leeftang, *Joos van Cleve...*, op. cit., pp. 37, 39, figs. 2.12–13.

¹¹⁶ The so-called "large" *Adoration of the Magi*, an altarpiece that was commissioned by Oberto de Lazzari (1573–1633), the later Doge of Genoa, for the high altar of the Dominican church of San Luca d'Erbe in Albarno, near Genoa, was consecrated in 1525. Cécile Scaillièrez, followed by Gianluca Zanelli and Micha Leeftang, suggested a date of execution in or before 1518 on the basis of an archival document that would indicate that the altarpiece must have been on its altar before 16 December 1518 (Cécile Scaillièrez, *Joos van Cleve au Louvre*, exh. cat., Musée du Louvre, Paris, 1991 (Paris 1991), p. 79; Gianluca Zanelli, "Pittura fiamminga a Genova all'inizio del XVI secolo: Il 'caso' Joos van Cleve," in *Joos van Cleve e Genova. Intorno al Ritratto di Stefano Raggio*, Farida Simonetti, Gianluca Zanelli, eds, exh. cat., Galleria Nazionale di Palazzo Spinola, Genoa, 2003 (Firenze, 2003), pp. 20–28; Maria Clelia Galassi, Gianluca Zanelli, "Joos van Cleve und Genua," in *Joos van Cleve. Leonardo des Nordens...*, op. cit., pp. 73–74; Leeftang, *Joos Van Cleve...*, op. cit., pp. 135–36). John Hand opposed this early date on the basis of stylistic arguments and regarded the evidence too circumstantial. He therefore kept to the traditional date of c. 1525 (Hand, *Joos van Cleve...*, op. cit., pp. 81–83, 160, cat. no. 74). I am inclined to think he is right. It is not certain at all that the contract of 16 December 1518, refers to the large *Adoration of the Magi* and stylistically the large altarpiece with its cooler tones and Italianate facial types, fits much better with the major works from the mid- to late 1520s.

¹¹⁷ At least fifteen small altarpieces, mostly triptychs or remaining parts of these, can be identified. As is clear from Dan Ewing's research and data, no painter in Antwerp was more productive than Joos van Cleve and no artist was copied that often: Dan Ewing, "Multiple advantages, moderate production: Thoughts on Patinir and marketing," in *Patinir. Essays and Critical Catalogue*, Alejandro Vergara, ed., exh. cat., Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid, 2007 (Madrid, 2007), pp. 88–94.

¹¹⁸ According to John Hand, no fewer than 15 portraits can be identified for the period 1518–21, which no doubt is only a fraction of the actual number he must have produced.

¹¹⁹ Claes van Brugghe would remain six years in Joos van Cleve's household. In 1522 he became an apprentice with Ariaen Tack.

¹²⁰ Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, inv. no. 41.190.20a–c. *From Van Eyck to Bruegel. Early Netherlandish Painting in The Metropolitan Museum of Art*, Maryan W. Ainsworth, Keith Christiansen, eds, exh. cat.,

Other small altarpieces were the result of workshop collaboration, where Joos van Cleve's contribution remained limited.

When looking for inspiration for his triptychs, Joos van Cleve seems to have turned away from Albrecht Dürer and focused on other sources, one of these being Rogier van der Weyden's *Descent from the Cross*, at the time still in the Chapel of Our Lady Outside the Walls in Leuven.¹²¹ Joos van Cleve painted an excellent and original copy of Van der Weyden's masterpiece with several subtle changes and a landscape panorama as a backdrop (fig. 44).¹²² Nothing is known about its early provenance, and there are no clues to its first owner. We do know however, that the iconic figure of Christ was re-used in two triptychs of a slightly later date, painted by assistants in Joos van Cleve's studio, such as the *Descent from the Cross* in Edinburgh, the centre part of a triptych with the two Antwerp donors, Jan Pels and his wife Digna de Herde portrayed on the wings (fig. 45).¹²³ It is therefore possible that the Van der Weyden copy was kept in the studio as a model.¹²⁴

Joos van Cleve was most certainly inspired by Joachim Patinir, who had become a member of the Guild of Saint Luke in 1515, and who was the inventor of a new type of landscape in brilliant deep cool green and blue, using the curious crystal-shaped rock formations from the area of Dinant and Bouvignes, from where he originated, as his landscape trademark. Whereas in the "small" *Adoration of the Magi* in Dresden no trace of Patinir's "new" landscapes can be found, those that Joos van Cleve used as a backdrop for his many triptychs in the years thereafter, were without exception based on the inventions of the younger artist. The same applies to Joos' "landscape" paintings from this period, such as the *Saint Jerome in Penitence* in Muskegon, the *Flight into Egypt* in Ponce, or for that matter the *Rest on the Flight into Egypt* in Brussels (fig. 46).¹²⁵ The landscape in the Brussels painting was copied partly from

Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 1998–1999 (New York, 1998), pp. 356–59, cat. no. 95 (Maryan Ainsworth); Hand, *Joos van Cleve*..., op. cit., pp. 56–57, 137, cat. no. 40; Leeftang, *Joos van Cleve*..., op. cit., pp. 91–93, 150–51, figs. 3, 1–4. This kind of collaboration recurs in Joos van Cleve's later paintings much more often.

¹²¹ This iconic altarpiece was acquired in 1548 by Mary of Hungary, the sister of the new Habsburg monarch Charles V, in exchange for a copy by Michael Coxie and a new organ. Shortly afterwards the altarpiece was displayed in the chapel of Mary's castle at Binche. It is now in the Museo Nacional del Prado in Madrid, inv. no. P002825.

¹²² Philadelphia Museum of Art, John G. Johnson Collection, inv. no. 373. The painting has been restored recently and is now finally on public view, but has not been given much attention in art historical literature: Hand, *Joos van Cleve*..., op. cit., pp. 47, 49; Leeftang, 'Uytmemende Schilder van Antwerpen'..., op. cit., p. 234, no. 26; Joris Van Grieken, "'Rogerij Belgae inventum' Rogier van der Weyden's Late Reception in Prints (c. 1550–1600)," in *Rogier van der Weyden in context. Papers presented at the Seventeenth Symposium for the Study of Underdrawing and Technology in Painting held in Leuven, 22–24 October 2009*, Lorne Campbell et al., eds (Paris–Leuven–Walpole MA, 2012), pp. 354–56, fig. 29.3. An IRR mosaic was published by Molly Faries (Faries, "Reshaping the Field...", op. cit., p. 94, fig. 33).

¹²³ National Gallery of Scotland, Edinburgh, inv. no. 1252; Hand, *Joos van Cleve*..., op. cit., pp. 57, 138, cat. no. 42. On this triptych and the interpretation of the IRR mosaics, Leeftang, *Joos van Cleve*..., op. cit., pp. 126–31, figs. 3, 41–45. It is likely that the centre panel was already finished and offered to the Antwerp couple. The wings were then painted later by Joos van Cleve himself to complement the *Descent from the Cross*.

¹²⁴ The expression of grief of the Magdalene, twisting her arms in despair, was repeated in the Naples *Crucifixion* by St John the Evangelist.

¹²⁵ Muskegon Museum of Art, Muskegon MI, inv. no. 1940.47; Museo de Arte de Ponce, Ponce, inv. no. 58.0045; Musées royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique, Brussels, inv. no. 2928. Hand, *Joos van Cleve*..., op. cit., pp. 39–41, 120, 136, cat. nos. 11, 12 and 37.

Joachim Patinir's landscape painting with the same subject in Madrid (**fig. 47**).¹²⁶ As Cécile Scailliérez and Micha Leeftang have been able to demonstrate convincingly, Joos van Cleve must have made use of drawings or patterns that would be used again and again as models for his landscape backgrounds, as is clear from its re-use for the background of the *Liverpool Virgin and Child with Angels* (**fig. 48**).¹²⁷

Would it be possible that Joos van Cleve and Joachim Patinir actually collaborated in some high-profile paintings, such as the aforementioned *Crucifixion Triptych* in New York? We do know that Patinir and Quinten Massijs collaborated at least once, in the *Landscape with the Temptation of Saint Anthony* in the Prado, dating from the early 1520s (**fig. 49**), whereas in a slightly earlier picture in the same museum, the *Landscape with the Rest of the Flight into Egypt*, the prominent figures of the Virgin and Child may have been painted by an assistant from Massijs' studio, possibly the so-called Master of the Mansi Magdalene.¹²⁸ Patinir was not a very gifted figure painter; therefore he must have made use of specialists when he needed large figures in his landscapes.¹²⁹ That Joos van Cleve actually may have worked with him, was already indicated by Karel van Mander, in his *Schilder-boeck* of 1604.¹³⁰ I think it would make sense that Joachim Patinir actually collaborated with other (figure) painters, such as Joos van Cleve and Jan de Beer, especially given his own extremely small oeuvre of paintings. Detailed stylistic examination of the landscape backgrounds in paintings by Massijs, Van Cleve and De Beer with those landscape paintings by Patinir that are signed or documented, would certainly be useful.

¹²⁶ Museo Thyssen-Bornemisza, Madrid, inv. no. 314 (1930.85). *Patinir. Essays and Critical Catalogue*..., op. cit., pp. 204–9, cat. no. 9 (Mar Borobia).

¹²⁷ Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool, inv. no. 9864. Cécile Scailliérez, "Joos van Cleve et Joachim Patinir: le cas de la Vierge à l'Enfant avec un dominicain," in Scailliérez, *Joos van Cleve au Louvre*..., op. cit., pp. 28–32; Hand, *Joos van Cleve*..., op. cit., pp. 78–79, 153–154, cat. no. 64; Leeftang, *Joos van Cleve*..., op. cit., pp. 62–63. Jan de Beer, too, may have used drawing models based on Patinir landscapes, as Dan Ewing has been able to demonstrate: Dan Ewing, *Jan de Beer. Gothic Renewal in Renaissance Antwerp* (Turnhout, 2016), pp. 195–97.

¹²⁸ On these two paintings in the Museo Nacional del Prado in Madrid (inv. nos. P1611 and P1615), see *Patinir. Essays and Critical Catalogue*..., op. cit., pp. 182–93, no. 5 and pp. 242–55, cat. no. 14 (Pilar Silva Maroto).

¹²⁹ It is telling that the two gift drawings Patinir received from his painter colleagues were figure drawings. Albrecht Dürer made him four drawings on coloured paper with various figures of Saint Christopher on it, one of these surviving in the British Museum in London (inv. no. SL.5218.178); Joseph Leo Koerner, "Dürer in Bewegung," in *Dürer war hier*..., op. cit., pp. 69–71, fig. 31; Alexander Marksches, "Highlands in the Lowlands. Bemerkungen zu Dürers Reise in die Niederlande," in *Dürer war hier*..., op. cit., p. 117. Jan de Beer presented him with a sheet of head studies, the so-called *Sketch of nine male heads*, again in the British Museum in London (inv. no. 1886.0706.7); Ewing, *Jan de Beer. Gothic Renewal*..., op. cit., pp. 76–87, 333, no. 28, fig. 30; Peter van den Brink, "In Pursuit of the Individual Hand. Jan de Beer as a Draughtsman," in Dan Ewing, Peter van den Brink and Robert Wenley, *'Truly Bright and Memorable'. Jan de Beer's Renaissance Altarpieces*, The Barber Institute of Fine Arts, Birmingham (London, 2019), pp. 26–28, 82–84, cat. no. 6.

¹³⁰ Karel van Mander, *Het Schilder-boeck* [...] (Haarlem, 1604), fol. 227r: "By Melchior Wijntgis te Middelborgh is van zijner [Joos van Cleve] handt een seer schoon Mary-beeldt, waer achter dat van Ioachim Patenier is een seer schoon Landschap" ("At Melchior Wijntgis in Middelburg is a beautiful Virgin and Child by his [Joos van Cleve] hand, with a very beautiful landscape background by Joachim Patinir"). However, since Van Mander mixed up Joos van Cleve's biography with that of his son Cornelis and added considerable fanciful hearsay, one should perhaps not attach too much value to his words. Robert Koch's suggestion that the *Rest of the Flight into Egypt* by Patinir in Berlin might actually be that painting is unlikely, since the figures are most certainly not by Joos van Cleve. Robert A. Koch, *Joachim Patinir* (Princeton, 1968), p. 52; *Patinir. Essays and Critical Catalogue*..., op. cit., pp. 176–81, cat. no. 4 (Alejandro Vergara); Alejandro Vergara, "Who was Patinir? What is a Patinir?," in *Patinir. Essays and Critical Catalogue*..., op. cit., p. 30. Alejandro Vergara, too, thinks that Van Cleve and Patinir may have collaborated (*ibid.*, p. 33).

It is clear from the production output of these early years (1515–21) that Joos van Cleve was an ambitious artist, who was able to produce many altarpieces, devotional pictures and portraits for a fast-growing clientele. Certainly, he was a very gifted painter himself, but his success was the result of a keen marketing strategy. He combined high-profile commissions with quality pictures “on spec,” as well as excellent portraits. He was able to play the market so successfully because he was able to manage his studio most effectively and used specialized assistants in the production chain. In addition, he was a masterful eclectic, transforming models by Dürer, Patinir and even Van der Weyden to such a degree that he was able to create new and superb works of art. The pride he took in his success was visualized in his additional self-portraits and signatures he left on his superior productions, although to some degree these may have functioned as marketing tools. As Dan Ewing reminded me, Joos van Cleve was not so much interested in fame or glory – unlike Dürer – but his driving motivation was monetary success and the attraction of high-profile clients and patrons.¹³¹

Joos van Cleve and Dürer’s Antwerp Legacy

Would Joos van Cleve, as the senior Dean of the Antwerp Guild of Saint Luke, have invited the city’s prominent guest to his house and studio, during that famous banquet on 5 August 1520? They must have been placed close to each other at the same table, as protocol would probably have it, so they had the opportunity to talk and make appointments. It is therefore not unlikely that Dürer paid a visit to Joos van Cleve’s house near the Capelle van Gratien, which would take him no more than six minutes from his apartment in the Wolstraat nearby, but there is no mention of such a visit in Dürer’s journal. However, shortly after his welcoming banquet, probably the very next day, he visited the house of Quinten Massijs, although he does not disclose anything he saw there. One of the pictures present in Massijs’ house may have been the very large and impressive *Ecce Homo*, which would have been nearly finished by then (**fig. 50**).¹³² This monumental painting might have stirred an interest in Dürer, and not only because Massijs used Dürer’s woodcut from the *Large Passion* as his most important source (**fig. 51**).¹³³ If he would have dropped in at Joos van Cleve’s painter’s workshop, which works in progress would he have witnessed there and would they have brought forth some excitement on his part? Most likely he would see several portraits and devotional paintings, a *Virgin and Child* or one or more versions of *Christ and Saint John the Baptist, embracing* (better known today as the *Kissing Babies*), and one or two triptychs the master was working on, perhaps even the *Crucifixion Triptych* Joos had in mind for his Genoese client (**fig. 43**). Of course this is all speculation on my part, but Albrecht Dürer no doubt paid visits to many different ateliers in Antwerp, so he would certainly not have limited himself to those of Massijs and Patinir.

For Dürer these pictures may not have been overly exciting, but with his potential contract as Antwerp’s new city painter in mind, he might have inspected the “battlefield” to find out more about the city’s potential in terms of lucrative commissions and the quality of its huge

¹³¹ In an email to the author, 18 April 2022.

¹³² Museo Nacional del Prado, Madrid, Inv. no. 2801. Larry Silver, *The Paintings of Quinten Massys* (Oxford, 1984), pp. 24, 60, 82, 94–95, 127, 180, 184, 220, no. 31, fig. 86; Friederike Schütt, *Quinten Massys. Bildstrategien der Affekterzeugung* (Petersberg, 2021), pp. 70–98.

¹³³ Rainer, Mende, Scherbaum, *Albrecht Dürer. Das druckgraphische Werk...*, op. cit., pp. 194–96, cat. no. 159 (Anke Fröhlich).

colony of painters. I do think he would try to judge the potential of his competitors, although it's not very likely he really saw them as such, with the possible exception of Jan Gossart, by that time already a most famous court painter, holding an even higher reputation than Bernard van Orley, Quinten Massijs or Joos van Cleve. It is most certainly for that reason he paid a visit to Middelburg in early December 1520 to see Gossart's *pièce de résistance*, his huge altarpiece with the *Descent from the Cross*, finished shortly before Dürer's arrival in Antwerp.¹³⁴

In the first few months of his stay in the Low Countries Dürer seems to have been focused on receiving his imperial life rent from Charles V and for that reason he worked closely together with Erasmus Strenberger, the secretary of Jacob Banisius.¹³⁵ Strenberger drew up the formal request for confirmation and renewal of the life rent, together with a draft of a suggested form for the imperial chancery to use.¹³⁶ In addition, Dürer networked his way into the household of Margaret of Austria, Duchess Regent of the Netherlands, dining out with her court artists Bernard van Orley and Conrad Meit, as well as other members of her household, including Jean de Marnix, advisor and treasurer of Margaret of Austria, or Tommaso Bombelli, a silk merchant from Genoa, who was Margaret's *argentier* between 1508 and 1527, as well as a very influential and powerful courtier, mediator and ambassador with a large international network.¹³⁷ Bombelli would become one of Dürer's closest friends during his stay in Antwerp, and he turned out to be an important contact towards Margaret of Austria.¹³⁸ He would in fact accompany Dürer on the latter's first important trip to Mechelen and Brussels on 26 August 1520, where the artist would seek contact with the official Nuremberg delegation for the Coronation of Charles V in Aachen, but also with Banisius, Strenberger and several people from the households of Margaret and Charles. During that short trip he received word that Margaret would in effect support his claim, and it is likely that his close ties to Bombelli and Banisius helped him to gain her support directly.

Dürer met Tommaso Bombelli and his two brothers Vincentio and Gherardo already in August 1520, when he portrayed them in three large charcoal drawings. He would continue to meet up with "Tomasin," as he would call him, and his family, for whom he made several portraits and kept in touch even after his return to Nuremberg.¹³⁹ Of all the portrait drawings that Dürer made of the Bombelli family members, only one survives with certainty,

¹³⁴ On Dürer's journey to Middelburg and Zeeland: Peter van den Brink, "A Tale of two drawings. Albrecht Dürer and Gossart's lost Middelburg Altarpiece," in *Ingenium et labor. Studia ofiarowane Profesorowi Antoniemu Ziembie z okazji 60. urodzin* [Studies offered to Professor Antoni Ziemba on His 60th Birthday], Piotr Borusowski et al., eds (Warsaw, 2020), pp. 109–17.

¹³⁵ Jacob Banisius, Emperor Maximilian's "kaiserlicher Rat," was a good friend of Willibald Pirckheimer and someone with influence in court circles.

¹³⁶ See n. 17.

¹³⁷ On Tommaso Bombelli, Dagmar Eichberger, *Leben mit Kunst – Wirken durch Kunst. Sammelwesen und Hofkunst unter Margarete von Österreich, Regentin der Niederlande* (Turnhout, 2002), pp. 288–89; Federica Veratelli, 'A la mode italienne'. *Commerce du luxe et diplomatie dans les Pays-Bas méridionaux, 1477–1530. Edition critique de documents de la Chambre des comptes de Lille* (Lille, 2013), pp. 26, 66–70, 72, 108, 111–17; docs. 86, 94, 138, 139, 147, 155, 160, 160b, 176, 177, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186.

¹³⁸ On Dürer and Tommaso Bombelli: Rupprich, *Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass...*, op. cit., vol. 1, pp. 152–54, 156, 161–62, 164–65, 169, 172–74, 176, 181, 187, 191–92, 196, 201; Ashcroft, *Albrecht Dürer...*, op. cit., vol. 1, pp. 558–59, 561, 563, 567, 569, 572–73, 576, 580, 583–85, 587, 613.

¹³⁹ In a letter, dated 23 February 1524 Cornelis Grapheus informed Dürer on the situation in Antwerp, especially with regard to the persecutions that took place towards those that supported Luther's Reformation, as both Dürer and Grapheus did as well. It is curious, however, that Tommaso Bombelli is mentioned twice, as a good friend to both Dürer and Grapheus. Was Bombelli a supporter of Reformation? The letter in question is in

a silverpoint drawing of Gherardo Bombelli's fiancée, a pretty young woman, daughter of an Antwerp solicitor (*procurator*), called Sebastian. She would become Dürer's favourite model (**fig. 52**).¹⁴⁰ A pair of portraits in the Uffizi by Joos van Cleve, dated in the year when Dürer arrived in Antwerp, can possibly be identified as the same young woman, together with Gherardo Bombelli, her fiancé (**figs. 53–54**).¹⁴¹ In all likelihood Joos van Cleve must have known Tommaso Bombelli quite well, not only because of their status and position in Antwerp and their stance with Margaret of Austria, but especially since we know of Joos' close connection with the Genoese merchants in Antwerp, since at least seven important commissions would come his way through them, probably more.¹⁴²

Joos van Cleve had a direct access to Margaret of Austria and her court, probably through his Cologne connections with Nicasius Hackeney and it is certain that he knew her and the art collection in her Renaissance palace in Mechelen, the "Hof van Savoye," quite well. The regent of the Low Countries actually owned some of his paintings.¹⁴³ In addition, Joos must have copied a painting by Marco d'Oggiono that Margaret kept in her library and after 1523 in her private bedroom (*seconde chambre à chemynée*), where Dürer must have seen it in the late Spring of 1521.¹⁴⁴ Joos would make this composition, *Christ and Saint John the Baptist, embracing* (**fig. 55**), into one of his bestsellers on the open market after making a one-to-one drawn copy after the original in Margaret's collection, which he would then use as a cartoon.¹⁴⁵

the collection of the Houghton Library of Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, MS Typ 134. See Ashcroft, *Albrecht Dürer*..., op. cit., vol. 2, pp. 721–22, no. 188.

¹⁴⁰ Städel Museum, Frankfurt am Main, inv. no. 15269 (verso), Nesselrath, "Zu Albrecht Dürers Silberstift-skizzenbuch...", op. cit., pp. 239, 240, 245, fig. 136; Van den Brink, "In grossem Stil...", op. cit., p. 307; *Dürer war hier*..., op. cit., pp. 621–22, cat. no. 47 (Peter van der Brink).

¹⁴¹ Van den Brink, "In grossem Stil...", op. cit., p. 307, n. 35. Gallerie degli Uffizi, Florence, inv. nos. 1643–44. The portraits are produced in colour in Till-Holger Borchert, "Albrecht Dürer und die Bildnismalerei in den Niederlanden," in *Dürer war hier*..., op. cit., pp. 358–59, figs. 230–31.

¹⁴² The already mentioned *Crucifixion Triptych* in New York is most likely the earliest of Joos van Cleve's Genoese commissions, followed by the so-called *San Donato-Altarpiece* for Stefano Raggio that was probably finished in 1522. The *Santa Maria della Pace Altarpiece*, commissioned by Niccolò Calvi Bellogio, now in the Paris Louvre, dates from 1525 and was painted in the same period as the large *Adoration of the Magi* in Dresden. The so-called Cerezo Altarpiece, painted for a chapel on Gran Canaria, for a Genoese merchant, is clearly later, dating from the early to mid-1530s. Apart from these five known altarpieces, two wings of a triptych are most likely made for a Genoese donor and the same accounts for an altarpiece wing with the *Stigmatization of St Francis*, both datable around 1525 or slightly later. On the latter, Peter van den Brink, "The *Stigmatization of Saint Francis* by Joos van Cleve: A New Discovery," in *Tributes to Maryan W. Ainsworth. Collaborative Spirit: Essays on Northern European Art, 1350–1650*, Anna Koopstra, Joshua Waterman, Christine Seidel, eds (London–Turnhout, 2022), pp. 278–95.

¹⁴³ Eichberger, *Leben mit Kunst*..., op. cit., pp. 46 (n. 77), 99, 274, 277, 297, 314–17, 343, 347, 365, 375, 386, figs. 113, 129. She possibly owned the painter's *Lucretia*, now in the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna (inv. no. 833; Hand, *Joos van Cleve*..., op. cit., pp. 89, 150, cat. no. 60), and most certainly Joos van Cleve's early *Portrait of Emperor Maximilian I*, Margaret's father (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, inv. no. 972; *ibid.*, pp. 112–13, no. 2).

¹⁴⁴ Eichberger, *Leben mit Kunst*..., op. cit., pp. 307–10.

¹⁴⁵ On this practice, Leeftang, *Joos van Cleve*..., op. cit., pp. 75–85, 170–71, 178–79. On the dates of these pictures Joos and his workshop produced by the dozen, opinions differ. The painting by Marco d'Oggiono, now in the Royal Collection in Hampton Court (RCIN 405463), was most likely painted between 1510 and 1513. John Hand placed the production of Joos van Cleve's paintings "on spec" after 1525 (Hand, *Joos van Cleve*..., op. cit., pp. 96–99, 164–66, cat. nos. 80–84.9), whereas Micha Leeftang stayed much closer in time to the original model, dating the earliest version, now in a private collection in Antwerp, to 1515 and others between 1515 and 1520, based on dendrochronological analysis and the use of Patinir-like landscapes. Martha Wolff, who examined the version in Chicago – which belonged to the Amsterdam banker Pompejus Occo – in detail and actually finding that the two children were *de facto* copied directly from the painting in Hampton Court, placed the earliest versions around 1520–25 (Martha Wolff, *Northern European and Spanish Paintings before 1600 in the Art Institute of Chicago*.

Dürer did not make use of Joos van Cleve's direct line with Margaret of Austria. Instead, he connected with people in her household directly, but that was most certainly very effective, since she let him know directly that she would support him.¹⁴⁶ Did this strain the possible bond which the two artists could have forged? We don't know, but the fact remains that Dürer did not mention Joos van Cleve anywhere in his journal. This certainly does not mean Albrecht Dürer ignored Joos van Cleve; it simply states they had no business relationship, which would involve gifts and dinners, like those that Dürer had with Conrad Meit, Lucas van Leyden or Bernard van Orley. Nor were they close friends. The only artist in Antwerp Dürer probably would call his friend was Joachim Patinir, although he was certainly on very good terms with Conrad Meit, Dirk Vellert and Jan Provoost as well.

Albrecht Dürer would name Patinir "maister Joachim, der gut landschafft Mahler," and he mentions the artist seven times in his journal, more than any other colleague, and from the content it is clear they had become friends.¹⁴⁷ Dürer made use of Patinir's assistant (*Knecht*) and pigments, already in August 1520, paying for it with prints. The next year he would portray him twice in silverpoint and gave him four drawings on blue paper with various presentations of Saint Christopher, a subject that Patinir painted more than once.¹⁴⁸ Shortly before he returned to Nuremberg, Dürer gave his friend another gift, prints by Hans Baldung Grien, Dürer's former assistant. In return, Joachim Patinir invited Albrecht Dürer for his wedding with Jehanne Noyts in May 1521, which pleased Dürer enormously.¹⁴⁹ He may have bumped into Joos van Cleve at the wedding party, drinking wine and exchanging casual talk, but we will never know for certain.

It may be true that there was no love lost between the two artists, but we do know that Joos van Cleve remained very much interested in the works of art Albrecht Dürer produced, and not only his prints. Dürer's paintings up to 1520 were *terra incognita* for Joos van Cleve, but the paintings the Nuremberg artist produced in Antwerp were of course another matter. However, these were not comparable to Dürer's great altarpieces or other major works of art that he had painted in Nuremberg or Venice. As we can judge from his journal, Albrecht Dürer must have produced some twenty paintings when he was in the Low Countries. It is likely that the two paintings with a *Virgin and Child* he offered the Bamberg Bishop Georg III Schenk von Limburg and his Antwerp host Joost Blankveld, were made in advance, but the other pictures that are mentioned were certainly produced in Antwerp.¹⁵⁰

A Catalogue of the Collection (New Haven–London, 2008), pp. 159–67). I tend to agree with Martha Wolff, since the first Leonardesque elements in the work of Joos van Cleve do not appear before 1520. On the subject of Joos and Leonardo, see Dan Ewing, "Joos van Cleve und Leonardo. Italienische Kunst in niederländischer Übersetzung," in *Joos van Cleve. Leonardo des Nordens...*, op. cit., pp. 113–31.

¹⁴⁶ Ashcroft, *Albrecht Dürer...*, op. cit., vol. 1, p. 560.

¹⁴⁷ On Dürer's friendship with Patinir, see Marksches, "Highlands in the Lowlands...", op. cit., pp. 117–18.

¹⁴⁸ See n. 125.

¹⁴⁹ Rupprich, *Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass...*, op. cit., vol. 1, pp. 152, 167, 169, 172, 175; Ashcroft, *Albrecht Dürer...*, op. cit., vol. 1, pp. 556–57, 576, 579, 582, 585. See also Maximiliaan P.J. Martens, "Joachim Patinir: The good landscape painter in written sources," in *Patinir. Essays and Critical Catalogue...*, op. cit., pp. 53–56, and Selina Blasco and Maximiliaan P.J. Martens, "Documents and literary sources concerning Joachim Patinir," in *Patinir. Essays and Critical Catalogue...*, op. cit., pp. 363–64, Doc. 4, and Koerner, "Dürer in Bewegung...", op. cit., pp. 68–73.

¹⁵⁰ Ashcroft, *Albrecht Dürer...*, op. cit., vol. 1, pp. 551, 556. The Tüchlein he offered Blankveld, was obviously meant to pay the rent.

Four of these were painted on Tüchlein, at least twelve others in oil (*öhlfarben*) on oak. Among these were four small pictures of what Dürer called a “Veronica angesicht,” small paintings with the “Vera Icon,” which were presented as gifts to Jacob Banisius, the Portuguese factor João Brandão and his predecessor Francisco Pessoa as well as the goldsmith Jan van de Perre.¹⁵¹ Furthermore Dürer painted five portraits, of the Gdańsk merchant Bernard von Reesen (**fig. 56**), an unidentified elder man, most likely the Antwerp revenue collector Lorenz Sterck (**fig. 57**), his host Joost Blankveld and his wife and finally, at the end of his journey, King Christian II of Denmark.¹⁵² Of all these paintings, the portraits were by far the most expensive.¹⁵³ Certainly, they were (and are) impressive, but nothing Joos van Cleve might not have seen before.

The only painting Dürer produced during his year in Antwerp that would reach truly iconic status was the Lisbon *Saint Jerome in His Study* (**fig. 58**).¹⁵⁴ It was painted in the second half of March 1521 as a gift for Dürer’s trusted friend Rodrigo (Rui) Fernandes de Almada, the second in command of the Portuguese Feitoria and the man who would succeed João Brandão in 1527 as head of the trade mission in Antwerp.¹⁵⁵

Without going into too much detail, it should be stressed that Albrecht Dürer’s painting of *Saint Jerome in His Study* is a monument to humanism. Saint Jerome is presented as a scholar here, explicitly not as a cardinal, clearly in keeping with the ideas Desiderius Erasmus had published in his critical biography *Hieronymi Stridonensis Vita* of 1516. There is no doubt Dürer discussed the subject of his painting beforehand with both Erasmus and the latter’s friend Pieter Gillis, or Petrus Aegidius, as he was known in the humanist circle in Antwerp both he and Erasmus were part of.¹⁵⁶ Dürer met Gillis and Erasmus for dinner in Antwerp in February 1521, roughly a month before he presented the painting to his Portuguese friend, and it is more than likely that they must have had a lively discussion on the status of Saint Jerome.

¹⁵¹ On that composition, see Van den Brink, Foister, “Einleitung...,” op. cit., p. 40.

¹⁵² Apart from the five portraits Dürer mentions specifically in his journal, he also mentions two pictures with “ein herzog angesicht uff ein täffelein mit öhlfarben” (“The portrait of a duke in oil on a small panel”) and “ein herzog angesicht von öhlfarben” (“The portrait of a duke in oil”) (Rupprich, *Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass...*, op. cit., vol. 1, pp. 165, 170). Most likely these were small representation portraits of Frederick II, Prince Elector and Count Palatine of the Rhine, or of Frederick the Wise of Saxony, comparable to the small portraits Joos van Cleve had produced of Emperor Maximilian I and Bernard van Orley of Charles V and Margaret of Austria. Albrecht Dürer presented the Prince Elector’s servant, Wilhelm Hauenhut, three engravings in early September 1520 in Antwerp and he met with Duke Frederick the Wise, one of his old clients, in Cologne, early November 1520.

¹⁵³ Three portraits, all dated 1521, survive. The *Portrait of Bernard von Reesen* is in the Gemäldegalerie Alte Meister, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Dresden, inv. no. 1871. The identification of the other two surviving portraits is uncertain. The portrait in the Museo del Prado in Madrid (inv. no. 2180) may well be that of Lorenz Sterck, whereas the portrait in the Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum in Boston (P21110), traditionally identified as Rodrigo Fernandes de Almada, may actually have been unfinished and therefore not mentioned in the journal. On Dürer’s painted portraits in the Low Countries, see Borchert, “Albrecht Dürer und die Bildnismalerei...,” op. cit., pp. 335–69. The 1520 dated Tüchlein of a *Bearded Man with a Red Bonnet* in the Louvre was possibly painted before Dürer left for Antwerp, Till-Holger Borchert even doubts the date (*ibid.*, pp. 364, 368, fig. 238).

¹⁵⁴ On Dürer’s *Saint Jerome*, Astrid Harth, Maximiliaan P.J. Martens, “Dürers berühmtes Bildnis des Heiligen Hieronymus. Entstehung, Bedeutung und Rezeption,” in *Dürer war hier...*, op. cit., pp. 429–55.

¹⁵⁵ It is interesting of note that Dürer did not attach a specific monetary value to the painting, something he did with almost every other painting he produced and to the large portrait drawings, too.

¹⁵⁶ Other members of that humanist circle were Cornelis Grapheus, Quinten Massijs and the banker Erasmus Schets. Marcus de Schepper, “Pieter Gillis, een Antwerps humanist,” in *Antwerpen, verhaal van een metropool 16^{de}–17^{de} eeuw*, Jan Van der Stock, ed., exh. cat., Hessenhuis, Antwerpen, 1993 (Gent, 1993), p. 206.

Erasmus was adamant in his judgement that Jerome could never have been a cardinal, as the Church of Rome considered him to be and presented accordingly, because the function did not exist in the Church Father's lifetime and was installed several centuries after his death in 420. For Erasmus Saint Jerome was a theologian, a scholar, a writer and the translator of the Holy Scriptures into Latin, the so-called Vulgate. Dürer, too, had a keen interest in the figure of Saint Jerome and his role for humanistic scholarship and piety, resulting in many prints, including a woodcut from 1512 that was used as a title page for the German translation of *De morte Hieronymi* by Dürer's friend Lazarus Spengler in 1514. The essence of Dürer's painting of *Saint Jerome* lies in the saint's pointing gesture towards the skull in combination with the melancholic but piercing look at the viewer. It is an homage to reason, explained by Erasmus in his *Enchiridion* of 1503, in which he stated that self-knowledge is obtained through reason, not through the interference of divine grace and human faith, as Luther would preach.¹⁵⁷ Nevertheless, it is certainly not impossible that Dürer's *Saint Jerome* bears the marks of Luther's critical attitude towards the saint through the omission of symbols of penance and motifs of Marian iconography.¹⁵⁸ This profound intellectual painting and conversation piece was a remarkable and fitting gift of friendship to a humanist-diplomat whom Dürer may have regarded as his best friend in Antwerp.¹⁵⁹

Countless painters have copied Dürer's invention of this solemn and serious church father, but most of these paintings, quite often rather horrific in their lack of quality, were not copied directly after the picture, which would remain in Antwerp until 1548, before it travelled to Lisbon with its owner. The only artist who seems to have had access to the original was Joos van Cleve, of all people. He painted at least four autograph variations, all different in appearance, and these in turn were copied in his studio.¹⁶⁰ Joos van Cleve transformed Dürer's private and intellectual painting into a populist prototype by removing the individual features and the focused outlook on the saint's face, replacing it by a standardized facial type from his own stock. The individual message, so essential in the intellectual exchange between Erasmus, Dürer and Fernandes de Almada, made way for a general message of the brevity and transience of life, with an overflow of symbolic references. This accounts especially for the painting in Cambridge, where the puzzling outlook on the saint's face seems exemplary for the U-turn his position has taken (fig. 59).¹⁶¹ Saint Jerome has ceased to be a scholar, he has been changed back into his traditional role as Church Father or cardinal, his *galerus ruber* – which Dürer obviously omitted – in front of him on the table, his study changed into a personalized Lourdes gift shop, with a view onto a landscape, where the history of Jerome's lion from the *Legenda aurea* has been displayed in full. A picture the Church of Rome would surely have liked.

Erasmus and Dürer would probably have looked at this transformation with amazement or even disgust, but they may never have been confronted with it, at least not Dürer, since

¹⁵⁷ Harth, Martens, "Dürers berühmtes Bildnis...", op. cit., pp. 446–47.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid., p. 447.

¹⁵⁹ On Fernandes de Almada, see Maria do Rosário de Sampaio Themudo Barata, *Rui Fernandes de Almada. Diplomata portugueses do século XVI* (Lisbon, 1971).

¹⁶⁰ The four that can be considered autograph, are the ones in Princeton, in a Scottish private collection, in the collection of the Prince of Hannover and the large Saint Jerome in the Harvard University Art Museums. Hand, *Joos van Cleve...*, op. cit., cat. nos. 75, 76, 77, 78.

¹⁶¹ Harvard Art Museums, Gift of Howland Warren, Dr. Richard P. Warren and Mrs. Grayson M.P. Murphy, Cambridge, MA, inv. no. 1961.26.

the production of this commercialization of his private image of Jerome only came into being in 1528, the year he died.¹⁶² Interestingly, a study of the Harvard painting with the aid of infrared reflectography revealed a – underdrawn and painted – text behind the two decorative friezes at the back wall. This text is still partly visible on the painted surface and it can be read as “HOMO BULLA | ANNO 1521” (fig. 60). Obviously this is not a reference to the painting’s year of fabrication, since it can only have been painted as early as 1528. The date 1521 obviously refers to the date of Dürer’s original, indicating that Joos had seen it then in the flesh. The text “HOMO BULLA” (‘Man is a bubble’) in combination with the date 1521 might therefore even refer to Dürer himself, given the fact that the painter had died in Nuremberg in 1528. Was it meant as a cryptic epitaph of a rather personal nature? The decoration that was painted over the text no doubt stems from Joos van Cleve’s studio and is not of a much later date, whereas the words “HOMO BULLA” have reappeared in the arch above the niche, underneath a painted piece of paper with the text “RESPICE FINEM” (‘Observe the end’).¹⁶³ There is no doubt that the countless copies by anonymous and less talented painters were produced after Joos van Cleve’s popular versions of the subject, and *not* after Dürer’s original invention. This way Joos van Cleve harvested the commercial success of Dürer’s innovative and brilliant *Saint Jerome*, perhaps even without grasping its essence.

Epilogue: Commercial Success and Artistic Failure

Although it is highly speculative, I do think that the story of Dürer’s *Saint Jerome* and Joos van Cleve’s interpretations of it might tell us something about these two artists and how they looked upon their profession. Unlike Dürer, Joos adapted easily to the changes of society and economy brought upon him and remained successful all his life. After 1521, he received several large commissions for altarpieces in Genoa, Cologne, Gran Canaria and from local clients. When the economic crisis struck at the end of the 1520s, he adapted his market strategy and started focusing on the standardized production of smaller devotional paintings on speculation, such as the *Saint Jeromes*, the *kissing babies* and the *Cherry Madonnas*. He was a true *Homo oeconomicus*.¹⁶⁴

Albrecht Dürer was a sick and possibly bitter old man when he returned to his home town Nuremberg, and his output in painting in the last seven years of his life was very limited, as was his print production.¹⁶⁵ Money played an essential role in his life, as is visible in his

¹⁶² The painting of *Saint Jerome in His Study* in Princeton is dated 1528, whereas dendrochronological analysis of the oak boards of the Harvard version indicates a *terminus post quem* of 1528 as well, whereas the other two autograph pictures should be dated even later, in the 1530s. Leeflang, *Joos van Cleve*..., op. cit., pp. 179–80, Table 5, nos. 23, 35, 56.

¹⁶³ In a workshop copy after the Harvard painting, in Poughkeepsie (The Frances Lehman Loeb Art Center, Vassar College, inv. no. 1985.20), the same decorations are visible, but no text is visible underneath, indicating the characters were already overpainted on the Harvard picture by then.

¹⁶⁴ It is rather amusing that Andreas Beyer uses this personal description for Albrecht Dürer: Andreas Beyer, “Dürer auf der Reise zu sich selbst,” in *Dürer war hier*..., op. cit., p. 79.

¹⁶⁵ It is plausible that the illness he caught in Zeeland had a lasting influence on his health and energy. Whether or not it was malaria, is something we will never be certain of. Dürer mentions this illness for the first time four months after he caught it, after Easter 1521: “Item in der dritten wochen nach ostern stieß mich ein heiß fieber an mit einer grossen ohnmacht, unlust und hauptwehe. Und do ich vormahls jn Seeland war, do überkam ich eine wunderliche kranckheit, von deren ich nie von keinem man gehört, und diese kranckheit hab ich noch.” (‘In the third week after Easter I was struck down by a high fever and drastic weakness, nausea and headache. Before, when I was in Zeeland, I suffered a mysterious illness that no one had ever heard of, and this sickness has

many letters, to Heller, to the Nuremberg City magistrates, even to Georg Spalatin, and of course in his notebook of the journey to the Low Countries, which was basically a cashbook in diary-format. Dürer regarded money always as a measure of his time, effort and status, but not everyone was able to grasp his brilliant qualities, which quite often led to frustrations on his part that sometimes ended up in writing. Dürer's self-assurance and self-knowledge were not always equalled by his insights concerning his fellow man.

One of the most famous and cryptic outcries is found in his journal, shortly before he would return to Nuremberg, on June 29, 1521: "In all I have done, in my living expenses, sales and other dealings in the Netherlands, in all my relationships whether with higher or lower classes of people, I have lost out, and quite especially with Lady Margaret who in return for what I presented and made for her, has given me nothing."¹⁶⁶ The black picture Dürer painted here is most certainly incorrect, although it is impossible to calculate exactly in which direction the balance dipped, since Dürer was not always very precise in noting down his expenses, nor is it possible to calculate the many gifts he received in kind.¹⁶⁷ One could argue that the only reason for this outburst had to do with the fact that he produced it just after he had heard from his landlord Joost Blankveld that he still needed to pay 31 gulden for the rent of his lodgings, which he did, although it is clear that he had hoped that Blankveld would have lowered his debt with considerably more than the five pounds of borax that he received in return for the two portraits he had painted of his host and his wife.

As Stijn Alsteens has argued, Dürer may have been furious with Margaret of Austria for not being willing to finance a large altarpiece he had in mind for her, but she had *de facto* supported his cause with her nephew Charles V, resulting in the re-installment of his yearly privilege.¹⁶⁸ She probably had good cause not to embark on such a large and complicated project, since she may have become aware that Dürer supported Luther's reform ideas, which opposed the Church of Rome, or was at least sympathetic towards them. As Jeroen Stumpel has demonstrated, Dürer embraced Luther's theological reformation and collected the latter's treatises and sermons throughout his journey, until the very end of his stay, when Cornelis Grapheus presented him with Luther's *Babylon Captivity*, that had appeared some eight months earlier in Latin.¹⁶⁹ By that time, in June 1521, the buying, selling, printing and even possession of Luther's books and pamphlets was prohibited by law, and the first public book burnings had long since taken place.¹⁷⁰

Would Dürer's sympathy and support for Luther's cause have made him *persona non grata* in Antwerp? Most certainly. When it would have become known that Dürer, like his friends Cornelis Grapheus and Jacob Probst, was following in Luther's footsteps he might have been

never left me.") (Rupprich, *Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass...*, op. cit., vol. 1, pp. 168–69; Ashcroft, *Albrecht Dürer...*, op. cit., vol. 1, p. 579).

¹⁶⁶ Ashcroft, *Albrecht Dürer...*, op. cit., p. 586; Rupprich, *Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass...*, op. cit., vol. 1, pp. 175–76: "Jch hab in allen meinen machen, zehrungen, verkaufen und andrer handlung nachthail gehabt jm Niederland, jn all mein sachen, gegen grossen und niedern ständen, und sonderlich hat mir frau Margareth, für das ich ihr geschenckt und gemacht hab, nichts geben."

¹⁶⁷ Heike Sahm, *Dürers kleinere Texte. Konventionen als Spielraum für Individualität* (Tübingen, 2002), pp. 133–84, spec. 137–55, 182–84.

¹⁶⁸ Stijn Alsteens, "Ein Erzherzoglicher Auftrag? Dürers *Jungfrau und Kind mit Heiligen* von 1521/22," in *Dürer war hier...*, op. cit., pp. 399–427.

¹⁶⁹ *De captivitate Babylonica ecclesiae, praeludium Martini Lutheri*, October 1520.

¹⁷⁰ Stumpel, "Luther in Dürers Tagebuch...", op. cit., p. 135.

arrested and forced to recant, and it would certainly have cost him his yearly imperial life rent. There can hardly be any doubt that Dürer's sympathy for Luther would make a future as Antwerp's city painter impossible. Had Albrecht Dürer himself decided to return home, or had the Antwerp city council nullified the contract with the Nuremberg superstar? And when was the turning point? Since Dürer still hoped to receive the commission for his large altarpiece from Margaret of Austria as late as 6 June 2021, it seems unlikely that he planned to return to Nuremberg one month later, but of course Dürer could have painted this prestigious altarpiece, an imaginary pendant to the *Feast of the Rose Garlands*, just as easily in Nuremberg.

According to Jeroen Stumpel, Dürer started to ship things home shortly before the dreadful news about the Worms Diet and Martin Luther's destiny reached Antwerp.¹⁷¹ On 12 May 1521, Dürer paid the Nuremberg merchant Paul Geiger one guilder and four stuivers to transport a small box (*kästlein*) and a letter to his home town.¹⁷² However, already two months earlier Dürer started to transport things to Nuremberg. On 16 March 1521 he handed over a carter's barrel to Jakob and Andreas Hessler, to be delivered at the house of Hans Imhoff the Elder in Nuremberg, and in the last week of April another shipment went out, this time with another carrier, Hans Staber. A fourth, larger transport, with a carrier called Kunz Metz, would take place on 5 June 1521, one day before he made his two-day trip with Agnes to Mechelen, to plead with Margaret for the commission of his altarpiece.¹⁷³

From his arrival in Antwerp until mid-March 1521 Dürer was in regular contact with three highly placed officials and civil servants of the city, especially with Pieter Gillis, the first Antwerp town clerk, the attorney-general and public orator of the city, Adriaen Herbouts, and, significantly, Lorenz Sterck, the revenue collector and exchequer official of Brabant and Antwerp. They dined together and overloaded each other with gifts. Dürer made a portrait drawing of Herbouts and even a painted one of Lorenz Sterck, most likely the portrait in Madrid (fig. 57). There is a clear peak in the meetings Dürer had with these city officials; between early January and the end of March 1521.¹⁷⁴ However, before his short trip with Jan Provoost to Bruges and Ghent, between 6 and 11 April, the meetings between Dürer and the Antwerp officials had come to a complete halt.¹⁷⁵ It is more than likely that they had discussed Dürer's planned position as city painter and the political and religious minefield that began to appear before their eyes. The announcement on 26 or 27 March 1521 of an imperial edict ordering the sequestration and public burning of all publications by Martin Luther and his followers, may have caused Dürer to develop second thoughts about his Antwerp future, and it may well have led to his own decision to turn his back on the city and return to Nuremberg.¹⁷⁶

¹⁷¹ Ibid.

¹⁷² Rupprich, *Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass...*, op. cit., vol. 1, p. 169; Ashcroft, *Albrecht Dürer...*, op. cit., vol. 1, p. 580.

¹⁷³ Rupprich, *Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass...*, op. cit., vol. 1, p. 166, 169, 173; Ashcroft, *Albrecht Dürer...*, op. cit., vol. 1, pp. 576, 579, 584. On Dürer's shipments to Nuremberg, see Sahm, *Dürers kleinere Texte...*, op. cit., p. 144.

¹⁷⁴ Rupprich, *Dürer. Schriftlicher Nachlass...*, op. cit., vol. 1, pp. 158, 165, 166, 167.

¹⁷⁵ He only presented Lorenz Sterck with his finished portrait, which must have taken him nearly two months, much longer than the five days he would need later for that of King Christian II of Denmark, and he was paid handsomely, although not nearly enough in Dürer's book: "Jch hab dem rentmaister Lorencz Sterck gar rein fleissig mit öhl farben conterfeth, war werth 25 gulden. Das hab ich ihn geschenckt, dargegen gab er mir 20 gulden und der Susanna 1 gulden zu trinckgeldt." (ibid., vol. 1, p. 170).

¹⁷⁶ It is remarkable, too, that Dürer's close connections to the Portuguese Feitoria, the richest trade mission in Antwerp, apparently ceased to exist after the edict was issued.

The only city official he remained in contact with was Cornelis Grapheus, town clerk, musician, poet, philologist and member of Erasmus' humanist circle. Grapheus, a convinced Lutheran, would be arrested early February 1522, but recanted. He would lose his position as secretary of the city council, and only in 1540 would he regain that position. However, Grapheus would remain loyal to the Reformation and kept in close contact with Dürer until the latter's death in 1528. It was no doubt this humanist town clerk who introduced the artist to Jacob Probst, the abbot of the Augustinian monastery in Antwerp and likely author of *Luther's lament* (*Lutherklage*), as Jeroen Stumpel has argued convincingly.¹⁷⁷

Dürer's negative reception in Mechelen, where Margaret of Austria refused to accept his present of her father's portrait, making a potential commission for his large altarpiece impossible, seems to have triggered something in Dürer. After his return to Antwerp, 8 June 1521, he is found in the Augustinian monastery, again and again, eating together with the brothers there. Accepting Grapheus' gift of Luther's *Babylonian Captivity*, only a few days before he would leave Antwerp for good, makes clear that Dürer was, after all, no *Homo oeconomicus*, but a devout man of principles – to which he would remain loyal.

Joos van Cleve may have been happy for Dürer's departure. Their characters and artistic visions differed enormously, but would Dürer have stayed on as Antwerp's first painter, he might have become a serious competitor, forcing Joos van Cleve to a less prominent position. However, Dürer left Antwerp and the inquisition that had started in Antwerp a few months after Dürer returned home did not affect Joos van Cleve. On the contrary, the future had never looked better.

¹⁷⁷ Stumpel, "Luther in Dürers Tagebuch....," op. cit., pp. 128–33.